

Community Development Department
Courthouse, 255 N. Forbes St.
Lakeport, CA 95457

Attn: Mary Claybon

Re: UP 20-96; 7408, 7522, 7527, & 7634, 7746 Highland Springs Rd. and 7257 & 7357 Amber Ridge Rd., Lakeport, CA 95453 – Highland Farms Commercial Cannabis Cultivation project.

The Redbud Audubon Society appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Highland Farms Commercial Cannabis Cultivation project as we have many concerns.

We request this project be denied for the following reasons.

This application has major errors and omissions, and implementation of the project as presented would be in violation of numerous State and Federal laws. This is one of the most environmentally destructive *Cannabis* projects that the Redbud Audubon Society has ever reviewed, and we believe the project must be rejected on multiple grounds, as set forth below.

- The original reconnaissance-level Biological Assessment (BA) performed by Pinecrest Environmental dated December 9, 2020, clearly shows in Figure 3 that there are potential wetlands in and around the proposed cultivation areas. The Analytical Environmental Services (AES) report dated February 11, 2022, also describes jurisdictional wetlands distributed throughout the site. Despite this, a protocol-level wetland delineation was never performed. A protocol-level wetland delineation **must** be performed to verify the precise extent of wetlands onsite subject to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) and/or Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) jurisdiction, and not doing so would be in violation of the Federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and/or the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The fact that no protocol-level wetland delineation was ever performed is a major omission.
- The original BA by Pinecrest states that two special-status chaparral plant species were identified onsite: Scrub oak (*Quercus dumosa*; CNPS List 1B.1) and Konocti manzanita (*Arctostaphylos manzanita* ssp. *elegans*; CNPS List 1B.3). The AES report makes the incorrect statement that no special-status species were observed onsite (p.16) and also says that 0.4 acre of chaparral will have to be removed during the course of project implementation (p.15). A minimum of three (3) appropriately timed protocol-level rare plant surveys **must** be conducted specifically in the chaparral habitats onsite to identify the location and extent of the populations of the two special-status chaparral species, quantify the number of individuals of special-status species to be removed, and propose specific mitigation measures to be implemented for the loss of special-status species and their habitat. Without considering these special-status plant species onsite the project would be in violation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The incorrect statement that no special-status plant species occur onsite despite plans to eliminate almost a half-acre of chaparral is a major omission.
- The Pinecrest BA clearly states that there is habitat for Foothill yellow-legged frog (FYLF), a special-status species, in the watercourses and potential wetlands onsite. Despite this, and despite the proposed construction of numerous culvert crossings onsite, there is no mention of potential

impacts to FYLF breeding, estivation, or migration, and no proposed mitigation measures to offset loss of FYLF habitat and take of FYLF individuals in the AES report. A revised BA that meets currently accepted CEQA standards **must** be performed that addresses potential impacts to FYLF. Implementing this project without consideration of impacts to FYLF and their habitat would be a violation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the California Fish & Game Code and is a major omission.

- The Summit Engineering water report states that drawdown of local groundwater of up to 15 feet may occur due to project implementation (p.8). This level of groundwater depletion has a high risk of dewatering and eliminating the current jurisdictional wetlands onsite that are immediately adjacent to the cultivation areas and groundwater pumps, leading to a loss of wetland habitat subject to Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) and/or Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) jurisdiction. The water report **must** be revised to take into account potential impacts to adjacent jurisdictional wetlands. Without mitigation for the potential loss of wetland habitat due to groundwater depletion, this project would be in violation of the California Environmental Quality Act, the California Water Code, the Regional Water Quality Control Board *Cannabis* General Order, as well as the Federal Clean Water Act. The lack of consideration of the impact of water table drawdown on wetlands subject to ACOE and/or RWQCB jurisdiction is a major omission.

- As shown in the Summit Engineering grading plans, numerous watercourse crossings are proposed to be built or reconstructed, the road leading to the site is proposed to be graded and widened, and cultivation areas that are known chemical and sediment sources are proposed to be located immediately adjacent to jurisdictional wetlands and watercourses. Despite this, there is no Stormwater Pollution & Prevention Plan (SWPPP) provided that would specify how the applicant proposes to keep sediment and contaminants out of these watercourses and wetlands and prevent them from entering Highland Reservoir. A Stormwater Pollution & Prevention Plan (SWPPP) or similar plan **must** be prepared for a project with this many potential impacts to water quality. Implementing a project without any such plan would be in violation of the Federal Clean Water Act and/or the California Water Code and is a major omission.

- No mention is made in the AES report of potential impacts and recommended mitigation measures to prevent take of birds and wildlife and their habitat due to lighting or noise, and not considering these factors would be a violation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Noise and light impacts on wildlife **must** be included in any CEQA-level review. The lack of consideration of light and noise impacts, essential tenets of all CEQA-level reviews, is a major omission.

- The Pinecrest memo dated May 3, 2021, states that cultivation should be limited to the south parcel and that wetlands in the north parcels should be restored and feral pig control measures adopted. These recommendations were ignored and not discussed in the AES report nor in any of the supporting documents.

Conclusion: In light of numerous errors and major factual omissions including potential violations of State and Federal law, we believe that the application must be denied. The existence of these many major errors and omissions also suggests deliberate obfuscation of the actual

environmental impacts of the project from the County and the public. At a minimum, to conform with State and Federal law, (1) a new Biological Assessment that meets current CEQA standards must be performed, (2) a protocol-level wetland delineation that meets current Army Corps of Engineers standards must be performed, (3) protocol-level rare plant surveys focused on chaparral areas that meet current California Department of Fish & Wildlife standards must be performed, (4) the water availability report must be revised to discuss the potential impacts to adjacent seasonal wetlands, and (5) a SWPPP must be prepared that describes potential discharge of sediment and pollutants to the watercourses and wetlands that are distributed throughout the site and measures to eliminate the possibility of such discharges from occurring.

Thank you for taking our concerns into consideration.

Donna Mackiewicz
Roberta Lyons
Redbud Audubon Society Conservation Committee

Hello Mr. Herzog,

There is a portion of your parcel that is incorporated into this project; a fifty foot public roadway and utility easement, is listed on the map you provided. The applicant is proposing PG&E utility lines within the easement, not cannabis cultivation. I have availability to meet with you in person, here at CDD or via phone call. Please advise if you would like to speak with me pertaining to this project's proposed development. Have a wonderful day!

Thank you,



Mary Claybon, MSML

Associate Planner

Community Development Department

255 N. Forbes St.

Lakeport, CA 95453

Phone: (707) 263-2221

Fax: (707) 263-2225

Email: Mary.Claybon@lakecountyca.gov

Hello

My name is Doug Herzog. I live on 7106 Amber ridge ct.lakeport.

I have concerns about power polls on amber ridge ct.

I have livestock & a family farm (business) adjacent to the road. Also our water main runs along side the road.

As far as the north western cultivation site that is partially on our property (see enclosed map). My family has paid property taxes for 32 years on this parcel.

I have spent 10 years clearing, developing a spring and grass seeding for cattle that i will graze this year.

All of the clearing on amber ridge ct. And rd.

That is on our property I also spent my time clearing with a chainsaw.

I can bring in the maps tomorrow if you want.

Thanks,

Doug Herzog