



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

April 19, 2023

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
INITIAL STUDY (IS 22-38)
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

1. Project Title: Pasta Farms II Cannabis Cultivation Project
2. Permit Numbers: Initial Study (IS 22-38) for the following:
 - Use Permit (UP 22-31, new)
 - Use Permit (UP 20-11, previously approved)
3. Lead Agency Name and Address: County of Lake
Community Development Department
Courthouse, 3rd Floor, 255 North Forbes Street
Lakeport, CA 95453
4. Contact Person: Eric Porter, Associate Planner
(707) 263-2221
5. Project Location(s): 10750 Seigler Springs Road, Kelseyville, CA
6. Parcel Numbers: Cultivation lots: 115-004-01 and 05
Cluster lots: 115-004-07 and 08
7. Project Sponsor's Name & Address: Peter Simon, Pasta Farms, LLC
1812 Ferdinand Court
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
8. General Plan Designation: Agriculture (A), Rural Lands (RL), Rural Residential (RR)
9. Zoning: "A" Agriculture and "RL-B5", Rural Lands – Special Lot Density
10. Flood Zone: None mapped
11. Slope: Slopes in the cultivation areas are less than 10%
12. Fire Hazard Severity Zone: California State Responsibility Area (CALFIRE); moderate risk of wildfire
13. Waterways: Several seasonal unnamed water courses
14. Fire District: Kelseyville Fire Protection District; CalFire
15. Parcel Sizes: 409.1 Acres Combined

16. **Description of Project.** The applicant seeks a major use permit for nine (9) A-Type 3 ‘medium outdoor’ commercial cannabis licenses. The project was approved for eleven (11) acres of outdoor commercial cannabis cultivation in 2021 under file no. UP 21-11. The new use permit under review would have four of these eleven outdoor acres convert to A-Type 3B ‘greenhouse’ (mixed light) cultivation in 2024 or 2025 and is identified as Phase III. Total outdoor canopy area for ‘Phase II’ = twenty acres (about 871,000 sq. ft.). Total canopy area for Phase III is sixteen acres of outdoor canopy (696,960 sq. ft.) and two acres of mixed-light (greenhouse) canopy (88,000 sq. ft.). Cultivation will occur on APNs 115-004-01 and 05. APNs 115-004-07 and 08 are clustering lots to make up the land area needed for the two use permits.

FIGURE 1 – TAX LOTS



Source: Lake County GIS Mapping

California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, Article 11, Section 15162 (a) When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines, on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or Negative Declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the Negative Declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:

- (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
- (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
- (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
- (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

There is an existing 300,000-gallon water storage tank used for fire suppression and irrigation. The original project also proposed the construction of a pesticide storage shed, compost shed, and a secured cannabis waste container. The site takes water from several existing permitted agricultural supply wells.

The approved project under Use Permit (UP 20-11) included planting of 11 acres of cannabis crop, removal of approximately 20 acres of vineyard and approximately 100 walnut trees by hand, construction of a 27,201 square foot (sf) processing building, installation of temporary hoop houses for shading, construction of four 22,000-sf greenhouses, installation of fencing, improvement of internal dirt/gravel roads for access to cultivation.

The original approval of UP 20-11 included a 300,000 gallon water tank. Of the 300,000-gallon capacity of the fire water tank, 65,000 gallons would be dedicated to fire suppression of the agricultural building. An ADA portable toilet, including an ADA compliant hand washing station is currently located in the agricultural building parking lot but would be moved inside the building once the permit is approved. As part of the Proposed Project, a gravel parking area would be constructed in front of the agricultural building, including 20 parking spots.

A Property Management Plan was developed for the project and was updated for the proposed expansion. According to the application materials received, the original and revised project includes mitigation measures and best management practices (BMPs) to reduce, control, or eliminate potential environmental impacts, as well as a detailed description of project operations. The Property Management Plan includes the subjects of air quality, cultural resources, energy usage, fertilizer usage, fish and wildlife protection, operations manual, pest management, security, storm water management, waste management, water resources, and water use. All elements within the Property Management Plan are components of the approved and the proposed project.

Property Details

The subject site is located on Siegler Springs Rd, approximately 4.1 miles south of Clear Lake Riviera, CA in southern Lake County. Siegler Springs Road, a dirt/gravel County-owned road extends through the Project Site. The property boundary consists of three parcels, two of which contain cannabis operations. The site has historically been used as a walnut orchard and vineyard. Parcel APN 115-004-05 contains the existing agricultural building and associated access points. Parcel APN 115-004-01 contains the fire water tank. Parcel APN 115-004-08, on which no cannabis activity would occur, contains a single residential house. A neighboring parcel (APN 115-004-07) contains a well house, which currently supplies water to parcel APN 115-004-05.

The topography of the property varies with the northern portion of the property being flat to slightly sloped and the southern portion of the property being moderately to steeply sloped. The majority of the site has a northerly aspect with the southern portion having a variety of aspects. The majority of the property is located within the Thurston Lake watershed and the southern portion of the property is located within the Seigler Canyon Creek-Cache Creek watershed. Surface water runoff from the proposed cultivation area generally sheet flows north, near the Konocti Conservation Camp into Thurston Creek, which generally flows north into Ely Flat. Ely Flat connects to the larger branch of Thurston Creek, which flows east into Thurston Lake, which appear to be an isolated basin that does not connect to Clear Lake. There are no existing or proposed stream crossings on the site. All proposed structures and construction activities would occur more than 100 feet from all surface water bodies. There are no drainages, wetlands or sensitive habitat types at the site.

Fencing is installed around the project site. The outdoor cultivation areas are fenced with 6-foot privacy-slatted chain-link fence on the Seigler Springs Road facing side and wildlife metal fencing with wood posts would be constructed on all other perimeters. There would be one point of entry at each cultivation area (north and south of Seigler Springs Road). At each access point, electric gates would be equipped with fire-rated locks and commercial-grade KnoxBox for both security and emergency access and connected to a security system.

Construction

The Applicant previously obtained a grading permit for removal of walnut trees. A minimal amount of grading would occur on the northeast portion of the site for the nursery expansion. A limited number of truck trips for base rock and the concrete slab would be necessary. Construction for the immature plant structure area is expected to take six weeks and would require a total of 60 truck trips. Some grading has previously occurred to construct the gravel parking lot in front of the existing agricultural building, as the slope in that area is generally flat, however there was not enough earth moved to require a grading permit. Minor trenching occurred for the installation of irrigation water lines and electrical communication lines for security, and no new trenching appears to be necessary for this project to occur.

Construction would occur Monday through Sunday from the hours of 7:00 am to 5:00 pm. Construction equipment would consist of the following: concrete mixers, bobcats, backhoes, rough-terrain forklifts, and supply tractors. Idling of construction vehicles would be minimized and discouraged. All equipment would be maintained and operated in a manner that minimizes any spill or leak of hazardous materials, refueling would occur in locations more than 100 feet from surface water bodies, and any servicing of equipment would occur on an impermeable surface. In the event of a spill or leak, the contaminated soil would be stored, transported, and disposed of consistent with applicable local, state, and federal regulations.

Cultivation Operations

Once operational, the project expansion area would involve several pick-ups and deliveries of cannabis and related materials weekly, with peak traffic occurring during the harvest time in early fall. The site would not be open to the public. Normal working hours would be Monday through Friday 7:00 am to 4:00 pm with flexible shifts and hours. The site would also operate on Saturdays and Sundays during peak season. It is anticipated that four employees would be required per shift, with up to 15 required during the peak season. No increase in employees is expected with the new project.

The outdoor cultivation season for Pasta Farm's begins in early April and ends around mid-November of each year. Mixed-light (greenhouse) operations occur year-round. The growing medium consists of an amended native soil mixture, with composted soil and other vegetation waste

compost generated on site added to the soil as an amendment. Imported soil amendments would include locally sourced oyster shell flour, gypsum, and soft rock phosphate.

Three cubic yard waste bins are serviced on a weekly basis by C&S Waste Solutions/Lake County Waste Solutions. Organic wastes are composted on site whenever possible and stored in the designated compost shed until it is incorporated into the soils of the cultivation areas as a soil amendment. Cannabis waste is minimized to the extent possible through grinding and mulching root balls, stocks, and stems, and stored in a secured cannabis waste container. Solid waste is not expected from cannabis vegetative material. Chemicals stored and used for cultivation operations include fertilizers/nutrients, pesticides, petroleum products, and cleaning products. All pesticides are securely stored inside the proposed pesticide storage shed. Yellow and well-marked hazardous waste lockers are maintained in the agricultural building, which stores all potentially hazardous materials. All materials are and will be maintained in their original containers.

The project has a security alarm system that is monitored by a 24-hour commercial alarm monitoring service. Cameras and motion sensor lights are installed on the fence line to provide complete coverage of the perimeters. The video and motion detection system are installed in a secure room with recording equipment and allow remote access.

Water Analysis

The applicant has submitted a Hydrology Report, prepared by Bill Vanderwall, P.E., and dated August 11, 2021. The Report evaluated water demand for the original 11 acres of outdoor cultivation, and an additional 11 acres of canopy to take the expansion into consideration. will reduce water demand to the vineyard, which is being removed to accommodate 9 acres of additional cannabis canopy.

