



COUNTY OF LAKE

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Planning Division

Courthouse - 255 N. Forbes Street

Lakeport, California 95453

Telephone 707/263-2221 FAX 707/263-2225

Dated: December 21, 2022

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM INITIAL STUDY, IS 22-34

1. **Project Title:** Getaway Campground
2. **Permit Number:** Major Use Permit (UP 22-28)
Initial Study (IS 22-34)
3. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of Lake
Community Development Department
Courthouse – 255 North Forbes Street
Lakeport CA 95453
4. **Contact Person:** Eric Porter, Associate Planner (707) 263-2221
5. **Project Location(s):** 18300 Morgan Valley Road, Lower Lake
APNs: 012-008-09, 42, 43, 44, 45, 52, 53
6. **Project Sponsor's Name:** Getaway House Inc.
147 Prince Street
Brooklyn, N.Y., 11201
7. **General Plan Designation:** Rural Lands
8. **Zoning:** "RL" Rural Lands
9. **Supervisor District:** District One (1)
10. **Flood Zone:** D, Undetermined and X, Low Flooding Risk
11. **Slope:** Generally steep (over 30%)
12. **Fire Hazard Severity Zone:** SRA High Fire Area
13. **Earthquake Fault Zone:** None
14. **Dam Failure Inundation Area:** Not located within Dam Failure Inundation Area
15. **Parcel Size:** 347 acres (based on material submitted by applicant)

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).

Major use permit to establish a campground. The development would consist of short-term stay nightly rental cabins containing up to 59 dispersed portable tiny cabins for guests. Although the tiny cabins are portable for repair purposes, they will be permanent features onsite and would range between 142 to 176 sq. ft.; they can each accommodate 2 to 4 people. Each cabin includes a kitchen area, bathroom area, and living area, and are connected to electricity, sewage, and drinking water systems.

Cabin pads are between 1,000 to 1,200 sq. ft. and include a parking area, outdoor seating area, a picnic bench, and a lockable campfire ring/pit. To minimize land disturbance and optimize privacy, tiny cabins and cabin pads are carefully placed between existing oak trees, approximately 100 feet apart from one another. Cabins will be sited to minimize removal of oak trees.

The Project also includes Back-of-House Operational Facilities for staff, including use of the existing 2,400-sq. ft. onsite residence for employee lodging, use of the existing 1,200-sq. ft. garage for storage and maintenance, and a proposed new a \pm 1,500-sq. ft commercial building for office/meeting space, laundry facilities, restroom, and a graveled area for daytime staff parking.

Guests reserve campsites in advance online; no walk-up guests are accommodated. A total of sixteen (16) employees are proposed to operate the Getaway Lake County Outpost, with up to eleven (11) employees onsite at any given time. The Project also includes appurtenant development associated with the dispersed tiny cabins, including private on-site septic, drinking water, electrical, and roads and trails. Roads and trails would utilize existing roads and trails to the maximum extent practicable.

The parent company, Getaway House Inc., currently owns and operates nineteen (19) of campground outposts across the United States. They seek to create unique, low environmental impact experiences that allow guests to connect with nature and community. Getaway provides outdoor recreation space for guests seeking to spend their free time relaxing and enjoying an area's natural resources. Getaway's campgrounds, or "Outposts," are designed to create opportunities for private time spent in nature. Their tiny cabins are nestled in nature and spaced to allow for privacy from neighboring cabins.

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

North, South, East and West: Rural Lands-zoned properties that vary in size between 10 and over 80 acres. Mostly undeveloped; two nearby lots have single family dwellings on them.

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

Lake County Community Development Department
 Lake County Department of Environmental Health
 Lake County Air Quality Management District
 Lake County Environmental Health Department
 Lake County Department of Public Works
 Lake County Department of Public Services

South Lake County Fire Protection District (CalFire)
 Central Valley Water Resource Control
 California Department of Public Health
 California Department of Housing and Community Development
 California Department of Drinking Water

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Initial Study Prepared By:
Eric Porter, Associate Planner



