



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

March 26, 2021

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM INITIAL STUDY (IS 20-98)

1. **Project Title:** BG Property Management LLC
2. **Permit Numbers:** Major Use Permit UP 20-82
Initial Study IS 20-98
3. **Lead Agency:** County of Lake
Community Development Department
Courthouse – 255 North Forbes Street
Lakeport CA 95453
4. **Contact Person:** Eric Porter, Associate Planner; (707) 263-2221
5. **Project Location(s):** 9200 Highland Springs Road, Lakeport, CA (cultivation site)
9100 and 8722 Highland Springs Road (co-location lots)
APNs: 007-006-45 (cultivation parcel)
007-006-10 and 007-006-43 (clustering parcels)
6. **Applicant:** BG Property Management LLC / Brian Brown
1607 32nd Street
Oakland, CA 94608
7. **General Plan:** Rural Lands (cultivation site and clustering parcels)
8. **Zoning:** “RL-B5-WW-SC” Rural Lands – Special Lot Size/Density – Waterway – Scenic (cultivation parcel)
“RL-B5” Rural Lands – Special Lot Size/Density and “RL-B5-WW-SC” Rural Lands – Special Lot Size/Density – Waterway – Scenic (clustering parcels)
9. **Supervisor District:** District 4
10. **Flood Zone:** Zone D: “Areas of Undetermined Flood Hazards”
11. **Slope:** Nearly entirely flat with slopes generally ranging from 0% to 10%
12. **Fire Hazard Severity Zone:** SRA (Calfire); Very High Fire Severity Zone
13. **Earthquake Fault Zone:** Not within a mapped fault zone
14. **Dam Failure Inundation Zone:** Not located within a Dam Failure Inundation Area
15. **Parcel Size:** 206.46 acres (combined; three parcels)

16. Description of Project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary).

BG is requesting approval of a Major Use Permit that is composed of: one (1) A-Type 3B “Mixed-Light”¹ commercial cannabis cultivation license; eight (8) A-Type 3 “Outdoor”² commercial cannabis cultivation licenses; one A-Type 4 “Nursery”³ license; and one (1) Type 13 “Self-Transport Distribution”⁴ license. Two separate canopy areas totaling 389,868 square-feet are proposed within 404,668 square-feet of cultivation area. The cultivation method would be via an above ground and in ground planting method using organic soil mixtures with drip irrigation systems. The proposed ancillary facilities include:

- Sixteen (16) 30-foot x 100-foot greenhouses;
- One (1) 100-foot x 100-foot processing building (10,000 sq. ft. containing storage and bathrooms); and
- Eighteen (18) 2,500-gallon water tanks (Note: one tank will need to be a 5,000 gallon steel/fiberglass for fire suppression)

The proposed processing facility would contain processing activities such as drying, trimming, curing, and packaging. Agricultural chemicals associated with the cannabis cultivation (i.e. organic fertilizers and pesticides) would be stored within the secure processing building.

The total acreage of the project site is 206.46 acres; however, as described, all project activities would only occur within the 151.64 acres comprising the cultivation parcel. The cultivation parcel and the clustering parcels are zoned Rural Lands. There are no residences located within the clustering parcels; however, there is an existing residence located in the cultivation parcel, southeast of the proposed cultivation area. No portions of the project site are located within the Commercial Cannabis Cultivation Exclusion Area (exclusion area). The project site is not located within the Community Growth Boundaries.

The cultivation parcel currently contains an existing residence located southeast of the proposed canopy area. The project site is located approximately 0.25-mile east of the intersection of Adobe Creek Road and Highland Springs Road in Lakeport. There are a number of unnamed, intermittent Class III watercourses along the southeastern project site boundary, one Class II unnamed tributary along the northwestern project site boundary, and one manmade ditch in the center of the project site. The cannabis cultivation area would be setback a minimum of 100 feet from the top of the bank of any water bodies. There would be no surface water diversions as part of the project.

The project site is currently accessed by a private gravel driveway directly from Highland Springs Road. The access driveway would be approximately 850 feet in length to the entrance of the processing facility and 1930 feet to the furthest outdoor cultivation area with an approximate slope of 0 – 5 percent. According to the applicant, the driveway would be 20 feet wide with 14 feet of unobstructed horizontal clearance and 15 feet of vertical clearance. The access driveway would have 6 inches of gravel added to the entire length, 10 parking stalls (one ADA compliant) in front of the processing facility and another 8 parking stalls (one ADA compliant) near the outdoor canopy area (for a total of 18 parking stalls [two ADA compliant]), and a 60-foot wide and 20-

¹ A-Type 3B: "Mixed-Light" license defined as: cultivation for adult use cannabis in a greenhouse, glasshouse, conservatory, hothouse, or other similar structure using light deprivation and/or artificial lighting below a rate of 25 watts per square foot between 10,001 and 22,000 square feet, inclusive, of total canopy size on one premises.

² A-Type 3: "Outdoor" license defined as: outdoor cultivation for adult use cannabis without the use of light deprivation and/or artificial lighting in the canopy area at any point in time from 10,001 square feet to one acre, inclusive, of total canopy size on one premises.

³ M-Type 4: "Nursery" license defined as: cultivation of medicinal cannabis solely as a nursery.

⁴ Type 13 “Self-Transport Distribution” license defined as: the transport of medicinal cannabis goods between entities licensed pursuant to California Code.

foot long hammerhead turnaround at both the processing facility and the cultivation site. A security gate would be installed at the entrance of the parcel. The gate entrance would be at least 2 feet wider than the width of the traffic lane with a minimum of 14 feet unobstructed horizontal clearance and 15 feet on unobstructed vertical clearance. The access gate would be located at least 30 feet from the main shared access road and property line. Due to existing topography and surrounding vegetation, as well as the distance from common public roadways, the cultivation site is unlikely to be seen from off-site; however, the project is also proposing to install a 6-foot tall metal fence with privacy mesh screening around the entire perimeter of the outdoor cultivation area that would be mounted with security cameras.

Construction

Construction of the project would take approximately 5 to 7 weeks and would be limited to the hours of 9 A.M. to 6 P.M. Monday through Saturday. Construction would involve: clearing of low-lying shrubs within previously disturbed areas as necessary; minimal grading of less than 45 cubic yards; delivery and installation of the eighteen 2,500-gallon water tanks, construction of the processing facility (including ADA compliant restrooms) and 16 greenhouses; installation of solar panels and backup batteries; extension/widening of existing driveway; construction of parking areas and turnarounds; and installation of security fence and cameras. Construction would require standard trucks, hand tools, and general equipment and would require a total of 130 to 160 truck trips during the duration of construction activities.

Post-Construction Operation

BG is applying for a Type-13 Self-Transport Distribution license and there would be a dedicated loading zone in the parking lot adjacent to the front entrance to the processing facility. The project would utilize approximately two unmarked transport vans to transport products off premises and would comply with all California Cannabis Track and Trace requirements throughout the distribution process. A maximum of one daily delivery and one daily pick-up would be required.

The project's hours of operation would take place between 8:00 AM and 6:00 PM with deliveries and pickups restricted to between 9:00 AM and 7:00 PM Monday through Saturday as well as Sunday between 12:00 PM and 5:00 PM. A Community Liaison/Emergency Contact would be available 24-hours a day, 7-days a week, including holidays. The gate would be locked outside of core operating/business hours (8:00 AM to 6:00 PM) and whenever BG personnel are not present. The gate would be secured with a heavy-duty chain, commercial grade padlock, and a Knox Box to allow 24/7 access for emergency services. Only approved BG managerial staff and emergency service providers would be able to unlock the gates. Up to 20 employees would work on-site during peak harvest times and an estimated 15 employees would work during non-peak harvest times. A closed-circuit television (CCTV) security system would be installed and would cover: entryways to the property, cultivation areas, and processing facility; the perimeter of the cultivation/canopy areas; monitoring, recording station, and security room within the processing facility; and the interior of the processing facility.

