

Footnote / Figure	Description (Short)	Disposition
[A1]	CEQA Appx G (Wildfire); §15126.2(a) – hazards/evacuation	No – statute
[A2]	PRC §4290; 14 CCR §§1270.00 et seq. – State Minimum Fire Safe	No – statute
[B1]	§15124; PRC §4290; 14 CCR §§1270.00 et seq.; PRC §21168.5	No – statute
[B2]	14 CCR §1270.01(i) – Driveway (≤4 res.; no commercial)	No – statute
[B3]	14 CCR §1270.01(y) – Road (includes commercial)	No – statute
[B4]	14 CCR §1273.06 – Turnouts supplement, not replace width	No – statute

[B5]	IS/MND (Apr 2025) p.12 (16-ft width; 15-ft gate); p.73 (WDF-1)	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (MND)
[B6]	IS/MND (Apr 2025) p.73 – 'commercial driveway' mitigation	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (MND)
[B7]	14 CCR §1270.01(y) – Road definition	No – statute
[B8]	Friends of B Street; San Joaquin Raptor – prejudicial misstatements	No – case law
[C1]	PRC §4290; §15126.2(a); League to Save Lake Tahoe v. Placer (2022)	No – statute/case law
[C2]	14 CCR §1273.01(a) (20-ft) & IS/MND p.12 (16-ft width; 15-ft gate)	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (MND); No – statute
[C3]	14 CCR §1273.04(a) – ≥50-ft inside turning radius	No – statute

[C4]	14 CCR §1273.03(a) – ≤16% grade; IS/MND pp.13,96 (0– 50% slopes)	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (MND); No – statute	
[C5]	14 CCR §1273.01(c) – all-weather 40,000 lbs; IS/MND p.13 (gravel)	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (MND); No – statute	
[C6]	PC Hearing UP 21-07 (Dec 12, 2024) 1:18:45 – staff limits 4290 to on-site	No URL	
[C7]	PC Hearing UP 21-07 (Mar 22, 2025) 0:21:48 – 'historically applied 4290 to parcels'	No URL	
Figure C2	Aerial imagery: non-compliance access curves below 4290	Yes – Include in this chapter	01 Poverty Flats 4290 Violations Aerial Imagery and Parcel Viewer.pdf
Figure C3	Parcel Viewer slope overlay showing >16% segments	Yes – Include in this chapter	01 Poverty Flats 4290 Violations Aerial Imagery and Parcel Viewer.pdf
[D1]	14 CCR §1273.07 –	No – statute	

	Undeveloped strategic ridgelines		
[D2]	§15126.2(a); League to Save Lake Tahoe v. Placer (2022)	No – statute/case law	
[D3]	IS/MND pp.13,33 – VHFHSZ; Ranch Fire history	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (MND)	
[D4]	Historic use of ridgeline for defense (Mendo Complex, Forks, Glen Haven)	No – reference (general)	
[D5]	Press Democrat (Kent Porter photo) caption re: Ranch Fire	No – URL/reference	
[D6]	Lake County CWPP (2009) – HV Rd shaded fuelbreak (Priority 1)	Yes – URL Link	https://museums.lakecountycalifornia.gov/DocumentCenter/View/4715/Lake-County-CWPP-PDF
[D7]	Lake County CWPP (2023/updated 2025) – retains/elevates	Yes – URL	https://museums.lakecountycalifornia.gov/DocumentCenter/View/14037/Lake-County-Community-Wildfire-Protection-Plan-042225

	es HV fuel break		
[D8]	CWPP (2009) p5-2 – shaded fuelbreak along High Valley Rd quote	Yes – URL	https://museums.lakecountyca.gov/DocumentCenter/View/4715/Lake-County-CWPP-PDF
[D9]	CalFire Update video (Aug 6, 2018) – ops along High Valley Rd	No – URL reference	
[D10]	YouTube: backburn/torching downslope from ridgeline	No – URL reference	
Figure D1	Incident Map – HV Rd as strategic ridgeline	Yes – Include in this chapter	02 Incident Map Mendocino Complex Fire
Figure D2	Photo – HV Rd strategic importance	Yes – Include in this chapter	02 Incident Map Mendocino Complex Fire.pdf
Figure D3	CalFire Ops Chief briefing – HV Rd operations	Yes – Include in this chapter	02 Incident Map Mendocino Complex Fire.pdf
Figure D4	Backburn/torching along ridgeline (imagery)	Yes – Include in this chapter	02 Incident Map Mendocino Complex Fire.pdf
Figure D5	Facebook posts: Ranch Fire on	Yes – Include in this chapter	02 Incident Map Mendocino Complex Fire.pdf

	Highland Springs Rd		
[E1]	14 CCR §1273.08(a) – Dead-end ≤1 mile (commercial)	No – statute	
[E2]	USFS closure practices on High Valley Rd (2015–2025)	Partial – attach specific closure orders	Original USFS bulletin Mentioned in the Mendocino Voice Article is no longer available on the agency website as of 10/13/2025.”
[E3]	Lake County wildfire history (Mendo Complex, Forks, Glen Haven)	No – reference (general)	
Figure E1	USFS extended closure map/screens hot – HV Rd	Yes – Include in this chapter	Original USFS bulletin Mentioned in the Mendocino Voice Article is no longer available on the agency website as of 10/13/2025.”
[F1]	Appendix G & §15126.2(a) – evac/emergency hazards analysis	No – statute	
[F2]	Golden Door v. San Diego (2020) – no deferred mitigation	No – case law	

[F3]	IS/MND (Apr 25, 2025 redline) – 110-trip screen; no evac modeling	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (MND)
[F4]	League to Save Lake Tahoe v. Placer (2022) – evac analysis required	No – case law
[F5]	No Oil v. City of LA (1974) – fair argument	No – case law
[F6]	Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino (1988) – no deferral	No – case law
[F7]	§15091 / PRC §21081 – feasibility findings	No – statute
[F8]	CA AG Wildfire CEQA Guidance (Oct 10, 2022)	No – URL/reference
[F9]	Penal Code §409.5 – closure authority; misdemeanor	No – statute

[F10]	Lake County News & Ukiah Daily Journal evac/arrest coverage	No – URL reference	
[F11]	Resident letter: shelter-in-place; threatened arrest (Mendo Complex)	Yes – Include in this chapter	11 Neighbor Testimony
Figure F1	Ukiah Daily Journal article excerpt – mandatory evac & arrest	Yes – Include in this chapter	https://www.ukiahdailyjournal.com/2018/08/02/la-test-evac-orders-shelter-info-resources-for-mendocino-complex-fire-hopland-fire/
[G1]	PRC §4290; §15126.2(a); §15126.4(a)(2); City of Santa Barbara v. SCt	No – statute/case law	
[G2]	IS/MND pp.12–13, 71–74, 92–95; WDF-1; 'less than significant' wildfire	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (MND)	
[G3]	Public testimony & CHP comments (2024–2025) – County on notice	Yes – Exhibit File 00 (hearing/CHP)	Refer to Exhibits from Chapter 2: 02 CHP letter.pdf
[H1]	PRC §21080(d);	No – statute	

§15064(f)(1) –
fair-argument
requires EIR

[H2]	IS/MND cites	Yes –
	(pp.12–13, 71–74, 92–95)	Exhibit File 00 (MND)
	– misclassificat ion; no evac modeling	
[H3]	Friends of B Street; San Joaquin Raptor – prejudicial omissions	No – case law