IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS *Would the project:*						
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist- Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? iv) Landslides?			X		<u>Earthquake Faults</u> The project site is not within an Earthquake Fault Zone as established by the California Geological Survey in accordance with the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. The proposed project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects due to earthquakes. <u>Seismic Ground Shaking and Seismic–Related Ground Failure, including liquefaction.</u> Lake County contains numerous known active faults. Future seismic events in the Northern California region can be expected to produce seismic ground shaking at the site. However, risks related to ground shaking, ground failure, and liquefaction would not be increased as a result of this project. <u>Landslides</u> According to the Lawrence Livermore landslide map series for Lake County, 1979, the area is considered generally stable with a marginal landslide risk. The proposed project would not result in an increased risk of landslides at this area. The land division would not have any impact on geology or soils since no development or ground disturbance is proposed. Any future development would be in compliance with all applicable Uniform Building Code regulations designed to ensure seismic safety. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. **Less Than Significant Impact**	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 36, 41, 42
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X		According to the soil survey of Lake County, prepared by the U.S.D.A, the soil within the project is as follows: **138 - Glenview-Arrowhead complex, 5 to 15 percent slopes.** This map unit is on volcanic hills. This unit is about 60 percent Glenview very gravelly loam and 20 percent Arrowhead extremely gravelly sandy loam. The components of this unit are so intricately intermingled that it was not practical to map them separately at the scale used. Permeability of the Glenview soil is moderately slow. Surface runoff is medium, and the hazard of erosion is moderate. The Arrowhead soil type has a moderate rate of erosion. However, the division of one (1) parcel into two (2) parcels according to the Tentative Parcel Map dated April 9, 2019 would not result in a substantial soil erosion and/or the loss of topsoil. **Less Than Significant Impact**	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 36, 41, 42
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-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X		According to the soil survey of Lake County, prepared by the U.S.D.A., the soil at the site is considered "generally stable" and there is a less than significant chance of landslide, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse as a result of the project. **Less Than Significant Impact**	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 36, 41, 42