December 22, 2022

Date: _____

SIGNATURE

Mireya Turner, Director
Community Development Department

SECTION 1 – EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

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

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.				Source Number**
	1	2	3	4	
I. AESTHETICS <i>Would the project:</i>					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X	<p>There are no scenic vistas visible from Morgan Valley Road, therefore this project's impacts will be less than significant.</p> <p>The project site is located in an area that is heavily treed and has steep terrain (see photo, next page). The site is not visible from Morgan Valley Road due to its location, tree coverage and terrain.</p> <p>Figure 1 – View of Site Entrance from Morgan Valley Road</p>  <p><i>Source: Google Earth Pro 2022</i></p> <p>The existing dwelling, garage and proposed overnight camping lodges are single story and will not be visible from a public road.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	7, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 33
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?			X	<p>No trees are proposed to be removed. There are no rock outcroppings on or adjacent to the site, and there are no historic buildings present on the site.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	7, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 33, 34

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?			X		The area is characterized by large lots with no scenic corridors along Morgan Valley Road. Less Than Significant Impact	7, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 33
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X		The project has some potential to contribute additional light or glare from exterior and lighting and windows on the buildings. The applicant has submitted light fixture cut-sheets that show individual fixture details for all exterior lighting. The standard for exterior lighting in Lake County is to meet the lighting recommendations found in 'darksky.org' lighting criteria, and the fixtures and explanation provided in the Project Description all appear to meet this exterior lighting regulation. All lighting shall be downcast and cannot shine into neighboring properties or onto the state highway - this is a standard condition of approval for all commercial projects. Figure 2 – Typical Cabin  <i>Source: Material Submitted by Applicant</i> Less Than Significant Impact	7, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 33
II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES <i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.</i>						
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X	The site is located in a forested part of Lake County. There are no agricultural uses on the site or in the immediate vicinity. No Impact	5, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 32, 33

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X	The immediate vicinity does not contain properties that are actively growing crops or that are in a Williamson Act contract. No Impact	5, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 32, 33
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	The property is in a non-urbanized area in Lower Lake. There are no timber-producing properties in the vicinity, and no land zoned Timber Preserve in proximity to the subject site. No Impact	5, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 32, 33
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, and no trees are being removed by this project according to the material submitted by the applicant. No Impact	5, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 32, 33, 34
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	No adverse impacts to farmland or forest land will result from this project. No Impact	5, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 32, 33, 34
III. AIR QUALITY <i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.</i> <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		X			<p>The project has some potential to result in some air quality impacts (primarily dust) during site preparation for the cabin pads, interior driveway improvements, and some parking. There is no mapped serpentine soil on the site. The parking areas and driveway will have a gravel surface.</p> <p>Construction of the project would take an estimated 2 to 4 months to complete.</p> <p>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures added:</p> <p><u>AQ-1:</u> Diesel generators are prohibited during and after construction.</p> <p><u>AQ-2:</u> Construction and/or work practices that involve masonry, gravel, grading activities, vehicular and fugitive dust shall be management by use of water or other acceptable dust palliatives to maintain visibly-moist soil during site preparation.</p> <p><u>AQ-3:</u> The applicant shall have the primary access and parking areas surfaced with chip seal, asphalt or an equivalent all weather surfacing including gravel to reduce fugitive dust generation.</p> <p>Less than significant with mitigation measures added.</p>	1, 8, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, 30, 32, 33
b)) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment			X		The campground will be able to accommodate about 110 guests and up to 10 employees according to the material submitted by the applicant. The parking areas are located next to each camp site, and one ADA-compliant space will be	1, 8, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, 30, 32, 33

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
under and applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?					<p>signed and available next to the house to be used by employees.</p> <p>Visitors to the site are unlikely to sit in their vehicles with the engines running, and the probability of any net increase in pollutants, including carbon monoxide and other greenhouse gasses, is very low. Dust resulting from site preparation will also be limited due to the short duration of construction (2 to 4 months), and due to the improvements that are already in place on the site (primarily the existing interior driveway).</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X			<p>The potential for dust migration can be significantly reduced with the use of water on the portions of the site that will have building pads prepared. This is a requirement within mitigation measure AQ-2.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measure added</p>	1, 8, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, 30, 32, 33
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?		X			<p>The use of water on the site during site preparation to hold the soil in place will significantly reduce dust migration.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measure added</p>	1, 8, 16, 17, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, 30, 32, 33
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X		<p>A Biological Resource Assessment was prepared for this site by Natural Investigations and is dated May 29, 2022 and updated July 7, 2022.</p> <p>The Assessment concluded that no federally listed species were detected, and no special status species were detected during the three field surveys conducted.</p> <p>Mitigation Measures Because special-status species that occur in the vicinity could migrate onto the Study Area between the time that the field survey was completed and the start of construction, the following mitigation measures are included as follows:</p> <p>BIO-1: An additional early-season botanical survey is required and shall include newly added project areas (Campsites 9, 10, 25, 26, 34, 35, 37 and 38-63). The early-season survey should be focused on rare plants that have been reported in the vicinity by the CNDDB and performed during the blooming period of the of target species. The survey should also focus on habitat types that are more likely to harbor rare species.</p> <p>The bristly leptosiphon plant areas shall be avoided, as well as any other rare plant populations that are discovered before construction. Approximately 0.61 acre of bristly leptosiphon was mapped in May 2022. The redesign of the project reduces impacts to this species to less than 10% of the mapped population, approximately 0.05 acre. Rare plant populations should be demarcated with exclusion fencing and signage. If the areas containing bristly leptosiphon or other rare plants must be disturbed</p>	2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 26, 31, 32, 33

