



**CITY OF LAKEPORT**  
**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**  
**INITIAL STUDY / ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**  
**(ER 14-01)**

**INITIAL STUDY AND ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

**Project Title:** Lakeport AutoZone Parcel Map & Architectural and Design Review

**Permit Number:** PM 14-01; AR 14-11; ZC 14-01; VR 14-01; and LLA 14-01

**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):** 301 & 401 Industrial Avenue, Lakeport  
APN: 005-045-29 & -30

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

**General Plan Designation:** Major Retail

**Zoning:** Existing: Industrial  
Proposed: Major Retail (Proposed Parcel 1); Industrial (Remainder)

**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 application for a Tentative Parcel Map (PM 14-01) to create four (4) new parcels, a Zone Change (ZC 14-01) from I, Industrial to C-2, Major Retail for proposed parcel 1, a Lot Line Adjustment (LLA 14-01) with 292 Industrial Avenue, and Architectural & Design Review (AR 14-11) of a proposed 7,842 square foot retail building on proposed parcel 1, and a Variance (VR 14-01) to exceed the maximum amount of signage permitted by an additional 85 square feet on property located at 301 & 401 Industrial Avenue in Lakeport.

Notice of the project has been provided to City departments and affected agencies and the submitted comments are addressed in the Initial Study/environmental review. The following Initial Study identifies potentially significant impacts associated with the project and suggests mitigation measures which will reduce the identified impacts to a less than significant level.

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

This project is located at the southern end of the City of Lakeport. Industrial Avenue intersects the property and is accessed via South Main Street. State Highway 29 bounds the property to the west. The site is currently developed with a Marine Repair Business along the highway frontage. A couple of additional vacant commercial structures are also present at the site. Property to the northeast of the project site is vacant and zoned C-2, Major Retail. Property to the north is designated Industrial and Service Commercial. Property to the East, South and West are designated Major Retail and include the KMART Shopping Center.

**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 checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                                    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources   | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise                     | <input checked="" 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

November 18, 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 project will change the general appearance of the subject property. The construction of subdivision improvements including the public street and utilities and the development of a new building and site improvements will alter the site’s existing appearance. The project must be reviewed and approved by the City Planning Commission and City Council under the City’s Zoning and Subdivision Ordinances. Potential aesthetic impacts are discussed below and those aesthetic issues beyond the scope of the CEQA checklist are addressed in the Architectural and Design Review section of the complete staff report.

**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 project will not have a substantial adverse effect on established scenic vistas. Figure 16 of the 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. The nearest view corridor is north of the project site near Grace Lane. There is **no impact**.

**Response I b):** The project will not substantially damage scenic resources within a state scenic highway. State Route 29 is located immediately adjacent to the west of the project site but is not designated a scenic highway. There is no scenic highway in the vicinity of the project site according to the State of California Department of Transportation website (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/cahisys.htm>). There is **no impact**.

**Response I c):** The project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. The project site is an 8.5 acre parcel that is partially developed. The subdivision of the land will change the overall visual character in that new street improvements will be developed. The new retail building will be constructed on a lot that is currently undeveloped, vacant, and surrounded by commercial uses. The applicant has provided exterior building elevations, material details, and other supplemental information regarding the proposed appearance of the new retail store and related improvements. Based on the submitted materials, it appears that the proposed improvements are generally in compliance with the City’s Architectural and Design Review criteria which address a variety of topics, including the requirement that new development “harmonize style,

intensity, and type of construction with the natural environment and respect the unique features of each site and the surrounding area.”<sup>1</sup> Staff has developed a mitigation measure which calls for the provision of effective and complimentary screens around visible mechanical equipment associated with the AutoZone store. This impact is ***less than significant with mitigation.***

**Response I d):** The project including the subdivision of the land into 4 parcels, the construction of a new public street, and the installation of new utilities will promote additional development and exterior lighting. New street lights will need to be installed to City and PG&E standards along Industrial Avenue.

A photometric plan was submitted by AutoZone but only for the proposed new store location and related improvements. The AutoZone photometric analysis did not address the entire TPM area.

The new retail store plans five wall-mounted light fixtures and four soffit lights for the front (east), west, and north sides of the retail building. The location of the wall-mounted and soffit light fixtures on the retail building is shown on Sheets CE1 and PH1.

The project photometric plan (Sheet PH1) indicates that four (4) 28-foot-tall parking lights will be installed around the perimeter of the AutoZone parking lot. Two of the light poles will be double heads and installed on the east and west sides of the property to cast light on the parking lots. The two single head parking lights will be placed on the north side of the of the project site. The photometric plan shows the light dispersion pattern and the potential impacts to adjacent properties. The photometric plan indicates that the most intensive lighting impacts will be within the AutoZone parking area and on the building and adjacent walkways. There does appear to be some spill over into South Main Street as well; however, at much lower values.

The creation of new light sources that could impact nighttime views is a potentially significant environmental impact. The exterior lighting serving the new retail building and related parking, entrances, and pedestrian areas will need to be shielded, provided with property line cut-offs, and/or down-lit so as to eliminate glare-related impacts to adjacent properties and the public right-of-ways along Industrial Avenue and South Main Street. A mitigation measure requires the installation of adequately-shielded parking lot and building-mounted lighting.

As shown on the plan, the proposed luminaire schedule indicates that the proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day time views in the area. However, the proposed height of the light standards (28 feet) is not consistent with a policy set forth in the City’s General Plan. Policy CD 7.7 of the General Plan Community Design Element addresses the height of light fixtures suggests that “light standard height should be related to the lighting need of the use: street lights up to 30 feet high, parking areas up to 18’ high; walkways and malls up to 15 feet high; planting areas up to 3 feet high.”<sup>2</sup> Staff has developed a mitigation measure recommending that the height of the light standards be reduced to a maximum of 18’ if it is determined that the height reduction will not detrimentally affect the site’s illumination requirements.

All future improvements constructed on the proposed parcels will be required to comply with the City’s Architectural and Design Review standards for commercial/industrial projects set forth in Chapter 17.27 of the Municipal Code as well as the performance standards set forth in Chapter 17.28.

Aesthetic impacts are ***less than significant with mitigation.***

***See conclusion of report for recommended mitigation measures.***

---

<sup>1</sup> Lakeport Municipal Code, Section 17.27.010 D.

<sup>2</sup> Lakeport General Plan, Community Design Element, Pg. V-17

**II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:**

In determining whether the project will cause impact to agricultural resources that 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-				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				

**Response II a):** According to the State of California Important Farmland Map for Lake County and the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection (<ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2006/lak06.pdf>), the project site is not considered prime farmland, unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance. The project site is located in an “Urban and Built-Up Land” area according to the Important Farmland Map. The project 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. There is **no impact**.

**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**.

**No recommended mitigation measures.**

### 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				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X		
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?		X		

**Response III a):** Notice of the project was provided to the Lake County Air Quality Management District (LCAQMD) and there was no indication that the proposed project will conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the County’s Air Quality program. The LCAQMD indicates the project can be “supported for air quality concerns” provided that certain concerns are adequately addressed. There is **no impact**.

**Response III b):** The construction of the project including the proposed subdivision improvements including the new street, utilities, storm drain systems, the new retail store and the related site improvements will result in temporary localized increases in particulate air pollution related to earthmoving, hauling, trenching, demolition, and other construction activities. Construction activities also result in pollutant emissions from the operation of gasoline and diesel powered equipment. These potential impacts are **less than significant with mitigation with mitigation**.

See conclusion of report for recommended mitigation measures related to minimizing the generation of dust during construction periods and other potential air quality-related issues.

**Response III c):** Based on the response from LCAQMD, development of the project will not directly result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant not currently in attainment. The Lake County region is currently under attainment levels for all criteria pollutants. There is **no impact**.

**Response III d, e):** The project is 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. Residential areas to the east and southeast of the project site may be considered sensitive receptors.

According to Figure 19 (Serpentine Rock and Soils) in the General Plan, there are no serpentine soils mapped on the project site. Serpentine soils are mapped immediately north of Industrial Avenue. The geotechnical study that was prepared for the project did not indicate that serpentine soils are present on the project site (GeoBoden Inc., 2013).

The project will result in a slight increase in traffic volumes and related vehicle emissions in the area. However, the potential increase in emissions associated with the project is not significant and will not detrimentally affect the existing air quality in the area.

Air quality impacts associated with the future retail activities are **less than significant with mitigation incorporation**. See conclusion of report for the recommended mitigation measure.

The development of TPM/subdivision improvements may result in temporary localized increases in particulate air pollution. Street and utility construction, storm drain line construction, site filling and compacting of the AutoZone building and parking lot pad will create potentially significant air quality impacts. In order to minimize the generation of dust or other air quality problems during construction periods, appropriate mitigation measures in conjunction with all development stages and projects is necessary.

Notice of the proposal was provided to the Lake County Air Quality Management District (LCAQMD) and the following comments were submitted:

- ❖ Parcel splits into 4 parcels or less would not be expected to have a significant air quality impacts with adequate construction phase dust controls and road surfacing requirements. Access roads and driveways are recommended to be asphaltic concrete, concrete or other durable surface that is not subject to fugitive dust generation. No significant impact in this regard would be expected if whatever utilized access is a paved and maintained surface.
- ❖ The subject property is located near an area known to contain serpentine rock and/or soils. Serpentine commonly contains regulated amounts of asbestos. The applicant should be aware of the District and State of California serpentine regulations regarding disturbing this material. If serpentine is found to be present during grading or construction, compliance with the requirements of the District's serpentine control regulation is required. The District's regulation requires an approved serpentine dust control plan, no visible emissions, worker notification, posting and covering of disturbed serpentine surfaces subject to traffic wear or wind erosion. Depending on the size of the project the State requires specific prescribed requirements. The District should be contacted prior to disturbing serpentine materials.
- ❖ The District recommends that vegetation removed during lot development and construction phase on Parcels 1 and 3 be chipped and spread for erosion control. (Staff note: There are no plans to remove any vegetation in conjunction with the proposed project.)
- ❖ With adequate mitigation, the project should not have a significant air quality impact and a mitigated negative declaration could be supported for air quality issues.

