



COUNTY OF LAKE

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Planning Division

Courthouse - 255 N. Forbes Street

Lakeport, California 95453

Telephone 707/263-2221 FAX 707/263-2225

October 7, 2021

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST INITIAL STUDY (IS 19-56)

1. **Project Title:** Lake Vista Farms
2. **Permit Numbers:** Major Use Permit UP 19-36
Initial Study IS 19-56
Early Activation EA 20-22
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of Lake
Community Development Department
Lake County Courthouse - 255 North Forbes Street
Lakeport CA 95453
4. **Contact Person:** Michael Taylor , Assistant Planner
(707) 263-2221
5. **Project Location(s):** 2050 and 2122 Ogulin Canyon Road – Clearlake, California
APN's 010-053-01 and 02
6. **Project Sponsor's Name/Address:** Lake Vista Farms, LLC
637 Lindaro Street, Suite 201
San Rafael, CA 94901
7. **General Plan Designation:** RL - Rural Lands
8. **Zoning:** RL - Rural Lands
9. **Environmental Setting/Existing Conditions:**

The proposed project (AKA Lake Vista Farms) is located northeast of the City of Clearlake, Lake County, on Ogulin Canyon Road about one (1) mile east of State Highway 53. The project site consists of two contiguous parcels, APN 010-053-01 (145.8 acres) and 010-053-02 (156.6 acres), totaling approximately 302.4 acres.

The project site is accessed via a gravel driveway from Ogulin Canyon Road through an existing security gate. There is a well-maintained existing network of unpaved roads throughout the project site.

The project site is part of a former hops farm, operated as Hops-Meister Farms, cultivating approximately 13.6 acres of hops beginning in about 2009. Hops-Meister Farms grew a variety of hops for the micro-brewing beer industry. Hops-Meister Farms removed the hops plants to prepare the fields for cultivation of crops that would be more financially feasible. The site has been developed to include hops farming, orchards, agricultural support facilities, including a 1,200 square foot single-family residence, septic system, barn, accessory structures, multiple wells, and accessory agricultural facilities (e.g., irrigation facilities). The pre-existing agriculture activities covered over 18 acres. Other land uses on the project site include residential, timberland, grazing land, and open space. There are also remnants of almond orchards in existence prior to 1993.

Elevations in the project area range from approximately 1,435 feet to 1,775 feet above mean sea level. The project area drains in various directions, but ultimately drains into Burns Valley Creek, a

perennial creek that runs parallel to Ogulin Canyon Road, flows towards the southwest, and is a tributary to Clear Lake. The vegetation in the area is mainly oaks, pine, native understory, and natural grasses.

Land uses surrounding the project site include residential estates, heavy service commercial, light industrial, hay production, row crops, grazing land, and open space. The western property line of APN 010-053-01 is adjacent to the City limits of Clearlake and the City's C-4 Zoning District, defined as "Heavy Service Commercial – Light Industrial".

A permit for Early Activation of Use, EA 20-22, of the proposed Major Use Permit UP 19-36, was approved by the Lake County Community Development Department on February 28, 2020 to allow commercial outdoor cultivation within a cultivation area of up to 640,332 square feet (14.7 acres) and a maximum canopy area of 479,160 square feet (11 acres) at the project site beginning April 1, 2020. The applicant's lessee subsequently constructed hoop houses on Site A and graded approximately 56,640 square feet of the eastern portion of Site B to create flat areas for cultivation. The Lake County Community Development Department cited the applicant with a Notice of Violation of EA 20-22 and a Stop Work Order and on May 13, 2020 revoked EA 20-22. To address the violation, the applicant coordinated with the Community Development Department staff to identify immediate corrective actions, which included removal of the cited hoop houses on Site A, stabilization of Site B, and installation of stormwater management controls to prevent erosion and runoff from the graded areas on Site B. No further cannabis cultivation has occurred at the project site since the revocation of EA 20-22.

10. General Site Information

Supervisor District:	District 2 - Sabatier
Flood Zone:	Not within a designated flood hazard zone
Slope:	Moderately steep to gently sloping
Fire Hazard Severity Zone:	A mixture of Moderate and Very High
Earthquake Fault Zone:	Not within a fault zone
Dam Failure Inundation Area:	Not within dam failure zone
Parcel Size:	Approximately 302 acres
Area Plan:	The Shoreline Communities Area Plan

11. Description of Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation.)

The project applicant is seeking discretionary approval from Lake County for a Major Use Permit, UP 19-36, for commercial outdoor cannabis cultivation operations at 2050 and 2122 Ogulin Canyon Road, Clearlake, Lake County, California. The proposed project (AKA Lake Vista Farms) is located northeast of the City of Clearlake about one (1) mile east of State Highway 53. The project site consists of two contiguous parcels, APN 010-053-01 (145.8 acres) and 010-053-02 (156.6 acres), totaling approximately 302.4 acres. Under the Lake County Zoning Ordinance Article 27, the project site qualifies for outdoor cannabis cultivation with a maximum canopy area of up to 15 acres.

The project site is within 1,000 feet of the City of Clearlake sphere of influence. Cannabis cultivation is prohibited within 1,000 feet of an incorporated city sphere of influence unless the applicant can provide a letter of support from the City. A letter of support has been obtained from the City in February 2020 (Attachment C).

The only access to the project site is via a gravel driveway from Ogulin Canyon Road through a locked security gate.

A Biological Site Assessment for the project site, dated August 22, 2019, was prepared by Natural Investigations Co. (Natural Investigations Co., 2019). The Biological Site Assessment identified up to

28.8 acres, represented by six (6) distinct fields (sites), that are suited for cultivation. These fields were selected based on several key factors including setbacks from watercourses and other sensitive natural resources, the use of previously cleared and/or developed agricultural areas, level to moderate sloping topography, existing access roads, access to a water source, and access to existing irrigation systems. The proposed project is to cultivate 15 acres of canopy at five (5) of the fields, referred to as Sites A through E, as discussed below. Although Sites A through E have a combined area of 25.8 acres, the total canopy would be limited to 15 acres. The proposed cannabis cultivation activities are to be co-located on the subject parcels in compliance with County regulations (refer to Attachment A – Development Site Plans).

The proposed project is to cultivate 15 acres of outdoor cultivation canopy across five (5) sites as summarized in Table 1. Details of each site are summarized below.

Table 1. Summary of cannabis cultivation canopy areas for each cultivation site.

Site	Name	Available Area (acres) ^{1,2}	Potential Canopy Area (acres) ^{1,2}
A	Northwestern Hops Field	6.0	5.1
B	Southwest Clearing	6.5	6.5
C	Northeast Hops Field	3.4	1.4
D	Central Hops Field	4.2	3.7
E	Chaparral Clearing	7.8	7.8

¹Source: Development Plans (Attachment A)

²This area may be different than provided in the Biological Assessment because the stream setbacks in the assessment were greater than required and roads were included in the Available Area.

All pesticides, fertilizers, and hazardous materials would be stored in the proposed Conex (or similar) shipping containers and/or approximately 8'x8' storage sheds. Pesticides and fertilizers would be held within their manufacturer's original containers, which are within secondary containment structures. The shipping containers/storage sheds would be located within fenced cultivation areas.

Excess plant matter (plant stems) would be composted on site. The proposed cultivation operation would draw water from existing wells located at each site.

According to the Property Management Plan (Attachment B), cannabis cultivation activities would occur 7:00 AM to 5:00 PM Monday through Saturday. All visitors to the site would be met by an employee of the site, who would request identification and log the visitor's purpose, time, and date of visit. Signage would be posted that states that the operational areas have restricted access and are closed to the public.

