



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

2019049163

April 5, 2019

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
INITIAL STUDY (IS 19-15)**

1. **Project Title:** Draper 2
2. **Permit Numbers:** Minor Use Permit MUP 19-09
Initial Study IS 19-15
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):** 9475 Bottle Rock Road, Kelseyville, CA
APN: 011-004-54, 55 and 56
6. **Project Sponsor's Name/Address:** Mary Draper
9475 Bottle Rock Road
Kelseyville, CA
7. **General Plan Designation:** Rural Lands
8. **Zoning:** "RL" Rural Lands
9. **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).**
Supervisor District: District 5
Flood Zone: Not within a designated flood zone.
Slope: Varied; relatively flat at cultivation site
Fire Hazard Severity Zone: High Fire Severity Zone
Earthquake Fault Zone: Not within a fault zone
Dam Failure Inundation Area: Not within dam failure zone
Parcel Size: ±80.01 acres

The applicant is requesting approval of a Minor Use Permit to obtain two additional Adult Type 3 Outdoor Cultivation Licenses for outdoor cultivation for adult use cannabis without the use of light deprivation and/or artificial lighting in the canopy area at any point in time up to 65,000 square feet, of total cultivation area and 43,560 square feet of total canopy area per license on one (1) premises.

On February 28, 2019, the applicant had been approved for two (2) A-Type 3 outdoor cultivation areas on the subject site; Site 1 was approved for a 44,467 s.f. cultivation area; Site 2 was approved for a 46,804 square foot cultivation area.

Regarding the history of this site, following the February 28, 2019 Lake County Planning Commission approval, the applicant paid her required Fish and Wildlife fee, the Service Fee required by the County, and the County tax payment for the period of February 28, 2019 through June 30, 2019.

The parcel is a single legal lot that was merged in 2018, and contains a 2700 s.f. dwelling, a well, a 2750 s.f. barn and several smaller out buildings. According to the application material submitted, there are three water tanks on site used to irrigate cannabis; one 1500 gallon tank, one 2500 gallon tank, and one 5000 gallon tank. Annual water usage on the previously approved cannabis cultivation areas is estimated to be 190,000 gallons. Estimated water usage on the proposed additional cultivation areas is anticipated to be 250,000 gallons, for a total annual usage of 440,000 gallons of water.

The original application, UP 18-25, provided the following studies and plans:

- Biological and Biotic Resource Survey (Alicia Ringstadt, Senior Biologist, Jacobzoon Assoc.)
- Cultural and Tribal Survey (Alicia Ringstadt, Senior Biologist, Jacobzoon Assoc.)
- Air Quality Management Plan (Shannon Wells, Biologist, Jacobzoon Associates)
- Energy Management Plan (Shannon Wells, Biologist, Jacobzoon Associates)
- Growing Medium Management Plan (Shannon Wells, Biologist, Jacobzoon Associates)
- Hazardous Materials Management Plan (Shannon Wells, Biologist, Jacobzoon Associates)
- Pest Management Plan (Shannon Wells, Biologist, Jacobzoon Associates)
- Property Management Plan (Shannon Wells, Biologist, Jacobzoon Associates)
- Security Plan (Shannon Wells, Biologist, Jacobzoon Associates)
- Stormwater / Wastewater Management Plan (Shannon Wells, Biologist, Jacobzoon Associates)
- Waste Management Plan (Shannon Wells, Biologist, Jacobzoon Associates)
- Water Management Plan (Shannon Wells, Biologist, Jacobzoon Associates)
- Site and Security Plans (Jacobzoon and Associates)

The amended application takes into consideration the expanded cultivation areas, and all plans have been updated accordingly. The applicant is proposing the following precautionary measures regarding the original and amended proposal:

Fertilizer is packed in five-gallon, resealable containers. The containers are then stored in a secondary storage container located in a locked storage shed adjacent to the canopy site. When containers are emptied, they are returned to the seller and refilled. Product is entirely consumed during the cultivation and there is no product remaining on-site during the winter season. The remaining containers are returned to the supplier. There are no other “chemicals” stored. There is no use of pesticides, rodenticides, or herbicides.