The Report makes several assumptions; (1) that drought year water recharge is 20% of water recharge in a non-drought year; (2) that the 'Cooper-Jacob' well equation is a valid means of computing water demand; (3) that the aquifer is uniform throughout the area of well influence, and (4) that the well test conducted by Jim's Pump is a valid indicator of well productivity.

There are three (3) wells that are proposed to be used in this project. The data for each is as follows:

Well #1

Located in the southeast vicinity of APN 115-004-07; the well had been located off-site during the original Use Permit review for UP 20-11, however the applicant has since purchased the property. The total drill depth of Well #1 is 300 feet. The output for this well was shown to be 197 gallons per minute (GPM). This well will be used for cannabis irrigation.

Well #2

This well is located in the eastern vicinity of APN: 115-004-05 and is 380 feet southwest of Well #1. The total drill depth of Well #2 is 300 feet. The tested output of this well is 275 GPM. This well will be used for cannabis irrigation.

Well #3

This well is located in the center vicinity of APN 011-069-48. The well is drilled to a depth of 300 feet and has a measured output of 25 GPM. This well is to be used for cannabis irrigation.

Nearby Well.

Located in the eastern vicinity of APN 115-004-07. The well is drilled to a depth of 200 feet and has a measured output of 25 GPM. This well is located 137 feet west of Well #1 and is to be used exclusively for residential use.

Aquifer Data

The aquifer has a top reed clay with boulders layer from 0-30' depth and is a confined aquifer according to the Report. The depth of the aquifer is estimated to be 300 feet for wells #1, #2 and #3, and 200 feet for the nearby well. The Report estimates the aquifer's area of influence to be 472 feet from wells #1, 2 and 3, and 372 feet for neighboring well. The next-closest well is located 550 feet from Well #1's radius of influence.

According to the Report, the aquifer will recharge from two distinct areas. Area 1 is measured to be 3,139,904 sf in size; Area 2 is measured to be 1,849,173 sf. Average (non-drought year) rainfall is 34 inches per year. Drought year rainfall is estimated to be 20% of this total (NOAA data on year 2021 was 9" for the year). *Total recharge of this area during a drought year was estimated to be 14,785,508 gallons per year (about 42.3 acre feet per year).*

Water Usage

The Report evaluated water usage for 11 acres of canopy (479,160 sf); the projected usage includes the restroom located in the processing building, which serves 15 employees. The Report took into consideration the expansion of the project and projected the total usage to irrigate 22 acres of cannabis canopy, which is about 2 acres larger than what is actually proposed.

The Report states that the project will need 12,121,004 gallons of water per year (about 37.2 acre feet per year); this is based on 22 total acres of irrigated cannabis area. This equals 550,954 gallons per acre. Subtracting two acres that are not going to be planted (the proposal calls for 20 total acres of cannabis) shows a total annual demand of (12,121,004 – [2 x 550,954 gallons], or an *actual projected total of 11,019,096 gallons of water demand per year (about 33.8 acre-feet per year).*

Conclusion

The Report finds that there is adequate water available to serve the project without adversely impacting other area wells.

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

- North: Parcels to the north are zoned RR (Rural Residential) and RL (Rural Lands) District. These parcels contain scattered rural residences within mixed forest lands.
- South: Parcels to the south are zoned RR (Rural Residential) and RL (Rural Lands) District. These parcels contain scattered rural residences within mixed forest lands.
- West: RL, RR, TPZ Parcels to the west are zoned RR, RL, and TPZ (Timberland Preserve) District. These parcels contain scattered rural residences within mixed forest lands.
- East: Parcels to the east are zoned RL District. These parcels contain scattered rural residences within mixed forest lands and some orchard areas.

FIGURE 2 – ZONING OF SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA



Source: Lake County GIS Mapping

18. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., Permits, financing approval, or participation agreement). Other organizations in the review process for permitting purposes, financial approval, or participation agreement can include but are not limited to:

- County of Lake
 - Lake County Community Development Department
 - Lake County Department of Public Works
 - Lake County Air Quality Management District
 - Lake County Agricultural Commissioner
 - Lake County Sheriff Department
 - Lake County Water Resources Department
 - Lake County Public Services
 - Lake County Department of Environmental Health
- Kelseyville Fire Protection District
- Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
- California Water Resources Control Board
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
- CalCannabis (Dept. of Food and Agriculture)
- California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection (Calfire)
- California Department of Pesticides Regulations
- California Department of Public Health
- California Bureau of Cannabis Control
- California Department of Consumer Affairs

19. 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.?

The applicant has a signed Agreement with the Middletown Rancheria Tribe to allow Tribal Monitors on site during all site disturbance. The monitoring agreement has no expiration date and carries over to the expansion area. All area tribes were notified of this expansion on November 18, 2022 by notice sent by email that contained a project description and site plan.

Native American research and outreach was conducted by ALTA Archaeological Consulting during preparation of the Cultural Survey Report, which included a record search at the Northwest Information Center. An ALTA archeologist contacted the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) in 2019 prior to the first use permit approval to request a review of Sacred Lands files. The search returned negative results. The NAHC forwarded a Native American Contacts list and letters were mailed to individuals indicated by NAHC. Furthermore, the Project owner has been working extensively with the local tribal government to ensure cooperation and transparency with any ground disturbance that could potentially impact or disturb any human remains or native artifacts. As a result, a Cultural Resources Monitoring and Treatment Agreement was entered into between the Middletown Rancheria of Pomo Indians of California and DiCesare Vineyards, LLC. The County of Lake, as the Lead Agency, initiated consultation with interested tribes pursuant to Public Resources Code 21080.3.1

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forestry Resources | <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wildfire |
| <input checked="" 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: April 19, 2023

SIGNATURE _____

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

I. AESTHETICS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Except as provided in Public Resource Code Section 21099, would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2, 3, 4, 9
c) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9
d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9

Discussion:

- a) The Project Site is not located near a designated State Scenic Highway or other designated scenic corridor. The nearest eligible State Scenic Highway is State Route 29, approximately 1.6 miles north of the Project Site, which does not provide views of the Project Site. The expansion would involve the planting of 9 additional acres of cannabis crops and installation of

an 18,000 sq. ft. expansion of the nursery, which would be similar to the current agricultural aesthetic of the surrounding area. Scattered residences exist around the site, however, none would have direct views of the structures associated with the expansion project due to dense vegetation, and there are no direct views of scenic resources at ground level on the project site that would potentially be blocked due to construction of the project.

No Impact

- b) No unique resources such as rock outcroppings or historic buildings exist on the site, which consists of a mix of vineyard and the previously-approved eleven (11) acre cultivation area, plus the 9 additional acres proposed with this action. The site is relatively rural and not open to the public.

Less than Significant Impact

- c) The expansion project proposes agricultural activities, which are consistent with the current visual character of the Project Site. Components of the project would be visible to people travelling along Seigler Springs Road; however, most of the scattered residences near the site would not have direct views of the cannabis cultivation areas or structures associated with the project. A few residences may have partial views of the proposed structures; however, this would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of public views. The proposed expansion would not substantially degrade the existing visual character and/or quality of public views.

Less Than Significant Impact

- d) The expansion has some potential to create a new source of light through security lighting; however, the amount of generated light would not be considered substantial. Security lighting would not initiate unless triggered by a motion sensor. The nursery building expansion will use blackout screens to prevent unnatural light from escaping. Lighting would be shielded and downward facing and shall be consistent with that which is recommended on the website: www.darksky.org and provisions of section 21.41.8 of the Zoning Ordinance.

The following mitigation measures are added to ensure that the changes proposed will not adversely impact Aesthetics:

- AES-1: Prior to cultivation, all greenhouses shall be equipped with blackout screening so that light is not visible from neighboring lots or public roads.
- AES-2: Prior to cultivation, the cultivation areas shall be screened from view with 6' tall screening fencing. Acceptable materials are chain link with privacy slats, or solid wood or metal fencing. Fabric is not permitted due to limited durability.

Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measures added

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	---------------

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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 2, 3, 4,
7, 8, 11,
13, 39 |
| 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"/> | 1, 2, 3, 4,
5, 7, 8, 11,
13 |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 2, 3, 4,
5, 7, 8, 11,
13 |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 2, 3, 4,
5, 6, 9 |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 2, 3, 4,
5, 7, 8, 11,
13 |

Discussion:

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.

- a) The site is classified by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program as "Unique Farmland". The Proposed Project intends to maintain a majority of the four properties for agricultural uses. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) The site is zoned Agricultural (A) and Rural Lands (RL). The project is compatible with these land uses and is not under a Williamson Act contract.

No Impact

- c) The site is not zoned forest land or timberland and would therefore not conflict with or result in the rezoning of forest land or timberland.

No Impact

- d) The expansion project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. Minor trenching would occur in the southern area of the project area to connect an irrigation line from the water tank to the cultivation area. However, trees would not be removed or disturbed as part of this process and the parcel is not zoned "forest land".

Less Than Significant Impact

- e) No other changes are proposed that would otherwise affect the existing environment. The area of disturbance had been planted with vineyards, which have since been removed. The majority of the vineyards on site remain active and viable.

Less Than Significant Impact

III. AIR QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
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"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 21, 24, 31, 36
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 21, 24, 31, 36
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 21, 24, 31, 36
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 21, 24, 31, 36

Discussion:

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.

