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</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTA</td>
<td>Lake Transit Authority</td>
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<td>SB</td>
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</tr>
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<td>SCAQMD</td>
<td>South Coast Air Quality Management District</td>
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<tr>
<td>SGMA</td>
<td>Sustainable Groundwater Management Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMAQMD</td>
<td>Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>State Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTA</td>
<td>Shasta Regional Transportation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMDL</td>
<td>Total Maximum Daily Load</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>Vehicle miles traveled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEB</td>
<td>Zero emission bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEV</td>
<td>Zero emission vehicle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Project Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Lake County Interregional Transit Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lead Agency Name &amp; Address</td>
<td>Lake Transit Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person &amp; Phone Number</td>
<td>James Sookne, Program Manager, (707) 263-7868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Component</td>
<td>Interregional Transit Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance and Operations Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component Location</td>
<td>Southwest corner of S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Center Drive and Dam Road Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(City of Clearlake)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9240 Hwy 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Lake, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Lake County)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor Parcel Number</td>
<td>010-043-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>012-025-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan Land Use</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cc (Community Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>CG (General Commercial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2 (Community Commercial)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 Introduction and CEQA Requirements

Lake Transit Authority (Lake Transit), serving as the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Lead Agency, has prepared this Initial Study to provide the public, responsible agencies, and trustee agencies with information about the potential environmental effects of the proposed Lake County Interregional Transit Center Project (hereafter referred to as the “project”).

Lake Transit is considering construction of a new transit center, relocation of route services from the existing transfer hub to the new transit center, acquisition of four (4) hydrogen buses, improvements to the existing Lake Transit maintenance and operations (M&O) facility to support the use of the new hydrogen buses, and expansion of intercity transit service.

This project is subject to the requirements of CEQA. The purpose of this Initial Study is to provide a basis for deciding whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report, a Mitigated Negative Declaration, or a Negative Declaration. This Initial Study is intended to satisfy the requirements of CEQA, (Public Resources Code, Div 13, Sec 21000-21177), and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sec 15000-15387). CEQA encourages lead agencies and applicants to modify their projects to avoid significant adverse impacts.

Section 15063(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines states the content requirements of an Initial Study as follows:

1. A description of the project including the location of the project;
2. An identification of the environmental setting;
3. An identification of environmental effects by use of a checklist, matrix, or other method, provided that entries on a checklist or other form are briefly explained to indicate that there is some evidence to support the entries;

4. A discussion of the ways to mitigate the significant effects identified, if any;

5. An examination of whether the project would be consistent with existing zoning, plans, and other applicable land use controls; and

6. The name of the person or persons who prepared or participated in the Initial Study.

1.2 Project Background and Objectives

Lake Transit provides public transit service throughout Lake County including the cities and unincorporated communities, as well as providing connections to Napa County and Mendocino County. Lake Transit’s projects are subject to the City of Clearlake and Lake County’s zoning and development guidelines. As described within this section, Lake Transit coordinates and works in partnership with the City and County to support residents and the community.

Project Need

Lake Transit operates an existing transit transfer hub in the City of Clearlake, within the parking lot of the Clearlake Shopping Center. The existing transfer hub services six Lake Transit fixed routes (three regional routes and three local routes). Several deficiencies have been identified for the existing transfer hub, including security issues, inadequate size (requiring turnaround on private land), poor public image, and a lack of control over land and utilities. This current location is a significant deterrent for some riders as it presents a poor image of the transit system, feels unsafe (particularly to seniors) and offers no scheduling or connection information.

In 2017, Lake Area Planning Council (APC), in coordination with Lake Transit, prepared the Lake Transit Hub Location Plan to assess the long-term viability of the existing transfer hub, Lake Transit’s long-term transit hub facility needs, and alternative transit hub sites (LTA and Lake APC 2017). The project need has been well documented in the following Lake Transit documents:

- Lake Transit Hub Location Plan (2017),
- Regional Transportation Plan (2022),
- Transit Development Plan (2015), and

Project Purpose

The proposed project would provide a safer, more efficient rider experience and expand existing intercity routes using hydrogen fuel cell transit buses. An improved transit center is important in enhancing the overall transit program, and ensuring that adequate capacity is available to accommodate future ridership growth. The proposed Interregional Transit Center is intended to serve as a centralized “node” for local rural transit system uses, as well as a linkage to larger metropolitan areas, increasing opportunities for rural access to airports and passenger rail service, as well as a number of other services that are locally unavailable, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions across the transit system.

One of the primary goals of the project is to construct a new transit center on a property in the City of Clearlake. A second component of the project would include electric vehicle charging and hydrogen fueling...
infrastructure, as well as a fleet of zero-emission buses for use in extending regular Lake Transit service to out-of-county destinations.

**Public Involvement and Agency Partnerships**

Lake APC, the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for Lake County, initiated a study of locating a new and enhanced transit hub. At the outset of the project, an advisory group representing Lake Transit, Lake APC, City of Clearlake, and Caltrans met to discuss potential sites and issues to be addressed during the study.

After the completion of the first Technical Memorandum and the identification of a preferred site, a design charrette was held on May 12th, 2016, at the Clearlake City Council Chambers. Roughly 20 people attended including City Council members, County Board of Supervisors, Lake APC board members, County/City staff, Clearlake Police Department and representatives from neighboring uses. After the charrette, Study Team members held a public open house in the lobby of the Clearlake City Hall just prior to the City Council meeting. This provided the public with the opportunity to view and comment on 3D illustrations of potential transfer hub designs and location.

To address concerns raised by the public at the charrette, the Study Team expanded the scope of the study to include: 1) a peer review of other transit centers located near a school or college, 2) hiring a security expert to review potential security measures, 3) and conducting a second workshop focused on addressing security concerns. In addition to the workshop, the Study Team and security consultant met separately with the Clearlake Police Department, Konocti Education Center, and Woodland Community College.

**Regional Planning Context**

Lake Transit is coordinating with two agencies that share parallel goals of meeting rural transportation needs. The first is Shasta Regional Transportation Agency (SRTA), which is in the process of implementing its North State Intercity Bus System project, further described below. The second agency is the Lake County region’s Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA), also known as Lake Links, which actively partners with Lake Transit to provide Non-Emergency Medical Transportation (NEMT) services to low-income seniors and disabled residents of the region. The proposed transit hub will play an important role in providing a centralized location for NEMT shuttle service to appointment locations both within and without Lake County.

The project is proposed within a complex and interconnected planning environment, with multiple public agencies cooperating to improve and serve the community. As described in the section above, Lake Transit works in partnership with the City of Clearlake, Lake APC, and Caltrans. The following planning documents provide a local and regional planning context within which the project would be implemented.

**Lake Transit – Lake Transit Hub Location Plan (2017)**

The Lake Transit Hub Location Plan details the deficiencies of the existing transit hub, the planning process, the public involvement process conducted to include community input, evaluation of 7 alternative sites, and identifies the preferred site. Additionally, the Transit Hub Location Plan describes the adopted plans that may change traffic volumes and circulation with the area surrounding the existing transfer hub, as well as planned changes in the public transit network.

Finally, the plan contains a detailed description of the necessary and potential components, and associated footprint requirements, of a new transit hub, and provides two conceptual site plan configurations for the
preferred site. The proposed Interregional Transit Center location would be located on the preferred site and would be consistent with the Corner Option configuration identified within the plan.

City of Clearlake – 2040 General Plan (2017)

The City of Clearlake 2040 General Plan (General Plan) identifies multiple goals, policies, and objectives applicable to development and growth in the vicinity of the proposed Interregional Transit Center. The General Plan also identifies roadway improvements that serve the site. As stated in the General Plan, Clearlake is expected to grow to a population of around 22,000 persons by the year 2040. This represents an increase of about 6,000 persons (from 2015) reflecting an overall growth of 40 percent of the City’s current population (Clearlake 2017).

Preferred growth Scenario for 2040

This scenario emphasizes design concepts from the Infill and Redevelopment Alternative and the Clustered Growth Development Alternative. The Regional Shopping Center (Wal-Mart/Airport Area) is one of the nine key growth areas specified in the General Plan.

Economic Development

General Plan Chapter 10, Economic Development, provides that the adjacent area along SR 53, Old Highway 53, and Dam Road could be developed as a regional shopping center to serve the daily needs of Lake County residents. New commercial development could benefit from the business generated from Walmart, and provide the retail shopping needs suited to locals instead of tourists.

Circulation

General Plan Chapter 4, Circulation, identifies that the City will improve existing streets to be more complete in accommodating bicycle and pedestrian movements. Additionally, the following circulation improvements are needed during the 2040 General Plan time horizon to mitigate traffic impacts to an acceptable level of service:

- Roundabout at Dam Road and Damn Road Extension
- Capacity improvements to SR 53, including improvements to the intersections of SR 53/18th Avenue and SR 53/Old Highway53/Dam Road.


The Lake Transit Energy Use Reduction Plan contains multiple recommendations for the Lake Transit to reduce energy use, from conserving energy at existing Lake Transit facilities, increasing onsite energy generation through solar panels, increasing operational efficiency of the transit system and its facilities, and reducing fuel consumption.

The following recommendations from the plan are relevant to the proposed project:

- Investigate feasibility of solar installation (in form of bus canopy at current facilities)
- Acquire four electric buses (and associated charging station)

Shasta Regional Transportation Agency – North State Intercity Bus Service

The SRTA is planning on extending the North State Intercity Bus Service (NS Express Connect), to include a Lake Feeder Line to connect the City of Clearlake, and associated Lake Transit routes, with the Sacramento Region to the east. The NS Express Connect would establish a new intercity transit express
route between Redding and Sacramento, with feeder routes linking the counties of Shasta, Modoc, Siskiyou, Humboldt, Lassen, Butte, Trinity, Tehama, Glenn, Lake and Colusa. SRTA anticipates using 35-foot zero emission buses (ZEB) for feeder routes. SRTA’s proposed NS Express Connect would use electric or hydrogen buses and connect the northern third of the state of California’s intercity public transportation system.

Although the SRTA would continue to consult and coordinate with Lake Transit in further planning and implementation of the proposed NS Express Connect, SRTA is the primary responsible party for the program.

State Planning Context

In addition to the complex local planning context provided above, California regulations and funding programs have driven an increase in Zero Emission Vehicles (ZEV), Zero Emission Buses (ZEB), hydrogen Fuel Cell Electric Vehicles (FCEV), and alternative fuel infrastructure (including electric vehicle charging stations and hydrogen fueling stations). Many of the regulations aim at reducing greenhouse gas emissions, electrifying the transportation sector, reducing reliance on oil, and improving air quality.

Relevant State and federal regulations and plans, as well as a brief overview of hydrogen safety codes and standards is provided in Section 1.10, Zero Emission Buses and Hydrogen Fuel Background.

1.3 Project Location and Existing Setting

The project facilities would result in construction within the grounds of existing Lake Transit properties, adjacent roadways, and at the existing transfer hub. Specifically, the project would result in improvements or construction activity at three different locations: the proposed Interregional Transit Center site and adjacent roadways, the existing M&O facility, and the existing transfer hub (see Figure 1, Regional Location Map).

Interregional Transit Center Site

See Figure 2, Interregional Transit Center Location. The Interregional Transit Center would be located on approximately 2 acres of land on the southwest corner of S. Center Drive and Dam Road Extension. Additionally, construction staging would occur on approximately 0.76 acre-portion of the property immediately west and adjacent to the proposed transit center. The site is located approximately 2 miles north of the existing M&O facility, and 0.2-mile northwest of the existing transfer hub. The site is located within the Shoreline Communities Planning Area and is identified as within FEMA Flood Zone X (outside the 0.2-percent annual chance floodplain).

Surrounding Land Uses

The site is bounded by S. Center Drive to the north and Dam Road Extension to the east. To the west is the Clearlake Masonic Lodge, and open space, and State Route (SR) 53 (a main traffic/transportation corridor through the City of Clearlake). To the north are Lake County Superior court, Lake County Mental Health Department, Adventist Health Hospital, and open space beyond. To the east are the Konocti Education Center and Woodland Community College Lake County Campus. To the south are the Sears Hometown Store, open space, and additional commercial uses.

The site is within a half mile of one of the City of Clearlake’s primary residential neighborhoods known as “the Avenues,” which will have access to the site via a recently constructed road connecting Dam Road Extension (Project area) to 18th Avenue (the southernmost of the residential “Avenues” region).
S. Center Drive has unpaved informal parking on the shoulders. Dam Road Extension has continuous walks on the east side of the roadway and, north of the intersection with S. Center Drive, existing Class II bike lanes and pedestrian facilities on both sides. The Woodlake Community College bus stop, serving Routes 1, 11, and 12, is located approximately 300 feet west of the site boundary, beyond Dam Road Extension. Regional access is provided by SR 53 intersections with 18th Avenue and Dam Road, approximately 0.3-mile northwest and 0.2 mile southwest of the site, respectively.

Site Description
The project site is generally flat and located at an elevation of approximately 1,830 feet above mean sea level. The area is undeveloped, with informal unpaved vehicle paths connecting the eastern boundary of the site to the southwestern boundary of the site. The site is an open, unirrigated field with eleven (11) medium and eight (8) large established oak trees. Tree size is evaluated using diameter at breast height (DBH). Medium-sized trees are between 4 and 18-inch DBH, large trees are above 18 inches DBH.

Utilities adjacent to the site include 6-inch and 10-inch water pipes. The newer 10-inch water pipe currently services Walmart and Woodland Community College, and has ample resources to serve the potential transfer center. The older 6-inch water pipe serves older properties in the area.

Electrical lines run south and west of the site. The western electrical line spans roughly 490 feet, and runs between the site and the parcel to the west. The southern electrical line spans roughly 190 feet, and borders the site and the Sears property.

A sewer line runs across the southernmost portion of the project parcel.

M&O Facility Site
As shown in Figure 3, M&O Facility Location, the Project M&O improvements would be located within the 3.2-acre Lake Transit M&O facility, located at 9240 Hwy 53, Lower Lake, CA, and an approximately 1-acre field immediately north and adjacent to the M&O facility. The site is located approximately 2 miles south of the proposed Interregional Transit Center. Project improvements would occur withing the existing building, and on approximately 10,000 sf of land located between the employee parking area and bus fleet storage area. Potential future solar improvements would occur on the field immediately north and adjacent to the 3.2-acre M&O facility. The site is located within the Lower Lake Planning Area and is identified as within FEMA the Special Flood Hazard Zone AE, but outside the Regulatory Floodway.

Surrounding Land Uses
The site is bounded by SR 53 to the west. To the north are open space and Seigler Canyon Creek. Rural open land, Seigler Canyon Creek, and Lower Lake High School are east of the site. To the south are existing residential uses. To the west beyond SR 53 are existing commercial and light industrial uses.

Regional access is provided by the site’s driveway connection with SR 53. A bus stop servicing Routes 3, 4, and 10 is located west of the site, across SR 53.

Site Description
Lake Transit operates an existing 7,000 square-foot M&O Facility that is half shop space and half offices. The existing facility includes two (2) indoor and one (1) outdoor maintenance bays. Paved vehicle circulation and employee parking areas surround the facility. Lake Transit’s bus fleet is stored in an uncovered, paved lot north of the facility. The bus fleet storage area is surrounded by a chain link fence, with security gate. The bus fleet storage area is closed and locked during non-business house. Typically,
the area would be operational from approximately 5 AM to 9:30 PM, Monday through Saturday (excluding holidays).

PG&E provides electrical service to the site. Existing storm drains are located on the east and west side of the site that connects bioswales, storm drain inlet, and ultimately connect to Siegler Creek.

**Existing Transfer Hub Site**

The existing Lake Transit transfer hub is located on the north side of the former Ray’s Food Place building, now occupied by Big 5 Sporting Goods and Tractor Supply Company, at the eastern end of Dam Road, as shown in Figure 3. This site provides three bus shelters and a large bus pullout that can accommodate three busses.

**Existing Transit Conditions**

Lake Transit provides public transit service throughout Lake County including the cities and unincorporated communities, as well as providing connections to Napa County and Mendocino County. In addition to fixed route service, curb-to-curb Dial-A-Ride (DAR) service is available in the Clearlake/Lower Lake area as well as the Lakeport area during the fixed route operating hours. Passengers must be eligible for DAR services under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Outside of the DAR service area, Lake Transit’s Flex Stop program allows passengers to request curbside service up to one mile from the regular fixed routes. The general public can utilize Flex Stop at a higher fare than disabled and other discount riders.

Lake Transit’s bus fleet is comprised of 31 cutaway buses that run on both gasoline and diesel fuel. The buses range from 12-seat minibuses to 32-seat buses. In Fiscal Year 2018-19, Lake Transit operated a total of 897,335 vehicle revenue miles.

**Fixed Routes**

As shown in Figure 2, Lake Transit provides fixed route service throughout Lake County and beyond, with fixed route service available in Clearlake, Upper Lake, Lakeport, Kelseyville, and Middletown and regional routes connecting to Deer Park (Napa County), Soda Bay, and Ukiah (Mendocino County). In general, service is provided Monday through Saturday between the hours of 7:00 AM and 6:00 PM. Certain routes operate weekdays only and/or during different hours (Transit Hub Location Plan). See Table 1-1 for descriptions of Lake Transit’s existing fixed route services.

**Table 1-1  Existing Routes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>General Description</th>
<th>Operational Schedule</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Endpoint A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercity Routes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 1 (North Shore)¹</td>
<td>North Shore Clearlake to Lakeport</td>
<td>Monday - Saturday</td>
<td>Clearlake, Existing Transfer Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 2 (Highway 175)</td>
<td>Hwy 175 Kit’s Corner to Middletown</td>
<td>Monday – Friday</td>
<td>Soda Bay Road, Riviera Shopping Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 3 (Highway 29)¹</td>
<td>Hwy 29 Clearlake to Deer Park</td>
<td>Monday – Saturday</td>
<td>Clearlake, Existing Transfer Hub</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Route Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>General Description</th>
<th>Operational Schedule</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Route 4 (South Shore)</strong>&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>South Shore Clearlake to Lakeport</td>
<td>Monday - Saturday</td>
<td>Clearlake, Existing Transfer Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Route 4a (South Shore via Soda Bay Rd)</strong></td>
<td>Soda Bay Kit’s Corner to Lakeport</td>
<td>Monday – Friday</td>
<td>Soda Bay Road, Kit’s Corner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Route 7 (To Ukiah)</strong></td>
<td>Lakeport/Ukiah</td>
<td>Monday – Saturday</td>
<td>Ukiah, Airport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Clearlake and Lower Lake Routes (Local Routes)** |
|-------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------|
| **Route 10 (Clearlake Park)**<sup>1</sup> | Clearlake/Clearlake Park North Loop | Monday - Saturday | Clearlake, Existing Transfer Hub | Clearlake, Bush & Second |
| **Route 11 (The Avenue)**<sup>1</sup> | The Avenues Loop | Monday – Saturday | Clearlake, Existing Transfer Hub | Clearlake, Walnut Grove Apts. |
| **Route 12 (Clearlake South)**<sup>1</sup> | Clearlake/Lower Lake South Loop | Monday – Friday | Clearlake, Hwy 53 & Main | Clearlake, Walnut Grove Apts. |

| **Lakeport Routes** |
|-------|---------------------|----------------------|-----------|
| **Route 8 (Lakeport City)** | Lakeport City | Monday - Saturday | Sutter Lakeside Hospital | Konocti Vista Casino |

**Notes:**

1. Route includes a stop at the existing Clearlake Transfer Hub in the Walmart Parking Lot

### Existing Transfer Hub

Six (6) Lake Transit fixed routes transfer at this location (three [3] regional routes and three [3] City of Clearlake routes). Many common destinations for public transit users are within walking distance of the existing transfer hub including: Walmart, Woodland Community College, County Courts, County Mental Health Department and Adventist Health Clear Lake Hospital. As such, the existing transfer hub in Clearlake represents a key location within the overall transit network. However, the location within the parking lot, in conjuncture with an incomplete pedestrian network, results in conflicts between transit riders walking to adjacent land uses and vehicles moving through the parking lot. The current situation is most challenging to seniors and those with disabilities seeking services at the County Behavioral Health offices, or Adventist Health Clear Lake Hospital, who would need to cover the approximately one-third to one-half mile to reach these destinations.

There is a maximum of six buses (not accounting for Dial-A-Ride vehicles) at the transfer hub at peak times. In the morning hours between 6:00 AM and 10:00 AM, the hour marks of 7:00, 8:00, and 9:00 are the busiest, with five buses stopped at the existing transfer hub. Peak evening bus activity occurs around 7:00 PM, with five to six buses stopped at the existing transfer hub.

### Projected Transit Conditions

The existing routes, as discussed in the prior section, serve all of the major corridors directly accessing the existing transfer hub and vicinity. While Lake Transit already has intercity connections to the south (Calistoga and St. Helena in Napa County) and to Ukiah to the west, there is no existing transit connection to the Sacramento region to the east. Therefore, it is estimated that at least one additional route serving the Lake Transit Center will be added in the future 20 years.
1.4 Project Description

The project consists of the following main components:

1. The Interregional Transit Center
2. The addition and use of zero-emission buses (ZEB) to expand existing Lake Transit service to further out-of-county destinations
3. M&O facility improvements to support ZEB
4. Existing Transfer Hub Decommissioning
5. Future solar facilities at the existing M&O facility

The first four components would be implemented upon project approval. The fifth component, installation and operation of a solar array facility, would be constructed at a later date dependent on funding procurement. The fueling infrastructure would also allow Lake Transit to purchase more ZEB in the future.

Interregional Transit Center

The Interregional Transit Center is broadly organized by a triangular transit plaza on the northeastern portion of the site, a diagonal interior driveway and electric bus charging stations on the central portion of the site, and a parking lot and greenspace park on the southern portion of the site. Interior crosswalks would support pedestrian movement through the project site, including through the parking lot. Onsite pedestrian infrastructure and vehicle movement areas (including driveways) would be designed to tie into the City of Clearlake’s planned Dam Road Extension & South Center Drive Bike/Pedestrian Improvements project.

The Project would include low maintenance, drought tolerant landscaping throughout the site, including within a proposed 0.6-acre greenspace area. Landscaping would be designed and installed in accordance with the City of Clearlake zoning landscaping ordinances. Existing trees would be incorporated into the project landscaping plan, including approximately six large trees.