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p>or habitats removed, a rare plant mitigation program should be implemented. Project construction activities shall be delayed long enough for a qualified biologist to prepare and implement the rare plant mitigation program.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measure added</p>	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X		<p>There is a pond on the site that may contain some riparian life, although the Biological Assessment concluded that there are no significant wetlands or riparian areas in the surveyed portion of the parent properties, and no mitigation measures regarding the pond or potential riparian areas were listed in the survey's recommendations.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 26, 31, 32, 33
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?			X		<p>There are no federally protected wetlands on the site.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 26, 31, 32, 33
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 Biological Assessment concluded that there were no migratory fish or wildlife corridors on the site.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 26, 31, 32, 33
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X		<p>The applicant's materials submitted indicate that no trees are being removed by this project.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 26, 31, 32, 33
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?			X		<p>No special conservation plans have been adopted for this site and no impacts are expected.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 26, 31, 32, 33
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>The applicant submitted a Cultural Assessment of the site, prepared by Natural Investigations and dated July 2022 and revised November 2022. The Assessment concluded that the likelihood of discovering sensitive relics, artifacts or remains is very low. The assessment also recommended that precautionary measures be added in the event of any discoveries.</p> <p>The following requirements are typically added to any project that undergoes a CEQA review and that involves any site disturbance:</p> <p>CUL-1: Should any archaeological, paleontological, or cultural materials be discovered during site development, all activity shall be halted in the vicinity of the find(s), the applicant shall notify the culturally affiliated Tribe, and a</p>	5, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p>qualified archaeologist to evaluate the find(s) and recommend mitigation procedures, if necessary, subject to the approval of the Community Development Director. Should any human remains be encountered, the applicant shall notify the Sheriff's Department, the culturally affiliated Tribe, and a qualified archaeologist for proper internment and Tribal rituals per Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 and Health and Safety Code 7050.5.</p> <p>CUL-2: All employees shall be trained in recognizing potentially significant artifacts that may be discovered during ground disturbance. If any artifacts or remains are found, the culturally affiliated Tribe shall immediately be notified; a licensed archaeologist shall be notified, and the Lake County Community Development Director shall be notified of such finds.</p> <p>Potential impacts can be mitigated to 'Less than Significant' with CUL-1 and CUL-2.</p>	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X			<p>The site has been evaluated by a professional Archaeologist, and had previously been surveyed according to data provided in the Cultural Assessment according to CHRIS records from Sonoma State University. The Assessments yielded negative results, and no further mitigation measures were recommended in the Assessment.</p> <p>Lake County has a rich heritage of Tribal activity. Because of this, the County typically adds protective measures to mitigate potential impacts to sensitive areas that may have not been discovered on the site. These are added as mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact with mitigation measures added</p>	5, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X			<p>According to the Cultural Assessment submitted, it is highly unlikely that any human remains are present on the site. If any are found, they are to be addressed through the requirements of CUL-1 stated above.</p> <p>Can be mitigated to 'Less than Significant' with CUL-1 and CUL-2</p>	5, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33
VI. ENERGY <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy, or wasteful use of energy resources, during project construction or operation?			X		<p>The applicant will use on-grid power for this project. Power demands for the buildings is anticipated to be low and should not exceed 600 amps for the entire project.</p> <p>There are no known power grid issues in this location.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	16, 23, 26, 33
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?			X		<p>There are no mandates for renewable energy within the Lake County Zoning Ordinance associated this project.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	16, 23, 26, 33