- a) Since the Lake County Air Basin is in attainment for all air pollutants, air quality plans are not required in Lake County.

Although the Lake County Air Basin is not required to have an air quality plan, the proposed project has the potential to result in short- and long-term air quality impacts from construction and operation of the proposed project.

The project has some potential to result in some air quality impacts (primarily dust) during site preparation. Existing interior roads are paved and graveled, and proposed roads would be constructed from compacted gravel. A backup generator may be used, but only for emergency use such as a power outage. There is no mapped serpentine soil on the site. The parking areas and driveway have a gravel surface.

Construction of the project would take an estimated 2 to 4 months to complete. Emissions during construction would be temporary in nature and would not result in significant air quality impacts.

Long term emissions associated with the Proposed Project operations are those associated with vehicle traffic and gravel roads.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) The project would not generate emissions of any criteria air pollutant that would cause the project region to be in a state of non-attainment.

No Impact

- c) The expansion has the potential to expose off-site sensitive receptors to air pollutant emissions from construction activities, which include emissions of particulate matter from diesel-fueled engines. Construction-related activities associated with the expansion would generate some emissions of air pollutants from site preparation (e.g., grading and clearing), off-road equipment, material transport, worker vehicles, and vehicle travel on unpaved roads. Existing off-site sensitive receptors consist of scattered residences, of which the closest to the site is a residence located approximately 230 feet north of the Project Site boundary.

Auto emissions can be a source of CO₂. According to the EPA, one vehicle mile traveled causes 404 grams of CO₂ to be emitted. Lake County does not have adopted thresholds of significance for CO₂ gas emissions, but uses Bay Area Air Quality Management District's standards of 1,100 tons *per project*. The total number of anticipated employees for Pasta II improvements will not increase from the original 15 employees projected to work on site. Emission projections are based on 15 employees, each driving a vehicle to and from work, and traveling 10 miles each direction; this is roughly the distance to Lower Lake and Kelseyville, the two nearest populated areas where employees would likely reside. Assuming 30 employee trips per day, plus one delivery trip, the following emissions will likely result during operations (construction emission characteristics are expected to be similar): 31 vehicle trips x 10 miles x 404 grams per mile per car = 125,240 grams of CO₂ emissions per day. Assuming a 270 day growing season, total CO₂ output would be about 33,814,000 grams of CO₂ per year, or 33.8 tons of CO₂ per year. Given the threshold of 1,100 tons per project, it would take approximately 32.5 years for this project to meet the recommended threshold of significance for CO₂ gas emissions due to vehicles.

The individual greenhouses and drying / processing building will be equipped with carbon filtration systems. While this will not eliminate CO₂ emissions, it will reduce emissions significantly.

The generation of dust (fugitive PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) during construction activities could adversely affect sensitive receptors and construction workers by exacerbating existing

respiratory problems such as asthma. The project has the some potential to release fumes from volatile organic compounds utilized. This is a potentially significant impact.

The following Mitigation Measures are therefore added:

- AQ-1: The following control measures shall be implemented during construction and for the life of the project:
 - a) During construction, emissions of fugitive dust from any active operation, open storage pile, or disturbed surface area, shall be controlled so that dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the boundary line of the emission source.
 - b) When wind speeds result in dust emissions crossing property lines, and despite the application of dust control measures, grading and earthmoving operations shall be suspended and inactive disturbed surface areas shall be stabilized.
 - c) Fugitive dust generated by active operations, open storage piles, or from a disturbed surface area shall not result in such opacity as to obscure an observer's view to a degree equal to or greater than does smoke as dark or darker in shade as that designated as No. 2 on the Ringlemann Chart (or 40 percent opacity).
 - d) All exposed soils be watered as needed to prevent dust density as described above and in order to prevent dust from visibly exiting the property.
 - e) All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material offsite shall be covered.
 - f) All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.
 - g) Diesel generators are prohibited during and after construction, except as an emergency, backup generator to be used only during power outages. Applicant shall maintain all necessary permits to house and operate an emergency backup generator.
 - h) Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas of the construction site to remind off-road equipment operators that idling time is limited to a maximum of 5 minutes.
- AQ-2: 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.
- AQ-3: The applicant shall have the primary access and parking areas surfaced with chip seal, asphalt or an equivalent all weather surfacing including gravel to reduce fugitive dust generation.

Less Than Significant with mitigation measures added

- d) The Proposed Project would result in some diesel exhaust emissions from on-site construction equipment during the construction phase. Diesel exhaust emissions can result in temporary and intermittent odors at off-site sensitive receptors. However, these odors are generally not

detectible beyond a project's property line due to the rapid deposition of diesel exhaust emissions.

The Property Management Plan, which is a component of the proposed project, requires the Applicant to prepare an Odor Response Program and submit to the Community Development Department for review and approval. As part of the Program, property owners and residents of property within a 1,000-foot radius of the proposed project would be provided with the contact information of the individual responsible for responding to odor complaints. 24 properties have been identified for notification.

Furthermore, potential odors would be minimized through the use of carbon filtration systems in the greenhouses and processing / drying building. Regarding the outdoor cultivation, the canopy would be housed under plastic sheeted temporary hoops and the agricultural building would be equipped with air circulation fans and passive carbon filtration.

Less than Significant Impact

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
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"/>	2, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 45
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 45
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal wetlands, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 21, 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 45
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"/>	13
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"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13

- 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? 1, 2, 3, 5, 6

Discussion:

- a) A Biological Assessment was prepared for the proposed project. The Biological Assessment was prepared for already-approved Use Permit UP 20-11, however the expansion area was part of the Assessment Area. As part of the Biological Assessment, a site visit was conducted on September 20, 2019. The California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants, California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) California Natural Diversity Database, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultation were reviewed to determine special-status species that may occur within the region. For the purpose of this Initial Study, special-status includes species that are:

- Ranked by CNPS as List 1 or List 2;
- Listed or proposed for listing as endangered or threatened under the California Endangered Species Act and/or Federal Endangered Species Act;
- Designated as endangered, rare, or fully protected pursuant to the California Fish and Game Code; or
- Designated as a Species of Special Concern by CDFW.

The site is currently in agricultural use and is subject to regular disturbance. The Project Site is comprised of existing orchard/vineyard, existing access roadways, and is surrounded by agricultural use. The Biological Assessment concluded that, if allowed to revegetate naturally, it was likely that non-native grasses and ruderal species would establish due to the ongoing disturbance from agricultural and other land management activities.

The Biological Assessment concluded that the site does not contain suitable habitat to support special-status plants. Additionally, removal of native vegetation is not proposed under the expansion project. Therefore, there would be no impact to special-status plants.

The habitat of the site is considered ruderal/disturbed and offers little value to wildlife species. However, intact woodland habitat surrounding the site may provide suitable habitat for the special-status purple martin. Proposed lighting would consist of minimal motion-detecting security lighting that would not overspill into the woodland habitat and would therefore not result in the potential to strand or disorient migratory birds.

The Biological Assessment considered the potential for bald and golden eagles to be impacted by the project, however, there are no known observations or nesting sites for these species within five miles of the site. Because of this, and because suitable eagle nesting and foraging habitat would not be impacted as part of the project, the Biological Assessment concluded that impacts to bald and golden eagles would be less-than-significant.

Although minimal, ground disturbing activities could result in minor sensory disturbance to birds nesting nearby, and birds may nest within walnut trees proposed for removal. Nesting migratory birds are protected under California Fish and Game Code as well as the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Additionally, purple martin (CDFW Species of Special Concern) has the potential to nest in the adjacent woodland habitat. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would avoid

potential impacts to nesting birds by requiring a preconstruction nesting bird survey prior to construction and establishing a disturbance-free buffer around active nests. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, potential impacts to nesting birds, including special-status bird species, would be less-than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

- BIO-1: Should work commence during the nesting season (February 1 through August 31), a preconstruction nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 48 hours prior to the start of ground disturbing activities. Areas on and within 500 feet of construction shall be surveyed as possible for active nests. Should an active nest be identified, a “disturbance-free” buffer shall be established by the qualified biologist based on the needs of the species identified and clearly marked by high-visibility material. The buffer shall remain in place until the biologist determines that the nest is no longer active. Construction activities, including removal of trees, shall not occur within the buffer. Should construction cease for a period of five days or more, an additional pre-construction nesting bird survey shall be conducted.

Less Than Significant with mitigation measure added.

- b) Habitats on the Project Site consist of developed land, vineyard, orchard, and ruderal/disturbed. These habitat types are not considered sensitive. The Project Site is limited to ruderal/disturbed habitat that was historically utilized as an orchard that was recently removed. At the time of the survey, the Project Site was bare ground with existing vineyard and remnant walnut orchard.

As a component of compliance with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Requirements for Cannabis Cultivation, use of chemicals such as pesticides and fertilizers are prohibited in conditions where such chemicals could enter riparian or aquatic habitat. A Property Management Plan has been prepared to facilitate the use of operational chemicals and ensure compliance with requirements protecting aquatic resources. As an additional component of the Property Management Plan, a stormwater management plan has been included to prevent runoff from impacting surface water resources. The Applicant would be required to prepare a Site Management Plan and Nitrogen Management Plan, and provide these documents to the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB). These plans would ensure that any riparian habitat or sensitive natural communities are protected from the discharge of waste associated with cannabis cultivation activities. There are no aquatic or riparian habitats within 100 feet of the site.

