



**Planning Department**  
**168 North Edwards Street**  
**Post Office Drawer L**  
**Independence, California 93526**

**Phone: (760) 878-0263**  
**FAX: (760) 872-2712**  
**E-Mail: [inyoplanning@inyocounty.us](mailto:inyoplanning@inyocounty.us)**

**FINAL MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT**  
**AND INITIAL STUDY**

**PROJECT TITLE: Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 2021-01/Chief Farms**

**PROJECT LOCATION: 50 W Nine Mile Canyon Road, near the community of Pearsonville**

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The proposed project is for a cannabis microbusiness license, including cultivation, non-volatile manufacturing, and distribution. This project would require (1) 840 ft<sup>2</sup> residential building for staff, (1) 1,440 ft<sup>2</sup> manufacturing building, and (5) 3,060 ft<sup>2</sup> green house structures for cultivation.**

**FINDINGS:**

- A. The proposed project is consistent with goals and objectives of the Inyo County General Plan.
- B. The proposed project is consistent with the provisions of the Inyo County Zoning Ordinance.
- C. Potential adverse environmental impacts will not exceed thresholds of significance, either individually or cumulatively.
- D. Based upon the environmental evaluation of the proposed project, the Planning Department finds that the project does not have the potential to create a significant adverse impact on flora or fauna; natural, scenic and historic resources; the local economy; public health, safety, and welfare. This constitutes a Negative Finding for the Mandatory Findings required by Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines.

On April 14, 2021, Inyo County received a comment letter from the California Department of Fish & Wildlife. Their comments related to expired biological studies for the project. For this reason, the applicant shall replicate the studies (completed in 2019) for habitat assessment of special status species, Desert tortoise, and Mohave Ground Squirrel, prior to the start of construction. This has been included in the Biological section of the CEQA checklist and the Mandatory Findings. These mitigation measures have been added as Conditions of Approval to the CUP that was approved by the Inyo County Planning Commission on April 28, 2021.

Additional information is available from the Inyo County Planning Department. Please contact Project Planner if you have any questions regarding this project.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name

5/7/2021

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

# INYO COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

## CEQA APPENDIX G: INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

### 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, 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 issues.



**Planning Department**  
**168 North Edwards Street**  
**Post Office Drawer L**  
**Independence, California 93526**

**Phone: (760) 878-0263**  
**FAX: (760) 872-2712**  
**E-Mail: [inyoplanning@inyocounty.us](mailto:inyoplanning@inyocounty.us)**

## **INYO COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

### **APPENDIX G: CEQA INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

1. Project title: CUP 2021-01/Chief Farms
2. Lead agency name and address: Inyo County Planning Department, PO Drawer L, Independence, CA 93526
3. Contact person and phone number: Steve Karamitros: 760-878-0268
4. Project location: 50 W. Nine Mile Canyon Rd.
5. Project sponsor's name and address: Chief Farms LLC. Luis Machado, 8309 Laurel Canyon Blvd # 193, Sun Valley, CA 91352
6. General Plan designation: Light Industrial
7. Zoning: Light Industrial
8. Description of project: The proposed project is for a cannabis microbusiness license, including cultivation, non-volatile manufacturing, and distribution. This project would require (1) 840 ft<sup>2</sup> residential building for staff, (1) 1,440 ft<sup>2</sup> manufacturing building, and (5) 3,060 ft<sup>2</sup> green house structures for cultivation.
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: The proposed cannabis cultivation project is located in an area that is dominated by vacant, open space land. The terrain is flat, covered with desert scrub. It is typical of basin and range geography.

<b>Location:</b>	<b>Use:</b>	<b>Gen. Plan Designation</b>	<b>Zoning</b>
Site	Vacant	(LI) Light Industrial	(M2) Light Industrial
North	Vacant	Natural Resource (NR)	Open Space-40 acre minimum (OS-40)
South	Vacant	Natural Resources (NR) & Rural Residential Medium Density (RRM)	Open Space (OS-40) & Rural Residential (RR-2.5)
East	Vacant	Light Industrial (LI)	Light Industrial (M2)
West	Vacant	Natural Resources (NR)	Open Space-40 acre minimum (OS-40)

**10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:** Inyo County Building and Safety, Inyo County Environmental Health, Inyo Mono Agricultural Commission.