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS <i>Would the project:</i>						
<p>a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</p> <p>i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist- Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</p> <p>ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?</p> <p>iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</p> <p>iv) Landslides?</p>			X		<p><u>Earthquake Faults</u> There are no mapped earthquake faults on or adjacent to the subject site.</p> <p><u>Seismic Ground Shaking and Seismic-Related Ground Failure, including liquefaction.</u> The site's soil is mostly type 209 – Skyhigh-Millsholm loams, 15 to 50 percent slopes. This soil type is generally stable and is not particularly prone to liquefaction. This soil complex has moderate erosion associated with it, however the project will have minimal ground disturbance and is not anticipated to greatly increase the likelihood of seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction. The site is not located on a mapped fault.</p> <p><u>Landslides</u> The site does not contain unstable soil, and the risk of landslides is remote.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	3, 4, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 32, 33
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			X		<p>Grading activities associated with this project are limited to the preparation of building pads and improvements to the interior driveway. The type 209 soil has moderate erosive potential, however the project proposes minimal ground disturbance, and the risk of substantial soil erosion is minimal.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	3, 4, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 32, 33
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 site is mapped as 209 – Skyhigh – Millsholm loam, 15 to 50 percent slopes. This complex is relatively stable and is not prone to landslides. The vegetation associated with this soil type is primarily oak woodlands.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	3, 4, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 32, 33
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>There is no significant risk to life or property based on the type of development proposed and based on the soil categorization and characteristics.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	3, 4, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 32, 33
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 site will be served through private on-site septic systems.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	3, 4, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 32, 33
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X		<p>There are no unique paleontological or geologic features on the site according to the Cultural Assessment submitted for this project.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	5, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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		<p>In general, greenhouse gas emissions from construction activities include the use of construction equipment, trenching, landscaping, haul trucks, delivery vehicles, and stationary equipment (such as generators, if any are used). Given that the project site area is flat and will require very minimal grading, greenhouse gas emissions resulting from construction would be negligible and would not result in a significant impact to the environment.</p> <p>The post-construction use of the site will involve overnight camping with a very low likelihood of cars idling on site.</p> <p>Further, the use of generators is prohibited except during emergency situations such as power outages.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	1, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, 30, 33
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				X	<p>This project will not conflict with any adopted plans or policies for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 18, 21, 23, 24, 26, 30, 33
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		<p>The resort will not be storing hazardous materials on site. There may be some fuel brought onto the site for construction activities, however no gasoline or other hazardous materials will be stored on site during and after construction occurs.</p> <p>There will be basic domestic cleaning supplies on site, including bleach products and other normal cleaning chemicals.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 5, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X		<p>The project does not need any chemicals that might be regarded as hazardous other than standard cleaning supplies. Cleaning supplies will be kept in the existing dwelling or 1,200 sq. ft. garage in a locked and secure room.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 5, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X	<p>The proposed project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 5, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X	<p>The project site is not listed as a site containing hazardous materials in the databases maintained by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).</p> <p>No Impact</p>	1, 5, 10, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 24, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?				X	The project is not located within two (2) miles of an airport and/or within an Airport Land Use Plan. No Impact	8, 16, 18, 22, 23, 26, 33
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X		The project would not impair or interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Less Than Significant Impact	4, 5, 13, 15, 16, 23, 26, 29, 33
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			X		The site is located in a Moderate to Severe Fire Hazard Area (State Responsibility Area). The applicant is proposing to install a 15,000 gallon water storage tank, which can be used for fire suppression if needed. There is an existing pond on site that can be used for fire suppression if needed. The applicant will need to be compliant with CalFire PRC 4290 and 4291 road standards, defensible space and clear areas. Less Than Significant Impact	2, 6, 9, 13, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 29, 33
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		The property will connect to a private well. The project will need approval by the State Drinking Water division, which is indicated in the materials submitted by the applicant. Less Than Significant Impact	4, 6, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 26, 30, 31, 33, 34
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X		The site is served by a private well. The applicant has submitted an engineered Water Supply and Demand Study dated September 2022. There are two existing wells on site located about 500 feet apart. The two wells generate 110 gallons per minute (GPM), and the applicant is proposing to install a 15,000 sq. ft. water storage tank on site. The estimated water demand is 15 gallons of water per day per person; the total projected demand, including the eastern neighbor who is sharing one of the wells with the applicant's property, is 8.3 acre-feet per year, or about 3,119,000 gallons per year. The water basin nearest to the site is the Lower Lake Valley Groundwater Basin (LLVGB). According to the Water Analysis, the projected recharge rate for this aquifer is 21 acre-feet per normal rainfall years, and 16 acre-feet during drought years. The total aquifer capacity is not estimated in the water study. There are few wells that share the water basin with the subject properties, and competitive draw-down is minimal within the recharge area. Less Than Significant Impact	4, 6, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 26, 30, 31, 33
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:			X		The applicant has submitted an engineered Soil and Erosion Control plan. The amount of site disturbance is minimal; the 59 proposed cabins have footprints under 200 square feet, and the new multi-use building is 1,500 sq. ft. in total area. The Erosion Control plan shows anti-erosion mitigation measures being put in place prior to construction.	4, 6, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 26, 30, 31, 33

