



COUNTY OF LAKE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
Planning Division
Courthouse - 255 N. Forbes Street
Lakeport, California 95453
Telephone 707/263-2221 FAX 707/263-2225

Dated: August 2, 2019


**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
INITIAL STUDY IS 18-18**

1. **Project Title:** Fiore Dulce / Bob Lipari
2. **Permit Number:** Minor Use Permit, MUP 18-14
Initial Study, IS 18-18
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of Lake
Community Development Department
Courthouse – 255 North Forbes Street
Lakeport CA 95453
4. **Contact Person:** Eric Porter, Associate Planner (707) 263-2221
5. **Project Location(s):** 21715 Jerusalem Grade Road, Middletown, CA 95461
APN: 013-013-49
6. **Project Sponsor's Name/Address:** Bob Lipari
PO Box 152
Middletown, CA 95461
7. **General Plan Designation:** Rural Lands
8. **Zoning:** "RL"; Rural Lands
9. **Supervisor District:** District One (1)
10. **Flood Zone:** None, but site contains a seasonal creek
11. **Slope:** Steep; over 30% for most of the site
12. **Fire Hazard Severity Zone:** SRA (entire site); Extremely High
13. **Earthquake Fault Zone:** None
14. **Dam Failure Inundation Area:** Not located within Dam Failure Inundation Area
15. **Parcel Size:** 142.31 Acres

Attachment 6

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).

General. Bob Lipari, proprietor of Fiore Dulce, LLC proposes to develop a commercial cannabis cultivation operation at 21715 Jerusalem Grade Road, Middletown, California on Lake County APN 013-013-49 (Project Property), composed of an **M – Type 2 “Small Outdoor”** medicinal cultivation area with a **total cultivation area of 10,000 square feet (s.f.; 100' x 100' in total size).**



Site Preparation. The applicant was approved for ‘early activation’ on June 11, 2019. Early activation allows some site work to occur, provided no grading over 50 cubic yards or building permits are required. The relatively small cultivation site (100' x 100') will be enclosed by a fence, which does not require a building or grading permit. Some minor grading will occur to level the dirt within the enclosure area. 75 cubic yards of high quality dirt will be imported onto the site. Fertilizer imported to the site includes 100 cubic feet of steer manure, 50 cubic feet of chicken manure, and 50 cubic feet of worm casings.

Site construction and preparation is expected to take up to one month following approval of the use permit and adoption of this Initial Study by the Lake County Planning Commission. The ‘staging area’ for site preparation equipment will be near the cultivation site, and will occur on previously-disturbed soil. The applicant has provided data on site clean-up in the event of a spill or other unplanned disturbance, which would occur immediately if necessary.

The ±142 acre Rural Lands-zoned Project Property is located approximately two miles southeast of the Hidden Valley Reservoir and development, but is not within the mapped dam inundation area. Current and past land uses for the area of the proposed commercial cannabis cultivation operation are/were rural residential, timber harvesting and agricultural uses. The proposed commercial cannabis cultivation operation will be located in an area that was used previously for Article 72 Medicinal Cannabis Cultivation.




Aerial Photo of Site and Immediate Vicinity

Cultivation. The proposed cannabis cultivation area and associated facilities are accessed via existing Jerusalem Grade Road, and unpaved County road. The proposed outdoor cultivation method is via an above ground organic soil mixture in fabric pots (“smart pots”) with drip irrigation systems in full sun. The proposed cultivation area will be surrounded by a 6-foot tall wire fence with privacy mesh where necessary to screen the cultivation areas from public view. Ancillary facilities include a groundwater well, five additional 2,500-gallon water storage tanks, and a 12’ x 16’ shed for chemical, fertilizer and pesticide storage.

As previously stated, the **M – Type 2 “Small Outdoor”** medicinal cultivation area will have a **total cultivation area of 10,000 square feet (s.f.; 100’ x 100’ in total size)**. According to the application material submitted, the total canopy area will be 2,400 square feet in size (see graphic below; canopy area appears to be larger than the 2,400 s.f. projected by the applicant). Annual estimated water usage is 65,000 gallons, and water will be stored in two 5,000 gallon water tanks, already present on site. The applicant is proposing portable toilets and a portable hand-wash station. The cultivation site would be served by an existing well on the property. A copy of the well permit was submitted with the application material provided.