The cultivation operation will draw water from the existing residential water supply, which uses a groundwater well. Water will be stored in the existing 1,500-gallon, 2,500-gallon water tank and 5,000-gallon tanks. Irrigation will be by low-pressure drip irrigation with rates of approximately 2.5 to 5 gallons per hour through a system of plastic pipes fitted with outlets for water (emitters). The water will be pumped from the holding tanks.

No cannabis product trimming, processing, packaging, or curing occurs on site. Flower buds are harvested, weighed, and sealed in numbered vacuum-sealed packages, placed in a container with dry ice, and immediately transported by a licensed distributor.

Cannabis vegetative waste will be minimized by not trimming, curing, or processing the cannabis on site. Excess plant matter (fan leaves, sugar leaves, branches) will be stored in bags in a closed receptacle in a shed within the pole barn. Every three days, or more often if necessary, vegetative waste, along with other solid waste will be transported to Quackenbush Mountain Resource and Compost Facility in Clearlake, CA. Approximately 1,500 pounds of vegetative waste is anticipated annually. The growing medium (soil) will be reused. If it becomes necessary to dispose of the growing medium, the waste would be collected and weighed before delivery to the local composting facility.

The facility is open for delivery and pick-ups Monday through Saturday, 9:00 AM to 7:00 PM, and Sunday 12:00 PM to 5:00 PM. Any and all visitors to the Site will be met by an employee of the Site and have the date, time, identification, and purpose of the visit will be logged.

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

North, West and South: RL 'Rural Land.' Parcel sizes generally range from 45 to 160 acres that are primarily undeveloped. A property located northeast of the northern subject lot contains a vineyard.

West: RR 'Rural Residential'; four lots in total. All four lots contain dwellings; three are used for crop production (vineyards and orchards).

East: RL 'Rural Lands' zoned lots, sparsely populated with dwellings.

11. Other public agencies whose approval is 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
 Northshore Fire Protection District
 Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
 California Water Resources Control Board
 California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection (Calfire)
 California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW)
 California Department of Food and Agriculture
 CalCannabis (via Dept. of Food and Agriculture)
 California Department of Pesticides Regulations
 California Department of Public Health
 California Bureau of Cannabis Control
 California Department of Consumer Affairs
 California Department of Transportation (CalTrans)

- 12. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.? Note:** Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3 (c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

Notification of the project was sent to local tribes. No responses were received.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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 type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forestry Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

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

Michalyn DelValle - Director
Community Development Department

SECTION 1**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

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

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

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
I. AESTHETICS						
<i>Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:</i>						
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X		<p>Bottle Rock Road is a designated scenic corridor that has greater setbacks and building height restrictions due to its scenic designation. The subject site is located on a hill, and is not visible from Bottle Rock Road; the cultivation areas are protected by the natural topography and flora.</p>  <p>Entrance to the Site from Bottle Rock Road</p> <p>The 81+ acre site has slopes that range from less than 10% to greater than 30%. The property and grow sites are accessible from an on-site gravel driveway that accesses Bottle Rock Road, a paved County maintained road. The grow site area is situated in a manner that would not obstruct views of the natural features and scenic resources in the area, which is consistent with County policies for preserving scenic viewsheds. Also, the topography and natural vegetation would act as a visual screen. Impacts are less than significant</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X		The proposed use would not damage scenic resources. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
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 parcel and more particularly the grow sites are shielded from view by existing vegetation and topography along Bottle Rock Road. Therefore, the proposed use would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and surrounding area. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
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 additional light tied to the security system. All lighting shall comply with the County's Dark Skies lighting ordinance. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