On December 10, 2019 Lake County Code Enforcement Officer Andrew Williams conducted a Public Resource Code 4290 and 4291 Cal Fire site inspection. The following items have been incorporated into the project as a result of this inspection:

- Installation of a reflective road name and address numbers at site entry.
- Widen the entry driveway from Ogulin Canyon Drive to the first hammerhead turnaround.
- Provide a 4-inch compacted road base on the main driveway.
- Relocated the employee parking to the south near the house and hammer head turn around area.
- Provide 2,500-gallon water tanks at each cultivation Site.
- All gates to be at least 14 feet wide.

Site A - Northwestern Hops Field: This site is located in the northwest corner of APN 010-053-01 near the entrance of the proposed project. The proposed cultivation would occur within an existing 6.0-acre agriculture field previously used to grow hops. Cultivation would occur outside of the 100-

foot stream setbacks, leaving up to 5.1 acres of the existing agricultural field that could be used for cannabis canopy. Refer to Attachment A, Sheets 1, 2, and A1 through A4.

Adjacent to Site A is an existing single-family residence that would be used as a caretaker's residence. A small parking area exists in the front of the house and the existing driveway would be widened and surfaced with gravel to accommodate a hammerhead turnaround, 23 parking spaces, farm vehicles, trash enclosure, and shipping container. A locked gate would be located on the gravel road to the south of the proposed parking spaces. Irrigation water would be supplied by an existing well. Cultivation accessory items at Site A include temporary greenhouses (hoophouses), portable toilets, a trash enclosure, chemical storage area, vegetative waste storage area, 2,500-gallon water storage tank, and a renovated 10' x 30' shipping container would be provided in order to house the security equipment and camera monitors. As depicted on the Development Plans (Attachment A), the cultivation would be fenced and would maintain setbacks from adjacent seasonal creeks. This proposed cultivation site was previously farmed; therefore, minimal site preparation would be needed to plant cannabis and no grading would be required. However, one existing walnut tree would be removed. Surrounding vegetation would be trimmed and maintained with no additional tree removal. Security cameras would be installed in accordance with County standards. Stormwater management improvements including fiber rolls would be installed around the perimeter of the cultivation site in accordance with the Property Management Plan (Attachment B).

Site B - "Southwest Clearing" This site is located towards the southwest corner of APN 010-053-01 on a ridge with an open field of approximately 6.5 acres. The area currently consists of grasses, brush, some trees, and an existing road spans the length of the field. There are no streams within 150 feet of Site B. This area would be cleared and graded to plant up to 6.5 acres of cannabis canopy. Refer to Attachment A, Sheets 1, 2, and B1 through B4.

The site would be accessed using existing onsite non-paved roads. A new 6-foot-tall wire fence with galvanized posts would be constructed around the cultivation area and secured with 12-foot wide locked gates at the entrance and exit points. Irrigation water would be supplied by an existing well. Cultivation accessory items at Site B include temporary greenhouses (hoophouses), portable toilets, a trash enclosure, pesticide and chemical storage facility, stockpile area, and vegetative waste storage area, 2,500 gallon water storage tank, and a chemical storage facility. This area was originally cleared in 2013 to prepare for agriculture activities and some grass and brush have grown in since. To prepare for cannabis cultivation, this area would be cleared and graded to plant up to 6.4 acres of cannabis canopy. Approximately 20 poor-quality walnut trees would be removed. If proposed grading exceeds 500 cubic yards or more than 1-acre of vegetation is cleared, the applicant would be required to obtain a ministerial grading permit from Lake County (Chapter 30 of the Lake County Code). No native oaks would be removed. Surrounding vegetation would be trimmed and maintained with no additional tree removal. Security cameras would be installed in accordance with County standards. Stormwater management improvements including fiber rolls would be installed around the perimeter of the cultivation site in accordance with the Property Management Plan (Attachment B).

Site C - "Northeast Hops Field" This site is located at the northeastern corner of APN 010-053-01 and northwestern corner of APN 010-053-02. The proposed cultivation would occur within an existing 3.4-acre field previously used to grow hops. Cultivation would occur outside of the 100-foot stream and pond setbacks, leaving up to 1.5 acres of the existing agricultural field that could be used for cannabis canopy. The barn and shade structures adjacent to the barn would be used as a nursery, where non-flowering/immature plants would be propagated. Refer to Attachment A, Sheets 1, 2, and C1 through C5.

The site would be accessed using existing onsite non-paved roads. A new 6-foot-tall wire fence with galvanized posts would be constructed around the cultivation area and secured with 12-foot wide locked gates at the entrance and exit points. There is an existing 16-foot-tall, 70 foot x 40 foot metal barn that would be utilized for drying cannabis. A small parking area would be located adjacent to

barn providing four (4) parking spaces. Irrigation water would be supplied by an existing well. Cultivation accessory items at Site C include temporary greenhouses (hoophouses), portable toilets, a trash enclosure, pesticide and chemical storage facility, stockpile area, and vegetative waste storage area, 2,500 gallon water storage tank. As depicted on the Development Plans (Attachment A), the cultivation would maintain setbacks from adjacent seasonal creeks and an existing pond. This proposed cultivation site was previously farmed; therefore, minimal site preparation would be needed to plant cannabis and no grading would be required. Surrounding vegetation would be trimmed and maintained with no tree removal. Security cameras would be installed in accordance with County standards. Stormwater management improvements including fiber rolls would be installed around the perimeter of the cultivation site in accordance with the Property Management Plan (Attachment B).

Site D - “Central Hops Field” This site is located on APN 010-053-01 northeast of Site B. The proposed cultivation would occur within an existing 4.2 acre field used to grow hops. Up to 3.7 acres could be used for cannabis canopy. There are no streams within 150-feet of Site D. Refer to Attachment A, Sheets 1, 2, and D1 through D4.

The site would be accessed using existing onsite non-paved roads that span the length of the site. A new 6-foot-tall wire fence with galvanized posts would be constructed around the cultivation area and secured with 12-foot wide locked gates at the entrance and exit points. Cultivation accessory items at Site D include temporary greenhouses (hoophouses), portable toilets, a trash enclosure, pesticide and chemical storage facility, stockpile area, vegetative waste storage area, and a 2,500 gallon water storage tank. This proposed cultivation site was previously farmed; therefore, minimal site preparation would be needed to plant cannabis and no grading would be required. Surrounding vegetation would be trimmed and maintained and no trees would be removed. Security cameras would be installed in accordance with County standards. Stormwater management improvements including fiber rolls would be installed around the perimeter of the cultivation site in accordance with the Property Management Plan (Attachment B).

Site E - “Chaparral Clearing” This site is located near the eastern border of APN 010-053-02 on a ridge within an area of dense chamise brush of approximately 7.8 acres. There are no streams within 150-feet of Site B. This area would be cleared and graded to plant up to 7.8 acres of cannabis canopy or the amount such that the cumulative canopy for all sites does not exceed 15 acres. Refer to Attachment A, Sheets 1, 2, and E1 through E4.

The site would be accessed using existing onsite non-paved roads. A new 6-foot-tall wire fence with galvanized posts would be constructed around the cultivation area and secured with 12-foot wide locked gates at the entrance and exit points. Irrigation water would be supplied by an existing well. Cultivation accessory items at Site B include temporary greenhouses (hoophouses), portable toilets, a trash enclosure, 2,500 gallon water storage tank, pesticide and chemical storage facility, stockpile area, and vegetative waste storage area. This area was cleared in 2003 and again in 2009 to prepare for agriculture activities. Since this time, chamise brush has taken over the site. To prepare for cannabis cultivation, the chamise would be cleared and the site would be graded to plant cannabis canopy. If proposed grading exceeds 500 cubic yards or more than 1-acre of vegetation is cleared, a ministerial grading permit would be obtained from Lake County (Chapter 30 of the Lake County Code). No trees would be removed to prepare the site. Surrounding vegetation would be trimmed and maintained with no tree removal. Security cameras would be installed in accordance with County standards. Stormwater management improvements including fiber rolls would be installed around the perimeter of the cultivation site in accordance with the Property Management Plan (Attachment B).