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

North, South, East and West: "RL" Rural Lands zoned property. Parcel sizes range 9.5 acres to over 150 acres. About half of the nearby properties contain dwellings. Two nearby lots contain orchards. See zoning map below.



Zoning Map of Site and Vicinity

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

Lake County Community Development Department
 Lake County Department of Environmental Health
 Lake County Air Quality Management District
 Lake County Department of Public Works
 Lake County Department of Public Services
 Lake County Agricultural Commissioner
 Lake County Sheriff Department
 South Lake County Fire Protection District (CalFire)
 Central Valley Water Resource Control
 California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection (CalFire)
California Department of Food and Agriculture (CalCannabis)
 California Department of Pesticides Regulations
 California Department of Public Health
 California Department of Consumers Affairs

Note: CalCannabis is the overseeing agency responsible for monitoring commercial cannabis cultivation throughout the State of California. The applicant must get approval from CalCannabis before on-site (permanent) cultivation can legally occur.

The environmental factors checked on the next page 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.

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Aesthetics</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Population / Housing</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Agriculture & Forestry</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Hazards & Hazardous Materials</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Public Services</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Air Quality</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Hydrology / Water Quality</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Recreation</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Biological Resources</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Land Use / Planning</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Transportation</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Cultural Resources</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Mineral Resources</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Tribal Cultural Resources</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Geology / Soils</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Noise</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Utilities / Service Systems</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Wildfire</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Energy</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <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:
Eric Porter, Associate Planner

S P A
SIGNATURE

Date: 8.2.19

Michalyn DelValle - Director
Community Development Department

Reviewed By: (BT)

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		There are no scenic vistas on or adjacent to the subject site, and Jerusalem Grade Road is not mapped as a 'scenic corridor'. The project site is located on a property that is surrounded by dense vegetation; the topography and natural vegetation would act as a natural screen. The cultivation area is not visible from any adjacent lots or any public roads. No further mitigation measures are necessary to comply with this impact category. Impacts to scenic vistas would be less than significant	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 adjacent to the subject site. 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 occur on a portion of the site that had historically been used for cultivating medicinal cannabis. Minimal physical changes to the site are needed by this action. The site is not located within an urbanized area, and the site is not visible from any public property, including roads. Less Than Significant.	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 a slight potential to create additional light through exterior security lighting. A lighting plan showing fixture types and locations is required and shall meet the County's recommended darkskies.org lighting regulations. Less Than Significant with a mitigation measure added as follows: AES-1: An Outdoor Lighting Plan that meets the darkskies.org lighting recommendations shall be submitted for review and acceptance, or review and revision prior to cultivation.	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**
<p align="center">II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES</p> <p><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></p> <p align="center"><i>Would the project:</i></p>						
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 proposed site does not contain prime or unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance. The project site contains soil that is mapped as "Grazing Land" and "Farmland of Local Importance". There is one adjacent property that is actively growing crops; other adjacent and nearby properties are naturally vegetated with native oak and manzanita shrubs, as well as other indigenous flora. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?			X		The northern neighboring lot contains agricultural uses (a Walnut orchard), however this proposal will have no impact to the neighboring property's ability to continue with the agricultural uses on their site. The subject site is not under a Williamson Act contract. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13
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 project site is zoned "RL" Rural Lands and is not zoned for forestland or timberland, nor has it been used historically for timber production. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13
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. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13
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	As proposed, this project would not induce changes to existing farmland that would result in its conversion to non-agricultural use. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13
<p align="center">III. AIR QUALITY</p> <p><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></p> <p align="center"><i>Would the project:</i></p>						
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		X			The project has some potential to result in short- and long-term air quality impacts. Lake County is designated as an 'Air Attainment Area', and there are no thresholds for adverse air quality levels that result from a project. It is likely that some dust and fumes may be released as a result of site preparation / construction of the cultivation area (although the cultivation area generally exists and was previously used for medicinal marijuana cultivation). Some vehicular traffic, including small delivery vehicles would be contributors during and after site preparation / construction; trips generated by the use will be minimal, estimated at 4 to 8 average daily trips. Odors generated by the plants, particularly during harvest season, will need to be mitigated either through passive means (separation	1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 21, 24, 31, 36