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 site is not categorized as 'prime farmland', although it does contain Class I through 4 soil. The site has not been used for agricultural uses in the past other than a medicinal marijuana cultivation site. According to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program and the County's Soil Data Base, provided by the NRCS (National Resource Conservation Service), the site is suitable for use as 'Other land', and is not regarded as significant farming land. The surrounding lots all contain Class 1 through 4 soil. Lots to the east and northeast are used for crop production, primarily vineyards and orchards. It appears that no impacts to farmland would occur with construction of the proposed project. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?			X		As proposed, the project will not impact agricultural uses or Williamson Act contracts given that there are no Ag Preserve zoned properties in the immediate vicinity. The project site is zoned "RL" Rural Lands and does not contain Williamson Act contracts. The neighboring properties to the north, west and south are zoned Rural Lands; the properties to the east are zoned Rural Residential. Three of the eastern adjacent lots are crop producing, and a vineyard exists to the northeast on an RL zoned lot. None of the neighboring lots would be adversely impacted by this use. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11
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. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
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. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7
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 that would result in its conversion to non-agricultural or non-forest use. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11
<p align="center">III. AIR QUALITY</p> <p><i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district 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 air quality impacts. The applicant indicates that two 65,000 s.f. outdoor cultivation sites will be planted using pots rather than planting 'in ground'; this will result in less dust-related particulates. The driveway will initially be treated with calcium chloride for dust mitigation, and will be maintained using on-site water. There is no mapped serpentine soil on the site, although some serpentine soil exists in the vicinity. Odors however have not been mitigated on the outdoor grow sites and may be released as a result of the proposed cannabis growing operation. The nearest house is located about 1,400 feet to the southeast of the grow sites and is downwind from the prevailing wind direction. The applicant has provided a contact in the event of odors, and has indicated that she would resolve the odor issues if they arise.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 12, 13

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p>According to the <i>Property Management Plan - Air Quality Management Plan</i> the applicant would be using organic methods and preventative pest management strategies in order to help reduce the amount of air pollution and/or particulates.</p> <p>The following fungicides will be used:</p> <p>Mycorrhizae Fungi Inoculant, Regalia, Triact 70, Zerotol, Oxidate</p> <p>The following pesticides will be used:</p> <p>Azamax, Monterey Garden BTI, Venerate, Grandevo</p> <p>Construction of the site would take place over a short period of time, would mostly apply to constructing the greenhouses, and would be temporary, which would not result in significant air quality impacts. Site preparation for the 'outdoor grow area' will be minimal, since the applicant is proposing to use pots rather than 'in ground' planting.</p> <p>Mitigated to less than significant impacts with mitigation measures MM AQ-1, 2, 3 added as follows:</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures:</u></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 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><u>AQ-3:</u> 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) 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	The County of Lake is in attainment of state and federal ambient air quality standards. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 4, 12
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X			See response to Section III (a). There are residences on properties adjacent to the subject parcel. The nearest residence is approximately 950 feet from the proposed cultivation area. Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-3 Incorporated.	1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 12
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			X		<p>There are residences on properties adjacent to the subject parcel. The nearest residence is approximately 950 feet from the cultivation area.</p> <p>Some odor impacts are anticipated from this cultivation operation; cannabis cultivation, especially during the flowering phase, generates volatile compounds (terpenes) that some people find objectionable. The <i>Project Management Plan - Air Quality</i> describes the odor mitigation plan to be enacted should odors become objectionable to neighbors. The cannabis facilities are set back well over 100 feet from property lines. The applicant must provide an odor mitigation plan to the Lake County Air Quality Department before an 'Authority to Construct' permit can be issued. Less Than Significant.</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 12

