

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

CITY OF LEMOORE

1. **Project Title:** Site Plan Review No. 2007-09
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of Lemoore, 210 Fox Street, Lemoore California 93245
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Joseph G. Mendiola, Assistant Planner (559) 924-6740
4. **Project Location:** Northwest corner at intersection of Daphne Street and East D Street
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Lemoore Equity Partners
210 E. Acequia Avenue, Visalia, CA 93292
6. **General Plan Designation:** CC – Central Commercial 7. **Zone District:** CC – Central Commercial
8. **Description of Project:** Construct an 83 room hotel on an 80,358 square foot site
9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** Residential to the north, commercial to the south, east and west
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required:** n/a

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.)

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

DETERMINATION - On the basis of this initial evaluation:

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

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

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

IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Holly Smyth, Planning Director

Printed Name

Date

City of Lemoore

For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

I. AESTHETICS - Would the project:

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|----|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | | | XX |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock, outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | | | XX |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | | | XX |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | | | XX |

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

(Note: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the *California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model* (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.)

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|----|
| 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? | | | XX |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | | | XX |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use? | | | XX |

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

III. AIR QUALITY - Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			XX
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		XX	
c) Result in cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non- attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			XX
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			XX
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			XX

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Dept. of Fish & Game or US Fish & Wildlife Service?			XX
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Dept. of Fish & Game or US Fish & Wildlife Service?			XX
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			XX
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?			XX
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			XX
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?			XX

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?			XX
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an Archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?			XX
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique pale ontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			XX
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?			XX

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the project:

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to *Division of Mines & Geology Special Publication 42.*)
 - ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - iv) Landslides?
- b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
- c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?
- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?
- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?
- b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident Conditions involving the release of hazardous materials Into the environment?
- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?
- d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?
- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?
- g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wild lands area adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the project:

- | | | | |
|--|--|----|----|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | | XX | |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted.)? | | | XX |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | | | XX |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | | XX | |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | | | XX |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | | | XX |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | | | XX |
| h) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | | | XX |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | | | XX |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | | | XX |

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|----|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | | | XX |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project(including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | | | XX |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | | | XX |

X. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:

- | | | | |
|---|--|--|----|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | | | XX |
| 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? | | | XX |

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

XI. NOISE - Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

			XX
--	--	--	----
- b) Exposure of persons to or generations of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?

			XX
--	--	--	----
- c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

			XX
--	--	--	----
- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

			XX
--	--	--	----
- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

			XX
--	--	--	----
- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

			XX
--	--	--	----

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by processing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure?

			XX
--	--	--	----
- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

			XX
--	--	--	----
- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

			XX
--	--	--	----

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:
 - i) Fire protection?

			XX
--	--	--	----
 - ii) Police protection?

--	--	--	--
 - iii) Schools?

			XX
--	--	--	----
 - iv) Parks?

			XX
--	--	--	----
 - v) Other public facilities?

			XX
--	--	--	----

XIV. RECREATION

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

			XX
--	--	--	----
- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have been an adverse physical effect on the environment?

			XX
--	--	--	----

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

			XX
--	--	--	----

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the project:

- a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections.)?
- b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?
- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?
- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?
- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?
- f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?
- g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?
- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?
- d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?
- e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to the serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?
- f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?
- g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

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

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE: cont'd

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.)?

			XX
--	--	--	----

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

			XX
--	--	--	----

EXPLANATION OF OTHER THAN "NO IMPACT" RESPONSES

- Item IIIb** The project will cause significant fugitive air during its construction phase through soil disruption becoming a contributing factor to an already existing current air quality problem within the region. This effect will be mitigated by requiring developer to comply with the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District Standards as well as with the City of Lemoore's dust control requirements.
- Item VIIIa** Due to the storm water runoff that will be created form the site, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) standards will need to be applied to reduce pollutants
- Item VIIIId** The project will convert existing undeveloped land into an industrial development causing considerable impervious land area and substantial increase in rate and amount of surface runoff. This effect will be mitigated through the build and design of an adequate storm drainage system for the proposed development to prevent on-site or off-site flooding. The project's improvement plans will provide the necessary design.