# TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION 

Project Title: Derum; Use Permit (UP 18-20); Initial Study (IS 18-24); Early Activation (EA 18-13)

Project Location: 13505 \& 13605 Seigler Canyon Road, Lower Lake, CA

## APN No.: 012-004-28 and 64

Project Description: Approval of up to 22,000 s.f. of outdoor Commercial Cannabis grow site via Use Permit (UP) 18-20; Initial Study (IS) 18-24, and Early Activations (EA) 18-13. The two parcels contain one dwelling unit (APN 64), a 20' x $20^{\prime}$ building to be used for drying the plants post-harvest; two 2500 gallon water tanks, and several smaller out buildings. Annual water use is estimated to be $1,600,000$ gallons according to the applicant. The parcel is accessible through an existing unimproved County road, Seigler Canyon Drive. In addition to the dwelling, the project site is currently developed with a graveled access road, a site for medicinal cannabis cultivation enclosed by a 6 foot chain link fence and steel gate with a combination lock. There are no mapped sensitive species on the site. The site is not in a flood plain.

The public review period for the respective proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration based on Initial Study IS 18-24 will begin on October 5, 2018 and end on November 4, 2018. You are encouraged to submit written comments regarding the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration. You may do so by submitting written comments to the Planning Division prior to the end of the review period. Copies of the application, environmental documents, and all reference documents associated with the project are available for review through the Community Development Department, Planning Division; telephone (707) 263-2221. Written comments may be submitted to the Planning Division or via email at eric.porter@lakecountyca.gov.


# CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM INITIAL STUDY IS 18-24 

1. Project Title:
2. Permit Number:

Specialty Tokes

Major Use Permit, UP 18-20
Early Activation, EA 18-13
Initial Study, IS 18-24
3. Lead Agency Name and Address: County of Lake Community Development Department Courthouse - 255 North Forbes Street Lakeport CA 95453
4. Contact Person:
5. Project Location(s):
6. Project Sponsor's Name/Address:
7. General Plan Designation:
8. Zoning:
9. Supervisor District:
10. Flood Zone:
11. Slope:
12. Fire Hazard Severity Zone:
13. Earthquake Fault Zone: None
14. Dam Failure Inundation Area: None
15. Parcel Sizes (based on GIS data):

Richard Derum
PO Box 1172
Lower Lake, CA 95457
Eric Porter, Associate Planner (707) 263-2221
13505 \& 13605 Seigler Cyn Road, Lower Lake, CA APN: 012-004-28 and 64

Rural Lands
"RL" Rural Lands
District Five (5) - APN: 012-004-28
District One (1) - APN: 012-004-64
None
Moderate to Steep
High Fire Severity Zone

APN 012-004-28: $\quad 19.85$ acres
APN: 012-004-64: $\quad 57.32$ acres
16. 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. Attach additional sheets if necessary).


Commercial cannabis Type III grow operation. The project site, known as Specialty Tokes, is located in a rural area of the County and is approximately $77+$ acres in size. The parcel is accessible through an existing unimproved County road, Seigler Canyon Drive. The project site is currently developed with a graveled access road, a single-family residence served by an existing onsite septic system and existing well(s), an existing site for medicinal cannabis cultivation enclosed by a foot chain link fence and steel gate with a combination lock.

The applicant is requesting approval of a Major Use Permit to obtain the following license for the Cultivation of Commercial Cannabis:

- One Type 3 Cultivation License [outdoor cultivation for adult use cannabis without the use of light deprivation and/or artificial lighting in the canopy area] from 10,001 square feet to one acre, inclusive, of total canopy size on two contiguous parcels (APNs 012-004-28 and 64). The proposed grow area will be fully enclosed with a 6 ' tall chain link fence, metal gates and security locks, and the site and growing facility will be protected by security surveillance cameras. Security is discussed later in this Initial Study.

The two parcels contain one dwelling unit (APN 64), a well, a 20' $\times 20^{\prime}$ building to be used for drying the plants post-harvest; two 2500 gallon water tanks, and several smaller out buildings. There is an existing medicinal grow area that contains up to 48 plants. Annual water use is estimated to be $1,600,000$ gallons according to the applicant.

## 17. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:

North, East and South: RL 'Rural Land.' Parcel sizes generally range from 80 to 160 acres. Most are undeveloped, although there are several residences located to the southeast of the subject site.

West: APZ ‘Agricultural Preserve'. Approximately 600 and 60 acres (2 parcels) respectively; semi developed with a vineyard.

Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., Permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

Lake County Community Development Department<br>Lake County Department of Environmental Health<br>Lake County Air Quality Management District<br>Lake County Department of Public Works<br>Lake County Department of Public Services<br>Lake County Agricultural Commissioner<br>Lake County Sheriff Department<br>Kelseyville Fire Protection District<br>Central Valley Water Resource Control<br>California Department of Forestry \& Fire Protection (Calfire)<br>California Department of Cannabis Control<br>California Department of Food and Agriculture<br>California Department of Pesticides Regulations<br>California Department of Public Health<br>California Department of Consumers Affairs

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．

| $\square$ | Aesthetics | $\square$ | Greenhouse Gas Emissions | $\square$ | Population／Housing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ | Agriculture \＆Forestry | $\square$ | Hazards \＆Hazardous Materials | $\square$ | Public Services |
| ® | Air Quality | $\square$ | Hydrology／Water Quality | $\square$ | Recreation |
| $\square$ | Biological Resources | $\square$ | Land Use／Planning | $\square$ | Transportation／Traffic |
| 区 | Cultural Resources | $\square$ | Mineral Resources | 区 | Tribal Cultural Resources |
| $\square$ | Geology／Soils | 】 | Noise | $\square$ | Utilities／Service Systems |
| ® | Mandatory Findings of Significance |  |  |  |  |

## DETERMINATION：（To be completed by the lead Agency）

On the basis of this initial evaluation：
$\square \quad$ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment，and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared．
$\boxtimes \quad$ 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．
$\square \quad$ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment，and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required．
$\square \quad$ 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．
$\square \quad$ 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：
Eric Porter，Associate Planner


Date： $10 \cdot 1 \cdot 18$
SIGNATURE
Michalyn DelValle－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. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I. AESTHETICS <br> Would the project: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? |  |  | X |  | The subject site is located in a rural area of the County. The actual grow site is protected by the natural topography of the landscape, and is located on a hilltop. The 77 acre site has slopes that range from less than $10 \%$ to greater than $30 \%$. The property and grow site are accessible from an on-site gravel driveway that accesses Seigler Canyon Road, an unpaved County road. The grow site is situated in a manner that would not obstruct views of the natural features and scenic resources in the area, which is consistent with County policies for preserving scenic resources. Also, the topography and natural vegetation would act as a natural screen. Impacts are less than significant | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,9, \\ & 38 \end{aligned}$ |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? |  |  | X |  | See Section I(a) above. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,9, \\ & 35,38 \end{aligned}$ |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? |  |  | X |  | The project parcel and more particularly the grow site are shielded from view by existing vegetation and topography along Seigler Canyon Road. Therefore, the proposed use would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and surrounding area. Less Than Significant. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,6,9, \\ & 38 \end{aligned}$ |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? |  |  | X |  | The project is not anticipated to create additional light or glare. The structures proposed are small and innocuous. If the applicant wishes to install outdoor lighting at a future date, the applicant must adhere to the Lake County Dark Skies lighting policy. Less Than Significant. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,9, \\ & 38 \end{aligned}$ |
| II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES <br> 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. <br> Would the project: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 site has not been used for agricultural uses in the past other than a medicinal marijuana grow site. According to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program and the County's Soil Data Base, provided by the NRCS (National Resource Conservation Service), the site is suitable for use as 'Grazing land'. The land nearby immediately west of the site contains a vineyard. Land immediately east of the site contains no agricultural uses. No impacts to farmland would occur with construction of the proposed project. Less than Significant Impact. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,6,7, \\ & 8,11,16,38 \end{aligned}$ |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? |  |  | X |  | As proposed, the project will not impact agricultural uses or Williamson Act contracts. The project site is zoned "RL" Rural Lands and does not contain Williamson Act contracts. Uses surrounding the project site consist of developed parcels with a vineyard located in the "APZ" Agricultural Preserve Zone to the west, and "RL" Rural Land zoned properties that are mostly vacant to the north, east and south. Further, upon issuance of a Major Use Permit the proposed project would be in conformance with the Lake County Zoning Ordinance. Less than Significant Impact. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,6,7, \\ & 8,11,16,38 \end{aligned}$ |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { IMPACT } \\ & \text { CATEGORIES* } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section $12220(\mathrm{~g})$ ), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section $51104(\mathrm{~g})$ )? |  |  | X |  | As proposed, the project will not conflict with existing zoning for, and/or cause rezoning of forest lands and/or timberlands or timberlands in production. The parent parcel contains indigenous Blue and Valley Oak trees, but is not a significant timber source and has not been used for timber production in the past. The property is not zoned as a Timber Preserve, and has no Oak Conservation easements on it. Less than Significant Impact. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,6,7, \\ & 8,11,16,38 \end{aligned}$ |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? |  |  | X |  | See response to Section II (c). The project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. Less than Significant Impact. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,6,7 \\ & 8,11,16,38 \end{aligned}$ |
| 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 nonforest use? |  |  | X |  | As proposed, this project would not induce any other changes to existing Farmland that would result in its conversion to non-agricultural use. Less than Significant Impact. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,6,7 \\ & 8,11,16,38 \end{aligned}$ |

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.

