



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: September 3, 2021

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM - **ADDENDUM** INITIAL STUDY IS 18-43

1. **Project Title:** Green Bear Farms, Cali LLC
2. **Permit Number:** **Modification MMU 21-22**
Amends Major Use Permit, UP 18-35
Initial Study, IS 18-43
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):** 4680 Clark Drive, Kelseyville, CA 95451
APN: 008-042-04
6. **Project Sponsor's Name/Address:** Wais Amin
3965 Derryfield Court
Dublin, CA 94568
7. **General Plan Designation:** Agriculture
8. **Zoning:** "A – WW – FF"; Agriculture - Waterway – Floodway Fringe
9. **Supervisor District:** District Five (5)
10. **Flood Zone:** AO (western portion), AE (middle of the site contains Cole Creek, a perineal creek); 2% (portion), X
11. **Slope:** Varied; ranges from flat (western 2/3) to over 30% (eastern 1/3)
12. **Fire Hazard Severity Zone:** Western 2/3 – None. Eastern 1/3 - SRA (High Fire)
13. **Earthquake Fault Zone:** None
14. **Dam Failure Inundation Area:** Not located within Dam Failure Inundation Area

15. Parcel Size: 54.66 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).

The original cannabis cultivation project was approved through Use Permit UP 18-35, and was for 49,728 square feet of mixed light cultivation area comprised of 46,080 square feet of canopy area within (20) 2,304 sq. ft. greenhouses; a 3,000 sq. ft. metal processing building, two existing 330 sq. ft. covered workstations, and a 1,460 sq. ft. greenhouse for new plant starts. The site uses an existing well, and a drip-micro spray irrigation system for water conservation. In addition to the greenhouses and drying building, the site contains a 2,700 s.f. dwelling on an existing septic and well, and a 500 s.f. garage.

On July 9, 2021, the County received an application for a modification to the cultivation area to enable the applicant to place sixteen (16) additional 96' x 32' greenhouses on the site for cultivation (12 greenhouses) and for use as nurseries for immature plants (4 greenhouses).

Access to the site is from Clark Drive, an unpaved private shared road at this location. The Project Site is not within a community growth boundary but is within a mapped Farmland Protection area which requires mixed light (greenhouse) cultivation; outdoor cultivation is not permitted in this mapped Protection area. Water is provided via existing on-site well. Sewage disposal occurs via existing on-site septic system.

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

North: "APZ" and "A" Agricultural Preserve and Agriculture-zoned properties with agricultural uses on them. There is a dwelling located on the northern neighboring lot approximately 680 feet away from the proposed cultivation area.

East: "A" Agriculture and "RL" Rural Lands. No dwellings present.

South: "A" and "RL" Agriculture and Rural Land-zoned lots; there are two dwellings located on the southern lots; the nearest is about 650 feet from the cultivation area.

West: "APZ" Agricultural Preserve. Vacant but actively used for crop production.

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 Cannabis Control
 California Department of Food and Agriculture
 California Department of Pesticides Regulations
 California Department of Public Health
 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.

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <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 checked="" 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 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

Date: _____

SIGNATURE

Community Development Department

SECTION 1

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, and then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