Construction The proposed project does not include the construction of new buildings, paved roads, or other permanent structures or impermeable surfaces. Site A, C, and D are existing agricultural fields that were used to grow hops and would require minimum site preparation. Sites B and E, although cleared in 2013 and 2009, respectively, for past agricultural activities, would require, as discussed above, vegetation clearing and grading to prepare for cultivation.

According to the applicant and project application, construction activities would occur as follows:

- Construction activities would be weather-dependent and would occur over a 4-8 week period.
- Materials and equipment would be staged on previously disturbed areas adjacent to the proposed cultivation sites. No new areas would be disturbed for the purpose of staging materials or storing equipment.
- Construction would occur during daylight hours, typically between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, Monday through Friday, with some weekend work or later hours when needed.
- Disturbed areas would be stabilized with temporary erosion control or with permanent erosion control as soon as possible after grading or construction is complete.

The following materials have been Attached to this document:

- **Attachment A – Development Site Plans, dated September 2019**
 - **Sheets 1 and 2 – Cover Sheet and Master Aerial Sheet**
 - **Sheets A1 through A4 – Site A, former Northwestern Hops site**
 - **Sheets B1 through B3 – Site B, Southwest Clearing**
 - **Sheets C1 through C5 – Site C, former Northeast Hops site**
 - **Sheets D1 through D4 – Site D, former Central Hops site**
 - **Sheets E1 through E3 – Site E, Chaparral Clearing**
- **Attachment B – Property Management Plan, dated September 12, 2019**
- **Attachment C – Letter from the City of Clearlake, dated February 24, 2020**

The following materials have been cited in the Source List and can be available upon request:

- **Biological Site Assessment for the Cannabis Cultivation Operations at 2050 and 2122 Ogulin Canyon Road, Clearlake California, prepared by Natural Investigations Co., August 22, 2019**

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.

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| ☒ <u>Aesthetics</u> | ☒ <u>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u> | ☒ <u>Population / Housing</u> |
| ☐ <u>Agriculture & Forestry</u> | ☒ <u>Hazards & Hazardous Materials</u> | ☒ <u>Public Services</u> |
| ☒ <u>Air Quality</u> | ☒ <u>Hydrology / Water Quality</u> | ☐ <u>Recreation</u> |
| ☒ <u>Biological Resources</u> | ☒ <u>Land Use / Planning</u> | ☒ <u>Transportation</u> |
| ☒ <u>Cultural Resources</u> | ☐ <u>Mineral Resources</u> | ☒ <u>Tribal Cultural Resources</u> |
| ☒ <u>Geology / Soils</u> | ☒ <u>Noise</u> | ☒ <u>Utilities / Service Systems</u> |
| ☒ <u>Wildfire</u> | ☒ <u>Energy</u> | ☒ <u>Mandatory Findings of Significance</u> |

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 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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. 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. 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, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION 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.

Initial Study Prepared By:

____ Michael Taylor _____ Planner

Date: _____

SIGNATURE

Scott Deleon - Director
Community Development Department

SECTION 1

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 projects 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, and then 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 the 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 effects 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 the 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

KEY: 1 = Potentially Significant Impact
2 = Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation
3 = Less Than Significant Impact
4 = No Impact

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
I. AESTHETICS <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X		The project site is located on land in a rural area that is surrounded by densely vegetated hillsides of pine, brush, and oak trees, which would act as a natural screen. Due to the rural nature of the site and because it is visually protected by the natural topography and surrounding vegetation the cultivation activities would not be visible from public roads. The proposed activities are agricultural in nature and are consistent with the past use of the property as well as the surrounding existing uses. In addition, the site is not located on or visible from a scenic highway. The impacts would be less than significant. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X		There are no scenic resources on or in the vicinity of this property. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views the site and its surroundings? If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X		The proposed use would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site or the quality of public views of the site as there are no additional structures being proposed to be constructed. No physical changes to the site are proposed or needed other than minor grading, the cultivation of cannabis, the construction of fencing, and small work and storage areas. Even though the site is adjacent to the City of Clearlake, it is not within an urbanized area, and is not visible from any public property, including roads. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		X			The project has some potential to create additional light and/or glare through the use of exterior security lighting. There are no proposed greenhouses incorporating artificial lighting. Lighting associated with the nursery would be enclosed within the existing barn located at Site C and would not impact surrounding parcels. Any lighting associated with the proposed project would comply with recommendations of "darksky.org" and local ordinances. To ensure that light or glare is not broadcast beyond the property boundaries, Mitigation Measure AES-1 is recommended. Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated. <u>Mitigation Measure:</u> AES-1: All outdoor lighting shall be shielded and downcast or otherwise positioned in a manner that would not broadcast light or glare beyond the boundaries of the subject property. All lighting equipment shall comply with the recommendations of the International Dark-Sky Association (www.darksky.org) and provisions of Section 21.48 of the Zoning Ordinance. Security lighting shall be shaded, facing downward, and motion activated.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES <i>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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</i> <i>Would the project:</i>						
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?				X	The majority of the subject property is classified as Grazing Land, which is not considered Farmland. There is an isolated finger, approximately 0.8 acres, of Farmland of Local Importance located on the northwestern corner of APN 010-053-01 that is southwest of Site A and west of Site B. The proposed project is outside of this area. Cultivation would only occur within the area classified as Grazing Land and would not convert Farmland. No Impact.	1, 8
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X	The subject site is not within a Williamson Act contract. No Impact.	
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))?				X	The proposed project is not located within or adjacent to forest lands or lands zoned Timberland Production. The proposed project would therefore not conflict with existing timberland zoning or result in the rezoning of forest lands and/or Timberland Production. No Impact.	1, 2, 3
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X	The proposed project is not located within or adjacent to forest lands, and would therefore not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. No Impact.	1, 2, 3
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?				X	See responses to II(a)-(d), the proposed project does not involve changes to the existing environment that would result in the site's conversion to non-agricultural or non-forest use. No Impact.	
III. AIR QUALITY <i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.</i> <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		X			The project site is located within the Lake County Air Basin, which is under the jurisdiction of the Lake County Air Quality Management District (LCAQMD). The LCAQMD applies air pollution regulations to all major stationary pollution sources and monitors air quality. The Lake County Air Basin is in attainment with both state and federal air quality standards. According to the USDA Soil Survey and the Ultramafic, ultrabasic, serpentine rock and soils map of Lake County, serpentine soils have not been found within the project area or project vicinity. Since the Lake County Air Basin is in attainment for all air pollutants, air quality plans are not required in Lake County. Although the Lake County Air Basin is not required to have an air quality plan, the proposed project has the potential to result	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 36

