



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

August 14, 2023

## CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM INITIAL STUDY (IS 21-42) **CORRECTION**

1. **Project Title:** Anthony and Matsuki Perkins
2. **Permit Numbers:** Use Permit UP 21-40  
Initial Study IS 21-42
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):** 140 and 270 Soda Bay Road, Lakeport, CA  
APN: 008-001-08 and 09
6. **Project Sponsor's Name/Address:** Anthony and Matsuki Perkins  
2331 Cynthia Court  
Costa Mesa, CA 92627
7. **General Plan Designation:** Resource Conservation, Agriculture, Service  
Commercial
8. **Zoning:** 008-001-08 and 09: "A-DR-SC-FF-WW"; Agriculture,  
Design Review, Scenic Combining, Floodway Fringe,  
Waterway
9. **Supervisor District:** District Four (4)
10. **Flood Zone:** "AO" and "AE"
11. **Hazard:** SRA, High Fire Area
12. **Slope:** Flat
13. **Parcel Sizes:** 008-001-08; 12.41 acres  
008-001-09; 31.90 acres  
**Total acreage: 44.31 acres**
14. **Previous Land Use Permits:** Certificates of Compliance (2003)
15. **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 for a proposed commercial cannabis cultivation, manufacturing, and distribution operation at 140 and 270 Soda Bay Road near Lakeport, California on Lake County APNs 008-001-08 & 09 (Project Property). The total canopy area is 43,200 square

feet (sf); the total cultivation area is 94,120 sf. The project will be comprised of two A-Type 3B “Medium Mixed-Light Tier 1” Cultivation Licenses, an A-Type 6 Non-Volatile Cannabis Manufacturing License, and an A-Type 11 Cannabis Distributor License. The two A-Type 3B “Medium Mixed-Light Tier 1” Cultivation Licenses will consist of thirty (30) proposed 3,000 sf greenhouses (15 for each license type) and a proposed 6,000 sf Processing and Non-Volatile Manufacturing Facility (metal building) on Lake County APN 008-001-08. The A-Type 6 Non-Volatile Cannabis Manufacturing License Type will also be located within the proposed Processing and Non-Volatile Manufacturing Facility on APN 008-001-08. The A-Type 11 Cannabis Distributor License will be located within a proposed 2,400 sf Distribution Facility (metal building) on Lake County APN 008-001-09. The Project Property has been enrolled for coverage under the State Water Resources Control Board’s Cannabis General Order as a Tier 2 Low Risk Discharger since October 23rd, 2020 (WDID: 5S17CC429168).

Six of the proposed greenhouse structures will contain immature cannabis plants. Two-thirds of the proposed 6,000 sf Processing and Non-Volatile Manufacturing Facility/Building (4,000 sf) will be used for processing (drying, curing, and trimming), packaging, and storing cannabis cultivated on the site. The rest of the proposed Processing and Non-Volatile Manufacturing Facility/Building (2,000 sf) will be used for cannabis manufacturing activities, including CO<sub>2</sub> and solventless extraction.


The 44-acre Agriculture and Service Commercial-zoned Project Property is situated between Clear Lake and Soda Bay Road, and approximately 1,500 feet east of Lakeport, CA. The Project Property is accessed via Soda Bay Road and a private gravel and native soil surfaced access road off of Soda Bay Road. Current and past land uses of the Project Property are/were intensive agriculture (vineyard and industrial hemp cultivation). The Project Parcel has been improved with two groundwater wells, a 24-acre vineyard, and a water storage reservoir. The proposed cultivation area(s) and Processing and Non-Volatile Manufacturing Facility will be established within the footprint of an existing industrial hemp cultivation area/field (Registration #: 17-19-0019G). The Industrial Hemp Registration on the Project Property will be rescinded prior to issuance of any cannabis permits/licenses. The proposed Distribution Facility will be established/constructed ~120 feet north of Soda Bay Road in the southwestern corner of the Project Property, and will be accessed via a proposed paved access road with curb and gutter.