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

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?		X			<p>The project site is located off of Clark Drive, a private dirt road that serves eight properties. The site is not near a Scenic Combining Area. Although the site is surrounded by thick vegetation and is generally screened from neighboring lots by the vegetation, the cultivation area is located in the center of the site, and will be very visible through gaps in the perimeter vegetation.</p> <p>Mitigation measure:</p> <p>AES-1: Prior to cultivation, the applicant shall use blackout screening in or on all greenhouses to prevent light from being visible from roads and neighboring dwellings.</p> 	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		<p>There are no trees that will be impacted by this proposal. There are no rock outcroppings on this site, and there are no historic buildings on or near this site.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X		The project site is not adjacent to or within the boundary of an scenic overlay or combining district, nor is it within an urbanized area Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		X			The project has some potential to create additional light or glare. Non-glare material shall be required to be used on the new greenhouse structures, and blackout film will be required to mitigate any light-related impacts to surrounding properties; this is a mitigation measure (AES-1). Prior to permit approval, the applicant will need to submit 'cut sheets' showing the wattage and placement of interior lighting. The applicant must adhere to the Lake County dark skies policy regarding outdoor and indoor lighting. Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measure AES-1 added	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES <i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</i> <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			X		The western portion of the property contains farmland of <i>local</i> importance. The eastern portion is steeper than the western portion, and contains land that is identified as being suitable for grazing. There is no soil that is mapped as Prime Farmland, Unique farmland, or Farmland of State Importance on the subject site. 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 immediate vicinity contains properties that are actively growing other more traditional crops, such as walnuts, pears and wine grapes. It does not appear that the proposed cultivation activity will conflict with neighboring properties in a manner that is more significant than if the applicant were to raise traditional crops. 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		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. Less than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X	The project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. Less than Significant 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. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, 13
III. AIR QUALITY <i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.</i> <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		X			<p>The project has some potential to result in some air quality impacts (primarily odor); however the applicant is proposing the use of 21 greenhouses, which can control odor in a more meaningful manner compared with outdoor cultivation of cannabis. The applicant states within his Property Management Plan that carbon filters / air scrubbers will be used in each greenhouse, and he states that he will undertake a ‘cyclical planting program that would cause certain portions of the canopy to be ‘harvest ready’ at specific intervals rather than have the entire cultivation area be ripe at one time; this will ultimately reduce odors by reducing the volume of ripe flowering plants at any given time. Dust during site preparation can be mitigated by wetting the soil with a mobile water tank and hose, although the cultivation portion of the site is already flat and has been disturbed historically by crop production.</p> <p>Construction of the project would begin following approval of the major use permits, and would last between 8 months and 1 year. There would be minimal soil disturbance, given that the site is flat and was previously disturbed.</p> <p>Additionally, implementation of mitigation measures below would further reduce air quality impacts to less than significant.</p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures added:</p> <p><u>AQ-1:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>AQ-2:</u> 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 CI engines as well as Lake County Noise Emission Standards.</p> <p><u>AQ-3:</u> 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.</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**
					<p>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.</p> <p>AQ-5: All vegetation during site development and ongoing operation shall be chipped and spread for ground cover and/or erosion control. The burning of cannabis waste material is prohibited.</p> <p>AQ-6: The applicant shall have the primary access and parking areas surfaced with chip seal, asphalt or an equivalent all weather surfacing to reduce fugitive dust generation.</p> <p>AQ-7: All areas subject to semi-truck/trailer traffic shall be paved with asphaltic concrete or an all-weather surfacing to reduce fugitive dust generation.</p> <p>AQ-8: 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.</p>	
b)) 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?			X		<p>The cultivation activity will take place entirely within greenhouses. The greenhouses will use carbon air filters to mitigate odor and any potential pollutants. Based on the filtration systems proposed, this project will not violate any air quality standard.</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 greenhouse cultivation that will occur has particulate control measures built in with the use of carbon filtration systems. These systems will help to reduce and eliminate airborne particulates, and will reduce the odors emitted by flowering cannabis plants.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 21, 24, 31, 36
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?		X			<p>Sensitive receptors in the area include adjacent and near proximity residents. The nearest off-premises house is about 650 feet away from the cultivation area. As described in Section III (a) above, with implementation of mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-8 impacts which will reduce impacts related to odor and dust to less than significant.</p>	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			X		<p>The site contains Cole Creek, a year-round creek. The cultivation area is located over 100 feet from the top of bank of this creek as is required by the Lake County Zoning Ordinance, Article 27, subsection (at).</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 21, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33,