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					in short- and long-term air quality impacts from construction and operation of the proposed project. Construction impacts, which are limited to minor grading in Sites B and E, would be temporary in nature and would occur over a 4 to 8 week period. Ongoing field management is considered an operational, not construction, activity. Operational impacts would include dust and fumes from site preparation of the cultivation area and vehicular traffic, including small delivery vehicles that would be contributors during and after site preparation / construction. Odors generated by the plants, particularly during harvest season, would be mitigated through passive means (separation distance), and other measures such as planting native flowering vegetation surrounding the cultivation area. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce air quality impacts to less than significant. Dust during site preparation would be mitigated by wetting the soil with a mobile water tank and hose. With the following proposed Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-7, the proposed project does not conflict and/or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans. Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated. <u>AQ-1:</u> Prior to cultivation, the applicant shall submit an <u>Odor Control Plan</u> to the Community Development Department for review and approval, or review and revision. <u>AQ-2:</u> All Mobile diesel equipment used for construction and/or maintenance shall be in compliance with State registration requirements. Portable and stationary diesel-powered equipment must meet the requirements of the State Air Toxic Control Measures for CI engines as well as Lake County Noise Emission Standards. <u>AQ-3:</u> Construction and/or work practices that involve masonry, gravel, grading activities, vehicular and fugitive dust shall be managed by use of water or other acceptable dust palliatives to mitigate dust generation during and after site development. <u>AQ-4:</u> The applicant shall maintain records of all hazardous or toxic materials used, including a Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) for all volatile organic compounds utilized, including cleaning materials to the Lake County Air Quality Management District. <u>AQ-5:</u> All vegetation during site development shall be chipped and spread for ground cover and/or erosion control. The burning of vegetation, construction debris, including waste material is prohibited. <u>AQ-6:</u> The applicant shall have the primary access and parking areas surfaced with chip seal, asphalt, or an equivalent all-weather surfacing to reduce fugitive dust generation. The use of white rock as a road base or surface material for travel routes and/or parking areas is prohibited.	

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					AQ-7: All areas subject infrequent use of driveways, overflow parking, etc., shall be surfaced with gravel. Applicant shall regularly use and/or maintain graveled area to reduce fugitive dust generations.	
b) Violate any air quality standard or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in an existing or projected air quality violation?			X		The County of Lake is in attainment of state and federal ambient air quality standards. There are no existing or projected air quality violations that would be exacerbated by the project. Less than Significant Impact.	36
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X			See response to impact discussion III(a). The nearest off-site residence is about 500 feet north of the nearest cultivation area. There are no schools, hospitals, or other sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the proposed project. The project would not expose any sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. However, construction activities, which are limited to grading sites B and E, have the potential to generate short-term fugitive dust if not properly controlled. Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-7 Incorporated.	2
d) Result in substantial emissions (such as odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?		X			Sensitive receptors in the area include a few scattered adjacent and/or nearby residents. The nearest off-site residence is about 500 feet north of the nearest cultivation area. The cultivation areas are set back in compliance with County standards in terms of the nearest off-site dwellings, so passive odor control (separation distance) would be adequate for the outdoor cultivation area. The applicant has emergency contact information that would be distributed to neighbors within 100 feet of the property as is required by Lake County Air Quality Management District. As described in Section III(a) above, implementation of mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-7 would reduce impacts to less than significant.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 36
III. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES						
<i>Would the project:</i>						
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?		X			A <i>Biological Site Assessment</i>, dated August 22, 2019, was prepared by Natural Investigations Co. for the project site. The purpose of the Assessment was to provide information as to whether the property contains sensitive plants or potentially contains sensitive wildlife requiring mitigation under CEQA. The terms sensitive plant or wildlife includes all state or federal rare, threatened, or endangered species and all species listed in the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) list of "Special Status Plants, Animals, and Natural Communities." A summary of the results is as follows: Plants. Special-status plant species, especially Konocti manzanita (<i>Arctostaphylos manzanita elegans</i>), have a moderate potential to occur in the Study Area in areas of chaparral. The non-native grasslands and ruderal habitat within the Study Area have a low potential for harboring special-status plant species due to the dominance of aggressive non-native grasses and forbs. The Study Area contains disturbed and undisturbed chaparral habitat. The disturbed chaparral habitat consists of relatively pure stands of chamise, with no manzanita or other shrubs or trees; this habitat has a low potential to contain special-status plant species. Areas of undisturbed chaparral have a moderate potential to sustain special-status plant species, such as Konocti manzanita. Wildlife. Streams, riparian corridors, and riverine wetlands within the Study Area can sustain aquatic special-status	1, 3, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					species and diverse wildlife species. However, the project entails agricultural activities within previously-farmed areas, and does not entail destruction of any streams, riparian corridors, or riverine wetlands. Further, during the field survey, no listed species or special-status species were observed within the Study Area. State and federal databases do not report any listed species or special-status species. No direct impacts to listed species or special-status species are expected from implementation of the proposed project. The Study Area contains potential nesting habitat because of the presence of trees and poles. However, no nests or nesting activity were observed in the project area during the field survey. If ground-clearing or tree-felling construction activities are conducted during the nesting season, nesting birds could be directly impacted by tree removal and indirectly impacted by noise, vibration, and other construction-related disturbance. Potentially Jurisdictional Waters. No vernal pools or isolated wetlands were identified within the study area. Several unnamed intermittent (Class II) and ephemeral (Class III) watercourses were identified within the study area. As noted, however, the project will not impact any identified streams, riparian corridors, or riverine wetlands Wildlife Corridors. No specific wildlife corridors exit within or near the study area. The project has some potential to result in short- and long-term biological impacts. The Biological Assessment concluded that the project area does not include any federally-designated critical habitat. Although the project area contains no special-status habitats, special-status habitats are directly adjacent to some of the proposed cultivation sites. Impacts would be Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures BIO-1 and BIO-2 Incorporated. BIO-1: If project activities occur during the breeding season (February 1 through August 31), a qualified biologist shall conduct a breeding survey no more than 14 days prior to project activities to determine if any special-status birds are nesting in trees on or adjacent to the study area. This shall include areas where water wells and security fencing will be installed. If the qualified biologist determines that the active nests of any special-status species are found close enough to affect breeding success, the qualified biologist shall establish an appropriate exclusion zone around the nest. This exclusion zone may be modified depending upon the species, nest location, and existing visual buffers. BIO-2: If initial ground disturbance at Sites B and E occurs during the bat maternity roosting season (April 1 through September 1), a qualified biologist shall conduct a bat roost assessment of trees and poles within 100 feet of the proposed construction at Sites B and E. If bat maternity roosts are present, the biologist shall establish an appropriate exclusion zone around the maternity roost.	

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		X			Refer to Section IV(a). The proposed project has been designed to maintain riparian buffers and grading setbacks of 100 feet. All cultivation sites have been designed to maintain a 100 foot setback from drainages and ponds. No development would occur within the drainage buffers and setbacks. There are no other sensitive natural communities within the project area. Erosion control measures to control erosion and sedimentation during construction and operation have been identified on the Development Site Plans (Attachment A) and in the Property Management Plan (Attachment B). Erosion control measures include swales, stockpile management, road and parking lot management, and sediment management. Since, during construction, the proposed project would disturb more than one acre, the proposed project would be subject to the requirements State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Construction General Permit (CGP) Order 2009-0009-DWQ. The SWRCB CGP would require the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which documents the stormwater dynamics at the site, the Best Management Practices (BMPs) and water quality protection measures that are used, and the frequency of inspections. BMPs are activities or measures determined to be practicable, acceptable to the public, and cost effective in preventing water pollution or reducing the amount of pollution generated by non-point sources. Implementation of the SWPPP would ensure that the riparian habitat is protected during construction activities and long-term operation of the proposed project Impacts would be Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures BIO-3 Incorporated. BIO-3: All work should incorporate erosion control measures consistent with Lake County Grading Regulations. Prior to construction, the project shall obtain coverage under State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Construction General Permit (CGP) Order 2009-0009-DWQ and prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the project site.	13, 24, 30
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?			X		Refer to Section IV(a). As discussed under Section IV(b), the proposed project has been designed to maintain riparian buffers and grading setbacks of 100 feet. No development would occur within the drainage buffers and setbacks. Therefore, project implementation would not directly impact any channels or wetlands. Soil disturbance from project implementation could increase erosion and sedimentation. Regulations at both the County and State levels require creation and implementation of an erosion control plan / stormwater management plan. Furthermore, since, during construction, the proposed project would disturb more than one acre, the proposed project would be subject to the requirements of the SWRCB CGP. Potential adverse impacts to water resources could occur during operation of cultivation activities resources by discharge of sediment or other pollutants (fertilizers, pesticides, human	13, 24, 30