Operations are proposed to be fully organic with regard to both dry and liquid fertilizer. The proposed dry fertilizers would include dry worm castings and chicken and bat guano. The proposed liquid fertilizers would be supplied from MaxSea and organic compost. Pesticides would include neem oil and citric acid oil, both at limited quantities during the growing months only when necessary. Any other pesticides that may be used would be from a list of those approved by California Department of Food and Agriculture. All fertilizers, nutrients, and pesticides would only be purchased and delivered to the property as needed and would be stored separately in the secure storage shed, in their original containers and used as directed by the manufacturer. All organic pesticides and fertilizers would be mixed/prepared on an impermeable surface with secondary containment, at least 100 feet from surface water bodies. Empty containers would be disposed of by placing them in a separate seal tight bin with a fitted lid and disposed of at the local

solid waste facility within the county. In accordance with the requirements of the State Water Resource Control Board's Cannabis General Order, at no time would fertilizers/nutrients be applied at a rate greater than 319 pounds of nitrogen per acre per year. Water soluble organic fertilizers/nutrients would be delivered via the drip and micro-spray irrigation system(s) of the proposed cultivation operation to promote optimal plant growth and flower formation while using as little product as necessary. Petroleum products would be stored year-round within the processing facility in containers approved by the State of California with secondary containment separate from pesticides and fertilizers.

To conserve water resources, the cultivation operation would utilize drip irrigation systems. An existing well located on parcel 007-006-45 would be pumped to the 18 above ground water storage tanks proposed for adjacent to the cultivation area. According to the application package, it is projected that approximately 4,860,640 gallons of water would be used on an annual basis (please refer to *Section X, Hydrology and Water Quality*, for additional details). The natural existing vegetated buffer would be maintained as needed between all project activities areas and the existing on-site waterways. In addition, straw wattles and/or cover crops are proposed around the entire cultivation area in order to reduce sediment erosion and a native grass seed mixture and certified weed-free straw mulch would be applied to all areas of exposed soil.

All electricity would be supplied from solar panels and backup batteries; however, a backup generator would be used in the event of a power outage. The project does not propose the storage or use of any hazardous materials. All organic waste would be placed in the designated composting area adjacent to the cultivation area and all solid waste would be stored in bins with secure fitting lids until being disposed of at a Lake County Integrated Waste Management facility (at least once a week during the cultivation season).

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

North: "RL" Rural Lands; large lots that are undeveloped or that contain isolated single-family dwellings.

South: "RL" Rural Lands; large lots that are undeveloped or that contain isolated single-family dwellings; and "O" Open Space.

East: "RL" Rural Lands; large lots that are undeveloped; and "O" Open Space.

West: Mendocino County "RL" Rangeland District; typically intended to create and preserve areas for grazing of livestock, production and harvest of natural resources, and protection of such natural resources as watershed lands from fire, pollutions, erosions, and other detrimental effects.⁵

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

Lake County Community Development Department
 Lake County Department of Environmental Health
 Lake County Air Quality Management District
 Lake County Department of Public Works
 Lake County Sheriff Department
 Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board
 California Water Resources Control Board
 California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire)
 California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW)
 California Department of Food and Agriculture (CalCannabis)

California Department of Pesticides Regulations
 California Department of Public Health
 California Bureau of Cannabis Control
 California Department of Consumer Affairs
 California Department of Transportation (CalTrans)

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.?** Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3 (c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

Notification of the project was sent to local tribes on April 27, 2021. A Cultural Resource Evaluation (dated September 11, 2020) of the 'to be disturbed' portions of the project site was prepared by Wolf Creek Archaeology Services. During a field inspection conducted as part of the Cultural Resource Evaluation, no historic or prehistoric cultural materials or features were encountered.

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"/> Population / Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture / Forestry | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards / Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <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: Katrina Hardt-Holoch, Consultant

Initial Study Reviewed and Edited By: Eric Porter, Associate Planner

Eric Porter

Date: May 24, 2021

SIGNATURE

Scott DeLeon – Interim Director
Community Development Department

SECTION 1

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, and then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially

Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).

- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

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

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
I. AESTHETICS <i>Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:</i>						
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X		The property has an 'SC' (Scenic Combining) overlay zoning designation as in close proximity to a scenic road, however the cultivation site will not obstruct any scenic vistas in this location. The project site is located in a rural area that is accessed by a private driveway off of Highland Springs Road. The zoning for the parcels includes the "SC" Scenic district, however, there are no scenic vistas on or adjacent to the parcels. Due to existing topography and surrounding vegetation, as well as the distance from common public roadways, the cultivation site cannot be seen from off-site. Additionally, the cultivation area would be surrounded by fencing with privacy screening and all proposed uses and structures would comply with the county's regulations for the "SC" combining district. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to impact views of mountains, Clear Lake, and/or other scenic vistas. Less than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X		<p>The property is located on Highland Springs Road, a designated scenic road, however the location of the cultivation site will not affect trees, rock outcroppings, or any historic buildings. The positioning of the cultivation area coupled with the topography and significant vegetative cover will conceal the cultivation site.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X		<p>The project site is located in a non-urbanized area. The project will not degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views due to existing topography and surrounding vegetation, as well as the distance from public roadways. The cultivation area cannot be seen from off-site. Additionally, the cultivation area would be surrounded by fencing with privacy screening and all proposed uses and structures would comply with the county's regulations for the "SC" combining district. Therefore, the project would not substantially degrade the quality of public views of the site or surroundings.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		X			<p>The project proposes security lighting along the front access gate, parking area, front of the processing facility, and surrounding the cultivation area. Although the cultivation site cannot be seen from off-site, there is potential that the additional source of light could adversely affect nighttime views in the area. In addition, the greenhouses have the potential to increase light and glare in the area during cultivation. Mitigation provided below would be required and would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.</p> <p>AES-1: All outdoor lighting shall be fully shielded and downward casting to prevent spillover onto other properties and the night sky in a manner that complies with the County's darksky.org lighting recommendations.</p> <p>AES-2: Prior to cultivation, the applicant shall provide blackout screening in or on each greenhouse to block light from spilling out beyond each greenhouse.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures AES-1 and AES-2 Incorporated</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
<p>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES</p> <p><i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</i></p> <p><i>Would the project:</i></p>						
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?			X		<p>The entire project site is designated as "Other Land" by the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Therefore, the project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance. The project site is not currently used as farmland; is not located within a mapped Farmland Protection Area, and should the project cease cultivation activities in the future, the project site could be returned to its existing state.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X	<p>The property is not under Williamson Act contract. None of the neighboring properties are under Williamson Act contracts, and there are no traditional agricultural uses within 1000 feet of the cultivation area. The base zoning of the cultivation site is "RL" Rural Lands, which allows the project's proposed uses with a Major Use Permit for Commercial Cannabis Cultivation pursuant to Article 27 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning or a Williamson Act contract.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?				X	Parcels reserved for timberland within the county are zoned “TPZ” Timberland Preserve District. The cultivation site is zoned “RL” Rural Lands. As previously discussed, the proposed uses under the project are allowed with a Major Use Permit for Commercial Cannabis Cultivation pursuant to Article 27 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance. No re-zoning of the project site is proposed or required and only low-lying brush would be removed. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning or cause the rezoning of forest land or timberland. No Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?				X	The project would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. No Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X		The project proposes the cultivation of cannabis on parcels zoned “RL” Rural Lands and on a site where no activities associated with farmland or forest land occurs. The project appears that it would not induce changes that would result in its conversion to non-agricultural or non-forest use on the subject site. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

III. AIR QUALITY

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.

Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		X			<p>The project has some potential to result in short- and long-term air quality impacts. Dust and fumes may be released as a result of site preparation/construction of the structures and cultivation area; and vehicular traffic, including small delivery vehicles that would be contributors during and after site preparation/construction. Additionally, Cannabis cultivation can generate objectionable odors, particularly when the plants are mature/flowering.</p> <p>The proposed greenhouses will be equipped with carbon filtration systems that will minimize migrating odors. The BG Property Management Plan contains an Air Quality Management Plan. In accordance with the provisions of the Air Quality Management Plan, the project would wet soils during construction and/or delay ground disturbing activities until site conditions are not windy to prevent fugitive dust during construction, including during site preparation work as well as during any interior driveway improvements. During operation, the project’s electricity demand would be supplied by solar panels and backup batteries and would only require a generator as backup when a power outage occurs. Odors generated by the plants, particularly during harvest season, would be reduced through passive means (separation distance and maintenance of native flowering vegetation surrounding the cultivation area), and active means (fans and carbon filters/air scrubber equipment in the processing facility). All air filtration and odor mitigation equipment would be inspected every other month by a supervisor to ensure each one is running as efficiently as possible and all carbon filter/air scrubbers would be replaced each quarter. All data and information would be made available to Lake County and/or Lake County Air Quality Management District officials upon request. The project would provide a Community Liaison/Emergency Contact to any residences within 1,000 feet of the property boundaries for notification and immediate action to eliminate any reported odors complaint. Additionally, implementation of the mitigation measures below would reduce air quality impacts to less than significant.</p> <p>AQ-1: Prior to obtaining the necessary permits and/or approvals for any phase, the applicant shall contact the Lake County Air Quality Management District and obtain an Authority to Construct (A/C) Permit for all operations and for any diesel-powered equipment and/or other equipment with potential for air emissions.</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
---	--	---	--	--	---	------------------