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?					<p><i>Further, a Biological Assessment</i> was prepared for this applicant by Pinecrest Environmental Consulting, Berkeley, CA (report dated April 23, 2018). The assessment states:</p> <p>There is no State or Federal designated Critical Habitat for any species onsite. The nearest Critical Habitat is located 5.8 miles south of the project site associated with habitat for slender Orcutt grass (<i>Orcuttia tenuis</i>) surrounding Boggs Lake. The next nearest Critical Habitat is located 12.7 miles to the west associated with habitat for Chinook salmon (<i>Oncorhynchus tshawytscha</i>) associated with the Russian River in Ukiah.</p> <p>The nearest verified occurrences of State or Federally listed Threatened or Endangered plant species are Konocti manzanita (<i>Arctostaphylos manzanita</i> ssp. <i>elegans</i>) located 0.9 miles to the southeast of the project site associated with a vineyard development on the slopes of Mt. Konocti. The second closest CNDDDB occurrence is Burke's goldfield (<i>Lasthenia burkei</i>) located 1.1 miles south of the project site associated with grazed pastures near Kelseyville.</p> <p>The nearest occurrence of State or Federally listed Threatened or Endangered animal species is Osprey (<i>Pandion haliaetus</i>) located 2.1 miles west of the project site associated with Kelsey Creek, and Western pond turtle (<i>Emys marmorata</i>) located 1.5 miles southwest of the project site associated with Kelsey Creek.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	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		<p>The Pinecrest Biological Study did not have recommendations for any additional protection measures related to riparian areas given that the nearest enclosed cultivation site is more than 100 feet away from Cole Creek.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	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	<p>There are no federally protected wetlands on the subject site.</p> <p>No Impact.</p>	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		<p>There are no native resident wildlife that are mapped for this property, and there are no mapped native resident fauna or migratory fish on the site. There are no mapped sensitive species located within 0.9 miles of the subject site.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact.</p>	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**
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X		According to Section 21083.4 of the California Public Resources Code, if a county determines that there may be a significant effect to oak woodlands, mitigation measures must be put in place in order to alleviate the impact created through the conversion of oak woodlands. There are no mapped conservation easements on this site that might otherwise require a tree replacement plan. Further, the applicant has not indicated that any oak trees would be removed by this proposal. Less than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 21, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34
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	No special conservation plans have been adopted for this site and no impacts are expected. No 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			An Archeological Research Study was conducted for this site by Wolf Creek Archaeological Services dated February 12, 2016. A follow up letter was submitted by the applicant on September XX, 2021 indicating that the expansion areas were included within the original Study area, and that no further mitigation measures appeared to be necessary. No significant artifacts or remains were discovered, and in the opinion of Dr. Parker, it is unlikely that any artifacts or remains will be uncovered during the course of site development. A total of 11 Lake County Tribes were notified of this action via AB 52 notices that were sent out electronically by the County on July 12, 2021. None of the Tribes that received notice requested a consultation In keeping with CEQA Guidelines, if archaeological resources are uncovered during construction, work at the place of discovery should be halted immediately until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the finds [§15064.5(f)]. Further, upon discovery of any 'significant' artifacts, the culturally affiliated Tribe shall be contacted, and if the Tribe determines that it is relevant to their cultural heritage, they shall choose the method of involvement in overseeing the construction of the site for the duration of ground disturbance. <u>Mitigation Measure:</u> <u>CUL-1:</u> Should any archaeological, paleontological, or cultural materials be discovered during site development, all activity shall be halted in the vicinity of the find(s), the applicant shall notify the culturally affiliated Tribe, and a qualified archaeologist 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, the applicant shall notify the Sheriff's Department, the culturally affiliated Tribe, and a qualified archaeologist for proper internment and Tribal rituals per Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and Health and Safety Code 7050.5.	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**
					<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 culturally affiliated 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>Potential impacts can be mitigated to 'Less than Significant' with CUL-1 and CUL-2.</p>	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X			<p>The site has been previously disturbed with traditional agricultural crops prior to the medicinal and now adult use cannabis being grown on site. In the event that any potentially significant relics or resources are discovered while pad preparation occurs, the cultivator is required to notify the County CDD Department, the surveying Archaeologist, and the culturally affiliated Tribe to respectfully re-inter any significant relics or artifacts discovered.</p> <p>Can be mitigated to 'Less than Significant' with CUL-1 and CUL-2.</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X			<p>The site has been previously disturbed with traditional agricultural crops prior to the medicinal and now adult use cannabis being grown on site. In the event that any human remains are discovered while pad preparation occurs, the cultivator is required to notify the Lake County Sheriff, the County CDD Department, the surveying Archaeologist, and the culturally affiliated Tribe to respectfully re-inter any human remains that are discovered.</p> <p>Can be mitigated to 'Less than Significant' with CUL-1 and CUL-2.</p>	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 recently upgraded the power service to the site from 400 amps to 4000 amps. The 4000 amp service provides adequate power to serve the 36 greenhouses that will be on the site, all of which use low wattage lighting. Electricity will be used to power equipment used in the greenhouses and drying building (such as lights, fans, and security cameras), and other items requiring power such as lights, security system, climate control system, and dehumidifiers.</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		<p>There are no mandates for renewable energy within Article 27 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance, and no known plans exist regarding State mandates for renewable or energy efficient power for commercial cannabis cultivation in greenhouses.</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**
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS <i>Would the project:</i>						
<p>a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p> <p>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist- Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</p> <p>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</p> <p>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</p> <p>iv) Landslides?</p>			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 stable and not prone to liquefaction.</p> <p><u>Landslides</u> According to the Landslide Hazard Identification Map prepared by the California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, the project parcel soil is considered "stable" and not located within and/or adjacent to an existing known "landslide area".</p> <p>The eastern portion of this site is steep; most of it is over 30% slope, however there is several hundred feet of separation between the cultivation site, and the steep portion of the lot – this will act as a buffer between the flat portion of the site and the steeper hill that has some potential for shifting due exclusively to the slope.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25
<p>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</p>			X		<p>Minimal grading activities associated with project will be needed to place the greenhouses on the cultivation site, which had historically been disturbed through the cultivation of traditional agricultural crops prior to the 2017 medicinal cannabis cultivation and subsequent greenhouse additions. The site at this location is flat and will require only minimal site preparation.</p> <p>The predominant soil type for the cultivation area is 'Type 233', which is categorized by the National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) as follows:</p> <p>233-Still loam, stratified substratum. This very deep well drained soil is on alluvial plains. Slope is 0 to 2 percent. The vegetation in areas not cultivated is mainly annual grasses and forbs with scattered oaks. Elevation is 1,000 to 2,000 feet.</p> <p>Surface runoff is very slow, and the hazard of erosion is slight. Some areas adjacent to stream channels are subject to rare periods of flooding. Many areas of this soil are protected from flooding by dikes and levees.</p> <p>This unit is used mainly for orchards, vineyards, and hay and pasture. The main crops grown on this unit are walnuts, pears, and wine grapes. Irrigation commonly is used for maximum production of these crops.</p> <p>The main limitation is the hazard of flooding in some areas. In areas that are subject to flooding, capital improvements should be designed to withstand flooding.</p> <p>Any structures proposed in the AO portion of the site will be required to have engineered footings; this is required for all</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 24, 25, 30