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					waste, etc.) into receiving waterbodies. However, the project proponent must file a Notice of Intent and enroll in Cannabis Cultivation Order WQ 2017-0023-DWQ. Compliance with this Order would ensure that cultivation operations would not significantly impact water resources by using a combination of Best Management Practices (BMPs), buffer zones, sediment and erosion controls, site management plans, inspections and reporting, and regulatory oversight. Implementation of these plans, BMPs, compliance with Water Board, and Mitigation Measure BIO-3 would ensure that the impacts are less than significant. Impacts would be Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures BIO-3 Incorporated.	
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?			X		Refer to Section IV (a). No wildlife corridors or nursery sites exist within or near the study area. Implementation of the proposed project would necessitate erection of security fences around the cultivation compounds. However, the fenced cultivation areas are surrounded by open space, allowing wildlife to move around these fenced areas. Implementation of the project would not 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 Impact.	13
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X		Refer to Section IV (a). The proposed use would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources such as tree preservation. Tree removal would be minimal and would consist of the removal of a few old, unhealthy, and nonnative trees remaining from prior use of the property as a commercial orchard. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13
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?			X		The proposed use would not conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans associated with this site. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?			X		A Cultural Resources Assessment was prepared by Natural Investigations Co. dated August 13, 2019. One historic-era building (house) was identified that was over 50 years old. As the house is not involved in the cannabis operations it was not recorded or evaluated, is not listed in the CRHR, and would not be impacted by this project. Less than Significant Impact.	14
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X			According to the Cultural Resource Assessment, five archaeological resources were newly identified during the survey, four prehistoric isolates and one historic-era dump. None of the five recorded resources qualify as a historic resource and are not eligible for listing in the CRHR. Considering the portion of the Project area being utilized for cannabis operations has been highly disturbed by grading and construction of a modern residential building and related outbuildings, along with the infrastructure for the existing agriculture activities all of which are underlain by thin soils with no potential for buried soils representing former	14

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					landscapes, the potential for the discovery of buried archaeological materials within the proposed Project area is considered to be low. However, to ensure that undiscovered resources are not impacted during construction, CUL-1 through CUL-3 are recommended. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-3 incorporated. <u>CUL-1:</u> Should any archaeological, paleontological, or cultural materials be discovered during site development, all activity shall be halted in the vicinity of the find(s), the local overseeing Tribe shall be notified, and a qualified archaeologist retained to evaluate the find(s) and recommend mitigation procedures, if necessary, subject to the approval of the Community Development Department. <u>CUL-2:</u> The applicant shall halt all work and immediately contact the Lake County Sheriff's Department, Middletown Rancheria, and the Community Development Department if any human remains are encountered. <u>CUL-3:</u> All employees shall be trained in recognizing potentially significant artifacts that may be discovered during ground disturbance. If any artifacts or remains are found, the Koi Nation and Elem Rancheria Tribes shall immediately be notified; a licensed archaeologist shall be notified, and the Lake County Community Development Department shall be notified of such finds.	
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X			Disturbance of human remains is not anticipated. However, to ensure that human remains are not disturbed during project construction, CUL-2 is recommended. Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure CUL-2 Incorporated.	
VI. ENERGY <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X		The proposed project would use a combination of existing power supplied by PG&E and solar power. The outdoor cultivation areas would have a minimal need for power. The proposed nursery in the barn at Site C would require power for lighting and climate control. Other uses that would require power include the security system, security lighting, and well pumps. No aspect of the project would result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Less than Significant Impact.	5
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X		The proposed use would not conflict or obstruct the Lake County General Plan for energy conservation or energy efficiency. Less than Significant Impact.	1
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS <i>Would the project:</i>						
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			X		<u>Earthquake Faults</u> There are two mapped earthquake faults near the subject site. The linear faults parallel Ogulin Canyon Road to the north. The estimated rupture for the northerly fault is less than 1,600,000 years ago and the more southerly fault is estimated to have ruptured 130,000 years ago. 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. All proposed construction is required to be built consistent with current California Building Code construction standards.	18, 19

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.					<u>Landslides</u> According to the U.S. Landslide Inventory provided by the USGS Landslide Hazard Program, there are no mapped landslides on or in the vicinity of the project site. The cultivation is located within flat areas.	
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?					The proposed project is not expected to cause potential substantial adverse effects due to seismic activity or landslides. Less Than Significant Impact.	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?						
iv) Landslides?						
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X		The Project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Sites B and E would be cleared and graded in preparation for cannabis cultivation, and the remainder sites have been previously farmed. Grading at Sites B and E would require a ministerial grading permit pursuant to Chapter 30 of the Lake County Code, which would require implementation of Best Management Practices ("BMPs") to the maximum extent practicable to prevent or reduce discharge of all construction or post-construction pollutants into the County storm drainage system. BMPs typically include scheduling of activities, erosion and sediment control, operation and maintenance procedures and other measures in accordance with Chapters 29 and 30 of the Lake County Code. The proposed project would also be subject to the requirements of the SWRCB CGP and would require the preparation of a SWPPP which documents the stormwater dynamics at the site, the BMPs and water quality protection measures that are used, and the frequency of inspections. Impacts would be Less Than Significant.	5, 24, 30
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. Department of Agriculture, the cultivation site is mapped as being generally stable to unstable. The soil is not in danger of subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse as a result of the proposed project as there is no grading or proposed ground disturbance on any unstable soils. Less Than Significant Impact.	7
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?			X		According to the USDA Soil Survey, the shrink-swell potential for the proposed project soil type is moderate, and is not considered to be expansive. The proposed project would therefore not increase risks to life or property as a result of expansive soil. Less Than Significant Impact.	7
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 waste water?				X	The project site has an existing septic system serving the existing residence. There are no new onsite wastewater disposal systems proposed. The proposed project would use portable toilets serviced by a licensed contractor. No Impact.	5
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X	The project site does not contain any known unique geologic feature or paleontological resources. Disturbance of these resources is not anticipated. No Impact.	14

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X		The project site is located within the Lake County Air Basin, which is under the jurisdiction of the LCAQMD. The LCAQMD applies air pollution regulations to all major stationary pollution sources and monitors air quality. Climate change is caused by greenhouse gases (GHGs) emitted into the atmosphere around the world from a variety of sources, including the combustion of fuel for energy and transportation, cement manufacturing, and refrigerant emissions. GHGs are those gases that have the ability to trap heat in the atmosphere, a process that is analogous to the way a greenhouse traps heat. GHGs may be emitted as a result of human activities, as well as through natural processes. Increasing GHG concentrations in the atmosphere are leading to global climate change. The Lake County Air Basin is in attainment for all air pollutants and has therefore not adopted thresholds of significance for GHG emissions. The primary GHGs that are of concern for development projects include Carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O). CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O occur naturally, and through human activity. Emissions of CO₂ are largely by-products of fossil fuel combustion and CH₄ results from off-gassing associated with agricultural practices and landfills. CO₂ is the most common GHG emitted by human activities. In general, greenhouse gas emissions can come from construction activities and from post-construction activities. No significant construction activities are proposed, and there are minimal gasses that would result from the outdoor cultivation and nursery activities. The outdoor cultivation areas would not have specific greenhouse gas-producing elements and the cannabis plants would, to a small degree, help capture CO₂. Less than Significant.	36
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X	To date, Lake County has not adopted any specific GHG reduction strategies or climate action plans. No Impact.	1, 3, 36
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X		The proposed project would use organic pest control and fertilizers. This will significantly limit potential environmental hazards. Cannabis waste is proposed to be chipped and disbursed on site; burning cannabis vegetation is not permitted; this is a standard condition of approval. Materials associated with the proposed Cultivation of Commercial Cannabis, such as gasoline, pesticides, fertilizers, alcohol, hydrogen peroxide and the equipment emissions may be considered hazardous if released into the environment. The applicant has stated that all potentially harmful chemicals will be stored and locked in a secured building on site. The project shall comply with Section 41.7 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance that specifies that all uses involving the use or storage of combustible, explosive, caustic or otherwise hazardous materials shall comply with all applicable local, state and federal safety standards and shall be provided with adequate	1, 3, 5, 21, 29, 31, 32, 34