The Interregional Transit Center would incorporate the following green initiatives:

- Three Electric Bus Charging Stations
- Four Public Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging Stations within the parking lot.
- Solar panels on south and west-facing sides of the Transit Building (estimated 27 kW system)
- Water harvesting methods, such as permeable pavement or bioswales

Security measures include real-time cameras (connected to the dispatch center) to be installed throughout the site. Additionally, the project includes safety-oriented design (clear lines of site from the facility to the street and rounded corners). Fencing would be provided along the western boundary of the New Intercity Transfer Hub, and between the project’s proposed greenspace and proposed sidewalks fronting Dam Road Extension. Overall, the design has been developed to minimize the areas hidden from police traveling along the adjacent roadways. Within the site, the areas not visible from a potential staff office location have been minimized.

The transit facility will be fully compliant with guidelines set forth under the American Disability Act, including the following provisions: no more than a 2 percent slope in any direction of travel; space of 5 feet

---

1 The actual electricity generation would depend on the physical design of the PV system. The results from the PVWatts tool assumes a 20-degree tilt on a roof-mounted system. At approximately 16 Watts (W) per square foot, a 27 kW system would require 1,700 square feet (LTA 2015).
by 8 feet located between the bus and sidewalk to accommodate wheelchair ramps and passage; and clear passages of travel provided for disabled patrons.

**Transit Plaza**

The overall site plan for the transit plaza is triangular shaped, delineated by S. Center Drive to the north, Dam Road Extension to the east, and a proposed diagonal interior drive to the south and west. The transit plaza consists of a transit building, a pedestrian platform with covered breezeway, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, landscaping, and bus bays. The project includes lighting and security cameras installed throughout the transit plaza.

**Transit Building**

The transit building would be a one-story, 2,160 sf building, with pedestrian waiting areas, private restrooms, and offices. Within this building, the waiting area would be on the south side (both to provide passengers with a view of arriving buses and to take advantage of natural sunlight) and the offices/restrooms on the north side. Solar panels would be placed on south and west-facing sides of the Transit Building.

**Bus Bays**

A total of eight (8) bus bays would be located along the triangular transit plaza. All of the bus bays are of sufficient dimensions to accommodate a 40-foot bus. Three (3) sawtooth bays are provided along the northern (Center Drive) side, two (2) straight bays are provided on the eastern (Dam Road Extension) side, and three (3) sawtooth bays are provided along the diagonal interior drive.

The sawtooth bays allow all buses to enter and exit the site regardless of the presence of buses in other bays, thereby reducing delays. This also allows specific bays to be designated for specific routes, which is a convenience to passengers.

The straight bays along Dam Road Extension would have an adequate length to allow a bus in the northern bay to depart even with a bus parked in the southern bay, though a bus could not access the southern bay if a bus is parked in the northern bay. This limitation could be addressed by designating the southern bay for a route that accesses the transit center at times when the bus on the route using the northern bay is not on-site.

**Pedestrian Platform/Breezeway**

The outdoor space adjacent to the transit building includes a covered breezeway and adjoining paved pedestrian platform. The breezeway would be an approximately 2,800 sf covered outdoor passenger waiting area, and would extend west from the transit building. The roofed but unwalled breezeway would provide shade and scattered seating to accommodate sitting and standing passengers. Outdoor seating under the breezeway is designed to accommodate 43 passengers.

The outdoor space would include a drinking fountain, pay phone, and trash bins, and general route and schedule information boards. For the bus bays not convenient to the building or breezeway, one bus shelter is provided to the south and one to the north. Eight bike lockers are provided adjacent to the northerly shelter.

**Diagonal Driveway and Electric Bus Charging Stations**

The diagonal driveway would be one-way in a northwesterly direction, with space for a Dial-A-Ride or NEMT shuttle services along the plaza.
Three electric bus charging bays will be located directly southwest of the diagonal driveway portion of the site marked for “buses only,” with a one-way entrance/exit directed towards the regular northwesterly egress onto South Center Drive.

Parking Lot and Greenspace

Auto parking is provided in a separate parking lot south of the bus charging infrastructure with two-way auto access onto Dam Road Extension. A total of 19 spots are included to be used for employees or park-and-ride. Four (4) of the 19 spots will be available for EV charging along with at least one (1) designated disabled spot.

Pedestrian crosswalks would connect the parking lot to the transit plaza to the north, and paved sidewalks would connect the parking lot to existing and planned pedestrian infrastructure along Dam Road Extension to the east.

An approximately 0.6-acre landscaped green space would be developed in the remaining southerly portion of the site with trees, grass and bench areas throughout. Fencing would be installed between the greenspace and the proposed sidewalk along Dam Road Extension to control access and safety to the site.

Offsite Improvements

Offsite improvements include new bicycle lanes and crosswalks. On the S. Center Drive and Dam Road Extension adjacent to the project site, 12-foot travel lanes would be maintained, and new 4-foot-wide bike lanes would be striped and signed. Four feet of distance has been provided between bike lanes and the adjacent parked buses, in order to improve sight lines and reduce the potential for conflicts.

As shown in Figure 7, Lake Transit anticipates six (6) offsite crosswalk improvements to connect the Interregional Transit Center with destinations north and east of the project site. Pedestrian crossings would connect the site to properties north of S. Center Drive and east of Dam Road Extension.

To enhance the pedestrian conditions at the northeast corner, the project design would formalize the current large-radius curve between Center Drive and Dam Road Extension. While the intersection would still serve all types of vehicles (a 25-foot curb return radius), this would slow traffic speeds and enhance pedestrian safety.

The project would also install speed limit signs and warning signs on Dam Road Extension for a school zone and buses turning into the transit center.

Zero Emission Buses and Expanded Intercity Route Service

Lake Transit proposes to purchase four (4) zero emission buses (ZEB) to supplement the existing fleet. Specifically, Lake Transit would purchase and use four (4) hydrogen buses. The buses would be stored at the M&O facility, consistent with existing practices. Improvements to the M&O facility to support the hydrogen buses are described in the next section. Hydrogen bus use is further described in Section 1.2, Operation and Maintenance.

Currently, Lake Transit offers intercity service to Ukiah (Mendocino County) and Calistoga (Napa County). The proposed ZEB (hydrogen bus) additions to the fleet will provide zero-emission service via Ukiah to the Charles M. Schulz–Sonoma County Airport (approximately seven miles northwest of downtown Santa Rosa). A second extended line that will be made possible by the expanded fleet will be via Calistoga to the Santa Rosa Bus Terminal in downtown Santa Rosa.
The expanded Intercity route service will use existing facilities and the facilities proposed by this project, as described above. No additional physical improvements would be required. Additional description of the expanded Intercity route service is provided in Section 1.2, Operation and Maintenance.

**M&O Facility Improvements**

Improvements to the Lake Transit M&O facility are proposed to support hydrogen buses. Improvements would consist of hydrogen fueling infrastructure and retrofits to the existing maintenance facility.

Retrofits to the maintenance facility would be required to allow for the proper air flow and ventilation needed to safely work on the hydrogen buses. In addition to retrofitting the building, solar panels will be installed on the south-facing pitched roofs. It is estimated that up to approximately 22 kW of solar could be accommodated by the facility’s south-facing roofs.

A hydrogen storage facility and dispensing station would be constructed between the existing maintenance facility and the bus parking area, as shown on Figure 3. Facility design has not been completed. The conceptual plan includes a liquid hydrogen fuel storage location east of the internal drive, a fuel dispenser west of the internal drive, and subsurface piping connecting the two facilities.

The fuel storage facility would be designed to receive liquid hydrogen by a vendor. Preliminary calculations indicate the storage facility would require approximately 50 feet by 80 feet of space and include a liquid hydrogen storage tank of approximately 15,000 gallons, liquid hydrogen pumps, a cryo compressor, vaporizers, and gaseous storage. This footprint would accommodate the initial design of receiving fuel by a vendor as well as conversion to on-site hydrogen generation. The hydrogen storage facility would be fully enclosed in either a security fence (such as chain link) or by a wall with secured, limited access.

Although design has not been completed, the hydrogen storage and fueling facility would include, at a minimum, the following elements:

- A dispensing platform
- Vehicle crash protection
- Electrical service
- Lighting
- Compressors to compress the hydrogen to vehicle storage pressure
- Piping from the gaseous hydrogen storage system to the dispenser
- Fire protection system
- Maintenance system
- Dispenser with fueling hose and nozzle, and integrated emergency shut-off switch.

The fuel storage facility would be modified at a future date to allow for onsite hydrogen generation with an electrolyzer, depending on electricity prices and funding availability. Onsite hydrogen generation could occur using either a single electrolyzer or multiple electrolyzers used in parallel.

The Project design would comply with applicable design standards, safety codes, and setback requirements, including (but not limited to) National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 2 Hydrogen Technologies Code. Specific setback requirements are dependent on facility size, design, components, and features.

**Existing Transfer Hub Decommissioning**

The existing transit facilities (shelter, benches, signs) would be removed.
Future Solar Facilities
Potential future solar improvements would occur on an approximately 1-acre field immediately north and adjacent to the M&O facility. Design and construction would occur at a later date dependent on funding procurement. The actual electricity generation would depend on the physical design of the photo voltaic (PV) system. Using the National Renewable Energy Laboratory’s PVWatts tool, and assuming a 20-degree tilt on a fixed (open rack) mounted system, and current PV system efficiencies, it is estimated that up to 460 kW PV array could installed.

1.5 Project Construction

Construction Schedule
Construction of the Interregional Transit Center could begin in mid-2024, and last approximately 10 months. Construction of the M&O facility Improvements would also begin in mid-2024 and last approximately 2 months. Anticipated work hours would be daylight hours (7:00 AM to 7:00 PM) Monday through Friday. Nighttime work is not anticipated.

Staging During Construction
Staging would occur with the project sites, as well as within the staging area adjacent to the proposed Interregional Transit Center, shown on Figure 1-2. Workers would park their vehicles within designated areas of the project sites.

Traffic Control
Construction of proposed facilities on and adjacent to S. Center Road and Dam Road Extension may require traffic control or brief road closures. The City would require the contractor to develop and implement a temporary Traffic Control Plan outlining work zones, activities, and time needed to complete the work in each zone.

Construction Workers and Equipment
The number of construction-related vehicles traveling to and from the project sites would vary daily. The estimated size of the construction workforce at any one time during construction is anticipated to range between 10 and 20 workers.

Construction debris, including soil, plant material, concrete, and asphalt, would be recycled where feasible. Materials found unsuitable for reuse or recycling would be disposed of at a regional landfill. Mass grading is not anticipated to require import or export of soils. Miscellaneous material deliveries would range from 4 to 14 loads per day.

Anticipated construction equipment includes excavator, loader/backhoe, compactor, industrial saw, small equipment for excavation, paving equipment, crane, and generator.

Interregional Transit Center
Depending on final design, the project would remove three to four existing blue oak trees in the small grove on the west side of Dam Road Extension, approximately 100 feet south of S. Center Drive. However, the largest (westernmost) blue oak tree would remain, as would a grove of blue oak trees on the southern portion of the site. Tree removal would be mitigated in accordance with Chapter 18-40 (Native Tree
Protection), of the City’s Municipal Code. Mitigation would consist of either replacing trees onsite or offsite at the ratio prescribed by the City’s Municipal Code Section 18-40.050.

**M&O Facility Improvements**

Installation of the hydrogen storage and fueling facilities would include trenching, foundation work, facility installation, pressure testing, leak detection, and hydrogen sampling. Once construction and verification has been completed, a final inspection by Lake County and the Fire Department are required to approve the station for operation.

At a future date, the conversion of the hydrogen storage facility would consist of installation of electrolyzer(s) and associated infrastructure such as electrical upgrades. It is anticipated that the Project would install a containerized hydrogen generation system, which contain the electrolyzer in a modular container for ease of installation and integration into existing fuel storage systems.

**Existing Transfer Hub Decommissioning**

Decommissioning of the existing transfer hub would consist of removal of the existing shelters. Removal of the shelters would require unbolting and small patchwork to fill minor holes.

### 1.6 Operation and Maintenance

Following construction, the project would result in relocating the six (6) routes currently serviced by the existing transfer hub to the new transit center. Additionally, the project would result in operation of the hydrogen fueling infrastructure at the M&O facility and expansion of Intercity transit service, as detailed below. The project is not anticipated to require new employees.

**Interregional Transit Center**

The estimated useful life for the new transit center is 40 years. Sawtooth bays allow buses to operate fully independently with each other. This means that buses can pull in or out of all bays regardless of the presence of buses in the adjacent bays. Therefore, the new facility would reduce delays and associated idling times currently experienced at the existing transfer hub (which would be decommissioned as a part of the project).

Relocating the six (6) routes currently serviced by the existing transfer hub to the new transit center would result in approximately 500 additional bus miles per year. However, the transit center is estimated to result in a fossil fuel use reduction for the agency due to replacing existing diesel-fueled buses with hydrogen-fueled ZEB. Additionally, the three electric charging stations will allow for future ZEB purchases by Lake Transit, further reducing fossil fuel emissions.

**Safety**

At least one Lake Transit staff member would be stationed at the new transfer hub during transit hours. It is anticipated that the staff member would be administrative personnel who could assist passengers with questions and ticket sales and/or a transit supervisor. Transit staff would have a good line of sight from the office onto Dam Road Extension in the direction of Konocti Education Center and Woodland Community College. Periodically, staff would walk the perimeter of the transfer hub property in an effort to maintain a strong presence as well as enforce no loitering on the premises. Transit staff would also be trained to coordinate with Konocti Education Center/Woodland Community College staff and security personnel. Lake Transit would assist in enforcing City of Clearlake Ordinance 5.21.3.d, which prohibits panhandling within 10 feet of a public transportation vehicle or stop, if asked to leave by the owner/operator. Additionally, Lake
Transit would work with Clearlake Police Department to conduct period police patrols. Finally, the Interregional Transit Center would avoid or secure with locking caps all outdoor electrical outlets where transients could easily charge cell phones or other electronic devices; securing or locking would occur during non-operational hours. Outdoor electrical outlets would be available during business hours for riders to charge their devices.

**M&O Facility Improvements**

Project operations at the M&O facility would consist of receipt of hydrogen fuel by vendors, storage and dispensing of hydrogen fuel, and regular inspection and maintenance of the fuel storage and dispensing facility. The Project would not require new employees.

The new ZEB would be stored with the existing bus fleet on the site. Fueling ZEB is anticipated to take approximately 15 minutes per bus per day, with 2 ZEB fueled per hour. The Project would not increase on-road mobile trips associated with employees or buses. Receipt of fuel by vendors is anticipated to result in two (2) new one-way truck trips per month, likely to originate in the Sacramento area where existing hydrogen generating companies are located. Fuel receipt would occur during normal operating hours.

Initial operations (receiving hydrogen fuel by vendors) of the Project facility would not result in a substantive increase in electrical energy or water consumption at the Project site. After conversion of the storage facility to allow for onsite hydrogen generation, it is estimated that the Project would require additional electricity and potable water during onsite generation. Depending on the efficiency of the electrolyzer, the system would require an estimated 2,374 to 2,672 megawatt hours (mWh) per year, and approximately 259,416 gallons of water per year.

**Safety**

Safety includes both physical design and operational activities. The hydrogen fueling station has several different safety systems that work together to keep vehicle operators safe while fueling. If flame detectors or gas sensors detect a fire or leak, redundant safety systems automatically stop hydrogen flow, seal storage tanks, and/or safely vent the hydrogen if required. Strategically placed emergency stops are designed to automatically shut down hydrogen equipment and isolate the gas supply, if activated. Separation walls and equipment setbacks are designed into the site plan to maximize safety. In addition to physical safety systems, hydrogen fueling stations also have logic systems that use sensors to detect illogical patterns or flows. If a sensor detects an off-normal condition the system will shut down if necessary (GoBiz 2020).

Hydrogen components for vehicles are built to meet strict manufacturer and published guidelines and undergo third-party testing for safety and structural integrity (DOE 2014). Hydrogen storage tanks on vehicles are put through rigorous testing including crash tests, gunfire and performance requirements. They are also made of high-strength composite materials that are much stronger than steel (CHBC 2018). With safety codes and current design, FCEVs and the fueling stations to supply the hydrogen are considered as safe as conventional systems (CHBC 2018).

Prior to the start of operations, Lake Transit would prepare a Facility Safety Plan (Safety Plan) and Operating Procedures consistent with recommendations from the Hydrogen Safety Panel’s *Safety Planning for Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Projects* (HSP 2020).

The Safety Plan would be based on the facility design, components, and anticipated operational parameters. The Safety Plan would detail potential risks and impacts to personnel, equipment and the environment, and controls that minimize the likelihood and/or severity of the risk. The Safety Plan would include a safety communication protocol to describe how project safety is communicated.
and made available to the operating staff, neighboring occupants, and local emergency response officials.

**Operating Procedures** provide guidelines for: who is authorized to operate the system and what required training they must have; what personal protective equipment (PPE) must be worn when performing specific tasks; steps for each operating phase, such as startup, normal operation, normal shutdown, emergency shutdown; operating limits; safety considerations, such as precautions necessary to prevent exposure and measures to be taken if physical contact or airborne exposure occurs; safety systems and their functions; nonroutine work authorizations; and maintenance activities.

Additionally, operations, maintenance, and safety training would be conducted at startup, and include Lake Transit staff and stakeholder staff (such as the Fire District).

**Expanded Intercity Route Service**

Currently, Lake Transit offers intercity service to Ukiah (Mendocino County) and Calistoga (Napa County). The proposed ZEB (hydrogen bus) additions to the fleet would provide zero-emission service via Ukiah to the Charles M. Schulz–Sonoma County Airport (approximately seven miles northwest of downtown Santa Rosa). A second extended line made possible by the expanded fleet would be via Calistoga to the Santa Rosa Bus Terminal in downtown Santa Rosa. Table 1-2 provides additional details regarding the expanded route service. The expanded route services are also shown in Figure 1-8.

**Table 1-2  Expanded Intercity Route Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Existing Terminus (County)</th>
<th>Proposed Terminus (County)</th>
<th>Additional Connection Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Route 3</td>
<td>Calistoga (Napa County)</td>
<td>Santa Rosa Bus Terminal in downtown Santa Rosa (Sonoma County)</td>
<td>Golden Gate Transit access to connections such as Rohnert Park, Novato, San Rafael, and BART in the Bay Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 7</td>
<td>Ukiah (Mendocino County)</td>
<td>Charles M. Schulz–Sonoma County Airport (Sonoma County)</td>
<td>Sonoma County Airport Express from there, which can reach further destinations such as Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park and Petaluma, as well as both Oakland and San Francisco International airports. Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) train, which also reaches Santa Rosa, Rohnert Park and Petaluma, as well as Novato, San Rafael, and Larkspur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Increased Ridership**

Construction of the transit center is anticipated to increase ridership across the entire system while the expanded service would increase ridership on the specific routes that are to be expanded. Lake Transit anticipates that expanding service on the two routes would increase ridership by providing access to additional places of employment, medical care, education, and entertainment. The projected ridership for both components is provided in Table 1-4.
Table 1-4  Projected Increased Ridership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Transit Center</th>
<th>Expanded Service</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Route 30</td>
<td>Route 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Ridership</td>
<td>311,240</td>
<td>16,262</td>
<td>13,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected 2023 Ridership</td>
<td>317,521</td>
<td>17,419</td>
<td>14,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected 2035 Ridership</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,494</td>
<td>18,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected 2063 Ridership</td>
<td>387,616</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LTA 2020

Future Solar Facilities

Assuming a 460 kW PV system were installed, the Project’s future solar facility could produce more than 700 MWh per year, or approximately 30 percent of the anticipated energy needs of the future onsite hydrogen production. Operations of the future solar facility would consist of regular monthly inspection and maintenance.

1.7  Compliance with Existing Regulations and Standard BMPS

The project would abide by the following regulations and industry-accepted Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce or avoid potential adverse effects that could result from construction or operation of the project. Although these actions would reduce or avoid the Project’s potential environmental impacts, they exist as elements of the Project and, as such, are considered prior to significance determinations, in accordance with Lotus vs. Department of Transportation (2014) 223 Cal.App.4th 645 (Lotus). CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(a) defines a “Project” as the whole of an action, and the whole of the Project would include features required to meet design standards, regulatory requirements, industry standards, and features required by non-project specific permits (such as the NPDES permit or standard Stormwater BMPs). Additionally, Project elements identified in this section are not developed in response to a Project-specific impact, but are common and typical for development projects.

In addition to these BMPs, mitigation measures are presented in the following analysis sections in Chapter 3, Environmental Analysis, to reduce potentially significant environmental impacts below a level of significance.

Implementation of Geotechnical Design Recommendations

The project would be designed and constructed in compliance with the site-specific recommendations made in the Project’s Geotechnical Report (to be developed during project design). This would include design in accordance with recommendations for open-cut trenching, trenchless construction, excavation dewatering, excavation shoring, pipeline foundation material, geotextile filter fabric requirements, pipeline embedment material, trench backfill material, shaft construction, and other factors. The geotechnical recommendations would be incorporated into the final plans and specifications for the project and would be implemented during construction.
Implementation Construction Best Management Practices

To limit dust, criteria pollutants, and precursor emissions associated with the construction activity, the following recommended Basic Construction Measures would be included in construction contract specifications and required during implementation of the Project:

- All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day;
- All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered or shall have at least two feet of freeboard;
- All visible mud or dirt tracked-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping shall be prohibited;
- All vehicle speeds on unpaved areas shall be limited to 15 miles per hour;
- All paving shall be completed as soon as possible after trenching work is finished;
- Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to five minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points;
- All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation;
- A publicly visible sign shall be posted with the telephone number and person to contact at Lake Transit regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours.

Implementation of Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

The project would seek coverage under State Water Resources Control Board (Water Board) Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Storm Water Runoff Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities. Lake Transit would submit permit registration documents (notice of intent, risk assessment, site maps, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, annual fee, and certifications) to the Water Board. The Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would address pollutant sources, best management practices, and other requirements specified in the Order. The SWPPP would include erosion and sediment control measures, and dust control practices to prevent wind erosion, sediment tracking, and dust generation by construction equipment. A Qualified SWPPP Practitioner would oversee implementation of the Project SWPPP, including visual inspections, sampling and analysis, and ensuring overall compliance.