**11. 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, has consultation begun?** Inyo County started the 30-day Tribal Consultation opportunity period, according to Public Resource code section 21080.31, by sending out certified written notices on February 8, 2021 inviting the Tribes to consult on the project. It described the project and location. The tribes that were notified are: Big Pine Tribe of Owens Valley, Bishop Paiute Tribe, Fort Independence Indian Community of Paiutes, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Tribe, Timbisha Shoshone tribe, Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians, Cabazon Band of Mission Indians and the Torrez Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians. Since no comments have been provided and no formal consultation meeting date requested, staff is submitting this Negative Declaration for a 21-day review and comment period. The County will continue to be open to consultation with the Tribe during this period. If the Tribe does not provide comments or schedule a formal consultation meeting within this 21-day period, the County, per Public Resources Code 21082.3 (d)(2) will consider the consultation process complete and certify the Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact.

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 21083.3.2.) 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.

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

**DETERMINATION**

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.



5/7/2021

Name

Date

# INYO COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**I. AESTHETICS** -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? <i>No, project's proposed 840 ft<sup>2</sup>- residence (staff use), 1,440 ft<sup>2</sup> structure for manufacturing operations, and five 3,060 ft<sup>2</sup> cultivation greenhouses will conform to the 40-foot allowable height requirement. These structures will likely be noticeable from US 395, but will not affect the overall scenic quality of the area or a particular scenic vista as you will be able to see over it to the surrounding mountains.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? <i>No, there are no scenic resources other than views of the desert landscape and surrounding mountains. There are no trees, rock outcroppings or historic buildings, nor is the project located within a scenic highway corridor.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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? <i>No, views to the project are possible from southbound traffic on US 395; however, the buildings will be shielded from northbound traffic since they are situated behind a berm of fill material on the south end of the project. The project will not affect the overall scenic integrity of the area, as the views would be from a considerable distance. The proposed buildings would not exceed 23-feet, well below the 40-foot allowed height.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? <i>No, the project is required to meet State regulations, and County General Plan policy, related to light and glare; therefore, the project will not affect day or nighttime views.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES:** 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. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? <i>No, the project is not located on farmland.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

*No, the project is not located on land zoned exclusively for agriculture and it is itself a type of agriculture. Inyo County has no Williamson Act contracts.*

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))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the project is not located on timberland.*

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the project is not located on forestland.*

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the project is not located on farmland.*

**III. AIR QUALITY:** Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, there is not an air quality plan for the area in which the project is proposed.*

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, there are not air quality standards being violated in the area for the area in which the project is proposed.*

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

*No, the project includes facilities for cannabis cultivation, manufacturing and distribution. It is not within an area that is in non-attainment for any criteria pollutants and none of the project components will release emissions that exceed ozone thresholds.*

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the cultivation component of the project will include the use of some fertilizers and herbicides on an as needed basis. The use of these products will be regulated by the County Environmental Health Department and State regulations, ensuring a less than significant impact. Furthermore, there are no sensitive receptors near the project site.*

e) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, little odor is produced when working with cannabis distillate. All extractions will be done in a closed-loop ventilation system, with no gas escaping during the extraction process. Cannabis products will be stored in airtight containers and the project will employ carbon scrubbers to prevent odor from leaving the building. Odors will not be detected outside the business premises; the greenhouses will utilize an odor-absorbing ventilation and exhaust system, which includes exhaust fans outfitted for carbon-filtration. The system also includes vacuum ovens, with floor-mounted hoods for extracting vapors from the rooms, designed to scrub odors from the air and filter them to prevent leakage outside the facility (see Chief Farms, LLC-Business Operating Plan).*