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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			<p><i>A Biological Assessment</i> was done by Jacobzoon Associates (JA) in October 2017 and updated in November, 2018. JA queried the California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife's 'Threatened and Endangered Species' data base according to the PEIR submitted. No sensitive species were found in the site survey, however there are mapped Konocti Manzanita shown in the County's Sensitive Species data base which is acknowledged in the Biological Assessment, which recommends re-assessing the site during the spring of 2019 for Konocti Manzanita starts.</p> <p>The site shall be reassessed in 2019 per the biologic study recommendation. Less than Significant Impact with the reassessment of the site in 2019. Mitigation measure MM Bio-1</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16
					<p>Mitigation measure MM Bio-1: The applicant shall provide a Biological Assessment for the disturbed area associated with the cannabis cultivation for a distance of 100 feet beyond the cultivation area border. Any mitigation measures identified for sensitive species shall be undertaken within 60 days of the revised limited Biological Study. A copy of this study shall be provided to the Community Development Department prior to the start of cultivation for year 2019.</p>	
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 County data base shows an unnamed seasonal stream about 215 feet northeast of the grow sites, and the Cole Creek riparian habitat in the vicinity of Bottle Rock Road to the east. The grow sites are located about 1800 feet west of the edge of the mapped riparian area, and no plans submitted show disturbance to the ground within or next to the mapped area. Less than Significant Impact.</p>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 14, 15, 16
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, 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. No Impact.</p>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 14, 15, 16
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>The County 'sensitive species' data base shows Clear Lake Cipromid / Castotstonid habitat within Cole Creek near Bottle Rock Road. The mapped riparian area is located about 1600 feet from the cultivation sites, and no proposals for disturbance of the mapped area are shown graphically or in text. Less than Significant.</p>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 14, 15, 16
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X		<p>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. It appears that several oak trees will be removed with this project, however there are no mapped conservation easements or oak woodlands on this site that might otherwise require extra protection or tree replacement. Less than Significant Impact.</p>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
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	<p>No special conservation plans have been adopted for this site. No Impact.</p>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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>Two cultural studies were undertaken for this property in 1979 and again in 1998. Neither study yielded any artifacts or finds of archeological significance.</p> <p>Sonoma State was notified of this proposal and indicated that a further study was needed due to outdated survey methods used in the original studies.</p> <p>In October 2017, Alicia Ringstadt, Senior Biologist and Project Manager for Jacobzoon and Associates, undertook a partial Archeological study on the disturbed portions of the subject site proposed as the cultivation sites. She took samples in 1-1/2 meter intervals for the entirety of the cultivation site boundary areas and found no evidence of any cultural usage of the site. Her conclusion was that the cultivation sites were unlikely to contain significant cultural resources. Further, a California Mitigation Measure requiring immediate cessation of any site disturbance is in place in the event of discovery of any artifacts or human remains (CR-1).</p> <p>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 overseeing 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.</p> <p>Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 added.</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), the Middletown Rancheria or other 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 Health and Safety Code 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 Middletown Rancheria or other 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>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?			X		No changes are expected to archaeological resources. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X			Minimal ground-disturbing activities are proposed. Disturbance of human remains is not anticipated. The applicant shall halt all work and immediately contact the Lake County Sheriff's Department and the Community Development Department if any human remains are encountered. Less Than Significant with mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 added.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
VI. ENERGY <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or			X		The proposed energy usage for this facility is minimal; energy use would be limited to the security system, the well pump, lighting for the chemical storage buildings, and some outdoor lighting. The applicant is proposing the	1, 2, 3, 5, 6

