



CITY OF LAKEPORT
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
INITIAL STUDY / ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
(GPA 16-01,ZC 16-01 and ER 16-01)

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: General Plan and Zoning Inconsistencies throughout the City Limits of Lakeport, California
General Plan Amendment & Zone Change

Permit Number: GPA 16-01; ZC 16-01 & ER 16-01

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

Contact Person and Phone Number: Daniel D. Chance, Associate Planner
(707) 263-5613 x19

Project Location(s): Various Parcels, Lakeport
APN: Varies Parcels (See Attachment 1)

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

General Plan Designation: Existing: (See Attachment 2)
Proposed: (See Attachment 2)

Zoning: Existing: (See Attachment 2)
Proposed: (See Attachment 2)

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 Lakeport General Plan 2025 was adopted in August of 2009. With that adoption, discrepancies between the Land Use Designation in the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance were created. A total of ninety-one (91) parcels with such discrepancies have been identified by Community Development Department Staff throughout the City.

In the determination of the appropriate changes, staff reviewed the following for determining recommended changes:

- Review of the goals in the land use section of the General Plan
- On-site review to determine the use taking place on the property and the immediate area for compatibility

On December 14, 2016, the Planning Commission and Community Development Department staff reviewed the inconsistencies between General Plan Designations and Zoning District land use mapping in the City limits of Lakeport. At that time, the Community Development Department staff and the Planning Commission reviewed proposed strategies for resolving these conflicts. A list (Attachment 1) and maps (Attachment 2) of identified parcels were reviewed by the Planning Commission in December 12, 2016. The inconsistencies reflect parcels with a zoning designation that are significantly different than the General Plan designation.

General Plan Land Use Designations & Zoning District Compatibility Table

General Plan Land Use Designation	Compatible Zoning District*
Residential	R-1 & R-2
High Density Residential	R-3 & R-5
Light Retail	C-1
Major Retail	C-1, C-2 & C-3
Resort Residential	R-5
Office Space	PO
Central Business District	CB
Industrial	I & C-3
Parkland/Open Space	OS
Public and Civic Uses	PCU

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION AND ZONING INCONSISTENCIES:

The following discussions for the changes for those properties that include the current recommendations to either change that include both General Plan Amendments and Zoning Changes to eliminate those inconsistencies identified in Attachment 1.

A summary of proposed recommendations to resolve individual discrepancies is provided here:

1. Those properties located adjacent to the Lakeport School District (2503 & 2508 Howard Street and 250 Lange Street) and currently used as school offices and school parking. *[Recommendation: General Plan Amendment from Residential to Public and Civic Use.]*
2. Those properties located along Lakeshore Boulevard (2301 Beach Street, 2435, 2440, 2468, 2502, 2432, 2427 and 2410 Lakeshore Boulevard) are primarily single family dwellings, with the exception of 2301 Beach Street (Anthony's RV Park). *[Recommendation: Rezoning from R-5, Resort/High Density Residential to R-1 Low Density Residential for this area. The rezoning to R-1 would make Anthony's RV Park a legal nonconforming use prohibiting any future expansion of any resort or high density residential uses.]*
3. The two properties of 1920 and 1940 Hartley Street are currently developed with single family dwellings. *[Recommendation: General Plan Amendment from Major Retail to Residential.]*
4. The four properties located along the north side of 11th Street (1150, 1320, 1330 and 1192 11th Street) are currently developed with single family dwellings on large lots; however the General Plan identifies these properties as Office Space. The Transportation Element of the General Plan identifies the need for the extension of Alden Avenue out to Eleventh Street in this area as means of improving north-south connection within the City. As an incentive to facilitate this goal, *[Recommendation: Extending the 11th Street Professional Overlay along the northern side of 11th Street, changing those properties to R-1 Low Density Residential with the inclusion of the 11th Street Professional Overlay. Excluding the flag portion of 1170 11th Street.]*
5. The property at 201 Smith Street is currently utilized by the Lake County Sheriff's Office the Sheriff's Office. *[Recommendation: Rezoning the property to PCU Public and Civic Use to be in conformance with the General Plan Designation of Public and Civic Use.]*
6. The property at 520 Smith Street is currently a single family dwelling on large lot. *[Recommendation: Rezoning the property to R-3 High Density Residential to be in conformance with the General Plan Designation of High Density Residential.]*
7. A number of parcels located in the downtown area of North Forbes Street, (825, 775, 727, 625, 601, 555 and 501 North Forbes Street) are identified within the Low Density, Medium, and High Density Residential zoning districts. While the General Plan designation identifies those properties as Office Space. The area is primarily made up of single family dwellings. *[Recommendation: Amending Section 17.15 of the Zoning Ordinance, "Regulations for the Eleventh Street Professional Use or "P" Combining District", by removing the reference to 'Eleventh Street' and allowing this combining district to be utilized in other areas of the City where we see the transition of existing single-family residential units to professional offices. This would preserve the existing residential uses in the area, while providing a larger potential inventory for offices in the immediate downtown and courthouse area.]*
8. A number of parcels located in the downtown area of North Tunis Street, North Brush Street, Third Street, Second Street, and First Street; (825 and 775 North Tunis Street; 325, 305, 140,155, 143, 135, 125 and 130 North Brush Street; 480 and 475 Third Street; 470 Second Street; 490 First Street) are identified within the Low Density, Medium, and High Density Residential zoning districts. While the General Plan designation identifies those properties as Office Space. The area is primarily made up of single family dwellings. *[Recommendation: Amending Section 17.15 of the Zoning Ordinance, "Regulations for the Eleventh Street Professional Use or "P" Combining District", by removing the reference to 'Eleventh Street' and allowing this combining district to be utilized in other areas of the City where we see the transition of existing single-family residential units to professional offices. This would preserve the existing residential uses in the area, while providing a larger potential inventory for offices in the immediate downtown and courthouse area.]*