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p>distance), or active means (Odor Control Plan), which will consist of planting fragrant plant material on the outer boundary of the cultivation site, and potentially by other means at the discretion of the applicant.</p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures added:</p> <p>AQ-1: Prior to obtaining the necessary permits and/or approvals for any phase, applicant shall contact the Lake County Community Development Department, and is required to submit an Odor Control Plan for review and approval or revision prior to the public hearing.</p> <p>AQ-2: All mobile diesel equipment used must 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.</p> <p>AQ-3: 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.</p>	
b) Violate any air quality standard or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in an existing or projected air quality violation?			X		<p>The County of Lake is in attainment of state and federal ambient air quality standards. The cultivation site is already prepared and has been used over the past few years as a medical marijuana cultivation site, so very little additional site disturbance will be needed. There is one other cultivation site within one mile of this property; the cumulative impact to air quality from both sites (during and after construction) will not be significant, provided proper dust mitigation measures are taken, particularly from the other site.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact.</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 21, 24, 31, 36
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X		<p>The nearest sensitive receptor is a dwelling located over 1,200 feet to the northeast of the cultivation site. This house is located downwind from prevailing wind direction, however this area is characterized by steep terrain and significant vegetation, both of which will help to diffuse some of the odors resulting from the cultivation site. There is a possibility of some odors being noticed by this neighboring dwelling, particularly during harvest time. The separation distance is significant, and the required Odor Control Plan has the potential to reduce the amount of airborne odors that would result. Less than Significant Impact</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 21, 24, 31, 36