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					building permits issued for buildings located in an AO flood plain. Less Than Significant Impact	
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 soil at the site is considered “stable” and there is little potential for landslide, subsidence, debris flows, liquefaction or collapse. The site is flat, and there would be no opportunity for significant soil movement such as land-slides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse in the event of an earthquake or significant storm runoff. Less Than Significant Impact	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		There is no significant risk to life or property based on the type of development proposed and based on the soil categorization and characteristics. Less Than Significant Impact	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		The project site will be served through an existing on-site septic system. Less Than Significant Impact	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		There are no unique paleontological or geologic features on the site according to the Archaeological Study undertaken by Wolf Creek Archaeology Services. Less than Significant Impact	1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15
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		In general, greenhouse gas emissions from construction activities include the use of construction equipment, trenching, landscaping, haul trucks, delivery vehicles, and stationary equipment (such as generators, if any are used). Given that the project site area is flat and will require very minimal grading, greenhouse gas emissions resulting from construction would be negligible and would not result in a significant impact to the environment. Further, the cannabis crop will be inside greenhouses that will have carbon air filtration systems, and which would not generate measurable greenhouse gases. Further, the use of generators is prohibited except during emergency situations such as power outages. Less than Significant Impact	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	This project will not conflict with any adopted plans or policies for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. No Impact	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			X		One function of the <i>Property Management Plan – Hazardous Waste Management Plan</i> is to identify and evaluate hazards associate with cannabis cultivation at the subject site. This includes analysis of cultivation, processing, storing and	1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 13, 17, 21, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31,