9. A number of parcels located in the downtown area of Martin Street, Armstrong Street and South High Street; (202, 230, 260, 290, 350 and 390 Martin Street; 215 Armstrong Street; 250, 235, 295 South High Street) are identified within the Low Density, Medium, and High Density Residential zoning districts. While the General Plan designation identifies those properties as Office Space. The area is primarily made up of single family dwellings. *[Recommendation: Amending Section 17.15 of the Zoning Ordinance, "Regulations for the Eleventh Street Professional Use or "P" Combining District", by removing the reference to 'Eleventh Street' and allowing this combining district to be utilized in other areas of the City where we see the transition of existing single-family residential units to professional offices. This would preserve the existing residential uses in the area, while providing a larger potential inventory for offices in the immediate downtown and courthouse area.]*
10. A number of parcels located in the downtown area of South Forbes Street, (301, 325, 355, 385 and 455 South Forbes Street) are identified within the Low Density, Medium, and High Density Residential zoning districts. While the General Plan designation identifies those properties as Office Space. The area is primarily made up of single family dwellings. *[Recommendation: Amending Section 17.15 of the Zoning Ordinance, "Regulations for the Eleventh Street Professional Use or "P" Combining District", by removing the reference to 'Eleventh Street' and allowing this combining district to be utilized in other areas of the City where we see the transition of existing single-family residential units to professional offices. This would preserve the existing residential uses in the area, while providing a larger potential inventory for offices in the immediate downtown and courthouse area.]*
11. The property at 25 C Street is a single family dwelling. *[Recommendation: Rezoning the property to R-5 Resort/High Density Residential, consistent with the zoning in the immediate area.]*
12. The properties at 700 & 900 Esplanade Street serve as private open space area for the adjacent community. The General Plan designation is Open Space and the Zoning is R-1 Low Density Residential. *[Recommendation: Rezoning to OS Open Space to reflect the park setting.]*
13. The property at 27 K Street is currently developed with a duplex. *[Recommendation: Rezoning the property to R-2 Medium Density Residential.]*
14. The property at 23 K Street is owned by the City of Lakeport and is developed with a pump station which draws water from Clear Lake and delivers it to the water treatment facility at 590 Konocti Avenue. *[Recommendation: Changing both the General Plan Designation and Zoning to PCU Public and Civic Use.]*
15. The properties at 1250 Pike Street and 30 Royal are currently developed with single family residential units. *[Recommendation: General Plan Amendment to Residential, reflecting the current use.]*
16. The property at 100 Kimberly Lane is the subject of a recently recorded lot line adjustment and Architectural and Design Review for a general retail store (Dollar General) and the property at 1525 South Main Street have a General Plan Designation of Major Retail and a Zoning of C-2, Major Retail and I, Industrial. *[Recommendation: Mending the General Plan Designation to reflect the boundaries of this new adjusted parcels providing "I" Industrial for the lands currently in the rear portions of the properties, while those properties fronting South Main Street to remain Major Retail.]*
17. A number of parcels located along Campbell Lane, Grace Lane, and Industrial Avenue Street have a General Plan Designation of Major Retail and a Zoning of I Industrial. *[Recommendation: Amending the General Plan Designation to Industrial. This would provide a larger area for the much needed industrial uses within the City.]*