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; iii) Create or contribute to runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?					Less Than Significant Impact	
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?				X	The site is not located in a mapped flood plain. No Impact	4, 6, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 26, 30, 31, 33
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?			X		There are no water quality control plans adopted that involve this property. Less Than Significant Impact	4, 6, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 26, 30, 31, 33
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Physically divide an established community?				X	The proposed project site would not physically divide an established community. No Impact	8, 16, 23, 26, 33
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X		This project is consistent with the Lake County General Plan, the Lower Lake Area Plan and the applicable portions of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance. The site is zoned "RL", which allows public or private campgrounds, resorts and retreats subject to a major use permit being granted. Less Than Significant Impact	8, 16, 23, 26, 33
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X	The Aggregate Resource Management Plan (ARMP) does not identify this site as having an important source of aggregate. No Impact	5, 14, 15, 16, 25, 26, 33
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X	Neither the County of Lake's General Plan, the Lower Lake Area Plan nor the Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan designates the project site as being a locally important mineral resource recovery site. No Impact	5, 14, 15, 16, 25, 26, 33

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XIII. NOISE <i>Would the project result in:</i>						
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X			Short-term increases in ambient noise levels to uncomfortable levels could be expected during site preparation and construction. Mitigation measures will decrease these noise levels to an acceptable level. Noise levels following construction will be limited to ambient noises associated with camping activities. Less Than Significant with the following mitigation measures incorporated: <u>NOI-1:</u> All construction activities including engine warm-up shall be limited Monday Through Friday, between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. to minimize noise impacts on nearby residents. Back-up beepers shall be adjusted to the lowest allowable levels. This mitigation does not apply to night work. <u>NOI -2:</u> Maximum non-construction related sounds levels shall not exceed levels of 55 dBA between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 45 dBA between the hours of 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. within residential areas as specified within Zoning Ordinance Section 21-41.11 (Table 11.1) at the property lines.	16, 17, 23, 26, 33
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X		The project is not expected to create unusual groundborne vibration due to site development or facility operation. The low level truck traffic during construction and for occasional post-construction deliveries would create a minimal amount of groundborne vibration. Less Than Significant Impact	16, 17, 23, 26, 33
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X	The site is not located within the vicinity of a public or private air strip. No Impact	
XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X		The project is not anticipated to induce population growth. Less than Significant Impact	16, 23, 26, 33
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	No housing will be displaced as a result of the project. No Impact	16, 23, 26, 33

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>						
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: - Fire Protection? - Police Protection? - Schools? - Parks? - Other Public Facilities?			X		The project does not propose any new housing or other uses that would necessitate the need for new or altered government facilities. The site is served by the Lake County Sheriff's Department, the South Lake Fire District; and Lake County Public Works (Morgan Valley Road). These agencies were notified of this project, and no adverse comments were received. Less Than Significant Impact	7, 16, 18, 19, 23, 26, 33, 34
XVI. RECREATION <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X	The project will not have any impacts on existing parks or other recreational facilities. No Impact	16, 23, 26, 33
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X	This project will not necessitate the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities. No Impact	16, 23, 26, 33
XVII. TRANSPORTATION <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?			X		The project site is served by Morgan Valley Road, a paved County road at this location. This project was routed to Public Works as well as to CalTrans. No adverse comments were received by either agency; CalTrans requested the interior driveway be improved to meet Public Resource Code (PRC 4290 and 4291 road standards for commercial uses. This is ordinarily added as a condition of approval for all commercial projects in Lake County. Less Than Significant Impact	7, 8, 13, 16, 18, 23, 26, 29, 33
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X		The proposed operation would not conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) subdivision (b) as Lake County is a Rural County and trip lengths can frequently exceed 20 miles per trip to access overnight lodging. Less Than Significant Impact	7, 8, 13, 16, 18, 23, 26, 29, 33