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
materials?					<p>packaging as well as all other activities associated with the production of cannabis. The goal of the plan is to determine whether there are existing hazards which require preventative control. Hazards include biological, chemical or physical. The plan also indicates 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.</p> <p>Materials associated with the proposed cultivation of commercial cannabis, such as gasoline, diesel, carbon monoxide, pesticides, fertilizers and the equipment emissions may be considered hazardous if released into the environment.</p> <p>Routine construction materials and all materials associated with the proposed cultivation of commercial cannabis shall be transported and disposed of properly in accordance with all applicable Federal, State and local regulations.</p> <p>According to the <i>Property Management Plan</i>, all pesticides and fertilizers would be stored in their original package in a secured storage shed, and would only be used in strict accordance with the product label requirements including, but not limited to directions pertaining to application, storage and disposal of the fertilizer product. No fertilizers or pesticides will be used within 100 feet of any spring, stream, lake, vernal pool or wetland.</p> <p>All equipment shall be maintained and operated in a manner that minimizes any spill or leak of hazardous materials. Hazardous materials and contaminated soil shall be stored, transported, and disposed of consistent with applicable local, state and federal regulations.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	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 uses organic pesticides and fertilizers that are stored in a locked building on site. The only potentially toxic chemicals that would be used is fuel for vehicles, and fuel is also stored in an enclosed locked building.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</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>No 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. 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 eastern portion of the site is located in a Severe Fire Hazard Area (State Responsibility Area) and is mapped as Moderate to Very High Fire Risk. The 56 acre site is mostly devoid of combustible material (fuel), and the cultivation area provides an additional fire break. 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		According to the Property Management Plan – Storm Water Management Plan is designed to help protect the water quality of surface water and the storm water management systems managed by Lake County. The property contains Cole Creek, a year-round stream. No pesticides or fertilizers are permitted within 100 feet of this creek. The Plan includes measures to monitor and evaluate the performance of the plan, as well as ensure that all data and information is reported to the appropriate local agencies, such as the County of Lake. According to the plan, it would focus on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protecting downstream water bodies from water quality degradation • Cultivation site, topsoil, fertilizer, and pesticide risks • How illicit discharges will be prevented • Downstream roads and bridges • Storm Water discharge to adjacent properties • Compliance with the Storm Water Management Ordinance of The Lake County Ordinance • Proposed Grading, Construction and post-construction best management practices, including Parameters and methodology of monitoring <u>Pest Management</u> The Pest Management Plan submitted states: This section shall describe how cultivation and nursery permittees will comply with the following pesticide application and storage protocols. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Complying with the California Food and Agriculture Code, Division 6 Pest Control Operations and Division 7 Agriculture Chemical; Chapter 1-3.6 and California Code of Regulations, Division 6 Pest Control Operations. b. Complying with all pesticide label directions; 	1, 3, 4, 5, 13, 21, 23, 24, 25, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 39

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p>c. Storing chemicals in a secure building or shed to prevent access by wildlife;</p> <p>d. Containing any chemical leaks and immediately clean up any spills;</p> <p>e. Preventing offsite drift;</p> <p>f. Not applying pesticides when pollinators are present;</p> <p>g. Not allowing drift to flowering plants attractive to pollinators;</p> <p>h. Not spraying directly to surface water or allow pesticide product to drift to surface water. Spray only when wind is blowing away from surface water bodies;</p> <p>i. Not applying pesticides when they may reach surface water or groundwater;</p> <p>j. Using only properly labeled pesticides; and</p> <p>k. Not using pesticides within 100 feet of any spring, top of bank of any creek or seasonal stream, edge of lake, delineated wetland or vernal pool. For purposes of determining the edge of Clear Lake, the setback shall be measured from the full lake level or 7.79 feet on the Rumsey Gauge.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X		<p>According to the Property Management Plan – <i>Water Usage</i>, the annual water usage is projected to be less than 2.2 acre-feet or 716,872 gallons; this is based on a projected ‘per plant’ use demand of 5 to 6.2 gallons per day on average.</p> <p>The Plan states:</p> <p>Irrigation water for the proposed cultivation operation, will be pumped from and onsite groundwater well to four 2,500-gallon water storage tanks located adjacent to the proposed cultivation area, via an HDPE water supply line.</p> <p>The water storage tanks will be equipped with float valves to shut off the flow of water from the well and prevent the overflow and runoff of irrigation water when full. An HDPE water supply line will be run from the water storage tanks to the irrigation systems of each greenhouse within the proposed cultivation area.</p> <p>The water supply lines will be equipped with redundant safety valves, capable of shutting off the flow of water so that waste of water and runoff is prevented/minimized when leaks occur and the system needs repair.</p> <p>The irrigation system of the proposed cultivation area(s) will be composed of PVC piping, black poly tubing, drip tapes/lines, and micro-spray emitters. Supplemental irrigation may be applied when needed by hand using garden hoses.</p> <p>On September 25th, 2018, a cumulative Water Analysis was prepared by Richard Stevenson (License #1025430). Mr. Stevenson conducted a thorough pump test of the onsite groundwater well. The results and conclusions of this test indicate that GBFC’s existing onsite groundwater well can produce more than 60 gallons per minute with a Specific Capacity of 11.787 gallons per minute per foot of drawdown. At 60 gallons</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 13, 21, 23, 24, 25, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 39