18. The property at 1125 North Main Street is currently developed with an apartment complex. *[Recommendation: Amending the General Plan Designation of the entire parcel to High Density Residential consistent with existing use of the property.]*
19. 950 & 1090 North Forbes Street, 175 10th Street and 975 North Main Street have a General Plan Designation of High Density Residential and Zoning of PO Professional Office. *[Recommendation: Providing Office Space for the portion of land fronting Forbes Street and Major Retail for portions of property fronting Main Street.]*
20. A number of properties along Lakeport Boulevard, are owned by the County of Lake and County Agricultural Department. These properties currently have a General Plan Designation of Public and Civic Use and Zoning C-2 Major Retail. *[Recommendation: Rezoning the properties to PCU Public and Civic Uses to reflect the government use of these properties.]*
21. A property along Konocti Avenue is owned by the City for a Senior Center. This properties currently has a General Plan Designation of Public and Civic Use and Zoning C-2 Major Retail. *[Recommendation: Rezoning the property to PCU Public and Civic Uses to reflect the government use of these properties.]*
22. A number of properties along Lakeport Boulevard, Konocti Avenue and Larrecou Lane are owned by the City, the Fire District and the County of Lake. These properties currently have a General Plan Designation of Public and Civic Use and Zoning C-2 Major Retail. *[Recommendation: Rezoning the property to PCU Public and Civic Uses to reflect the government use of these properties.]*
23. The property at 1305 Eleventh St. is currently a single family residence with a General Plan Designation of Light Commercial and Zoned R-1, Low Density Residential. *[Recommendation: Amending the General Plan Designation of the entire parcel to Low Density Residential consistent with existing use of the property.]*
24. The Property at 105 Lupoyoma Circle is currently a single family dwelling a General Plan Designation of Office Space and Zoned R-3, High Density Residential. *[Recommendation: Amending the General Plan Designation of the entire parcel to High Density Residential consistent with existing use of the property.]*
25. One property located along the north side of 11th Street (1320 11th Street) are currently developed with a single family dwelling on a large lot; however the General Plan identifies these properties as Office Space and High Density Residential. *[Recommendation: Rezoning the rear portion of the 1320 11th Street from R-1 Low Density Residential to R-3 High Density Residential.]*

The following properties have been eliminated from the inconsistencies between the General Plan Designation and Zoning land use classifications:

- A. The two properties at 800 & 810 North Main Street, Natural High Site has a General Plan Designation of Resort Residential and Zoning of OS Open Space. *[Recommendation: To be addressed as a separate General Plan Amendment and Zone change for lands within the Lakeport Lakefront Revitalization Plan Study area.]*
- B. The property at 2565 Parallel Drive is the Mendocino College Lake Center community college campus. The entire 30 acre property has a General Plan Designation of Major Retail while the Zoning is split with the approximately first 400 feet of the property fronting Parallel Drive designated as PO Professional Office with the remainder of the property designated as R-1 Low Density Residential. Neither the General Plan nor Zoning is consistent with existing uses occurring at the site. *[Recommendation: At this time, staff has met with the Mendocino College staff and discussed long term goals for the college, as well as, preparation of facilities Master Plan that may include onsite*

student housing and on-site agricultural studies. Staff would defer any changes to this property until the Master Plan is prepared.]