Implementation of Industrial Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

Lake Transit would seek to update the existing M&O facility's Industrial Storm Water NPDES permit which controls pollutants in storm water discharges during Project operations. The Industrial SWPPP identifies storm water drainage patterns, discharge locations, and potential sources of storm water pollution and includes site-specific BMPs that must be implemented to prevent storm water pollution. A dedicated Pollution Prevention Team is responsible for compliance with the requirements of the Industrial General Permit through proper implementation of the Industrial SWPPP.
Compliance with Tree Ordinance

The Project would seek a native tree removal permit for trees identified as protected by City of Clearlake Municipal Code Section 18-40.020 (Protected Trees), and comply with zoning clearance and planting replacement to the satisfaction of the City of Clearlake planning department.

1.8 Required Agency Approvals

The project may require the following approvals:

City of Clearlake
- Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and Design Review (DR)
- Oak Tree Removal Permit
- Grading Permit
- Building Permit
- Encroachment Permit for work along Dam Extension Road and S. Center Drive

Lake County
- Grading Permit
- Building Permit

Lake County Fire Protection District
- Plan Check Review
- Solar Plan Review

1.9 Tribal Consultation

On January 19, 2022, Lake Transit sent a tribal consultation invitation to the Elem Indian Colony, Habematoel Pomo of Upper Lake, Big Valley Rancheria, Scotts Valley Rancheria, Robinson Rancheria, Middletown Band of Pomo Indians, and Koi Nation with regard to the Project.

On March 16, 2022, Lake Transit met with Robert Geary, who represents the Habematoel Pomo Tribe and Koi Nation, to discuss the Project’s potential for impacting tribal cultural resources. Subsequent to the meeting, the Habematoel Pomo Tribe provided their recommended Treatment Protocol for Handling Human Remains and Cultural Items Affiliated with the Habematoel Pomo of Upper Lake.

In addition, the Anthropological Studies Center (ASC) requested a review of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File for information on Native American cultural resources in the Project area. NAHC responded that sacred resources may exist within the Project area and provided contact information for tribal communities that may have further information. On November 22, 2021, letters were sent to all of the individuals provided by the NAHC requesting any additional information or comments they have on the Project or Project Area. On December 6, 2021, Mr. Cromwell of the Robinson Rancheria responded recommending a cultural resource monitor be on site during the entire project. An additional email was sent on January 7, 2022, to Chairperson Beltran of the Koi Nation requesting any additional information regarding the sacred site identified by the NAHC. Chairperson Beltran responded that same day stating that he would like to have a Cultural Resource Monitor present for the project and requested more information (Dino Beltran 2022, pers. comm.). Project information, including a map was sent to Chairperson Beltran, also that same day.

For a summary of the investigation and mitigation measures related to cultural and tribal resources, see Section 3.5 Cultural Resources and 3.18 Tribal Resources.
1.10 Zero Emission Buses and Hydrogen Fuel Background

As stated in Section 1.2, Project Background and Objectives, California regulations and funding programs have driven an increase in ZEV, ZEB, FCEV, and alternative fuel infrastructure (including electric vehicle charging stations and hydrogen fueling stations). Additionally, Federal regulations, funding programs, and research programs support the development of hydrogen fueling infrastructure and hydrogen fuel use.

A summary of the most relevant federal and State actions is provided below. This section also contains a brief overview of how hydrogen FCEVs work, and safety, codes and standards that apply to FCEV and hydrogen fueling stations.

Federal Background


The US Department of Energy (DOE) Hydrogen Program, led by the Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Technologies Office (HFTO) within the DOE’s Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy (EERE) department, conducts research and development in hydrogen production, delivery, infrastructure, storage, fuel cells, and multiple end uses across transportation, industrial, and stationary power applications. The program also includes activities in technology validation, manufacturing, analysis, systems development and integration, safety, codes and standards, education, and workforce development. The DOE identifies a reduction of gasoline and diesel-fueled cars as integral for the US’s energy security. The DOE EERE also runs the Alternative Fuels Data Center, which contains a clearing house of information on hydrogen laws, vehicles, regulations, benefits and considerations.

The National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), a laboratory of the DOE, conducts hydrogen and fuel cell research and has determined that 100 percent of new bus sales can fully transition to ZEV by 2030 (NREL 2022a). NREL has stated that transit buses are one of the best early transportation applications for fuel cell technology (NREL 2022b).

On November 15, 2021, President Biden signed the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law. In December 2021, the DOE established a new Office of Clean Energy Demonstrations to oversee the $21.5 billion in Bipartisan Infrastructure Law funding for clean energy demonstration projects, including hydrogen. The law invests in deployment of electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure as one of many important ways to confront the climate crisis. The law also establishes a discretionary grant program for Charging and Fueling Infrastructure (Charging and Fueling Infrastructure Program) to strategically deploy publicly accessible EV charging infrastructure and hydrogen, propane, and natural gas fueling infrastructure along designated alternative fuel corridors or in certain other locations that are accessible to all drivers of such vehicles (FHWA 2021).

California Background

A wide, interconnected framework of State Executive Orders (EO), Assembly Bills (AB), Senate Bills (SB), State agency regulations, and State agency planning and funding documents rely on, plan for, and promote the installation of hydrogen fueling stations and use of hydrogen fuel in the transportation sector. These regulations, plans, and funding sources aim to reduce statewide GHG emissions, increase renewable
energy generation and use, decarbonize transportation, and improve air quality. These State actions include or rely on increasing hydrogen fueling infrastructure and FCEV. Relevant State targets for reducing greenhouse gases and increasing renewable energy are summarized in Table 1-5. An overview of State agency regulations and plans relevant to hydrogen fuels and infrastructure is provided in Table 1-6.

Table 1-5  State Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets and Renewable Energy Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Action</th>
<th>Targets or Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EO B-16-2012</td>
<td>This EO orders State agencies to facilitate the rapid commercialization of ZEVs. The EO sets a target for the number of ZEVs in California as 1.5 million ZEVs by 2025. Also, the Executive Order sets as a target for 2050 a reduction of GHG emissions from the transportation sector equaling 80 percent less than 1990 levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ZEV Mandate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1505 [Environmental Performance Standards for Hydrogen Fuel]</td>
<td>Passed in 2006, the bill directs the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to adopt regulations to ensure production and use of hydrogen for transportation purposes would reduce greenhouse gas, criteria air pollutants, and toxic air contaminant emissions, as well as reduce dependence on petroleum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO B-30-15</td>
<td>Signed on April 29, 2015, contains the target of reducing GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. The emission reduction is an interim-year goal to provide substantial progress toward the ultimate goal of reducing emissions by 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 32 and AB 197</td>
<td>Senate Bill (SB) 32, passed in 2016, extended the State's greenhouse gas reduction goals and codifies the GHG reduction target of 40 percent below 1990 levels by year 2030, consistent with EO B-30-15. The companion bill to SB 32, AB 197 provides additional direction to CARB in developing each update to the Scoping Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO B-55-18</td>
<td>Signed in 2018, EO B-55-18 sets a statewide goal of achieving carbon neutrality by 2045.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 8 and EO B-48-18</td>
<td>AB 8 directs the CEC and CARB to jointly prepare an annual report on the time and cost needed to attain 100 hydrogen refueling stations within the state. EO B-48-18 further directs the state to implement 5 million zero-emission vehicles by 2030, install 250,000 electric vehicle chargers, including 10,000 direct current (DC) fast chargers, and 200 hydrogen refueling stations by 2025.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO N-79-20</td>
<td>This EO contains a goal of 100 percent of operating trucks and buses as ZEVs by 2045, where feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 643</td>
<td>SB 643 requires the CEC, in consultation with the CARB and CPUC, to prepare a statewide assessment of FCEV fueling infrastructure and fuel production needs to support the adoption of zero-emission trucks, buses, and off-road vehicles to meet the goals and requirements of EO N-79-20 and regulations. The assessment will be completed by no later than December 31, 2023, and updated at least once every three years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 350 [Clean Energy and Pollution Reduction Act]</td>
<td>Established clean energy, clean air, and greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goals, including reducing GHG to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB 350 increases California’s renewable electricity procurement goal from 33 percent by 2020 to 50 percent by 2030.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SB 350 also directs State agencies to identify recommendations on how to increase access to zero-emission and near-zero-emission transportation options to low-income customers, including those in disadvantaged communities. SB 350 called for the formation of the Disadvantaged Communities Advisory Group (DACAG) to review and provide guidance on CEC and CPUC clean energy programs and determine whether those programs are effective and useful in disadvantaged communities. In spring 2019, the DACAG specifically advised the CEC to focus its Clean Transportation Program investments on zero-emission fuels.

### Table 1-6 State Agency Hydrogen Regulations and Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulation or Plan</th>
<th>Description and Relation to Hydrogen Fuels and Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>California Air Resources Board</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan</td>
<td>Provides the strategy for achieving California’s 2030 GHG target. Identifies electrification of the transportation sector using both electricity and hydrogen. Contains clean fuel goals of promoting research development and deployment of low carbon fuels such as renewable gas, including renewable hydrogen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Draft 2022 Scoping Plan Update | The Draft 2022 Scoping Plan Update assesses progress toward the statutory 2030 target, while laying out a path to achieving carbon neutrality no later than 2045. The Plan identifies clean energy production and distribution infrastructure as necessary for a carbon-neutral future. 

   *The solution will have to include transitioning existing energy production and transmission infrastructure to produce zero-carbon electricity and hydrogen, and utilizing biogas resulting from wildfire management or landfill and dairy operations, among other substitutes.*

   And 

   *Vehicles must transition to zero emission technology to decarbonize the transportation sector.*

   And 

   *Electric vehicle chargers and hydrogen refueling stations must become easily accessible for all drivers to support a wholesale transition to ZEV technology.* |
| Low Carbon Fuel Standards | The Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) is designed to decrease the carbon intensity of California’s transportation fuel pool and provide an increasing range of low-carbon and renewable alternatives, which reduce petroleum dependency and achieve air quality benefits. The LCFS incentivizes use of electricity and hydrogen as low carbon transportation fuels by providing several opportunities to generate LCFS credits. |
| Innovative Clean Transit Regulation | In 2019, the CARB passed the Innovative Clean Transit (ICT) Regulation, requiring all public transit agencies to transition to zero emission technologies by 2040. The ZEB percentage increases gradually with time. The ZEB purchase requirements begin in 2023 and 2026 for large and small transit agencies, respectively. Starting 2029, 100 percent of all transit agencies’ new bus purchases must be ZEBs, with a goal of complete |
### Regulation or Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description and Relation to Hydrogen Fuels and Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>transition to ZEBs (all buses in each transit agency’s fleet to be ZEBs) by 2040.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ICT regulation requires each transit agency to submit a complete Zero-Emission Bus Rollout Plan (Rollout Plan) before the ICT’s ZEB purchase requirements take effect. On January 9, 2020, CARB issued the updated Zero-Emission Bus Rollout Plan Guidance for Transit Agencies. The Zero Emission Bus (ZEB) Rollout plan requirements differ based on fleet size:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Large fleet has 100 or more active buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— Small fleet has less than 100 buses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each transit agency would submit a transit board approved ZEB purchase and deployment plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— June 30, 2020, for large transit agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— June 30, 2023, for small transit agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARB identified that the regulation would assist the State to achieve its mid- and long-term GHG targets, protect public health and address environmental impacts of climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 Mobile Source Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Draft 2020 Mobile Source Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Advanced Clean Fleet Rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Energy Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Zero-Emission Vehicle Infrastructure Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Integrated Energy Policy Report (IEPR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation or Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Clean Transportation Program | CEC is identified as the State’s primary ZEV infrastructure planning agency. Through the Clean Transportation Program (formerly known as the Alternative and Renewable Fuel and Vehicle Technology Program), the CEC funds projects that will "develop and deploy innovative technologies that transform California's fuel and vehicle types to help attain the state's climate change policies." The CEC develops an Investment Plan and updates it each year to determine funding priorities and opportunities for the Clean Transportation Program. As stated by the CEC:  

*The Clean Transportation Program does not operate in a vacuum but within a context of several state funding programs, vehicle regulations, and agency collaborations. These include vehicle regulations and incentives developed by the California Air Resources Board (CARB), low-carbon fuel standards developed by CARB, infrastructure investments by investor-owned utilities overseen by the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), and broader business coordination with the Governor’s Office of Business and Economic Development (GO-Biz). There is strong collaboration among the agencies on a regular basis and through the ZEV Market Development Strategy, spearheaded by GO-Biz. The projects supported by the Clean Transportation Program interact with and are informed by these other efforts. (CEC 2021)*

The CEC's actions are further guided by state law that requires the CEC to prepare a statewide assessment of the charging infrastructure needed to achieve the goal of 5 million ZEVs on the road by 2030, assess the infrastructure needed to achieve full ZEV adoption within the coming decades. The recent CARB Mobile Source Strategy approximated this trajectory to include about 180,000 medium-and heavy-duty ZEVs by 2030 (including plug-in electric vehicles and fuel cell electric vehicles). |

In addition to the items above, the California Governor’s Office of Business and Economic Development has published Hydrogen Station Permitting Guidebook. Per the guidebook:  

*The Hydrogen Station Permitting Guidebook is intended to help local jurisdictions and hydrogen station developers navigate and streamline the station development process. It also provides stakeholders with background on hydrogen and fuel cell electric vehicles, California’s efforts to accelerate infrastructure development, and insights into the upward momentum of this market since its launch in 2015. (GO-Biz 2022)*

Currently, the CEC’s staff estimates that about 10,000 FCEVs were registered and operating in California in 2021. The CEC identified 52 retail hydrogen refueling stations that are open, with another 31 planned and under contract through the Clean Transportation Program (CEC 2022b).

Near Lake County, Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (AC Transit) in San Francisco East Bay opened their first hydrogen fueling facility in 2011, and opened a second hydrogen fueling station in 2014. As of 2020, AC Transit operates 22 hydrogen fuel cell electric buses (FCEB) and plans on purchasing an additional 20 FCEB.

**How A Fuel Cell Electric Vehicle Works**

Within a FCEV, the fuel cell takes the chemical energy stored in pure hydrogen and converts it into electricity and heat. The only byproducts of the process are heat and water vapor. FCEV do not produce air
pollutant or greenhouse gas emissions (zero tailpipe emissions). The FCEV contains onboard batteries that are charged by the vehicle during operation, extending the distance the vehicle is able to travel.

FCEV are typically quieter than internal combustion vehicles. An average automobile operates at 65–75 decibels, and diesel buses operate at 100 decibels (dB). Fuel cell passenger vehicles and transit buses operate at 50–60 dB (CAFC 2022).

Refueling a FCEV is relatively fast: 3-5 minutes to refuel a passenger vehicle, 12-20 minutes for a 60-ft bus, and 6-10 minutes for a 40-ft bus. Safety systems at the station and on the vehicle are designed for a buoyant, gaseous fuel and are designed to work together. On the small chance that hydrogen does escape from the vehicle or station, it quickly disperses in the atmosphere. Because hydrogen systems are a closed-loop system, nothing drips or spills when vehicles are refueling (DOE 2014).

Safety, Codes and Standards

Hydrogen Properties

Hydrogen has a number of properties that are advantageous with regard to safety. It is much lighter than air and has a rapid diffusivity (3.8 times faster than natural gas), which means that when released in an open environment, it disperses quickly into a non-flammable concentration (DOE 2014). Hydrogen rises at a speed of almost 20 meters per second, twice as fast as helium and six times faster than natural gas. Because hydrogen is buoyant and disperses rapidly, it is less likely to be confined than other gases and therefore poses less risk as an asphyxiant.

Hydrogen is non-toxic and non-poisonous. It will not contaminate groundwater and is a gas under normal atmospheric conditions with a very low solubility in water. A release of hydrogen is not known to contribute to atmospheric pollution or water pollution (DOE 2014).

An explosion cannot occur in a tank or any contained location with only hydrogen. An oxidizer, such as oxygen, must be present. If a hydrogen tank is punctured, air cannot enter a tank while hydrogen is escaping due to the design of hydrogen tanks and properties of hydrogen. Because of the buoyancy of hydrogen, escaped hydrogen rapidly disperses to low concentrations (DOE 2017). If hydrogen is released it will disperse upwards rapidly and will be in the flammable range for only a very short time (seconds to minutes) (NFPA 2016).

Hydrogen burns with a pale blue, nearly invisible, flame. A hydrogen flame is just as hot as a hydrocarbon flame (fueled by hydrocarbon products such as petroleum and natural gas). However, hydrogen flames have low radiant heat compared to a hydrocarbon fire; in other words, the levels of heat emitted from the flame are lower. This decreases the risk of secondary fires (DOE 2017).

Regulations and Codes

Federal, State, and local codes and standards regulate the design, installation, and use of hydrogen fueling stations. A summary of applicable codes and standards is provided in Table 1-7. Additional codes and standards may apply, depending on the design, size, and components of a hydrogen fueling station.
### Table 1-7  Codes & Standards for a Hydrogen Fueling Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Station Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Title 24 Codes:</td>
<td>California Title 24 contains requirements for a building’s structural, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing systems, in addition to measures for energy conservation, sustainable construction, maintenance, fire and life safety, and accessibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– California Building Code, Part 2, Title 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– California Electrical Code, Part 3, Title 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– California Energy Code, Part 6, Title 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– California Fire Code, Part 9, Title 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local fire and building codes.</td>
<td>Fundamental laws that the station will need to meet in order to be properly permitted to operate by the local government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 70 National Electrical Code</td>
<td>Basic electrical requirements are included in these two standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFPA 79 Electrical Standard for Industrial Machinery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME B31 Pressure Piping</td>
<td>Requirements for high pressure equipment and hydrogen storage tanks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Boiler &amp; Pressure Vessel Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA/ANSI HGV 4.X standards for HRS components</td>
<td>Standards for hydrogen components, like hoses, valves, compressors, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Station Fueling Protocol</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAE J2601-2 Fueling Protocols Gaseous Hydrogen Powered Heavy Duty Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA HGV 4.3 Test methods for hydrogen fueling parameter evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAE J2601/4 Ambient Temperature Fixed Orifice Fueling**</td>
<td>These standards ensure the station fuels the vehicle properly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Station Hydrogen Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAE J2719 Hydrogen Fuel Quality for Fuel Cell Vehicles</td>
<td>Fuel quality is important to ensure the station does not contaminate the vehicle. The California Fuel Cell Partnership recommends testing the fuel quality of the station when it is installed, periodically, and after any major repair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO 14687 Hydrogen fuel quality — Product specification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO 19880-8 Gaseous hydrogen — Fueling stations — Part 8: Fuel quality control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: CAFCP 2021</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## LEGEND

1. Transit Building
2. Seating under Breezeway
3. Solar Panels on South and West Facing Sides of the Transit Building
4. North Bus Shelter
5. Bike Lockers
6. Bike Lanes
7. East Bus Shelter
8. Electric Bus Charging Stations (3 Stations)
9. Parking Area (19 Spaces)
10. Electric Vehicle Charging Station
11. Greenspace Area with Park Benches and Low Maintenance, Drought Tolerant Plant Materials
12. Fence
13. Crosswalk
14. Concrete Sidewalk
15. Existing Tree

## NOTES:

- Landscaping to be low maintenance, drought tolerant, and allow easy visibility for security (see standards for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design).
- Benches to be designed to not encourage overnight uses.
- Solar lighting to be used throughout the site.
2. 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
- Agricultural & Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Energy
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology & Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology & Water Quality
- Land Use & Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population & Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Tribal Cultural Resources
- Utilities & Service Systems
- Wildfire
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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 would be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there would 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 would be prepared.
- I find that the proposed 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 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 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.

_________________________________   ____________________
Lake Transit Signature     Date
3. Environmental Analysis

3.1 Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, 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) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public view of the site and its surroundings? (Public Views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?
   - ✓

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?
   - ✓

The Interregional Transit Center site is located within the City of Clearlake, adjacent to existing urban uses including commercial/retail uses and government service buildings. The proposed Interregional Transit Center would be visible from SR 53 and Dam Road Extension. Full design of the Interregional Transit Center has not been completed. However, conceptual plans for the center do not include any substantive vertical elements above a one-story building and breezeway.

The M&O facility site is visible from State Route 53, and adjacent to existing urbanized uses, rural residential, and open space. Full design of the M&O facility improvements has not been completed. However, typical elevations for proposed facilities would not exceed that of a standard one or two-story building.

a-c) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, substantially damage scenic resource in within a state scenic highway, or substantially degrade existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surrounding? (Less than Significant)

This evaluation is applicable to Project features that would be located on or disrupt access to a scenic vista, or result in significant visual changes within its viewshed. A scenic vista can generally be defined as a viewpoint that provides expansive views of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public.
City of Clearlake

Scenic places in the City are identified as city parks, vistas from the parks, SR 53 and Lakeshore Drive scenic drives, view corridors from Lakeshore Drive, “glimpses” of the lake, Clear Lake, Borax Lake, and Anderson Marsh Historic State Park (City of Clearlake 2017).

The Project site is zoned General Commercial (GC) by the City of Clearlake. Sections 18-9 of the City of Clearlake Municipal Code establish development standards for the General Commercial zoning designation. Because the project site is zoned GC, the proposed development would be subject to the requirements set forth in this section, as well as subject to all City standards for commercial uses such as lighting, parking, height regulations, and design review. The Interregional Transit Center would require an issuance of conditional use permit from the City. No variances to signage or height restrictions are anticipated.

The site is also located within the Scenic Corridor (SC) combining district due to the proximity to SR 53. The City’s Municipal Code, Section 18-13.010 states the purpose of the Scenic Corridor combining district is to “preserve the scenic quality of the land immediately visible from SR 53.”

County of Lake

The Lake County General Plan does not identify specific scenic corridors or vistas. However, the General Plan does include a number of applicable scenic resource policies.

The Project site is zoned Community Commercial (C2) by Lake County. Article 19 of the Lake County Municipal Code establishes development standards for the Community Commercial zoning designation. Because the project site is zoned C2, the proposed development would be subject to the requirements set forth in this Article, as well as subject to all County standards for commercial uses such as lighting, parking, height regulations, and design review. No variances to signage or height restrictions are anticipated.

Project Analysis

The Project sites are not located near an officially designated state scenic highway. The nearest designated scenic highway is Route 12, more than 30 miles away. SR 53 is identified as ‘eligible’ for scenic highway designation, but is not officially designated as such. Therefore, the Project would have no impact on scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway.

The Project’s Interregional Transit Center is located within an urbanized area. The M&O facility improvements are located in an urbanized area of Lake County (identified as an urban growth area by the County General Plan). City and County review and approval of the Interregional Transit Center and M&O facility improvements, respectively, is a component of the anticipated design review.