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?					use of 'on grid' power, however no adverse impact is anticipated through the use of grid power in this circumstance. Less than Significant Impact.	
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				X	The proposed outdoor cultivation operations would not conflict with or obstruct an energy plan. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
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 the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? iv) Landslides?			X		<u>Earthquake Faults</u> The project site is located near (but not in) a mapped Earthquake Fault Zone as established by the California Geological Survey. The proposed project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects due to earthquakes based on the size and function of the proposed use. <u>Seismic Ground Shaking and Seismic-Related Ground Failure including liquefaction.</u> This particular lot does not contain unstable soils or mapped faults, although it is near a mapped fault. It appears unlikely that ground shaking, ground failure or liquefaction will occur on this property in the future; the eastern hillside next to Bottle Rock Road is steep, but also heavily vegetated. The disturbed area is far enough away from the watershed that it will not impact this hillside with runoff, thus reducing risk of liquefaction. <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 prone to erode and has a high shrink-swell character, but is not located within and/or adjacent to an existing known "landslide area". According to the property Management Plan, some grading would occur on the property to enlarge the existing medicinal cannabis grow site to accommodate the proposed commercial grow areas; however the amount of grading needed is minimal and would not require a grading permit. The cannabis plants will help to anchor the soil in place on the terraced grow sites, and the total area that will be graded and prepared for additional plants is relatively small at 80,000+ square feet, or about 2% of the total site size. Project design shall incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) to the maximum extent possible to prevent or reduce discharge of all construction or post construction pollutants into the County storm drainage system. BMPs include scheduling of activities, erosion and sediment control, operation and maintenance procedures and other measures in accordance with Chapter 29 of the Lake County Code. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 17, 18, 19, 20
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X		No erosion or loss of topsoil is anticipated. Some grading occurred in late 2018 on this site; the County's grading code enforcement officer, Ron Yoder visited the site in November 2018 and required an engineered grading plan, which the applicant provided. Mr. Yoder was satisfied that the grading that had occurred without a permit was below the threshold for requiring a grading permit, and the matter was dropped. Regarding the new proposal, some minor grading needed for this major use permit will be minimal and well below the threshold for requiring a grading permit. The grow sites contain a mix of 107 (Bally-Phipps complex, 1S to 30 percent slopes) and 117 (Bottlerock-Glenview-Arrowhead complex, 5 to 30 percent slope) soil types; both types are moderate to severely prone to erosion, however the grow area is comparatively small, and the cannabis plants will help anchor the soil in place. The applicant has also indicated that wattles and other organic materials will be place on the outer boundary of the grow sites to further prevent soil erosion. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**																														
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X		According to the soil survey of Lake County, prepared by the U.S.D.A., the soil at the site is considered generally stable. There is a less than significant chance of landslide, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse as a result of the project. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 20																														
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		The shrink-swell potential for the project soil type is low to moderate. The proposed project would not increase risks to life or property. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9																														
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 onsite waste disposal system. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 21																														
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X		Disturbance of paleontological resources or unique geologic features is not anticipated, and mitigation measures are in place to assure that in the event any artifacts are found, that the applicant will notify the overseeing Tribe(s) and a licensed Archeologist - CUL-1. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6																														
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	Cannabis cultivation activities would not generate a substantial number of vehicle trips and would not require intensive use of heavy equipment, and as such, would not degrade air quality or produce significant amounts of greenhouse gasses. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 12																														
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. The County of Lake does not have established thresholds of significant for greenhouse gases. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 12																														
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		Materials to be used on site are as follows: <table border="1" data-bbox="630 1392 1360 1906"> <tbody> <tr><td>Advanced Nutrients pH Down</td><td>Regalia</td></tr> <tr><td>Advanced Nutrients pH Up</td><td>Sanidate</td></tr> <tr><td>Azamax</td><td>Sparetime Supply Archipelago Bat Guano</td></tr> <tr><td>Botanicare Cal-Mag Plus</td><td>Sparetime Supply Glacial Rock Dust</td></tr> <tr><td>Canadian Kelp Meal</td><td>Sparetime Supply Mocha Bat Guano</td></tr> <tr><td>Clorox Bleach</td><td>Sparetime Supply Nitrogen Bat Guano</td></tr> <tr><td>Earth Juice Catalyst</td><td>Sparetime Supply Phillipine Bat Guano</td></tr> <tr><td>EB Stone Organics Earthworm Castings</td><td>Sparetime Supply Steamed Bone Meal</td></tr> <tr><td>Grandevo</td><td>Stutzman Farms Chicken Manure</td></tr> <tr><td>Hydrogen Peroxide</td><td>Triact 70</td></tr> <tr><td>Isopropyl Alcohol</td><td>Ultra Fine AG Gypsum</td></tr> <tr><td>Monterey Garden BTI</td><td>Venerate</td></tr> <tr><td>Mycorrhizae Fungi Inoculant</td><td>Vital Garden Supply Tea</td></tr> <tr><td>Oxdate</td><td>Zerotol</td></tr> <tr><td>Pacific Pearl Oyster Shell Flour</td><td>[Blank]</td></tr> </tbody> </table> Materials associated with the proposed Cultivation of Commercial Cannabis, such as gasoline, pesticides, fertilizers, alcohol, hydrogen peroxide and the	Advanced Nutrients pH Down	Regalia	Advanced Nutrients pH Up	Sanidate	Azamax	Sparetime Supply Archipelago Bat Guano	Botanicare Cal-Mag Plus	Sparetime Supply Glacial Rock Dust	Canadian Kelp Meal	Sparetime Supply Mocha Bat Guano	Clorox Bleach	Sparetime Supply Nitrogen Bat Guano	Earth Juice Catalyst	Sparetime Supply Phillipine Bat Guano	EB Stone Organics Earthworm Castings	Sparetime Supply Steamed Bone Meal	Grandevo	Stutzman Farms Chicken Manure	Hydrogen Peroxide	Triact 70	Isopropyl Alcohol	Ultra Fine AG Gypsum	Monterey Garden BTI	Venerate	Mycorrhizae Fungi Inoculant	Vital Garden Supply Tea	Oxdate	Zerotol	Pacific Pearl Oyster Shell Flour	[Blank]	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 22, 23
Advanced Nutrients pH Down	Regalia																																			
Advanced Nutrients pH Up	Sanidate																																			
Azamax	Sparetime Supply Archipelago Bat Guano																																			
Botanicare Cal-Mag Plus	Sparetime Supply Glacial Rock Dust																																			
Canadian Kelp Meal	Sparetime Supply Mocha Bat Guano																																			
Clorox Bleach	Sparetime Supply Nitrogen Bat Guano																																			
Earth Juice Catalyst	Sparetime Supply Phillipine Bat Guano																																			
EB Stone Organics Earthworm Castings	Sparetime Supply Steamed Bone Meal																																			
Grandevo	Stutzman Farms Chicken Manure																																			
Hydrogen Peroxide	Triact 70																																			
Isopropyl Alcohol	Ultra Fine AG Gypsum																																			
Monterey Garden BTI	Venerate																																			
Mycorrhizae Fungi Inoculant	Vital Garden Supply Tea																																			
Oxdate	Zerotol																																			
Pacific Pearl Oyster Shell Flour	[Blank]																																			