- C. The property's at C 35 Street and 410 Esplanade Street currently location of Vector Control, The General Plan Designation is Resort Residential and the Zoning is R-5 Resort/High Density Residential and PCU Public and Civic Uses. *[Recommendation: Not taking any action on this identified inconsistency until Vector Control completes its Master Plan as recommended by the Lake County Grand Jury 2016 Report. The General Plan land use designation or Zoning change as part of a larger development application for the Vector Control facility.]*

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

This project consists of various locations within the incorporated area of the City of Lakeport. The proposed project includes amending the General Plan or rezoning those 91-parcels determined to be inconsistent. Those changes would reflect generally what has historically taken place on those parcels, and would have no subsequent impact on those neighboring and surrounding land uses. All of the changes would be consistent with the General Plan.

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

None

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:

Daniel D. Chance, Associate Planner

March 1, 2018
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 amendments of the Lakeport General Plan and rezoning of lands under the Lakeport Zoning Ordinance throughout Lakeport to address identified inconsistencies 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 Amendments and Zoning Changes will not have a substantial adverse effect on 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. Although there will be land uses and zoning changes taking places in identified view corridors, there are no proposed projects proposed with this project and any future project would be subject to individual environmental analysis. None of the proposed changes in land use and zoning would represent a significant potential change from what is currently permitted. There is **no impact**.

Response I b): The proposed General Plan Amendments and Zoning Changes will not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway. There are no designated scenic highways within the City of Lakeport. There are no structures associated with this project that could be visible from State Highway 29. None of the proposed changes in land use and zoning would represent a potential change from what is currently permitted. There is **no impact**.

Response I c): The proposed General Plan Amendments and Zoning Changes will not have a substantial adverse effect on the visual character or quality of the sites or surroundings. None of the proposed changes in land use and zoning would represent a potential change from what is currently permitted. There is **no impact**.

Response I d): The proposed General Plan Amendments and Zoning Changes will not have a substantial adverse effect on the lighting and glare on-site or on surrounding properties. None of the proposed changes in land use and zoning would represent a potential change from what is currently permitted. There is **no impact**.

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 determined all of the properties associated with the General Plan Amendments and Zoning Changes are 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 Mapping. The proposal will not result in the conversion of prime farmland to non-agricultural use. There is **no impact**.

Response II b): The sites associated with the General Plan Amendments and Zoning Changes are 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): Changes in land use mapping associated with this 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 General Plan Amendments and Zoning Changes 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 Amendments and Zone Changes associated with the inconsistencies as part of this project will not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the County’s air quality program. There is **no impact**.

Response III b): There are no improvements associated with this project and no temporary localized increases in particulate air pollution related to construction activities within the City. Some of the changes in either the land uses or zonings may be located in mapped serpentine areas, however no improvements are proposed at this time. In addition, none of changes to the land uses and zoning changes would represent a potential change from what is currently permitted. There is **no impact**.

Response III c): The General Plan Amendments and Zone Changes associated with those inconsistencies located throughout Lakeport will not directly result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant not currently in attainment. All sites associated with the General Plan Amendments and Zoning Changes represent minor changes to the existing land uses, and would not represent a significant change from what was originally analyzed in the Environmental Impact report for the Lakeport General Plan. The Lake County region is currently under attainment levels for all criteria pollutants. There is **no impact**.

Response III d, e): Approval of the General Plan Amendments and Zone Changes associated with those inconsistencies located throughout Lakeport do not represent a significant change of use for those parcels; and subsequently, are not expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or result in the creation of objectionable odors. No development is proposed as a part of this project. 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				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Game or US Fish and Wildlife 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 Amendments and Zoning Changes will not directly result in any substantial adverse effects on candidate, sensitive, or special status species. The existing project would not include any improvements. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

Response IV b): The sites proposed with land use and zoning changes do not include development, and would not impact riparian vegetation or serve as habitat region for any identified sensitive natural community. Any future development of these properties would require the project to be reviewed for potential impact on riparian vegetation or identified sensitive habitats. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

Response IV c): No development is proposed in wetlands or vernal pools associated with this project. Any future development of these properties would require the project to be reviewed for potential impact on wetlands or vernal pools. None of the proposed changes to the land uses and/or zoning changes would represent a potential change from what is currently permitted. 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 General Plan Amendments and Zoning Changes 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. None of the proposed changes to the land uses and zoning would represent a potential change from what is currently permitted. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

Response IV e): The proposed General Plan Amendments and Zoning Changes 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 changes to the land use designations and/or zoning will not result in an impact to potential historical resources on any properties. The change in either the zoning or land use would allow some small changes to the allowed uses for a number of subject properties; however those changes would not reflect a major change in what is currently permitted by either the General Plan or Zoning Ordinance. Any future site improvements would be evaluated for impacts to potential historical or archaeological resources at that site. There is **no impact** related to this proposed project.