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p>per minute, the onsite groundwater well can produce the maximum anticipated daily water demand for the existing/proposed cultivation operation in less than one hour. Additionally, continuous water level and water use monitoring conducted of the onsite groundwater well indicate that existing cultivation operation has had no identifiable impact on the aquifer from which the onsite groundwater well receives water.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	
<p>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; iii) Create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; iv) Impede or redirect flood flows? 			X		<p>The subject property contains Cole Creek a year round stream. Article 27 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance requires 100 feet of separation between any cultivation area and the top of a stream bank. The applicant shows adequate separation on the submitted site plans per Article 27.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 13, 21, 23, 24, 25, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34
<p>d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</p>			X		<p>The project site is partially located in a flood plain and has a year round stream on site. If the greenhouses are to be constructed within the AO flood zone, then engineered footings are required for any structure that will be placed within this flood plain. 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.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 13, 21, 23, 24, 25, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34
<p>e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</p>			X		<p>There are no water quality control plans adopted that involve this property.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	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>						
<p>a) Physically divide an established community?</p>				X	<p>The proposed project site would not physically divide an established community.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 35

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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 is consistent with the Lake County General Plan, The Kelseyville Area Plan and the Lake County Zoning Ordinance. Less than Significant Impact	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 Aggregate Resource Management Plan (ARMP) does not identify this project as having an important source of aggregate. No Impact	1, 3, 4, 5, 26
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X	The County of Lake's General Plan, the Kelseyville 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	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 to uncomfortable levels could be expected during project grading and/or construction. Mitigation measures will 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 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 Impact	1, 3, 4, 5, 13

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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	The site is not located within the vicinity of a public or private air strip. No Impact	
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X		The project is not anticipated to induce population growth. Less than Significant Impact	1, 3, 4, 5
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	No housing 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 provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: - Fire Protection? - Police Protection? - Schools? - Parks? - Other Public Facilities?			X		The project does not propose any new housing or other uses that would necessitate the need for new or altered government facilities. There will not be a need to increase fire or police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities as a result of the project's implementation. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 3, 4, 5, 13, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 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

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XVII. TRANSPORTATION <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?			X		The project site is served by Clark Drive, a private dirt road that shared by 8 lots in the vicinity. This project was routed to the County Road Department, who had no adverse comments regarding increased construction, delivery or employee-related trips generated by this project. The applicant has been maintaining Clark Drive since the original use permit was approved in 2019. Less than Significant Impact	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 27, 28, 35
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X		The proposed operation would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) subdivision (b) as Lake County is a Rural County and trip lengths can frequently exceed 20 miles per trip to access retail outlets, restaurants, gas stations, et cetera. Less than Significant Impact	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 27, 28, 35
c) 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 Clark Drive are proposed, nor do any appear to be needed. Less than Significant Impact	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 27, 28, 35
d) 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		The site does not contain resources that would be eligible for being listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or are locally significant. Less than Significant Impact	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			The County has provided mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 that are prescriptive if any potentially significant artifacts, items or any human remains are discovered during the process of site disturbance. Implementation of CUL-1 and CUL-2 would reduce potential impacts to 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			X		The site is served by an on-site well and septic system. Power is available to the site via overhead power lines on Clark Drive. According to the Water Availability Analysis	1, 3, 4, 5, 29, 32, 33, 34, 37, 39