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

*A Biological Assessment Report was prepared by an applicant-supplied biologist with Bloom Biological Inc. (BBI). The California Native Diversity Data Base (CNDDDB) was queried to identify special-status plant and wildlife species that could potentially be found in the project impact area. There was a single observation of Mohave ground squirrel (MGS) documented approximately 6.2 miles southeast of the project area. This observation occurred in 1985; however, no observations of MGS within the same vicinity have been documented since that time. On April 5, 2019, the site was visually inspected by biologist Jeff Johnson with Pacific BioScience, Inc. This initial survey rendered no visual observations of MGS, so live trapping was conducted per CDFG Mohave Ground Squirrel Survey Guidelines (2003). Trapping days for each of the three sessions were: April 6-10, May 8-12, June 15-19, 2019. No MGS were trapped or observed during this period. MGS were not observed, nor were they detected, on or in the vicinity of the transect grid during the focused protocol study (see Mohave Ground Squirrel Trapping & Study Report, June 2019). It has been concluded that habitat does exist that could support MGS; therefore, further focused protocol surveys will be conducted, prior to the start of construction, to confirm MGS absence.*

*BBI biologist Dr. Peter Bloom conducted a habitat assessment survey, of the 18-acre site, on March 8, 2019. The site was evaluated for the presence of sensitive wildlife species and the habitats with which they are associated. The survey involved walking transects & documenting all biological resources observed. Botanically, two perennial plants, Creosote (*Larrea tridentata*) and White Bursage (*Ambrosia dumosa*) dominate the parcel. Silver Cholla (*Opuntia echinocarpa*) were also observed. Two annual plants, Stork's Bill (*Erodium sp.*) and Fiddleneck (*Amsinckia sp.*) were observed. Only two species of birds were observed during the survey, the Common Raven (*Corvus corax*) and White-crowned sparrow (*Zonotrichia leucophrys*), both of which are non-sensitive species. The expected migratory birds, which might pause on-site during their spring migration, are also non-sensitive. Other than potential habitat for MGS, there was no presence or habitat for any other State or federally listed sensitive species. Due to the absence of any candidate, sensitive or special status plant or wildlife species on the parcel, and the planned MGS preconstruction survey, impacts from the project on biological habitat is less than significant. If MGS are found during preconstruction surveys, the applicant will continue to follow CDFW protocols for avoid significant impacts.*

*The biological resources report can be found at: <https://www.inyocounty.us/services/planning-department/current-projects>.*

*Due to the expiration of surveys (conducted in spring 2019), the applicant shall perform preconstruction surveys following the Mohave Ground Squirrel Survey Guidelines to ensure their absence within the Project area and a 50-foot buffer zone; preconstruction, protocol level presence or absence surveys for Desert Tortoise no more than 14 days prior to the start of project activities, utilizing a construction monitor (in the event nothing is found) or an Incidental Take Permit (if Desert Tortoise is located during preconstruction surveys); and, CDFW protocol surveys for special status plants and natural communities prior to the start of construction.*

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, there is no identified riparian habitat on the project site based on the USFWS National Wetlands Inventory Mapping Tool, or in close proximity, that would be affected by the project.*

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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, there are no identified wetlands on the project site based on the USFWS National Wetlands Inventory Mapping Tool, or in close proximity to any that would be affected by the project.*

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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

*No, although the project site could potentially have occurrences of wildlife species, the project will not interfere with migratory fish or wildlife species.*

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, there are no local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources that pertain to the project site.*

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, there are no adopted habitat or conservation plans that affect the project site.*

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, a cultural study was conducted by NWB Environmental Services, LLC. on the project site, including a records request to the California Historical Resources Information System. The record search indicated two resources within the 1 mile buffer and near the project area (on the southern end of the project's 18-acre parcel). These resources are outside the project impact area, which is confined to the northern part of the parcel (within a 2-acre area). These resources will not be affected by the staging of equipment, or the construction and operation of the project site. No other historical resources as defined in Section 15064.5 were found.*