Would the project:
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

The project has some potential to result in air quality impacts. The applicant indicates that one 12,000 s.f. outdoor cultivation site will be planted. Dust will be mitigated by gravel (existing), and on site water tanks. Odors however have not been mitigated and may be released as a result of the proposed cannabis growing operation. The nearest house is located about 1,100 feet to the south east of the grow site. The applicant has not specified how odors resulting from mature plants will be mitigated other than by air dispersal.

According to the Property Management Plan - Air Quality Management Plan the applicant would be using organic methods and preventative pest management strategies in order to help reduce the amount of air pollution and/or particulates.

Construction of the project would take place over a short period of time and would be temporary, which would not result in significant air quality impacts.

Additionally, implementation of mitigation measures below would further reduce air quality impacts to less than significant. Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation.

## Mitigation Measures:

AQ-1: Prior to obtaining the necessary permits and/or approvals for any phase, applicant shall contact the Lake County Air Quality Management District and obtain an Authority to Construct (A/C) Permit for all operations and for any diesel powered equipment and/or other equipment with potential for air emissions.

AQ-2: All Mobile diesel equipment used for construction and/or maintenance must be compliance with State registration requirements. Portable and stationary diesel powered equipment must meet the requirements of the State Air toxic Control Measures for $\mathbf{C I}$ engines.

AQ-3: Construction and/or work practices that involve masonry, gravel, grading activities, vehicular and fugitive dust shall be management by use of water or other acceptable dust palliatives to maintain two inches of visibly-moist soil in the project area and to ensure that dust does not leave the property.
$1,3,4,5,21$, 24, 36
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| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source <br> Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | AQ -4: The Cultivation of Commercial Cannabis is subject to AB 2588 Air Emission Inventory requirements administrated by the Lake County Air Quality Management District. Therefore, 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. Said information shall be made available upon request and/or the ability to provide the Lake County Air Quality Management District such information in order to complete an updated Air Toxic emission Inventory. <br> AQ-5: 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. <br> AO-6: All areas subject to semi-truck/trailer traffic shall be paved with asphaltic concrete or an all-weather surfacing to reduce fugitive dust generation. <br> AQ - 7: All areas subject to low use (driveways, over flow parking, etc.) shall be surfaced with gravel. Applicant shall regularly use and/or maintain graveled area to reduce fugitive dust generations. <br> AO - 8: The use of white rock is prohibited for any road surfacing, including parking areas as it breaks down and would create excessive dust. |  |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? |  | X |  |  | See Section III (a) above. Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated. <br> Mitigation: Implement MMs AQ-1 through AQ-8. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,21, \\ & 24,36 \end{aligned}$ |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under and applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? |  |  |  | X | The County of Lake is in attainment of state and federal ambient air quality standards. No Impact. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,21, \\ & 24,36 \end{aligned}$ |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? |  | X |  |  | Sensitive receptors in the area include near proximity residents. As described in Section III (a) above, with implementation of mitigation measures MMs AQ-1 through AQ-8, impacts are anticipated to be less than significant. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,21, \\ & 24,36 \end{aligned}$ |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? |  |  | X |  | The proposed use is Cultivation of Commercial Cannabis. The size of the grow area is comparatively small ( 22,000 s.f.), and should not generate significant objectionable odors or fugitive dust following site preparation. Dust generated during site preparation shall be mitigated by the use of water. With implementation of mitigation measures MMs AQ-1 through AQ-8 impacts are anticipated to be less than significant. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,21, \\ & 24,36 \end{aligned}$ |
| IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 Califormia Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? |  |  | X |  | A Biological Assessment was done by Natural Investigations (NI) in September 2017. NI queried the California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife's 'Threatened and Endangered Species' data base according to the PEIR submitted. No sensitive species were found in the site survey, however there are mapped Konocti Manzanita shown in the County's Sensitive Species data base. The area to be disturbed is located 600 feet from the edge of the mapped manzanita boundary. Less than Significant Impact. <br> Riparian Habitat: <br> There are no riparian habitats mapped on APN 012-004-64. Seigler Creek is on property under Mr. Derum's ownership, but will not be impacted by the grow site, which is to be located on APN 64. Less Than Significant Impact. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,11 \text {, } \\ & 12,13,16,29 \text {, } \\ & 33 \end{aligned}$ |
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| IMPACT <br> CATEGORIES* | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| b) Have a substantial adverse <br> effect on any riparian habitat or <br> other sensitive natural community <br> identified in local or regional <br> plans, policies, and regulations or <br> by the California Department of <br> Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and <br> Wildlife Service? |  |  |  |  |  |
| c) Have a substantial adverse <br> effect on federally protected <br> wetlands as defined by Section <br> 404 of the Clean Water Act <br> (including, not limited to, marsh, <br> vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through <br> direct removal, filling, <br> hydrological interruption, or other <br> means? |  |  |  |  |  |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { IMPACT } \\ & \text { CATEGORIES* } \end{aligned}$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | 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 Director. Should any human remains be encountered, they shall be treated in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. <br> MM CUL-2: Employees shall be trained in recognizing potentially significant artifacts that may be discovered during ground disturbance, and in who to notify should this occur. |  |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? |  | X |  |  | See Response to Section V (a). | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,11, \\ & 14,15 \end{aligned}$ |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? |  | X |  |  | See Response to Section V (a). | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,11, \\ & 14,15 \end{aligned}$ |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? |  | X |  |  | See Response to Section V (a). | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,11, \\ & 14,15 \end{aligned}$ |
| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS <br> Would the project: |  |  |  |  |  |  |