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
d) Result in substantial emissions (such as odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?		X			This area is sparsely populated, thereby limiting the potential impacts to neighboring properties. The nearest off-premises house is about 1200 feet away to the northeast measured from the edge of the cultivation area. Odor control measures will be necessary for the cultivation areas, including the outdoor portion of the site used for cannabis cultivation. The cultivation areas are site back a significant distance from the nearest off-site dwellings, so passive odor control (separation distance) may be adequate for the outdoor cultivation area. The applicant has an emergency contact name and number that will be distributed to neighbors within 1000 feet of the property as is required by Community Development Department. As described in Section III (a) above, with implementation of mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-3 will reduce impacts to less than significant.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 21, 24, 31, 36
IV. 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		The applicant provided a Biological Assessment, prepared by Natural Investigations, Inc., (Sacramento, CA), dated March 5, 2018. No mitigation measures were recommended within the 'Initial Study' prepared by Natural Investigations. There are no mapped sensitive or special status species on the site; therefore no specific biologic mitigation measures are recommended. Less than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 21, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34
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		The Biological Assessment provided states that 'no mitigation measures are necessary for this proposal.' Based on this Biological Assessment, it appears that no adverse effects to a riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities will occur. Less than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34
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	The site contains no state or federally protected wetlands. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 21, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34
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		The Biological Assessment provided states that no Biological impacts will result from this proposal, including to migratory fish or wildlife. Less than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 21, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X		There are no Tree Conservation designations on the subject site. It appears that tree removal will be minimal, particularly because the cultivation area has previously been legally used for medicinal cannabis cultivation through County 'self certification program' that had been available through Zoning Ordinance Article 72 (now discontinued). Less than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 21, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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		There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans 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, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 21, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34
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			<p>A Cultural Resources Evaluation was conducted for the subject parcel involved with this proposal by 'Archeological Resource Service'. This survey yielded no specific results that would otherwise indicate that this is a site of <u>Tribal</u> significance, however the surveying archaeologist made several conclusions on early 1900s activity that occurred on the site, and made several recommendations that are listed below as mitigation measures CUL 3 to CUL 5. Mitigation measures CUL 1 and CUL 2 are typical within Lake County 'Conditions of Approval' as a safeguard for significant Tribal artifacts or remains during the course of site preparation and disturbance.</p> <p>CUL-1: Should any archaeological, paleontological, or cultural materials be discovered during site development, all activity shall be halted in the vicinity of the find(s), 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 Director. Should any human remains be encountered, they shall be treated in accordance with Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and with California Health and Safety Code section 7050.5.</p> <p>CUL-2: 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 local overseeing Tribe shall immediately be notified; a licensed archaeologist shall be notified, and the Lake County Community Development Director shall be notified of such finds.</p> <p>CUL 3: The structural remains of the former agricultural operation should be left undisturbed. Should any project propose to modify, remove or otherwise change the ruins of the former house and associated buildings and other structures, a complete state record form should be filed to record and fully describe the location.</p> <p>CUL 4: No further improvement that involves earth moving, excavation, trenching, or other changes in the present ground surface should be made to the spring area without the participation of an archeologist. Any artifacts for features located near the spring that are encountered during any earth disturbing operations should be properly recorded by an archaeologist, and appropriate recommendations for preservation or recovery made.</p> <p>CUL 5: The ditch should be left undisturbed. If any changes are made in the ditch area, the entire feature should be examined and its function determined. Following this process, appropriate recommendations should be made for the preservation of the ditch or any remnants of it, if appropriate.