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*In the unlikely event an archaeological or cultural resource is discovered on the site during any future development, work shall immediately stop and Inyo County staff shall immediately be notified per Inyo County Code (ICC) Chapter 9.52, Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County Code. Therefore, the project will not cause an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource if by chance one is discovered, pursuant to Section 15064.5.*

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, there are no known human remains or burial sites on the parcels. Refer to the response to (V b) for the potential for archaeological resources. While unlikely, human remains are a potential archaeological resource, and will be handled similar to other archaeological resources, as outlined in (V b)*

**VI. ENERGY:** Would the project:

a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

*No, the microbusiness facility will use energy primarily for cultivation and manufacturing uses. It will not require large amounts of energy and is required to meet California Building Standards including Green and Title 24 Standards.*

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

*No, although the project is located in one of the County's Pearsonville Solar Energy Development Areas (SEDA), as identified by the General Plan, it represents a very small percentage of that particular SEDA. The SEDA is 600 acres. The proposed project, when developed, would represent less than 3% of the entire SEDA, leaving plenty of land for subsequent solar energy development.*

**VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:** Would the project:

a) Directly or indirectly cause 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

*No, the project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Geologic Hazard Zone (A-P Zone). The closest fault zone is associated with the Little Lake Fault Zone, located approximately 1.5-miles east northeast of the site and the Garlock Fault Zone, located approximately 30-miles southwest of the site (see BSK Associates Geotechnical Engineering Investigation).*

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

*No, the California Building Code ensures that structures be built according to required seismic standards, designed to withstand such events.*

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

*Zones of Required Investigation referred to as "Seismic Hazard Zones" (SHZ) in CCR Article 10, Section 3722, are areas shown on Seismic Hazard Zone Maps where site investigations are required to determine the need for mitigation of potential liquefaction and/or earthquake-induced landslide ground displacements. There are no mapped areas that have Seismic Hazard Zones in the project area. (see BSK Associates Geotechnical Engineering Investigation).*

iv) Landslides?

*Zones of Required Investigation referred to as "Seismic Hazard Zones" (SHZ) in CCR Article 10, Section 3722, are areas shown on Seismic Hazard Zone Maps where site investigations are required to determine the need for mitigation of potential liquefaction and/or earthquake-induced landslide ground displacements. There are no mapped areas that have Seismic Hazard Zones in the project area. (see BSK Associates Geotechnical Engineering Investigation).*

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

*No, the proposed project will result in the disturbance of soil due to pre-construction grading or built structures. The applicant shall follow the procedures for site preparation, as set forth in Section 4.3-Site Preparation Recommendations of the Investigation (see BSK Associates Geotechnical Engineering Investigation). Future development will require compliance with the California Building Standards that require Best Management Practices be implemented to minimize erosion and keep all site materials from leaving the site.*

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- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

*No, the proposed project is not located in an area with a geologic unit or soil that is known to be unstable. Surface soil samples were obtained from the site and tested to provide a preliminary screening of the potential for concrete deterioration or steel corrosion due to attack by soil-borne soluble salts. As part of project design, the applicant shall adhere to the recommendations presented in the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation completed by BSK Associates. The subsurface material generally consists of silty sand, with varying amounts of gravels and silts throughout the bottom of the testing boreholes. The upper 5 feet of material is anticipated to have a very low potential for expansion, with an expansion index of 0 at Boring B-2. Based on the results of the consolidation test, the on-site soils below 5-feet are considered to have a low potential for hydrocompaction (see BSK Associates Geotechnical Engineering Investigation). If any questions arise about the quality of the soil during the development of the property, the applicant/developer shall work with Inyo County's Building and Safety Department to employ the proper design standards that minimize expansive soils.*

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

*No, the proposed project is not located in an area with a known expansive soil type. The subsurface material generally consists of silty sand, with varying amounts of gravels and silts throughout the bottom of the testing boreholes. The upper 5 feet of material is anticipated to have a very low potential for expansion, with an expansion index of 0 at Boring B-2. Based on the results of the consolidation test, the on-site soils below 5-feet are considered to have a low potential for hydrocompaction (see BSK Associates Geotechnical Engineering Investigation). If any questions arise about the quality of the soil during the development of the property, the applicant/developer shall work with Inyo County's Building and Safety Department to employ the proper design standards that minimize expansive soils.*