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					safety devices against the hazard of fire and explosion, and adequate firefighting and fire suppression equipment. All equipment shall be maintained and operated in a manner that minimizes any spill or leak of hazardous materials. Hazardous materials and contaminated soil shall be stored, transported, and disposed of consistent with applicable local, state, and federal regulations. 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?			X		See response to Section IX (a). Less than Significant.	1, 3, 5, 21, 29, 31, 32, 34
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X	The proposed project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. No Impact.	2
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?				X	The California Environmental Protection Agency (CALEPA) has the responsibility for compiling information about sites that may contain hazardous materials, such as hazardous waste facilities, solid waste facilities where hazardous materials have been reported, leaking underground storage tanks and other sites where hazardous materials have been detected. Hazardous materials include all flammable, reactive, corrosive, or toxic substances that pose potential harm to the public or environment. The following databases compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5 were checked for known hazardous materials contamination within ¼-mile of the project site: - State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) GeoTracker database - Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database - SWRCB list of solid waste disposal sites with waste constituents above hazardous waste levels outside the waste management unit. The project site is not listed in any of these databases as a site containing hazardous materials as described above. No Impact.	39
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?				X	The project is not located within two (2) miles of an airport and/or within an Airport Land Use Plan. No Impact.	1, 3, 4, 5, 20, 22
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X	The project would not impair or interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. No Impact.	1, 3, 4, 5, 20, 22, 35, 37
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			X		The parcel is mapped as Moderate to High Fire Risk. The applicant would be required to adhere to all federal, state and local agency requirements/regulations for setbacks and defensible space. Less Than Significant Impact.	1, 3, 4, 5, 20, 35, 37

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?			X		The onsite drainages are tributary to Clear Lake. Clear Lake is listed on the California Clean Water Act Section 303(d) List for Mercury and Nutrients. Sources of Mercury include past and present discharges from Mercury mines, geothermal sources, erosion of soils with naturally occurring mercury, and atmospheric deposition. The proposed project is not a source of mercury. Clear Lake Nutrients result in nuisance algae blooms as a result of phosphorous loading. Sources of phosphorous include point sources from permitted stormwater dischargers (Lake County and Caltrans) and nonpoint sources. Nonpoint sources include irrigated agriculture from about 13,000 acres throughout the County. The total cultivation proposed is 15 acres and replaces over 18 acres of pre-existing agriculture activities (hops and orchards). The proposed cultivation represents only a minor amount, 0.11%, of the County's irrigated agricultural area. In addition, the cultivation site and operator must enroll in and comply with the State Water Resources Control Board Cannabis Cultivation General Order (Order WQ 2019-001-DWQ) General Waste Discharge Requirements (WDRs) for Discharges of Waste Associated with Cannabis Cultivation Activities. The General Order regulates discharges of waste associated with cannabis cultivation from irrigation runoff, fertilization, road construction, grading activities, etc. This includes Nonpoint Source Policy that requires Best Practicable Treatment Control (BPTC) measures for cannabis cultivation activities to reduce and control nonpoint source pollution. Enrollees are required to submit technical and monitoring reports to demonstrate compliance with the Cannabis Cultivation General Order. Because the proposed project does not increase irrigated agricultural area beyond pre-existing agricultural activities, represents a minor amount of the County's total irrigated area, and must comply with the Cannabis Cultivation General Order, the impacts to Clear Lake Nutrients would be less than significant. The project site has an existing, permitted onsite wastewater treatment (septic) system serving the existing residence. There are no new onsite wastewater disposal systems proposed. Employees for the proposed project would use portable toilets serviced by a licensed contractor. The frequency of service would be weekly or as needed. All equipment shall be maintained and operated in a manner that minimizes any spill or leak of pollutants. The proposed project has been designed to maintain riparian buffers and grading setbacks of 100 feet. All cultivation sites have been designed to maintain a 100 foot setback from drainages and ponds. No development would occur within the drainage buffers and setbacks. Since, during construction, the proposed project would disturb more than one acre, the proposed project would be subject to the requirements of the SWRCB CGP and would require the preparation of a SWPPP which documents the stormwater dynamics at the site, the BMPs and water quality protection	1, 3, 4, 5, 21, 24, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 40, 41, 42

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**																												
					measures that are used, and the frequency of inspections. BMPs are activities or measures determined to be practicable, acceptable to the public, and cost effective in preventing water pollution or reducing the amount of pollution generated by non-point sources. Implementation of the SWPPP would ensure that the riparian habitat is protected during construction activities and long-term operation of the proposed project. Less Than Significant.																													
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X		The project site does not have a municipal water supply service, and relies on well water. The proposed project would use water from existing, onsite, permitted wells. According to maps in the Lake County Groundwater Management Plan, the Project Area appears to be located near the Clear Lake Cache Formation Groundwater Management Plan Area. The Property in the sub watershed "Burns Valley / Frontal Clear Lake" (12-digit HUC code is 180201160310). This sub watershed is part of the upper Cache Creek Watershed. The watershed of the surrounding area is relatively pristine, with south-facing slopes supporting chaparral, grasslands, and oak savannas, while the north-facing slopes are dense with mixed oak and conifer forests and woodlands. The valley floors are more developed, and consist of ranch estates, irrigated agricultural lands, ranchland and pasture, and commercial enterprises. As shown on the Development Plans (Attachment A), there are five (5) existing groundwater wells that would be used for cultivation. The yield, in gallons per minute (GPM), for each well is summarized in the Table below. An approximate maximum daily potential water demand per acre, (Attachment B) is about 2.1 GPM per acre of canopy or 31.5 GPM for 15 acres. The combined yield of the five (5) wells is 721 GPM. Thus, the maximum potential demand is only 4.4% of the combined well yield. There are five (5) proposed 2,500-gallon water storage tanks, one at each cultivation site, to provide additional stored water for irrigation and fire suppression. <table><tr><td></td><td></td><td>Depth</td><td>Yield¹</td></tr><tr><td>Well #</td><td>Site</td><td>(ft)</td><td>(GPM)</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>A</td><td>240</td><td>60</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>C</td><td>114</td><td>60</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>E</td><td>460</td><td>100</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>D</td><td>358</td><td>200</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>B</td><td>340</td><td>300</td></tr></table> ¹Source: Well logs provided by applicant. The total daily demand is approximately 3,000 gallons per day per acre of canopy (Attachment B). The cultivation period is approximately 120 to 150 days. Therefore, the annual water demand is approximately or 5.4 to 6.8 million gallons per year (16.6 to 20.7 acre-feet). The total annual yield from the five (5) wells is 1,163 acre-feet. The annual demand is only 1.4% to 1.8% of the annual yield. Irrigation BMPs would be implemented to minimize water usage. Also, demand estimates are based on each plant requiring 6-gallons per day, which is a conservative (high) estimate. Therefore, water demand would likely be much less than the maximum daily potential and annual yield. Water would be delivered to a drip irrigation system via a jet pump pressure tank. Drip lines would be sized to irrigate large areas			Depth	Yield ¹	Well #	Site	(ft)	(GPM)	1	A	240	60	2	C	114	60	3	E	460	100	4	D	358	200	5	B	340	300	5
		Depth	Yield ¹																															
Well #	Site	(ft)	(GPM)																															
1	A	240	60																															
2	C	114	60																															
3	E	460	100																															
4	D	358	200																															
5	B	340	300																															