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X		No changes to Morgan Valley Road are proposed, nor do any appear to be needed. Less than Significant Impact	7, 8, 13, 16, 18, 23, 26, 29, 33
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X	As proposed, this project will not impact any existing emergency accesses. No Impact	7, 8, 13, 16, 18, 23, 26, 29, 33
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES <i>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</i>						
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or			X		The site does not contain resources that would be eligible for being listed in the California Register of Historical Resources or are locally significant. Less than Significant Impact	5, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		X			The County has provided mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 that are prescriptive if any potentially significant artifacts, items or any human remains are discovered during the process of site disturbance. Implementation of CUL-1 and CUL-2 would reduce potential impacts to Less than Significant.	5, 14, 16, 17, 18, 23, 26, 27, 28, 32, 33
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 site will use two existing wells, and private on-site septic systems. Storm water drainage can be maintained on site based on the Erosion Control Plan submitted. Less Than Significant Impact	7, 16, 18, 19, 23, 26, 33
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X		There are no obvious capacity issues associated with the aquifer that serves this area. Less Than Significant Impact	7, 16, 18, 19, 23, 26, 33
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X		The site will be served by on-site septic systems. Less Than Significant Impact	7, 16, 18, 19, 23, 26, 33

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure?			X		The existing landfill has sufficient capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs for at least the next 4 years according to the Director of the Landfill. Less Than Significant Impact.	7, 16, 18, 19, 23, 26, 33
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X		All requirements related to solid waste will apply to this project. Solid waste disposal is not projected to be excessive. Less Than Significant Impact	7, 16, 18, 19, 23, 26, 33

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
XX. WILDFIRE <i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</i>						
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X		The site is located in a mapped Moderate and High Fire area. The site is positioned in such a way that access into and out of the site is generally direct from Morgan Valley Road. The number of overnight guests will at most be about 110 (assuming 2 per cabin) at full capacity. The applicant has prepared an emergency Evacuation Plan, which is included with the materials submitted. In the event that an evacuation is needed. The evacuation route will be Morgan Valley Road. The nearest fire station is located in Lower Lake, about 2 miles from the subject site. Less Than Significant Impact	2, 6, 9, 13, 16, 17, 23, 26, 29, 33
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?					The site is located in a mapped Moderate to High Fire Area. The site is served by the South Lake Fire District (CalFire), and is next to Morgan Valley Road, which would be the path of travel for fire trucks. The applicant is proposing to add one (1) 15,000 gallon water tank on the site that could be used for emergency fire protection if necessary. Less Than Significant Impact	2, 6, 9, 13, 16, 17, 23, 26, 29, 33
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 site is already connected to two wells capable of producing 110 gallons per minute combined. The road leading to the site is a fully paved County road; no further improvements to this road are needed. Less Than Significant Impact	2, 6, 9, 13, 16, 17, 23, 26, 29, 33
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?			X		There is some potential for downslope or downstream flooding due to the slope of the site. The applicant is not moving significant amounts of earth, and no trees will be removed by this project, which will enable soils to be anchored in place by existing vegetation. Less Than Significant Impact	2, 6, 9, 13, 16, 17, 23, 26, 29, 33
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 campground with 59 small cabins for use as overnight lodging. As proposed, this project is not anticipated to significantly impact habitat of fish and/or wildlife species or cultural resources with the incorporated mitigation measures as described above. Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measures added.	All

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?		X			Potentially significant impacts have been identified related to Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural / Tribal Resources and Noise. Implementation of and compliance with mitigation measures identified in each section as project conditions of approval would avoid or reduce potential impacts to less than significant levels and would not result in cumulatively considerable environmental impacts. Less than significant impact with mitigation measures added.	All
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X			The proposed project has potential to result in adverse indirect or direct effects on human beings. In particular, to Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural / Tribal Resources and Noise have the potential to impact human beings. Implementation of and compliance with mitigation measures identified in each section as conditions of approval would not result in substantial adverse indirect or direct effects on human beings and impacts would be considered less than significant. Less than significant impact with mitigation measures added.	All