Less than Significant Impact

- c) As stated above, there are no aquatic habitats present on or adjacent to the site. Therefore, no direct conversion of aquatic habitat would occur. As stated above, the project design includes a Property Management Plan that would prevent chemicals, sediment, or impaired runoff from entering surface water sources and the Applicant would be required to prepare a Site Management Plan and Nitrogen Management Plan to the CVRWQCB. The project does not include the storage of materials within 100 feet of aquatic habitat. This is consistent with setbacks identified in the State Water Resources Control Board Requirements for Cannabis Cultivation and within Article 27.11 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance.

Less Than Significant Impact

- d) The site is mostly developed with commercial cannabis and vineyards, and is subject to regular disturbance from ongoing agricultural activities. Existing fencing occurs around vineyard block areas, and existing roadways bisect the site. The site does not serve as a wildlife corridor or nursery. Lands surrounding the site contain significant and undeveloped mixed forest habitat that could provide suitable habitat for migrating animals or rearing of young. The project would not alter or impact wildlife access to or use of these areas.

Less than Significant Impact

- e) The project would not conflict with any local policies protecting biological resources. There are no significant biological resources present on the site and no vegetation removal is proposed aside from the vineyard and remaining orchard trees within the site.

No Impact

- f) There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plans, Natural Community Conservation Plans, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans that cover the area of the site. Therefore, the project would not conflict with an established or proposed conservation plan. A technical report for preserving landscape connectivity for the region has been prepared and identifies key areas for preservation of wildlife corridors throughout the region (Mayacamas to Berryessa Connectivity Network; Gray et. al., 2018). This report recognizes that significant undeveloped land in the vicinity of the site allows for a medium to high level of wildlife terrestrial permeability. However, the site is outside of the areas identified as wildlife corridors key to preservation of large-scale wildlife movement. As stated above, there are no riparian habitats or aquatic habitats on the site. Additionally, the Project Site does not facilitate wildlife movement and would not impact wildlife use or access to nearby undeveloped habitat. Conversion of previous orchard habitat into cannabis cultivation and maintenance of existing dirt and gravel roadways would not conflict with the goals of the Mayacamas to Berryessa Connectivity Network.

No Impact

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14c, 15
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15

Discussion:

- a) An archaeological record search at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC), Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) contact program, and field survey were completed in September and October of 2019. The NWIC record search found that part of the Proposed Project Site had been previously surveyed but that no cultural resources had been identified. The NAHC determined that there were no listings in the Sacred Lands file for the Proposed Project Site but identified five individuals who might have information regarding resources; all were contacted, and an Agreement with the Middletown Rancheria Tribe was signed and is of record to allow Tribal Monitors on site during site disturbing activities.

The Archaeological Survey was completed using transects spaced no more than 20 meters apart. Ground surface visibility was very good, as much of the remnant orchard had been removed. Two large lithic scatter sites were identified, however the project cultivation and processing areas have been located over 100 feet from the two known and potentially sensitive archaeological sites.

The presence of prehistoric resources indicates an increased potential for buried resources or human remains that could be uncovered during construction. Identification of subsurface deposits, new resources, or human remains are all potentially significant impacts. If any artifacts, archaeological features, or human remains are encountered during grading or excavation, the mitigation measures below shall be implemented. With the mitigation measures incorporated below, all potential environmental impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Mitigation measures:

- CUL-1: Prior to the initiation of ground-disturbing activities, all construction personnel shall be trained in the protection of cultural resources, the recognition of buried cultural remains, and the notification procedures to be followed upon the discovery of archaeological materials, including Native American burials. The training shall be presented by an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Prehistoric and Historic Archaeology and by a Native American representative and should include recognition of both prehistoric and historic resources. Personnel shall be instructed that unauthorized collection or disturbance of artifacts or other cultural materials is illegal, and that violators will be subject to prosecution under the appropriate laws. Supervisors shall also be briefed on the consequences of intentional or inadvertent damage to cultural resources.
- CUL-2: Prior to beginning of work, the applicant shall ensure that the boundaries of the archaeological sites are clearly described and illustrated in the final design plans. Prior to the commencement of project construction, demolition, grading, preparation, or other ground-disturbing activities, the applicant shall retain a qualified professional archaeologist to work with the construction contractor to place wooden stakes along the mapped limits of any cultural resource situated within 100 feet of construction activities. Site personnel shall be directed to keep all equipment, materials, and activities outside of the exclusion zones. The exclusion zone stakes and flagging will remain in place for the duration of construction activities.

- CUL-3: Should human remains be uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, all construction shall halt within 50 feet of the find and the County Coroner shall be notified immediately. Compliance with Section 15064.5 (e) (1) of the CEQA Guidelines and Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 shall be required. If the coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the coroner shall ask the NAHC to identify a Most Likely Descendant, who will work with the construction contractor, agency officials, and a qualified professional archaeologist to determine an appropriate avoidance strategy or other treatment plan. Project-related ground disturbance in the vicinity of the find shall not resume until the process detailed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (e) has been completed.
- CUL-4: Prior to cultivation, the applicant shall retain a professional archaeologist to update the conditions of the site on the Office of Historic Preservation's DPR 523 resource recordation forms to reflect the sensitive site on the subject property.
- CUL-5: Should human remains be uncovered during ground-disturbing activities, all construction shall halt within 50 feet of the find and the County Coroner shall be notified immediately and compliance with Section 15064.5 (e) (1) of the CEQA Guidelines and Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 shall be required. If the coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the coroner shall ask the NAHC to identify a Most Likely Descendant, who will work with the construction contractor, agency officials, and a qualified professional archaeologist to determine an appropriate avoidance strategy or other treatment plan. Project-related ground disturbance in the vicinity of the find shall not resume until the process detailed in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (e) has been completed.
- CUL-6: The Cultural Resources Treatment and Monitoring Agreement (Attachment 7 of the Pasta Farms IS/MND) entered into between the Middletown Rancheria Tribe of Pomo Indians of California and the Hidden Valley Lake Association shall be adhered to in order to formalize procedures for the protection and treatment of Native American cultural resources, as defined by the agreement.

Less than Significant Impacts with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-6 incorporated

- b) The project has some potential to create an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource; therefore mitigation measures CUL-1 through CUL-6 have been added. There is also an existing Tribal Monitoring Agreement in place with the Middletown Rancheria Tribe to allow and require Tribal Monitors to be present during any site disturbance.

Less than Significant Impacts with Mitigation Measures incorporated

- c) The project has some potential to create an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource; therefore mitigation measures CR-1 through CR-6 have been added.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures incorporated

VI. ENERGY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resource, during construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5
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"/>	1, 3, 4, 5

Discussion:

- a) Construction of the project could create an increased energy demand. The site is presently served by one 800 amp electrical service, and one (1) 200 amp electrical service. Fossil fuels used for construction vehicles and other equipment would be used during site clearing, grading, and trenching. Fuel consumed during construction would be temporary in nature and would not represent a significant demand on available fuel. There are no unusual characteristics that would necessitate the use of construction equipment that would be less energy efficient than at comparable construction sites in the region or State.

As stated in the Energy section of the Property Management Plan, energy requirements and required equipment (e.g., insulation, water heating systems, light control) would be based on the California Energy Commission's 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. Furthermore, a training would be conducted for all employees to cover areas such as limited electrical usage, keeping doors closed, and other basic methods. These measures would help conserve energy.

As stated, the existing (older) and new agricultural buildings currently receives electrical power from PG&E. The nursery expansion would connect to existing electric lines. Electricity would mainly be required for interior and security lights and would be minimal. Therefore, operation of the project would not result in inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.

The applicant has provided electrical calculations dated 12/5/2022 for the expansion project. According to the electrical calculations submitted, he project is currently served by an 800 amp service. The expansion area would require a total of 2200 additional amp service, which appears to be consistent of a project with this scope.

There are no known grid capacity issues at this location. PG&E was notified of this expansion in November 2022, and on December 7, 2022 provided comments to the County. The comments indicated that PG&E operations underground electric distribution facilities on the property, and there are setback limits to any new buildings from underground power lines. The PG&E comments made no mention of 'at' or 'over capacity' for their facilities at this location.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) The project would not conflict with a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, and would not result in the wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.

Less Than Significant Impact

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
a) Directly or indirectly cause potentially 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 18, 19
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?					
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?					
iv) Landslides?					
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 19, 21, 24, 25, 30
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 18, 21
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5, 7, 39
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2, 4, 5, 7, 13, 39
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 14, 15

Discussion:

- a) Although there are no mapped faults on or near the site, the Project site is located in a seismically active area of California and is expected to experience moderate to severe ground shaking, potentially during the lifetime of the Project. That risk is not considered substantially different than that of other similar properties and projects in Northern California.

Earthquake Faults (i)

According to the USGS Earthquake Faults map available on the Lake County GIS Portal, there are no mapped earthquake faults on the Project site. The nearest active Alquist-Priolo fault is an unnamed late quaternary fault in the Konocti Bay fault zone located immediately west of the Project site.