</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					Less than Significant Impact with mitigation measures CUL-1 through CUL-5 added.	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X			There are no known or mapped significant archeological resources on this site. Less than Significant Impact with mitigation measures CUL-1 through CUL-5 added.	1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X			The County requires the applicant to notify the local overseeing Tribe(s) if any human remains (or significant artifacts) are unearthed during site preparation. Violating this condition would put the use permit at risk of revocation. Further, 11 recognized Tribes received a Request for Comment to this proposal, and Sonoma State has commented. In response, the applicant has had an Archeological Study prepared, and no significant finds resulted. Less than Significant Impact with mitigation measures CUL-1 through CUL-5 added.	1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15
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		<p>The applicant states that he will use on-grid power as the primary energy source, however the outdoor cultivation area will have minimal need for power. The primary (new) energy demands will be to power the security cameras required by the County for the cultivation area and for any processing areas. Other potential power users include the security system, the well pump, and although none is proposed, any outdoor lighting that might be needed in the future.</p>  <p>Gate Water Tanks Access Road Shed 12'x24' Planter Ø 6' Canopy Ø 8' Canopy Area per Plant = 50 sqft 48 Plants x 50 sqft = 2,400 sqft Cultivation Fence 100' x 100' = 10,000 sqft 6' Chain Link, Single 6' Gate with Chain and Lock Oak Creek Class III</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X		There are presently no mandatory energy reduction requirements for outdoor cultivation activities within Article 27 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance, and the proposal will not conflict with, or obstruct, a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15
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			X		<p><u>Earthquake Faults</u> There are no mapped earthquake faults on or adjacent to the subject site.</p> <p><u>Seismic Ground Shaking and Seismic-Related Ground Failure, including liquefaction.</u> The mapping of the site's soil indicates that the soil is mostly stable. There is a small amount of unstable (mapped) soil in the upper right-hand portion of the lot next to Jerusalem Grade Road, however it is about 1000 feet from the cultivation site.</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
<p>the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Public. 42.</p> <p>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</p> <p>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</p> <p>iv) Landslides?</p>					<p><u>Landslides</u> There is some minor risk of landslides based on slope of the site, however the soil is generally stable and not prone to slides historically.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X		<p>The soil on the cultivation site portion of the property is Type 153, Konocti-Hambright complex, 15 to 30 percent slopes. This map unit is on hills. Rock outcroppings and stones 10 inches to 50 feet in diameter are common throughout the unit. The vegetation is mainly oaks, brush, and annual grasses. The soil is not characterized by severe shrink-swell potential, but is prone to erosion. Given the small (10,000 s.f.) area proposed for cultivation, the proposal would not have any marked increase in the loss of topsoil through erosion, and the applicant is proposing wattles and erosion-control measures within the Stormwater Management Plan submitted</p> <p>Less Than Significant</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25, 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		<p>The vast majority of the site is mapped as 'stable soil' according to Lake County GIS data. The use of a relatively small portion of the site (10,000 s.f.) for cannabis cultivation and its proximity well away from the mapped unstable soil, this proposal would not affect the stability of the soil on site, nor would it make it any more prone to liquefaction, lateral spreading, or subsidence.</p> <p>Less Than Significant</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25, 30
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		<p>The soil on the site is Benridge-Konocti association, 15 to 30 percent slope (type 112) and Konocti-Hambright complex, 15 to 30 percent slope (type 153). The cultivation site contains Konocti-Hambright complex (type 153) soil; the type 112 soil is further north, about 200 feet from the cultivation site. Type 153 soil is not overly expansive according to NRCS data for Lake County.</p> <p>Less Than Significant</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25, 30
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	<p>The +142 acre site is large enough to support an in-ground septic system if one is needed in the future. The adjacent property is owned by the applicant and contains a dwelling on a septic system. The Lake County Planning Commission has been requiring 'drying buildings' that have an ADA-compliant bathroom. It is probable that the Planning Commission will require a similar setup with this proposal. The soil is relatively well-drained, and does not appear to be problematic if a new septic system is added to the cultivation site.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25, 29, 30
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X		<p>There are no identified unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features mapped or known on the site.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15