The applicants are also seeking to obtain a Type 11 Cannabis Distributor license, so that they may test, package, label, store, and transport cannabis products/goods ready for retail sale. The proposed Distribution Facility building will be located in the southwest corner of the site, in an area that is zoned C-3 Service Commercial, and which is easily accessed directly from Soda Bay Road. Within the proposed Distribution Facility, there will be separate, designated secure spaces for cannabis products/goods storage, packaging, labeling, and loading activities. Processed cannabis batches and cannabis products batches, will be stored within the Cannabis Goods Storage Area of the proposed Distribution Facility, where they will be securely stored and sampled for testing per State of California requirements and standards. After a cannabis batch or cannabis goods batch has “passed” testing, it will be transferred to the Packaging and Labeling Area of the proposed Distribution Facility, where it will be packaged and labeled in preparation for distribution to State of California licensed Retail and Distribution facilities.

The applicant will utilize an unmarked, registered, and insured distribution vehicle/van to transport cannabis to and from their cultivation, manufacturing, and distribution operation. The distribution vehicle will only travel from the Project Property to the premises of licensed cannabis facilities, and back to the Project Property. The distribution vehicle will be locked and secured whenever it is not being loaded or unloaded, and it will never be left unattended

while transporting cannabis. The distribution vehicle will be stored within the Loading/Unloading area of the proposed Distribution Facility when not in use.

Figure 1 – Area Map and Site Plan



Source: Material Submitted by Applicant

### Construction

#### Equipment

Construction will occur in two stages; year 1 (three months duration), and year 2 (two months duration). The following equipment is expected to be required to construct the proposed project buildings and facilities:

- Trencher,
- Backhoe,
- Excavator,
- Backhoe,
- Cement truck, and
- Water truck

#### Construction Hours

Construction is projected to last three months during year 1, and two months during year 2; the project will be built in stages. Construction will take place on Monday through Saturday, between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. during these days. Site preparation for the greenhouses, processing building and appurtenant buildings is needed. Although the cultivation areas on

the site are flat, footings for the buildings are required, particularly because the entire project site is within a flood plain and must have engineererd footings on all buildings. Trenching for foundation footings and utilities will be needed, along with a screening fence.

#### *Vehicle Trips During and After Construction*

The County estimates that between 16 and 24 daily trips will result during and after construction. If the project takes four months, a total of 2880 vehicle trips is likely. The County estimates that up to 12 employees will work during construction, and another 12 to 18 will work during peak harvest time, and 8 to 12 during non-peak harvest time. This will result in up to 36 trips per day excluding deliveries and transportation of goods during peak harvest time. Deliveries and transportation of goods will likely generate another 2 trips per day.

#### *Hours of Operation/Work Shifts*

The proposed project will operate from 8 am to 6 pm, Monday through Saturday. Work will occur in two shifts during non peak harvest time, and three shifts during peak harvest time.

#### *Water Analysis*

A Hydrology Report (“Report”) was prepared for this project by Realm Engineering and is dated May 20, 2022. The Report evaluates annual water demand for the project; aquifer capacity and recharge rate during drought and non-drought years; evaluates drought management actions needed, and provides well data on the two on-site wells.

There are two existing permitted on-site wells, identified as Well #1 and Well #2. Well #1 produced about 300 gallons of water per minute during the four hour well test. Well #2 produced 6.1 gallons per minute, and would be used as a back-up water source if needed.

The applicants have an on-site water reservoir that holds 4.0 acre feet (1,303,000 gallons). This will be the primary water storage area. The applicant will also install two 5,000 gallon water tanks for emergency use in the event of a fire.

There is an existing 24 acre vineyard and hemp field on site. The hemp field and 3 acres of vineyard will be removed to accommodate the cannabis project. The applicants have not monitored water usage for the vineyard, but vineyard water usage is estimated in the Hydrology Report. The Report estimates that 21.6 acre feet of water are needed for the 24 acre vineyard based on an industry standard of 0.9 acre-feet per year needed to grow wine grapes.

The project would remove 4.62 acres of wine grapes and hemp; this will offset any new impacts of the cannabis cultivation to an extent. Removing this amount of hemp and vineyard will cause 3.87 less acre-feet per year to be used. Further, the applicants have indicated that they will ‘dry-farm’ the remaining vineyard, further reducing the water demand for the vineyard. The Report estimates that a total of 12 acre-feet of water will be needed for the vineyard and the cannabis cultivation per year; this is a reduction of about half of what had been used annually for the vineyard.

The Report estimates that 6.2 acre feet per year of water would be needed for the cannabis operation (about 2,020,000 gallons). The Report also estimates that the manufacturing activities proposed would require about 208,000 gallons per year; about 2/3 acre foot.