Seismic Ground Shaking (ii) and Seismic-Related Ground Failure, including liquefaction (iii)

Lake County contains numerous known active faults. Future seismic events in the Northern California region can be expected to produce seismic ground shaking at the site. The site does not contain any mapped unstable soils. It is unlikely that ground failure or liquefaction would occur on the site in the future, and all proposed construction is required to be built under Current Seismic Safety Construction Standards.

Landslides (iv)

The Project cultivation sites contain slopes that are less than 10%. Due to low slopes and relatively stable soils, the project would not be significantly prone to landslides and would not result in an increased risk of landslides.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) Soils on the site are classified by the USDA Web Soil Survey as having a low erosion potential. Construction of the project would involve minor grading and earth moving activities, as well as construction of project components. Construction activities would result in the temporary disturbance of soil and could expose disturbed areas to potential storm events, which could generate accelerated runoff, localized erosion, and sedimentation. This is a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measures GEO-1 and GEO-2 would reduce impacts related to erosion and loss of topsoil.

Furthermore, a Site Management Plan would be prepared by a storm water professional and would provide details for waste discharge requirements and post-construction BMPs. The Site Management Plan would also provide compliance with the requirements of Chapter 29 of the Lake County Code, Storm Water Management Ordinance. The project would comply with the County Grading Ordinance.

Mitigation Measures:

- GEO-1: Prior to any ground disturbance, the permittee shall submit erosion control and sediment plans to the County's Water Resource Department and Community Development Department for review and approval. Said erosion control and sediment plans shall protect the local watershed from runoff pollution through the implementation of appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) in accordance with the Grading Ordinance. Typical BMPs include the placement of straw, mulch, seeding, straw wattles, silt fencing and the planting of native vegetation on all disturbed areas. No silt, sediment or other materials exceeding natural background levels shall be allowed to flow from the project area. The natural background level is the level of erosion that currently occurs from the area in a natural, undisturbed state. Vegetative cover and water bars shall be used as permanent erosion control after project installation. The applicant shall include a detailed description of the relocation or proper disposal of excess soil of said excavation.

- GEO-2: Excavation, filling, vegetation clearing or other disturbance of the soil shall not occur between October 15 and April 15 unless authorized by the Community Development Department Director. The actual dates of this defined grading period may be adjusted according to weather and soil conditions at the discretion of the Community Development Director.

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

- c) According to the USDA Web Soil Survey of the site, soil on the site consists of Type 127, Collayomi-Aiken-Whispering complex. This soil unit is generally well drained and generally stable. The groundwater table is over 80 inches deep; therefore, there is a low risk of liquefaction at the site. Based on the soil types present, there is a less than significant chance of landslide, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse as a result of the project.

Less Than Significant Impact

- d) The soils on the site are generally stable and are not classified as having a high shrink-swell potential. Soils on the site are not highly expansive and the linear extensibility of the soils is low. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to substantial adverse effects from expansive soil.

Less Than Significant Impact

- e) Soil types on the site primarily consist of Type 127 Collayomi-Aiken-Whispering complex, which is a very gravelly loam type typical of areas with low-to-moderate slopes and are well-drained. Loamy soils are typically suitable for on-site wastewater disposal systems. However, no new onsite wastewater disposal systems are being proposed; therefore no impact would occur.

No Impact

- f) An Archaeological Survey Report ("Report") was undertaken for the year 2020 use permit for these properties. The Report, prepared by Alta Archaeological Consulting and dated November 6, 2019, indicated that there were two sites identified on the 81.5 acre area that was surveyed. Both of these sites are outside of the project areas. The Report found that there are no known unique geological features present on the cultivation portion of the site, and the site is set back more than 100 feet from the two known potentially sensitive archaeological areas.

The Applicant has entered into a Tribal Monitoring Agreement with the culturally-affiliated Tribe, who was notified of this project expansion on February 10, 2023. No comments have been returned for this expansion as of this date.

There is always the potential, however remote, that previously unknown unique paleontological resources or sites could be encountered during subsurface construction activities. This is a potentially significant impact. In the event that paleontological resources or sites are found, Mitigation Measures GEO-3 would ensure that the Proposed Project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site. After implementation of Mitigation Measures GEO-3, impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measure:

- GEO-3: In the event of any inadvertent discovery of paleontological resources, all work within a 50-foot radius of the find shall be halted and the County shall be notified. Workers shall avoid altering the materials until a professional paleontologist can evaluate the significance of the find and make recommendations to the County on the measures that shall be implemented to protect the discovered resources.

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
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"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 36
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 36

Discussion:

- a) Air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions were estimated for the project. Construction of the project would emit GHG emissions primarily from the combustion of diesel fuel in heavy equipment. Construction GHG emissions are a one-time release and are typically considered separate from operational emissions, as global climate change is inherently a cumulative effect that occurs over a long period of time and is quantified on a yearly basis. Construction of the project is estimated to result in 33 metric tons of CO₂ equivalent (metric tons or MT of CO₂).

Consistent with recommendations of other air districts throughout California, and in the absence of a construction-specific significance threshold, this analysis amortizes the total construction emissions over the assumed lifetime of the project, and adds those emissions to the operational emissions. Using 30 years as a representative lifetime consistent with recommendations of other air districts throughout California, the project would result in total amortized construction emissions of 33.8 MT of CO₂ per year.

Operational GHG emissions from build-out of the project would result from direct mobile sources, including vehicle trips, as well as indirect GHG emissions sources from electricity use and water usage and conveyance. Operation of the project, including amortized construction emissions, would result in 33.8 metric tons of CO₂ per year. While Lake County has not adopted a threshold of significance for GHG emissions, the nearby Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has established GHG thresholds that are used by several air districts in Northern California, including a numeric threshold of 1,100 metric tons CO₂ *per project*. At the projected rate of CO₂ emissions, it would take about 32 years for this project to meet the threshold limit for CO₂ gas emissions; therefore the potential for CO₂ emissions is less than significant.

The County, in its discretion, has deemed that the BAAQMD's GHG thresholds are appropriate to use to evaluate the significance of the project's GHG emissions. Compared to the BAAQMD threshold, construction and operation of the project would result in a negligible increase in GHG emissions. Therefore, construction and operation of the project would not result in a substantial increase in GHG emissions. Impacts associated with construction and operational GHG emissions are considered less than significant. Additionally, incorporation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would further minimize GHG emissions from construction activities.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) To date, Lake County has not adopted any specific GHG reduction strategies or climate action plans. The quantitative thresholds developed by BAAQMD were formulated based on AB 32 and California Climate Change Scoping Plan reduction targets. Thus, a project cannot exceed a numeric BAAQMD threshold without also conflicting with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs (the state Climate Change Scoping Plan). Because the project emissions would be below the BAAQMD numeric threshold, the project would not conflict with any adopted plans or policies for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

On October 9, 2021, AB 1346 Air Pollution: Small Off-Road Equipment (SORE) was passed, which will require the state board, by July 1, 2022, consistent with federal law, to adopt cost-effective and technologically feasible regulations to prohibit engine exhaust and evaporative emissions from new small off-road engines, as defined by the state board. The bill would require the state board to identify and, to the extent feasible, make available funding for commercial rebates or similar incentive funding as part of any updates to existing applicable funding program guidelines to local air pollution control districts and air quality management districts to implement to support the transition to zero-emission small off-road equipment operations, and the applicant should be aware of and expected to make a transition away from SOREs by the required future date.

Less than Significant Impact

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 13, 21, 24, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 5, 13, 21, 24, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 5

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 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"/> | 2, 40 |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 4, 5, 20, 22 |
| f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 4, 5, 20, 22, 35, 37 |
| g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 4, 5, 20, 35, 37 |

Discussion

- a) Materials associated with the cultivation of commercial cannabis, such as fertilizers, pesticides, cleaning solvents, and gasoline, could be considered hazardous if improperly stored, disposed of, or transported. However, as stated in the Property Management Plan, all fertilizers, pesticides, and other hazardous materials would be properly stored in their manufacturer’s original containers and placed within a well-marked hazardous waste storage locker within the drying / processing building. Cannabis waste would be mulched or composted; solid waste is not expected from cannabis vegetative material. The Proposed Project shall comply with Section 41.7 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance, which 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.

Less than Significant Impact

- b) All fertilizers, pesticides, and other hazardous materials are proposed to be properly stored in their manufacturer’s original containers and placed within a well-marked hazardous waste storage locker within the agricultural building. The site is not classified as being within a flood zone or inundation area, nor is it in area mapped as having unstable soils according to the USDA Web Soil Survey.

Less Than Significant Impact

- c) The project is located in a rural location and is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.

Less Than Significant Impact

- d) The site is not listed as a site containing hazardous materials in the Department of Toxic Substances Control EnviroStor database or the State Water Resources Control Board’s GeoTracker database.

No Impact

- e) The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip. The nearest airport is the Paul Hoberg Airport, over ten miles southeast of the site.

No Impact

- f) Construction of the project would occur within the boundary of the site and would not result in lane closures and thus would not affect emergency access or evacuation and would not interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan.

No Impact

- g) The site is located within a Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone in a State Responsibility Area and within a Non-Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone in a State or Federal Responsibility Area. The site does not involve unique slopes or other factors that would exacerbate wildfire risks. The Applicant would adhere to all Federal, State, and local fire requirements/regulations for setbacks and defensible space; these setbacks are applied at the time of building permit review.