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?					<p>submitted, it was calculated that 46,080 ft² of mixed-light canopy area would need approximately 718,000 gallons of water for irrigation per year, with a maximum anticipated daily demand of approximately 3,750 gallons. During the 2020 cultivation season, GBFC used approximately 400,000 gallons of water for irrigation for 27,900 ft² of mixed-light canopy area. Based on this empirical data, the applicant estimates that with the addition of the proposed greenhouses, giving them a total combined mixed-light canopy area of 46,035 ft², their annual water usage will be ~661,000 gallons with a maximum anticipated daily demand of ~3,500 gallons.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X		<p>In the Water Availability Analysis submitted, it was calculated that 46,080 ft² of mixed-light canopy area would need approximately 718,000 gallons of water for irrigation per year, with a maximum anticipated daily demand of approximately 3,750 gallons. During the 2020 cultivation season, GBFC used approximately 400,000 gallons of water for irrigation for 27,900 ft² of mixed-light canopy area. Based on this empirical data, the applicant estimates that with the addition of the proposed greenhouses, giving them a total combined mixed-light canopy area of 46,035 ft², their annual water usage will be approximately 661,000 gallons with a maximum anticipated daily demand of approximately 3,500 gallons.</p> <p>On September 25th, 2018, Richard Stevenson (License #1025430) conducted thorough pump test of the onsite groundwater well. The results and conclusions of this test indicate that the onsite groundwater well can produce more than 60 gallons per minute with a Specific Capacity of 11.787 gallons per minute per foot of drawdown. At 60 gallons per minute, the onsite groundwater well can produce the maximum anticipated daily water demand for the existing/proposed cultivation operation in less than one hour.</p> <p>Continuous water level and water use monitoring conducted of the onsite groundwater well indicate that existing cultivation operation has had no identifiable impact on the aquifer from which the onsite groundwater well receives water.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 29, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39
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		<p>The site is served by an existing on-site septic system. No new septic systems are proposed, nor do they appear to be needed.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 29, 32, 33, 34

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure?			X		<p>The existing landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs for at least the next 4 years according to the Director of the Landfill.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact.</p>	1, 3, 4, 5, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 36
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X		<p>All requirements related to solid waste will apply to this project. Solid waste disposal is addressed in the Property Management Plan, and is not projected to be excessive.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	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**
XX. WILDFIRE <i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</i>						
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X		<p>The eastern portion of the site is within an SRA (high fire) area. The western portion of the site however is the flat portion, and is generally clear of fuel load. The expansion area is about 500 feet east of Clark Drive, and is within the flat portion of the lot. The emergency evacuation route, if needed, would be Clark Drive, a narrow private road. Clark Drive only serves 8 lots, of which only four contain dwellings, so the likelihood of an impassable street (Clark Drive) is minimal in the event of a wildfire. The connector street is Gaddy Lane, which serves a larger population, but which is paved with 2' wide shoulders (see photo below).</p>  <p style="text-align: center;">GADDY LANE</p> <p>The cannabis cultivation use will not generate a significant number of daily trips. This general area has had to evacuate recently, however 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>The eastern 1/3 of the site is steep and heavily treed. The western 2/3 of the site is generally clear of significant vegetation. The prevailing wind direction is generally from the northwest to the southeast; this is optimum in terms of fire risk – a fire in this location would likely move up the hill rather than toward the cultivation area / flat portion of the site.</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 site is already clear of heavy vegetation on the flat portion that contains the future cultivation area, so no purpose would be served by requiring additional fuel breaks. The applicant has four 2,500 gallon water tanks that can be used for fire suppression in an emergency.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 20, 23, 31, 35, 37, 38
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream			X		<p>There is little chance of risks associated with post-fire slope runoff, instability or drainage changes given the location of Cole Creek, which runs in between the sloped portion of the</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**
flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?					property and the flat portion containing the project site. Less than Significant Impact	
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 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 Aesthetics, Air Quality, Cultural / Tribal Resources and Noise. 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 Aesthetics, Air Quality, Cultural / Tribal Resources, and Noise 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

* Impact Categories defined by CEQA

****Source List**

1. Lake County General Plan
2. Lake County GIS Database
3. Lake County Zoning Ordinance
4. Kelseyville Area Plan
5. Green Bear Farms, Cali LLC Cannabis Cultivation Applications – Modification and Major Use Permit UP 18-35.
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 Green Bear Farms, Cali LLC, prepared by Pinecrest Environmental Consulting, Berkeley, CA, and dated April 23, 2018.
14. Cultural Site Assessment Survey – Wolf Creek Archaeology Services, February 12, 2016.
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 – January 15, 2019
39. Cumulative Water Analysis, prepared by Richard Stevenson, received 9-7-2021.