Employee water usage would be about 60,000 gallons per year. Total projected water usage is 2,287,850 gallons per year.

#### *Well Test*

A well test was performed on the primary well (identified as Well #1 in this document) by Stevenson Water Treatment and Distribution Systems, Inc. on February 2, 2022. The 6-hour test yielded an average of 266 gallons per minute over a 6 hour time-frame. The water level dropped by 26 feet during the test, and fully recovered within 17 hours of shut down.

#### *Aquifer Data*

The Report provides data on the aquifer serving the site. The site is located in the Big Valley Water Basin. There are two distinct areas that comprise the basin; the younger alluvial basin to the north (at the well site), and the older portion of the aquifer to the south. The primary aquifer for this project is identified in the Report as being the A1 aquifer, which is found about 72 feet below ground surface and is composed of gravel. The two aquifer sections were divided by the Kelseyville fault.

The California Department of Water Resources estimates the A1 aquifer to have a total storage capacity of about 105,000 acre feet of water, with a usable capacity of about 60,000 acre feet. Total water usage within the A1 aquifer is estimated to be 12,944 acre-feet per year taking into consideration all existing wells that draw from this aquifer. The Report states that, despite occasional fluctuations in the aquifer's recharge rate, groundwater levels in the A1 aquifer have remained stable over the past three decades.

The majority of Big Valley Basin recharge appears to occur through Manning and Thompson Creeks. The estimated rainfall recharge rate of the basin with regards to the subject site is as follows: the 44.3 acre property x 2.8 feet of annual precipitation (non drought year) = 124 acre feet per year of total rainfall on the site. Because the site is flat, it is estimated that about 15% of the rainfall reaches the aquifer. This equals 18.6 acre-feet of aquifer recharge per year due to on-site water percolation into the aquifer. This amount is greater than the projected annual water usage of the project.

#### *Drought Management*

Ordinance 3106, adopted in July 2021, requires a Drought Management Plan for all land use applications that require water. The applicants have provided this Plan, which includes the following:

- Regularly inspect the entire water delivery system for leaks and immediately repair any leaky faucets, pipes, connectors, or other leaks;
- Apply weed-free mulch in cultivation areas that do not have ground cover to conserve soil moisture and minimize evaporative loss;
- Implement water conserving irrigation methods (drip or trickle and micro-spray irrigation);
- Maintain daily records of all water used for irrigation of cannabis. Daily records will be calculated by using a measuring device (inline water meter) installed on the main irrigation supply line between the water storage area and cultivation area(s);
- Install float valves on all water storage tanks to keep them from overflowing onto the ground.

With the Water Conservation and Use requirements outlined above, the proposed cultivation operation would efficiently use water resources at all times. Additionally, Article 27 Section 27.13 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance requires commercial cannabis cultivators using

water from a groundwater well to install a water level monitor on their water supply well, and to regularly record readings from the continuous water level monitor.

### *Energy Usage*

According to the applicant's application material, the proposed use would consist of 30 3,000 sf greenhouses and two processing / manufacturing buildings that total 8,200 sq. ft.. The greenhouses would require between 400 and 800 additional amps. The two processing / manufacturing buildings would each require at least 200 amps. Estimated power usage would be between 800 and 1200 amps.

There are no grid capacity issues at this location. PG&E was notified of this project, and sent a response dated October 28, 2022, indicating that the project would not interfere with their operations. There was no indication that they could not serve this project with power.

### *Solid Waste Management*

Annual non-hazardous solid waste generated by project operations is estimated to be about 4 tons per year. All non-hazardous waste will be hauled to the nearest waste disposal transfer station located in Lakeport.

### *Wastewater Management*

The site will rely on new restrooms inside the 6,000 sq. ft. manufacturing building, which will require a new septic system, and portable ADA-compliant restroom and wash station, and will be serviced at regular intervals by the applicant's septic company.

### *Stormwater Management*

A Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) has been prepared and submitted to Lake County Planning Department; the Plan is identified as Sheet 1, and was prepared by Realm Engineering, a professional engineering firm. The Plan shows Best Management Practices (BMPs) for stormwater control in the form of straw wattles surrounding the cultivation area. The cultivation area is set back more than 100 feet from the on-site reservoir and from the water course on site. Setbacks from any surface water channel or above-ground water storage facility is 100 feet or more as is required by Article 27.11(at) of the Lake County Code.