Most of the Project improvements would be at ground level (parking lot, landscaping). Other improvements, such as fencing, the Interregional Transit Center, and lighting poles would not exceed the height of adjacent and nearby existing facilities. The proposed facilities would be consistent in height and dimensions with existing commercial and industrial facilities in the viewshed. The Project would not block or substantially obscure views of Clear Lake, mountain views, SR 53, or Dam Road Extension. The Project facilities would not be located on a scenic vista. Public views of the regional scenic resources would not be substantially altered or disrupted by the Project. The Project impact on a scenic vista would be less than significant.

The proposed Project facilities would be located either within the existing M&O facility site, or adjacent to similar existing infrastructure (Interregional Transit Center). Once constructed, the above-ground improvements would not be readily distinguishable from the existing infrastructure currently present in the area. The new facilities would be placed consistent with setback requirements and height limitations of the
respective zoning designations. Therefore, the Project improvements would not conflict with applicable zoning and, therefore, would have no related aesthetic impacts.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Less than Significant)

Nighttime construction work is not anticipated to be required for the Project. Therefore, no exterior lighting would be required during construction, and no impact would result.

The Project improvements would be located within an urbanized environment (Interregional Transit Center) and existing developed area (M&O facility), and adjacent to an urban area where nighttime lighting currently exists, including existing parking lot lighting and street lighting. In addition, the M&O facility site has existing lighting similar to that which would be installed as part of the Project. The proposed new lighting would be located within the Project site and focused onto the areas within the site.

The Project lighting would be designed to be consistent with City and County zoning (as applicable), which regulate lighting to balance the safety and security needs for lighting with the City and County’s desire to preserve dark skies and to ensure that light trespass and glare have negligible impact on surrounding property (especially residential) and roadways.

City review and approval of the lighting design is a component of the anticipated Conditional Use Permit and design review. The zoning code includes standards for fixtures, shielding, placement, height, energy efficiency, and illumination levels. To comply with these requirements, specific design preferences would include directing light downward and away from other properties, shielding lights, avoiding brightly illuminated vertical surfaces where feasible, such as walls and lamp poles, and using the minimum lumens necessary. Given the Project’s compliance with the design requirements mentioned above, light emissions would be minimized, and potential light or glare impacts would be less than significant.
### 3.2 Agriculture and Forest Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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))?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### a-e) 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? (No Impact)

The Project would not be located on lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance (CDC 2016), nor on land under a Williamson Act contract. The Interregional Transit Center site is designated Commercial by the City of Clearlake General Plan, and zoned CG (General Commercial) under the City’s municipal code. The Lake County General Plan land use designation for the M&O facility improvement site is Cc (Community Commercial). The County zoning for the site is C2 (Community Commercial).

The Project would not be constructed on land zoned for agricultural or forestland uses. Thus, the Project would not convert Important Farmland, land under a Williamson Act contract, or forest land to other uses, nor conflict with zoning for agricultural or forestry uses. No impact to agriculture or forestry resources would result.
3.3 Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Project sites are located within the Lake County Air Basin (LCAB) and are under the jurisdiction of the Lake County Air Quality Management District (LCAQMD). Lake County is currently designated as attainment or unclassified for all federal and state ambient air quality standards.

As the LCAQMD does not have an attainment plan or recommended thresholds of significance for use in CEQA, LCAQMD refers to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)'s recommended CEQA Guidelines to evaluate a project’s potential air quality impact.

A Health Risk Assessment evaluation was prepared for the Project to identify potential health risk impacts associated with the construction of the Project and operation of the Interregional Transit Center (Illingworth and Rodkin, Appendix A).

**a-b)** Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard? (No Impact)

These impacts relate to consistency with an adopted attainment plan and increasing emissions of non-attainment criteria pollutants. Lake County is currently designated as Attainment or Unclassified for all federal and state ambient air quality standards, and does not have an applicable air quality attainment plan. As there is no applicable air quality plan, and the area is not designated non-attainment for any criteria pollutant, the Project would have no impact.

The BAAQMD, which oversees air quality in the San Francisco Air Basin, has published CEQA Guidelines to assist projects in assessing potential air quality and greenhouse gas impacts under CEQA. The San Francisco Air Basin, in contrast to the LCAB, is designated as nonattainment for state and federal ozone standards, and nonattainment for state particulate matter (PM) standards. Specifically, the San Francisco Air Basin is designated nonattainment for state PM10 and PM2.5 standards. The BAAQMD’s CEQA Guidelines provide thresholds of significance, screening criteria and levels, and impact assessment methodologies. As provided by the BAAQMD’s guidance, if the Project meets the screening criteria for an
impact category, and is consistent with the methodology used to develop the screening criteria, then its air quality impact for that category may be considered less than significant (BAAQMD 2017).

The BAAQMD’s relevant screening criteria land use type would be ‘Government (Civic Center)’. The BAAQMD’s screening criteria for operational and construction-generated criteria pollutants are 149,000 square feet of facility and 277,000 square feet of facility, respectively. The BAAQMD’s screening criteria for General Light Industry are 541,000 sf of facility and 259,000 square feet of facility.

The Project facilities, including the 2,160 square foot Interregional Transit Center, and M&O facility improvements, would not exceed the BAAQMD’s recommended screening criteria for Government or General Light Industry.

c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Less than Significant)

Sensitive receptors are defined by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) as facilities or land uses that include members of the population that are particularly sensitive to the effects of air pollutants, such as children, the elderly, and people with illnesses. Potential impacts are related to emissions of fugitive dust and diesel particulate matter (DPM).

Construction equipment and heavy-duty truck traffic generate DPM exhaust, which is a known toxic air contaminant. DPM is a human carcinogen and chronic (long-term) inhalation exposure to DPM poses a chronic health risk. DPM from equipment exhaust poses potential health impacts to nearby receptors if those receptors have prolonged exposure to substantial emissions. The LCAQMD has not established health risk thresholds. This assessment uses the BAAQMD’s adopted health risk thresholds and assessment methodology, The Project’s construction and operational impacts are assessed separately below.

Sensitive Receptor Locations

The closest sensitive receptors to the Interregional Transit Center are the children attending the Konocti Education Center (4th through 12th grade school) 188 feet east of the new transit center site. The Woodland Community College Childcare Development Center (i.e., campus daycare) is located approximately 755 feet east of the new center and the Adventist Health Care Center (i.e., hospital) is located approximately 680 northwest of the new center.

The nearest sensitive receptor to the M&O facility site is an existing residential unit located approximately 38 feet south of the M&O facility boundary, and 280 feet south of the proposed improvements. Additionally, Lower Lake Elementary and preschool are located approximately 715 feet and 575 feet east of the facility boundary, respectively. These receptor locations are located more than 700 feet east of the proposed improvements.

Construction

The types of air pollutants generated by construction activities are typically nitrogen oxides and particulate matter, such as dust and exhaust. Construction activities could temporarily increase levels of PM2.5 and PM10 downwind of construction activity. These are temporary emissions that vary considerably from day-to-day and by the type of equipment and weather. In addition, CO and reactive organic gases are emitted during operation of gas and diesel-powered construction equipment.

For construction related PM2.5 and PM10 dust, the BAAQMD recommends incorporation of best management practices (BMPs) to reduce localized dust impacts to less than significant. As described in Section 1.3, Construction Best Management Practices, the Project would incorporate the BAAQMD’s Basic
Construction Measures for fugitive dust. Therefore, the Project would adhere to the basic construction measures recommended by BAAQMD, and the construction-phase impacts from fugitive PM2.5 and PM10 dust would be less than significant.

Construction equipment and heavy-duty truck traffic generate diesel particulate matter (DPM) exhaust, which is a known toxic air contaminant. DPM from equipment exhaust and PM2.5 pose potential health impacts to nearby receptors if those receptors have prolonged exposure to substantial emissions. As required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]), construction contractors would be required to minimize idling times for trucks and equipment to five minutes, as well as to ensure that construction equipment is maintained in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications.

Construction is anticipated to occur up to 10 months for the Interregional Transit Center and 2 months for the M&O facility improvements. The majority of heavy-duty off-road construction equipment activity would be on the Interregional Transit Center site. Given the short duration of construction activity, limited daily activity, and continuous shifting of the construction activities, distance to receptors, and because emissions would dissipate rapidly from the source with an increase in distance, prolonged exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would not occur. Therefore, the impact of construction-related emissions on sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

**Operation**

Operation of the Project’s M&O facility improvements are not anticipated to result in new or increased emissions of DPM or other toxic air contaminant. Therefore, the impact of operation of the M&O facility improvements on sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

The Project would result relocation of route services from the existing transfer hub to the new Interregional Transit Center, thereby relocating emissions associated with operating diesel-fueled buses closer to existing sensitive receptors. DPM emissions from operations of the Interregional Transit Center were estimated using the latest version of CARB’s EMFAC emissions model (i.e., EMFAC2021) and offsite DPM concentrations estimated using the U.S. EPA’s AERMOD model. Modeling assumptions, parameters, and output are provided in Appendix A.

Community health risk impacts associated with operation of the new transit center were assessed by predicting increased lifetime cancer risk and computing the Hazard Index (HI) for non-cancer health risks. Unlike cancer risk, HI values are not cumulative but based on the highest (or maximum) annual DPM concentration. The maximally exposed individual (MEI) is identified as the receptor that is most impacted by the project’s operation. As a result, the MEI would be located at the Konocti Education Center.

The community health risk impact results are provided in Table 3.3-1. The health risk analysis showed that increased cancer risks associated with the operation of the Interregional Transit Center at nearby sensitive receptor locations would be less than one in a million. Non-cancer health risks associated with chronic DPM exposure would be less than 0.1. As shown in the table, the calculated risks associated with operation of the Interregional Transit Center are well below the single source thresholds established by BAAQMD. The impact would be less than significant.
Table 3.3-1  Community Health Risk Impacts from Operation of the Interregional Transit Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitive Receptor Location (Receptor Type)</th>
<th>Cancer Risk (per million)</th>
<th>Hazard Index (maximum)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Konocti Education Center (4 - 12 School)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland CC Child Development Center (Daycare)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventist Health (Infant @ Hospital)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD Single-Source Threshold</td>
<td>&gt;10.0</td>
<td>&gt;1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Illingworth & Rodkin, 2022. Appendix A

d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people? (Less than Significant)

Implementation of the Project would not result in major sources of odor. The Project type is not one of the common types of facilities known to produce odors (i.e., landfill, coffee roaster, wastewater treatment facility, etc.). Minor odors from the use of equipment during construction activities would be intermittent and temporary and would dissipate rapidly from the source with an increase in distance. In addition, operation of the Project would not result in locating sensitive receptors near an existing odor source. Thus, the Project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The impact would be less than significant.
3.4 Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Biological Resources Evaluation

A Biological Resources evaluation was prepared for the Project to identify any special-status plant and wildlife species and sensitive habitats (including wetlands) that have the potential to occur on or in the vicinity of the Project site (GHD 2022, Appendix B). The assessment included literature and database searches as well as site surveys to determine what species might have potential to be present on the Project site. Database searches included the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Information for Planning and Conservation, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries West Coast Region California Species List Tools. The database searches encompassed the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangles (quads) centered on the Project area quad (Lower Lake).

A reconnaissance field survey was conducted by a GHD Biologist on December 28, 2021. The survey methods were intended to identify sensitive habitat and detect wildlife activity. The survey included a
physical search of the area, including inspecting the ground, shrubs, holes, and trees for the presence of any wildlife species. Additionally, the bark of vegetation and the ground layer under vegetation were inspected for evidence of wildlife species, such as feathers, pellets, whitewash, scat, and tracks. This reconnaissance-level site visit was conducted to identify general special status resources and habitat within the Project site.

A seasonally appropriate, protocol level botanical survey was conducted by qualified GHD Botanist on April 25-26, and June 9-10, 2022. The survey included the Interregional Transit Center site and the M&O facility site, with the surveyor walking the perimeter and a meandering transect throughout the Project site boundary. The survey methods were intended to assess the potential for special status plants and Sensitive Natural Communities (SNCs) to occur within the Project site. Prior to surveys, the list of special status plant species derived from database queries, was analyzed to determine the potential to occur based on elevation and habitat suitability. Surveys were timed to capture all plant species with low to high potential to occur in the Project site.

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? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Special-status species include those plant and wildlife species that have been formally listed, are proposed as endangered or threatened, or are candidates for such listing under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) or California Endangered Species Act (CESA). These acts afford protection to both listed and proposed species. Birds and raptors are protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (50 CFR 10.13), and their nest, eggs, and young are also protected under the California Fish and Wildlife Code (§3503, §3503.5, and §3513). In addition, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Species of Special Concern, which are species that face extirpation in California if current population and habitat trends continue, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Birds of Conservation Concern, and CDFW special-status invertebrates, are all considered special-status species. Although CDFW Species of Special Concern generally have no special legal status, they are given special consideration under CEQA. Plant species on California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants with California Rare Plant Ranks (Rank) of 1, 2 and 4 are also considered special-status plant species and must be considered under CEQA. Bat species designated as “High Priority” by the Western Bat Working Group (WBWG) qualify for legal protection under Section 15380(d) of the CEQA Guidelines. Species designated “High Priority” are defined as “imperiled or are at high risk of imperilment based on available information on distribution, status, ecology and known threats.”

A Biological Resources Technical Memorandum was prepared for the Project to evaluate the potential for special-status plant and wildlife species and sensitive habitats to occur on or in the vicinity of the Project site (GHD 2022, Appendix B). The assessment included literature and database searches as well as site surveys to determine what species and habitats have potential to be present on the Project site. The information and data collected for the assessment have been used as the basis of this biological resources analysis.

Construction

Special-status Plant Species

The database review of the California Natural Diversity Database, California Native Plant Society Inventory of Rare and Endangered Vascular Plants, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Information for Planning and
Consultation showed one-hundred seven (107) special status plant species known to occur within a 9-quad vicinity of the Project site. Based on species specific habitat requirements and habitat availability within the Project site, two (2) special status plant species were determined to have moderate or high potential to occur within the Project site, and include Konociti manzanita (*Arctostaphylos manzanita ssp. elegans*) and Baker’s Navarretia (*Navarretia leucocephala ssp. bakeri*).

However, no special status plant species were observed at the Project site during the seasonally appropriate protocol level botanical survey. Therefore, the project would not impact a special-status plant. There would be no impact.

**Special-status Wildlife Species**

Literature and database searches showed thirty-six (36) special status wildlife species known to occur within a 9-quad vicinity of the Project site. Based on species specific habitat requirements and habitat availability within the Project site, nine (9) special status wildlife species were determined to have moderate or high potential to occur within the Project site and include the pallid bat (*Antrozous paalidus*), silver-haired bat (*Lasionycteris noctivagans*), western red bat (*Lasarius blossevillii*), hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus*), long-eared myotis (*Myotis evotis*), fringed myotis (*Myotis thysanodes*), Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), purple martin (*Progne subis*), and western pond turtle (*Emys marmorata*).

No special status wildlife species were observed during wildlife habitat assessment field survey. However, the Project site contains potential habitat for some special status bats, a special status reptile, and special status and other migratory birds.

**Bats**

Vegetation and structures on the Project site provide habitat to a variety of bat species. Construction of the Project may adversely impact special-status bat species through the removal or modification of vegetation or structures and due to ground disturbance. If special-status bats were adversely affected, a significant impact would potentially occur. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is designed to avoid adverse impacts to special-status bats which may be present in the Project Area, including the pallid bat, silver-haired bat, western red bat, hoary bat, long-eared myotis, fringed myotis. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, the impact to special-status bats would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

**Western Pond Turtle**

No on-site streams or creeks are present on the Project site. Siegler Creek is located north and east of the M&O facility site. The Project site is outside of the riparian habitat corridor associated with Seigler Canyon Creek. The Anderson Marsh, and associated Anderson Marsh State Historic Park (AMSHP), is located between the two Project areas.

Pond turtles occur in a variety of permanent and semi-permanent freshwater aquatic habitats including lakes, rivers, ponds, creeks, and marshes. The species is frequently observed basking on exposed banks, logs, and rocks. Winter activity is possible but limited to unusually warm, sunny days; normally pond turtles are dormant during winter months on the north coast; dormancy typically involved burrowing into loose substrate above the high-water mark. Overwintering sites can include undercut banks, burrowing under leaf/needle litter, or in soil or mud. The species has been known to travel into upland habitats around their main water body.

The western pond turtle has a moderate potential to occur at the M&O facility site due to the proximity of the site to Seigler Canyon Creek. Specifically, the future solar facility-portion of the site (currently an open field) may provide suitable habitat for this species. Closest known record is from 6.25 miles west of the Project
Area (CDFW 2022). If construction within the future solar facility-portion of the site occurred while pond turtles were present, it would be considered a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure BIO-2 is designed to avoid adverse impacts to western pond turtles. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2, the impact to western pond turtles would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Aquatic Resources

Water quality in Seigler Canyon Creek could be affected by run-off, erosion, sedimentation, leaking equipment, chemical/material spills, or trash/debris. Construction activities could degrade water quality and/or increase erosion within or near Seigler Canyon Creek if not managed properly. No project improvements are proposed within Seigler Canyon Creek. As described in Section 1.7 (Compliance with Existing Regulations and Standard BMPs), the Project would include erosion and sediment control measures required within a Construction SWPPP, and address pollutant sources and implement best management practice within and around the work area to prevent pollutants from entering the creek. Therefore, the impact to water quality in Seigler Canyon Creek would be less than significant.

Passerines and Raptors

Several trees on the Project site and within the Project vicinity that may provide suitable nesting habitat for common avian species protected by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) and California Fish and Game Code (FGC). If trees were to be removed or trimmed while a special-status bird or bird protected under the MBTA were present (nesting), or be juxtaposed to vegetation with a nesting bird, it could be injured or abandon its nest, both of which will be considered a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure BIO-3 is designed to avoid adverse impacts to nesting birds resulting from vegetation removal during the breeding season. Bird species to be protected by this mitigation measure include all birds protected under the MBTA, Cooper’s Hawk, and purple martin. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-3, the impact to nesting birds would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

Operation

The Project would result in operation of a new Interregional Transit Center, hydrogen fueling infrastructure at the existing M&O facility, and a future solar facility. Potential impacts to special status species are not expected to differ from existing uses at the Project site.

Project improvements include installation of lighting at the Interregional Transit Center and the M&O facility. The Project lighting would be designed to be consistent with City and County zoning (as applicable), which regulate lighting to balance the safety and security needs for lighting with the City and County’s desire to preserve dark skies and to ensure that light trespass and glare have negligible impact on surrounding property and roadways. Given the design requirements of the lighting and limited extent of lighting, operational nighttime lighting is not anticipated to impact the foraging ability of bats. The potential impact related to the proposed lighting and other operations would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-3 would reduce impacts to bats and nesting birds by limiting construction and vegetation removal to specified work windows, and if that is not feasible, then by providing a procedure to follow to identify nests and/or roosts and establish buffers and other avoidance measures until nesting and/or roosting is complete. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2 would reduce the construction-related impacts on western pond turtles to a less-than-significant level by locating any potential active nests before the start of construction and establishing buffers and avoiding nests if found.
With the implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-3, the potential impact on special status species and communities would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Avoid Impacts to Special-Status Bats**

Prior to construction, including any tree removal or trimming, Lake Transit shall have a qualified bat biologist conduct a Habitat Assessment for special-status bats, focusing on the trees to be removed. Survey methodology shall include visual examination of suitable habitat areas for signs of bat use and may utilize ultrasonic detectors to determine if special status bat species utilize the vicinity.

Removal of trees that potentially support a bat maternity roost should only occur between September 1 and October 15, after the young have learned to be self-sufficient but before hibernation. Trees supporting bats should not be removed while bats are hibernating between October 15 and March 15 or otherwise while bats are present.

If a special-status bat species is found, or if suspected day roosts for special-status bats are identified, then the Habitat Assessment shall identify suitable performance measures for avoiding impacts to roosts, which may include, but would not be limited to:

- Consultation with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife to determine appropriate measures for protecting bats with young if present, and for implementing measures to exclude non-breeding bat colonies during construction process.
- Phased removal of trees where selected limbs and branches not containing cavities are removed using chainsaws on the first day, with the remainder of the tree removed using chainsaws or other equipment on the second day.

If no bat utilization or roosts are found, then no further study or action is required.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Avoid Impacts to Western Pond Turtles**

This measure applies to only to construction work conducted within 300 feet of Seigler Canyon Creek (survey zone). For construction activity outside of survey zone, no further mitigation is necessary. If construction activity within the survey zone occurs outside the western pond turtle nesting season, no further mitigation is necessary.

If work must be performed during the western pond turtle nesting season (April 1 – August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys within 300 feet Seigler Canyon Creek no more than 7 days prior to the onset of construction activity withing that area. If western pond turtle nests are located, buffer zones and additional adaptive measures should be established by a qualified biologist until all hatchlings have left the nest. These adaptive measures may include, but are not limited to, relocation, exclusion buffers, or nest exclosures. Because turtles may move into and out of the area, the approved biologist will also conduct training for construction personnel on the required avoidance procedures, exclusion fencing, and protocols in the event that a western pond turtle enters an active construction zone (i.e., outside the buffer zone).

If western pond turtle nests are located, the approved biologist will be on site daily while construction-related activities are taking place within the survey zone and will inspect the Project site daily for western pond turtle prior to construction activities. Additionally, if erosion control is implemented within the survey zone, non-entangling erosion control material will be used to reduce the potential for entrapment. Tightly woven fiber netting (mesh size less than 0.25 inch) or similar material will be used to ensure that turtles are not trapped (no monofilament).
If a western pond turtle is encountered during construction activities, the approved biologist will notify the Wildlife Agencies immediately. Construction activities will be suspended in a 100-foot radius of the animal until the animal leaves the project site on its own volition or it is determined that the turtle will not be harmed. Any trapped, injured, or killed turtles shall be reported immediately to the CDFW.

**Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Avoid Impacts to Nesting Birds**

Contractors shall attempt to remove trees and other vegetation that could potentially contain nesting birds outside the bird nesting season (March 1 - August 15) to avoid direct effects on special status and protected birds. If vegetation removal occurs outside the bird nesting season, no further mitigation is necessary.