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		<p>In general, greenhouse gas emissions can come from construction activities and from post-construction activities such as vehicle trips (employees, deliveries, et cetera). Lake County does not require a commercial cannabis applicant to provide GHG estimates during or after site preparation. In this case the site disturbance ('construction') will be very minimal because the cultivation area is already in existence. Minimal new construction will occur on the site, and there are minimal gasses that would be emitted from outdoor cultivation activities. The County estimates between 4 and 8 average daily trips; the site is more than ½ hour from the nearest restaurant, so it is reasonable to assume that there would be few mid-day lunch trips by employees. The outdoor cultivation area will not have specific greenhouse gas-producing elements; no ozone will result, and the cannabis plants will to a small degree help capture carbon dioxide.</p> <p>Lastly, the applicant has indicated that he will have two or three employees; given the proximity of the site from urban establishments, it is very unlikely that employees will leave at lunchtime; therefore the likely average daily trips that would result is between 4 and 6 (the applicant lives on the adjacent lot).</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 21, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X		<p>This project will not conflict with any adopted plans or policies for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 21, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 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		<p>This proposal will use organic pest control and fertilizers. This will significantly limit potential environmental hazards that could otherwise result. Cannabis waste is required to be chipped and disbursed on site; burning cannabis waste is prohibited in Lake County. Less than Significant</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 13, 17, 21, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36
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		<p>The applicant has provided a 'Spill containment and cleanup plan' within the Property Management Plan. The types of caustic chemicals to be used are very limited; gasoline for vehicles and possibly alcohol are two potentially caustic chemicals that will be present on site. Less than Significant</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 13, 17, 20, 21, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36
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	<p>The proposed project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 13, 17, 21, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36
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		<p>The project site is not listed as a site containing hazardous materials in the databases maintained by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact.</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 13, 17, 21, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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. Of note is that Jerusalem Grade Road is a narrow unpaved road that serves more properties to the east. This is the only evacuation route, however this is not unusual for commercial cannabis cultivation sites, which by their nature tend to be established in outlying and sparsely populated areas. Less Than Significant 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 site is mapped as having an Extremely High Fire Risk. The applicant will adhere to all Federal, State and local fire requirements/regulations for setbacks and defensible space; these setbacks are applied at the time of building permit review. Less than Significant Impact	1, 3, 4, 5, 20, 35, 37
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 adjacent parcel is owned by the applicant and is currently served by an existing onsite septic and well. The applicant shall adhere to all Federal, State and Local regulations regarding wastewater treatment and water usage requirements. Less Than Significant.	1, 3, 4, 5, 13, 21, 23, 24, 25, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X		There is no groundwater 'depletion threshold' established for water usage in Lake County. While the water table appears to be robust at this location, it is unknown whether the groundwater available is sustainable over a long period of time. The applicant has indicated that an estimated 325,850 gallons of water will be used annually. This is consistent, perhaps slightly higher than with other / similarly sized outdoor cannabis cultivation water use projections in Lake County. The applicant is required as a condition of approval to provide a 'Groundwater Adequacy Analysis test'. This is to occur prior to cultivation, and is a standard condition of approval for all new cannabis cultivation activities in Lake County. The purpose of this test is to determine how quickly (or slowly) the aquifer recharges after an extended use. Cultivators hire a well expert to do a sonar reading of the aquifer level. There are three readings required; the first is prior to the start of the continuous well draw. The second is after a continuous flow over a 12 hour period to tell what the actual draw-down of the aquifer is; then a 24 hour shutdown period occurs, followed by a final aquifer level test after the 24 hour shutdown period. Less than Significant	1, 3, 4, 5, 13, 21, 23, 24, 25, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34
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			X		The applicant has stated that the total cultivation area is 10,000 s.f. in size (100' x 100'), and the canopy area is about 9,000 s.f. in area. This represents a very small portion of the 142 acre site. Further, much of the cultivation area will remain permeable, since above-ground pots are porous. Water can	1, 3, 4, 5, 13, 21, 23, 24, 25, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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?					pass through the above-ground pots and be absorbed into the soil; the amount of non-permeable surface doesn't increase through the use of above-ground pots. The applicant has provided a Stormwater Management Plan with his application submittal. This Plan will be provided to CDFA in conjunction with this Initial Study for their consideration. Less than Significant.	
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?			X		The project site is not located in a flood plain, tsunami or seiche zone. Further, all chemicals including pesticides, fertilizers and other potentially toxic chemicals shall be stored in a manner that the chemicals will not be adversely affected in the event of a flood. Less than Significant	1, 3, 4, 5, 13, 21, 23, 24, 25, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X		There are no water quality control plans provided by the applicant (none are required by the County), and there is no threshold in Lake County for groundwater depletion or baseline for sustainable groundwater. The burden of the applicant is to be able to provide adequate water for their cannabis cultivation sites; they are prohibited to import water other than 1 time in an emergency situation, and only with the CDD Director's written permission. Less than Significant.	1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 13, 21, 23, 24, 25, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34
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, 6, 35
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X		This project appears to be consistent with the Lake County General Plan, the Middletown Area Plan and the Lake County Zoning Ordinance, Article 27, subsection (at). Less than Significant.	1, 3, 4, 5, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28
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	The site contains no mapped mineral resources. No Impact	1, 3, 4, 5, 26