In order to minimize the generation of dust during construction, site grading and building activities should be avoided during windy periods and all surfaces subject to grading and/or heavy traffic and equipment usage, including public streets, should be wetted down with water. Materials transported to and from the site must be covered or thoroughly watered in order to minimize fugitive dust and any spilled materials must be removed from City roadways immediately.

Development or redevelopment of the proposed parcels will likely result in increased traffic volumes and related vehicle emissions in the area. These potential impacts will be evaluated in conjunction with future development proposals. However, the potential increase in emissions associated with future development is not expected to detrimentally affect the existing air quality in the area.

The proposed subdivision will not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant, expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or create objectionable odors that will affect a substantial number of people.

***See conclusion of report for recommended mitigation measures.***

**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 Service?		X		
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				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				
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

The project site has been previously partially developed and substantially altered and disturbed by previously grading and filling activities and is now generally open and not heavily vegetated except for several locations around the perimeter of the property.

The most notable vegetation exists along the northern property line where there is a linear stand of Cottonwood, Willow, Oak trees and underbrush, adjacent to a pond in the southern triangular shaped area of APN 05-045-29 south of McAtee’s Marine, in between K Mart and Hwy 29, and a line of Cottonwood and Willow trees in and adjacent to the open surface water channel south of McAtee’s Marine.

County GIS maps also show a cluster of cottonwood and oak trees in the vicinity of a small storm water drainage course that extends through the APN 05-045-29. The trees and vegetation around the drainage course and to the west of the Kmart retention/mitigation pond is habitat harboring/sheltering various bird species and other small wildlife typically found in a wetland or riparian areas.

The southern edge of the project site contains a berm with non-native grasses. The southern side of the berm on the K-Mart side has been planted with redwood trees.

The project site is not known to support any potential waters of the United States, however there are wetlands and a potentially sensitive natural community/habitat suitable for special-status species along the west side of the retention/mitigation pond to the west of the Kmart building and the open drainage channels. The project may lead to a potentially significant impact on the environment around this pond and drainage channels and mitigation in the form of a 20 foot development setback from the top of banks (where remaining) is recommended.

The site has moderate habitat function and biologic value for potentially important plant and animal species.

It appears that the proposed parcels can be developed or redeveloped without significantly altering the site’s existing biological resources as long as appropriate mitigation measures are implemented.

**Response IV a):** The project would not 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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. This determination is based on the disturbed nature of the site, moderate habitat conditions, and a review of existing information, including the California Department of Fish and

Wildlife Natural Diversity Data Base records for the area (2014). No special-status species have been previously reported on the project site (CNDDDB 2014). Therefore, there is **no impact**.

**Response IV b):** The project could have a substantial adverse effect on the limited riparian habitat adjacent to and west of the Kmart retention/mitigation pond and those areas associated with the drainage channels. Consistent with General Plan policies within the Conservation Element which encourage the protection of watercourses and riparian areas through the implementation of buffers between these areas and proposed development the final map should include a 20' setback from the open drainage channel traversing proposed parcel 3 and the pond adjacent to the southeastern property corner of proposed parcel 3. No development or disturbance should be allowed to occur in this area. These potential impacts are **less than significant with mitigation**.

**Response IV c):** This checklist question addresses potential impacts to federally protected waters of the United States, including wetlands, which are under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The proposed project would not 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 because no waters of the United States (including wetlands) occur on the project site. However, as discussed in Response IV(b) the final map should include a 20' setback from the open drainage channel traversing proposed parcel 3 and the pond adjacent to the southeastern property corner of proposed parcel 3 consistent with General Plan policies within the Conservation Element which encourage the protection of watercourses and riparian areas through the implementation of buffers between these sensitive biological area and development. These potential impacts are **less than significant with mitigation**.

**Response IV d):** The project will not directly result in substantial adverse impacts to the 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 developed nature of the area surrounding the project site, including SR 29 to the west, presents barriers for migration and reduces the overall quality of habitat for native and migratory wildlife species in the area. There is **no impact**.

**Response IV e):** The project and related site improvements will not directly result in any conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. No native trees will be directly or indirectly affected by the proposed project. There is **no impact**.

**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**.

The project will not impact the diversity and numbers of existing plants and animals on the subject property.

Based on a review of the submitted materials and taking into account the scope of the proposal, the project will not result in impacts to sensitive, endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats; locally designated species; wetland habitat; or wildlife dispersal or migration corridors. The project will not 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 the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

The developed urban nature of the area surrounding the project site, including Highway 29 to the immediate west, means that the proposed improvements associated with the AutoZone project will not

interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

*See conclusion of report for recommended mitigation measure.*

**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		

The project has the potential to significantly impact to the site’s cultural resources unless mitigation measures are incorporated and implemented.

AutoZone retained Area West Environmental, Inc. to conduct a cultural resources survey and prepare a report to support this CEQA analysis (Area West Environmental 2013). The survey addresses the proposed location of the AutoZone store and not the entire La Monica property. However, it’s reasonable to assume that the findings of the survey apply to the entire 8.532 acres. The survey consisted of four components, including office and archival research, records search through the Northwest Information Center at California State University, contact with Native American groups and related agencies, and a pedestrian survey on December 11, 2013. During the field visit, three presence/absence soil test pits were excavated.

According to the submitted report, no surface prehistoric cultural resources were observed on the property. Although no surface cultural materials were located during the pedestrian survey, the report states that there is a high probability of subsurface materials being located on the property, given the proximity of several prehistoric sites, and that at other sites within a mile of the project site. In addition, the report stated that the possibility of subsurface human remains cannot be eliminated (Area West Environmental, 2013).

**Response V a):** No historical resources that meet the criteria of significance under CEQA are located on or adjacent to the project site. There is **no impact**.

**Response V b):** The project requires construction of street improvements and underground utilities. The development of Parcel 1 for the AutoZone building will also require land grading and utility line excavation and other soil disturbance activities associated with the building construction. Parcel 1 may also need to be over excavated prior to engineered fill placement for the building pad. It is possible that ground-disturbing activities may inadvertently uncover buried, previously unknown cultural resources. In the event that construction activities occur within previously undisturbed soils and buried cultural resources are discovered, such resources could be damaged or destroyed, potentially resulting in significant impacts on cultural resources. Potential future, unanticipated impacts on cultural resources associated with the future construction activities are **less than significant with mitigation**. See conclusion of report for the recommended mitigation measure.

**Response V c):** It is possible that project ground-disturbing activities may uncover buried paleontological resources (i.e. fossils). In the event that construction activities occur within previously undisturbed soils and buried paleontological resources are discovered, such resources could be damaged or destroyed, potentially resulting in significant impacts on paleontological resources. These potential impacts are **less than significant with mitigation**. See conclusion of report for the recommended mitigation measure.

**Response V d):** There are no known formal cemeteries in the project area, and neither the results of the records search nor the pedestrian survey indicate that human remains are present on the project site. However, there is a potential that ground-disturbing activities during construction may uncover previously unknown buried human remains, which would be a potentially significant impact. Potential impacts are **less than significant with mitigation**. See conclusion of report for the recommended mitigation measure.

Future development proposals will be submitted to the California Historical Resources Information System at Sonoma State University for review and comment. Any recommended mitigation measures will be imposed as conditions of approval.

**See conclusion of report for recommended mitigation measures.**

**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			X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.				
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			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

AutoZone Inc. retained GeoBoden Inc. to prepare a geotechnical investigation report for the proposed retail building project site (GeoBoden Inc., 2013). The report does not address the entire TPM project, but does contain the results of the field investigation, laboratory testing, and recommendations pertaining to geotechnical design aspects of the proposed retail site development.

According to the Lake County Soil Conservation Service – Soil Survey, three types of soil are present within the project area including Henneke-Montara-Rock outcrop complex with slopes varying between 15% and 50%; Manzanita loam with slopes varying between 5% and 15%; and Still gravelly loam.

The Henneke-Montara-Rock outcrop soils are present in the northeast portion of the site on the north side of Industrial Avenue. The permeability of the Henneke soil is moderately slow, surface runoff is rapid, and the hazard of erosion is severe. The Montara soil is described as shallow and well-drained and is also subject to rapid surface runoff and severe erosion according to the soils survey. Rock outcrop consists of hard, fractured serpentinitic rock. The survey states that this soil classification is mainly used as wildlife habitat and watershed.

The Manzanita loam soils are present in the western and southwestern portion of the subject properties. This soil is a very deep, well drained soil typically found on terraces. Permeability of this soil is slow, surface runoff is medium and the hazard of erosion is moderate. The main development-related limitation is the soil's slow permeability.

The Still gravelly loam soil is described as a very deep and well-drained soil typically found on alluvial planes. This soil is found in the central and eastern portions of the subject properties. Permeability of the soil is moderately slow, surface runoff is very slow, and the hazard of erosion is slight. In terms of development, its main limitations are moderately slow permeability and the hazard of flooding.

The approval of the TPM will require City street and underground utility improvements which are expected to be constructed in conjunction with the proposed AutoZone store. These improvements may lead to significant adverse environmental impacts associated with the exposure of people or structures to strong seismic ground shaking, seismic related ground failure, landslides, and related geologic impacts; expose people to potential impacts involving erosion; changes in topography or unstable soil conditions resulting from excavation, grading or fill; land subsidence; expansive soils; or unique geologic or physical features.

The City will require geotechnical/soil reports to be submitted in conjunction with the construction of City street and utility facilities and for each future development proposal. Said reports will be used to determine potential impacts to the project site's geology and soils and appropriate mitigations measures will be imposed to reduce such impacts to a less than significant level.

All applicable recommendations set forth in the AutoZone geotechnical investigation will be incorporated into the final grading plan and the applicable construction plans as construction notes or in a similar manner.