a) Expose people or structures to 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 AlquistPriolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
iv) Landslides?
) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

Earthquake Faults
The project site is not located within a mapped Earthquake Fault Zone as established by the California Geological Survey. The proposed project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects due to earthquakes based on the sizes and functions of the proposed use.

Seismic Ground Shaking and Seismic-Related Ground Failure including liquefaction.
This particular lot does not contain unstable soils or mapped faults. It appears unlikely that ground shaking, ground failure or liquefaction will occur on this property in the future.

Landslides
According to the Landslide Hazard Identification Map prepared by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, the project parcel soil is prone to erode and has a high shrink-swell character, but is not located within and/or adjacent to an existing known "landslide area".

According to the property Management Plan, some grading would occur on the property to enlarge the existing medicinal cannabis grow site to accommodate the proposed commercial grow area. The cannabis plants will help to anchor the soil in place on the terraced grow site, and the total area that will be graded and prepared for additional plants is relatively small at 22,000 square feet, or about $0.006 \%$ of the total site size.

Project design shall incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent possible to prevent or reduce discharge of all construction or post construction pollutants into the County storm drainage system. BMPs include scheduling of activities, erosion and sediment control, operation and maintenance procedures and other measures in accordance with Chapter 29 of the Lake County Code.

## Less than Significant

Grading needed for this major use permit will be minimal and well below the threshold for requiring a grading permit. The Skyhigh-Milsholm soil type (209) is prone to erosion, however the grow area is comparatively small, and the cannabis plants will help anchor the soil in place. The applicant has also indicated that wattles and other organic materials will be place on the outer boundary of the grow site to further prevent soil erosion.
$1,3,5,6,7$,
$10,17,18,19$,
$20,25,31,36$
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| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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.D.A., the actual grow site contains Type 209 soil ('Skyhigh-Millsholm loam', 15 to 50\% slope). This soil type is characterized by its proneness to erode and high shrinkswell potential. Given that the cultivation site is relatively small, located on a hilltop and will be planted with cannabis, there is little potential for landslide, subsidence, debris flows, liquefaction or collapse. The applicant has also indicated that wattles and other organic materials will be place on the outer boundary of the grow site to further prevent soil erosion. <br> Less Than Significant Impact | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,5,6,7 \\ & 10,17,18,19 \\ & 20,25,31,36 \end{aligned}$ |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? |  |  | X |  | The actual grow site contains Type 209 soil ('Skyhigh-Millsholm loam', 15 to $50 \%$ slope). This soil type is characterized by its proneness to erode and high shrink-swell potential. Other structures needed for this grow operation include fencing, a $20^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}$ ( 400 s.f.) processing room and a small shed. <br> Less Than Significant Impact. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,5,6,7 \\ & 10,17,18,19 \\ & 25,31,36 \end{aligned}$ |
| c) 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 will be served through an existing onsite septic system and well. <br> Less Than Significant Impact. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,5,6,7, \\ & 10,17,18,19, \\ & 25,31,36 \end{aligned}$ |

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:


| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | e. To prevent off-site drift, the applicant will be applying fertilizer in controlled environment, using the appropriate tools to minimize the risk. f. The applicant will not apply the fertilizer directly to the surface water and will spray only when wind is blowing away from the surface water bodies. g. The applicant will not apply the fertilizer if there is a risk of it reaching the surface water. <br> h. The applicant will not apply fertilizer within 100 ft of any spring, stream, edge of lake, wetland, or vernal pool. <br> According to the Property Management Plan - Pest Control, pesticides to be used will consist of food-grade Diatomaceous earth and citric acid. All pesticides will be stored in a secure building on site. Regarding rodenticide use, the Plan states: In accordance with CDPR guidance, under the CalCannabis Licensing Program cannabis cultivation operations are only allowed to use the following repellants in and around cannabis cultivation sites to protect their crops from rodent herbivory: capsicum oleoresin (consistent with the label), putrescent whole egg solids, and garlic. Because these are repellants and not rodenticides, they have no potential for secondary poisoning of non-target species. <br> 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 safety devices against the hazard of fire and explosion, and adequate firefighting and fire suppression equipment. <br> All equipment shall be maintained and operaled 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 Impact. |  |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? |  |  | X |  | See Response to Section VIII (a). Less than Significant Impact. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,5,12,13, \\ & 16,20,21,24, \\ & 29,31,32,36 \end{aligned}$ |
| 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 | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,5,12,13, \\ & 16,20,21,24, \\ & 29,31,32,36 \end{aligned}$ |
| 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 project site is not listed as a site containing hazardous materials in the databases maintained by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), California Department of Toxic Substance, and Control State Resources Water Control Board. Less Than Significant Impact. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,5,12,13, \\ & 16,21,24,29, \\ & 31,32,36 \end{aligned}$ |
| 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 for people residing or working in the project area? |  |  |  | X | The project is not located within two (2) miles of a public use airport and/or within an Airport Land Use Plan. No Impact | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,5,12,13, \\ & 16,21,24,29, \\ & 31,32,36 \end{aligned}$ |
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| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? |  |  | X |  | Project is located just under 2 miles from a private airstrip. The positioning of the landing strip is such that no 'low flyovers' on the subject site will not occur. Less than Significant Impact. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,5,12,13, \\ & 16,20,21,24, \\ & 29,31,32,36 \end{aligned}$ |
| g) 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. Less Than Significant Impact. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,5,12,13, \\ & 16,20,21,23, \\ & 24,29,31,32, \\ & 36,37 \end{aligned}$ |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? |  |  | X |  | The project site is located in a Severe Fire Hazard Area (State Responsibility Area). The applicant will adhere to all Federal, State and local fire requirements/regulations. Less Than Significant Impact. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,5,12,13, \\ & 16,20,21,23, \\ & 24,29,31,32, \\ & 36,37 \end{aligned}$ |

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:


| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site? |  |  |  |  | According to the Property Management Plan - Storm Water Management Plan, the proposed use would protect downstream water bodies from water quality by implementing measures to prevent potential of contamination from fertilizers and chemicals and using best management practices. The applicant is proposing wattles and organic barriers around the outer perimeter of the grow area to prevent and minimize rainwater runoff into the watershed. <br> The permit holder shall protect all disturbed areas by applying BMPs, which may include the placement of straw, mulch, seeding, straw wattles, and silt fencing and planting of native vegetation on all disturbed areas to prevent erosion. Therefore, proposed use would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area. Less than significant. | 34 |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on-site or off-site? |  |  | X |  | The project site is not located within a flood zone; construction of the project will not induce flooding on-site or off-site. Less than Significant | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,12, \\ & 13,16,29,33 \\ & 34 \end{aligned}$ |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? |  |  | X |  | The project site is marginally developed with a medicinal cannabis grow site, a dwelling, and several out buildings. The project does not propose to create a substantial amount of additional impermeable surfaces, therefore the project would not create a substantial amount of additional run-off and impacts would be less than significant. Lake County Water Resources and Environmental Health were notified of this action and had no adverse comments. The applicant will be required to comply with all federal, state and local regulations pertaining to erosion and storm water as applicable. Less Than Significant | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,12, \\ & 13,16,29,33, \\ & 34 \end{aligned}$ |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? |  |  | X |  | The applicant shall adhere to all Federal, State and Local regulations regarding water quality and usage. Less Than Significant. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,12, \\ & 13,16,29,33, \\ & 34 \end{aligned}$ |
| g) Place housing within a $100-$ year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? |  |  |  | X | The project is not located within a 100 -year flood zone. No Impact | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,12, \\ & 13,16,29,33, \\ & 34 \end{aligned}$ |
| h) Place within a 100 -year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? |  |  |  | X | See Response in Section IX (g). No Impact | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,12, \\ & 13,16,29,33, \\ & 34 \end{aligned}$ |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? |  |  |  | X | The project parcel is not located within a flood zone. No Impact | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,12, \\ & 13,16,29,33, \\ & 34 \end{aligned}$ |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? |  |  | X |  | The project site is not located in an area of potential inundation by seiche or tsunami. The soil on the grow site is 209 , 'Skyhigh-Millsholm loam, 15 to $50 \%$ slope. This soil type is prone to shrink-swell and to high erosion. The cannabis plants will help to anchor the soil in the grow location. The surrounding area is heavily vegetated, and the grow site, albeit terraced, is on a relatively flat portion of the knoll on the hilltop, further reducing the likelihood of a mudflow occurring on the property. Additional mitigation measures do not appear to be necessary. Less than Significant | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,12, \\ & 13,16,29,33, \\ & 34 \end{aligned}$ |