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p>equipment emissions may be considered hazardous if released into the environment. The applicant has stated that all potentially harmful chemicals will be stored in a locked, secured building on site.</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 - Fertilizer Management Plan</i>, the fertilizer used will consist primarily of organic materials (bat guano, chicken guano, seashells, kelp, fish oil to name several fertilizers that are planned to be used).</p> <p>According to the <i>Property Management Plan – Pest Control</i>, all pesticides will be stored in a secure building on site.</p> <p>a. The following Fungicides are used on site:</p> <p>Mycorrhizae Fungi Innoculant, Regalia, Triact 70, ZerotoI, Oxidate</p> <p>b. The following Pesticides are used on site:</p> <p>Azamax, Monterey Garden BTI, Venerate, Grandevo</p> <p>The project shall comply with Section 41.7 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance that specifies that all uses involving the use or storage of combustible, explosive, caustic or otherwise hazardous materials shall comply with all applicable local, state and federal safety standards and shall be provided with adequate safety devices against the hazard of fire and explosion, and adequate firefighting and fire suppression equipment.</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. Less than Significant Impact.</p>	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X		See Response to Section VIII (a). Less than Significant Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 23
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X	The proposed project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X		The project site is not listed as a site containing hazardous materials in the databases maintained by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), California Department of Toxic Substance, and Control State Resources Water Control Board. Last Mile Auto Dismantlers is a site currently under corrective action and is located approximately one-half mile to the southeast. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 24, 25
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, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 26

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 22
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			X		The project site is located in a moderate fire hazard severity zone and is in State (CalFire) Responsibility Area. The applicant will adhere to all Federal, State and local fire requirements/regulations. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 22, 27, 28
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		This project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The project will employ Best Management Practices (BMPs) related to erosion and water quality to reduce impacts related to storm water and water quality and adhere to all federal, state and local requirements, as applicable. Minimal site preparation, construction and/or grading are proposed. The cultivation operations are several hundred feet away from the nearest waterbody. There is no evidence that project implementation will impact any water resources. Water resource protection will be achieved by compliance with the <i>Project Management Plan</i> and compliance with the State Water Board's Cannabis Cultivation General Order. Less Than Significant	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 29, 30
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X		According to the <i>Property Management Plan – Water Resources Management Plan</i> , the projected monthly water usage would occur primarily between late spring and early fall (June through October), and monthly usage would vary between 2,000 gallons and 12,000 gallons during the growing months. Total annual projected use is about 500,000 gallons according to the applicant and projections made by staff. Environmental Health and Water Resources were notified of this activity and had no adverse comments on the proposal. The method of water storage on site will be one 1,500 gallon water storage tank, one 2,500 gallon water storage tank, and one 5,000 gallon water storage tank. The water will be pumped from the existing on-site well. Less than significant	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 31
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 that would: i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site; ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or iv) impede or redirect flood flows?			X		The project site is located on a hill approximately 1800 feet from Cole Creek, a Class I tributary. According to the <i>Property Management Plan – Storm Water Management Plan</i> , the proposed use would protect downstream water bodies from water quality by implementing measures to prevent potential of contamination from fertilizers and chemicals and using best management practices. The applicant is proposing wattles and organic barriers around the outer perimeter of the grow area to prevent and minimize rainwater runoff into the watershed. Less Than significant.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 15, 17, 29, 30
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?			X		The project site is not located in an area of potential inundation by seiche or tsunami. The parcel is not located within a flood zone. In addition, the soils at the project site are generally stable; therefore is minimal potential to induce mudflows. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 24, 32