**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 Lakeport 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."<sup>3</sup> "Active" earthquake faults are defined as those for which there is evidence of activity during the last 11,000 years, or Holocene time. Active faults in our area include the Mayacama, about seven miles southeast of Lakeport, and the Konocti Bay, nine miles to the east. The Healdsburg and San Andreas faults lay 24 and 35 miles to the southwest. Faults near Lakeport, categorized as "potentially active," include the Collayomi, nine miles southwest; the Barlett Springs, approximately 20 miles east; and the Big Valley, running along the west shore of Clear Lake. According to the geotechnical report prepared for the project site, the Big Valley fault is the closest known active fault, located within 0.15-mile of the site with an anticipated maximum moment magnitude of 6.4. Immediately east of the City, between the City limits and Clear Lake, there is a potentially active 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.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Lakeport General Plan, Safety Element, Pg. X-1

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

There is no indication that seismic-related issues will preclude development of the proposed project. As such, potential impacts related to the potential rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, or seismic-related ground failure are considered to be **less than significant**.

**Response VI a. iv):** No potential adverse effects related to landslides are anticipated as a result of the project. The project site is level and is not subject to landslides. There is **no impact**.

**Response VI b):** According to the geotechnical report, the soils in the area of Parcel 1 consist primarily of clayey silt, sand, silty sand and clayey sand underlain by bedrock. Observed subsurface soils consisted of native soils to the maximum explored depth of 21.5 feet below ground surface. The geotechnical report contains a detailed analysis of the site's soil conditions and addresses geotechnical limitations including the potential for erosion, soil stability issues, and the presence of expansive soils. This report provides recommendations related to site and foundation preparation, fill placement and compaction requirements, utility trench backfill, and foundations (GeoBoden Inc., 2013). As stated above, all applicable recommendations set forth in the geotechnical investigation will be incorporated into the final grading plan and the applicable construction plans as construction notes or in a similar manner.

Based on the findings of this geotechnical analysis and the incorporation of the geotechnical recommendations into the project design, the proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. The impact is considered to be **less than significant**.

Erosion control measures will be implemented during the construction and post-construction periods due to storm water mitigation requirements. The project is subject to the City's erosion control regulations (Municipal Code Ch. 17.20), storm water management ordinance (Municipal Code Ch. 8.40), the Lake County Clean Water Program Storm Water Management Plan, and the State Water Resources Control Board's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit.

Issues related to site drainage and erosion control are further addressed in the Hydrology and Water Quality section of this Initial Study.

**Response VI c):** The proposed project is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that could become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. As stated in the geotechnical report prepared for the project, for liquefaction to occur on a site, three key components are required: 1) liquefaction-susceptible soils; 2) groundwater within a depth of 50 feet or less; and 3) and strong earthquake shaking. Soils susceptible to liquefaction are generally saturated loose to medium dense sands and non-plastic silt deposits below the water table. The geotechnical analysis stated that the site is underlain by shallow bedrock.

A supplemental soils analysis prepared by registered civil engineer shall be provided to the City for review and approval prior to the issuance of a development permit. The soils report should specifically address existing conditions and needed improvement to support the entire development of Industrial Avenue associated with this project. Potential impacts are **less than significant with mitigation**.

**Response VI d):** The proposed project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in California Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property. The geotechnical report states that the near surface soils have a low to medium expansion potential. However, the report indicates that the proposed new footings will not be affected by soil expansion if recommendations in the report are incorporated into geotechnical design. The report states that reinforcement of footings should be designed by the structural engineer based on the anticipated loading conditions and that the structure footings that are supported in low to medium expansive soils should have No. 5 bars (two top and two bottom). AutoZone has incorporated these recommendations into the project design. This impact is **less than significant**.

**Response VI e):** The 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 will serve the proposed project. No septic tanks are proposed. There is **no impact**.

No impact anticipated in conjunction with the proposed TPM.

**See conclusion of report for recommended mitigation measure.**

**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	

AutoZone Inc. retained GeoBoden Inc. to prepare a Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact Analysis and letter (GeoBoden Inc., 2014) associated with the AutoZone retail store and associated site improvements. This letter does not cover the entire area associated with the TPM project. The letter stated that long-term air quality effects could cause some localized air quality degradation related to increased vehicular traffic. However, due to the small size of the proposed development and considering that the store will consist of an auto parts store like the O’Reilly store on the south side of the site, the project would not 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).

**Response VII a):** As discussed previously in the Air Quality section, implementation of the proposed project would result in short-term emissions during construction, as well as emissions during operation of the retail store. Potential impacts associated with project construction and operation of the proposed project is discussed below.

**Construction**

The most common greenhouse gases (GHG) resulting from human activity are carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O). The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32) also define GHGs to include hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorinated carbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>). HFCs and PFCs are usually emitted in industrial processes and, therefore, are not applicable to the proposed project.

Construction activities would generate short-term emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O from the use heavy-duty equipment and on-road vehicles (e.g., employee commuter cars and haul trucks).

GHG emissions are typically evaluated in relation to meeting Assembly Bill 32 GHG reduction goals and/or other GHG thresholds adopted by air districts within the state. Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), which was signed in 2006, codified the state's GHG emission target by requiring that the state's GHG emission be reduced to 1990 levels by 2020. The Scoping Plan for AB 32 identifies specific measures to reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and requires the Air Resources Board and other state agencies to develop and enforce regulations and other initiatives for reducing GHGs. The Scoping Plan also recommends, but does not require, an emissions reduction goal for local governments of 15% below "current" emissions to be achieved by 2020.

GHG impacts caused by emissions from project construction would be ***less than significant***.

### **Operation**

Operation of the retail project would generate long-term emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, and SF<sub>6</sub>. These emissions would be generated from electricity generation and transmission and transport water for irrigation. Equipment and maintenance trips would also represent a minor source of CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O. Note that trees and other vegetation planted in the landscaping would create a long-term emissions sink that would actively sequester atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>.

LCAQMD has reviewed the proposed project and submitted comments related to greenhouse gas emissions. The retail project will result in an increase in the amount of vehicle traffic in the area which could cause some localized air quality degradation. Issues related to traffic will be addressed in the Transportation/Traffic section.

Although solar power has not been incorporated into the proposed project, a variety of methods will be used to promote an energy-efficient project. The facilities electrical, lighting and mechanical systems will be run through an Energy Management System ("Venstar") which complies with Title 24 energy management requirements. Controls for this system will be monitored at a remote monitoring station at AutoZone headquarters.

The GHG emissions that will be generated during operation of the proposed project will not significantly impact the environment. This impact is therefore considered ***less than significant***.

***Response VII b):*** As discussed above, the project includes a number of energy efficiency measures that will contribute to long-term GHG reductions. These measures are consistent with strategies identified in the AB 32 Scoping Plan and statewide goals to conserve energy. Based on the review of project design features, implementation of the project is not expected to conflict with the goals of AB 32.

In addition, the LCAQMD indicated that if their stated concerns are adequately addressed, the District can support the approval of the project. There was no indication from the District that the proposed project will conflict with any plan, policy or regulation related to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. This impact is considered ***less than significant***.

**No mitigation measures are proposed.**

**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?				
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?				

The project would not appear to create significant adverse impact related to hazards and hazardous waste.

All new propane tanks serving future development will be required to maintain adequate setbacks from property lines and structures or be buried. All proposed commercial/industrial activities will be thoroughly reviewed and will be required to comply with the City's Zoning and performance standards.

Future tenants of the new parcels and related physical improvements may be exposed to risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires as a large undeveloped area exists to the west of Highway 29. This risk will be reduced to a less than significant level provided that an adequate number of fire hydrants are installed to serve each of the proposed parcels and improvements thereon. There are currently no fire hydrants in the vicinity of the existing improvements as the nearest one is located at the southwest corner of South Main Street and Industrial Avenue according to City records. All future improvements will be required to be within 250' of a fire hydrant. The City Engineer has suggested the provision of a fire hydrant per the Uniform Fire Code and the direction of the Fire District Chief. City staff has recommended a condition of approval requiring the extension of a water main and the installation of a fire hydrant at the west end of the Industrial Avenue. (See related mitigation measure in *Public Services* section of this Initial Study.)

There is a private school located in the vicinity of the project west of Highway 29. The project will not authorize the establishment of any businesses that will emit hazardous emissions, handle hazardous materials, etc. The proposed project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous material sites compiled pursuant to Government Code section 65962.5.

The project 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.

The project would not appear to impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

Emergency personnel response time is not a significant issue given the proximity of the Main Street fire station to the subject property.

**Response VIII a, b):** Construction of the proposed project would involve the use of heavy equipment, which would contain fuels and oils, and various other products that could be characterized as hazardous materials. As part of the proposed project, the contractor will implement measures identified in a spill prevention and control plan to ensure transport, storage, and handling of hazardous materials required for construction is conducted in a manner consistent with relevant regulations and guidelines. In addition, the Fire District will review construction plans when finalized. The Fire District is available to respond to hazardous materials complaints or emergencies, if any, during construction.

For these reasons, the proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and would not result in reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Implementation and compliance with the plans, standards, and special provisions would reduce any potential impacts to a **less than significant** level.

**Response VIII c):** A private school is located approximately 0.5-mile west of the project site (west of SR 29). However, there is no indication that the future retail activities will emit hazardous emissions or involve the release of hazardous materials that would affect the school. There is **no impact**.

**Response VIII d):** According to the Draft EIR prepared by Quad Knopf, Inc. in conjunction with the 2009 General Plan update, there are no sites in the City of Lakeport which are listed on the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Information System (CERCLIS); the National Priority List (NPL); or the Department of Toxic Substances Control Cortese List.<sup>5</sup> There is **no impact**.

**Response VIII e), f):** The proposed 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):** The proposed project will not directly interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency response system. The Lakeport County Fire Protection District has reviewed the project and noted the need for additional fire hydrants along Industrial Avenue and the termination of the proposed cul-da-sac with a minimum radius of 50'. With the incorporation of these mitigations (See Public Services and Transportation/Traffic sections of this environmental review for proposed mitigation measures) the project is not anticipated to create and significant hazards to the public or the surrounding environment.

Impacts resulting from this project are **less than significant**.

**Response VIII h):** The proposed project does not have the potential to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires as there are no significant wild lands adjacent to the subject property. The retail building will have a fire sprinkler system, notification alarms and strobe lights. **No impact** is expected.