If work must be performed during the avian nesting season (March 1 – August 15), a qualified biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys within construction footprint and 300 feet of a tree, to check for bird nesting activity and to evaluate the site for presence of special-status bird species. The biologist shall conduct a minimum of one day pre-construction survey within the 7-day period prior to vegetation removal or ground-disturbing activities. If ground disturbance and vegetation removal work lapses for seven days or longer during the breeding season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a supplemental avian pre-construction survey before project work is reinitiated. If active nests are detected within the construction footprint or within 300 feet of construction activities, the biologist shall flag a buffer around each nest. Construction activities shall avoid nest sites until the biologist determines that the young have fledged or nesting activity has ceased. If nests are documented outside of the construction (disturbance) footprint, but within 300 feet of the construction area, buffers will be implemented as needed. In general, the buffer size for common species would be determined on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the CDFW. Buffer sizes will take into account factors such as (1) noise and human disturbance levels at the construction site at the time of the survey and the noise and disturbance expected during the construction activity; (2) distance and amount of vegetation or other screening between the construction site and the nest; and (3) sensitivity of individual nesting species and behaviors of the nesting birds.

If active nests are detected during the survey, the qualified ornithologist shall monitor all nests at least once per week to determine whether birds are being disturbed. Activities that might, in the opinion of the qualified ornithologist, disturb nesting activities (e.g., excessive noise), shall be prohibited within the buffer zone until such a determination is made. If signs of disturbance or distress are observed, the qualified ornithologist shall immediately implement adaptive measures to reduce disturbance. These measures may include, but are not limited to, increasing buffer size, halting disruptive construction activities in the vicinity of the nest until fledging is confirmed, placement of visual screens or sound dampening structures between the nest and construction activity, reducing speed limits, replacing and updating noisy equipment, queuing trucks to distribute idling noise, locating vehicle access points and loading and shipping facilities away from noise-sensitive receptors, reducing the number of noisy construction activities occurring simultaneously, and/or reorienting and/or relocating construction equipment to minimize noise at noise-sensitive receptors.
b, c) 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, including wetlands? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

No sensitive natural communities were observed within the Project site during the seasonally appropriate botanical surveys. The Project site is outside of the riparian habitat corridor associated with Siegler Canyon Creek.

Within the Interregional Transit Center site, there is a small, approximately 411 square foot area with hydrophytic (water-loving) plants on the southwest portion of the proposed construction staging area (see Figure 1-2). Hydrophytic plants indicate the potential for a wetland. The Project footprint would not result in impacts in this location of the Project site; therefore, no formal wetland delineation was conducted.

Near the M&O facility site, the National Wetland Inventory (NWI) shows Seigler Canyon Creek as a PEM1C freshwater emergent wetland.

Construction

As noted under Impact ‘a’, the Project would include erosion and sediment control measures required within a Construction SWPPP, and address pollutant sources and implement best management practice within and around the work area to prevent pollutants from entering the creek. The construction-related impacts to the riparian habitat would be less than significant. The Project is located outside of the riparian corridor. No other sensitive communities exist at the Project site.

Project improvements for Interregional Transit Center would not be located on potential wetlands. The presence of hydrophytic vegetation within the identified construction staging area indicates a potential wetland. A formal wetland delineation was not conducted; however, it is assumed that the location of hydrophytic vegetation is a wetland for the purposes of a conservative analysis. Direct or indirect impacts to the location of hydrophytic vegetation would, therefore, be considered a significant impact. Avoidance of the location through Mitigation Measure BIO-4 would reduce the impact to less than significant.

The Project improvements to the M&O facility, excepting for the future solar facility, would be located more than 100 feet from creek and beyond locations of potential emergent wetlands that may occur in proximity to the creek. Construction of the improvements would result in no impact.

Construction of the future solar facility-portion of the M&O site would occur at a later date depending on funding procurement. Wetland delineation determinations typically expire after five years, at which time the determination would require revisiting to determine if the delineation is still accurate or need revision due to changes in conditions. Because the future solar facility construction could occur within 100 feet of Seigler Canyon Creek, and because the creek is identified as a freshwater emergent wetland, construction occurring in proximity to the creek may impact potential wetlands. If wetlands are present within the footprint or construction boundary of the future solar facility, and if full avoidance of the wetland is not incorporated, the Project would be subject to permitting requirements of Section 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). Section 401 of the CWA requires any applicant for a federal license or permit, which involves an activity that may result in a discharge of a pollutant into waters of the U.S., obtain a certification that the discharge will comply with applicable effluent limitations and water quality standards. CWA 401 certifications are issued by RWQCBs under the California Environmental Protection Agency. Discharge of fill material into “waters of the U.S.,” including wetlands, is regulated by the USACE under Section 404 of the CWA. Compliance with permitting requirements, which include minimization, protection, and (where applicable) preservation, restoration, or compensation. Avoidance and mitigation of impacts through Mitigation Measure BIO-5 would reduce the impact to less than significant.
Operation

Project operation would not encroach into the riparian corridor for Seigler Creek. The potential impact from Project operations would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

With incorporation of Mitigation Measures BIO-4 and BIO-5, inadvertent indirect or direct impacts to wetlands and other Waters of the U.S. will be reduced or avoided by clearly delineating boundaries of disturbance activities, utilizing existing disturbed areas for access roads and appropriate staging of construction equipment. Additionally, Mitigation Measure BIO-5 requires preparation of a wetland delineation for the future solar facility site prior to the start of construction of that component. If wetlands are determined to be present and within the footprint or construction boundary for the future solar facility, the Project would secure required Section 401 and 404 wetlands permitting with state and federal agencies prior to construction. These potential inadvertent impacts to wetlands and Waters of the U.S. will be reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation.

Mitigation Measure BIO-4: Avoid Construction-related Impacts to Potential Wetlands and other Waters of the U.S.

Because implementing the Project directly or indirectly has the potential to inadvertently harm potential wetlands or Waters of the U.S., the following avoidance and minimization measures will be incorporated into the Project:

- The locations of potential wetlands and other Waters of the U.S. to be retained onsite during construction shall be clearly identified in the contract documents (plans and specifications).
- Before clearing and grubbing commences, disturbance areas and exclusion zones shall be flagged to clearly define the limits of the work area in the field with flagging or orange construction fencing and no activities shall occur inside the exclusion zones. The exclusion zone shall be, at minimum, a 20-foot no construction buffer zone established from the edge of the Juncus effusus hydrophytic vegetative community.
- Flagging or fencing shall remain in place for the duration of construction in the vicinity of the protected resources and shall be periodically inspected and repaired as needed to maintain the exclusion zone.

Mitigation Measure BIO-5: Avoid and Mitigate Construction-related Impacts to Potential Wetlands and other Waters of the U.S. from Future Solar Facility

Because implementing the Project directly or indirectly has the potential to inadvertently harm potential wetlands or Waters of the U.S. associated with Seigler Canyon Creek, the following avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures will be incorporated into the Project for the future solar facility component. A wetland delineation determination will be conducted prior to the start of construction of the future solar facility.

- If no wetlands are found to occur within the Project footprint or construction area, no additional mitigation is required.
- If wetlands are found to occur within the Project footprint or construction area, the facility design and construction plan will attempt to avoid the wetlands. Avoidance and minimization measures to be implemented include:
• The locations of wetlands and other Waters of the U.S. to be retained onsite during construction shall be clearly identified in the contract documents (plans and specifications).

• Before clearing and grubbing commences, disturbance areas and exclusion zones shall be flagged to clearly define the limits of the work area in the field with flagging or orange construction fencing and no activities shall occur inside the exclusion zones. The exclusion zone shall be, at minimum, a 20-foot no construction buffer zone established from the edge of the wetlands.

• Flagging or fencing shall remain in place for the duration of construction in the vicinity of the protected resources and shall be periodically inspected and repaired as needed to maintain the exclusion zone.

If full avoidance of wetlands is not implemented, then Sections 404 and 401 of the Clean Water Act (CWA) require permitting and state certification for construction and/or other work conducted in “waters of the United States.” Such work includes levee work, dredging, filling, grading, or any other temporary or permanent modification of wetlands, streams, or other water bodies. The Project would require both a RWQCB 401 Water Quality Certification and U.S Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Section 404 permit. The Project will secure the RWQCB 401 and USACE Section 404 permits, as applicable and relevant.

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? (Less than Significant)

Wildlife movement corridors are areas that connect suitable wildlife habitat areas in a region otherwise fragmented by extensive urban development, changes in vegetation, or human disturbance. Wildlife movement corridors are important because they provide access to mates, food, and water; allow the dispersal of individuals away from high population density areas, and facilitate the exchange of genetic traits between populations.

According to the CDFW BIOS Viewer version 6.22.0711, the Project site is not located within or near any natural landscape blocks identified by the California Essential Habitat Connectivity Project. The Project site is outside of the riparian habitat corridor associated with Siegler Canyon Creek and no other significant wildlife movement corridors or regional wildlife linkages were identified within the Project area. Construction and operation of the Project would not impact either the creek or the riparian corridor as improvements are outside of the riparian area. Therefore, wildlife and fish that may use this corridor would not be impeded. Impacts to wildlife migration would be less than significant.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Less than Significant)

The City of Clearlake has a Tree Ordinance (Municipal Code, Native Tree Ordinance, Section 18-40) for the protection of trees within the City. The tree ordinance requires permit for removal of native oak trees greater than 6 inches diameter at breast height (DBH) and trees designated as a “heritage tree” by the City Council, and prohibitions of disturbances within the root protection zone of protected trees. As described in Section 1.7 (Compliance with Existing Regulations and Standard BMPs), the Project would include compliance with the City Tree Ordinance requirements and obtain a tree removal permit. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant.
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? (No Impact)

The Project site is not located within the boundaries of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. As such, the Project would not conflict with the provisions of an applicable plan. No impact would occur.
3.5 Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Archaeological Resources Study

An Archaeological Resources Study was prepared for the Project by the Anthropological Studies Center of Sonoma State University (ASC 2022). The study assessed the potential for surficial and/or buried archaeological and historical resources in the proposed improvement area through the completion of the following:

- Records and literature search at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information Center (CHRIS);
- Further literature review of publications, files, and maps for ethnographic, historic-era, and prehistoric resources and background information;
- Communication with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to request a review of the Sacred Lands File and contact information for the appropriate tribal communities;
- Contact with the appropriate local Native American Tribes; and
- Pedestrian archaeological survey of the Project area.

Study results were used as a technical basis for evaluating potential impacts to historic and cultural resources under CEQA.

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5? (Less than Significant)

CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(b) establishes the criteria for assessing a significant environmental impact on historic resources. That section states, “[a] project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment.” The CEQA Guidelines define substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource as a “physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired” (Section 15064.5(b)(1)). The significance of an historic architectural resource is considered to be “materially impaired” when a project demolishes or materially alters the physical characteristics that justify the inclusion of the resource in the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR), or that justify the inclusion of the
resource in a local register, or that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the CRHR as determined by the lead agency for the purposes of CEQA (Section 15064.5(b)(2)).

No historic-era resources are recorded or identified with the Project site. The Project Area’s sensitivity for buried historic-era resources is low, as is the Project Area’s sensitivity for unrecognized surficial historic-era resources. No evidence of the previously-identified historic-era artifact deposits were observed on the surface within the Project area. Therefore, the impact is less than significant. The potential for historic-period archaeological resources is evaluated in Impact ‘b’ below.

b) **Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

The Archaeological Resources Study conducted for the Project found no previously recorded cultural resources located within the proposed Interregional Transit Center Site. A pedestrian archaeological survey of the Interregional Transit Center site also identified no archaeological resources.

The Archaeological Resources Study found one previously recorded prehistoric cultural resource and one prehistoric archeological district on the M&O facility site, both primarily within the future solar facility-portion of the site. A pedestrian archaeological survey of the M&O facility site identified a previously unrecorded historic-era cultural resource partially within the site.

Background research indicates a high sensitivity for prehistoric archaeological resources on the surface, and a low sensitivity for historic-era archaeological resources on the surface (ASC 2022). The sensitivity for buried prehistoric archaeological resources in the improvement area is also considered high (ASC 2022).

A search of the NAHC’s Sacred Lands File for Sacred Sites identified a sacred site within the vicinity of the Project site. Additionally, information suggesting the presence of sacred sites or archaeological resources was received from individuals or organizations contacted as part of the study. Such coordination included letters and telephone calls to Native American contacts provided by the NAHC. The potential exists for encountering previously undiscovered archaeological resources during Project construction. If such resources were to represent unique archaeological resources as defined by CEQA, any substantial change to or destruction of these resources would be a significant impact. Therefore, the impact is considered potentially significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

Implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-1 would reduce the potential impact to previously undiscovered archaeological or cultural resources to a less-than-significant level by requiring procedures to be taken in the event of inadvertent discovery of resources consistent with appropriate laws and requirements.

**Mitigation Measure CR-1: Archaeological Inadvertent Discovery Procedures**

Lake Transit shall ensure the following procedures are followed. If archaeological materials are encountered during initial ground-disturbing activities, work within 100 feet of a discovery shall be halted until a qualified archaeologist assesses the find, consults with the appropriate tribes and agencies, and makes recommendations for the treatment of the discovery to protect the integrity of the resource and ensure that no additional resources are affected. Upon completion of the assessment, the archaeologist shall prepare a report to document the methods and results of the assessment. The report shall be submitted to the City or County (as appropriate), appropriate tribes, and the Northwest Information Center upon completion. Following initial ground disturbance, in the event that any subsurface archaeological features or deposits, including locally darkened midden...
soil, are discovered during later construction-related earth-moving activities, all ground-disturbing activity in the vicinity of the resource shall be halted, a qualified professional archaeologist shall be retained to evaluate the find, and the appropriate tribal representative(s) shall be notified. If the find qualifies as a historical resource, unique archaeological resource, or tribal cultural resource as defined by CEQA, the archaeologist, in consultation with tribes, shall develop appropriate measures to protect the integrity of the resource and ensure that no additional resources are affected. In considering any suggested measures proposed by the consulting archaeologist in order to mitigate impacts to historical resources or unique archaeological resources, the City or County (as applicable), in consultation with applicable Native American tribes, shall determine whether avoidance is necessary and feasible in light of factors such as the nature of the find, Project design, costs, and other considerations. If avoidance is infeasible, other appropriate measures (e.g., data recovery, reburial at another location within the site) shall be instituted. Work may proceed on other parts of the Project while mitigation for unique archaeological resources is being carried out.

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Based on the archaeological field survey and records search performed for the Project, no indication of human burials was identified on the Project site (ASC 2022). Although no human remains have been directly observed, the possibility of encountering human remains during Project construction cannot be discounted. Therefore, the impact related to the potential disturbance or damage of previously undiscovered human remains, if present, is considered significant. Mitigation Measure CR-2 would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level by addressing discovery of unanticipated remains, associated grave goods, or items of cultural patrimony consistent with appropriate laws and requirements.

Following construction, no ground disturbing activities are anticipated to occur other than those related to routine maintenance of the Project, such as landscaping or irrigation repair. Therefore, it is unlikely any human remains would be encountered during operation. The operational impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure CR-2 would reduce the impact of construction activities on potentially unknown human remains to a less than significant level by addressing discovery of unanticipated remains, associated grave goods, or items of cultural patrimony consistent with appropriate laws and requirements.

Mitigation Measure CR-2: Protect Human Remains If Encountered during Construction

Lake Transit shall ensure the following measures are implemented to protect human remains. If human remains, associated grave goods, or items of cultural patrimony are encountered during construction, work shall halt within 100 feet of the find and the County Coroner shall be notified immediately. The following procedures shall be followed as required by Public Resources Code §5097.9 and Health and Safety Code § 7050.5. If the human remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of the determination. The Native American Heritage Commission shall then notify the Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The MLD shall complete an inspection and make its MLD recommendation for disposition of the remains within 48 hours of receiving access to the site. Lake Transit and the MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment, with appropriate dignity, of any human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects. Said determination may
include avoidance of the human remains, reburial on-site, or reburial on tribal or other lands that will not be subject to future disturbance. Any reburial of human remains shall be accomplished in compliance with the California Public Resources Code Sections 5097.98(a) and (b). Unless otherwise required by law, the site of any reburial of Native American human remains shall not be disclosed.
3.6 Energy Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? (Less than Significant)

Construction

Construction of the Project would involve grading, excavation, use of heavy machinery, and materials hauling as discussed in Section 1.5, Project Construction, and Section 3.3, Air Quality. Temporary energy use in connection with Project construction would include consumption of diesel fuel and gasoline by construction equipment and transport of earth moving equipment, construction materials, supplies, and construction personnel to and from the Project site. As summarized in Section 1.7, Compliance with Existing Regulations and Standards, implementation of Construction Best Management Practices is included as part of the Project, requiring provisions in contractor agreements for minimizing idling time to 5 minutes or less during construction, requiring construction equipment to be maintained per specifications established by the manufacturer, and using electric equipment and/or equipment using alternative fuels as feasible and appropriate. With implementation of such construction measures, the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary use of energy resources is not anticipated during Project construction. The impact would be less than significant.

Operation

Energy-consuming equipment anticipated to be used during operation of the Project includes mechanical and electrical equipment associated with the new Interregional Transit Center building, new lighting, fuel pumping, and (at a future date) onsite hydrogen generation. The proposed new lights would minimize energy consumption in accordance with City of Clearlake Zoning Code 18.22.080 (Energy Conservation).

The Interregional Transit Center would be designed and installed in accordance with applicable design standards, including Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards for non-residential buildings. The Project would replace existing diesel-fueled bus trips with clean, zero emission bus trips. In the near-term, the Project would result in approximately 2 heavy-duty truck trips per month for hydrogen vendor fuel delivery to the M&O facility. Once onsite hydrogen generation facilities are installed, the Project would result in increased electricity consumption to operate the hydrogen electrolyzers. Additionally, the electric charging stations on the Interregional Transit Center would support the future use of Battery Electric Buses anticipated by other transit agencies.
As discussed in Section 1.10, Zero Emission Buses and Hydrogen Fuel Background:

- Lake Transit is required by State law to convert their bus fleet to ZEB
- The State is planning for and requiring an increase in hydrogen fuel generation and use within California to address climate change

Additionally, State laws require energy providers to increase procurement and delivery of renewable electricity. California’s Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS), as modified by SB 350, requires that retail sellers of electricity increase the amount of electricity generated and sold to retail customers per year from eligible renewable energy resources to 50 percent by December 31, 2030. SB 100 requires that 100 percent or retail sales of electricity be renewable by 2045. Hydrogen generated using renewable energy is, by extension, considered a renewable fuel.

It is noted that the Project’s operational trips and electricity consumption are a necessary component of the Project and, therefore, would not constitute wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. The increase in energy demand resulting from the Project would not be expected to require or result in the construction of new sources of energy supplies or additional energy infrastructure capacity, and the Project would not conflict with applicable energy policies or standards. Therefore, operation of the Project would not use large amounts of energy nor use it in a wasteful manner. The operational impact would be less than significant.

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency? (Less than Significant)

There are no local plans for renewable energy that would apply to the Project site. Implementation of the Project would not obstruct a state plan for renewable energy.

The City of Clearlake and Lake County General Plans include goals to promote energy-conserving features and clean alternative energy use in new construction (Policy CO 6.1.1 and Policy OSC-5.1, respectively).

Construction and operation of the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the General Plan goals. Project construction would not require a large amount of fuel or energy usage because of the limited extent and nature of the proposed improvements and the minimal number of construction vehicles and equipment, worker trips, and truck trips that would be required for a project of this small scale. Project operation would similarly utilize the minimum necessary energy to operate the facilities. No conflicts with a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency have been identified. Therefore, no impact would result.
### 3.7 Geology and Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Landslides?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Project area is not located within an active Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone and no other active or potentially active faults have been mapped within the area. The closest mapped active fault to the sites is the Konocti Bay Fault Zone, located approximate 4 miles west of the Project (CDC 2021). As mapped by the California Department of Conservation, the Project sites are not located within identified liquefaction or landslide zones.
Environmental Analysis

The 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. (No Impact)

The Alquist-Priolo Act (Public Resources Code Sections 2621–2630) was passed in 1972 to mitigate the hazard of surface faulting to structures designed for human occupancy. The purpose of the Act is to prevent the construction of buildings used for human occupancy on the surface trace of active faults. The project site is not located within an active Alquist-Priolo earthquake fault zone, in which the state requires special studies for structures for human occupancy, and no other active or potentially active faults occur within the project site. The closest fault (Konocti Bay Fault Zone) is located approximately 4 miles west of the project site. Due to the distance from the project to the nearest recognized fault, the potential for ground surface fault rupture to occur at the project site is considered low. No impact would result.

Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking? (Less than Significant)

The Project area is located within a seismically active region where the project site would be susceptible to strong ground shaking due to seismic activities primarily along the Konocti Bay Fault Zone, which is the nearest active fault to the project site. Earthquake engineering design as required by the Uniform Building Code would reduce the probability of damage to the facilities during a seismic event. Therefore, the potential impact related to strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.

Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction, or expansive soils, or unstable geologic units or soils potentially result in on, or off, site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? (Less than Significant)

As stated in Section 1.7, Compliance with Existing Regulations and Standard BMPs, the Project would be designed and constructed in compliance with the site-specific recommendations in the Geotechnical Evaluation to be prepared for this Project. This would include design in accordance with recommendations for site preparation, grading, excavations, fill quality and placement, foundations, pavement sections, asphalt overlay, compactions, moisture barriers, and other factors. The geotechnical recommendations would be incorporated into the final plans and specifications for the project, and would be implemented during construction.

Implementation of the design recommendations included in the project geotechnical report would reduce the potential impact to people and structures due to liquefaction, and expansive or otherwise unstable soils, to less than significant.

Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides? (Less than Significant)

The Project site is located on relatively flat terrain. No landslides have occurred at the Project site in recent history. Project construction and operation would not increase the risk of landslides above existing conditions. The impact would be less than significant.
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Less than Significant)

The Project site is relatively flat. Construction activities would include grading, cuts, and fills that have the potential to cause erosion. As described in Section 1.7, Compliance with Existing Regulations and Standard BMPs, the Project will prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities (Construction General Permit) (Order No. 2009-0009, as amended by Order No. 2012-0006), which includes best management practices to prevent soil erosion. Compliance with the NPDES permit requirements would ensure that potential impacts from soil erosion or loss of topsoil during construction would be less than significant.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? (No Impact)

The Project would not install nor require the installation of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where soil infiltration would be required. No impact would occur.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Paleontological resources are the remains or traces of prehistoric animals and plants. Paleontological resources, which include fossil remains and geologic sites with fossil-bearing strata are non-renewable and scarce and are a sensitive resource afforded protection under environmental legislation in California. Since the Project does not include substantial excavation, it is unlikely that Project construction would impact potentially significant paleontological resources. Nonetheless, such an impact cannot be ruled out altogether. Therefore, the impact is potentially significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation Measure GEO-1 would reduce the impact of construction activities on unknown paleontological resources to a less than significant level by addressing discovery of unanticipated buried resources and preserving and/or recording those resources consistent with appropriate laws and requirements.

