

Exhibit 1-A — Federal Access and Indemnification Violations Summary Box

Poverty Flats Ranch UP 23-09 / IS 23-20 (Project No. PL 25-198)
Chapter 1 — BLM and Indemnification Violations
(Sorted by jurisdictional severity — Federal → State → County/Local)

Federal / Cross-Jurisdictional Violations

Citation	Brief Description
43 U.S.C. § 1761 et seq. (FLPMA)	Requires Right-of-Way grant for commercial use of federally managed roads; none issued for Poverty Flats access. No ROW was issued. BLM made clear they will not authorize this commercial activity
43 C.F.R. § 2808.10	Prohibits unauthorized use or trespass on BLM lands without a Right-of-Way authorization. No ROW was issued. BLM made clear they will not authorize this commercial activity
18 U.S.C. § 1856 / 21 U.S.C. §§ 841, 844, 846	Transport or possession of cannabis on federal lands constitutes criminal trespass and controlled-substance offense.
18 U.S.C. § 2 and § 371	Aiding and abetting and conspiracy liability for knowingly authorizing projects that require federal trespass.
18 U.S.C. § 1962 (c),(d)	Potential RICO exposure for pattern of unlawful approvals deriving financial benefit from illegal activity.
Mills v. United States (2006) 170 IBLA 353; Clouser v. Espy (9th Cir. 1994) 42 F.3d 1522	Confirms federal agencies retain exclusive authority to deny right-of-way use across federal lands.

State Law / CEQA / Professional Compliance

Citation	Brief Description
CEQA Guidelines §§ 15124, 15126.2(a)	Omission of federal access barrier and indemnification agreements renders

	project description unstable and inaccurate.
CEQA Guidelines § 15125(a)	Failure to disclose lawful access as a baseline constraint violates CEQA requirements for complete environmental setting.
Pub. Res. Code § 21168.5	Approvals invalid for 'prejudicial abuse of discretion' where material facts withheld from decisionmakers.
Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino (1988)	CEQA prohibits deferral of critical issues such as legal access or agency consultation.
Friends of B Street v. City of Hayward (1980)	Project without lawful access is infeasible and cannot be approved under CEQA.
Cal. Civ. Code § 1668	Contracts exempting a party from a violation of law (such as Indemnification Agreements) are void as against public policy.
City of Santa Barbara v. Superior Court (2007)	Exculpatory clauses cannot shield gross negligence or willful misconduct by public entities.

County / Local Violations

Citation	Brief Description
Gov. Code §§ 23005, 25203, 25303	Board of Supervisors has exclusive authority to approve contracts; CDD's Indemnification Agreements exceeded delegated powers.
Lake County Code Ch. 21 (Zoning – Use Permits)	Major Use Permits approved without demonstrated lawful access across federal land.
Lake County Code Ch. 13 (Fire and Construction Safety)	County approved projects without verifying lawful road classification or access under fire-safe regulations.
County Administrative Practice	Omission of Indemnification Agreements and BLM denial letters from Commission

records constitutes procedural obstruction.

Gov. Code § 6200 / Penal Code § 118

Concealment or falsification of government records and certifications constitutes felony offense.

Summary Note: This exhibit consolidates the federal-access, indemnification, and misconduct violations underpinning Chapter 1. It demonstrates that the Poverty Flats project depends on unlawful federal trespass, that the County adopted unauthorized Indemnification Agreements to circumvent this barrier, and that both federal and state law categorically prohibit such approvals. Under CEQA Guidelines §§ 15124 and 15126.2(a), the permit must be reversed because the project lacks lawful access and was approved through a process tainted by prejudicial misrepresentation and abuse of discretion.