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?				X	The project would not conflict with or obstruct water quality or management plans. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 29
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, 2, 3, 5, 6
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, Kelseyville Area Plan, and Lake County Zoning Ordinance. The property is zoned "RL" Rural Lands. Cannabis cultivation is permitted by the Lake County Zoning Ordinance with a use permit. The applicant shall adhere to all incorporated mitigation measures and conditions of approval. California Department of Food & Agriculture (DCFA) is responsible for licensing and regulation of cannabis cultivation and enforcements defined in the Medicinal and Adult Use Cannabis Regulation and Safety Act (MAUCRSA) and CDFA regulations related to cannabis cultivation. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
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 the portion of the parcel identified for cultivation as having an important source of aggregate. The portion of the property where the soil unit is 112 and the residence is located, is identified as a quarry resource area. No loss of mineral resource would result from this project. Less Than Significant.	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 33
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 cultivation location as being a locally important mineral resource recovery site. No loss of mineral resource would result from this project. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 33
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		No permanent increases in ambient noise levels will occur with this project. A small amount of infrequent noise could be anticipated if a properly-permitted backup power generator is activated during any power outage or during generator testing, but these impacts would not be significant or long lasting. Maximum non-construction related sounds levels shall not exceed maximum levels specified in Zoning Ordinance Section 21-41.11 (Table 11.2) at the surrounding residences. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
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 operation. The low level truck traffic would create a minimal amount of groundborne vibration. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
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	Project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 26

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	No people or housing will be displaced as a result of the project. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
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 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.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
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, 2, 3, 5, 6
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, 2, 3, 5, 6
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 accessible off of Bottle Rock Road, a paved County maintained road. A minimal increase in traffic is anticipated due to construction, employees exiting and entering premises, routine maintenance and periodic incoming and outgoing deliveries. The project is expected to generate an average of 10 to 20 vehicle trips per week. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 34, 35

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X		The project is expected to generate an average of 10 to 20 vehicle trips per week. Significant impacts are not anticipated. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 34, 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	The proposed project would not increase hazards at the project site. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 23, 34, 35
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X	As proposed, this project will not impact existing emergency access. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 23, 34, 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			<p>The applicant has not undertaken a Cultural Resource study, but did contact Sonoma State's Natural Resources Agency who collects data on surveys done on private property in Northern California. The NWIC (Sonoma State) has indicated that two earlier studies (1979 and 1998 respectively) had been undertaken covering 100% of the site.</p> <p>In October 2017, Senior Biologist and Project Manager Alicia Ringstadt (Jacobzoon and Associates) undertook a partial Archeological Study of the proposed 'disturbance areas' (grow sites), and the study yielded no finds of archeological significance. No further studies were required at that point.</p> <p>Further, a standard mitigation measure requires the notification of the overseeing Tribe and contacting a licensed Archeologist of any Native American artifacts or remains are found.</p> <p>Less Than Significant with mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 added.</p>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
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			<p>See Response to Section XVII.</p> <p>Implementation of CUL-1 and CUL-2 would reduce impacts to Less than Significant.</p>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
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 domestic well and onsite septic system. Power is available from PG&E lines along Bottle Rock Road adjacent to the site. No system expansion is required. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 21
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X		The subject parcel is served by an existing domestic well. Cannabis cultivation will minimize water use by using a low-pressure drip irrigation system. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 21

