INITITAL STUDY / NEGATIVE DECLARATION
FOR
General Plan Amendment 2013-01 and Change of Zone 2013-01

INTRODUCTION, PROJECT DESCIPTION AND LOCATION

CEQA Requirements

This document is the Initial Study/ Negative Declaration on the potential environmental effects of the following project: General Plan Amendment 2013-01 and Change of Zone 2013-01. The City of Lemoore will act as the Lead Agency for this project pursuant to the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)* and the *CEQA Guidelines.*

Section 15063 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the Lead Agency to prepare an Initial Study to determine whether a discretionary project will have a significant effect on the environment. The purposes of an Initial Study, as listed under Section 15063[c] of the CEQA Guidelines, include:

(1) Provide the Lead Agency with information to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an EIR [Environmental Impact Report] or a Negative Declaration.

(2) Enable an applicant or Lead Agency to modify a project, mitigating adverse impacts before an EIR is prepared, thereby enabling the project to qualify for a Negative Declaration.

(3) Assist in the preparation of an EIR, if one is required, by:

- *(A) Focusing the EIR on the effects determined to be significant,*
- *(B) Identifying the effects determined not to be significant,*
- *(C) Explaining the reasons for determining that potentially significant effects would not be significant, and*
- *(D) Identifying whether a program EIR, tiering, or another appropriate process can be used for analysis of the project's environmental effects.*

(4) Facilitate environmental assessment early in the design of a project;

(5) Provide documentation of the factual basis for the finding in a Negative Declaration that a project will not have a significant effect on the environment;

(6) Eliminate unnecessary EIRs;

(7) Determine whether a previously prepared EIR could be used with the project.

This Initial Study/Negative Declaration has been prepared in response to the requirements presented above. Pursuant to Section 15003 of the CEQA Guidelines, the City of Lemoore has prepared this Initial Study to determine whether the Project will have a significant effect on the environment. The Initial Study Checklist in Section Three found that there are no potentially significant environmental impacts that may result from the project that were not already covered in the General Plan EIR. Based on this Initial Study, it has been determined that a Negative Declaration should be prepared.

References

Referenced in this Study are the following reports:

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statues (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et. seq.)
- *City of Lemoore General Plan EIR (SCH#91042091),* December 1992
- *City of Lemoore General Plan Policy Document,* Adopted May 2008
- *City of Lemoore General Plan Map,* Adopted May 2008
- *City of Lemoore, Municipal Code, Title 9, Lemoore Zoning Code,* Adopted July 2012
- *City of Lemoore, Zoning Map,* July 2012
- *San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District, "Guide for Assessing and Mitigating Air Quality Impacts,"* 2002
- State of California Department of Conservation, Kings County Important Farmland, 2010
- Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3. *Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act,* Section 15000 et. seq.

Project Location

The site is located inside the city limits of the City of Lemoore at the northwest and southwest corners of Bush Street and Marsh Drive, Lemoore, CA.

Project Description

The project is a request by Tim Palmquist representing the property owner, to remove the collector street and bikeway status from Bush Street west of Marsh Drive, and to change the land use designation from Low Density Residential and Parks & Recreation to Community Facilities, and 2) Change of Zone 2013-01, a request to change the zoning map from Low Density Residential (RLD) and Parks & Recreation (PR) to Public Services & Community Facilities (CF) on approximately 53 acres.

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Environmental Checklist and Discussion

1. Project title:
   General Plan Amendment 2013-01 and Change of Zone 2013-01

2. Lead agency name and address:
   City of Lemoore
   711 W Cinnamon Drive
   Lemoore, CA 93245

3. Contact person and phone number:
   Steve Brandt, AICP
   City of Lemoore Planning Department
   (559) 924-6700

4. Project location:
   The site is located inside the city limits of the City of Lemoore at the northwest and southwest corners of Bush Street and Marsh Drive, Lemoore, CA.