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					slowly, to maximize absorption, and would be placed under a layer of straw mulch. The following irrigation BMP's will be implemented: - Utilize a drip irrigation system with a schedule that minimizes water usage. - Regularly inspect the water delivery system to prevent and immediately repair leaks - Replace worn, outdated, or inefficient system components and equipment to ensure a properly functioning irrigation system - Utilized drip irrigation instead of spray sprinklers - Reduce overspray of impervious surfaces and prevent runoff water The proposed project does not include increases in impervious area that would reduce the potential for groundwater recharge. Less than significant.	
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: i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; iii) Create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?			X		The proposed cultivation areas are in flat areas that have already been cleared and graded for agriculture or would require minimum clearing and grading for new cultivation and have been designed to maintain riparian buffers and grading setbacks of 100 feet. No development would occur within the drainage buffers and setbacks. The proposed project has been designed to maintain existing flow paths. Also, the proposed project does not include increases in impervious area. Therefore, the proposed project would not alter an existing drainage patterns or addition of impervious surfaces. (i) As discussed in Section (a) above, construction activities and operation of the proposed project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation, with implementation of mitigation measure BIO-8, which requires compliance with Lake County Grading Regulations and coverage under the Construction General Permit. (ii)&(iii) The proposed project does not include increases in impervious area; thus, the proposed project would not increase the rate or amount of surface runoff or exceed the capacity of the existing drainage system. (iv) The proposed project is not within a FEMA Floodplain. Less than Significant.	5, 24, 25
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X	The project site is not located in an area of potential inundation by seiche or tsunami. The subject parcel is not located within a flood hazard zone. Therefore, there is no risk of release of pollutants due to inundation. No Impact.	2, 5, 19, 20, 25, 31
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X	The proposed project would not conflict or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or a sustainable groundwater management plan. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 19, 20, 25, 31, 40
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Physically divide an established community.				X	The proposed project site would not physically divide an established community. No Impact.	1, 3, 4, 5
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan,			X		This project is consistent with the Lake County General Plan, the Shoreline Communities Area Plan, and the Lake County Zoning Ordinance. Less than Significant.	1, 3, 43

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?						
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project:</i>						
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?				X	According to the California Department of Conservation: Mineral Land Classification, there are no known mineral resources on the project site. No Impact.	26
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?				X	Neither the County of Lake's General Plan nor the Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan designate the project site as being a locally important mineral resource recovery site. No Impact.	26
XIII. NOISE <i>Would the project result in:</i>						
a) 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?		X			Short-term increases in ambient noise levels could be expected during project preparation and/or development. Mitigation measures would reduce potential noise impacts. Less Than Significant with the following mitigation measures incorporated: <u>NOI-1:</u> All construction activities including engine warm-up shall be limited Monday Through Friday, between the hours of 7:00am and 7:00pm to minimize noise impacts on nearby residents. Back-up beepers shall be adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. This mitigation does not apply to night work. <u>NOI -2:</u> Maximum non-construction related sounds levels shall not exceed levels of 55 dBA between the hours of 7:00AM to 7:00PM and 45 dBA between the hours of 10:00PM to 7:00AM within residential areas as specified within Zoning Ordinance Section 21-41.11 (Table 11.1) at the property lines.	1, 3, 4, 5
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X		The project is not expected to create unusual groundborne vibration due to site development or facility operation. The low level truck traffic during construction and for deliveries would create a minimal amount of groundborne vibration. According to the applicant's application package, two (2) trucks would be used for an approximate six (6) trips for construction. Less Than Significant Impact.	1, 3, 4, 5
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING <i>Would the project:</i>						
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)?			X		The project is not anticipated to induce population growth. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 3, 4, 5
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	No housing would be displaced as a result of the project. No Impact.	1, 3, 4, 5

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES <i>Would the project:</i>						
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: - Fire Protection? - Police Protection? - Schools? - Parks? - Other Public Facilities?			X		The project does not propose any new housing or other uses that would necessitate new or altered government facilities. The proposed project is not anticipated to substantially increase the demands for fire protection services such that new or expanded facilities would be warranted. The Lake County Fire Protection District #1 Main Fire Station is located approximately 2.6 miles east of the site (via Olympic Drive and Hwy 53 to Ogulin Canyon Road). An open water source for helicopter water drops is located 1 mile due east (treated wastewater pond). On-site facilities (e.g. new water tanks and the existing pond) would be provided and available in order to ensure adequate fire suppression measures would be available in the event of an emergency. In addition, the development and implementation of an Emergency Procedures and Fire Protection Plan that includes control measures and training to encourage fire prevention and responses in the event a fire emergency, including fire evacuation routes is recommended. The project would be required to comply with all applicable local and state fire code requirements related to design and emergency access. The project includes on-site improvements (e.g. water tanks, site address posting, gate and roadway widths, fire truck turnaround areas, pass through access road design, etc.) consistent with these requirements. The impacts on fire protection services would be Less Than Significant Impact. Construction and operation of the proposed project may result in accidents or crime emergency incidents that would require police services. Construction activities would be temporary and limited in scope. Accidents or crime emergency incidents during operation are expected to be infrequent and minor in nature. The Lake County Sheriff's Department, Clearlake Police Department and other law enforcement agencies were notified of the proposed project. The impacts on police protection services would be Less Than Significant Impact.	1, 3, 4, 5, 20, 23, 37
XVI. RECREATION <i>Would the project:</i>						
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?				X	The project would generate business income, an increase in local employment opportunities, and increase public fee and tax revenue which may result in slight increases in population growth, which could lead to increased use of park and recreation facilities. However, the increased use of park and recreation, would occur over a large area and in multiple sites and therefore be diminished and would not substantially deteriorate existing parks or other recreational facilities. No Impact.	1, 3, 4, 5
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X	This project would not necessitate the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities. No Impact.	1, 3, 4, 5

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XVII. TRANSPORTATION <i>Would the project</i>						
a) Conflict with a plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle lanes and pedestrian paths?			X		The project site is accessible off of Ogulin Canyon Road, approximately 0.8 miles from SR 53, a principle north-south route through Lake County. There are no transit stops within 0.25 miles of the project site and no bicycle or pedestrian facilities on Ogulin Canyon Road. During construction, a temporary increase in construction-related traffic is anticipated from trucks and employee vehicles that would access the site daily. During operation, the previous Hops Farm likely generated a similar amount of traffic per acre of cultivation as would be expected from cannabis cultivation activities. Under full operation, the Hops Farm cultivated approximately 13.6 acres. Thus, an approximate 10% increase in traffic would be expected to cultivate 15 acres of cannabis canopy. During operation, the proposed project would employ 8 fulltime employees and 15-20 seasonal employees (during planting and harvesting). Harvesting and planting would occur 2-3 times per year. This activity would be consistent with prior agricultural activities that occurred onsite. Truck deliveries of various project-related materials would occur throughout the year. It is anticipated that truck deliveries would be monthly, roughly 10-12 times per year. Thus, a 10% increase in trips compared to the Hops Farm operation would be only 2-4 trips for fulltime employees, 4 to 8 trips for seasonal employees, and 3 to 5 trips per year for truck deliveries. East of SR 53, the initial, paved portion of Ogulin Canyon Road (0.6 miles) is designated as a “basic street” within the City of Clearlake. The City of Clearlake General Plan Circulation Element contains a number of Goals and Policies regarding the City street system, however, there does not appear to be any policy applying specifically to Ogulin Canyon Road. East of the City limits, Ogulin Canyon Road is an unpaved County Road. Although the road from SR 53 to the project site is in poor condition, there is good visibility and sight distance conditions. Since the proposed project is within 1,000 feet of the City of Clearlake’s Sphere of Influence, the applicant was required to obtain a letter of support from the City. The City provided a letter of support (Attachment C) and requested an appropriate mitigation fee for Ogulin Canyon Road maintenance. Less Than Significant	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 27, 28, 35
b) For a land use project, would the project conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1)?			X		State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) states that for land use projects, transportation impacts are to be measured by evaluating the proposed project’s vehicle miles traveled (VMT), as follows: <i>“Vehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. Generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in the project area compared to existing conditions should be presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact.”</i>	1, 3