**No mitigation measures are proposed.**

**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				X

<sup>5</sup> Pg. 5-2, Draft EIR, City of Lakeport General Plan Update

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X

The project will result in new property and site improvements including structures, driveways, sidewalks, street paving and other impervious surfaces that will result in changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, and/or the rate and amount of surface water runoff generated from the subject property. There will be a net increase in the amount of storm water runoff generated at this site as a result of the build out of the proposed parcels. As future development occurs the net increase will need to be quantified and adequate storm drainage facilities will be required to be provided.

The impact of the additional land development and new impervious surfaces will be partially mitigated by the payment of the City’s standard storm drainage mitigation fee (currently \$.10 per square foot of new impervious surfaces). The storm drainage fee will apply to all new structures, driveways and other impervious surfaces on all four of the proposed parcels.

In addition to the payment of the storm drainage fee, City policy requires the development of downstream storm water conveyance system improvements or on-site detention/retention facilities to mitigate the impact of the net increase in storm water flows resulting from a development project. The storm water that will be generated from the subject property will be directed into Clear Lake via a pair of 4’ box culverts that extend to the east under South Main Street and outflow into the Pier 1900 lagoon. There is also an open drainage ditch on the north side of the site that flows east and crosses South Main Street to the northeast.

Existing storm drainage facilities shown on the TPM include three 48” concrete masonry pipes near the northeast corner of APN 05-045-29. To the west of these pipes the map identifies a proposed 20’ wide storm drainage easement which follows the boundary of existing storm water drainage course that originates west of Highway 29 and extends across the southern portion of proposed Parcel 3. The TPM also identifies an existing 20’ wide storm drainage easement along the south side of APN 05-045-30. This existing easement extends through proposed Parcels 1, 2 and 3. Three additional existing 48” concrete masonry pipes are shown near the southeast corner of proposed Parcel 1. These pipes tie into the aforementioned box culverts which extend to Clear Lake to the east.

The majority of the storm water drainage generated from the improvements on the proposed parcels will be directed toward the existing and proposed drainage easements on the south side of the project site. Future improvements on proposed Parcel 4 may be directed toward Industrial Avenue.

The submitted map indicates that portions of the site are located outside the flood zone boundary (Zone X) and inside the flood zone boundary (Zone AO 1’ depth). A review of the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) indicates that proposed Parcels 1 and 2 are entirely within Flood Zones and that portions of Parcels 3 and 4 are within the flood zone. The majority of the existing structure on Proposed Parcel 3 is in the flood zone according to the FIRM. Future construction activities in the flood zone areas will be required to comply with the City’s Flood Damage Prevention Ordinance.

RFE Engineering, Inc. was retained to prepare a preliminary drainage study for the proposed project (RFE Engineering, Inc., 2014). The study report was prepared by a civil engineer and provides a description of

existing drainage conditions, and quantifies the net increase in impervious surfaces and storm water associated with the proposed one acre AutoZone store project. The study does not address the entire TPM project.

The following baseline setting information was extracted from the drainage study report and used to analyze potential hydrology and water quality impacts associated with the proposed project. It is important to note that the following information mixes a discussion of the existing conditions of the entire 8.5 acres and the specific drainage impacts associated with only the 1 approximate one acre AutoZone store site.

According to the ALTA survey of the site, the site is fairly flat with average slopes around 1.5%. The elevation of the project site ranges from about 1336 to 1340 feet above sea level. The majority of the site runoff flows northeast as sheet flow over the project site and spills into the gutter at Industrial Avenue and South Main Street where it flows south to an inlet at the southeast corner of the property on South Main Street. An underground storm drain system on the south side of the project site provides storm water conveyance from west of SR 29 through the site to Clear Lake about 1,000 feet to the east of the site. Drainage along the Industrial Avenue frontage is surface drained towards South Main Street where the surface flow is picked up in a drain inlet at the intersection of the twin 48-inch storm drain pipes under South Main Street.

The project site is located in a Zone "AO" (area to be determined to be in an area of one foot depth of flooding with a 0.2% chance of flood hazard) as determined in FEMA Flood Map No 06033C0493D dated September 30, 2005.

According to the geotechnical study prepared for the proposed project (GeoBoden Inc., 2013), groundwater was encountered within the exploratory borings at 10 feet (below ground surface). Fluctuations of the groundwater table, localized zones of perched water, and rise in soil moisture content should be anticipated during the rainy season. Irrigation of landscaped areas can also lead to an increase in soil moisture content and fluctuations of intermittent shallow perched groundwater levels. The report concluded that groundwater may not be considered in design or construction.

The RFE Engineering Preliminary Drainage Study (February 2014) used the "Rational Method" as outlined in the "Lake County Hydrology Design Standards" adopted June 22, 1999, to determine peak storm water flows. The AutoZone site development project drainage study summarizes storm water runoff rates for the peak 10-year, and 100-year pre-development and post-development on-site storms. Because of the greatly increased impervious area, the runoff expected in the post-construction condition is greater than that of the pre-construction condition.

Under the proposed project, the storm water runoff will enter the on-site storm conveyance system and will be transported to the on-site underground detention system (shown in Sheet C2). The off-site drainage will be positively affected by the proposed project since the project flows will be detained to pre-developed conditions before being released off-site.

The Preliminary Drainage Study for the AutoZone site contains the following conclusions:

- The proposed project on-site storm drain system was designed to convey storm water into an on-site underground storm drain detention basin with a holding volume of 500 cubic feet then released to the public storm drain system off-site.
- The off-site flows will be contained in roadside storm water conveyance along Industrial Avenue. This drainage will eventually tie into the existing 48-inch storm drain piping in South Main Street.

- Overland release of on-site drainage will provide a minimum of 1 foot of freeboard from the highest water surface to the finished floor elevation in the event of storm drain blockage.

**Response IX a), c), d), e), f):** Construction of the proposed project and associated improvements will result in the changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, and/or the rate and amount of surface water runoff generated from the property. Without on-site improvements, there would be a net increase in the amount of storm water runoff generated at this site.

The preliminary grading and drainage plan (Sheet C2) identifies an on-site underground storm water detention basin and associated storm drains in the eastern parking lot area. The location and size of the storm water detention basin and associated storm drains and drop inlet sizes and locations are based on the results of the drainage study (summarized above). This detention basin has been appropriately sized to meter out the runoff from the site so that there is no net increase. Storm water generated from the project will be conveyed into the detention basin and will ultimately exit the site via a storm drain pipe. The off-site flows will be contained in roadside storm water conveyance along Industrial Avenue. This drainage will eventually tie into the existing 48-inch storm drain pipe in South Main Street.

As part of the proposed project, AutoZone Inc. will also comply with all applicable local and state regulations regarding storm water management, including the Municipal Code Chapter 8.40 (Storm Water Management), the Lake County Clean Water Program Storm Water Management Plan and the requirements of the California Water Resources Control Board (NPDES Phase II/Construction Activities Storm Water General Permit requirements) prior to the issuance of development permits. Copies of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board Notice of Intent (NOI), Storm Water Management Plan (SWMP), and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be provided to the City prior to any construction activities.

In addition, AutoZone Inc. will pay the standard City storm water mitigation fee based on the amount of new impervious surface area prior to the issuance of a development permit.

A supplemental hydrology analysis and engineered stormwater drainage plan will be required to be submitted prior to the issuance of any development or improvement permits. The hydrology analysis should quantify the net increase in stormwater runoff related to the new impervious surfaces resulting from the project. The drainage plan will be required to address the findings of the hydrology analysis and include the provision of a system capable of collecting and detaining the stormwater generated from the proposed project so that there is no net increase in the flow rate of off-site runoff. Potential impacts are considered **less than significant with mitigation**.

**Response IX b):** The proposed project 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 and as such the proposed project is not expected to interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. There is no indication that the project will 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 runoff in a manner that will result on on-site or off-site flooding. **No impact** is anticipated regarding these issues.

**Response IX g):** The proposed retail project does not involve any residential or housing elements. Therefore, the proposed project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area. There is **no impact**.

**Response IX h- i):** As described above, the project site occurs within the flood zone boundary. The project will need to comply with the City's floodplain management regulations (LMC Ch. 15.16) which requires special construction techniques to minimize impacts. Potential impacts are **less than significant with mitigation**.

**Response IX j):** The subject property is not located in close proximity to Clear Lake or another water body. As such, approval of the proposal will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow. There is **no impact** associated with these issues.

**See conclusion of report for recommended mitigation measures.**

**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

The project is in conformance with the City’s General Plan and will not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

The proposed parcels are in conformance with the applicable Zoning guidelines related to lot size, dimensions and length to width ratio.

The building encroachment issue affecting APNs 05-045-28 and -30 will be resolved through the recordation of a lot line adjustment prior to the recordation of the Parcel Map.

**Response X a):** Recordation of a 4 lot parcel map and the construction of the proposed retail store will not physically divide an established community. The subject property (proposed Parcel 1) is currently vacant and is adjacent to commercial development. **No impact** has been identified.

**Response X b):** AutoZone is requesting the parcel be rezoned from I Industrial to C-2 Major Retail. The zoning designations surrounding the project site include C-3 Service Commercial to the north, I Industrial to the west, and C-2 Major Retail to the south and east. The proposed project is consistent with the general area and the applicable Zoning Ordinance standards.

This Zoning change would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The impact would be **less than significant**.

**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.

**No recommended mitigation measures.**

**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.

**No recommended mitigation measures.**

**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		

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

**Response XII a):** The project will result in a short-term increase in construction-related noise. During the operation of future retail activities, there will be a minimal increase in the area’s existing ambient noise levels. The existing noise levels in the area around the site are moderate given its proximity to other commercial uses in the area and vehicle traffic along South Main Street.

The Noise Element of the General Plan addresses future noise levels in the City and indicates that the Main Street area is “projected to experience a significant increase in noise over 60 dBA.”<sup>6</sup> The General Plan states that nearby residences “will be exposed to excessive noise levels, defined as those over 60 dBA.”

The level of noise increase associated with construction of the proposed project could result in the temporary generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the Lakeport General Plan or the applicable standards of other agencies. To reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level, the project proponents will be required to implement a mitigation measure which addresses compliance with the noise guidelines and other relevant noise-related policies. Therefore, potential impacts are considered **less than significant with mitigation incorporation**. See conclusion of this report for the related mitigation measures.