Mitigation Measure GEO-1: Protect Paleontological Resources during Construction Activities

In the event that fossils are encountered during construction (i.e., bones, teeth, or unusually abundant and well-preserved invertebrates or plants), construction activities shall be diverted away from the discovery within 50 feet of the find, and a professional paleontologist shall be notified to document the discovery as needed, to evaluate the potential resource, and to assess the nature and importance of the find. Based on the scientific value or uniqueness of the find, the paleontologist may record the find and allow work to continue, or recommend salvage and recovery of the material, if it is determined that the find cannot be avoided. The paleontologist shall make recommendations for any necessary treatment that is consistent with currently accepted scientific practices. Any fossils collected from the area shall then be deposited in an accredited and permanent scientific institution where they will be properly curated and preserved.
3.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The LCAQMD refers to the BAAQMD’s recommended CEQA Guidelines to evaluate a project’s potential greenhouse gas impact. The BAAQMD publishes CEQA Air Quality Guidelines to assist local jurisdictions and lead agencies in complying with the requirements of CEQA regarding potentially adverse impacts to air quality and greenhouse gases.

On April 20, 2022, the BAAQMD adopted new thresholds of significance for climate impacts and substantiated the thresholds in the Justification Report: CEQA Thresholds for Evaluating the Significance of Climate Impacts from Land Use Projects and Plans (Justification Report) (BAAQMD 2022). The BAAQMD analyzed what would be required of new land use development projects to achieve California’s long-term climate goal of carbon neutrality by 2045, and identified specific measures for new land use development to address its “fair share” of implementing the goal of carbon neutrality by 2045. The BAAQMD’s newly adopted thresholds for land use development are provided in Table 3.8-1. The BAAQMD did not adopt or provide recommended thresholds for construction-generated GHGs.

**Table 3.8-1 BAAQMD Recommended GHG Thresholds of Significance for Land Use Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thresholds for Land Use Projects (Must Include A or B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Projects must include, at a minimum, the following project design elements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The project will not include natural gas appliances or natural gas plumbing (in both residential and nonresidential development).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The project will not result in any wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary electrical usage as determined by the analysis required under CEQA Section 21100(b)(3) and Section 15126.2(b) of the State CEQA Guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Achieve compliance with electric vehicle requirements in the most recently adopted version of CALGreen Tier 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Achieve a reduction in project-generated vehicle miles traveled (VMT) below the regional average consistent with the current version of the California Climate Change Scoping Plan (currently 15 percent) or meet a locally adopted Senate Bill 743 VMT target, reflecting the recommendations provided in the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research’s Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Residential projects: 15 percent below the existing VMT per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Office projects: 15 percent below the existing VMT per employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Retail projects: no net increase in existing VMT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The BAAQMD provides that a lead agency should not use the BAAQMD-adopted threshold when the agency is, “faced with a unique or unusual project for which the analysis supporting the thresholds as described in this report do not squarely apply.” The BAAQMD recommends that in such cases, the lead agency should develop an alternative approach that is more appropriate to the particular project before it, considering all the facts and circumstances of the project on a case-by-case basis.

This Project is, in fact, unique as a transit/transportation project, and is not suitable for thresholds that would apply to a standard land use project or typical commercial/residential development. The Project does not fit the activity, use, or emissions inventory profiles of typical commercial or residential land uses. The Project is a transit development, which would support bus trips (rather than light duty auto trips). Therefore, thresholds of significance for industrial development are more appropriate for the Project’s analysis than thresholds developed for typical commercial or residential development.

A review of potential sources for thresholds of significance to apply includes:

- CARB’s Mandatory Reporting Program for Greenhouse Gases (MRR) and Cap-and-Trade Program Regulatory Documents (including Initial and Final Statements of Reasons)
- BAAQMD’s California Environmental Quality Act Air Quality Guidelines (including Appendix D, Thresholds of Significance Justification) (BAAQMD 2017)
- Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) Guide to Air Quality Assessment in Sacramento County (SMAQMD 2021)

A review of the potential sources of thresholds is provided below.

**CARB Background**

The State has implemented a Cap-and-Trade program as a major climate program, effective 2012. As described in CARB’s 2017 Scoping Plan:

The Cap-and-Trade Program includes GHG emissions from transportation, electricity, industrial, agricultural, waste, residential and commercial sources, and caps them while complementing the other measures needed to meet the 2030 GHG target. Altogether, the emissions covered by the Cap-and-Trade program total 80 percent of all GHG emissions in California.

AB 32 also requires CARB to adopt regulations for the mandatory reporting of GHG emissions (MRR) in order to monitor and enforce compliance with CARB’s GHG emissions reduction actions. The MRR and Cap-and-Trade programs use two emissions thresholds for determining compliance requirements:

- 10,000 MTCO₂e Threshold for MRR reporting
- 25,000 MTCO₂e “Major Source” Threshold for Cap-And-Trade Compliance
The 10,000 MTCO$_2$e threshold is for entry into the MRR reporting system; the 25,000 MTCO$_2$e threshold defines a ‘major source’ under the Cap-and-Trade program.

South Coast Air Quality Management District Guidance

The current SCAQMD guidance on assessing GHG emissions from industrial developments is to apply a 10,000 MTCO$_2$e/year threshold of significance. SCAQMD recommends including construction emissions amortized over 30 years added to operational GHG emissions to assess the significance of industrial projects under CEQA (SCAQMD 2008). SCAQMD’s guidance references the CARB’s MRR reporting threshold as informing the recommended threshold of significance (SCAQMD 2008). The SCAQMD threshold of 10,000 MTCO$_2$e/year is industry standard for industrial developments and is regularly used by agencies such as the Port of Los Angeles for industrial projects in the State of California.

Although the Project is not within SCAQMD’s jurisdiction, GHG emissions are inherently global, not local, in nature; accordingly, it is appropriate to utilize guidance from jurisdictions where large scale industrial developments are more common.

Bay Area Air Quality Management District Guidance

2010 Thresholds/2017 Guidelines

In 2010, the BAAQMD adopted thresholds of significance for GHG impacts and updated their Guidelines to reflect the new thresholds. The BAAQMD’s Guidelines were further updated in May 2017 to address the California Supreme Court’s 2015 opinion in California Building Industry Association vs. Bay Area Air Quality Management District, 62 Cal.4th 369. The BAAQMD’s 2017 Air Quality Guidelines provide the following project-level operational GHG thresholds of significance:

- For land use development projects, the threshold is compliance with a qualified GHG Reduction Strategy; or annual emissions less than 1,100 metric tons per year (MT/yr) of CO$_2$e; or 4.6 MT CO$_2$e/SP/yr (residents + employees). Land use development projects include residential, commercial, industrial, and public land uses and facilities.

- For stationary-source projects, the threshold is 10,000 metric tons per year (MT/yr) of CO$_2$e. Stationary-source projects include land uses that would accommodate processes and equipment that emit GHG emissions and would require an Air District permit to operate.

2022 Thresholds

On April 20, 2022, the BAAQMD adopted new thresholds of significance for climate impacts. The BAAQMD’s Justification Report for the newly adopted greenhouse gas thresholds differentiates between thresholds and treatment of commercial/residential development and other projects. Per the Justification Report:

The Air District has developed these thresholds of significance based on typical residential and commercial land use projects and typical long-term communitywide planning documents such as general plans and similar long-range development plans. As such, these thresholds may not be appropriate for other types of projects that do not fit into the mold of a typical residential or commercial project or general plan update.

Lead agencies should keep this point in mind when evaluating other types of projects. A lead agency does not necessarily need to use a threshold of significance if the analysis and justifications that were used to develop the threshold do not reflect the particular circumstances of the project.
under review. Accordingly, a lead agency should not use these thresholds if it is faced with a unique or unusual project for which the analyses supporting the thresholds as described in this report do not squarely apply. In such cases, the lead agency should develop an alternative approach that would be more appropriate for the particular project before it, considering all of the facts and circumstances of the project on a case-by-case basis. (emphasis added)

Additionally, the BAAQMD’s Justification Report states:

There is no proposed construction-related climate impact threshold at this time. Greenhouse gas emissions from construction represent a very small portion of a project’s lifetime GHG emissions. The proposed thresholds for land use projects are designed to address operational GHG emissions which represent the vast majority of project GHG emissions. (BAAQMD 2022)

The BAAQMD’s recommended 2022 thresholds differentiate between typical ‘indirect’ land uses (commercial or residential development) and other types of development such as industrial or transit land uses. As a transit/transportation development, the BAAQMD’s recommended threshold would not apply to the proposed project.

Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District Guidance

The SMAQMD provides threshold of significance applicable to project construction and operation, as shown in Table 3.8-2.

### Table 3.8-2 SMAQMD Greenhouse Gas Thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Phase</th>
<th>Operational Phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,100 MTCO₂e/Year</td>
<td>Demonstrate consistency with the Climate Change Scoping Plan by implementing applicable Best Management Practices (BMP), or equivalent on-site or off-site mitigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All projects must implement tier 1 BMPs (BMP 1 &amp; 2):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BMP 1</strong> - projects shall be designed and constructed without natural gas infrastructure. <strong>BMP 2</strong> - projects shall meet the current CalGreen Tier 2 standards, except all electric vehicle capable spaces shall instead be electric vehicle ready.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects that exceed 1,100 metric tons/year after implementation of tier 1 BMPs must implement tier 2 BMPs (BMP 3):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>BMP 3</strong> - residential projects shall achieve a 15% reduction in vehicle miles traveled per resident and office projects shall achieve a 15% reduction in vehicle miles traveled per worker compared to existing average vehicle miles traveled for the county, and retail projects shall achieve a no net increase in total vehicle miles traveled to show consistency with SB 743.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: SMAQMD 2021

### Thresholds Applied to Project

Therefore, as the BAAQMD does not have recommended thresholds of significance to apply to construction-period emissions or transit projects, the SMAQMD and SCAQMD-recommended GHG methodologies and thresholds were applied as follows:

- Construction emissions are quantified and amortized over the life of the project, defined as 30 years, and added to the operational emissions for comparison against the threshold of significance (SCAQMD Methodology)
Operational emissions are quantified and compared against the thresholds identified by SMAQMD and provided in Table 3.8-2 (SMAQMD Threshold).

In order to assess the potential impact of construction-generated emissions, the construction GHG emissions are annualized over an assumed 30-year project lifespan, added to operational emissions, and compared against a threshold of 1,100 MTCO₂e.

The GHG analysis also discusses greenhouse gas emissions and consistency with the goals of the State of California’s 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan. If the Project meets the criteria laid out in applicable greenhouse gas emissions plans, policies, and regulations, then its impact for that category may be considered less than significant.

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? (Less than Significant)

Construction emissions were estimated using CalEEMod 2020.4. Operational emissions for the Interregional Transit facility were also estimated using CalEEMod 2020.4. Details regarding the source equipment inventory, assumptions, and all data used to calculate construction-related and operational greenhouse gas emissions are available in Appendix D, GHG Emissions Modeling Output.

In order to assess the potential impact of construction-generated emissions, the construction GHG emissions are annualized over an assumed 30-year project lifespan, added to operational emissions, and compared against a threshold of 1,100 MTCO₂e. The Project’s construction-generated greenhouse gas emissions of 567.5 MTCO₂e annualized over 30 years would equal 8.9 MTCO₂e per year. Operation of the Interregional Transit Center would not result in an increase in diesel-fueled bus use, or require new Lake Transit employees. The facility’s greenhouse gas generation associated with area (landscaping), energy, and water-consumption is estimated to be approximately 12 MTCO₂e per year. With annualized construction emissions, the Project would emit an estimated 20.9 MTCO₂e per year. The Project’s emissions would be less than the applicable threshold, and the Project’s impact would be less than significant.

Although the Project may result in future onsite hydrogen generation at the M&O facility that would require an increase in energy consumption, that activity would occur at a future date, possibly in conjunction with the Project’s future solar facilities. PG&E’s 2021 electric power mix primarily consisted of renewable and large hydroelectric energy sources, and 16.4 percent fossil-fueled fired energy generation (PG&E 2021). State laws require energy providers to increase procurement and delivery of renewable electricity. California’s Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS), as modified by SB 350, require retail sellers of electricity to increase the amount of electricity generated and sold to retail customers per year from eligible renewable energy resources to increase to 50 percent by December 31, 2030. SB 100 future requires that 100 percent or retail sales of electricity be renewable by 2045. This analysis assumes that onsite hydrogen generation will primarily utilize renewable energy sources and, therefore, would not generate a substantive quantity of greenhouse gases.

Using CARB’s Benefits Calculator Tool for the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program, the total GHG emissions reductions for the North State Intercity Bus System - Lake County Interregional Transit Center related to replacing existing buses with ZEB is projected to be 14,239 MTCO₂e over the lifespan of the project (LTA 2020).
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (No Impact)

The City of Clearlake and Lake County do not have adopted, qualified Climate Action Plans.

The CARB 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan provides California’s climate policy portfolio and recommended strategies to put the State on a pathway to achieve the 2030 target. The scenario includes ongoing and statutorily required programs, continuing the Cap-and-Trade Program, and high-level objectives and goals to reduce GHGs across multiple economic sectors. Existing programs, also known as “known commitments,” identified by the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan include: SB 350, the Low Carbon Fuel Standard, CARB’s Mobile Source Strategy, SB 1383 for short-lived climate pollutants and California’s Sustainable Freight Action Plan. The high-level objective and goals recommendations cover the energy, transportation, industry, water, waste management, agriculture, and natural and working lands, and are to be implemented by a variety of State agencies.

The Project is analyzed for consistency with the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan in Table 3.8-3. As shown in the table, the Project is consistent with the applicable Scoping Plan measures. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact.

**Table 3.8-3 Consistency Analysis between Project and Climate Change Scoping Plan.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoping Plan Reduction Measure</th>
<th>Consistency/Applicability Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>California Cap-and-Trade Program Linked to Western Climate Initiative</strong> Implement a broad-based California Cap-and-Trade program to provide a firm limit on emissions. Link the California cap-and-trade program with other Western Climate Initiative Partner programs to create a regional market system to achieve greater environmental and economic benefits for California. Ensure California’s program meets all applicable AB 32 requirements for market-based mechanisms.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> This is a statewide measure that cannot be implemented by the Project or lead agency. PG&amp;E obtains 30 percent of its power supply from renewable sources such as solar, wind, and geothermal, in conformance with various regulations (PG&amp;E 2021). The State’s Renewable Portfolio goals require energy producers to achieve a 60% renewables goal by 2030, and 100% carbon-free by 2045.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California Light-Duty Vehicle Greenhouse Gas Standards</strong> Implement adopted standards and planned second phase of the program. Align zero-emission vehicle, alternative and renewable fuel, and vehicle technology programs with long-term climate change goals.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> This is a statewide measure that cannot be implemented by the Project or lead agency. However, the standards would be applicable to the light-duty vehicles that will access the Project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Energy Efficiency</strong> Maximize energy efficiency building and appliance standards; pursue additional efficiency including new technologies, policy, and implementation mechanisms. Pursue comparable investment in energy efficiency from all retail providers of electricity in California.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> This is a measure for the state to increase its energy efficiency standards in new buildings. The Project would be required to build to the latest standards in energy efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renewable Portfolio Standard</strong> Achieve 50 percent renewable energy mix</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> This is a statewide measure that cannot be implemented by the Project or lead agency. The Project would receive energy from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping Plan Reduction Measure</td>
<td>Consistency/Applicability Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statewide by 2030. Renewable energy sources include (but are not limited to) wind, solar, geothermal, small hydroelectric, biomass, anaerobic digestion, and landfill gas</td>
<td>PG&amp;E which is required to achieve a 60% renewables goal by 2030 and be 100% carbon-free by 2045.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Carbon Fuel Standard</strong> Develop and adopt the Low Carbon Fuel Standard.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent</strong>. This is a statewide measure that cannot be implemented by the Project or lead agency. The standard would be applicable to the fuel used by vehicles that will access the Project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Transportation-Related Greenhouse Gas Targets</strong> Develop regional greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets for passenger vehicles. This measure refers to SB 375.</td>
<td><strong>Not Applicable</strong>. This is a statewide measure calling for the development of GHG emission reduction targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Efficiency Measures</strong> Implement light-duty vehicle efficiency measures.</td>
<td><strong>Not Applicable</strong>. This is a statewide measure that cannot be implemented by the Project or lead agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goods Movement</strong> Implement adopted regulations for the use of shore power for ships at berth. Improve efficiency in goods movement activities.</td>
<td><strong>Not Applicable</strong>. The Project does not propose any changes to modes of transportation of goods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Million Solar Roofs Program</strong> Install 3,000 MW of solar-electric capacity under California’s existing solar programs.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent</strong>. This measure is intended to increase solar power throughout California, which is being done by various utility companies and solar programs. The Project includes solar facilities on the Interregional Transit Center roof and existing M&amp;O facility roof, as well as future solar facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium/Heavy-Duty Vehicles</strong> Adopt medium and heavy-duty vehicle efficiency measures.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent</strong>. This is a statewide measure that cannot be implemented by the Project or lead agency. However, the standards would be applicable to the medium and heavy-duty vehicles that would access the Project site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industrial Emissions</strong> Require assessment of large industrial sources to determine whether individual sources within a facility can cost-effectively reduce greenhouse gas emissions and provide other pollution reduction co-benefits. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from fugitive emissions from oil and gas extraction and gas transmission. Adopt and implement regulations to control fugitive methane emissions and reduce flaring at refineries.</td>
<td><strong>Not Applicable</strong>. This measure will apply to the direct GHG emissions at major industrial facilities. The Project is not an industrial facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Speed Rail</strong> Support implementation of a high-speed rail system.</td>
<td><strong>Not Applicable</strong>. This is a statewide measure that cannot be implemented by the Project or lead agency. High speed rail systems are not part of this Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Building Strategy</strong> Expand the use of green building practices to reduce the carbon footprint of California’s new and existing inventory of buildings.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent</strong>. The Project would comply with the California Energy Code and thus include the required energy efficiency features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping Plan Reduction Measure</td>
<td>Consistency/Applicability Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Global Warming Potential Gases</strong>&lt;br&gt;Adopt measures to reduce high global warming potential gases.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> This measure is applicable to the high global warming potential gases such as hydrofluorocarbons, perfluorocarbons, and sulfur hexafluoride found in air conditioning and commercial refrigerators. The Project’s cooling system would utilize equipment that complies with this measure. Consistent with new State law, the project would be required to use refrigerants with a Global Warming Potential of 150 or less, and to comply with the Refrigerant Management Program that will be in place prior to Project operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recycling and Waste</strong>&lt;br&gt;Reduce methane emissions at landfills. Increase waste diversion, composting, and commercial recycling. Move toward zero-waste.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> The Project does not include a landfill. The project would reduce waste with implementation of state mandated recycling and reuse mandates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Forests</strong>&lt;br&gt;Preserve forest sequestration and encourage the use of forest biomass for sustainable energy generation.</td>
<td><strong>Not Applicable.</strong> The Project would not include tree removal or areas for reforestation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water</strong>&lt;br&gt;Continue efficiency programs and use cleaner energy sources to move and treat water.</td>
<td><strong>Consistent.</strong> This is a measure for State and local agencies. However, the Project would adhere to California Green Building Standards Code regulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agriculture</strong>&lt;br&gt;In the near-term, encourage investment in manure digesters and at the five- year Scoping Plan update determine if the program should be made mandatory by 2020.</td>
<td><strong>Not Applicable.</strong> The Project does not include agricultural production.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source of Scoping Plan Reduction Measures: CARB 2017*
### 3.9 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A summary of applicable safety regulations is provided in Table 1-7, Codes & Standards for a Hydrogen Fueling Station.

**a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? (Less than Significant)**

The Project would include modifications to the existing M&O facility to receive, store, and distribute hydrogen fuel. The Project would add a hydrogen storage tank with an estimated 15,000-gallon storage capacity. The proposed hydrogen storage tank would be located on the east side of the M&O facility, with paved areas surrounding 3 sides, and open space on the fourth.

Hydrogen is identified as a hazardous material (flammable gas) under the criteria of the Federal OSHA Hazard Communication Standard 29 CFR 1910.1200. However, hydrogen is non-toxic and non-poisonous.
The Project improvements would require compliance with the Unified Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Material Management Regulatory Program. The Lake County Environmental Management Department has been designated by Cal EPA to implement the Unified Program for Lake County. The Unified Program consolidates and coordinates program elements, including the California Accidental Release Prevention Program (Cal ARP); Hazardous Material Release Response Plans and Inventories; and Uniform Fire Code Hazardous Materials Management Plans and Inventories.

The transportation of hazardous materials on railroads and roadways is regulated by U.S. Department of Transportation, the CHP, and Caltrans, and use of such materials is regulated by the DTSC (22 Cal. Code Regs §§ 66001, et seq.). The use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials is required to be in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations during both Project construction and operation. The M&O facility is required to operate under a permit and comply with appropriate regulatory agency standards designed to avoid hazardous waste releases. The Project would be required to comply with federal, state and local regulations regarding the handling, transportation, disposal, and clean-up of hazardous materials.

All potentially hazardous materials would be required to be handled, used, and stored in accordance with manufacturers’ specifications and applicable health and safety regulations. Compliance with the requirements of the CUPA Unified Program permit and a Hazardous Materials Business Plan (HMBP) would ensure that hazardous materials are properly transported, stored, inventoried, and disposed. Mandatory compliance with regulations would ensure that the improvements to the existing facility are constructed, maintained, and operated in accordance with current safety and environmental protection standards. With adherence to applicable regulatory requirements, the operational impacts related to the transport and use of hydrogen fuel (hazardous) would be less than significant.

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? (Less than Significant)

As discussed under Impact ‘a’ above, the Project would result in new hydrogen fuel storage and dispensing improvements at the M&O facility. The Project would operate under a CUPA Unified Program permit and a HMBP. The HMBP contains a hazardous materials inventory and emergency response procedures, pursuant to Chapter 6.95, Division 20 of the California Health and Safety Code. The M&O facility is operated in accordance with an Industrial Storm Water NPDES permit which controls pollutants in storm water discharges. The Industrial SWPPP identifies storm water drainage patterns, discharge locations, and potential sources of storm water pollution and includes site-specific BMPs that must be implemented to prevent storm water pollution.