5. Project Applicant's name and address:
   Tim Palmquist
   Land Works LLC
   760 W. 16th Street, Suite M
   Costa Mesa, CA 92627

6. City of Lemoore General Plan designation on the site:
   Low Density Single-Family and Parks & Recreation

7. City of Lemoore Zoning on the site:
   Low Density Residential (RLD) and Parks & Recreation (PR), and within the Naval Air Station Lemoore (NASL) Overlay Zone

8. Description of Project:
   The project is a request by Tim Palmquist representing the property owner, to remove the collector street and bikeway status from Bush Street west of Marsh Drive, and to change the land use designation from Low Density Residential and Parks & Recreation to Community Facilities, and 2) Change of Zone 2013-01, a request to change the zoning map from Low Density Residential (RLD) and Parks & Recreation (PR) to Public Services & Community Facilities (CF) on approximately 53 acres.

   The property owner has preliminary agreements with West Hills Community College District and Lemoore Naval Air Station to place a conservation easement on the property that would prohibit future development for inhabited uses. The easement will be held by Community College District and the title to the property will be held by the Naval Air Station. The site is planned for use as a storm drainage basin for stormwater from the college campus. These agreements are not considered part of the project being evaluated.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:
   The Project site is located within City boundaries. On the north side of the site is the Union Pacific Railroad line. On the east side of the site is the Lemoore campus of West Hills College. South of the site is land that has been designated as a protected wetlands. West of the site is agricultural land.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:
No public agency approval is required for the project GPA and COZ.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this Project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agriculture Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology /Soils
☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology / Water Quality	☐ Land Use / Planning
☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise	☐ Population / Housing
☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation / Traffic
☐ Utilities / Service Systems	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

St Brandt — 10-9-13

Prepared by: Steve Brandt, AICP — Date
Contract City Planner

Environmental Checklist and Discussion

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

Response:

Scenic Resources and Visual Character (a, b, c): The project will result in a further restriction on uses that could potentially affect the visual character of the area. No known aesthetic resources exist on the site, and it is not within any State, City or County-identified scenic vista or scenic highway corridor.

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Lighting (d): The project would add new sources of light.

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required

.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. *Agricultural Resources*				
In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Response:

Farmland Conversion (a, c): The Project site was previously designated for development. The Kings County Important Farmland Map 2010 designates the site as Vacant or Disturbed Land.

Conclusion: There is ***no impact.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Zoning Conflicts (b): The Project site is not encumbered by a Williamson Act contract.

Conclusion: There is ***no impact.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

3. *Air Quality*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management of air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or hazardous emissions?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Response:

This environmental issue focuses on the Project's air quality impacts. Issues over Project consistency with applicable air quality plans, policies and regulations, increases of any pollutant for which the area has been designated as a "non-attainment" area are to be addressed. Additional concerns are over the exposure of sensitive receptors, such as nearby residents, to high levels of air pollution or odors.

The San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District (SJVAPCD) "Guide for Assessing and Mitigation Air Quality Impact (GAMAQI)" provides guidelines, using as a measure of potential

impact the number of vehicle trips per day the project is anticipated to generate. This project will not generate any additional vehicle trips.

The Project will not be subject to Rule 9510, Indirect Source Review (ISR). .

Conclusions:

Applicable Air Quality Plan (a): The proposed Project does not conflict with the implementation strategy of the San Joaquin Valley Regional Air Quality Management Plan.

Conclusion: The impact is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Air Quality Standards (b, c): Air quality impacts related to this Project will come mainly from particulate (dust and exhaust) emissions from construction on the properties and vehicle trips generated to and from the new residences. The project is considered within the Small Project Analysis Level (SPAL). Projects within this level are considered to have a less than significant impact on air quality.

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Sensitive Receptors (d): Sensitive receptors include, but are not limited to, land uses such as grammar schools, day care centers, medical facilities, and recreational facilities that contain young children, elderly persons, or people with existing respiratory health problems. The project will not generate emissions that would affect sensitive receptors.

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Objectionable Odors (e): The Project will not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors. .

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Global Warming/Climate Change: "Global warming" is the term coined to describe very widespread climate change characterized by a rise in the Earth's ambient average temperatures with concomitant disturbances in weather patterns and resulting alteration of oceanic and terrestrial environs and biota. The predominant opinion within the scientific community is that global warming is currently occurring, and that it is being caused and/or accelerated by human activities, primarily the generation of "greenhouse gases" (GHG).

The project will not have an effect on greenhouse gases.

Conclusion: The impact ***is less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. *Biological Resources*				
Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with any local policies or 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Response:

Biological Resources (a, d) Although formal studies of wildlife movement in the study area were not conducted, it is not considered likely that any portions of the project site serve as important linkage between wildlife habitats, although some common wildlife species may pass through, according to the City's General Plan EIR.