Less Than Significant Impact

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 29, 30
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 off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 15, 18, 29, 32
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?					

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| d) In any flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 23, 32 |
| e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 29 |

Discussion:

- a) No water bodies exist on the cultivation site. The closest surface water body is a seasonal waterway approximately 1,500 feet from the southern Project Site boundary. Surface water runoff from the proposed cultivation area generally sheet flows north into Thurston Creek. Most runoff is anticipated to infiltrate into existing soils and infiltration swales would be installed within the 100-ft setback along Seigler Springs Road.

Construction of the project could potentially violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, as construction equipment and materials have the potential to result in accidental discharge of pollutants into water resources. Operation of the project could potentially introduce contaminants into water resources from stormwater runoff, as parking lots often contain contaminants such as vehicle oil and gasoline, and pesticides used on the cultivation areas could potentially mix into stormwater runoff.

The applicant submitted an engineered Site Map that included erosion control measures for UP 20-11. The Map was prepared by Vanderwall Engineering, and is dated March 2020. The map shows Best Management Practices being employed during construction. The map does not take into account the expansion area, however the same stormwater control measures will be required with the expansion.

The Applicant submitted information through the SWRCB online portal for discharges of waste associated with cannabis cultivation related activities, which certifies that the cannabis cultivation activities associated with the Proposed Project are consistent with the requirements of the *State Water Board Cannabis Cultivation Policy – Principles and Guidelines for Cannabis Cultivation (Policy)* and the *General Waste Discharge Requirements and Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Waste Associated with Cannabis Cultivation Activities, Order No WQ-2019-0001-DWQ (General Order)*. As a result, the SWRCB provided the Applicant a Notice of Applicability (NOA) that the Policy and General Order are applicable to the site and the Applicant was assigned a waste discharge identification (WDID) number (5S17CC423496). The Applicant will be required to provide the California Department of Food and Agriculture CalCannabis Cultivation Licensing Division with the NOA as proof of enrollment with the Water Boards.

Coverage under the General Order will require the Applicant to prepare a Site Management Plan and Nitrogen Management Plan, and provide these documents to the CVRWQCB. The Site Management Plan would be prepared by a storm water professional with a QSP, QSD, and QISP State certifications, and would provide details for waste discharge requirements and post-construction BMPs. The Site Management Plan would also provide compliance with the requirements of Chapter 29 of the Lake County Code, Storm Water Management Ordinance. The Property Management Plan for the project reiterates that the Site Management Plan and Nitrogen Management Plan will be prepared and submitted to the CVRWQCB.

As part of the General Order coverage, the Applicant shall comply with the annual reporting requirement of the Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) of the General Order and pay an annual fee to the SWRCB.

Potential violations to water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, including actions that could substantially degrade surface or ground water quality, would be mitigated through coverage under the SWRCB General Order which includes a Site Management Plan, Nitrogen Management Plan, and MRP. Furthermore, Mitigation Measure GEO-1 includes submission of erosion control and sediment plans for approval by the County's Water Resource Department and Community Development Department. Therefore, impacts to water quality from the project would be less than significant.

Less Than Significant Impact

- b) There is no groundwater 'depletion threshold' established for water usage in Lake County and water consumption due to cannabis cultivation is fairly new. The site is located within the Clear Lake Pleistocene Volcanic Area Groundwater Basin. This basin has not been specifically labeled as overdrafted; however, the neighboring Big Valley Groundwater Basin may be overdrafted during periods of drought.

The applicant has submitted a Hydrology Report, prepared by Bill Vanderwall, P.E., and dated August 11, 2021. The Report evaluated water demand for the original 11 acres of outdoor cultivation, and an additional 11 acres of canopy to take the expansion into consideration. will reduce water demand to the vineyard, which is being removed to accommodate 9 acres of additional cannabis canopy.

The Report makes several assumptions; (1) that drought year water recharge is 20% of water recharge in a non-drought year; (2) that the 'Cooper-Jacob' well equation is a valid means of computing water demand; (3) that the aquifer is uniform throughout the area of well influence, and (4) that the well test conducted by Jim's Pump is a valid indicator of well productivity.

There are three (3) wells that are proposed to be used in this project. The data for each is as follows:

Well #1

Located in the southeast vicinity of APN 115-004-07; the well had been located off-site during the original Use Permit review for UP 20-11, however the applicant has since purchased the property. The total drill depth of Well #1 is 300 feet. The output for this well was shown to be 197 gallons per minute (GPM). This well will be used for cannabis irrigation.

Well #2

This well is located in the eastern vicinity of APN: 115-004-05 and is 380 feet southwest of Well #1. The total drill depth of Well #2 is 300 feet. The tested output of this well is 275 GPM. This well will be used for cannabis irrigation.

Well #3

This well is located in the center vicinity of APN 011-069-48. The well is drilled to a depth of 300 feet and has a measured output of 25 GPM. This well is to be used for cannabis irrigation.

Nearby Well.

Located in the eastern vicinity of APN 115-004-07. The well is drilled to a depth of 200 feet and has a measured output of 25 GPM. This well is located 137 feet west of Well #1 and is to be used exclusively for residential use.

Aquifer Data. The aquifer has a top reed clay with boulders layer from 0-30' depth and is a confined aquifer according to the Report. The depth of the aquifer is estimated to be 300 feet for wells #1, #2 and #3, and 200 feet for the nearby well. The Report estimates the aquifer's area of influence to be 472 feet from wells #1, 2 and 3, and 372 feet for neighboring well. The next-closest well is located 550 from Well #1's radius of influence.

According to the Report, the aquifer will recharge from two distinct areas. Area 1 is measured to be 3,139,904 sf in size; Area 2 is measured to be 1,849,173 sf. Average (non-drought year) rainfall is 34 inches per year. Drought year rainfall is estimated to be 20% of this total (NOAA data on year 2021 was 9" for the year). Total recharge of this area during a drought year was estimated to be 14,785,508 gallons per year (about 42.3 acre feet per year).

Water Usage. The Report evaluated water usage for 11 acres of canopy (479,160 sf); the projected usage includes the restroom located in the processing building, which serves 15 employees. The Report took into consideration the expansion of the project and projected the total usage to irrigate 22 acres of cannabis canopy, which is about 2 acres larger than what is actually proposed.

The Report states that the project will need 12,121,004 gallons of water per year (about 37.2 acre feet per year); this is based on 22 total acres of irrigated cannabis area. This equals 550,954 gallons per acre. Subtracting two acres that are not going to be planted (the proposal calls for 20 total acres of cannabis) shows a total annual demand of (12,121,004 – [2 x 550,954 gallons], or an actual projected total of 11,019,096 gallons of water demand per year (about 33.8 acre-feet per year).

Conclusion. The Report finds that there is adequate water available to serve the project without adversely impacting other area wells.

Less Than Significant Impact

- c) No surface water resources occur on the Project Site. Grading, impervious surfaces, and earth-moving activities associated with construction of the Proposed Project have the potential to result in erosion, siltation, temporary changes to drainage patterns, and contamination of stormwater. This would be a potentially significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure GEO-1 includes submission of erosion control and sediment plans for approval by the County's Water Resource Department and Community Development Department. The Applicant has gained coverage under the SWRCB General Order which includes a Site Management Plan, Nitrogen Management Plan, and MRP. These plans would include implementation of BMPs during construction to reduce the potential for impacts associated with erosion and exceeding water quality thresholds. Implementation of BMPs such as fiber rolls, hay bales, and silt fencing, and post-construction performance standards would reduce the potential for sediment and stormwater runoff containing pollutants from entering receiving waters. Furthermore, the project involves installation of infiltration swales within the 100-ft setback along Seigler Springs Road which would absorb and filter any potential water runoff. Impacts related to alterations in drainage patterns and impervious

surfaces due to construction of the project would be less than significant with Mitigation Measure GEO-1 and plans required under the General Order.

Once operational, the Proposed Project would increase impervious surfaces on the Propose Site through the construction of a 27,201-sf nursery facility and four 22,000-sf greenhouses. This would represent a relatively low amount of impervious surfaces and is not expected to increase the rate of surface runoff. Soils on the site are generally well-drained and any runoff is expected to absorb into the cultivation area or be intercepted by the infiltration swales. The proposed outdoor canopy area would not increase the impervious surface area of site and should not increase the volume of runoff from the site. The proposed gravel parking area and improvement of internal dirt/gravel roads would be constructed of dirt and/or gravel and would not interfere with water recharge. All proposed structures and construction activities would occur more than 100 feet from all surface water bodies.

Flooding on- or offsite would not substantially increase due to the proposed project, as surface runoff would mainly recharge into the soils and be managed through site design. Grading associated with the project is minimal and would

Less Than Significant Impact

- d) The Proposed Project is located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Hazard Zone D, defined by FEMA as an “Area of Undetermined Flood Hazard”, meaning that no analysis of flood hazards has been conducted. The Project Site is not located within a FEMA defined Special Flood Hazard Area (100-year floodplain). The Project Site is not located within a Special Flood Hazard Area as classified by County GIS data. Furthermore, all chemicals including pesticides, fertilizers and other potentially toxic chemicals would be stored in hazardous waste lockers within the agricultural building in a manner that the chemicals would not be adversely affected in the event of a flood.