**Response XII b), c):** Construction of the proposed project and the subsequent retail activities do not have the potential to expose persons to, or cause generation of, excessive ground-borne vibration or

<sup>6</sup> Lakeport General Plan, Noise Element, Pg. IX-4

ground-borne noise levels. Similarly, there is no indication that the development of the project and its subsequent use will result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. As previously noted the existing ambient noise levels are moderate. There is **no impact** associated with these potential issues.

**Response XII d):** Temporary construction activities associated with the development of the proposed project have the potential to create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. A mitigation measure has been recommended which requires all construction activities to be subject to the noise guidelines set forth in Chapter 17.28 of the Lakeport Municipal Code, including a prohibition of construction activities on Sundays. The noise regulations prohibit work starting before 7:00 a.m. or extending later than 10:00 p.m. This potential impact is considered **less than significant with mitigation incorporation**.

**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**.

**See conclusion of report for recommended mitigation measures.**

**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) - c):** Based on the existing site conditions as well as the size, scope and characteristics of the project, the proposed project will not induce substantial growth in the Lakeport area, either directly or indirectly; displace any existing housing; or displace any residents in a manner that would necessitate the construction of replacement housing. **No impact** has been identified for these issues.

**No recommended mitigation measures.**

**XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES:**

**Would the project:**

	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

Based on a review of the proposal and comments received from other public agencies and departments, approval of the proposed TPM and Architectural and Design Review will not detrimentally affect existing government services including fire protection, police protection, public facility maintenance, and other governmental services. Furthermore, the project will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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 related to fire protection, police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities.

**Fire protection:** The Lakeport County Fire Protection District reviewed the proposal and provided no objections or detailed comments.

There are currently no fire hydrants in the vicinity of the existing site improvements as the nearest one is located at the southwest corner of South Main Street and Industrial Avenue. All future improvements will be required to be within 250' of a fire hydrant. The City Engineer has recommended the installation of a fire hydrant per the Uniform Fire Code and the direction of the Fire District Chief. City staff has developed a mitigation measure requiring the extension of a water main and the installation of a fire hydrant at the west end of the Industrial Avenue.

The Fire District imposes a fire mitigation fee which will be collected in conjunction with the issuance of a building permit. The fee as of April 2015 is \$1.00 per square foot for all new covered areas.

**Police protection:** The City of Lakeport Chief of Police reviewed the proposal and indicated that there are no concerns related to police protection.

**Schools:** Notice of the proposed project was not forwarded to the Lakeport Unified School District due to the limited scope of the project. The Lakeport Unified School District has adopted a school impact fee resolution in accordance with State law. This resolution requires the developer of commercial structures to pay a fee of \$0.47 per square foot of new commercial building area to District to mitigate the impacts to the schools.

The future development or redevelopment of the proposed parcels will likely result in the need for increased maintenance of other public facilities such as water and sewer lines, storm drainage facilities, street surface and street lights. Property tax revenues will be generated from the project as a result of the new improvements and will augment the increased maintenance expenses.

**Parks & other public facilities:** Given its scope, the proposed project and the related retail uses will not substantially affect the City’s park system or other public facilities.

Potential impacts to public services, specifically fire protection and schools are considered to be *less than significant with mitigation incorporation*. **No impact** is anticipated regarding police protection, parks, and other public facilities.

**See conclusion of report for recommended mitigation measures.**

**XV. RECREATION:**

**Would the project:**

	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

The City of Lakeport maintains a small system of parks, recreation facilities and open space for its citizens. Within the City there are approximately 63.5 acres of parkland not including recreational facilities at the public schools. Lakeport’s park and recreational facilities include: parks, boat launch facilities, public swimming pool, and partially-developed parks. In addition to City parks, recreational facilities in the Lakeport area are provided at the Highland Springs Reservoir, Lake County Fairgrounds, Lakeside County Park and Clear Lake State Park. Community use of public school playing fields provides additional recreational facilities.

**Response XIV a), b):** The proposed project will not result in a substantial increase in population or employment levels which could increase the use of existing neighborhood/regional parks such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated.

The proposed retail project does not include recreational facilities and will not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, there the project would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment related to recreational facilities. There is **no impact**.

Section 16.16.040 L.1.of the City Subdivision Ordinance exempts subdivisions containing four or fewer parcels which are not used for residential purposes from the park dedication fee. A condition of approval can be imposed which requires an in-lieu fee to be paid if a residential structure is built. However, residential uses are not allowed in the Industrial zoning district and Parcels 2, 3 and 4 will retain the Industrial zoning designation.

**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			X	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
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	

According to the Transportation Element of the Lakeport General Plan, Industrial Avenue is designated as a local street. The existing roadway has not been dedicated to the public and it is not maintained by the City. The applicant/property owner has proposed to dedicate the existing roadway plus additional area for a cul-de-sac to the public. The map identifies a 50' wide right-of-way plus a cul-de-sac with a 50' radius at the west end. This design is consistent with the standard for commercial, industrial or collector streets in flat areas which is set forth in Section 16.17.100 B.3. of the Lakeport Municipal Code. Right of way improvements will be required to be constructed to City of Lakeport standards. Improvement plans in accordance with Section 16.18.070 of the Lakeport Subdivision Ordinance shall be prepared and submitted for City review and approval. A subdivision improvement agreement in accordance with Section 16.18.060 of the Lakeport Subdivision Ordinance shall be executed prior to recordation of the parcel map.

AutoZone retained KD Anderson & Associates, Inc. to prepare a traffic impact analysis report (KD Anderson & Associates, Inc., 2013) for the proposed AutoZone site project only. The report does not address the entire TPM project.

The traffic study addresses both current and future traffic conditions at key intersections in the vicinity of the site (South Main Street/Lakeport Boulevard and South Main Street/Industrial Avenue intersection). To assess traffic impacts, the report analyzed characteristics of the proposed retail project, including estimated trip generation and the directional distribution/assignment of project generated traffic. The following baseline setting information was extracted from the traffic report and used to analyze potential transportation/traffic impacts associated with the proposed project.

**Circulation System - Roads**

Regionally, the project site is served by major Lakeport streets and state highways. In the area of the proposed project, access to SR 29 occurs at a grade separated interchange with Lakeport Boulevard. Lakeport Boulevard is located approximately 0.5 mile to the north of the site. To the south, South Main Street provides access to SR 29 via a signalized intersection approximately 0.75 mile to the south of the project site.

***South Main Street***

South Main Street traverses the City along the west side of Clear Lake. The Lakeport General Plan classifies Main Street as an "Arterial Street". The posted speed limit is 35 miles per hour (mph). In the vicinity of the project site, South Main Street is a two-lane facility with a continuous two-way center

turn lane. Sidewalk facilities and a designated bike lane are provided on the west side of the street, as is on-street parking. There is currently no northbound bike lane on the east side of the street. Sidewalk facilities currently terminate on the east side of the street approximately 200 feet to the north of Industrial Avenue and then commence approximately 800 feet to the south at Peckham Court.

Traffic volume information collected for the Lakeport General Plan Update indicated that in 2004 South Main Street carried 9,900 vehicles per day in the area near Royale Avenue to the north of the project site. A 2011 speed study undertaken by the Area Planning Council (APC) indicates that approximately 10,400 vehicles per day use South Main Street in the vicinity of Industrial Avenue.

### ***Lakeport Boulevard***

Lakeport Boulevard is a major route linking Lakeport and SR 29 while concurrently providing local access to adjoining retail commercial uses. The Lakeport General Plan classifies Lakeport Boulevard as an "Arterial Street." The roadway is striped with a continuous two-way left turn lane in the commercial area west of Main Street and on-street parking is prohibited to accommodate this feature. The posted speed limit is 30 mph. Traffic volume information collected for the Lakeport General Plan Update indicated that in 2004 Lakeport Boulevard carried 11,925 vehicles per day in the area between SR 29 and Bevins Street. The 2011 APC speed study states approximately 8,800 vehicles use Lakeport Boulevard in the vicinity of South Forbes Street each day.

### ***Industrial Avenue***

Industrial Avenue is a local 2-lane private street providing access to several adjacent businesses and terminates approximately 1,000 feet to the west of South Main Street. The street has a dilapidated asphalt surface at the present time.

### **Intersections**

The quality of traffic flow in urban areas is often governed by the operation of key intersections. The following two intersections were identified for evaluation in the traffic study through consultation with City staff.

#### ***Lakeport Blvd / South Main Street intersection***

The Lakeport Boulevard/South Main Street intersection is a "T" intersection controlled by stop signs at the approaches. Separate left and right turn lanes exist at the Lakeport Boulevard approach. Separate left and right turn lanes are provided at the northbound and southbound South Main Street approaches, respectively. K Street intersects South Main Street immediately north of the intersection and is limited to right turns on South Main Street. Crosswalks are provided across all three legs of the intersection.

#### ***Industrial Avenue /S. Main Street Intersection***

The Industrial Avenue/South Main Street intersection is controlled by a stop sign on Industrial Avenue. Northbound left turn channelization is provided on South Main Street via the existing continuous center turn lane. There are no marked crosswalks at the intersection.

### **Existing Traffic Volumes / Levels of Service**

KD Anderson & Associates conducted new traffic counts in November 2013 to support the traffic study. These counts were conducted on days when local schools were in session. Intersection turning movement counts were made at study intersections during the period from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. The highest hourly traffic volume period within each two hour window was identified as the peak hour and used for this analysis.

The report notes that the volume of traffic in and around the Lakeport area can vary throughout the year, with summer month's traffic influenced by visitors to Clear Lake. This increase in recreational oriented traffic may also be offset somewhat by the lack of school oriented traffic in the summer months. It is estimated that the traffic count data collected for this analysis is likely indicative of average conditions for the year, but that these counts are likely lower than peak summer month volume levels.

Figure 3 in the report illustrates the intersection turning movement count data recorded for each count period. This figure also notes the geometric layout of each intersection and the location of traffic controls. This data has been used to determine the operating Level of Service (LOS) at each intersection.