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

*No, the project will require a County approved waste handling system, in the form of an underground septic system. Septic systems are common in the area and the soils are capable of supporting them. Any proposed septic system for the site shall be reviewed and approved by the Inyo County Environmental Health Department.*

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the project site does not include a unique paleontological or geologic feature.*

**VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:** Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

*No, the proposed cannabis microbusiness will not generate greenhouse gas emissions that will have a significant impact. Temporary construction-related emissions will occur, but such dust related impacts will be minimized through best management practices.*

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the proposed project will not cause conflicts with a plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gasses*

**IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:** Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the project's cannabis cultivation activities will use fertilizers and possibly pesticides. The use of fertilizers and/or pesticides will be regulated by the County Department of Environmental Health and will be required to follow all State and local regulations regarding hazardous materials. Irrigation runoff, which contains pesticides and herbicides, will be captured and conveyed, via a dedicated drainage system, to an agricultural runoff tank. The tank shall be pumped into trucks and disposed of at an authorized disposal site in accordance with federal, state and local regulations. In addition, fertilizers (nitrogen & phosphorus) will have limited exposure to the elements during movement/transport/disposal between storage and the greenhouses.*

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the project's cannabis cultivation activities will use fertilizers and pesticides. The use of fertilizers and/or pesticides will be regulated by the County Department of Environmental Health and will be required to follow all State and local regulations regarding hazardous materials.*

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the proposed project is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest school is 13.8 miles from the proposed project. The project will not emit hazardous emissions, or handle acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste.*

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the proposed project is not located on a site included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. There are no DTSC sites mapped within or adjacent to the project area and no additional sites are identified in the site vicinity on Geotracker and EnviroStor databases.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

*No, the project is not included in an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public or public use airport.*

f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

*No, the proposed project will not physically interfere with an adopted emergency plan or emergency evacuation plan.*

g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires,?

*No, risk of loss, injury, and death involving wildland fires is minimal from this project. Fire risks are moderate at the project site, and no areas in proximity to it can be considered urbanized. Land surrounding the project site is sparsely vegetated and there are few residences in proximity of the project; therefore, the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires is less than significant at this site, and any potential risk is further mitigated by compliance with California Building Standards. The project site is located within a State Responsibility Area.*

**X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:** Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?

*No, the project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Low Impact Development (LID) techniques have been incorporated into the project's design. Drainage and stormwater issues are managed so that the site's pre-development hydrology is maintained, using design techniques that infiltrate, filter, store, evaporate and/or detain runoff close to the source of rainfall. Applicant hydrologists used the San Bernardino "Technical Guidance Document for Water Quality Management Plans" as the basis for their water quality and water discharge designs. Onsite drainage designs include earthen swales, catch basins, PVC pipes, and biofiltration. Groundwater was not encountered at the site by BSK Associates. Based on analysis of historical groundwater elevation data, the groundwater elevation is approximately 310 feet below the surface. Therefore, groundwater is not an impact or design consideration regarding the shallow surface LID designs (see "On-site Hydrology and Drainage Analysis Chief Farms, RJR Engineering, November 2020). The applicant will continue coordination with Inyo County's Environmental Health Department, the Inyo County Building and Safety Department, as well as the Regional Water Quality Board, to ensure waste discharge requirements for the project are met.*

b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?