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p>AQ-2: All mobile diesel equipment used shall comply with State registration requirements. Portable and stationary diesel-powered equipment shall meet the requirements of the State Air Toxic Control Measures for CI engines.</p> <p>AQ-3: The applicant shall maintain records of all hazardous or toxic materials used, including a Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) for all volatile organic compounds utilized, including cleaning materials. Said information shall be made available upon request and/or the ability to provide the Lake County Air Quality Management District such information in order to complete an updated Air Toxic emission Inventory.</p> <p>AQ-4: All vegetation removed during site development shall be chipped and spread for ground cover and/or erosion control. The burning of vegetation, construction debris, including waste material is prohibited.</p> <p>AQ-5: All graveled areas of vehicular travel (access driveway, parking area, turnaround) shall be regularly used and/or maintained to reduce fugitive dust generation.</p> <p>AQ-6: An Odor Control Plan shall be submitted to the County of Lake Planning Division prior to the start of any cultivation under this permit that provides the planting of fragrant plants around the perimeter of the outdoor cultivation site. All planted areas shall be irrigated and the plants maintained in a healthy state for the duration of the project. Plants shall be planted no greater than two feet apart, and irrigation line locations shall be shown on the Odor Control Plan submitted.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-6 Incorporated</p>	
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under and applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			X		<p>The County of Lake is in attainment of state and federal ambient air quality standards. The cannabis cultivation would not be expected to generate dust or air emissions that would violate air quality standards. Additionally, the processing facility would be equipped with fans and carbon filters/air scrubbers to reduce or eliminate potential contaminants from the atmosphere that are generated from inside. The project would receive electricity from solar panels and backup batteries and would not require the continued use of generators. Therefore, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X			<p>There are isolated residences scattered throughout the surrounding parcels. However, nearest off-site sensitive receptors to the cultivation site are located over 2,000 feet away, which complies with the Lake County Zoning Ordinance requirement of a minimum 200-foot setback from off-site residences. Levels of pollutants associated with cannabis are typically based on odors and dust migration during site preparation, and from odors generated by the plants during maturity. The applicant has proposed mitigation measures that would mask and/or suppress odors and suppress dust migration during and after site preparation. Implementation of these project features and mitigation measures would ensure that sensitive receptors are not exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-6 Incorporated</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?		X			<p>The project area is sparsely populated. The nearest off-site residences are located approximately 2,000 feet from the cultivation site, which complies with the Lake County Zoning Ordinance requirement of a minimum 200-foot setback from off-site residences. Dust and fumes may be released as a result of site preparation/construction of the structures and cultivation area; and vehicular traffic, including small delivery vehicles that would be contributors during and after site preparation/construction. Additionally, Cannabis cultivation can generate objectionable odors, particularly when the plants are mature/flowering. The response in III(a) discusses the project features and mitigation measures that would mask odors and suppress dust migration during and after site preparation. Implementation of these project features and</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p>mitigation measures would ensure that sensitive receptors are not exposed to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</p>	
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project:</i>						
<p>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?</p>		X			<p>A Biological Assessment (dated September 18, 2020) of the project site parcels was prepared by Pinecrest Environmental Consulting. An on-site survey was conducted on June 17, 2020. The on-site communities consist almost entirely of oak and chamise chaparral punctuated with cypress and chamise chaparral in serpentine-containing soils with mixed conifers interspersed and more common in upper slopes, emergent wetland vegetation and grassland in several locations. The unnamed Class III watercourses generally have vegetation that is undifferentiated from the rest of the vegetation. Several of the existing ponds have developed wetland vegetation surrounding them and some of the wet meadow features exhibit traits characteristic of jurisdictional wetlands; however, most of the riparian corridors are too ephemeral to support wetland vegetation. Overall, the cultivation site consists of approximately 73 percent mixed oak-chamise chaparral, 25 percent serpentine cypress chaparral, and 2 percent wetland and pond.</p> <p>Based on the on-site survey, the areas proposed for cultivation were previously disturbed from prior agricultural activity on the site. Portions of the cultivation area contain low groundcover. Two special-status plant species were observed at the project site. Watershield was found in one of the ponds; however, because this species is limited to the pond and the proposed commercial cannabis activities would be prohibited within 100 feet of jurisdictional waters, including the pond, no impacts are predicted for this species. Glandular Western flax was observed in serpentine chaparral. Mitigation is included below to ensure that impacts to special-status plant species would be less than significant.</p> <p>Because the cultivation areas would be located approximately 500 feet from the nearest pond or potential wetland habitat, up a slope of approximately 100 feet in elevation, and are separated by several driveways and dense chaparral with no watercourses in between, it is very unlikely that any amphibians would estivate in the cultivation area. No special-status animal species were observed at the project site; however, there are numerous suitable watercourses onsite for several listed amphibians and some unidentified tadpoles were observed in the perennial pond. However, mitigation is included below to ensure the impacts to amphibians from vehicle traffic along onsite roads would be less than significant.</p> <p>BIO-1: Prior to site disturbance including the removal / clearing of chaparral, a springtime plant survey shall be conducted. The results of this survey, including recommendations, shall be provided to the Lake County Planning Department prior to a hearing and cultivation. Any recommendations shall be added as conditions of approval for this use permit.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measure Incorporated</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10
<p>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or</p>		X			<p>There are a number of unnamed, intermittent Class III watercourses along the southeastern project site boundary, one Class III unnamed tributary along the northern project site boundary. There is a pond located approximately 500 feet from the proposed cultivation area boundary. Overall, the cultivation site consists of approximately 73 percent mixed oak-chamise chaparral, 25 percent serpentine cypress chaparral, and 2 percent wetland and pond. The project would be setback a minimum of 100 feet from the top of the bank of any water bodies, including all unnamed watercourses and wetland/ponds. Additionally,</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?					<p>the project proposes to install straw wattles around the cultivation site to reduce sediment movement and runoff from the cultivation site to protect watercourses and waterbodies, as well as maintain natural vegetation buffers between the watercourses/waterbodies and the cultivation site. Mitigation measure BIO-1 provided in IV(a) requiring a springtime plant survey should chaparral be removed would ensure that impacts to natural communities to be less than significant.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measure BIO-1 Incorporated</p>	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X		<p>Several of the existing ponds have developed wetland vegetation surrounding them and some of the wet meadow features exhibit traits characteristic of jurisdictional wetlands; however, most of the riparian corridors are too ephemeral to support wetland vegetation. No project activities would occur within a minimum of 100 feet from the top of the bank of any water bodies, including the riparian corridors or ponds. Additionally, the project proposes to install straw wattles around the cultivation site to reduce sediment movement and runoff from the cultivation site to protect watercourses and waterbodies, as well as maintain natural vegetation buffers between the watercourses/waterbodies and the cultivation site. The existing onsite roadways would be graveled and anywhere requiring revegetation after disturbance would only have native grass seed mixture or certified weed-free straw mulch applied. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?		X			<p>The on-site survey conducted as part of the Biological Assessment identified a number of unnamed, intermittent Class III watercourses along the southeastern project site boundary, one Class II unnamed tributary along the northwestern project site boundary and some unidentified tadpoles were observed in the perennial pond. However, the cultivation area is separated from the nearest pond or potential wetland habitat by approximately 500 feet, a slope of approximately 100 feet in elevation, and several driveways and dense chaparral with no watercourses in between. Due to the separation distance, the lack of watercourses travelling between the pond and the cultivation area and the steep terrain, it is very unlikely that any amphibians would estivate in the cultivation area. Furthermore, the project proposes to install straw wattles around the cultivation site to reduce sediment movement and runoff from the cultivation site to protect creeks and drainages, as well as maintain natural vegetation buffers between the creeks/drainages and the cultivation site.</p> <p>Mitigation included under IV(a) requires the project to implement all best management practices included in the Property Management Plan submitted for this project, including practices to protect amphibians from onsite traffic and protect nesting birds. Implementation of these mitigation measures would ensure that impacts to native wildlife nurseries would be less than significant.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measure BIO-1 Incorporated</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X		<p>There are no mapped conservation easements on the project site that might otherwise require extra protection or tree replacement. The applicant has indicated that no trees would be removed and only chaparral/scrub would be removed. Therefore, the project would not conflict with tree preservation policies or ordinances.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X	<p>There are no Habitat Conservation Plans associated with this property. The applicant has indicated that no trees would be removed and only chaparral/scrub would be removed. Therefore, the project would not conflict with conservation plans.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X			<p>A Cultural Resource Evaluation (September 11, 2020) of the project site was conducted by Wolf Creek Archaeology. The purpose of the investigation was to locate, describe, and evaluate any archaeological or historical resources that may be present in the area. The background research indicated that no prehistoric sites had been recorded within 1 mile of the project area. A field inspection conducted as part of the Cultural Resource Evaluation involved a complete reconnaissance of the project area. The ground surface was examined for historic and prehistoric cultural materials. No historic or prehistoric cultural materials were found and the Cultural Resources Evaluation determined that no significant historic sites exist within the project area. Therefore, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource. A minimal amount of grading (a maximum of 45 cubic yards) is proposed, however the entire cultivation area (404,668 square-feet) would be disturbed and there is some potential for previously unknown cultural resources, including historical resources, to be encountered. Therefore, mitigation is included below to ensure that potential impacts to unknown historical resources would be less than significant.</p> <p>CUL-1: Prior to initiation of ground disturbance activities, all on-site personnel of the project shall be trained in recognizing potentially significant artifacts that may be discovered during ground disturbance. Should any archaeological, paleontological, or cultural materials be discovered during site development, all activity shall be halted within 100 feet of the find(s), the applicant shall notify the culturally affiliated Tribe, and a qualified archaeologist to evaluate the find(s) and recommend mitigation procedures, if necessary, subject to the approval of the Community Development Director. No work shall commence within 100 feet of the find(s) until the recommended mitigation procedures, if necessary, has been adopted by the applicant. Should any human remains be encountered, the applicant shall notify the Sheriff's Department, the culturally affiliated Tribe, and a qualified archaeologist for proper interment and Tribal rituals per Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and Health and Safety Code 7050.5.</p> <p>CUL-2: The applicant and all employees shall complete sensitivity training prior to the start of cultivation activities in order to be able to recognize potentially significant relics, artifacts or other materials that may be uncovered during ground disturbance activities.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 Incorporated</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X			<p>As detailed within the Archaeological Study, no known archeological resources occur within the project area and mitigation is provided to ensure that potential impacts to unknown archaeological resources would be less than significant.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 Incorporated</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X			<p>No known human remains were discovered during the Cultural Study evaluation performed by Wolf Creek Archaeology and referenced herein within the project area. Mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 are provided to ensure that potential impacts to unknown human remains are respectfully interred if they are discovered during site disturbance, and that proper protocols for notification and interment are followed. Given the lack of discovery during the Cultural study and the addition of MMs CUL-1 and CUL-2, potential impacts would be less than significant.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 Incorporated</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
VI. ENERGY <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X		The project would have a minimal electricity demand as the majority of the cultivation area proposed by the project would occur outdoors under full, direct sunlight. Electricity would be required for the proposed greenhouses (at up to 25 watts per square-foot) and processing facility. All electricity needed for the project would be supplied from solar panels and backup batteries that would be included in the permits for the processing facility and greenhouses and would be installed as part of the project. All new buildings in California, including the proposed greenhouses and processing facility are required to comply with the Building Energy Efficiency Standards established in Title 24, Part 6 of the California Code of Regulations. Pursuant to these standards, the greenhouses and processing facility would utilize LED lights or other high-efficiency lighting. Furthermore, pursuant to Article 27, the mixed-light cultivation within the greenhouses would be limited to 1,200 watts and be required to conform to all applicable electrical codes. Therefore, the project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Less than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?				X	The project would consume electricity that would be supplied from solar panels and backup batteries that would be included in the permits for the processing facility and greenhouses and would be installed as part of the project. Therefore, the proposed cultivation operations would not conflict with or obstruct an energy plan. No Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS <i>Would the project:</i>						
Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: (i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. (ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? (iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (iv) Landslides?			X		There are no mapped earthquake faults on or within three miles of the project site. However, Lake County contains numerous known active faults and future seismic events in the Northern California region can be expected to produce seismic ground shaking at the project site. The soils within the project site consist of Types 142 and 173 soils, which do not have significant landslide risks associated with them. In addition, the project would be required to adhere to all applicable current state and local building codes, seismic design standards, and the Building Permit. Furthermore, the cultivation area is nearly completely flat with little to no slope. Therefore, the project would not cause substantial adverse effect involving fault rupture, ground shaking, liquefaction, or landslides. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 12, 13, 14
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X			According to the soil survey of Lake County prepared by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the soil within the proposed cultivation area consists of Henneke-Montara-Rock outcrop complex (Soil Type 142). Henneke-Montara-Rock is a well-drained weathered serpentine that typically occurs on hillslopes and mountains, with moderately low to moderately high permeability. Surface runoff for this soil is medium and the hazard of erosion is very high. Because the location of the proposed cultivation area is nearly completely flat with little to no slope, the project would require a minor amount of grading (a maximum of 45 cubic yards). The project's Property Management Plan	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 14