Conclusion: The proposed Project would have ***no impact*** on migrating bird species or their habitat, including those of listed as candidate, sensitive or special status by State Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Biological Resources (b, c): The site for the proposed Project is disturbed and within a developed area. There are no riparian, wetland or sensitive habitats on the site. The City of Lemoore General Plan Draft EIR indicates that no species of concern are expected to occur within the project area.

Conclusion: The Project will have ***no impact*** to riparian areas and wetlands.

Local Policies or Ordinances (e): The Project will not conflict with the City's ordinances and the Project will have less than significant impact.

Conclusion: The proposed Project would have ***no impact*** on local ordinances or policies protecting biological resources.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Biological Resources (f): The Project will not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Conclusion: The Project will have ***no impact*** on any habitat conservation plan or other natural community conservation plan.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. *Cultural Resources*				
Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064385?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Response:

Disturbance of Cultural Resources (a, b, c, d): According to the City of Lemoore General Plan EIR 2012, there are no historical, archaeological, or paleontological resources within or near the project area.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Conclusion: There is ***no impact***.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
6. *Geology/Soils*				
Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42?	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 of collapse?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems when sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Response:

Geology/Soils and Risks (a): According to the City of Lemoore General Plan EIR, no active faults underlay the project site. There is sufficient distance to either the San Andreas or Owens Valley Faults that the effects of earthquakes should be minimal. Secondary hazards due to landslides and liquefaction are considered to be minimal.

Conclusion: The impacts from geologic resources would be ***less than significant***

Mitigation Measures: None are required

Erosion and unstable soils (b, c): The City of Lemoore General Plan states that erosion is not generally significant due to the relatively flat topography of the area. The Project area does not include any topographical features that would accelerate erosion. The Project is not expected to accelerate the natural rate of erosion.

Conclusion: The impacts from geologic resources would be ***less than significant***

Mitigation Measures: None are required

Expansive Soils (d): According to the City of Lemoore General Plan 2012, soils with moderate to high shrink-swell potential do exist within the proposed General Plan area. Expansive soils require particular engineering design, site preparation, and construction practices in order to prevent structure damage from soil movement associated with moisture level changes. When these practices are employed on a project-by-project basis the potential for structural damage is minimal.

Conclusion: The site is suitable for the proposed construction with suitable preparation of the surface soil, adequate compaction, use of select fill material, and proper surface drainage. The impacts from geologic resources would be ***less than significant***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Soils incapable of supporting water or wastewater supply systems (e): The Project does not include installation or use of wastewater disposal systems.

Conclusion: ***No impacts*** from geologic resources would occur to water or alternative septic systems.

Mitigation Measures: None are required

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
7. *Hazards/Hazardous Materials*				
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

Response:

Hazardous Materials (a, b, c): The project will not result in the use or disposal of hazardous materials.

Conclusion: *No impacts* from hazardous materials would occur.

Mitigation Measures: None are required

Located in a Hazardous Materials Site (d): The Project Area does not include any hazards found to be on a list of hazardous material sites.

Conclusion: Impacts from hazardous materials is less than significant.

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Public Airstrip or Private Airstrip (e,f): The project site is not within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip.

Conclusion: There is ***no impact.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Emergency Plan (g): The Project site is accessible from surrounding roads, and alternative routes for emergency access or evacuation exist in the Project vicinity. The City of Lemoore has an existing Emergency Operations Plan for Response to Disasters and Terrorism that includes access and evacuation routes. The proposed Project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with the adopted emergency and evacuation plan. The proposed Project will not change emergency access or access to nearby uses. Therefore no impact has been identified.

Conclusion: There is ***no impact.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Risk of Fire (h): The Project area is located in an urbanized area that is not susceptible to wildland fires..

Conclusion: There is ***no impact.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. *Hydrology/Water Quality*				
Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 flooding on- or off-site?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☒	☐
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Response:

Water Quality (a): The site improvements will not generate any unusual discharges and will not negatively impact the existing stormwater drainage system.

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Groundwater (b): The project will not negatively affect groundwater sources.

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Surface Water (c, d, e): The Project will not negatively affect surface water resources.

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Stormwater (d, e): The Project will not change the drainage pattern of the site.