Less than Significant Impact

- e) The Lake County Watershed Protection District has adopted the Big Valley Groundwater Management Plan (1999) and the Lake County Groundwater Management Plan (2006). There are no thresholds in the County for groundwater depletion. However, the Applicant has installed a meter on the production well and provides a record of all data collected to the County annually. The Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct applicable water quality or sustainable groundwater management plans.

Less than Significant Impact

XI. LAND USE PLANNING

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	---------------

Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 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? 1, 3, 4, 5, 20, 21, 22, 27

Discussion:

- a) The sites are located in a rural area of Lake County, characterized by large parcels of minimally developed land with some residential and agricultural uses. The proposed Project would not physically divide any established community.

No Impact

- b) The proposed Project is consistent with the Lake County General Plan and Cobb Mountain Area Plan, and would create diversity within the local economy and future employment opportunities for local residents.

The General Plan Land Use and Base Zoning District designation currently assigned to the Project Parcel is Agricultural (A). The Lake County Zoning Ordinance allows for commercial outdoor cannabis cultivation in the A land use zone with a major use permit. The project is consistent with other agricultural uses in the vicinity and would not conflict with any land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Less than Significant Impact

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	---------------

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"/> | 1, 3, 4, 5, 26 |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 4, 5, 26 |

Discussion:

- a) The Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan does not identify the portion of the Project parcel planned for cultivation as having an important source of aggregate resources. The California Department of Conservation describes the generalized rock type for the Project Property as the Lower Cretaceous-Upper Jurassic Great Valley Sequence and the Lower Cretaceous Great Valley Sequence, composed mostly of marine mudstones, siltstones, sandstones, and conglomerate. Additionally, according to the California Department of Conservation, Mineral Land Classification, there are no known mineral resources on the project site.

No Impact

- b) According to the California Geological Survey's Aggregate Availability Map, the Project site is not within the vicinity of a site being used for aggregate production. In addition, the site not delineated on the County of Lake's General Plan, the Kelseyville Area Plan nor the Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan as a mineral resource site. Therefore, the project has no potential to result in the loss of a local mineral resource recovery site.

No Impact

XIII. NOISE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
a) Result in the 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 13
b) Result in the generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 13
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"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15

Discussion:

- a) Noise related to outdoor cannabis cultivation typically occurs either during construction, or as the result of machinery related to post construction equipment such as well pumps or emergency backup generators during power outages. The drying building (existing) may need to have a carbon filtration system added, which will generate some noise.

This project will have some noise related to site preparation, and hours of construction are limited through standards described in the conditions of approval.

Although the property size and terrain will somewhat help to reduce any noise detectable on at the property line, mitigation measures will still be implemented to further limit the potential sources of noise.

The following mitigation measures are added to reduce potential noise-related impacts to 'less than significant' levels:

Mitigation Measures:

- NOI-1: The maximum non-construction related sounds levels shall not exceed levels of 55 dBA between the hours of 7:00AM to 10:00PM and 45 dBA between the hours of 10:00PM to 7:00AM within residential areas at the property lines
- NOI-2: All construction activities including engine warm-up shall be limited Monday through Friday, between the hours of 7:00am and 7:00pm to minimize noise impacts on nearby residents. Back-up beepers shall be adjusted to the lowest allowable levels.
- NOI-3: The maximum one-hour equivalent sound pressure received by a receiving property or receptor (dwelling, hospital, school, library, or nursing home) shall not exceed levels of 57 dBA between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 50 dBA from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. within residential areas measured at the property lines.

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

- b) Under existing conditions, there are no known sources of ground-borne vibration or noise that affect the Project site such as railroad lines or truck routes. Therefore, the Project would not create any exposure to substantial ground-borne vibration or noise.

The Project would not generate ground-borne vibration or noise, except potentially during the construction phase from the use of heavy construction equipment. The Project is not expected to need any pile driving, rock blasting, or rock crushing equipment during construction activities, which are the primary sources of ground-borne noise and vibration during construction. As such, the Project is not expected to create unusual groundborne vibration due to site development or facility operation.

Less Than Significant Impact

- c) The Project site is not located within two miles of an airport or airstrip. Therefore, the Project would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels from air travel.

No Impact

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5
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"/>	1, 3, 4, 5

Discussion:

- a) The Project is not anticipated to induce significant population growth to the area since no housing is involved, and any new employees used would be hired locally.

No Impact

- b) The Project will not displace any existing or future planned housing.

No Impact

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	---------------

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:

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

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 20, 21, 22, 23, 27, 28, 29, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37

- 1) Fire Protection?
- 2) Police Protection?
- 3) Schools?
- 4) Parks?
- 5) Other Public Facilities?

Discussion:

- a) The Project does not propose any new housing or other uses that would necessitate new or altered government facilities. No new roads are proposed. The Project would be required to comply with all applicable local and state fire code requirements related to design and emergency access. The above-stated categories and project responses are as follows:

- *Fire Protection.* Kelseyville Fire Protection District and CalFire
- *Police Protection.* Lake County Sheriff's Department
- *Schools and Parks.* No impact
- *Other Public Facilities.* No change to public roads are requested and none appear to be needed; the interior driveway is private, and is required to comply with PRC 4290 and 4291 regulations for fire safety reasons. Power to the 20,000 sq. ft. existing building is provided by on-grid power, and a minimal increase of power would be needed to serve the 18,000 sq. ft. building expansion.

There will not be a need to increase fire or police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities as a result of the project's implementation.

Less than Significant Impact

XVI. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
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"/>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5

Discussion:

- a) As the staff for the proposed Project will be hired locally, there will be no increase in the demand or use of neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities and no impacts are expected.

No Impact

- b) The proposed Project does not include any recreational facilities and will not require the construction or expansion of existing recreational facilities, and no impacts are expected.

No Impact

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
Would the project:					
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 27, 28, 35
b) For a land use project, would the project conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(1)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 27, 28, 35
c) For a transportation project, would the project conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(2)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 27, 28, 35
d) Substantially increase hazards due to geometric design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 27, 28, 35
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 20, 22, 27, 28, 35

Discussion:

- a) Access to the project is provided by State Route 29 (SR-29) and State Route 175 (SR-175) to Seigler Springs Road. Construction of the project would temporarily result in a negligible increase in traffic volumes in the vicinity of the site. Vehicular trips from construction would consist of worker trips and deliveries of equipment and materials to and from the site. The temporary increase in trips due to construction of the project would not cause a significant change to roadway level of service.

Operation of the project would generate limited traffic from infrequent deliveries and employee trips. Regular employee trips result in approximately 6 trips per day, and peak operations during fall harvest result in approximately 15 employee trips per day. Therefore, operation of the project would not constitute a substantial increase in traffic, and would not cause a significant change to roadway level of service.

Less than Significant Impact

- b) State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Subdivision (b) states that for land use projects, transportation impacts are to be measured by evaluating the proposed Project's vehicle miles traveled (VMT), as follows:

“Vehicle miles traveled exceeding an applicable threshold of significance may indicate a significant impact. Generally, projects within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less than significant transportation impact. Projects that decrease vehicle miles traveled in the project area compared to existing conditions should be presumed to have a less than significant transportation impact.”

The County has not formally adopted transportation significance thresholds. As a result, the project-related VMT impacts were assessed based on guidelines described by the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) in the publication *Transportation Impacts (SB 743) CEQA Guidelines Update and Technical Advisory*, 2018. The OPR Technical Advisory identifies several criteria that may be used to identify certain types of projects that are unlikely to have a significant VMT impact and can be “screened” from further analysis. One of these screening criteria pertains to small projects, which OPR defines as those generating fewer than 110 new vehicle trips per day on average. OPR specifies that VMT should be based on a typical weekday and averaged over the course of the year to take into consideration seasonal fluctuations. The estimated trips per day for the proposed Project will be under the 110 trip threshold for significance by the State.

The proposed Project would not generate or attract more than 110 trips per day, and therefore it is not expected for the Project to have a potentially significant level of VMT.

Less than Significant Impact

- c) The Project is not a transportation project. The proposed use will not conflict with and/or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)(2).

No Impact

- d) The Project does not propose any changes to road alignment or other features, does not result in the introduction of any obstacles, nor does it involve incompatible uses that could increase traffic hazards. Equipment used in cultivation will be transported to the Project site as needed.

No Impact

- e) The proposed Project would not alter the physical configuration of the existing roadway network serving the area, and will have no effect on access to local streets or adjacent uses (including access for emergency vehicles). Internal gates and roadways shall meet CALFIRE requirements for vehicle access according to PRC §4290, including adequate width requirements. Furthermore, as noted above under impact discussion (a), increased project-related operational traffic would be about 50 trips per day plus occasional delivery trips; this amount does not meet any 'level of significance', and is considered to have a less-than-significant impact. The proposed Project would not inhibit the ability of local roadways to continue to accommodate emergency response and evacuation activities, and the interior roadway will be improved to meet CALFIRE commercial driveway standards, including emergency on-site turn arounds. The proposed Project would not interfere with the City's adopted emergency response plan.

No Impact

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	---------------

Would the project Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15 |
| b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 14, 15 |

Discussion:

- a) The site contains no features that would make it eligible for listing with any historic registry.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-6 incorporated in the event of inadvertent discovery during site preparation.