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p>contains grading and erosion best management practices to prevent erosion during pre-construction, construction, and operation. The best management practices have been taken from the California Stormwater Quality Association BMP Handbook, the California State Water Quality Control Board BMPs, and the Lake County Water Resources Construction & Development BMPs and include the improvement of the access driveway, parking areas, and turnaround with a minimum of 6 inches of gravel and watering exposed soils during construction. The natural existing vegetated buffer would be maintained as needed between all project activities areas and the existing on-site waterways, and a native seed mixture and certified weed-free straw mulch would be applied to all areas of exposed soils, which would help retain soil and prevent erosion. In addition, straw wattles and/or cover crops are proposed around the entire cultivation area in order to reduce sediment erosion. Mitigation measures are also included to ensure that impacts related to erosion and loss of topsoil would be less than significant.</p> <p>GEO-1: Prior to any ground disturbance, the permittee shall submit an engineered Grading, Erosion Control and Sediment Plan to the Water Resource Department and the Community Development Department for review and approval. The Plan shall contain all proposed best management practices and mitigation measures required for the control of runoff and prevention of sedimentation to protect the local watershed during construction and operation. 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.</p> <p>GEO-2: Excavation, filling, vegetation clearing, or other disturbance off the soil shall not occur between October 15 and April 15 unless authorized by the Community Development Department Director. The actual dates of the defined grading period may be adjusted according to weather and soil conditions at the discretion of the Community Development Director.</p> <p>GEO-3: All erosion control and sedimentation prevention measures shall be monitored by the permit holder during the rainy seasons (October 15 to May 15), including during operation.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated</p>	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?			X		<p>According to the soil survey of Lake County, prepared by the U.S.D.A., the soil at the proposed cultivation area (primarily soil Type 142) is considered generally stable. There is a less than significant chance of landslide, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse as a result of the project based on the characteristics of this soil type, the mostly flat slope of the proposed cultivation area (between 0 and 10 percent), and the lack of faults in this immediate area.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 14
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?			X		<p>According to the soil survey of Lake County, prepared by the U.S.D.A., the soil at the proposed cultivation area (primarily soil Type 142) consists of gravelly loam, gravelly clay loam, very gravelly clay, and clay loam. Clay soils can exhibit high shrink-swell potential; however, the project would not increase risks to life or property and would be required to adhere to all applicable current state and local building codes, seismic design standards, and the Building Permit.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			X		<p>The project would be served through an existing on-site wastewater disposal system. No additional wastewater disposal system is proposed or would be required.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic	X				<p>No significant paleontological resources were discovered during the Cultural Study performed by Wolf Creek Archaeological Services within the project area and mitigation measures have been provided to ensure that potential</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
feature?					impacts to unknown paleontological resources would be less than significant. Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated	
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X		Construction of the project would take approximately 5 to 7 weeks and would require standard trucks, hand tools, and general equipment and would require a total of 130 to 160 truck trips during the duration of construction activities. Accordingly, greenhouse gas emissions related to construction activities would be minimal and would not have the potential to significantly impact the environment. During operation, a maximum of one daily delivery and one daily pick-up would be required. Up to 20 employees would work on-site during peak harvest times and an estimated 15 employees would work during non-peak harvest times. Cultivation activities would not require the use of heavy equipment and the processing facility would be equipped with airborne particulate carbon filters. The project would receive electricity from solar panels and backup batteries and would not require the continued use of generators. Therefore, greenhouse gas emissions related to operation of the project would be minimal and would not have the potential to significantly impact the environment. Less than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X		Lake County is an "air attainment" county and does not have any established thresholds of significance for greenhouse gases. The project would not conflict with any adopted plans or policies for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X		Materials associated with the proposed Cultivation of Commercial Cannabis, such as gasoline, pesticides, fertilizers, alcohol, hydrogen peroxide and the equipment emissions may be considered hazardous if released into the environment. However, as detailed in the BG Property Management Plan, operations would be fully organic with regard to both dry and liquid fertilizer. The proposed dry fertilizers would include dry worm castings and chicken and bat guano. The proposed liquid fertilizers would be supplied from MaxSea and organic compost. Pesticides would include neem oil and citric acid oil, both at limited quantities during the growing months only when necessary. Any other pesticides that may be used would be from a list of those approved by California Department of Food and Agriculture. All fertilizers, nutrients, and pesticides would only be purchased and delivered to the property as needed and would be stored separately in the secure storage shed, in their original containers and used as directed by the manufacturer. All organic pesticides and fertilizers would be mixed/prepared on an impermeable surface with secondary containment, at least 100 feet from surface water bodies. Empty containers would be disposed of by placing them in a separate seal tight bin with a fitted lid and disposed of at the local solid waste facility within the county. In accordance with the requirements of the State Water Resource Control Board's Cannabis General Order, at no time would fertilizers/nutrients be applied at a rate greater than 319 pounds of nitrogen per acre per year. Water soluble organic fertilizers/nutrients would be delivered via the drip and micro-spray irrigation system(s) of the proposed cultivation operation to promote optimal plant growth and flower formation while using as little product as necessary. Petroleum products would be stored year-round within the processing facility in containers approved by the State of California with secondary containment	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 15, 16, 17

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p>separate from pesticides and fertilizers.</p> <p>Cannabis waste is required to be chipped and spread on-site; burning cannabis waste is prohibited in Lake County. All solid waste that cannot be composted would be stored in bins with secure fitting lids until being disposed of at a Lake County Integrated Waste Management facility.</p> <p>Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard related to the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X		<p>Construction of the project would require some light construction equipment such as skid-loaders to prepare the pads for the greenhouses and the processing building. As detailed in the Property Management Plan's Grading and Erosion Control BMPs, all equipment staging would occur on previously disturbed areas (existing roadway/driveway) or on areas that would be further developed as part of the project and any required petroleum products or machinery lubricants would be stored under cover and in state approved containers within a secondary containment inside of the storage area.</p> <p>The project would not use, store, or dispose of hazardous materials. Operations would be fully organic and all fertilizers, nutrients, and pesticides would only be purchased and delivered to the property as needed and would be stored separately in the secure storage shed, in their original containers and used as directed by the manufacturer. All nutrients would be mixed/prepared on an impermeable surface with secondary containment, at least 100 feet from surface water bodies. Empty containers would be disposed of by placing them in a separate seal tight bin with a fitted lid and disposed of at the local solid waste facility within the county.</p> <p>Cannabis waste would be chipped and spread on-site and other solid waste that cannot be composted would be stored in bins with secure fitting lids until being disposed of at a Lake County Integrated Waste Management facility.</p> <p>Therefore, the project would not release hazardous materials into the environment.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 15, 16, 17
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X	<p>The project would not be located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The nearest school to the project site is Donaldson Alternative School (3980 Gard St), located approximately 7 miles east of the project site.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X		<p>The project site is not listed as a site containing hazardous materials in the databases maintained by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), California Department of Toxic Substance, and Control State Resources Water Control Board. Therefore, the project would not create a significant hazard related to lists of hazardous materials compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 18, 19, 20
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X	<p>The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of an airport. The nearest airport to the project site is Lampson Field, approximately 4.6 miles to the northeast. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 21
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation			X		<p>The site takes access onto Highland Springs Road, a paved County-maintained road at this location. Any evacuations needed would occur down Highland Springs Road if needed. All project activities would occur on-site and the security gate would include a Knox Box to allow 24/7 access into the site for</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 22