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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 subject parcel is served by an onsite septic system. No Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 21
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			X		The existing landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs. According to the Property Management Plan – Waste Management Plan has been developed to help minimize the generation of waste and for the proper disposal of waste produced during the cultivation and processing of cannabis at the project site. The goal is to prevent the release of hazardous waste into the environment, minimize the generation of cannabis vegetative waste and dispose of cannabis vegetative waste properly, and manage growing medium and dispose of growing medium properly. All employees are required to follow the procedures outlined in this plan. Any deviations from this plan must be immediately brought to the attention of Director of Cultivation. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 36, 37
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X		All requirements related to solid waste will apply to this project. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 36, 37
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		The project site is located in a moderate fire hazard severity zone and is in State (CalFire) Responsibility Area as well as within the Kelseyville Fire Protection District's service area. The applicant will adhere to all Federal, State and local fire requirements/regulations. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 22, 27, 28
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		The immediate area contains dense undergrowth and tree coverage. The applicant has graded a portion of the site for a fire break. The cultivation areas proposed will serve to act as a buffer between eastern properties and fires that might originate from the west, however the cultivation activity proposed will have a neutral effect on exposing persons to pollutant concentrations in the event of a wildfire in the area. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 22, 27, 28
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		Infrastructure exists on the property, and no additional infrastructural improvements are needed. Less than Significant Impact.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
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 an existing residence on the property. The risk of flooding, landslides, slope instability, or drainage changes would not be increased due to this project. Less Than Significant.	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 20, 29, 32

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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 undisturbed area, so there is some risk of degradation; however mitigation measures are proposed that would alleviate most or all of the project-related impacts. As proposed, this project is not anticipated to significantly impact habitat of fish and/or wildlife species or cultural resources.	ALL
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?		X			Potentially significant impacts have been identified related to Air Quality, Biological, Cultural / Tribal, and Hazards & Hazardous Materials. These impacts in combination with the impacts of other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects could cumulatively contribute to significant effects on the environment. Implementation of and compliance with mitigation measures identified in each section as project conditions of approval would avoid or reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels and would not result in cumulatively considerable environmental impacts.	ALL
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X			The proposed project has potential to result in adverse indirect or direct effects on human beings. In particular, to Air Quality, Biological, Cultural / Tribal, and Hazards & Hazardous Materials have the potential to impact human beings. Implementation of and compliance with mitigation measures identified in each section would reduce adverse indirect or direct effects on human beings and impacts to less than significant.	ALL

* Impact Categories defined by CEQA

****Source List**

1. Lake County General Plan
2. Lake County Zoning Ordinance
3. Kelseyville Area Plan
4. Site Visit
5. County of Lake Major Use Permit Application and Supplemental Materials
6. *Project Management Plan for Minor Use Permit*; June 6, 2018
7. U.S.G.S. Topographic Maps
8. California Department of Transportation:
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/index.htm
9. U.S.D.A. Lake County Soil Survey
10. Important Farmland Map <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/agriculture/>
11. Lake County Department of Agriculture
12. Lake County Air Quality Management District
13. Lake County Serpentine Soil Mapping
14. California Natural Diversity Database (<https://www.wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB>)
15. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory
16. Fish and Wildlife Protection Plan for the Cannabis Cultivation Operation at 1320 Van Sleeper Road, Upper Lake, California; Prepared by Natural Investigations Company, Inc. dated May 23, 2018
17. Lake County Grading Ordinance, adopted 2007
18. U.S.G.S. Geologic Map and Structure Sections of the Clear Lake Volcanic, Northern California, Miscellaneous Investigation Series, 1995
19. Official Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone maps for Lake County
20. 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
21. Lake County Health Services Department
22. Lake County Emergency Management Plan
23. Lake County Hazardous Waste Management Plan, adopted 1989
24. Lake County Natural Hazard database
25. Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List: www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public
26. Lake County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, adopted 1992
27. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection - Fire Hazard Mapping
28. Northshore Fire Protection District
29. National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)
30. Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
31. State Water Resources Control Board
32. FEMA Flood Hazard Maps
33. Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan
34. 2010 Lake County Regional Transportation Plan, Dow & Associates, October 2010
35. California Department of Transportation (CALTRANS)
36. CalRecycle Solid Waste Information System
<http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/Search.aspx>
37. Lake County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan and Siting Element, 1996