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Water Quality (f): The Project will not otherwise substantially degrade water quality.

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Flood Hazard (g, h, i): The project is not within a 100-year flood hazard area.

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Inundation (i, j): The project is located in the Central Valley of California which is over 100 miles from the Pacific Ocean, 300 feet above mean sea level, and separated by the Kettleman Hills.

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
10. Mineral Resources				
Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Response:

Mineral Resources (a, b): No mineral resources are known to exist on the Project site, and no portion of it is being used for mineral resource extraction.

Conclusion: There is ***no impact.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

11. Noise

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project result in:				
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Response:

Permanent and Temporary Ambient Noise Levels (a, d): The City of Lemoore General Plan states that existing noise problems are not significant. The General Plan EIR and the City's adopted Thresholds of Significance state that average daytime noise levels should not exceed 55 dBA, and maximum daytime noise levels should not exceed 70 dBA.

Conclusion: Short-term impacts are ***less than significant with mitigation***. Long-term impacts are ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Effectiveness of Measures: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Excessive Groundborne Vibration or Groundborne Noise Levels (b): Construction activities and ongoing operation of the proposed Project site is not expected to involve the uses of explosives or any other intensive construction activities that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or noises. Exposure to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels is not anticipated.

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Level: (c): The typical day-to-day residential use will not generate noise levels exceeding the City's noise level standards.

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Airport Noise (e, f): The Project site is not within an airport land use plan, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Conclusion: There is ***no impact.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
12. *Population and Housing*				
Would the project:				
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)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Response:

Population Growth and Displacement (a, b, c): The Project will not generate nor displace existing housing or people.

Conclusion: There is *no impact.*

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. Public Services				
Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impact, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Response:

Protection, Schools, Parks, Other (a): The project area as proposed will not require public services.

Conclusion: There are ***no impacts.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
14. Recreation				
Would the project:				
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Response:

Recreational Facilities (a, b): The Project will not increase the use of existing parks to such a level that it will result in physical deterioration of recreational facilities. No recreational facilities are included in the Project area, and the Project will not require the expansion or construction of additional recreational facilities in the City.

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
15. Transportation/Traffic				
Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?)	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Conflict with adopted polices, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Response:

Increase in Traffic (a, b): The Project will not generate additional traffic. The Project may include a temporary increase in traffic during construction, as a result of temporary road obstruction from construction, but the total volume is minimal.

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Air Traffic Patterns (c): The Project does not propose any improvements that would result in a change in air traffic patterns.

Conclusion: There is ***no impact.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Hazards Due to a Design Feature (d): The plan does not contain any design features that have been identified as hazardous or incompatible with surrounding uses.

Conclusion: There is ***no impact.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Emergency Access (e): The proposed Project will not change emergency access or access to nearby uses.

Conclusion: There is ***no impact.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Parking (f): The proposed Project will demand additional parking.

Conclusion: This impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Alternative Transportation (g): The project will not affect efforts to encourage alternative transportation.

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
16. Utilities/Service Systems				
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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 project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Response:

Wastewater (a, b, e): The project will not generate wastewater.

Conclusion: The Project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements. The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Storm Water (c): The Project will not discharge large volumes of stormwater. The Project will not negatively alter the drainage pattern of the site and will not result in a need for improved storm water facilities.

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Water Service (d): The Project will not lead to substantial depletion of groundwater supplies, and will not lead to significant new demands on the City's water supply system. Thus it will not require new or expanded entitlements, or require the construction of new water supply facilities that would lead to significant environmental effects.

Conclusion: The impact is ***less than significant.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

Solid Waste (f, g): The project will not generate refuse.

Conclusion: There is ***no impact.***

Mitigation Measures: None are required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
17. *Mandatory Findings of Significance*				
Would the project:				
a) Does the project have the potential to: substantially degrade the quality of the environment; substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species; or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Does the project have possible environmental effects 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 probably future projects.	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Will the environmental effects of a project cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Response: The proposed Project would not 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, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or disturb paleontological resources or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The proposed Project is consistent with long-range plans and would not be inconsistent with existing environmental plans. The Project would not contribute substantially to adverse cumulative conditions, or create any substantial indirect impacts (i.e., increase in population could lead to an increase need for housing, increase in traffic, air pollutants, etc).