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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, the Middletown Area Plan nor the Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan designates the project site as being a locally important mineral resource recovery site. Less than Significant Impact	1, 3, 4, 5, 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 can be expected during project grading and/or construction, although the amount of site preparation for this proposal is minimal at best. Mitigation measures can decrease these noise levels to an acceptable level. 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 10:00PM 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. <u>NOI-3:</u> The operation of the Air Filtration System 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) measured at the property lines.	1, 3, 4, 5, 13
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X		The project is not expected to create unusual groundborne vibration due to facility operation. The low level truck traffic during the minimal construction needed, and occasional deliveries would create a minimal amount of groundborne vibration. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 3, 4, 5, 13
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 will not induce population growth. No Impact	1, 3, 4, 5
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	No housing will be displaced as a result of the project. No Impact	1, 3, 4, 5
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the				X	The project does not propose housing or other uses that would necessitate the need for new or additional governmental or quasi-public services. There will not be a need to increase fire	1, 3, 4, 5, 13, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23,

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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?					or police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities as a result of the project's implementation. No Impact.	24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 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 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
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 proposed project site is accessed from Jerusalem Grade Road, an unpaved gravel County road. A minimal increase in traffic is anticipated due to construction (projected to be between 4 and 6 ADT), and incoming and outgoing deliveries through the use of small vehicles only are anticipated to be infrequent. Estimated daily employee trips are between 4 and 6 trips is slightly less than a single family dwelling, which averages 9.55 average daily trips according to International Transportation Engineer's manual, 9 th edition. Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures added.	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 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		This project will result in minimal increases in construction-related and use-related daily trips. This project would not conflict with CEQA guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1). Less than significant impact.	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 27, 28, 35
c) For a transportation project, would the project conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(2)?				X	The project is not a Transportation project. No Impact	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 27, 28, 35
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		No changes to Jerusalem Grade Road are proposed, nor do any appear to be needed. Less than Significant Impact	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 27, 28, 35

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X	As proposed, this project will not impact existing emergency access. No Impact	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 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		This site is not 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). Less than Significant.	1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 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		All local Tribes were notified of this action. Thus far no Tribe has expressed concern over this proposal, nor has any Tribe requested 'consultation' per AB 52. Less than Significant.	1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 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 relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X		The subject parcel is served by an existing well. The adjacent property, under the same ownership, contains a dwelling that is served by a well and a septic system. The applicant shall adhere to all Federal, State and Local regulations regarding wastewater treatment and water usage requirements. Further, a Stormwater Management Plan was submitted that address on-site drainage on this relatively small cultivation area. There is no obvious change proposed that might adversely affect these named categories. Less than significant	1, 3, 4, 5, 29, 32, 33, 34, 37
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X		The applicant is required to confirm the adequacy of the water source productivity as a condition of approval via well test; however there are no minimum thresholds for aquifer recharge in Lake County, so there is no way to verify if the water usage will be detrimental to the surrounding area. Less Than Significant	1, 3, 4, 5, 29, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37
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 adjacent site, under the same ownership, has a dwelling and is served by an existing septic system with no known issues regarding adequacy. Less Than Significant	1, 3, 4, 5, 29, 32, 33, 34
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure?			X		The existing landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. No waste management plan was submitted for this proposal, however the County does not require such a plan for cannabis cultivation projects. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 3, 4, 5, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 36

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
e) Negatively impact the provision of solid waste services or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			X		The applicant will chip and spread the cannabis waste on site. Small cannabis cultivation sites such as this one generate very little non-cannabis related waste, and the plant waste material must be chipped and spread on site. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 3, 4, 5, 29, 32, 33, 34, 36
f) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X		All federal, state and local requirements related to solid waste will apply to this project, but are not anticipated to create issues that require specific mitigation measures. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 3, 4, 5, 29, 32, 33, 34, 36