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
plan?					emergency services. Therefore, the project would not impair or interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Less Than Significant Impact	
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			X		The property is located within the State Responsibility Area (SRA) and is in the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Accordingly, the project would be required to adhere to state and county regulations regarding fire prevention and suppression as well as site access. In accordance with these regulations, all structures would have a minimum setback from the property line of 30 feet; a 100-foot Defensible Space Zone/Reduced Fuel Zone would be created around the cultivation area; the access roadway would be a minimum of 20 feet wide, consist of all-weather surfacing (gravel), and would be engineered to support a load of 50,000 pounds; the access gate would be a minimum of 22 feet wide and would be equipped with a Knox Box to allow 24/7 access for emergency services; and a 5000-gallon, steel or fiberglass water tank would be installed for fire suppression use. Furthermore, all gasoline- and diesel-powered equipment would only be used by trained personnel and would be turned off and stored indoors when not in use to prevent accidental sparking of dry vegetation during idling of high temperature engines. Accordingly, the project would not expose people or structures to wildland fires. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 23, 24, 25
X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?		X			According to the Grading and Erosion Control BMPs included in the project's Property Management Plan, a minimal amount (a maximum of 45 cubic yards) of grading would be required during construction. Additionally, the project would be setback a minimum of 100 feet from the top of the bank of any water bodies, including the unnamed Class III and Class II waterways and ponds. As detailed in the engineered Grading and Erosion Control Plan, the project would employ best management practices and mitigation measures (GEO-1, GEO-2, and GEO-3) related to erosion and water quality, and would adhere to all related federal, state, and local requirements, as applicable. Therefore, the project would not substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality. Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 15, 16, 17
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X		With the exception of the interior of the proposed processing facility and greenhouses, the project site would remain nearly entirely covered in permeable cover and the decrease in permeability of the project site cover would be nominal. Therefore, groundwater recharge potential would not change as a result of the project. The project site is equipped with an existing well. The existing well has an estimated yield of 55-gallons per minute with minimal drawdown and rapid recharge as per the Well Test. The water would be pumped for storage in 18 2,500-gallon aboveground water tanks proposed for adjacent to the cultivation area. According to water use studies of Northern California, cannabis plants use approximately 5.99 gallons of water per day. It has also been documented through CalCannabis' Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Report that outdoor cannabis uses between 25-35 inches of water per year. Based on these ranges, the project's Water Use Management Plan included as part of the Property Management Plan estimates that the project's water demand would fall between 4,860,640 to 6,075,801 gallons (best case) and 7,290,961 to 8,506,121 gallons (worst case) with an average estimate of 4,860,640 gallons per year. Water consumption would vary, with the highest consumption occurring during the summer months (June, July, August, September). In accordance with the State Water Quality Control Board Cannabis General Order, the project would implement best management practices to conserve water, including: a visual monitoring inspection program to check all water conveyance areas and storm water drainage areas to identify any spills, leaks, or uncontrolled pollutant sources, at a minimum of prior to each rain event; utilization of drip lines for water delivery to plants; application of mulch to	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 26, 27, 28, 29