## X. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:

| a) Physically divide an <br> established community? |  |  | X | The proposed project site would not physically divide an established <br> community. Less Than Significant | $1,3,4,5,20$, <br> $27,28,35$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? |  |  | X |  | This project is not inconsistent with the Lake County General Plan, The Lower Lake Area Plan and the Lake County Zoning Ordinance, and most significantly with Ordinance 3073, which established the rules for commercial cannabis cultivation within Lake County. The following policies apply to this application: <br> Lake County General Plan, Section 3.2 Land Use Designations <br> The General Plan Land Use Designation is "Rural Lands-Resource Conservation." <br> The purpose of Rural Lands is to allow rural development in areas that are primarily in their natural state and allows some agricultural production. This category is appropriate for areas that are remote or characterized by steep topography, fire hazards, and limited access. <br> - Typical uses permitted by right include, but are not limited to, animal raising, crop production, single family residences, game preserves and fisheries. Other typical uses permitted conditionally include, but are not limited to, recreational facilities, manufacturing and processing operations, mining, and airfields. These lands also provide important groundwater recharge functions. As watershed lands, these lands function to collect precipitation and provide for important filtering of water to improve water quality. They are generally supportive to the management of the natural infrastructure of the watersheds, and are located outside of Community Growth Boundaries. <br> The purpose of Resource Conservation designated land is to assure the maintenance or sustained generation of natural resources within the County. The highest priority for these lands is to provide for the management of the County's natural infrastructure. This management should include, but is not limited to functioning as watershed lands, which collects precipitation and provide for the important filtering of water to improve water quality. In addition, these lands provide important ground water recharge capabilities which is critical to the maintenance of the natural ecosystems and to providing a sustainable ground water supply for the County. Typical uses permitted by right include, but are not limited to resource utilization through a conditional use permit. <br> Section 3.9 Economic Development <br> Goal LU-6: "To maintain a healthy and diverse local economy that meets the present and future employment, shopping, recreational, and service needs of lake County residents". <br> - Policy LU 6.1: "The County shall actively promote the development of a diversified economic base by continuing to promote agriculture, recreation services and commerce and by expanding its efforts to encourage industrial and non-industrial corporate developments, and the developments of geothermal resources". <br> The proposed Commercial Cannabis Operation, would create diversity within the local economy, create future employment opportunities for local residents and allow access to commercial cannabis products. <br> Lower Lake Area Plan <br> The Lower Lake Area Plan does not regulate cannabis grow operations. <br> Lake County Zoning Ordinance. <br> - A Major Use Permit shall be obtained for the proposed use. On May 15, 2018, the applicant has submitted Major Use Permit, UP 18-20. The applicant also applied for Early Activation and for an Initial Study (this document). <br> - The applicant shall adhere to all incorporated Mitigation Measures, including all Conditions of Approval. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,8, \\ & 20,21,22,27, \\ & 33,34 \end{aligned}$ |
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| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source <br> Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Property Management Plan <br> The applicant(s), including staff/employees shall adhere to all aspects discussed in the Property Management Plan for this property. <br> Less than Significant. |  |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? |  |  |  | X | This project is not located within the boundaries of a habitat or natural community conservation plan. No Impact | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,8, \\ & 21,22,27,33, \\ & 34 \end{aligned}$ |
| XI. MINERAL RESOURCES <br> Would the project: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 | The County's Aggregate Resource Management Plan (ARMP) does not identify this project as having an important source of aggregate. No Impact | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,7, \\ & 26 \end{aligned}$ |
| 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 | The County of Lake General Plan, the Lower Lake Area Plan nor the Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan designates the project site as being a locally important mineral resource recovery site. No Impact | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,7, \\ & 26 \end{aligned}$ |
| XII. NOISE <br> Would the project result in: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels 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 to uncomfortable levels could be expected during project grading and/or construction, and potentially through the use of certain emergency generators. The applicant is proposing to use gasoline power generators as an emergency backup power source. Specifications on the generators must be provided to Lake County Planning Department; noise levels generated that exceed the County's noise standards (daytime and nighttime) shall be mitigated to acceptable levels. Less Than Significant with the following Mitigation Measures added: <br> NOI-1: 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. <br> NOI -2: Maximum non-construction related sounds levels shall not exceed levels of 55 dBA between the hours of 7:00AM to 10:00PM and 45 Dba between the hours of $10: 00 \mathrm{PM}$ to 7:00AM within residential areas as specified within Zoning Ordinance Section 21-41.11 (Table 11.1) at the property lines. <br> NOI -3: The operation of the Heating and Ventilation Units and Generators shall not exceed levels of 57 dBA between the hours of 7:00AM to 10:00PM and 50 dBA from 10:00PM to 7:00AM within residential areas as specified within Zoning Ordinance Section 21-41.11 (Table 11.2); the noise levels are measured at the property lines. | 1,3, 4, 5 |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of 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. Less Than Significant | 1,3, 4, 5 |