## **16. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:**

All properties surrounding the project property are zoned "C3" Service Commercial and "A", Agriculture. The following neighboring lot characteristics are present. See Figure 2, next page for map.


- South: "C3" Service Commercial zoned land containing service commercial uses. Varied lot sizes.
- North and East: "A" Agriculture zoning; 20 acre lot containing an orchard and a dwelling.
- West: "C3" Service Commercial and "A" Agriculture zoned lots. The "A" zoned lot contains a dwelling; the "C3" zoned lots are developed with service commercial uses.

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

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

Lake County Agricultural Commissioner  
 Lake County Sheriff Department  
 Kelseyville Fire Protection District,  
 Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board  
 State Water Resources Control Board  
 California Department of Forestry & Fire Protection (Calfire)  
 California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW) - Notification for a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement.  
 California Department of Food and Agriculture (CalCannabis) - Cannabis cultivation licenses  
 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)

Figure 2 – Zoning of Subject Lots and Neighboring Lots



Source: Lake County GIS Mapping, 2022

**17. 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.

Lake County sent an Assembly Bill (AB) 52 notice to 11 tribes on December 21, 2021, informing tribes of the proposed project and offering consultation under AB-52. Of the 11 notified Tribes, the Yocha Dehe Tribe responded and deferred to the Big Valley Tribe. The

Big Valley Tribe did not respond to the request for consultation that was sent out via AB 52 notice.

### 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" or "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated", as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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





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*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
<b>I. AESTHETICS</b> <i>Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:</i>						
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?		X			<p>The project site is located on a flat property that is partially visible from Soda Bay Road. Clear Lake cannot be seen from this portion of Soda Bay Road, however the buildings proposed will be visible from this road and from neighboring sites. Soda Bay Road is a scenic road at this location.</p> <p>The applicant needs to screen the project from view from Soda Bay Road. Lighting from greenhouses and the proposed building is addressed later in this section. The following mitigation measures are needed:</p> <p>AES-1: the applicant shall install a minimum 6' tall screening fence around the cultivation area and the processing / drying / manufacturing buildings. Fabric shall not be used; the screening material shall be chain link with slats, or a solid wood or metal fence. This shall occur prior to any cultivation occurring on site.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact with mitigation measure added</p>	1, 2, 4, 16, 18
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?		X			<p>The proposed project will be screened from Soda Bay Road with a 6' tall screening fence. The project would not result in the removal of any trees, and does not contain any rock outcroppings or historic buildings.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measure added</p>	1, 2, 4, 16, 18

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			<p>The site is located within an semi-urbanized area. The site contains a 24 acre vineyard; 3 acres of wine grapes will be removed for the project. The site also contains a hemp farm that will also be removed. The cultivation area will be screened by a 6' tall screening fence, which is required by mitigation measure AES-1 above.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measure added</p>	1, 2, 4, 16, 18
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 has the potential to create additional light or glare because of the 32 proposed buildings associated with the project. The following mitigation measures are required to lessen the impact associated with on-site lighting:</p> <p>AES-2: During construction, all lighting, including security lighting, will be directed downward and consistent with the Lake County regulations for lighting as found within darksky.org. This shall be maintained for the life of the project.</p> <p>AES-3: All greenhouses and transparent or translucent buildings containing interior lighting shall be equipped with blackout screening. No light shall be visible from outside any building that contains interior lighting.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measures added</p>	1, 2, 4, 16, 18

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
<p><b>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES</b></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>						
<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?</p>			X		<p>The cultivation sites are mapped as 'Farmland of Local Importance' and 'High Value Farmland' regarding the quality of the soil. There are no mapped soils categorized as 'prime farmland', 'farmland of statewide importance' or any other high value soils within or adjacent to the cultivation areas.</p> <p>Figure 3 – Map of Farmlands of Importance</p>  <p>Source: Lake County GIS Mapping</p> <p>Lake County allows commercial cannabis cultivation on land that is mapped as having high value soil if the land is not within a Farmland Protection Area, although the cultivation activities are required to take place only in greenhouses; outdoor cultivation is prohibited.</p> <p>The applicant is proposing to have 30 greenhouses on site, as well as two buildings to be used for processing and manufacturing. This is consistent with Article 27.11(at)'s requirements for cultivating on high value farmland.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	<p>1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 11, 16, 18</p>
<p>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</p>			X		<p>The site is not under a Williamson Act contract, but has a productive vineyard on it. The property to the immediate east is also actively producing agricultural products. The subject site takes access from Soda Bay Road, a paved County-maintained road at this location. No blockage of the access road is anticipated to occur as the result of this project, and all cultivation activities will take place inside greenhouses that have carbon filtration systems that will inhibit or prevent pesticide and fertilizer residue from travelling onto neighboring agriculturally-productive land.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	<p>1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 11, 16, 18</p>

