

Chapter 9 (Slope, Survey, Scaling, and Boundary Defects) — Exhibit Index

Footnote / Figure	Description (Short)	Disposition	Notes (You will fill)
[A1]	CEQA §15124 – precise project location/boundaries on detailed map	No – statute	
[A2]	CEQA §15064(a) – substantial evidence; fair-argument standard	No – statute	
[A3]	State Water Board Cannabis framework – >30% slopes elevate risk tier	No – programmatic reference	
[A4]	IS/MND (redlined) – average slope ≈39.5%	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (MND)	
[A5]	Property Management Plan – southern-aspect sloping montane topography	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (Property Management Plan)	
[A6]	Plan/profile sheets – pads/roads on S–SW hillslopes; steep contour bands	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (Site Plan/Plan Set)	
[A11]	IS/MND – slopes 0%–>50%; cultivation areas claimed on ridgetops	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (MND)	
[A12]	IS/MND – “majority are flat, ridgetop areas; little risk”	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (MND)	
[A13]	IS/MND – Tier-2 Low Risk premised on flat slopes outside riparian setbacks	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (MND)	
[A14]	Clear Lake Nutrient TMDL – severe erosion hazard soils	No – reference report	

[A15]	Statewide Cannabis General Order (WQ 2023-0102-DWQ) – tiering logic	No – programmatic reference	
[A16]	State Water Board Cannabis Policy – prohibition on ≥50% slope (WDRs required)	No – programmatic reference	
[A17]	General Order/Policy – ≥50% slopes foreclose Tier-2 enrollment	No – programmatic reference	
Figure A1	Site Plan vs ridge lines/boundary – cultivation not on ridgetops	Yes – Include in this chapter	01 Slope and Survey Imagery.pdf
Figure A2	Parcel Viewer slope overlay – slopes ≥30%; potential encroachment flags	Yes – Include in this chapter	01 Slope and Survey Imagery.pdf
Figure A3	Updated Parcel Viewer slopes – 30–40%, 40–50%, ≥50%; sites b & f ≥50%	Yes – Include in this chapter	01 Slope and Survey Imagery.pdf
Figure A4	USDA soils map – cultivation on high/severe erosion-risk units	Yes – Include in this chapter	01 Slope and Survey Imagery.pdf
[B1]	CEQA §15124 – precise location/boundaries; mapping duty	No – statute	
[B2]	CEQA §15064(a) – speculative/unsupported findings barred	No – statute	
[B3]	Plan Set note – “THIS IS NOT A BOUNDARY SURVEY”	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (Site Plan/Plan Set)	

[B4]	Plan Set note – “Written dimensions prevail over scaled dimensions”	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (Site Plan/Plan Set)	
[B5]	IS/MND figures sourced to Lake County Parcel Viewer (not survey-grade)	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (MND)	
[B6]	County Surveyor direction – Parcel Viewer not acceptable; require legal desc. & professional survey	Partial – attach Agency Comments/Surveyor memo	07 - Agency Comments pg. 9
[B7]	BLM letters to Max Stockton (Aug 2024/Jan 2025) – require professional survey; avoid trespass	Yes – Include in this chapter	08 BLM Response Letter (UP 23-09) January 28, 2025
[B8]	IS/MND – “No development within 100 feet” of watercourses	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (MND)	
[B9]	IS/MND – Tier-2 statement relies on “flat slopes outside riparian setbacks”	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (MND)	
[B10]	IS/MND – average slope ≈39.5% (summary table)	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (MND)	
[B11]	Property Management Plan – sloping montane topography	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (Property Management Plan)	
[B12]	CEQA §15064(a) – speculative determinations improper	No – statute	