| $\begin{gathered} \text { IMPACT } \\ \text { CATEGORIES* } \end{gathered}$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? |  |  | X |  | No permanent increases in ambient noise levels will occur with this project. A small amount of infrequent noise could be anticipated if the proposed backup power generator is activated during any power outage or during generator testing, but these impacts would not be significant or long lasting. Implementation of NOI-1 through NOI-3 would reduce impacts to Less than Significant. | 1, 3, 4, 5 |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? |  |  | X |  | During construction, a temporary increase in noise is expected. Mitigation measures have been incorporated that will limit the short-term impacts of noise associated with the project. Implementation of NOI-1 through NOI-3 would reduce impacts to Less than Significant. | 1,3,4,5 |
| 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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? |  |  |  | X | Project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport. No Impact | 1,3,4,5 |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? |  |  | X |  | Project is located about 9100 feet from a private airstrip. The orientation of the airstrip is such that landings and takeoffs would not impact the subject site. Less than Significant Impact | 1, 3, 4, 5 |

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:

| a) Induce substantial population <br> growth in an area, either directly <br> (for example, by proposing new <br> homes and businesses) or <br> indirectly (for example, through <br> extension of roads or other <br> infrastructure)? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| b) Displace substantial numbers <br> of existing housing, necessitating <br> the construction of replacement <br> housing elsewhere? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c) Displace substantial numbers is not anticipated to induce population growth. No Impact <br> of people, necessitating the <br> construction of replacement <br> housing elsewhere? |  |  |  | No housing will be displaced as a result of the project. No Impact | $1,3,4,5$ |  |  |

## XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES <br> Would the project:

| a) Would the project result in <br> substantial adverse physical <br> impacts associated with the <br> provision of new or physically <br> altered governmental facilities, <br> need for new or physically altered <br> governmental facilities, the <br> construction of which could cause <br> significant environmental <br> impacts, in order to maintain <br> acceptable service ratios, response <br> times or other performance <br> objectives for any of the public <br> services: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| The project does not propose housing or other uses that would necessitate the <br> - Fire Protection? |  |  | Theed <br> need for new or altered government facilities. There will not be a need to <br> increase fire or police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities as a <br> result of the project's implementation. Less than Significant. |  |  |  |


| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - Schools? <br> - Parks? <br> - Other Public Facilities? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| XV. RECREATION <br> Would the project: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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 will not have any impacts on 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 will not necessitate the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities. No Impact | $1,3,4,5$ |
| XVI. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC <br> Would the project: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Contlict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and nonmotorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? |  |  | X |  | The project site is located on a parcel with slopes from approximately $10 \%$ or less, to greater than $30 \%$. The project site is accessible by Seigler Canyon Drive, an unpaved County public road, and the site is served by a gravel driveway that takes access from Seigler Canyon Drive. A minimal increase in traffic is anticipated due to construction, employees exiting and entering premises, routine maintenance and weekly and/or monthly incoming and outgoing deliveries. Lake County Public Works was notified of this action and had no adverse comments regarding traffic impacts. Less than Significant | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,9 \\ & 20,22,27,28, \\ & 35,37 \end{aligned}$ |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? |  |  | X |  | See Response to Section XVI (a). Less than Significant Impact. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,9 \\ & 20,22,27,28 \\ & 35,37 \end{aligned}$ |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks? |  |  |  | X | The project location is not located in the vicinity of any airfield. No Impact | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,9, \\ & 20,22,27,28, \\ & 35,37 \end{aligned}$ |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? |  |  |  | X | Seigler Canyon Drive that serves this location is an unpaved public County road. The additional trips generated by this use are anticipated to be similar to those generated from a single family dwelling, and no changes to this public road are proposed. Therefore, this project would not increase hazards at the project site. No Impact | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,9 \\ & 20,22,27,28, \\ & 35,37 \end{aligned}$ |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? |  |  |  | X | As proposed, this project will not impact existing emergency access. No Impact | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,9 \\ & 20,22,35,37 \end{aligned}$ |


| IMPACT <br> CATEGORIES* | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source <br> Number** |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| f) Conflict with adopted <br> policies, plans, or programs <br> regarding public transit, bicycle, <br> or pedestrian facilities, or <br> otherwise decrease the <br> performance or safety of such <br> facilities? |  |  |  | $\mathbf{X}$ | The only parking associated with the project would be for the applicant and his <br> 4 employees, however only two employees are to work in any given shift. The <br> property has ample room for parking near the residence. If the applicant did <br> need additional parking, there is adequate parking available throughout the <br> project parcel. No Impact | $1,3,4,5,9$, <br> $20,22,27,28$, <br> 35,3 |