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	The project site is zoned "A" Agricultural and is not zoned for forestland or timberland, nor has it been used historically for timber production.  No Impact	1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 11, 16, 18
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, 4, 5, 7, 11, 16, 18
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?			X		As proposed, this project would not induce changes to existing farmland that would result in its conversion to non-agricultural use.  Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 11, 16, 18
<b>III. AIR QUALITY</b> <i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.</i> <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X		The project has potential to result in short- and long-term air quality impacts. Lake County is designated as an 'Air Attainment Area', and there are no thresholds for adverse air quality levels that result from a project. It is likely that some dust and fumes may be released as a result of site preparation / construction of the greenhouse and metal building pads. Some vehicular traffic, including small delivery vehicles would be contributors during and after site preparation / construction; trips generated by the use will be minimal, estimated at 1 to 2 average daily trips. Odors generated by the plants, particularly during harvest season, will need to be mitigated through filtration systems inside all greenhouses containing mature plants, and in the two metal buildings proposed.  Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 6, 16, 23
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under and applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?			X		The cultivation activity will occur in greenhouses. The greenhouses will be required to be equipped with air filtration systems, which will help to minimize odor migration as well as the release of fertilizers / pesticides. Lake County is an Air Attainment County.  Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 6, 16, 23

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		X			<p>Sensitive receptors typically include young children, chronically ill individuals, the elderly, or people who are more sensitive to dust and cannabis odors than the general population. There are several dwellings located on lots adjacent to the cultivation lot, however the nearest dwelling is located about 1000 feet to the south-east of the cultivation site; the other dwelling is located about the same distance to the west. A total separation of 200 feet is required by Article 27.13(at) of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance, the governing County document for commercial cannabis cultivation. The following mitigation measures will help to reduce impacts related to dust during construction and operations:</p> <p><u>AQ-1:</u> Prior to obtaining the necessary permits and/or approvals for any phase, applicant shall contact the Lake County Community Development Department, and is required to submit an Odor Control Plan for review and approval or revision prior to the public hearing.</p> <p><u>AQ-2:</u> All mobile diesel equipment used must be in compliance with State registration requirements. Portable and stationary diesel powered equipment must meet the requirements of the State Air Toxic Control Measures for CI engines.</p> <p><u>AQ-3:</u> Construction and/or work practices that involve masonry, gravel, grading activities, vehicular and fugitive dust shall be managed by use of water or other acceptable dust palliatives to mitigate dust generation during and after site development.</p> <p><u>AQ-4:</u> The applicant shall maintain records of all hazardous or toxic materials used, including a Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) for all volatile organic compounds utilized, including cleaning materials. Said information shall be made available upon request and/or the ability to provide the Lake County Air Quality Management District such information in order to complete an updated Air Toxic emission Inventory.</p> <p><u>AQ-5:</u> All vegetation 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><u>AQ-6:</u> The applicant shall have the primary access and parking areas surfaced with chip seal, asphalt or an equivalent all weather surfacing to reduce fugitive dust generation. The use of white rock as a road base or surface material for travel routes and/or parking areas is prohibited.</p> <p><u>AQ-7:</u> All areas subject infrequent use of driveways, over flow parking, etc., shall be surfaced with gravel. Applicant shall regularly use and/or maintain graveled area to reduce fugitive dust generations.</p> <p><u>AQ-8:</u> All buildings containing mature cannabis plants shall be equipped with carbon or similar air filtration systems prior to operation. This includes the two metal buildings and 24 of the greenhouses that will contain mature plants.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measures added</p>	1, 2, 6, 16, 23
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors or dust) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?		X			<p>During project operations, odors found to be unpleasant by some are emitted from cannabis plants. The cannabis plants would be grown within open hoop houses, and will generate odors. The applicant is required to plant fragrant plants around the cultivation area with a 2' separation distance between plants. This only applies to the south-eastern portion of the cultivation site due to the direction of the prevailing winds from the north- north-west.</p>	1, 2, 6, 16, 23