*No, the project would use 1.2-acre feet of water annually for cultivation. The proposed project is on a parcel of land zoned for light industrial use. Because the project is located in an high priority basin (State Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Basin Prioritization Map, May 2020), the applicant's project was reviewed by the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority, and access to the groundwater basin, via the permitted well, was granted. The applicant will have to comply with well permit(s) requirements from the County Environmental Health Department and meet all State regulations pertaining to wells and groundwater.*

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:

i) result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;

*No, the project is proposed in an area that is virtually flat and there are no streams in the area that will be affected by the increase of impervious surface from the project. Due to soil types, erosion potential is high and regular maintenance of the project's surrounding berms and pad perimeter will limit flooding potential (see "On-site Hydrology and Drainage Analysis Chief Farms, RJR Engineering,*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

November 2020). The project has been reviewed by the County Public Works Department and they found no issues regarding grading and runoff. In the unlikely event issues are found at pre-construction, they will be addressed during building review.

ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

No, the proposed project is situated near the base of an alluvial fan on the east side of the Sierra Nevada Mountains. These alluvial fans may experience high intensity short duration storms, and runoff can change direction and channelization flows. Applicant Consultant RJR analyzed the aerial photography from the area, as well as site topography, to determine if the project site was in the direct line of an existing major runoff channel. Based on the visible braiding and channels, it was determined that the project site is located along a topographic expression which reduces the overall flood risk to the property. The project design directs alluvial runoff both north and south, around the project's concrete pads. The site has been designed as a raised pad with a large berm around 3 sides of the pad to deflect flows around the side. Construction of the project site will include grading, green house installation, and concrete pad installation. Compaction of the subgrade, vehicle/equipment traffic, and the addition of buildings will increase the impermeable area of the project site by 22%. This will increase the storm water runoff from the property during 10 year and 100 year storm events. To manage this increase volume of runoff, the project includes a surface basin to capture the increased runoff and allow for infiltration into the ground. The proposed storm drain system is hydraulically adequate to provide the necessary conveyance of stormwater from the 100 year storm event (see "On-site Hydrology and Drainage Analysis Chief Farms, RJR Engineering, November 2020). The project has been reviewed by the County Public Works Department and they found no issues regarding grading and runoff. In the unlikely event issues are found at pre-construction, they will be addressed during building review.

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Construction of the project site will include grading, green house installation, and concrete pad installation. Compaction of the subgrade, vehicle/equipment traffic, and the addition of buildings will increase the impermeable area of the project site by 22%. This will increase the storm water runoff from the property during 10 year and 100 year storm events. To manage this increase volume of runoff, the project includes a surface basin to capture the increased runoff and allow for infiltration into the ground. The proposed storm drain system is hydraulically adequate to provide the necessary conveyance of stormwater from the 100 year storm event (see "On-site Hydrology and Drainage Analysis Chief Farms, RJR Engineering, November 2020). The project's design for irrigation runoff, which contains pesticides and herbicides, will capture and convey these wastes via a dedicated drainage system, to an agricultural runoff tank. The tank shall be pumped into trucks and disposed of at an authorized disposal site in accordance with federal, state and local regulations. In addition, fertilizers (nitrogen & phosphorus) will have limited exposure to the elements during movement/transport/disposal between storage and the greenhouses. The project has been reviewed by the County Public Works Department and they found no issues regarding grading and runoff. In the unlikely event issues are found at pre-construction, they will be addressed during building review.

iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

This will increase the storm water runoff from the property during 10 year and 100 year storm events. To manage this increase volume of runoff, the project includes a surface basin to capture the increased runoff and allow for infiltration into the ground. The proposed storm drain system is hydraulically adequate to provide the necessary conveyance of stormwater from the 100 year storm event (see "On-site Hydrology and Drainage Analysis Chief Farms, RJR Engineering, November 2020). The project has been reviewed by the County Public Works Department and they found no issues regarding grading and runoff. In the unlikely event issues are found at pre-construction, they will be addressed during building review.

d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project is proposed in an area that is not included in a flood hazard, seiche or tsunami zone.

e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project has been approved for water use from the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority.

**XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING:** Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

*No, the proposed project does not physically divide an established community.*

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the applicant wants to cultivate cannabis, manufacture cannabis products, and distribute the products to retailers, which requires a conditional use permit, as outlined by the County's zoning code. The project site is located in the Light Industrial zoning designation, with a Light Industrial (LI) General Plan designation. Both allow for cannabis microbusiness projects.*

**XII. MINERAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the project makes use of undeveloped land and no known mineral resources are located on it. No extraction of known mineral resources is being foregone by this project.*

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*There are no known locally-important mineral resources being foregone as a result of this project*

**XIII. NOISE:** Would the project result in the:

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

*No, there will be some construction related noise from grading activities, engine noise from trucks, and building construction. This noise will not exceed acceptable levels. Also, Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) allows for decibels of 90 for an 8 hour day and 100 for a limit of 2 hours. There are no sensitive receptors in the area.*

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, exposure to noise levels will be primarily airborne, and groundborne vibrations if any would be brief.*

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan, or within 2-miles of a public airport.*

**XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING:** Would the project:

a) Induce substantial 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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*The proposed project is not likely to induce population growth. Workers will be hired, to the extent possible, from the local area. Given the lack of residential infrastructure and services, employee housing will likely be found in Olancho, Lone Pine, Ridgecrest, or other unincorporated communities in the southern portion of Inyo County.*

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the proposed project will not displace existing housing or create a situation where replacement housing will be necessary. It is in an area of very sparse residential development.*

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

**XV. PUBLIC SERVICES:** Would the project:

a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

*No, the Southern Inyo Fire Protection District was consulted on the project. No concerns related to their ability to serve the project area were given.*

Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

*No new police service will be required because of this project. Onsite private security will be used at the project location.*

Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No new school service will be required because of this project.*

Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No new parks will be required because of this project.*

Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the proposed project will not create a need for additional public services.*

**XVI. RECREATION:** Would the project:

a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the proposed project will not increase the use of existing recreational facilities. No portion of this project anticipates any change in the level of service required.*

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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the proposed project does not include, nor will it cause, a need for an increase in parks or other recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.*

**XVII. TRANSPORTATION:**

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?

	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the proposed project will not significantly increase traffic, and therefore, will not affect public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities. Because of the extremely remote nature of the project location, few alternative transportation opportunities exist, but those that do would be unchanged by this project. This CUP was reviewed together by the County Road Department. No issues were identified.*

b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the cannabis microbusiness (cultivation, manufacturing, distribution) will not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b). The applicant estimates that this project will generate about 2-3 vehicle trips coming and going per day, from suppliers and facility vehicles, and 5 from employees. The cultivation component will generate approximately 10 daily trips (arrivals and departures) by employees and 4-5 deliveries per month. Based on this information, it can be determined that the average daily trips are less than the 100 trips that would require a detailed traffic analysis on the project. Therefore, the Project will result in*



	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

*no impact to this resource. The subject site is not within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or high quality transit corridor.*

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

*The proposed project will not result in any design features for transportation that increase hazard. Autos and trucks will be accommodated on a parking lot on the project site.*

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?      
*No, the project is proposed on a site that is about 500-feet from US 395, and is accessible via a frontage road (Sterling Rd.), with plenty of turn radius for access on the northern end of the project site.*

**XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:

a) cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 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) 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

*No, a cultural study was conducted by NWB Environmental Services LLC on the project site, including a records request to the California Historical Resources Information System and the Native American Heritage Commission. Resources, in the form of lithic scatter, were identified on the southern end of the project's parcel. Less than 2 acres of impact are expected from the project, and this area is on the parcel's upper most two-acres. Cultural resources are outside the project footprint and will not be affected by staging of equipment, construction, or operation of the project site. No other historical resources as defined in Section 15064.5, including resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), were found. If any archaeological or cultural resource is discovered on the site during any future development, work shall immediately stop and Inyo County staff shall immediately be notified per Inyo County Code (ICC) Chapter 9.52, Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County Code. Therefore, the project will not cause an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource if by chance one is discovered, pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)*

ii) 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 § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.