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 Amendments and Zoning Changes as proposed are 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 this project. There is **no impact**.

Response VI b), c), d): No development is proposed for this project. The changes in land use designation and zoning will not result in substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil or include new construction upon expansive soil. The changes to the land use designation or the zoning would not represent a significant change in the allowable uses of those properties. 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 either currently or capable of serving all subject parcels. No development is proposed 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 existing uses at these sites. The changes to the land use designation or the zoning would not represent a significant change in the allowable uses of those properties. None of changes to the land uses and zoning would represent a significant potential change from what is currently permitted, or what was originally addressed as part of the Environmental Impact Report for the Lakeport General Plan. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

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

² Ibid.

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

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				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
plan?				
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?				X

Response VIII a), b): The proposed General Plan Amendments and Zone Changes addresses inconsistencies between the land use designation and zoning on properties throughout the city of Lakeport, and no aspect of this project includes provisions associated with the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. There is **no impact**.

Response VIII c): Some of the properties involved in the General Plan Amendments and Zone Changes are located within a quarter-mile of an existing or proposed school. However, no development is proposed as part of this project. The changes to the land use designation or the zoning would not represent a significant change in the allowable uses of those properties that would have the potential of impacting existing or proposed schools. None of changes to the land uses and zoning would represent a significant potential change from what is currently permitted. There is **no impact**.

Response VIII d): The California Environmental Protection Agency compiles a list of known contaminated sites, the “Cortese List,” which includes known hazardous waste sites, leaking underground storage tanks, and landfills with evidence of groundwater contamination. Staff review of that list did not identify any identified contaminated sites either on or in close proximity to any of the properties associated with the General Plan Amendment and Zone Changes proposed as a part of this project. There is **no impact**.

Response VIII e), f): The project consists of General Plan Amendments and Zone Changes in the City of Lakeport and 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 Amendments and Zoning Changes associated with this project will not directly interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency response systems. The General Plan Amendment and Zoning Changes will not represent a significant change in land use beyond what is currently permitted and therefore will not result in any changes that will physically interfere with an adopted emergency evacuation plan. There is **no impact**.

Response VIII h): The project consists of changes to the land use mapping and zoning designations only. No development is associated with this project. Proposed changes reflect only minimal changes reflect any minimal changes to what is currently permitted on any of the subject properties. Approval of this project will not result in an increased exposure of people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wild land fires. **No impact** is identified.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:

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				X

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

Response IX a), b): The proposed General Plan Amendments and Zone Changes will not include any development or any significant change to existing land uses, and will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. In addition, none of changes to the land uses and zoning changes would represent a potential change from what is currently permitted. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in any significant increase in water demand. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

Response IX c) – f): The proposed General Plan Amendments and Zone Changes will not include any development or any significant change to existing land uses, and would not have an impact on any storm water drainage systems. 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)- i): The proposed General Plan Amendments and Zone Changes will not include any development or change in land use that would increase or impact housing located in the 100-year-floodplain. Any future development associated with housing would be evaluated through additional environmental review based on individual characteristics of a future project. There is **no impact**.

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 within the City. 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”³ in our area. Seiche waves are a potential hazard in Lakeport, however no development is proposed as a part of this project. Furthermore, all proposed changes to the land uses and zoning changes do not represent a significant change from what is currently permitted. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

Would the project:

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

	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 project consists of General Plan Amendments and Zone Changes that address inconsistencies between the City’s General Plan Designation and the Zoning Maps. None of the proposed land use or zoning changes would divide any established community. The proposed project will not impact surrounding 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 addressing inconsistencies between the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance land use designations. The purpose of this project is to either amend the General Plan designation or rezone the properties to either reflect the existing use of the property or the goals as defined in the General Plan. 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 properties. 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				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				

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 without the project?				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 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				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				

Response XII a): The project consists of correcting inconsistencies between the General Plan designation and Zoning land use classifications. None of the proposed changes will expose persons to noise levels in excess of standards established in the Lakeport Zoning Ordinance. There is **no impact**.