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p>areas within the cultivation area without groundcover to conserve soil moisture within the grow area; and, pursuant to Article 27 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance, installation of an inline water meter on the drip line supply line as well as the water storage tanks to accurately determine where and how much water is being used (staff would record and log all data in order for the project's water use to be reviewed annually and shared with the County). In addition, the water tanks would be equipped with float valves to prevent overflow and runoff of irrigation water when full. Therefore, the project would not impeded sustainable management of the groundwater basin.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	
<p>c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner that would:</p> <p>(i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site;</p> <p>(ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(iv) or impede or redirect flood flows?</p>			X		<p>According to the Biological Assessment, the project site contains a number of unnamed, intermittent Class III watercourses along the southeastern project site boundary and one Class II unnamed tributary along the northwestern project site boundary; however, the cultivation area is nearly completely flat with little to no slope. The project site is within Zone D: "Areas of Undetermined Flood Hazard."</p> <p>According to the engineered Grading and Erosion Control Plan, a minimal amount (a maximum of 45 cubic yards) of grading would be required during construction. Additionally, the project would be setback a minimum of 100 feet from the top of the bank of any water bodies, including the unnamed Class III and Class II watercourses. As such, the project would not substantially alter the existing topography of the project site and would not alter the course of any waterbodies. As detailed in the Property Management Plan and support materials provided, the project would employ best management practices and mitigation measures (GEO-1, GEO-2, and GEO-3) related to erosion and water quality, and would adhere to all related federal, state, and local requirements, as applicable. In addition to not altering the existing topography, the project would not construct or install substantial structures that would alter the existing drainage; the proposed processing facility, greenhouses, and water tanks would not have a large footprint (approximately 0.004 percent of the cultivation parcel). Accordingly, the project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation, increase the rate or amount of runoff, provide additional sources of polluted runoff, or impede flood flows.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 15, 16, 17
<p>d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</p>			X		<p>The project site is not located in an area of potential inundation by seiche or tsunami or flood hazard zone.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 15, 16, 17
<p>e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</p>		X			<p>The project would employ best management practices and mitigation measures (GEO-1, GEO-2, and GEO-3) related to water quality and supplies, and would adhere to all related federal, state, and local requirements, as applicable. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct any water quality control or sustainable groundwater management plans.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 15, 16, 17, 26, 27, 28, 29
<p>XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING <i>Would the project:</i></p>						
<p>a) Physically divide an established community?</p>				X	<p>The project site and surroundings are sparsely populated rural areas. There is an existing driveway on the project site that serves the site that would be improved slightly (surface treatment), however no new roads are needed, and no division of an existing community would occur by this action.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
<p>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</p>			X		<p>The project site is subject to the Lake County General Plan, the Lake County Zoning Ordinance, and the Lakeport Area Plan. The cultivation parcel is zoned "RL-B5-WW-SC" Rural Lands – Special Lot Size/Density – Waterway – Scenic and the clustering parcels are zoned "RL-B5" Rural Lands – Special Lot Size/Density and "RL-B5-WW-SC" Rural Lands – Special Lot</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
mitigating an environmental effect?					<p>Size/Density – Waterway – Scenic. However, no project activities are proposed for the clustering parcels.</p> <p>The cultivation parcel’s “RL” land use designation allows commercial cannabis cultivation per Lake County Zoning Ordinance (Article 27, Table B) and subsection (at) with a use permit. In accordance with Article 27, the project is requesting approval of a Major Use Permit that is composed of one A-Type 3B “Mixed-Light” commercial cannabis cultivation license; eight A-Type 3 “Outdoor” commercial cannabis cultivation licenses; one A-Type 4 “Nursery” license; and one Type 13 “Self-Transport Distribution” license. The project would be required to adhere to all incorporated mitigation measures and conditions of approval of the Major Use Permit.</p> <p>In accordance with the cultivation site’s “WW” Waterway designation (Article 37, Sec. 21-37), no project activities would occur within a minimum of 100 feet from the top of the bank of any water bodies. Furthermore, the project would implement best management procedures and mitigation to ensure the protection of biological and water resources associated with all waterways within the boundaries of the project site.</p> <p>The zoning for the parcels includes the “SC” Scenic district, however, there are no scenic vistas on or adjacent to the parcels. Additionally, as detailed in II(a), due to existing topography and surrounding vegetation, as well as the distance from common public roadways, the cultivation site cannot be seen from off-site. Additionally, the cultivation area would be surrounded by fencing with privacy screening and all proposed uses and structures would comply with the county’s regulations for the “SC” combing district.</p> <p>No portions of the project site is located within the Commercial Cannabis Cultivation Exclusion Area or within the Community Growth Boundaries.</p> <p>Based on the above, the project would not conflict with the Lake County General Plan, the Lake County Zoning Ordinance, and the Lakeport Area Plan.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?			X		<p>The cultivation site contains no known or mapped mineral resources. Furthermore, a minimal amount of grading (a maximum of 45 cubic yards) is proposed and no large-scale removal of material, including mineral resources would occur. Therefore, the project would not result in the loss of availability of mineral resources.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 30
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X	<p>The project would not result in the loss of availability of a mineral resource recovery site.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 30
XIII. NOISE <i>Would the project result in:</i>						
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X			<p>Temporary, short-term noise would be created by the project during construction, primarily during grading. In accordance with the anti-idling policies of the California Air Resources Control Board, the project would be required to turn off all equipment when not in use and mitigation is included to limit the hours of construction.</p> <p>There is some potential for increased noise as the cultivation site resulting from the air filtration systems within the processing facility. However, given the intervening topography and the distance between the cultivation site and the nearest residences (over 2,000 feet away), it is highly unlikely that operation of the project would increase ambient noise in excess of maximum levels specified in Zoning Ordinance Section 21-41.11 (Table 11.2). There is also some potential for increased noise due to increased traffic during peak</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p>harvest times. However, pursuant to the project's Property Management Plan, the project's core business hours of operation would take place between 8:00 AM and 7:00 PM with deliveries and pickups restricted to between 9:00 AM and 7:00 PM Monday through Saturday as well as Sunday between 12:00 PM and 5:00 PM. Additionally, a Community Liaison/Emergency Contact would be available 24-hours a day, 7-days a week, including holidays, to accept any complaints regarding project operation's, including noise.</p> <p>Some infrequent noise could occur if a backup power generator is activated during generator testing or when solar power and backup battery power are not available. Mitigation is included to address potential noise impacts from the emergency generator.</p> <p>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</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</p>	
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X		<p>The project is not expected to create unusual groundborne vibration due to site development or operation. The low-level of truck traffic during construction and for occasional deliveries would create a minimal amount of groundborne vibration.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X		<p>The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of an airport. The nearest airport to the project site is Lampson Field, approximately 4.6 miles to the northeast. Therefore, the project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X	<p>The project is the cultivation of cannabis. No new dwelling units or infrastructure, including public roads or utilities, are proposed or would be required.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	<p>The project would develop a cannabis cultivation site on an undeveloped portion of two parcels. No people or housing would be displaced.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES <i>Would the project:</i>						
<p>Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fire Protection? - Police Protection? - Schools? - Parks? - Other Public Facilities? 			X		<p>The project does not propose housing or other uses that would increase the population of the project site or the County that would necessitate the need for new or altered public services. The project site is located within a Very High Fire Severity Zone. However the project would implement setback, fuel clearance, site design, and operational practices and features pursuant to state and county regulations regarding fire prevention and suppression and site access.</p> <p>Therefore, there would not be a need to increase fire or police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities as a result of the project's implementation.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
XVI. RECREATION <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X	<p>There are no neighborhood, regional parks, or other recreation facilities on or within the vicinity of the project site. The project is the cultivation of cannabis. Therefore, the project would not increase the use of parks or recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X	<p>The project is the cultivation of cannabis. Therefore, the project would not include or require recreational facilities.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
XVII. TRANSPORTATION <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?			X		<p>The project would be accessible from a private driveway off of Highland Springs Road (an existing, private dirt road). No transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities exist within the vicinity of the project site.</p> <p>The increase in trips during construction would be minimal (approximately 130 to 160 total trips during the duration of construction activities) and temporary (approximately 5 to 7 weeks). Employee trips during operation are not anticipated to exceed 30 total trips (for 15 employees) per day, with a maximum of 40 trips (for 20 employees) anticipated during peak harvest times. There are no known capacity issues with Highland Springs Road. Pursuant to Public Resources Code 4290 and 4291 Fire Safety Requirements, the access roadway would be a minimum of 20 feet wide, consist of all-weather surfacing (gravel), and would be engineered to support a load of 50,000 pounds; the access gate would be a minimum of 22 feet wide. Therefore, the project would not conflict with circulation system program, plan, ordinance, or policy.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3,			X		<p>CEQA section 15064.3, subdivision (b) lists thresholds that would otherwise trigger a traffic impact study. Projects in Lake County that generate 200 or more ADT require a traffic impact study. Employee trips during operation are not anticipated to exceed 30 total trips (for 15 employees) per day, with a</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
subdivision (b)?					maximum of 40 trips (for 20 employees) anticipated during peak harvest times. As such, the project would not require a traffic impact study and would not be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines 15064.3, subdivision (b). Less Than Significant Impact	
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X	Interior driveway improvements would occur to comply with Public Resources Code 4290 and 4291 Fire Safety Requirements, however, no changes to Highland Springs Road are proposed or required. No Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?			X		All project activities would occur on-site and the security gate would include a Knox Box to allow 24/7 access for emergency services. Furthermore, interior driveway improvements would occur to comply with Public Resource pursuant to Public Resources Code 4290 and 4291 Fire Safety Requirements. Therefore, the project would not result in inadequate emergency access. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</i>						
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or		X			A Cultural Resources Evaluation was prepared for the cultivation site by Wolf Creek Archaeology. The findings yielded no known significant historical, cultural, or tribal resources. Furthermore, standard mitigation measures (CUL-1 and CUL-2) require the notification of the local culturally-affiliated Tribe and contacting a licensed archeologist of any Native American artifacts or remains are found. Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 Incorporated	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe?		X			There are no mapped or observed significant resources (Tribal Cultural) that are on or immediately adjacent to the site. Furthermore, a standard mitigation measures (CUL-1 and CUL-2) require the notification of the local culturally-affiliated Tribe and contacting a licensed archeologist of any Native American artifacts or remains are found. Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 Incorporated	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11
XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X		The subject parcel is served by an existing agricultural well and onsite septic system. In accordance with the State Water Quality Control Board Cannabis General Order, the project would implement best management practices to conserve and monitor water use, the project would not result in significant impacts with regard to water consumption. There is an existing septic system on the project site that the bathroom in the proposed processing facility would connect to and the project would be required to adhere to all federal, state, and local regulations regarding wastewater treatment. All electricity needed for the project would be supplied from solar panels and backup batteries that would be included in the permits for the processing facility and greenhouses and would be installed as part of the project. Pursuant to Article 27, the project would be required to conform to all applicable electrical codes, including those regulating proper installation. The project site does not contain a telecommunication system and is not supplied with natural gas; however, the project would not require them. Accordingly, the project would not require or	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p>result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded utilities.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?			X		<p>The subject parcel is served by an existing agricultural well that has a 55-gallon per minute output with minimal drawdown and fast recovery. There is no minimum threshold for well productivity in Lake County. However, pursuant to Article 27 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance the project would include installation of an inline water meter on the drip line supply line as well as the water storage tanks to accurately determine where and how much water is being used (BG staff shall record and log all data in order for the project's water use to be reviewed annually and provided to the County). Therefore, it is anticipated that the project would have sufficient water supplies.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 26, 27, 28, 29
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X		<p>The subject parcel is served by an existing onsite septic system. A new ADA-compliant restroom may be required as a condition of approval and would be installed in the processing facility. The Planning Commission may at their discretion allow a portable ADA-compliant restroom and handwash station; that would be determined at the public hearing for this use permit. The project would be required to adhere to all federal, state, and local regulations and conditions of approval pertaining to wastewater treatment.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?			X		<p>The Property Management Plan contains policies to help minimize the generation of waste and for the proper disposal of waste produced during the cultivation and processing of cannabis at the project site. The goal is to prevent the release of hazardous waste into the environment, minimize the generation of cannabis vegetative waste and dispose of cannabis vegetative waste properly, and manage growing medium and dispose of growing medium properly. All employees would be required to follow the procedures outlined in this plan.</p> <p>Depending on the methods of growing done for the year, it is estimated around 5,000 pounds of vegetative waste would be generated annually. However, in order to reduce waste and recycle nutrients, all vegetative waste, even if more than 5,000 pounds, would either be buried in the composting area found within the cultivation area or chipped and stored to be used when soil cover is needed. Recycled vegetative waste that has been composted on site would be used to supplement the existing soil on site.</p> <p>Solid waste would be produced consistent with normal business and would be stored in bins with secure fitting lids until being disposed of at a Lake County Integrated Waste Management facility, at least once a week during the cultivation season. The closest Lake County Integrated Waste Management facility to the proposed cultivation operation is the Eastlake Landfill. According to the Grounds Plan included in the project's Property Management Plan, trash and recycling receptacles would be provided for anyone on-site to properly dispose of waste. The designated grounds manager would visually sweep the parcel and collect any waste that was not properly disposed of at the end of each day. Accordingly, the project would not generate solid waste in excess of standards or capacity.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 31, 32
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X		<p>The County uses a standard condition of approval regarding compliance with all federal, state, and local management for solid waste. The cultivator must chip and spread any vegetative waste on-site. The project would be required to comply with all federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste disposal.</p>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					Less Than Significant Impact	
XX. WILDFIRE <i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</i>						
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X		The property is located within the State Responsibility Area (SRA) and is in the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Accordingly, the project would be required to adhere to state and county regulations regarding site access. All project activities would occur on-site and the security gate would include a Knox Box to allow 24/7 access for emergency services. Furthermore interior driveway improvements would occur to comply with Public Resources Code 4290 and 4291 Fire Safety Requirements. Accordingly, the project would not impair an emergency response or evacuation plan. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 23, 24, 25
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?			X		The slope of the site varies from 0% to over 30%. The cultivation portion of the primary site is relatively flat, so terrain at the cultivation site is not a major factor in wildfire exacerbation. Most of Lake County is in a mapped high fire area including this site. The fuel load on the west side of the property is significant, however the actual cultivation site is located on a portion of the site that has very little fuel. Prevailing winds will blow from the northwest across the cultivation area to the more populated lots to the southeast. The proposed cannabis cultivation activity will provide a four acre fire break, although this portion of the site is already relatively devoid of fuel. The inclusion of cannabis plants will not significantly increase the potential for wildfire-related pollutants or by adding significantly to an uncontrolled wildfire. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 15, 16, 17
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?			X		The project shall be required to adhere to state and county regulations regarding fire prevention and suppression as well as site access, including compliance with Public Resource Code 4290 and 4291, which affects defensible space, road widths and slopes, gate opening widths, surface material on roads and driveways, and overhead clearances as well as other factors related to wildfire mitigation. The project would install and maintain 100 foot wide fuel breaks, improve the access driveway, and install one 5,000-gallon steel or fiberglass water tank for fire suppression use. However, no changes to roadways, including Highland Springs Road, or additional utilities, including power lines, are proposed. The infrastructure improvements described above are intended to comply with applicable fire safety requirements and best practices and would serve to reduce fire risk and assist in suppression of fires. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 23, 24, 25
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?			X		The property is located within the State Responsibility Area (SRA) and is in the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone. Because the project would not alter the existing drainage of the project site and given the flat nature of the proposed cultivation area, there would be minimal potential for downstream flooding or landslides as a result of post-fire conditions. Therefore, the project would not expose people or structures to associated risks. Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation, reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE						
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X			The project proposes a cultivation of commercial cannabis in a somewhat previously disturbed area with low groundcover and mitigation measures are proposed that would reduce project-related impacts to less-than-significant levels. Because of this, there would be minimal risk of degradation of the environment. As proposed, this project is not anticipated to significantly impact the habitat of 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. Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated	ALL
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?		X			The scope of this project is 404,668 square feet of cultivation area. Potentially significant impacts have been identified related to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, and Tribal Cultural Resources. These impacts in combination with the impacts of other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity could cumulatively contribute to significant effects on the environment if proper mitigation measures are not put in place. However, implementation of mitigation measures identified in each section and compliance with regulatory requirements and conditions of approval would avoid or reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels. Other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would also be required to identify and reduce impacts to the extent feasible through mitigation and conditions of approval. Therefore, the project would not result in cumulatively considerable environmental impacts. Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated	
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X			The proposed project has potential to result in adverse indirect or direct effects on human beings. In particular, risks associated Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hydrology and Water Quality, Noise, and Tribal Cultural Resources, have the potential to impact human beings. Implementation of and compliance with mitigation measures identified in each section would reduce adverse indirect or direct effects on human beings. Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Measures Incorporated	ALL