*No, a cultural study was conducted by NWB Environmental Services LLC on the project site, including a records request to the California Historical Resources Information System and the Native American Heritage Commission. No archaeological or cultural resources as defined Public Resources Code Section 5024.1 were found. If any archaeological or cultural resource is discovered on the site during any future development, work shall immediately stop and Inyo County staff shall immediately be notified per Inyo County Code (ICC) Chapter 9.52, Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County Code. The project description was also sent to Tribes requesting AB52 notification. No requests for additional information have been received from the Tribes.*

**XIX UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:** Would the project:

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?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

*No, the proposed project will not result in the construction of new or expanded utility or service systems. The applicant is working with SCE to establish a connection to this preexisting infrastructure. Water will be obtained from an on-site well and domestic wastewater will be treated by on-site septic systems. Agricultural runoff will be managed via surface retention tanks & will be pumped and hauled to certified disposal facilities.*

b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?

*Yes, all water necessary for the project will be pumped from a preexisting well on the property. The proposed Conditional Use Permit will not result in a need for new entitlements of water resources, nor will the proposed future use of the site, a cannabis microbusiness. In addition, the applicant's project was reviewed by the Indian Wells Valley Groundwater Authority, and access to the groundwater basin, via the permitted well, was granted. The applicant will follow the standards provided by the County Environmental Health Department and meet all State regulations pertaining to wells and groundwater.*

c) Result in a determination by the waste water 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?

*No, the proposed project's wastewater treatment will not unduly burden the commitments of any potential treatment provider. Wastewater disposal will utilize on-site septic systems, separated storage areas for green waste, and a dedicated conveyance system to bring greenhouse runoff to a surface tank, where water will be pumped and trucked off to a proper disposal site. This plan will be reviewed and approved by the Inyo County Environmental Health Department.*

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?

*No, the proposed project will not create a need for additional solid waste capacity. Solid waste needs for the project will be minimal. All cannabis waste will be removed and destroyed by Cannabis Waste Recycling, a cannabis disposal company in Murrieta, California. All waste will be stored in a locked, tamper-proof waste bin in the office area while awaiting disposal.*

e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

*The proposed project and any subsequent development will comply with Inyo County's solid waste standards, as required by the Inyo County Department of Environmental Health.*

**XX. WILDFIRE:**

a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

*No, there is not an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan for the area the project is proposed.*

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?

*No, there are no extenuating factors that will expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from wildfire. Fire risks are moderate at the project site. The project site and land surrounding the project site is sparsely vegetated. The proposed project does little to add to the wildfire risk in the area. The risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires is less than significant at this site, and any potential risk is further mitigated by compliance with California Building Standards. The project site is also located within the Southern Inyo Fire Protection District.*

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?

*No, the project will not cause the need for additional wildfire associated infrastructure. The project site is also located within the Southern Inyo Fire Protection District.*

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	---	------------------------------	-----------

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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the proposed project location is on flat land and will not create downslope or downstream flooding or landslides. The proposed storm drain system is adequate to avoid any potential issues with downstream properties.*

**XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

a) Does the project have the potential to 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, 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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

*No, the project will not impact or degrade the quality of the environment. The limited impacts to resources on the project area are less than significant. The project proponent has designed the project to avoid impacts to resources. As a Condition of Approval for the permit, and due to the expiration of surveys (conducted in spring 2019), the applicant-supplied-biologist shall perform preconstruction surveys following the Mohave Ground Squirrel Survey Guidelines to ensure their absence within the Project area and a 50-foot buffer zone; preconstruction, protocol level presence or absence surveys for Desert Tortoise no more than 14 days prior to the start of project activities, utilizing a construction monitor (in the event nothing is found) or an Incidental Take Permit (if Desert Tortoise is located during preconstruction surveys); and, CDFW protocol surveys for special status plants and natural communities prior to the start of construction.*

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)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the proposed project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. Due to the sparseness of the natural environment, and lack of disturbance to plant or animal habitat, this location is well suited for the proposed project.*

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

*No, the proposed project has no known environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly. The proposed project would not adversely impact the residents in the vicinity and may have positive impacts resulting from employment opportunities.*