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

Response XII c), d): All future activities and uses at those identified sites will be subject to the noise guidelines set forth in Chapter 17.28 of the Lakeport Municipal Code. There is **no 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 proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
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): The approval of this project will not result in the increase of population of the community. The General Plan Amendments and Zone Changes will not result in any impacts that would likely substantially change housing patterns or require the extension of roads or infrastructure in the City. There is **no impact** associated with the approval of this project.

Response XIII b) - c): The project consists of correcting inconsistencies between the General Plan designation and Zoning land use classifications. One of those changes would allow professional office uses on property that was zoned High and Low Density residential, however this change reflects the office designation on those properties in the General Plan, and previously addressed as part of the

Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan. In addition, changes along 11th Street would include changing the zoning from Low Density Residential to High Density Residential, Professional Office and Light retail which reflects the General Plan Designations, and was addressed as part of the Environmental Impact Report for the General Plan. 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 project consists of correcting inconsistencies between the General Plan designation and the Zoning classification that would not result in any significant impacts to the provision of public services and utilities:

Fire protection: The change in General Plan Designation and Zoning land use classifications will not result in an increased demand for fire protection services. **No Impact.**

Police protection: The change in General Plan Designation and Zoning land use classifications will not result in an increased demand for police protection services. **No Impact.**

Schools: The change in General Plan Designation and Zoning Changes will not result in increased demands on local schools. **No Impact.**

Parks & other public facilities: This proposed General Plan Amendments and Zoning Changes do 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 Amendments and Zoning changes do 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				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				
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 safety of such facilities?				X

Response XVI a) and d): The project consists of correcting inconsistencies between the General Plan designation and the Zoning classification. Those changes 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 changes may add additional traffic along some areas, such as 11th Street or westerly of Forbes Street, however those changes reflect land uses defined in the General Plan, and consistent with what was previously addressed in the General Plan Environmental Impact Report. Any future projects associated with these properties would be required to be addressed on a case by case basis. The proposed changes to either the General Plan Designation or Zoning will not result in the generation of additional peak hour traffic or trips beyond that of the previous use of those site throughout the City. The proposed changes to either the General Plan Designation or Zoning will not result in the need for new or expanded roadways, or additional public transit.

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** identified.

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 Amendments and Zone Changes corrects inconsistencies and will not result in any changes to existing circulation patterns in the City that would impede access by emergency personnel. There is **no impact**.

Response XVI f): The change in General Plan Designation and Zoning Changes will not result in an increased demand on public transit, bicycles or pedestrian facilities. Those changes would not impact Lake County Transit. **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				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
waste?				

Response XVII a)- e): The entire City is served with adequate connections to both water and wastewater. 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 a new or expansion of existing wastewater treatment facilities. Expected water and sewer demand associated with changing the General Plan Designation or the zoning Classification will not result in the need for any upgrades to the existing water and sewer connections. There is **no impact**.

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

Response XVII f), g): Approval of the proposed General Plan Amendments and Zone Changes will not result in any increase in demand for solid waste services. 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 with sufficient capacity. There is **no impact**.

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			X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
incremental effects of an individual project are significant when viewed in connection with the effects of past 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): The proposed project consists of General Plan Amendments and Zone Changes that address inconsistencies between the General Plan Designation and the Zoning Map. No new development is proposed with this project. The uses on those properties would continue to operate whether residential or commercial. Any changes to the use of those properties primarily reflect land uses as defined in the General Plan and were subject to review under the Environmental Impact Report prepared for the General Plan. The General Plan Amendments and Zone Changes 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 continue those uses at the various sites. 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 the proposed General Plan Amendments and Zone Changes is to address inconsistencies between the General Plan and the Zoning land use designations mapping. A proposed change in either the General Plan or the Zoning land use classifications is to develop internal consistencies within the two City documents.

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.