* Impact Categories defined by CEQA

REFERENCES

1. Bay Area Air Quality Management District. 2014. *Rules and Compliance*, accessed on December 03, 2021 <<https://www.baaqmd.gov/rules-and-compliance>>.
2. Board of Forestry and Fire Protection. 2016. *California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection SRA Fire Safe Regulations*. January 1, 2016.
3. California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey. 2020. *Earthquake Zones of Required Investigation*, accessed December 02, 2021 <<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/EQZApp/app/>>.
4. California Department of Conservation. 2015. *Landslide Inventory (Beta)*. <<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/lis/app/>>.
5. California Department of Conservation. 2021. *California Geological Society*. <<https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/mlc/>>.
6. California Department of Fish and Wildlife. 2021.
7. California Department of Transportation. 2015. *Scenic Highways, California State Scenic Highways*. <Highways. <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>>.
8. California Governor’s Office of Planning and Research. 2018. *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA*. December 2018. <https://opr.ca.gov/docs/20190122-743_Technical_Advisory.pdf>.
9. California Legislative Information. *PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE – PRC DIVISION 4. FORESTS, FORESTRY AND RANGE AND FORAGE LANDS [4001 - 4958]*.

<https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=PRC§ionNum=4290>.

10. California State Water Resources Control Board. *GeoTracker Database Search*. <<https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov>>.
11. Vacant
12. Vacant
13. 2020. *Fire Hazard Severity Zones*. <<https://gispublic.co.lake.ca.us/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=e68893fda34e495ab5f053f6a96b305c>>.
14. *Biological Survey prepared by Natural Investigations, Inc.*
15. *Known Fault Lines*. <<https://gispublic.co.lake.ca.us/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=98f7705afb0a49aa982be98ea28cca6b>>.
16. *Lake County Parcel Viewer*. <<https://gispublic.co.lake.ca.us/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=87dfc0c535b2478bb67df69d6d319eca>>.
17. *Slope and Terrain Viewer*. <<https://gispublic.co.lake.ca.us/portal/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=de53cdcea0c44a53a2b9f444e729960c>>.
18. *Lake County Zoning Ordinance*. Adopted 1986. Articles 1 through 72, as Amended through October 5, 2021.
19. County of Lake, Environmental Health. 2017. *Hazardous Materials Management (CUPA)*, <www.lakecountyca.gov/Page1670.aspx>.
20. Department of Toxic Substances Control. 2021. Envirostor. <<https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>>.
21. EPA United States Environmental Protection Agency. 2021. Multisystem Search. <<https://enviro.epa.gov/facts/multisystem.html>>.
22. *Advanced Facility Search*; Federal Aviation Administration, ADIP. <<https://adip.faa.gov/agis/public/#/airportSearch/advanced>>.
23. *Lake County General Plan*; Lake County. 2008.
24. *Lake County Air Quality Management District, Rules and Regulations*. Lake County Air Quality Management District. 2006. Latest Update on: August 9, 2006.
25. *Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan*; Lake County Planning Department, Resource Management Division. 1992. November 19, 1992.
26. *Project Description and Supplemental Materials*, received 4-8-2021.
27. *Cultural Resource Assessment; Natural Investigations, Inc., dated July 2022, revised November 2022*.
28. *Cultural Resource history*; Sonoma State. 2018. Northwest Information Center.

29. *Emergency Operations Plan*; Office of Emergency Services. 2020., *Lake Operation Area*. July 2020.
30. *General Waste Discharge Requirements and Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Waste Associated with Cannabis Cultivation Activities*; State Water Resources Control Board. 2019. *Order WQ 2019-0001-DWQ*, <https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/board_decisions/adopted_orders/water_quality/2019/wqo2019_0001_dwg.pdf>.
31. State Water Resources Control Board. 2021. *GEOTRACKER*. <<https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>>.
32. *Soil Survey*; United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. Web. <https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoil_Survey.aspx>.
33. *Site and Landscape Plans, Northpoint Consulting Engineers*.
34. *Application and Support Materials*, received October 2022.