### ***Intersection Level of Service***

The report indicates that satisfactory LOS A to B operations are currently experienced at the study intersections. Although the Lakeport Boulevard/South Main Street intersection experiences some queue formations at each approach to the intersection during peak periods of the afternoon peak hour, the intersection operates satisfactorily overall. Traffic volumes are relatively minor at the Industrial Avenue approach to South Main Street and utilization of the existing center turn lane results in relatively short delays for left turn traffic onto South Main Street.

### **Traffic Signals**

The extent to which improvements are already needed at either intersection was considered in the traffic report. The peak hour volume of traffic occurring at each intersection was compared to the CA MUTCD requirements for Warrant 3 (Peak Hour Traffic). At the time of the 2013 study, neither intersection carried volumes that reach the level satisfying Warrant 3, which suggests that while a signal might help alleviate brief periods of congestion, the overall volume of traffic at each location does not justify a traffic signal at this time.

**Response XVI a):** Although the proposed AutoZone project will result in an increase in traffic in the vicinity of the project site, the project will not 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.

According to the traffic report, the AutoZone project is expected to generate a total of 485 daily trips, with roughly 10% or 47 trips during the p.m. peak hour. A total of 17 trips are projected during the a.m. peak hour after discounting for pass-by trips already occurring on South Main Street adjacent to the site, the project is projected to generate 12 and 32 new trips in the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively.

Regarding the existing plus project traffic conditions, the traffic report concluded that development of the AutoZone project alone does not result in a significant impact to traffic based on the criteria adopted by the City. Satisfactory operations are currently experienced at the study intersections and no changes to existing LOS are projected with development of the AutoZone site (Parcel 1).

The transportation-related impacts identified in this section do not rise to a level in which off-site improvements will be required; however, on-site improvements are necessary for consistency with the Lakeport Subdivision Ordinance and are considered to be ***less than significant with mitigation incorporation***. See the conclusion of this report for required mitigation measures.

**Response XVI b):** Lake County has not established a congestion management agency according to the Interim City Engineer. As such, this question is not applicable to this project. There is ***no impact***.

The traffic study prepared for the proposed AutoZone project addressed the long-term cumulative traffic impacts associated with the project. According to the AutoZone study, the Lakeport Boulevard / South Main Street intersection is projected to operate with very long delays in the future during the p.m. peak hour with the existing all-way stop sign control. The average delay for all vehicles would exceed the City's LOS C minimum standard during this time period, with or without development of the proposed project. As noted in the General Plan DEIR, it will eventually be necessary to signalize this intersection. Signalization is projected to yield LOS C p.m. peak hour operations.

As identified relative to existing conditions, AutoZone project impacts to study intersections under long-term conditions are similarly projected to be minor. AutoZone project traffic will incrementally contribute to unsatisfactory p.m. peak hour operations at the Lakeport Boulevard/South Main Street intersection. Review of forecast p.m. peak hour traffic volumes at this intersection indicates that the trips associated with the auto parts sales store represent 1.7% of the total new trips expected through the intersection under the development assumptions presented in the Lakeport General Plan DEIR.

**Response XVI c):** There are no components of the AutoZone 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. There would be **No impact**.

**Response XVI d):** Based on the findings of the traffic report prepared for the AutoZone project, there is no indication that the proposed project will substantially increase transportation-related hazards due to a proposed design feature or incompatible uses. This impact is **less than significant**.

**Response XVI e):** Adequate emergency access will be provided into the site of the retail business based on the responses from the Fire District and the Police Department. There is **no impact**.

**Response XVI f):** As described in the traffic report, development of the proposed AutoZone may incrementally contribute to the demand for facilities to serve pedestrians, cyclists and transit riders in the local area. However, the traffic report stated that this demand is expected to be relatively minor. A brief discussion of the pedestrian, bicycle, and transit impacts is provided below.

**Pedestrian Impacts.** It is possible that some of the AutoZone's employees or customers may elect to walk to and from the site. As stated previously, sidewalk facilities are provided on the west side of South Main Street to the north and south of the site. The proposed AutoZone project includes construction of sidewalks on Industrial Avenue adjacent to the site. These improvements represent a reasonable project contribution to the City's inventory of pedestrian facilities that is commensurate with the project's relative impact.

**Bicycle Impacts.** While the use of bicycle travel may be an option for employees or customers to the site, such traffic will likely be low and the number of cyclists associated with this project is not likely to create an appreciable safety impacts on the streets that provide access to the project. The Lakeport General Plan Circulation Element - Bicycle Plan does require a bike lane to be stripped on South Main Street.

**Transit Impacts.** Some project employees or customers are likely to take advantage of the regular bus transit service that already passes the site. The existing bus stop located approximately 300 feet to the south of the site will provide access to the available transit services.

The proposed project will not conflict with adopted policies/plans/programs related to public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. The potential impacts are **less than significant**.

The proposal to subdivide the subject property and create three additional parcels (number of net new parcels) will not directly cause a substantial increase in traffic that would detrimentally affect the existing traffic volumes and/or the capacity of the street system in the vicinity of the project.

Each of the proposed parcels will have frontage along the newly dedicated Industrial Avenue and therefore adequate emergency access will be provided

The future development and redevelopment of the subject properties will likely result in increased in vehicular traffic volume and turning movements which will affect Industrial Avenue and South Main Street and potentially impact Lakeport Boulevard and Highway 29. Future traffic-related impacts will need to be thoroughly analyzed in conjunction with new development proposals.

Section 16.18.100 B. of the Lakeport Municipal Code addresses the need to complete right of way improvements and indicates that “the completion of right-of-way or street improvements for subdivisions of four (4) or less parcels shall not be required until a permit or other grant of approval for the development of any parcel within the subdivision is applied for.” Given that development is already in place upon proposed parcels 2 and 3 full length right-of-way improvements including curb, gutter, sidewalk and street construction (except as otherwise noted in proposed mitigation measures for this project) will be required to be constructed prior to the recordation of the final map. Additional improvements may be required as part of future development applications.

The right-of-way improvements recommended by the Interim City Engineer will be required to be installed consistent with Municipal Code Section 16.18.100 B.

***See conclusion of report for recommended mitigation measures.***

**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	

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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), b), e):** Construction of the project and its subsequent use for retail purposes will not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board. Sewer generated from the project will be treated by the CLMSD plant in south Lakeport. The City’s Public Works Director and City Engineer have recommended the incorporation of two mitigation measures directly related to sanitary sewer requirements for this project: 1) The legal description for Parcels 3 and 4 will be required to include a 20’ wide Public Utility Easement for the sewer main and drainage that extends through the parcels. The sewer main will be required to be located in the center of the easement.; and 2) an 8” sanitary sewer line together with lateral serving existing structures located on proposed parcels 2 and 3 shall be required.

Significant impacts to the City’s water system are not expected given the estimated water usage amounts. The City’s Public Works Director and City Engineer are recommending the installation of a 12” water main in accordance with City and Lakeport Fire Protection District standards. have recommended the incorporation of two mitigation measures directly related to sanitary sewer requirements for this project:

Adequate capacity exists at this time and the project will not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. The project will comply with all requirements related to the project’s water and sewer system, including the payment of the standard CLMSD sewer expansion fees and City of Lakeport Water Expansion fees. AutoZone will pay these fees prior to the issuance of development permits.

Potential impacts related to sewer capacity are considered to be ***less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures.***

**Response XVII c):** Construction of the proposed storm drainage facilities has the potential to cause significant environmental effects as some of the activities may be located in environmentally-sensitive habitat areas.

Potential impacts to the storm water system are considered **less than significant with mitigation**. Please see the Hydrology and Water Quality section of this report for more discussion regarding storm water issues.

**Response XVII d):** According to the City’s Public Works Director there are sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. AutoZone Inc. will pay the required water expansion fee (based on water meter size) prior to the issuance of development permits. The applicant will be required to install a 12” City water main in the Industrial Avenue right-of-way in accordance with the requirements of the City of Lakeport and the Lakeport County Fire Protection District.

Potential impacts related to the City’s water supply and distribution facilities have been determined to be **less than significant with mitigation**.

**Response XVII f), g):** The proposed project will result in an increase in the generation of solid waste during retail operations. In addition, waste may be generated if unsuitable materials are discovered during construction and removed from the site. Excess graded materials are expected to be hauled off-site.

The City contracts with Lakeport Disposal for its solid waste disposal and all businesses are subject to mandatory garbage service and recycling requirements. 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.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, the project will be served by a landfill with sufficient capacity and is expected to comply with all applicable solid waste regulations. Impacts related to the storage, collection and disposal of solid waste are **less than significant**.

**See conclusion of report for recommended mitigation measures.**

**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		X		

<sup>7</sup> 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
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?				
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 projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?			X	
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):** Based on the findings set forth in the Initial Study, the proposed retail project has the potential to adversely impact the environment unless mitigation measures are incorporated into the project approval. The potentially significant effects identified herein are related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology/soils, noise, public services, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems.

The potential environmental impacts identified in the Initial Study are **less than significant with mitigation incorporation**.

**CONCLUSION AND MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:** The application for a TPM to create four lots out of approximately 8 acres of land at 301 and 401 Industrial Avenue (APN 05-045-29 and APN 05-045-30) also has the potential to impact the environment unless mitigation measures are incorporated into the project approval. The potentially significant effects identified in the Initial Study include air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hydrology/water quality, geology/soils, public services, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems.

Staff has developed mitigation measures which have been agreed to by the applicant, and when implemented will mitigate the identified environmental impacts to a less than significant level.