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
<p align="center">XX. WILDFIRE</p> <p align="center"><i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</i></p>						
a) Impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X		<p>The subject site is accessed by Jerusalem Grade Road, a narrow, unpaved County road. The property is located within an SRA (high fire) area.</p> <p>The fire risk on the site is mapped as being Moderate to Very High; the site is steep (about 30% slope on average), and has a relatively dense fuel load. The Valley Fire burned the site in 2016, so there is a burn scar on the entire property. Some vegetation has repopulated the lot since the fire occurred.</p> <p>The cannabis cultivation use will not further exacerbate the risk of injury or death due to a wildfire. This site is no more prone to excessive fire risk than most other sites in Lake County. Further, the trips generated by this use will be roughly the equivalent of a single family dwelling (around 10 average daily trips) based on the number of employees proposed.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 20, 23, 31, 35, 37, 38
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		<p>As previously stated, the fire rating on the site is Moderate to Very High, and the slope on the site averages about 30%. Prevailing wind direction is from the north/northwest, but the prevailing wind direction in the event of a wildfire in this area would be of little consequence given that wildfires generate their own wind. The recent Valley Fire removed some of the fuel load, however grasses and shrubs have repopulated the site, and some trees still remain on the site.</p> <p>Clearing a 10,000 s.f. area (already done) will have little positive or negative impact to the overall vulnerability of the site to wildfire. Because the project would not specifically increase the fuel load, this project is regarded as being neutral to the exacerbation of wild fire risk.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact.</p>	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 20, 23, 31, 35, 37, 38
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			<p>The site improvements proposed are minimal and don't rise to the level of warranting additional roads. The responsible Fire Districts, who were notified of this action, have not indicated that additional fire breaks are necessary.</p> <p>CalFire has provided the following comments that are incorporated as Mitigation Measures:</p> <p><u>WILDFIRE-1:</u> All regulations on the State of California's Public Resource Code, Division 4, and all Sections in 4290 and 4291 (4001-4958) shall apply to this application/construction.</p> <p><u>WILDFIRE -2:</u> All regulations in the California Code of Regulations Title 14, Division 1.5, Chapter 7, Subchapter2, Article 1 through 5 shall apply to this application/ construction.</p> <p><u>WILDFIRE -3:</u> All regulations in the California Building Code, Chapter 7A, Section 701A, 701A.3.2.A</p>	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 20, 23, 31, 35, 37, 38

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p><u>WILDFIRE -4:</u> All regulations in the California Government Code, TITLE 5. LOCAL AGENCIES [50001 - 57550], DIVISION 1. CITIES AND COUNTIES [50001 - 52203], PART 1. POWERS AND DUTIES COMMON TO CITIES AND COUNTIES [50001 - 51298.5], CHAPTER 6.8. Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones [51175 - 51189], Section 51182</p> <p><u>WILDFIRE -5:</u> This shall include, but not be limited to property line set backs for structures that are a minimum of 30 feet, addressing, on site water storage for fire protection, driveway/roadway types and specifications based on designated usage, all weather driveway/roadway surfaces engineered for 75,000lb vehicles, maximum slope of 16%, turnouts, gates (14 foot wide minimum), gate set backs (minimum of 30 feet from road), parking, fuels reduction including a minimum of 100 feet of defensible space. If this property will meet the criteria to be, or will be a CUPA reporting facility/entity to Lake County Environmental Health (see hyperlink below), it shall also comply specifically with PRC4291.3 requiring 300 feet of defensible space and fuels reduction around said structure.</p> <p>http://www.fire.ca.gov/fire_prevention/fire_prevention_wildland_codes</p> <p>Less than Significant Impacts with mitigation measures WILDFIRE 1 through 5 added.</p>	

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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 little chance of risks associated with post-fire slope runoff, instability or drainage changes based on the lack of site changes that would occur by this project. Less than Significant Impact	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 20, 23, 31, 35, 37, 38
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		The project proposes a relatively small cultivation of commercial cannabis in a 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. There are no mapped sensitive species on the property, and the Biological Study that was undertaken made no recommendations for any mitigation measures related to Biological issues.	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		There is one other commercial cannabis cultivation site within 2 miles of the subject site that was approved for an A-Type 3 outdoor cultivation, which is up to 65,000 s.f. of cultivation area containing 43,560 s.f. of canopy. The cumulative impact of these two sites is miniscule given the enormity of the overall area. It is unreasonable to assume that these two cultivation areas will provide a cumulative adverse impact to any of the categories of review that are required by this Initial Study.	All
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X			There is some potential for risk regarding Cultural and Noise, however mitigation measures proposed appear to be adequate to mitigate any proposed risks in these categories. Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures added.	All

* Impact Categories defined by CEQA

****Source List**

1. Lake County General Plan
2. Lake County GIS Database
3. Lake County Zoning Ordinance
4. Middletown Area Plan
5. Lipari Cannabis Cultivation Applications – Minor 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, (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/index.htm)
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 for Lipari property; prepared Natural Investigations, Inc., (Sacramento, CA), dated March 5, 2018.
14. Cultural Site Assessment Survey – Prepared by the ‘Archeological Resource Service’.
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 – July 7, 2019