Hydrogen is a gas that rapidly disperses. It will not contaminate groundwater and is a gas under normal atmospheric conditions with a very low solubility in water. A release of hydrogen is not known to contribute to atmospheric pollution or water pollution (DOE 2014). Because hydrogen is buoyant and disperses rapidly, it is less likely to be confined than other gases and therefore poses less risk as an asphyxiant.

The use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials is required to be in compliance with local, state, and federal regulations during both Project construction and operation. The M&O facility is required to operate under a permit and comply with appropriate regulatory agency standards designed to avoid hazardous waste releases. The Project would be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations regarding the handling, transportation, disposal, and clean-up of hazardous materials. With required adherence to applicable regulatory requirements, the impacts related to accidental release of hazardous materials would be less than significant.
c) **Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (Less than Significant)**

The Project would be located within 0.25 mile of two existing schools. The two nearest schools to the Project site are the Konocti Education Center (approximately 0.15 mile from the Interregional Transit Center Site) and the Lower Lake Elementary School and preschool (approximately 0.11 mile from the M&O facility). As provided in Impact ‘a’ and ‘b’ above, the Project would comply with federal, state, and local regulations that reduce potential for routine or accidental emissions of hazardous materials to less than significant. Additionally, because hydrogen is a gas that rapidly disperses, hydrogen emissions from the M&O facility would not affect nearby schools. The impact would be less than significant.

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? (No Impact)**

The Project site is not listed as a Cleanup Program Site under the State Water Resources Control Board's Site Cleanup Program. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact.

e) **For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area? (No Impact)**

The nearest airport is Lampson Field, located more than 14 miles to the west of the Project site. The Project is not located near a public use airport or active private airstrip. Therefore, the Project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the Project area from airport activity. The Project would result in no impact.

f) **Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Less than Significant)**

The Safety Element of the City of Clearlake General Plan and Health & Safety Element of the Lake County General Plan include goals, policies, and actions to minimize the potential risk of death, injuries, property damage, and economic hardship and social displacement resulting from fires, floods, earthquakes, landslides, and other hazards. The General Plans element also addresses safety and hazards related to airport land use, groundwater contamination, the potential release of hazardous materials into the community, and general issues related to police and fire protection services.

The Lake Emergency Operational Plan (EOP) addresses planned methods for managing information, resources, and priorities during a multi-jurisdiction response to extraordinary emergency situations associated with natural and human caused disasters. The Lake EOP encompasses the boundaries of Lake County and includes the City of Clearlake. The City of Clearlake Hazard Mitigation Plan and Lake County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Update address long-term risk to people and their property from hazards.

The Project would not change existing circulation patterns along local roadways or generate substantial new traffic. Construction of proposed facilities along S. Center Drive or Dam Road Extension may require traffic control or brief road closures. In accordance with City requirements, the construction contractor would be required to obtain an encroachment permit from the City for any portion of work completed within the S. Center Drive or Dam Road Extension ROW. The contractor would develop a Traffic Control Plan required by the City’s Encroachment Permit, which would include notification of emergency responders and a work...
area access plan detailing access to each portion of the project area, including those properties which may experience temporary delay or disruption of access. With implementation of the Traffic Control Plan, the impact to emergency response or evacuation elements associated with local and regional plans would be less than significant.

g) **Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

The Project site improvements are located in a Local Responsibility Area (LRA), which is an area where a local agency, in this case the City of Clearlake and Lake County, has primary responsibility for fire and emergency response. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection mapping (CALFIRE 2022) indicates both sites are located outside of Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Very High FHSZ). The M&O facility site is surrounded by land also not considered Very High FHSZ. However, the Interregional Transit Center site is located near land identified as within the Very High FHSZ. Specifically, land east of Dam Road Extension is within the Very High FHSZ.

Although the Project site areas are not located within designated areas at risk of wildland fires, it is possible that accidental fire ignition could occur during construction (e.g., related to heavy machinery usage). Because the vegetation at portions of the Project site could be dry during construction, the construction-related impact is considered significant. With implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 (Reduce Wildland Fire Hazards during Construction), the potential impact related to wildland fires during construction would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measure**

Implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1 would require the use of construction techniques that would reduce the likelihood of wildland fires during construction of the Project. With implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, the impact related to wildland fires would be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: Reduce Wildland Fire Hazards during Construction**

Prior to construction, Lake Transit and its contractor(s) shall remove and/or clear away dry, combustible vegetation from the construction site. Grass and other vegetation less than 18 inches in height above the ground shall be maintained where necessary to stabilize the soil and prevent erosion. Vehicles shall not be parked in areas where exhaust systems contact combustible materials. Fire extinguishers shall be available on the construction site to assist in quickly extinguishing any small fires, and the contractors shall have on site the phone number for the local fire department.
3.10 **Hydrology and Water Quality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction**

The Project would include modifications to the existing M&O facility and construction of the Interregional Transit Center. During construction, temporary construction activities have the potential to degrade water quality that could be discharged to the local storm drain system as a result of erosion caused by earthmoving activities or the accidental release of hazardous construction chemicals. Therefore, if not properly managed, construction activities could result in erosion, as well the discharge of chemicals and materials. In such an instance, applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements could be violated, and polluted runoff could substantially degrade water quality in the local storm drain system.
As summarized in Section 1.7, Lake Transit and/or their construction contractor would be required to obtain coverage under State Water Resources Control Board Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Storm Water Runoff Associated with Construction and Land Disturbance Activities, as amended by Order No. 2012-0006. This would include required submittal of permit registration documents (notice of intent, risk assessment, site maps, construction Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), annual fee, and certifications) to the State Water Resources Control Board. The construction SWPPP would address pollutant sources, non-storm water discharges resulting from construction dewatering, best management practices, and other requirements specified in the above-mentioned Order. The SWPPP would also include dust control practices to prevent wind erosion, sediment tracking, and dust generation by construction equipment. A Qualified SWPPP Practitioner would oversee implementation of the Plan, including visual inspections, sampling and analysis, and ensuring overall compliance. With implementation of the storm water control measures identified in Section 1.7 of this Initial Study, the impact of construction-related activities on water quality would be less than significant.

**Operation and Maintenance**

Following construction, the Project would include operation and maintenance of the Interregional Transit Center and hydrogen fuel facilities at, as well as operation and maintenance of new hydrogen ZEB. The proposed hydrogen fuel facilities would be located within the existing M&O facility within the central portion of the property.

The Project site is located within the California Regional Water Quality Control Board’s North Coast Region (NCRWQCB). The Water Quality Control Plan for the North Coast Region (Basin Plan) addresses surface and groundwater quality within the Project area. The Project is also subject to compliance with Lake County’s Low Impact Development (LID) requirements.

The M&O facility has existing storm water discharge points to which runoff discharges directly to the Lake County Special Districts municipal storm sewer system (MS4). The Interregional Transit Center would similarly discharge to the MS4. Specifically, the Project would not discharge to a water body that has a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) requirement or is listed as impaired under CWA 303(d) for industrial pollutants associated with the facility.

Control of pollutants in storm water discharges at the Project site is required through several required permits and plans. The Project improvements at the M&O facility would be operated under an Industrial Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (Industrial SWPPP), which is currently in place, and would be amended to cover operation of the proposed new facilities.

An Industrial Stormwater NPDES Permit and Industrial SWPPP for the Project identifies storm water drainage patterns, discharge locations, and potential sources of storm water pollution and includes site-specific best management practices that are required to be implemented to prevent storm water pollution. A dedicated Pollution Prevention Team is responsible for compliance with the requirements of the Industrial General Permit through proper implementation of the Industrial SWPPP.

The Project would also operate under a CUPA Unified Program permit and a Hazardous Materials Business Plan, which would be required to be amended and implemented for the proposed Project facilities. The Hazardous Materials Business Plan includes a hazardous materials inventory and emergency response procedures, pursuant to Chapter 6.95, Division 20 of the California Health and Safety Code.

All potentially hazardous materials would be required to be handled, used, and stored in accordance with manufacturers’ specifications and applicable health and safety regulations. The use of hazardous materials would require compliance with the Hazardous Materials Business Plan Program. Compliance with the
requirements of these programs at the Project site would be achieved through compliance with the CUPA Unified Permit and the Industrial SWPPP.

With adherence to applicable regulatory requirements, the operational impacts related to water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would be less than significant, and the Project would not substantially degrade surface or ground water quality.

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? (Less than Significant)

Relative to groundwater, the Project site is located within the Clear Lake Cache Formation Groundwater Subbasin and Lower Lake Valley Groundwater Subbasin, which are designated as a low or very low priority groundwater basin by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR). Please see Impact ‘e’ below for additional information on the local groundwater basin and the applicable groundwater sustainability plan. No groundwater supplies would be needed to support the Project, nor would construction or operation of the Project interfere with groundwater recharge in a manner that would impact groundwater resources. Therefore, no impact to sustainable groundwater management would result.

c.i) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (Less than Significant)

The M&O facility onsite drainage system consists of a series of ditches, pipes, culverts, and inlets, and the system connects to the storm water drainage system through an existing storm drain connection. Approximately 50 percent of the existing M&O facility site is developed with a combination of buildings and pavement. The Project would expand the use of the existing facility by adding new hydrogen fuel storage and dispensing facilities. Additionally, the Project would increase the amount of impervious surfaces at the Interregional Transit Center site by approximately 1.3 acres.

No on-site streams or creeks are present on the property. Drainage patterns at the Project site would remain essentially the same as they currently exist and would connect to the local storm drain system. The Project would require adherence to the requirements set forth in the General Construction Permit, which would include a construction SWPPP that includes BMPs to prevent erosion and siltation. Operation and maintenance activities would also require adherence to the requirements set forth in the Industrial Stormwater NPDES Permit, Industrial SWPPP, CUPA Unified Permit, and HMBP for the M&O facility (see Impact ‘a’ for additional information). As a result, the impacts relative to erosion or siltation would be less than significant.

c.ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Less than Significant)

No on-site streams or creeks are present on the Project site. Siegler Creek is located north and east of the M&O facility site. The Project would increase the amount of impervious surfaces at the Interregional Transit Center site by approximately 1.3 acres, and at the M&O facility by an estimated 0.1 acre.

The portion of the Project site that would have new impervious pavement represents approximately 60 percent of the total area of the Interregional Transit Center site.
Because the increased impervious area exceeds one acre, permanent water quality treatment is included as part of the Project, consistent with Lake County’s Low Impact Development (LID) requirements. Specific LID improvements would be determined during facility design, but may include vegetated swales to provide water quality treatment for stormwater runoff prior to discharge to an existing permeable area on the Project site or the MS4. Drainage patterns at the Project site would remain essentially the same as they currently exist and would connect to the local storm drain system.

Because the on-site and proposed drainage infrastructure for the Project is adequate and would be required to manage the increase in runoff and mimic existing hydrologic conditions, the stormwater drainage system would have adequate capacity to serve the Project. As a result, the impacts relative to storm drain capacity and potential for flooding would be less than significant.

c.iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Less than Significant)

Please see Impact ‘c.ii’ above relative to contribution of runoff water in relation to the capacity of existing stormwater drainage systems, and Impact ‘a’ above relative to water quality and sources of polluted runoff.

Because the existing and proposed on-site drainage infrastructure for the Project is adequate and would be required to manage the increase in runoff and mimic existing hydrologic conditions, the stormwater drainage system would have adequate capacity to serve the Project. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure that the Project facilities are managed during construction to avoid discharges to the stormwater system, and designed and operated to minimize the potential for violations of water quality standards. As a result, the impacts relative to drainage capacity and water quality would be less than significant.

c, iv) Impede or redirect flood flows? (Less than Significant.)

No streams or creeks are present at the Project site or at the off-site improvement areas. The Interregional Transit Center site is located in FEMA Zone X, which is defined as areas of minimal flood hazard (FEMA 2022). The M&O site is located within FEMA the Special Flood Hazard Zone AE, but outside the Regulatory Floodway. Regulatory floodway means the channel of a river or other watercourse and the adjacent land areas that must be reserved in order to discharge the base flood without cumulatively increasing the water surface elevation more than a designated height.

Construction within Zone AE is regulated by the Federal Insurance and Hazard Mitigation program, which includes the design requirements that ensure flood carrying capacity of the area is maintained. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure that the Project facilities would not substantially impede or redirect flood flows. As a result, the impact would be less than significant.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? (No Impact)

The Project site is not located within a designated floodplain or within a tsunami or seiche zone. No impact would result.
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? (No Impact)

As described under Impact ‘a’ above, the Project site is located within the NCRWQCB and within an area covered by the Basin Plan for the Sacramento River Basin. The Project would be required to comply with applicable storm water standards and permits that are designed to reduce potential water quality impacts to a less-than-significant level. As further described under Impact ‘a’ above, the Project as proposed would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the regional Basin Plan. Therefore, no impact related to obstruction of the Basin Plan would result.

In 2014, the State of California enacted the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), which requires groundwater basins and subbasins in California designated as high- or medium-priority by the DWR to be managed sustainably. The Project site is located within the Clear Lake Cache Formation Groundwater Subbasin and Lower Lake Valley Groundwater Subbasin, which are designated as a low or very low priority groundwater basin by the California DWR and are not required to complete Groundwater Management Plans to comply with SGMA. The Lake County Watershed Protection District’s Lake County Groundwater Management Plan, developed before adoption of the SGMA, includes an assessment of the impacts of predicted future groundwater levels on beneficial users, including groundwater-dependent shallow wells, and interconnected surface water. The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Lake County Groundwater Management Plan. Therefore, no conflict would result.
3.11 Land Use and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a) Physically divide an established community? (No Impact)**

Division of an established community typically occurs when a new physical feature, in the form of a highway or railroad, physically transects an area, thereby removing mobility and access within an established community. The Project would construct an Interregional Transit Center and improvements to the M&O facility within the existing Lake Transit property. Therefore, the Project would not physically divide an established community. No impact would occur.

**b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (No Impact)**

The Project would implement improvements at the existing M&O facility and within an existing urbanized area at the Interregional Transit Center site. The improvements at the Interregional Transit Center site would be consistent with the allowable uses within the Commercial land use designation of the City of Clearlake General Plan, and respective Commercial General (CG) zoning. The improvements at the M&O facility site would be consistent with the allowable uses within the Community Commercial (Cc) land use designation the Lake County General Plan, and respective Community Commercial (C2) zoning.

Specific policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects are evaluated in this document under the corresponding issue areas. See Sections 3.13, Noise, for a full analysis of the Project’s noise impacts.

The Project would not involve a change of land use on the affected property from the land use designation or zoning. Ultimately the land use of the M&O facility site would remain the same as existing conditions, as it would continue as storage and maintenance facilities for transit. The proposed design of the Interregional Transit Center facilities would be consistent with all applicable land use policies and regulations. Therefore, implementation of the facilities on the M&O facility and Interregional Transit Center sites would not conflict with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. No impact would occur.
3.12 Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a, b) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state, or a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (No Impact)

The Project sites are not located within an area classified as mineral resource zone or aggregate source by the City of Clearlake General Plan or Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan. Minimal grading and excavation would occur during Project construction, preserving any mineral resource that may exist on site. There would be no impact.
3.13 Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential noise impacts were evaluated based on the findings of an environmental noise assessment performed by Illingworth & Rodkin (Illingworth & Rodkin 2022b, Appendix C).

A noise monitoring survey was performed from Wednesday June 22, 2022, through Friday, June 24, 2022. The survey included two long-term (LT) noise measurements and three short-term (ST) noise measurements to quantify existing ambient noise levels near the Interregional Transit Center site. Sites were selected to characterize the ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project site. Detailed data for the existing noise environment is provided in Appendix C. The noise environment at the Interregional Transit Center site and surrounding area includes noise primarily from local vehicular traffic along SR 53, Dam Road Extension, and South Center Drive.

a) Result in generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

Construction

Construction activities would be carried out in stages. During each stage of construction, there would be a different mix of equipment operating, and noise levels would vary by stage and vary within stages, based on the amount of equipment in operation and the location at which the equipment is operating.

The Project includes mass grading within the Interregional Transit Center site and installation of the new facilities, and minor demolition activity and installation of new facilities at the M&O site. As stated in Section 1.5 (Project Construction), anticipated construction work hours would be daylight hours (7:00 AM to 7:00 PM) Monday through Friday, which would be consistent with the allowable noise-production hours of the City of Clearlake Municipal Code and Lake County Municipal Code.

Construction of the Interregional Transit Center is anticipated to take approximately 10 months. Project construction equipment is anticipated to include backhoes, forklifts, pickup trucks, concrete mixer trucks,
front-end loaders, rollers, dump trucks, graders, scrapers, and excavators. Most of the heavy equipment would be used during the first month of construction, during site preparation and grading. The concrete mixer and pick-up trucks would be used throughout construction. Pile driving would not be used as a method of construction.

Based on the noise modeling contained in Appendix C, construction activities for the Interregional Transit Center would not produce noise levels exceeding 80 decibels when measured at a distance of one hundred feet from the source. Therefore, the Project construction complies with the City’s construction requirements and noise impacts are less than significant.

Project construction at the M&O site would generate noise similar to construction noise levels for the Interregional Transit Center. The Lake County Municipal Code exempts construction site sounds between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm. However, Lake County General Plan Policy N-1.7 require contractors to implement noise-reducing mitigation measures during construction when residential uses or other sensitive receptors are located within 500 feet. Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measure NOI-1 is incorporated to ensure consistency with the Lake County General Plan, and reduce the temporary construction noise impact to less than significant.

**Operation**

**Interregional Transit Center**

The main noise source attributable to the Project’s operations would be bus operations. Noise measurements were made at the existing transfer hub. The purpose of these measurements was to document existing noise levels produced by Lake Transit buses. While buses were parked and idling, sustained noise levels of 62 to 64 dBA were recorded at a distance of approximately 130 feet. When these buses passed by the monitoring location, noise levels of 69 to 77 dBA were recorded at approximately 20 feet, and noise levels of 55 dBA were noted at 150 feet. An additional bus was observed to produce noise levels of 55 dBA at approximately 100 feet away. The average noise level at 85 feet from the acoustic center of the activity was 61 dBA Leq, and assuming a similar level of activity throughout the day (between the hours of 6:00 AM to 8:00 PM, consistent with existing schedules), the Ldn attributable to these activities would also be 61 dBA at 85 feet.

The City of Clearlake identifies transportation-related noise increases to be 3 dB Ldn or greater as significant where existing traffic noise levels range between 60 and 65 dBA Ldn at the outdoor activity areas of noise-sensitive uses. Where existing traffic noise levels are less than 60 dBA Ldn at the outdoor activity areas of noise-sensitive uses, a +5 dB Ldn increase in roadway noise levels is considered significant. No formalized outdoor activity areas exist at the Lake County Superior Court building to the northwest, at the Lake County Behavioral Services building to the north, or at the commercial buildings to the south (Freedom Heating and Air Conditioning, Sears Appliance Store, and Walmart), and operational noise levels at these land uses are not discussed further.

The outdoor activity area at the Clearlake Masonic Lodge, located west of the Project site, includes a covered barbeque near the southeast corner of the building. The barbeque area is located approximately 150 feet from the primary noise sources at the Interregional Transit Center and would be exposed to operational noise levels of 56 dBA Ldn. With the operation of the Project, the existing noise level at the barbeque area (63 dBA Ldn) would increase by approximately 1 dBA Ldn and reach 64 dBA Ldn. Project operations would not increase noise levels by 3 dBA Ldn or more at the at the Clearlake Masonic Lodge barbeque area.
The nearest outdoor activity areas at the Konocti Education Center are located approximately 200 feet from the primary noise sources at the Interregional Transit Center and would be exposed to operational noise levels of 51 dBA Ldn. With the operation of the Project, the existing noise level at the outdoor activity areas at the Konocti Education Center (55 dBA Ldn) would increase by 1 to 2 dBA Ldn and reach 56 to 57 dBA Ldn. Project operations would not increase noise levels by 5 dB Ldn or more at the nearest outdoor activity areas at the Konocti Education Center.

The nearest dwellings are approximately 1,000 feet north of the Project site. At 1,000 feet, and assuming no intervening acoustical shielding, operational noise levels would be 40 dBA or less. As noted above, the nearest sensitive school building is approximately 200 feet east. At 200 feet, and assuming no intervening acoustical shielding, operational noise levels would be 54 dBA or less. No transient accommodations exist in the project vicinity. Based on the above, predicted noise levels would not exceed 55 dBA between the hours of 10:00 PM and 7:00 AM or 65 dBA between the hours of 7:00 AM and 10:00 PM and would comply with the Clearlake Municipal Code. The operational impact would be less than significant.

M&O Facility

The Project would result in the purchase four (4) hydrogen buses to replace the existing intercity transit buses. The new hydrogen buses would be stored at the M&O facility, consistent with existing practices. Improvements to the M&O facility are proposed to support hydrogen buses. Improvements would consist of hydrogen fueling infrastructure and retrofits to the existing maintenance facility to allow for the proper air flow and ventilation needed to safely work on the hydrogen buses. In addition to the retrofitting the building, solar panels will be installed on the south-facing pitched roofs. No new substantial operational noise sources are proposed at the M&O Facility. The operational impact would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

With the implementation of Mitigation Measures NOI-1, the Project’s construction activities at the M&O facility would be consistent with the Lake County General Plan Policy N-1.7 and the potential temporary impact on sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Implement Lake County General Plan Noise Policy Measures

For construction activities at the M&O site, Lake Transit shall require construction contractors to comply with the following measures:

- Construction activities shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm, Monday through Friday in accordance with the Lake County General Plan, unless permission is granted with a development permit or other planning approval.
- Equip all internal combustion engine-driven equipment with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment.
- Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines.
- Locate stationary noise-generating equipment such as air compressors or portable power generators as far as possible from sensitive receptors. Construct temporary noise barriers to screen stationary noise-generating equipment when located near adjoining sensitive land uses.
- Utilize “quiet” air compressors and other stationary noise sources where technology exists.
- Control noise from construction workers’ radios to a point where they are not audible at existing residences bordering the project site.
- Notify all adjacent businesses, residences, and other noise-sensitive land uses of the construction schedule in writing.
- Designate a “disturbance coordinator” who would be responsible for responding to any complaints about construction noise. The disturbance coordinator will determine the cause of the noise complaint (e.g., bad muffler, etc.) and will require that reasonable measures be implemented to correct the problem. Conspicuously post a telephone number for the disturbance coordinator at the construction site and include it in the notice sent to neighbors regarding the construction schedule.

b) Result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels? (Less than Significant)

Project construction may generate perceptible vibration when heavy equipment or impact tools are used close to sensitive receptors. Construction of the Interregional Transit Center would include site preparation, grading, building construction, paving, and architectural coating; utilizing such equipment or tools would include demolition, site preparation, grading, trenching, building construction, and paving. Such activities could occur as close as 25 feet from the nearest building. Construction of improvements for M&O site for the hydrogen facility would consist of demolition and site preparation, excavation/foundations/trenching, facility installation, and repaving. Such activities could occur as close as 75 feet from the nearest building. Foundation construction techniques involving impact or vibratory pile driving equipment, which can cause excessive vibration, are not expected with the proposed project.