The proposed subdivision – TPM generally conforms to the City’s Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances. There are, however, some issues which must be resolved prior to recordation of the Parcel Map as described herein.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project as provided for in the California Environmental Quality Act. Staff further recommends that the Planning

Commission approve the TPM application and map dated May 19, 2015, for the four lots located at 301 and 401 Industrial Avenue (APN 05-045-29 and APN 05-045-30). Approval of the TPM shall be subject to the environmental mitigation measures and conditions of approval as set forth below:

**Mitigation Measures:**

1. All new exterior lighting serving the new buildings and related parking, driveway and pedestrian areas shall be shielded, provided with property line cut-offs, and/or downlit so as to eliminate glare-related impacts to adjacent properties or the public right-of-way. Details and specifications regarding the proposed building-mounted and parking lot lighting shall be included in the building permit application package. **(Aesthetics)**
2. The parking lot light standards should not exceed a height of 18 feet if determined to be possible without detrimentally affecting the site's security and illumination requirements. In no case shall the height of the light standards exceed a height of 25 feet. **(Aesthetics)**
3. Roof-mounted mechanical equipment shall be provided with architectural screens which effectively screen the equipment and complement the building's architecture. Ground-mounted mechanical equipment, if provided, shall also be provided with visual screens. Said screens shall be detailed on the building construction plans. **(Aesthetics)**
4. Metal or other similar type awning structures shall be provided over the three doors on the west side of the north façade of the proposed building to be constructed on Parcel 1.
5. All construction activities shall include adequate dust suppression including frequent watering, the use of palliatives or other methods during grading, earth work, and building periods. Site grading and building activities shall be avoided during windy periods and all surfaces subject to grading and/or heavy traffic and equipment usage, including public and private streets, should be periodically sprinkled with water. Graded areas and other bare soil areas shall be stabilized to prevent the generation of wind-blown dust. Materials transported to and from the site shall be covered or thoroughly watered in order to minimize fugitive dust and any materials deposited on adjacent roadways shall be removed in a timely manner. **(Air Quality)**
6. All parking areas, driveways, shoulders, walkways and other areas subject to vehicular and pedestrian traffic associated with Parcel 1 shall be paved with asphaltic concrete or standard concrete and maintained to limit dust. Paving shall occur prior to occupancy to minimize dust emissions. Access to exposed serpentine surfaces shall be restricted by fencing or other barriers until the surface is adequately covered by non-asbestos material. Access to other areas should be limited to authorized vehicles prior to paving unless the traveled surfaces are well maintained with adequate cover and watered regularly to prevent visible dust. A gate or fence may be required to limit public access onto the site should active project work be suspended and the unfinished project has the potential to generate fugitive dust or create nuisance conditions. **(Air Quality)**
7. If serpentine soils/materials are encountered during site grading or construction, a serpentine dust control plan shall be submitted to the Lake County Air Quality Management District for review and approval and additional dust suppression measures shall be instituted in accordance with LCAQMD requirements. Serpentine rock shall not be used as a surface material for parking, pathways, etc. **(Air Quality)**

8. Engine warm-up and idling activities associated with the construction activities shall be done in accordance with the applicable State law governing said activities. Consideration shall be given to nearby residences with respect to heavy equipment use and storage. **(Air Quality)**
9. Any vegetation removed as a result of construction shall be recycled as firewood, or chipped and spread for groundcover and erosion control, or removed from the site. There shall be no burning of site vegetation, construction debris, or household materials. **(Air Quality)**
10. The applicant/owner/developer shall comply with the performance standards set forth in Section 17.28.010 of the City of Lakeport Municipal Code regarding the generation of noise; odors, smoke, fumes, dust or particulate matter; and the accumulation of solid waste. The applicant/owner shall take the appropriate steps to effectively reduce or eliminate these types of problems if the City receives legitimate complaints. **(Air Quality)**
11. A note shall be placed on the final map indicating a 20' setback from the open drainage channel traversing proposed parcel 3 and the pond adjacent to the southeastern property boundary of proposed parcel 3. No development or disturbance shall occur within this required setback area unless a biological survey and environmental review under CEQA is completed. **(Biological Resources)**
12. Project approval shall not become effective, operative, vested or final until the California Department of Fish and Game filing fee required or authorized by Section 711.4 of the Fish and Game Code is submitted. Said fee shall be paid within 30 days of project approval by the City of Lakeport Planning Commission. **(Biological Resources)**
13. Either a Native American monitor and/or a qualified archaeologist shall be present during excavation and removal of ground materials beyond 18 inches below existing ground level. **(Cultural Resources)**
14. During any excavation or other substantial subsurface disturbance activities any individuals conducting the work should be given a cultural awareness training session and advised to watch for cultural resource materials. If any evidence of prehistoric cultural resources be observed (freshwater shells, beads, bone tool remnants or an assortment of bones, soil changes including subsurface ash lens or soil darker in color than surrounding soil, lithic materials such as flakes, tools or grinding rocks, etc.), or historic cultural resources (adobe foundations or walls, structures and remains with square nails, refuse deposits or bottle dumps, often associated with wells or old privies), all work must immediately cease, and a qualified archaeologist must be consulted to assess the significance of the cultural materials. **(Cultural Resources)**
15. If human remains are discovered, all work must immediately cease, and the local coroner must be contacted. Should the remains prove to be of cultural significance, the Native American Heritage Commission in Sacramento, California, must be contacted, with notification of most likely descendants. **(Cultural Resources)**
16. The applicant/owner/developer shall submit a supplemental soils analysis prepared by a civil engineer to the City prior to the issuance of a development permit. The soils report should specifically address existing conditions and needed improvements to support the entire development of Industrial Avenue associated with this project. **(Geology and Soils)**
17. The applicant/owner/developer shall submit a supplemental hydrology analysis prepared by a civil engineer to the City prior to the issuance of a development permit. The hydrology analysis shall quantify the net increase in stormwater runoff related to the new impervious surfaces (buildings,

parking area, driveways, walkways, etc.) resulting from the project. **(Hydrology and Water Quality)**

18. The applicant/owner/developer shall submit an engineered stormwater drainage plan prior to the issuance of a development permit. The drainage plan shall address the findings of the hydrology analysis and include the provision of a system capable of collecting and detaining the stormwater generated from the proposed project so that there is no net increase in the flow rate of off-site runoff. The drainage plan shall address all existing storm drainage channels located on the site. Details regarding the proposed collection, conveyance and detention facilities shall be included in the drainage plan. **(Hydrology and Water Quality)**
19. The proposed underground retention basin for development to occur on Parcel 1 shall drain directly into the existing storm drainage structure located at the southeast corner of the property and not directly into the 48" storm drain pipe as shown. **(Hydrology and Water Quality)**
20. The applicant/owner/developer shall place curbs at the back of sidewalks adjacent to slopes to provide a minimum of 6" of height above completed landscape installation as it related to proposed development to occur on Parcel 1. **(Hydrology and Water Quality)**
21. The drainage on the north side of Industrial Avenue traditionally flows north to the inlet just south of Campbell Lane. The applicant/owner/developer shall maintain this drainage pattern. It is acceptable to the City of Lakeport to drain the north side of Industrial Avenue, both existing and newly developed, by gutter flow into the existing curb and gutter on the west side of South Main Street. If necessary to drain the private property on the northwest corner of the intersection, a through curb drain (with sediment basin) may be provided. **(Hydrology and Water Quality)**
22. The drainage on the south side of Industrial Avenue traditionally flows south to the inlet near the southern property line. The applicant/owner/developer shall maintain this drainage pattern. The new storm drain line shall be moved from the southbound lane of South Main Street to the new drainage easement to the west of the development with an inlet located in the curb and gutter with an area drain in the lot to the southwest. This storm drain pipe shall be connected to the existing 48" CMP using a full concrete drainage structure with a manhole lid access. **(Hydrology and Water Quality)**
23. The applicant/owner/developer shall either remove entirely or replace the two 36" storm drain pipes within the drainage channel of Parcel 3 with three 48" CMP culverts to conform to the flow lines of the downstream 48" culverts. **(Hydrology and Water Quality)**
24. The applicant/owner/developer shall comply with Lakeport Municipal Code Chapter 8.40 (Stormwater Management), the Lake County Clean Water Program Storm Water Management Plan and the requirements of the California Water Resources Control Board (NPDES Phase II/Construction Activities Storm Water General Permit requirements) prior to the issuance of a development permits. Copies of the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board Notice of Intent (NOI), Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP), and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) shall be provided to the City prior to any construction activities. All erosion control measures and construction activities shall be completed in accordance with the project's Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. **(Hydrology and Water Quality)**
25. The applicant/owner/developer shall provide oil/sediment interceptors /filters as part of the on-site stormwater conveyance system. Said interceptors/filters shall be installed at each drop inlet and shall be capable of separating petroleum products and other sediments from stormwater runoff. The applicant/owner/developer shall maintain all interceptors/filters on a regular basis to

- ensure their functional use. Plan and details for the interceptors/filters shall be included with the on-site stormwater drainage plans. **(Hydrology and Water Quality)**
26. The stormwater drainage collection, conveyance and detention facilities shall be developed in accordance with the approved plans and shall be completed prior to the issuance of any final occupancy permit. **(Hydrology and Water Quality)**
  27. The applicant/owner/developer shall be subject to all requirements of Lakeport Municipal Code Chapter 8.40 (Stormwater Management) and any subsequent revision or modifications thereof. All erosion control measures and construction and post-construction stormwater Best Management Practices shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans. **(Hydrology and Water Quality)**
  28. All on-site stormwater catch basins should be provided with a 1 foot sump for sediment removal and related maintenance. **(Hydrology and Water Quality)**
  29. The applicant/owner/developer shall provide adequate ingress and egress for maintenance purposes by City staff to the existing storm drainage structure located at the southeastern corner of proposed Parcel 1. The final map shall include and display a drainage maintenance easement for this storm drainage structure. This maintenance access area shall be free from obstructions including landscaping and provide a 12 foot wide double swing access gate which will swing 180 degrees open into the parking lot. **(Hydrology and Water Quality)**
  30. The applicant/owner/developer shall pay the standard City stormwater mitigation fee of \$0.10 per square feet for all new impervious surface area prior to the issuance of a development permit. **(Hydrology and Water Quality)**
  31. The applicant/owner/developer shall construct all improvements in the flood zone in accordance with the City's Floodplain Management Ordinance (Lakeport Municipal Code Ch. 15.16), including the submittal of adequately detailed construction plans prior to the issuance of a building permit. **(Hydrology and Water Quality)**
  32. There shall be no Sunday construction activity. All construction work shall comply with the noise standards set forth in Section 17.28.010 A. of the Lakeport Zoning Ordinance. The applicant/owner/developer shall submit construction plans to the City which address compliance with applicable noise standards. **(Noise)**
  33. The applicant/owner/develop shall install up to two fire hydrants to serve the proposed project in accordance with Section 903 of the Uniform Fire Code. The hydrants shall be located so that all existing and future structures are reachable by 250' hose lay length. The location of the hydrants shall be coordinated with the Lakeport County Fire Protection District and shall be detailed on the street improvement plans. **(Public Services)**
  34. The applicant/owner/developer shall pay the fire mitigation fee of \$1.00 per square foot for all covered construction to the Lakeport Fire Protection District prior to the issuance of a development permit. **(Public Services)**
  35. The applicant/owner/developer shall pay the required school impact fees for commercial structures of \$0.47 per square foot of building construction to the Lakeport Unified School District prior to the issuance of a development permit. **(Public Services)**
  36. The applicant/owner/developer shall dedicate land to the City of Lakeport for the Industrial Avenue street right-of-way on the Parcel Map. The right-of-way dedication shall be of sufficient size to provide a 50' wide right-of-way and a cul-de-sac bulb with a curb to curb diameter of 150' with an

additional 5' of public utility easement and pedestrian easement behind sidewalk.  
**(Transportation/Traffic)**