XVII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

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:

| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the Califomia Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section $5020.1(\mathrm{k})$, or | X |  | The applicant has done a Cultural / Anthropological Study on the affected portion of the subject site. The Study yielded no significant findings; the author, Dr. John Parker, summarized the study by saying it was very unlikely that any significant artifacts or other significant cultural items would be present on the site. Regardless, a standard mitigation measure requires the notification of the overseeing Tribe and contacting a licensed Archeologist of any Native American artifacts or remains are found. <br> Implementation of CUL-1 and CUL-2 would reduce impacts to Less than Significant. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,11, \\ & 14,15 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 XVII. <br> Implementation of CUL-1 and CUL-2 would reduce impacts to Less than Significant. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,11 \\ & 14,15 \end{aligned}$ |

## XVIII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:

| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? |  | X |  | The subject parcel is served by an existing well and septic system. The applicant shall adhere to all Federal, State and Local regulations regarding wastewater treatment and water usage requirements. Less Than Significant | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,7, \\ & 13,16,21,24, \\ & 25,26,29,31, \\ & 32,33 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? |  | X |  | According to the plan, the proposed grow site is anticipated to use a monthly rate ranging from 50,000 gallons of water (June and October), to 119,000 gallons of water (July) to irrigate the plants. Environmental Health and Water Resources were notified of this activity and had no adverse comments on the proposal. <br> Less than significant | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,7, \\ & 13,16,21,24, \\ & 25,26,29,31, \\ & 32,33 \end{aligned}$ |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? |  | X |  | The disturbed area will be about 20,000 square feet. The existing grow site from the Self Certification process approved in 2017 is about 20,000 square feet in gross area. The increase in disturbed area is small given the overall size of the property ( 57 acres, or about $2 \%$ of the total lot size for the portion of land located south of Seigler Canyon Drive). Less Than Significant | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,7, \\ & 13,16,21,24 \text {, } \\ & 25,26,29,31 \text {, } \\ & 32,33 \end{aligned}$ |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? |  | X |  | Environmental Health and Water Resources were notified of this activity and had no adverse comments on the proposal. Less Than Significant | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,7, \\ & 13,16,21,24, \\ & 25,26,29,31, \\ & 32,33 \end{aligned}$ |


| IMPACT CATEGORIES* | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | All determinations need explanation. <br> Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence. | Source Number** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| e) 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 |  | Environmental Health and Water Resources were notified of this activity and had no adverse comments on the proposal. Less Than Significant | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,7, \\ & 13,16,21,24, \\ & 25,26,29,31, \\ & 32,33 \end{aligned}$ |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? |  |  | X |  | The existing landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. <br> According to the Property Management Plan - Waste Management Plan has been developed to help minimize the generation of waste and for the proper disposal of waste produced during the cultivation and processing of cannabis at the project site. The goal is to prevent the release of hazardous waste into the environment, minimize the generation of cannabis vegetative waste and dispose of cannabis vegetative waste properly, and manage growing medium and dispose of growing medium properly. All employees are required to follow the procedures outlined in this plan. Any deviations from this plan must be immediately brought to the attention of Director of Cultivation. <br> Less than Significant. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,7, \\ & 13,16,21,24, \\ & 25,26,29,31, \\ & 32,33 \end{aligned}$ |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? |  |  |  | X | All requirements related to solid waste will apply to this project. The solid waste provider, South Lake Disposal, does not have capacity issues. Further, this use is not expected to generate much solid waste, and no adverse comments have been received for this proposal. Less than Significant. | $\begin{aligned} & 1,3,4,5,7, \\ & 13,16,21,24, \\ & 25,26,29,31 \text {, } \\ & 32,33 \end{aligned}$ |
| XIX. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habilat 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, 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 |  |  | The project proposes a Cultivation of Commercial cannabis in previously disturbed area. As proposed, this project is not anticipated to significantly impact habitat of fish and/or wildlife species or cultural resources with the incorporated mitigation measures described above. | 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, and the effects of probable future projects)? |  | X |  |  | Potentially significant impacts have been identified related to Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Hazards \& Hazardous Materials, Noise, and Tribal Cultural Resources. These impacts in combination with the impacts of other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects could cumulatively contribute to significant effects on the environment. Implementation of and compliance with mitigation measures identified in each section as project conditions of approval would avoid or reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels and would not result in cumulatively considerable environmental impacts. | All |
| 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 potential to result in adverse indirect or direct effects on human beings. In particular, to Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Hazards \& Hazardous Materials, Noise, and Tribal Cultural Resources have the potential to impact human beings. Implementation of and compliance with mitigation measures identified in each section as conditions of approval would not result in substantial adverse indirect or direct effects on human beings and impacts would be considered less than significant. | All |
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