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					To date, the County has not yet formally adopted its transportation significance thresholds or its transportation impact analysis procedures. The proposed project would not generate or attract more than 100 trips per day; therefore, it is not expected for the project to have a potentially significant level of VMT, therefore, impacts related to CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3. subdivision (b) would be less than significant. The proposed cannabis cultivation is considered to be similar to other agricultural and industrial uses in the area. Less than Significant Impact.	
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X		The proposed project does not propose any changes to road alignment or other features, does not result in the introduction of any obstacles, nor does it involve incompatible uses that could increase traffic hazards. Less than Significant Impact	1, 3, 4, 5
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X		Adequate existing access is provided to the site via locally maintained roads and the existing driveway. The proposed project would not alter the physical configuration of the existing roadway network serving the area, and would have no effect on access to local streets or adjacent uses (including access for emergency vehicles). Internal roadways would meet CAL FIRE requirements for vehicle access. Furthermore, as noted above under impact discussion (a), increased project-related operational traffic would be minimal. The proposed project would not inhibit the ability of local roadways to continue to accommodate emergency response and evacuation activities. The proposed project would not interfere with the City's adopted emergency response plan. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 3, 4, 5 20, 27, 28, 35
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</i>						
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or				X	See Response to Section V(a). No Impact.	1, 3, 4, 5, 14, 15
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		X			See Response to Section V(a). A Request for Review was mailed to the area tribes on Month ##, Year. A response was received from <i>First and Last Name</i> of the Koi Nation and Elem Rancheria Tribal Preservation Departments, stating that the project falls within their area of concern and requested consultation on the project. The Rancherias were notified of the mitigation measures proposed.[AD1] Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-3 Incorporated.	1, 3, 4, 5, 14, 15
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or				X	The proposed project would be served by onsite irrigation wells, an existing residential septic system, and existing power by PG&E. No new utilities or relocation of utilities would be required as part of the proposed project. No Impact.	5

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?						
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X		See Response to Section X(b). Less Than Significant Impact.	
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?				X	The proposed project would be served by an on-site septic system and portable toilets. No Impact.	5
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure?			X		The nearest existing landfill is the County operated Clearlake Landfill, which serves the County area. This landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 3, 34
e) Negatively impact the provision of solid waste services or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			X		The proposed use would not negatively impact the provision of solid waste services or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals as the applicant would chip and spread the cannabis waste on site. Less than Significant Impact.	5
f) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X		All requirements and regulations related to the storage transport, and disposal of solid waste would apply to this project. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 3, 34

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XX. WILDFIRE						
<i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</i>						
a) Impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X		On December 10, 2019 Lake County Code Enforcement Officer Andrew Williams conducted a Public Resource Code (PRC) 4290 and 4291 Cal Fire full site inspection and provided recommendations to the proposed project so that the project would be in compliance with the PRC. The recommendations have been incorporated into the proposed project. The property is located within an SRA Area and must comply with all federal, state, and local agency requirements. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 3, 5, 23, 37
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?			X		See response XX (a). Less than Significant Impact.	1, 3, 5, 23, 37
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?			X		Except as indicated in a) above, no additional wildfire-related site improvements appear to be needed. Less than Significant Impacts.	1, 3, 5, 23, 37
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?			X		There is slight chance of impact associated with post-fire slope runoff, instability or drainage changes given the flatness of the cultivation site. Less than Significant Impact.	5
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE						
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?		X			Per the impact discussions above, the potential of the proposed project to substantially degrade the environment is less than significant with incorporated mitigation measures. As described in this Initial Study, the proposed project has the potential for impacts related to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Transportation, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Utilities and Service Systems. However, these impacts would be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level with the incorporation of avoidance and mitigation measures discussed in each impact section. Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.	All
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,		X			The are no project impacts that are individually limited or cumulatively considerable. There is no evidence in the record there are incremental effects of a project that are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects (the Hops Meister Farm), the effects of this current project, and/or the effects of future projects. In addition, implementation of mitigation measures identified in each section would avoid or reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels. Based on the findings and conclusions contained in the Initial Study, the proposed project would have impacts that are individually	All

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
and the effects of probable future projects)?					limited, but are not cumulatively considerable. Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X			The proposed project has the potential to result in adverse indirect or direct effects on human beings in the areas of Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, Transportation, Tribal Cultural Resources, and Utilities and Service Systems. Implementation of mitigation measures identified in each section would avoid or reduce the substantial adverse indirect or direct effects on human beings to a less than significant level. Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated.	All

* Impact Categories defined by CEQA

****Source List**

1. Lake County General Plan
2. Lake County GIS Database
3. Lake County Zoning Ordinance
4. City of Clearlake General Plan
5. Lake Vista Farms Cannabis Cultivation Application – Major Use Permit.
6. U.S.G.S. Topographic Maps
7. U.S.D.A. Lake County Soil Survey
8. Lake County Important Farmland Map, California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program
9. Department of Transportation's Scenic Highway Mapping Program, (<https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>)
10. Lake County Serpentine Soil Mapping
11. California Natural Diversity Database (<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDB>)
12. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory
13. Biological Assessment - prepared by Natural Investigations Company, Inc., dated August 22, 2019.
14. Cultural Resource Report - Natural Investigations Company, Inc., dated August 13, 2019.
15. California Historical Resource Information Systems (CHRIS); Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University; Rohnert Park, CA.
16. Water Resources Division, Lake County Department of Public Works Wetlands Mapping.
17. U.S.G.S. Geologic Map and Structure Sections of the Clear Lake Volcanic, Northern California, Miscellaneous Investigation Series, 1995
18. Official Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone maps for Lake County
19. Landslide Hazards in the Eastern Clear Lake Area, Lake County, California, Landslide Hazard Identification Map No. 16, California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, DMG Open –File Report 89-27, 1990
20. Lake County Emergency Management Plan
21. Lake County Hazardous Waste Management Plan, adopted 1989
22. Lake County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, adopted 1992
23. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection - Fire Hazard Mapping
24. National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)
25. FEMA Flood Hazard Maps
26. Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan
27. Lake County Bicycle Plan
28. Lake County Transit for Bus Routes
29. Lake County Environmental Health Division
30. Lake County Grading Ordinance

31. Lake County Natural Hazard database
32. Lake County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan and Siting Element, 1996
33. Lake County Water Resources
34. Lake County Waste Management Department
35. California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS)
36. Lake County Air Quality Management District website
37. South Lake County Fire Protection District
38. Site Visit by Lake County CDD and Code Enforcement staff on December 10, 2019
39. Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List, www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public
40. Water Quality Control Plan (Basin Plan) for the California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Valley Region Fifth Edition, Revised May 2018.
https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/
41. Clear Lake Nutrient TMDL Program Technical Memorandum dated July 5, 2018
https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/board_decisions/tentative_orders/1807_clnut/2018_0627_tech_memo_final.pdf
42. https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2019/wqo2019_0001_dwq.pdf
43. The Shoreline Communities Area Plan (2009)