37. The applicant/owner/developer shall dedicate 10' of Right-of-Way behind the proposed face of curb along the east side of Parcel 1, including the radius curve at the intersection of South Main and Industrial Avenue. **(Transportation/Traffic)**
38. The applicant/owner/developer shall eliminate the curb, gutter and sidewalk requirements shown along the north side of Industrial Avenue, including the curb return to the existing sidewalk conform on South Main Street. Maintain existing handicap ramp and curb, gutter and sidewalk improvements and maintain existing asphalt/concrete swale at the edge of the existing roadway. Industrial Avenue shall be constructed, as shown on the Parcel Map, to the edge of the proposed gutter lip and between this point and the existing asphalt/concrete swale the applicant/owner/developer shall grind and replace 3" of asphalt/concrete. A minimum of 1% slope shall be maintained along the proposed gutter lip and existing asphalt/concrete swale to facilitate drainage. **(Transportation/Traffic)**
39. The applicant/owner/developer shall provide pavement design for heavy duty and light duty paving. For heavy duty paving, the design criteria shall be TI=7.0. At least two R values under the existing roadway shall be obtained and tested. For the light duty paving, the design criteria shall be TI=5.5. The HMA surface shall be a minimum of 3 inches of HMA. In lieu of R-value testing, the pavement can be designed with a stabilization fabric and R=25. **(Transportation/Traffic)**
40. The applicant/owner/developer shall provide a 27' wide commercial driveway approach on Parcels 2 and 3 and two 27' wide commercial driveway approaches (curb and gutter only) for Parcel 4. Locations of driveways shall be provided on submitted improvement plans. **Transportation/Traffic)**
41. The applicant/owner/developer shall construct and complete right-of-way improvements to City standard. Improvement plans in accordance with Section 16.18.060 of the Subdivision Ordinance shall be prepared and submitted for City review and approval. A subdivision improvement agreement in accordance with Section 16.18.070 of the Lakeport Subdivision Ordinance shall be executed prior to recordation of the Parcel Map. The sidewalk on the north side of Industrial Avenue may be omitted along the limits of Parcel 4. **(Transportation/Traffic)**
42. The legal description for Parcels 3 and 4 shall include a 20' wide Public Utility Easement for the sewer main and drainage that extends through the parcel. The sewer main shall be located in the center of the easement. Said easement shall also be depicted on the final map. **(Utilities/Service Systems)**
43. The applicant/owner/developer shall install a 12" City water main in accordance with the requirements of the City of Lakeport and the Lakeport County Fire Protection District. **(Utilities/Service Systems)**
44. The applicant/owner/developer shall install an 8" sanitary sewer line in accordance with the requirements of the City of Lakeport standards and regulations. The sewer laterals serving existing structures located on Parcels 2 and 3 shall be tied into the new sanitary sewer line to be provided on Industrial Avenue. **(Utilities/Service Systems)**
45. The applicant/owner/developer shall dedicate area within the subdivision as needed for public street right-of-way, drainage, public utility easements, and other easements. Said dedication shall include the existing sewer lateral serving existing buildings. **(Utilities/Service Systems)**
46. Prior to this issuance of occupancy for proposed development on Parcel 1 the applicant/owner/developer shall provide a 5' public utility easement behind sidewalk. **(Utilities/Service Systems)**
47. The applicant/owner/developer shall comply with all requirements related to the project's sewer system, including the payment of the standard CLMSD sewer expansion fee of \$12,717, as of July

2014. (Sewer expansion fees are indexed annually to the CPI index and adjusted for inflation each July in accordance with Resolution 2271 (2006).) Said fees shall be paid prior to the issuance of a development permit. **(Utilities/Service Systems)**

48. The applicant/owner/developer shall pay the required water expansion fee, \$6,923 for a standard ¾ inch meter with escalating cost for larger meters. (Water expansion fees are indexed annually to the CPI index and adjusted for inflation each July.) Said fees shall be paid prior to the issuance of a development permit. **(Utilities/Service Systems)**

**Recommended Conditions of Approval for Planning Commission Consideration:**

49. The applicant/owner/developer shall agree to the conditions imposed by the Planning Commission and shall execute a City of Lakeport Project Conditions Agreement and/or Subdivision Improvement Agreement prior to the recordation of the Parcel Map or completion of the Lot Line Adjustment.
50. The project shall be developed in accordance with the approval of the Planning Commission and City Ordinances. Construction drawings and improvement plans for the retail project shall conform to those plans approved by the Commission and to the conditions of approval and mitigation measures. A building permit shall be obtained from the City before the construction activities are commenced.
51. Minor alterations to the approved plans and specifications which do not result in increased environmental impacts may be approved in writing by the City of Lakeport Community Development Director.
52. The new buildings and all site improvements, including the parking lot, landscaping, storm drainage improvements, right-of-way improvements and other project components shall be completed prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit by the City.
53. The applicant/owner/developer shall prepare and submit a detailed final landscaping plan, including irrigation plan, prior to the issuance of a building permit. Said landscaping plan shall specify the type, size, number, and location of all landscape planting materials. This final landscaping plan shall eliminate the placement of trees and any other deep rooting vegetation over the existing drainage easement located along the southern boundary of the property. The planting of all landscaping materials shall be completed prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit and shall be continuously maintained and watered over the life of the project. Landscaping irrigation shall comply with the State's Model Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance (AB 1881) and shall be designed to minimize water usage. All plant materials that are not healthy or that dies shall be replaces with similar landscape materials in a timely manner.
54. All site signage, including entry signage, parking lot, ancillary, and all other signs shall conform to the City of Lakeport Sign Ordinance, Resolutions, and Interpretations.
55. All exposed metal, pipes, trim, flashing, vents, etc. shall be painted to complement the building or coated to eliminate glare impacts.

56. The applicant/owner/developer shall maintain the exterior of the buildings and all related site improvements in good condition for the life of the project. Damaged or dilapidated portions of the buildings or related improvements shall be promptly repaired or replaced as necessary.
57. Durable survey monuments shall be installed at the following locations:
  - a. Boundary corners.
  - b. At the beginning and ending of property line curves and points of intersection.
  - c. Lot corners or at any other location at the discretion of the City Engineer, including but not limited to, the centerline intersection of South Main Street and Industrial Avenue and center of Industrial Avenue cul-de-sac.
58. The applicant/owner/developer shall prepare a Parcel Map in accordance with the provisions of the City of Lakeport Subdivision Ordinance and California Subdivision Map Act. Said map shall be recorded in accordance with the time frames as set forth in the City Subdivision Ordinance.
59. The applicant/owner/developer shall cause the subdivision map to be prepared by a licensed land surveyor. Said map shall be submitted with all data required by the City Subdivision Ordinance, including traverse sheets, guarantee of title, tax statements, and other required data. The developer shall pay the required review checking and filing fees.
60. The applicant/owner/developer shall enter into a subdivision improvement agreement which covers right-of-way improvements, storm drainage, sanitary sewer, water supply, utilities, and other improvements as set forth in Chapter 16.18 of the City of Lakeport Subdivision Ordinance. All subdivision improvements shall be completed in accordance with City standards within 18 months of approval of the tentative map.
61. The applicant/owner/developer shall provide improvement security in accordance with Section 16.18.080 of the Lakeport Subdivision Ordinance. Said security shall include bond, cash deposit, letter of credit, or other form of security as approved by the Lakeport City Attorney.
62. All existing and proposed electric and communication service laterals and poles serving the subject property and proposed new parcels, including telephone, cable television and internet, shall be relocated or installed underground. The applicant/owner/developer shall provide a plan detailing the provision of electrical, telephone, cable television and internet services. Said plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.
63. The applicant/owner/developer shall provide illuminated street address numbers on each existing and proposed structure.
64. The applicant/owner/developer shall pay the South Main Street Reimbursement Fee in accordance with Ordinance 1581 (1988) in the amount of approximately \$0.11 per square feet of land area prior to recordation of the parcel map.
65. The application/owner shall provide the City with new legal descriptions for each of the subject parcels involved in the lot line adjustment. The legal descriptions shall be prepared and stamped by a registered land surveyor or civil engineer and shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to being recorded by the County. The cost for the City's contract surveyor's review of the legal descriptions shall be paid by the applicant/owner(s).

66. The applicant/owner(s) shall pay the estimated property taxes for the adjusted parcels, including advance taxes for the next fiscal year, as required by the County Tax Collector's Office prior to the recordation of the lot line adjustment.
67. The applicant/owner(s) shall provide updated Title Reports (not older than six months at time of submittal) for each affected property. If necessary, the applicant/owners(s) shall obtain consent of lienholders prior to recordation of the lot line adjustment on a form provided by the City of Lakeport.
68. The applicant/owner shall coordinate the reapportionment of each parcel's sewer assessment (Assessment District 91-1) with the City Engineer's office, including the payment of the reapportionment fee, prior to the recordation of the lot line adjustment.