- b) It is possible, but unlikely due to the lack of new site disturbance that is needed, that significant artifacts or human remains could be discovered during Project construction. If, however, significant artifacts or human remains of any type are encountered it is recommended that the Project sponsor shall contact the culturally affiliated tribe and a qualified archaeologist to assess the situation. The Sheriff's Department must also be contacted if any human remains are encountered.

Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-6 incorporated

XIX. UTILITIES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 3, 4, 5, 29, 32, 33, 34, 37
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 22, 31
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 22
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 35, 36
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 35, 36

Discussion:

- a) Irrigation water would be taken from an existing agricultural supply well located on an adjacent parcel east of the site. Minor trenching would occur for the installation of irrigation water lines and electrical communication lines for security. The existing agricultural building currently receives electrical power from PG&E; the proposed nursery and greenhouses would connect to existing electric lines. The construction of new or expanded utility lines within the site has been addressed throughout this Initial Study and where appropriate, impacts have been reduced to less than significant levels through mitigation. The Proposed Project would not require expanded stormwater drainage, wastewater treatment, or natural gas. No offsite utility improvements would be needed to serve the project. The Applicant shall adhere to all Federal, State and Local regulations regarding wastewater treatment and water usage requirements.

Less than Significant Impact

- b) A Water Well Pump Test was completed by Environmental Pollution Solutions on January 10, 2020. The test results indicated that the well should readily provide sufficient water for the project (capable of producing 180 gallons per minute) and recommended that the Applicant install water storage to provide at least a few days buffer in the event of drought. The project site contains a 300,000-gallon agricultural water storage tank for fire suppression and water management.

Soil moisture probes and evapotranspiration calculators would be used to determine minimal water required for cultivation. Drip irrigation is used with timers and daily monitoring for cannabis plants to conserve water.

Less than Significant Impact

- c) The Project will be served by existing onsite portable ADA-compliant restroom and handwashing facilities.

Less Than Significant Impact

- d) As described previously, it is anticipated that weekly waste collection would be required with a three cubic yard bin service through C&S Waste Solutions/Lake County Waste Solutions, which utilizes the Lake County Transfer Station for disposal. Organic wastes would be composted on site whenever possible and used as soil amendments - solid waste is not expected from cannabis vegetative material. The amount of solid waste expected to be generated by the project is minimal and negligible in the context of the capacity of the landfill. The project would continue to comply with all local, state and regulations regarding solid waste.

There is adequate solid waste capacity to accommodate the proposed Project, and the project would not generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure.

Less than Significant Impact

- e) The Project will be in compliance with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Less than Significant Impact

XX. WILDFIRE

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------	---------------

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:

- a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 23, 25, 28, 29

- | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Would the project, 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1, 2, 3, 5,
6, 23, 25,
28, 29 |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 1, 2, 3, 5,
6, 21, 23,
32 |

Discussion:

- a) The 2018 Lake County Emergency Operations Plan establishes multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional coordination during emergency operations within the County. Construction of the project would occur within the site boundaries and would not result in lane closures and thus would not affect emergency access or evacuation. The project would adhere to all Federal, State and local fire requirements/regulations, including Chapter 13, Article VIII (Hazardous Vegetation/Combustible Material Abatement), of the Lake County Code, and would not conflict with the County Emergency Operations Plan.

The applicant is required to do several things to make this expansion project 'fire-safe'. The following mitigation measures are therefore added to assure that workers on site, as well as those in the vicinity, have a measure of protection against potential wildfires:

- WILD-1: Prior to cultivation occurring in the expansion area, the applicant shall improve the interior driveway in a manner that it complies with Public Resource Code 4290 and 4291. The applicant shall call the Building Official / Fire Marshal for a site inspection once the interior driveway is brought into PRC 4290 and 4291 compliance.
- WILD-2: The applicant shall keep no less than 20,000 gallons of water on site for fire suppression purposes at all times.
- WILD-3: Prior to cultivation, the applicant shall create 100 feet of defensible space around all buildings requiring a building permit.

Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measures added

- b) The site is located within a Moderate Fire Hazard Severity in a State Responsibility Area. Furthermore, the site and vicinity is classified as a Wildland Fire Hazard Area based on County GIS data. However, there are no unique elements that would exacerbate wildfire risk compared to similar sites. The site does not involve unique slopes or other factors that would exacerbate wildfire risks; slopes within the Project Site are generally under ten percent. Although the site would not exacerbate the risk of wildfire, introducing increased human activity naturally has the potential to increase fire risk. However, the Applicant would adhere to all Federal, State, and local fire requirements/regulations for setbacks and defensible space; these setbacks are applied at the time of building permit review. Therefore, wildfire risk

would not be exacerbated and the potential to expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire is less than significant.

Less Than Significant Impact

- c) As mentioned above, the project is not located in a High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Infrastructure associated with the project, such as installation of the nursery and greenhouses, would be constructed and located within the site boundary. New off-site electrical distribution lines would not be necessary to serve the project. The installation and/or maintenance of infrastructure associated with the project does not involve any unique elements that would exacerbate fire risk. All improvements shall adhere to all Federal, State and local agencies requirements.

Less than Significant Impact

- d) As described in Section VII, Geology and Soils, the project is not located on an unstable geologic unit or soil and does not have a high risk of landslides or liquefaction. The site is relatively flat and the minimal grading associated with the project would not significantly alter drainage patterns. Therefore, the project would not 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.

No Impact

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact	Source Number
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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ALL
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ALL

Discussion:

- a) The project proposes the cultivation of commercial cannabis in a rural area of the County on an “A” Agricultural-zoned parcel.

According to the biological and cultural studies conducted, the proposed Project does not 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 when mitigation measures are implemented.

Mitigation measures are listed herein to reduce impacts related to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural/Tribal Resources, Geology and Soil, Noise, and Wildfire.

Less than significant with mitigation measures added

- b) Potentially significant impacts have been identified related to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural/Tribal Resources, Geology and Soil, Noise, and Wildfire. 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. Of particular concern would be the cumulative effects on hydrology and water resources.

Implementation of and compliance with the 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 any cumulatively considerable environmental impacts.

Less than significant with mitigation measures added

- c) The proposed Project has the potential to result in adverse indirect or direct effects on human beings. In particular, Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural / Tribal Resources, Geology and Soil, Noise, and Wildfire have the potential to impact human beings. Implementation of and compliance with the mitigation measures identified in each section as conditions of approval would not result in substantial adverse indirect or direct effects on human beings and impacts would be considered less than significant.

Less than significant with mitigation measures added

Impact Categories defined by CEQA

Source List

1. Lake County General Plan
2. Lake County GIS Database
3. Lake County Zoning Ordinance
4. Cobb Mountain Area Plan
5. Pasta II Farms Cannabis Cultivation Application – Major Use Permit.
6. U.S.G.S. Topographic Maps
7. U.S.D.A. Lake County Soil Survey
8. Lake County Important Farmland Map, California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program

9. Department of Transportation's Scenic Highway Mapping Program, (<https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>)
10. Lake County Serpentine Soil Mapping
11. California Natural Diversity Database (<https://wildlife.ca.gov/Data/CNDDDB>)
12. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory
13. Biological Assessment for 10750 Siegler Springs Road, Kelseyville, CA. Prepared for Environmental Pollution Solutions LLC. Wiemeyer Ecological Sciences. January 16, 2020.
14. Archaeological Survey Report – Commercial Cannabis Cultivation 10750 Seigler Springs Road, Kelseyville, CA. APNs 115-004-050, 115-004-080, and 115-004-101. Alta Surveying / Alex DeGeorgey, M.A., RPA. November 6, 2019.
15. California Historical Resource Information Systems (CHRIS); Northwest Information Center, Sonoma State University; Rohnert Park, CA.
16. Water Resources Division, Lake County Department of Public Works Wetlands Mapping.
17. U.S.G.S. Geologic Map and Structure Sections of the Clear Lake Volcanic, Northern California, Miscellaneous Investigation Series, 1995
18. Official Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone maps for Lake County
19. Landslide Hazards in the Eastern Clear Lake Area, Lake County, California, Landslide Hazard Identification Map No. 16, California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, DMG Open –File Report 89-27, 1990
20. Lake County Emergency Management Plan
21. Lake County Hazardous Waste Management Plan, adopted 1989
22. Lake County Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, adopted 1992
23. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection - Fire Hazard Mapping
24. National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)
25. FEMA Flood Hazard Maps
26. Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan
27. Lake County Bicycle Plan
28. Lake County Transit for Bus Routes
29. Lake County Environmental Health Division
30. Lake County Grading Ordinance
31. Lake County Natural Hazard database
32. Lake County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan and Siting Element, 1996
33. Lake County Water Resources
34. Lake County Waste Management Department
35. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
36. Lake County Air Quality Management District website
37. Lake County Fire Protection District
38. Site Visit – July 24, 2020
39. United States Department of Agriculture – Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey
40. Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites List,
41. State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Cannabis Policy and General Order
42. Lake County Groundwater Management Plan, March 31st, 2006.
43. Lake County Rules and Regulations (LCF) for On-Site Sewage Disposal
44. Lake County Municipal Code: Sanitary Disposal of Sewage (Chapter 9: Health and Sanitation, Article III)