* Impact Categories defined by CEQA

** Source List

1. Lake County General Plan:
http://www.lakecountyca.gov/Government/Directory/Community_Development/Planning/2008FinGP.htm
2. Lake County Zoning Ordinance:
http://www.lakecountyca.gov/Government/Directory/Community_Development/Planning/ZoneOrd.htm
3. Lake County GIS Portal: <http://gispublic.co.lake.ca.us/portal/home/>
4. Lake County Parcel Viewer: <https://gispublic.co.lake.ca.us/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?>
5. Lakeport Area Plan:
<http://www.lakecountyca.gov/Assets/Departments/CDD/Area+Plans/Lakeport+Area+Plan.pdf?method=1>
6. BG Property Management, Property Management Plan, 9200 Highland Springs Road, Lakeport, CA 95453, October 1, 2020
7. California Scenic Highway Program: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>

8. Lake County Community Development Department, Commercial Cannabis Cultivation Application: <https://www.lakecountycalifornia.gov/Assets/Departments/CDD/Marijuana+Cultivation+Ordinance/Cannabis+Policy/CCC+Application+Packet.pdf>
9. California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program: <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp>
10. Pinecrest Environmental Consulting, Inc., Biological Assessment, 9200, 9100, 8722 Highland Springs Road, APN 007-006-45, 007-006-34, 007-006-10, Lake County, California, September 18, 2020
11. Wolf Creek Archaeology, Cultural Resource Evaluation of Portions of APNs 007-006-10 and 45, 9200 Highland Springs Road, Lakeport, September 11, 2020
12. California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, EQ Zapp: California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application interactive map, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>
13. California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, California Landslide Inventory interactive map, <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/lsi/app/>
14. United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Web Soil Survey interactive map, <https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>
15. Lake County Hazardous Waste Management Plan, adopted 1989
16. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit
17. Lake County Division of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Management
18. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Multisystem Data Search, <https://enviro.epa.gov/facts/multisystem.html>
19. California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Envirostor Database Search, <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>
20. California State Water Resources Control Board, GeoTracker Database Search, <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov>
21. AirNav.com, Airport Search, <http://airnav.com/cgi-bin/airport-search>
22. Lake County Emergency Management Plan
23. Lake County Community Wildfire Protection Plan, Wildfire Safety at Home, <https://www.lakecountycalifornia.gov/Assets/County+Site/Fire+Safe+Council/cwpp/home.pdf>
24. California Public Resource Code Section 4290, https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PRC§ionNum=4290
25. California Public Resources Code Section https://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PRC§ionNum=4291
26. Cramer Enterprises, Well Test, Brian Brown, 9200 Highland Springs Rd, December 2, 2020.
27. Bauer, et. al., Cultivation on Aquatic Habitat in Four Northwestern California Watersheds, March 18, 2015, <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0120016>
28. California Department of Food and Agriculture, CalCannabis Cultivation Licensing, Final Program Environmental Impact Report, <https://www.cdfa.ca.gov/calcannabis/PEIR.html>
29. California State Water Resources Control Board, Cannabis General Order, https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2019/wqo2019_0001_dwq.pdf
30. Lake County Planning Department, Resource Management Division, Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan, An Element of the Lake County General Plan, adopted November 19, 1992
31. Lake County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan and Siting Element, 1996
32. CalRecycle Solid Waste Information System <http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/Search.aspx>