Neither Lake County nor the City of Clearlake specify a construction vibration limit to apply to project construction activities. The California Department of Transportation recommends a vibration limit of 0.5 in/sec PPV for buildings structurally sound and designed to modern engineering standards, 0.3 in/sec PPV for buildings that are found to be structurally sound but where structural damage is a major concern, and a conservative limit of 0.25 in/sec PPV for historic and some old buildings. For the purposes of this study, groundborne vibration levels exceeding the conservative 0.25 in/sec PPV limit at the existing adjacent buildings would have the potential to result in a significant vibration impact.

Vibration levels generated by proposed activities and equipment would be below the 0.25 in/sec PPV criteria at the nearest structures. Vibration levels generated by construction activities would be perceptible indoors when construction is located adjacent to structures and secondary vibration, such as a slight rattling of windows or doors, may be considered annoying at times. However, architectural damage to normal residential structures would not be anticipated and vibration levels would be below those anticipated to cause structural damage. In addition, construction would occur during daytime hours only, thus reducing the potential for residential annoyance during typical periods of rest or sleep (Illingworth & Rodkin 2022b). The construction-related impact would be less than significant.

Operational activities resulting in vibration would not occur. Therefore, no impact from operation, related to vibration, would occur.

c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (No Impact)

The nearest airport is Lampson Field, located more than 14 miles to the west of the Project site. The Project is not located near a public use airport or active private airstrip. The project site is not located within any compatibility zones in an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport. Therefore, the project would not expose people to noise in the vicinity of an airport. No impact would result.
### 3.14 Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial unplanned 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)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a) Induce substantial unplanned 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)? (No Impact)**

The Project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth because it does not propose new homes, businesses, roads, or extension of utilities that would result in direct or indirect population growth. The Project would serve the existing community. Construction is anticipated to be staffed by local contractors (who could travel to the Project site from their homes) and would not generate a need for temporary housing. Maintenance and operation of the Project is anticipated to be performed by existing Lake Transit staff, and no new employment opportunities would be induced by maintenance and operation of the Project. Due to these reasons, there would be no impact.

**b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (No Impact)**

No housing currently exists within the perimeter of the Project; therefore, no people or housing units would be displaced necessitating the construction of replacement housing. No impact would result.
### 3.15 Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associated with the provision of new or physically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>altered governmental facilities, need for new or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physically altered governmental facilities, the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>construction of which could cause significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmental impacts, in order to maintain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acceptable service ratios, response times or other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 public services? (No Impact)**

As discussed in Section 4.14, Population and Housing, the Project would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth nor create substantial new demand for services. Therefore, the Project would have no impact on the service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives of schools, parks, and other public facilities that are based on population growth. Fire and police service levels provided to the existing Lake Transit facilities would continue to be sufficient. The Project would not require a new or physically altered government facility to serve the Project site. No impact would occur.
### 3.16 Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Anderson Marsh State Historic Park (AMSHP) is located between the two Project Areas. The AMSHP trailhead is approximately 0.65 mile from the existing transfer hub, and 0.40 mile from the M&O facility. Additionally, the Deja-Vu RV Park and Clear Lake Campground (located adjacent to each other) are approximately 0.25 mile from the existing transfer hub (0.50 mile to the proposed Interregional Transit Center), and approximately 0.80 mile from the existing M&O facility. The Lower Lake Park is located approximately 0.40 mile from the existing M&O facility, 1.40 miles from the existing transfer hub.

Following Project implementation, the proposed Interregional Transit Center would be approximately 0.90 mile from the AMSHP Trailhead, and 1.65 miles from the Lower Lake Park.

**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? (No Impact)**

The proposed Interregional Transit Center would be located approximately 0.50-mile further away from nearby parks including the AMSHP and, therefore, would not encourage an increase in use of parks due to transit center location alone. However, the purpose of the Project is to provide a safer, more efficient rider experience and to expand existing intercity routes (using hydrogen ZEB), which could lead to an increase in ridership over time, and thus could – in theory – incrementally increase the use of existing parks and recreational centers. However, this potential increase is not anticipated to be at the level where it would cause substantial physical deterioration of park facilities. Additionally, park facilities would continue to be maintained under the existing maintenance schedule independent of this Project. No impact would occur.

**b) Include or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (No Impact)**

The Project does not propose construction or expansion of recreational facilities, or elements that would cause the need for construction or expansion of recreational facilities. No impact would occur.
### 3.17 Transportation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities? (Less than Significant)

During construction, the normal functionality of S. Center Drive and Dam Road Extension in the project area would be altered due to the need for temporary lane closures. In addition, construction would result in additional vehicle trips by construction workers, supply trucks, and haul trucks travelling to and from active portions of the Project site. The number of construction-related vehicles traveling to and from the Project site would vary on a daily basis. It is estimated that construction crew trips could require up to 34 trips per day (17 workers). The addition of construction-related traffic would occur during daytime hours. Nighttime work is not anticipated.

Construction of proposed facilities along S. Center Drive or Dam Road Extension may require traffic control or brief road closures. S. Center Drive and Dam Road Extension are both two-lane roads. In accordance with City requirements, the construction contractor would be required to obtain an encroachment permit from the City for any portion of work completed within the S. Center Drive or Dam Road Extension ROW. The construction contractor’s encroachment permit application would include a proposed temporary traffic control plan, and if necessary, would include plans for re-routing of vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. To the extent feasible, only a single lane would be closed at any time in order to maintain access to the Project vicinity. Traffic controls would be required in accordance with the City standards, and contractors would be required to comply with the general conditions of the encroachment permit. Therefore, through compliance with local requirements, construction activities would not result in substantial adverse effects or conflicts with the local roadway system. The temporary construction impact on the circulation system would be less than significant.

On-road activity from Project operations would be similar to existing Lake Transit operations. No increase in trips related to the Project operations would occur. Because the Project would not represent an increase in the intensity of the use taking place, and would not require additional staffing or maintenance visits, no conflicts with a program plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, have been identified. Therefore, no impact would result.

See Impact ‘c’ below for a discussion of potential impacts relative to traffic hazards during construction.
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)? (No Impact)

In November 2017, the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) released a technical advisory containing recommendations regarding the assessment of vehicle miles travelled (VMT). VMT refers to the amount and distance of automobile travel attributable to a project. The term “automobile” refers to on-road passenger vehicles, specifically cars and light trucks. The movement of heavy trucks and equipment associated with the construction of the Project is not considered for the purposes of determining transportation impacts under this section. Additionally, the movement of heavy trucks or buses during Project operations is not considered for the purposes of determining transportation impacts, as heavy vehicle trips are generally not meant to be the standard for VMT analysis.

Transportation projects that reduce or have no impact on VMT are presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact (OPR 2018). For roadway capacity projects, lead agencies have discretion to determine the appropriate measure of transportation impact consistent with CEQA and other applicable requirements. The purpose of the proposed Project is to construct an Interregional Transit Center to replace an existing transit hub, provide increased safety for riders and the community, and replace 4 existing diesel-fueled intercity buses with zero emission, hydrogen fueled buses. The Project would not add additional motor vehicle capacity to the roadway network and would not lead to additional vehicle travel. There would be no impact.

For reference, the California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research’s (OPR) guidance on assessing this impact provides the following:

Presumption of Less Than Significant Impact Near Transit Stations

Proposed CEQA Guideline Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1), states that lead agencies generally should presume that certain projects (including residential, retail, and office projects, as well as projects that are a mix of these uses) proposed within ½ mile of an existing major transit stop or an existing stop along a high quality transit corridor will have a less-than-significant impact on VMT.

The proposed Project would result in the construction and operation of a major transit stop; therefore, the Project would facilitate the goal of reducing VMT and would have no impact.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Less than Significant)

The Project would not alter the existing alignment of the surrounding streets. Construction traffic would access the Interregional Transit Center site from Dam Road Extension. Construction-related truck traffic would access the M&O facility improvements site from SR 53. The affected streets are fully developed two-lane roads with either control-stop or signalized intersections. As such, the surrounding street network can adequately accommodate the car and light truck traffic related to the construction and operation of the site. The impact would be less than significant.

The Project would not introduce any new curves or intersections. Access to the Project facilities would be accomplished through the existing M&O facility drive, new Interregional Transit Center drives, and internal paved facilities. The existing M&O facility driveway on SR 53 would continue to provide the primary access to the site from the regional street network and would retain its current configuration with no proposed modifications.

The Interregional Transit Center would result in additional bus pullouts along S. Center Drive and Dam Road Extension. However, Project design would proceed in compliance with City standards, and in
coordination with the City’s proposed Active Transportation Program (ATP) Dam Road Extension & South Center Drive Bike/Pedestrian Improvements project. Once installed, the Project would not pose a substantial hazard to vehicle, bicyclist, or pedestrians in the vicinity. The Project’s impact would be less than significant.

d) Result in inadequate emergency access? (Less than Significant)

Construction of the Project may temporarily slow emergency response times. Dam Road Extension and S. Center Drive would remain open during construction activities; however, traffic may be shifted temporarily during construction. To the extent feasible, only a single lane would be closed at any time in order to maintain access to the Project vicinity The contractor would develop a Traffic Control Plan required by the City’s Encroachment Permit, which would include notification of emergency responders and a work area access plan detailing access to each portion of the project area, including those properties which may experience temporary delay or disruption of access. With implementation of the Traffic Control Plan, the impact would be less than significant.
### 3.18 Tribal Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, or in a local register of historic resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource that is a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of the Public Resources Code section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of the Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a, b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Resources, or in a local register of historic resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

CEQA requires lead agencies to determine if a proposed Project would have a significant effect on tribal cultural resources. The CEQA Guidelines define tribal cultural resources as: (1) a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe that is listed or eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources, or on a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k); or (2) a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant according to the historical register criteria in Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(c), and considering the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

Efforts to identify tribal cultural resources that could be affected by the Project included a records search at the Northwest Information Center, literature review, a sacred lands search through the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), contact with appropriate local Native American Tribes, and a pedestrian archaeological survey of the Project site. Based on consultation with the Koi Nation, Robinson Rancheria of Pomo Indians, and Habematolel Pomo Tribe, Lake Transit understands the cultural tribal sensitivity of the Project sites and incorporates the requested tribal monitoring and recommended treatment protocol as Mitigation Measures TC-1 and TC-2, respectively.

### Mitigation Measures

Implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1 (Archaeological Inadvertent Discovery Procedures), and CR-2 (Protect Human Remains If Encountered during Construction) would be required for the Project (please see
Section 3.5, Cultural Resources for a full description of these mitigation measures). Additionally, Mitigation Measures TR-1 and TR-2 would be required for the Project.

Implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1, CR-2, TR-1, and TR-2 would reduce the potential impact to previously undiscovered tribal cultural resources to a less-than-significant level by requiring procedures to be taken in the event of inadvertent discovery of resources consistent with appropriate laws and requirements, as well as incorporating tribal monitoring and treatment protocols due to the sensitive nature of the area.

Mitigation Measure TCR-1: Tribal Monitoring during Construction

No less than five working days before the start of any ground-disturbing construction activity, the contractor shall notify the Habematolel Pomo Cultural Resources Department, Koi Nation, and the Robinson Rancheria of Pomo Indians about the start date of ground disturbing activities. The tribes will be given the opportunity to send a tribal monitor to inspect the subsurface soils once during the first five days of ground disturbing activity on the project. Should the tribes choose not to send a monitor to perform the inspection within the first five days, work can continue as long as the notice was provided and documented. Should a tribe choose to send a monitor, Lake Transit shall enter into a Monitoring Agreement with the tribe prior to the start of ground-disturbing activities.

Mitigation Measure TCR-2: Implement Habematolel Pomo of Upper Lake’s Treatment Protocol during Construction

Lake Transit shall implement the Habematolel Pomo of Upper Lake’s Treatment Protocol for Handling Human Remains and Cultural Items Affiliated with the Habematolel Pomo of Upper Lake during Project construction.
3.19 Utilities and Service Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electrical power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Water**

The Project would temporarily utilize water for dust suppression and other activities during construction. Construction-related water demands would be short-term and minimal in volume. No new or expanded facilities would be needed to supply dust-suppression water.

Following construction, the Project would utilize water for staff use in the Interregional Transit Center and for onsite hydrogen generation at the M&O facility. The potable water demand of staff at the Transit Center is anticipated to be marginal; potable water demand for hydrogen generation at the M&O facility is anticipated to be similar to what would be used for a small office.

Other than a lateral connection to the existing water line, no new or expanded infrastructure would be required to serve the Interregional Transit Center. In addition, existing entitlements would be sufficient to serve the operational phase of the Project. Therefore, no new or expanded water facilities would be required. No impact would occur.
Wastewater
The Project would result in employees being stationed at the Interregional Transit Center site, which would result in an increase in use of the restrooms and kitchen facilities. However, this is not anticipated to generate a significant amount of wastewater. Other than a lateral connection to the existing sewer line, no new or expanded infrastructure would be required. The existing transmission pipelines and wastewater treatment plant is anticipated to have sufficient capacity to serve the Project. Therefore, the Project would not require construction of a new or expanded wastewater treatment facility. No impact would occur.

Storm Water
The Project would result in new impervious surfaces at the Interregional Transit Center site. Storm water associated with new impervious surfaces at the Interregional Transit Center site would be collected via proposed on-site storm water features, which would be designed to comply with the Stormwater Best Management Practices Handbook for New Development and Redevelopment, as required by Lake County. Storm water generated by Project hardscapes would be released at the same rate as pre-project conditions during an applicable design storm, and would discharge to the existing stormwater infrastructure adjacent to the Project site. With implementation of the proposed on-site storm water infrastructure, the capacity of the existing storm water drainage system would be adequate to serve the Project. Therefore, no additional off-site storm water improvements are anticipated to be required to accommodate runoff from the Project. The impact would be less than significant.

Other Utilities
Electrical energy for the Project would be provided by PG&E. The Project would not result in an increased consumption of gasoline or other petroleum products. Energy-consuming equipment anticipated to be used during operation of the Project includes lighting, the new Interregional Transit Center, and onsite hydrogen generation. The new facilities would be a new source of energy demand. However, all systems would be designed for energy efficiency and be consistent with existing zoning and building codes. Overall, the addition of the new facilities is not anticipated to demand a significant amount of energy such that it would require new or expanded off-site infrastructure. No additional electrical, natural gas, or telecommunication facilities or expansion of existing facilities would be required to serve the Project. The impact would be less than significant.

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? (Less than Significant)

As discussed in Impact ‘a’, the Project would require minimal water. The impact on available water supplies during normal, dry, and multiple dry years would be less than significant.

c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? (Less than Significant)

As discussed in Impact ‘a’, the Project may require a marginal increase in wastewater treatment. The Project would not induce the growth of the regional or local population, but would relocate existing Lake Transit Staff to the proposed Interregional Transit Center and marginally increase onsite consumption of water on the M&O facility site. Based on the marginal increase of water consumption and, therefore, wastewater generation, it is anticipated that the local wastewater provider would have adequate capacity to serve the Project’s projected demand. The impact would be less than significant.
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? (Less than Significant)

Construction of the Project would result in a temporary increase in solid waste disposal needs associated with demolition and construction wastes. Following construction, the proposed Project would be expected to produce additional solid waste. Demolition debris, such as pavement, would be off-hauled for recycling. Materials with no practical potential for reuse would be disposed of at a regional landfill.

Solid waste from the Project site would be delivered to a Transfer Station. Any materials not recycled would be hauled to Eastlake Landfill located at 16015 Davis Street, Clearlake, CA, Lake County. The Eastlake Landfill is an active solid waste landfill with an allowable daily capacity of 20 tons per day and approximately 2.8 million cubic yards remaining capacity and is permitted to remain in operation through 2043 (CalRecycle 2022). In addition, there are several other active permitted regional landfills in the Project vicinity, including the Evans Road Landfill and Demaria Landfill (CalRecycle 2022).

The solid waste generated during construction and operation of the Project would represent a small fraction of the daily permitted tonnage of these facilities. Solid waste from the Project would not be expected to exceed the capacity of or otherwise adversely affect the Eastlake Landfill. Therefore, the impact related to increased demand for solid waste and landfill space would be less than significant.

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (Less than Significant)

No applicable federal solid waste regulations would apply to the Project. At the State level, the Integrated Waste Management Act mandates a reduction of waste being disposed and establishes an integrated framework for program implementation, solid waste planning, and solid waste facility and landfill compliance. Demolition debris, such as pavement, would be off-hauled for recycling. Materials with no practical potential for reuse would be disposed of at a regional landfill. The State of California requires that large construction and demolition projects reuse or recycle at least 65% of the debris generated. Project construction and demolition activities would be required to comply with applicable solid waste regulations, and solid waste generated on-site would be required to be disposed of in accordance with all applicable federal and state regulations related to solid waste. The impact would be less than significant.
3.20 Wildfire

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

The Project site is located within a Local Responsibility Area (LRA), which is an area where a local agency, in this case the City of Clearlake and Lake County, has primary responsibility for fire and emergency response. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection mapping (CALFIRE 2022) indicates both sites are located outside of Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Very High FHSZ). The M&O facility site is surrounded by land also not considered Very High FHSZ. However, the Interregional Transit Center site is located near land identified as within the Very High FHSZ. Specifically, land east of Dam Road Extension is within the Very High FHSZ.

a) **Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Less than Significant)**

The project would improve existing facilities within the M&O facility site and develop new facilities within an urbanized area (Interregional Transit Center). As discussed in Section 3.17, Transportation, Impact ‘d’ and 3.9, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Impact ‘f’, the Project would not change existing circulation patterns along local roadways or generate substantial new traffic. Construction of proposed facilities along S. Center Drive or Dam Road Extension may require traffic control or brief road closures. In accordance with City requirements, the construction contractor would be required to obtain an encroachment permit from the City for any portion of work completed within the S. Center Drive or Dam Road Extension ROW. The contractor would develop a Traffic Control Plan required by the City’s Encroachment Permit, which would include notification of emergency responders and a work area access plan detailing access to each portion of the project area, including those properties which may experience temporary delay or disruption of access. With implementation of the Traffic Control Plan, the impact to local and regional emergency response or evacuation plans would be less than significant.
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? (No Impact)

Wildfire risk is dependent upon existing environmental conditions, including but not limited to the amount of vegetation present, topography, and climate. The sites are located within the City of Clearlake and Lake County; both sites are adjacent to parking lots, existing urbanized development, open grassland, and vegetated areas.

The Project would improve M&O facility and transit infrastructure. The project would not house residents or other occupants, nor would the project increase the population of the Project area. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact.

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? (Less than Significant)

The Project would not require the installation or maintenance of wildfire infrastructure. The Project would improve the existing emergency access to the Interregional Transit Center site, by increasing the paved vehicle movement and turnaround areas. Additionally, emergency access design for the Project will be reviewed and approved by the Lake County Fire Protection District through the required plan check process. Additionally, these components of the Project would improve access to the site for emergency vehicles and provide additional exit routes for users should a wildfire occur. Therefore, fire risk would not be exacerbated and a less than significant impact would occur.

D) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes? (No Impact)

The Project would not construct new structures or residences that would create new risks for potential inhabitants. Additionally, the Project site is in a relatively flat area. The relatively flat terrain would make the Project site unlikely to result in landslides. The Project site is not located within a floodplain hazard area that could exacerbate flooding risks if a fire was to occur in the immediate vicinity of the site. Therefore, the Project would result in no impact.
### 3.21 Mandatory Findings of Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less-than-Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

Potential Project impacts to biological and cultural resources are addressed in Section 3.4, Biological Resources, Section 3.5, Cultural Resources, and Section 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources, respectively. With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures identified in this Initial Study, the potential for Project-related activities to degrade the quality of the environment, including wildlife species or their habitat, plant or animal communities, or important examples of California history or prehistory would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Mitigation Measures BIO-1 (Avoid Impacts to Special-Status Bats), BIO-2 (Avoid Impacts to Western Pond Turtles), BIO-3 (Avoid Impacts to Nesting Birds), BIO-4 (Avoid Construction-related Impacts to Potential Wetlands and other Waters of the U.S.), BIO-5 (Avoid and Mitigate Construction-related Impacts to Potential Wetlands and other Waters of the U.S. from Future Solar Facility), CR-1 (Archaeological Inadvertent Discovery Procedures), and CR-2 (Protect Human Remains If Encountered during Construction), TRC-1 (Tribal Monitoring during Construction, and TRC-2 (Implement Habematolel Pomo of Upper Lake’s Treatment Protocol during Construction) would be required for the Project. For a full description of these mitigation measures, please see Sections 3.4, Biological Resources, and 3.5, Cultural Resources, and 3.18, Tribal Cultural Resources.
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? (Less than Significant)

Cumulative impacts are defined as “two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15355). Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time. This cumulative impact analysis uses the list approach. A search was undertaken to identify other reasonably foreseeable projects that may have overlapping or cumulative impacts with the Project. Efforts to identify cumulative projects included review for ongoing and planned projects within the City of Clearlake and Lake County (Planning Projects Viewer). The City’s proposed ATP Dam Road Extension & South Center Drive Bike/Pedestrian Improvements project would be located in close proximity to the Project, and could be constructed in a similar timeframe as the Project.

As summarized in Section 3 of this IS/MND, the Project would not result in impacts on agriculture and forestry resources. Therefore, implementation of the Project would not contribute to any related cumulative impact on those resources.

The Project impacts summarized in this Initial Study would not add appreciably to any existing or foreseeable future significant cumulative impact, such as visual quality, cultural resources, biological, traffic impacts, or air quality degradation. The impacts of the proposed Project would be mitigated to less than significant. Incremental impacts, if any, would be very small, and the cumulative impact would be less than significant.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Less than Significant with Mitigation)

With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures identified in this Initial Study, the potential for Project-related activities to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.
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