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measures added	
<b>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b> <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>The applicant provided a Biological Resource Assessment ("Assessment"), prepared by Pinecrest Environmental Consulting Inc., and dated July 21, 2019. The Assessment concluded that the proposed project should not have any adverse impacts on sensitive environments if the mitigation measure found in Appendix D are established. The mitigation measure in Appendix D is as follows:</p> <p>BIO-1: Pesticides and Fertilizer Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pesticide and fertilizer storage facilities shall be located outside of the riparian corridor setbacks for structures.</li> <li>• Pesticide and fertilizer storage facilities shall not be located within 100 feet of a wellhead, or within 50 feet of identified wetlands.</li> <li>• Pesticide and fertilizer storage facilities shall be adequate to protect pesticide and fertilizer containers from the weather.</li> <li>• Store all bags and boxes of pesticides and fertilizers off the ground on pallets or shelves.</li> <li>• If the structure does not have an impermeable floor, store all liquid pesticides and fertilizers on shelves capable of containing spills or provide appropriate secondary containment.</li> <li>• Routinely check for leaks and spills.</li> <li>• Have spill cleanup kit onsite to be able to respond to any leaks or spills.</li> <li>• Inspect planting stock for pests and diseases prior to planting.</li> <li>• A void planting stock with pests and disease and notify the supplier of the planting stock of the infestation.</li> <li>• Comply with all pesticide laws and regulations as enforced by the California Department of Pesticide Regulation and County Agricultural Commissioner.</li> <li>• For pesticides with the signal word CAUTION that have listed food uses, comply with all pesticide label directions as they pertain to personal protective equipment, application method, and rate, environmental hazards, longest reentry intervals and greenhouse and indoor use directions.</li> <li>• For all other pesticides, use must comply with all label requirements including site and crop restrictions.</li> <li>• Prior to the use of any registered pesticide on Cannabis, Operator Identification Number should be obtained from the County Agricultural Commissioner if required.</li> <li>• Submit monthly pesticide use reports to the County Agricultural Commissioner if required.</li> </ul> <p>Less than Significant Impact with mitigation measures added</p>	1, 2, 5, 7, 16, 18, 19, 21
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>No removal of riparian or any other vegetation is proposed as part of this project.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 5, 7, 16, 18, 19, 21

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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		There are no federally-protected wetlands located in or within 100 feet of the cultivation sites. Both lots are within an AE or AO flood plain, and some flood control measures will be needed during the building permit review process.  Less than Significant Impact	1, 2, 5, 7, 16, 18, 19, 21
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		Wildlife movement corridors consist of areas of undisturbed vegetation that interconnect separate areas of habitat. Riparian areas, in particular, are important for maintaining terrestrial wildlife movement, as these areas provide cover, water, and other wildlife habitat elements, and owing to their linear nature along creeks and streams, provide natural interconnections among non-adjacent areas of wildlife habitats.  The Assessment did not identify any wildlife corridors on the site.  Less than Significant Impact	1, 2, 5, 7, 16, 18, 19, 21
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?			X		The proposed project would be consistent with all Lake County ordinances related to the protection of biological resources, because there are no protected biological resources present on the project site. The proposed project would not affect any wetlands, ephemeral drainages, or other sensitive habitats protected by the Lake County Zoning Ordinance. No tree removal will be required, so no County tree removal policies or ordinances would apply. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.  Less than Significant Impact	1, 2, 5, 7, 16, 18, 19, 21
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		There are no adopted habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan applicable to the project site. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.  Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 5, 7, 16, 18, 19, 21
<b>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES</b> <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X			A Cultural Resource Evaluation was prepared for this project by Wolf Creek Archaeology and dated March 17, 2018.  The background research indicated that there no pre-historic sites located within 1 mile of the project areas.  During the field inspection, some remnants of the 1918 Black Bart Mine were discovered and recorded. The Evaluation states that “though the Black Bart Mine is historiiica and represents a significant period in the economic development of Lake County, there was a lack of historic material and features conducive to its study.” The Assessment concludes that even though the mine has some historical significance, that the mine as a whole should not be considered a significant historic cultural resource.  Several old home foundations were discovered, but were not regarded as having historical significance. The author theorized that based on how the foundations were constructed, they were probably placed on the ground in the 1960s.  Lake County is rich in tribal culture. Because of this, it is a matter of practice that mitigation measures are put in place whenever a	2, 9, 11, 16, 18



IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p>discretionary land use project involves any earth movement.</p> <p>The following mitigation measures are therefore added as a precautionary measure:</p> <p><u>CUL-1</u>: 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 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><u>CUL-2</u>: 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>Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measures added</p>	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		X			<p>Site disturbance will take place as part of construction project, so there is a potential for inadvertent discovery of as-of-yet undiscovered resources during project construction. Therefore, this impact is considered significant. Mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 will reduce potential effects of inadvertent discovery to 'less than significant levels'.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measures added</p>	2, 9, 11, 16, 18
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X			<p>There is a remote possibility that an unanticipated discovery of human remains could occur during construction of the proposed project. This impact, if it occurs, would be considered significant. To reduce this impact to less than significant, mitigation measures CUL-1 and CUL-2 are added.</p> <p>Less Than Significant with mitigation measures added</p>	2, 9, 11, 16, 18
<b>VI. ENERGY</b> <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		<p>According to the applicant's application material, the proposed use would consist of 30 greenhouses and two processing / manufacturing buildings that total 8,200 sq. ft.. The greenhouses would require between 400 and 800 additional amps. The two processing / manufacturing buildings would each require at least 200 amps. Estimated total power usage would be between 800 and 1200 amps.</p> <p>There are no grid capacity issues at this location. PG&amp;E was notified of this project, and sent a response dated October 28, 2022, indicating that the project would not interfere with their operations. There was no indication that they could not serve this project with power.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 10, 28
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for			X		<p>There are presently no mandatory energy reduction requirements for mixed light cultivation or manufacturing activities within Article 27 of the</p>	1, 2, 10, 28

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
renewable energy or energy efficiency?					Lake County Zoning Ordinance, and the proposal will not conflict with, or obstruct, a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.  Less Than Significant Impact	
<b>VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b> <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:  i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist- Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.  ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?  iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?  iv) Landslides?			X		<u>Earthquake Faults</u> There are no mapped earthquake faults on or adjacent to the subject site.  <u>Seismic Ground Shaking and Seismic-Related Ground Failure, including liquefaction.</u> The mapping of the site's soil indicates that the soil is generally stable.  <u>Landslides</u> The cultivation sites contain Still gravelly loam soil (Map Unit Symbol: 234): This series is comprised of a combination of Millsholm and Bressa soil series. This unit is characterized by slow permeability, occasional flooding, and is suited for vineyards and orchards, as well as for hay production. The soil is stable and is not prone to landslides, primarily due to the slope where this soil unit is found. The slope in the site is under 10%, and the property has no history of landslides.  Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 5, 11, 12, 13
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.D.A., the soil within the project is Still gravelly loam soil (Map Unit Symbol: 234). Surface runoff and permeability are slow with this soil type. The slope of the site is flat, being under 10%. The hazard of erosion is minimal, however both properties are located in the AO and AE flood plain, so the building footings will need to be engineered if this project is approved.  The applicant has submitted an engineered Drainage and Erosion Control Plan that shows Best Management Practices being used around the cultivation areas to contain stormwater runoff and prevent it from migrating into any water courses. No tree removal is proposed. Some ground disturbance is needed to prepare the site for the 32 buildings that are proposed.  Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 5, 11, 12, 13
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-site or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X		According to Lake County GIS data and the soil survey of Lake County, prepared by the U.S.D.A., the soil at the site is mapped as " <u>Generally Stable</u> " and there is a less than significant chance of landslide, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse as a result of the project.  Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 5, 11, 12, 13

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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		According to the soil survey of Lake County, prepared by the U.S.D.A., the type 234 soil does not have a high shrink-swell potential or high expansion characteristics. Site preparation would occur on flat ground, and would not increase risks to life or property and impacts would be less than significant.  Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 5, 11, 12, 13
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			X		The proposed project will require a new septic system and leach field to serve the restroom proposed for the 6,000 sq. ft. manufacturing building.  Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 5, 11, 12, 13
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?			X		No paleontological resources have been identified on the project site within the Cultural Assessment, and there are no unique geological features on or near the site according to the Cultural Assessment that was prepared for this project. There had been a mine on the site during the early 1900s, however this mine did not leave significant relics or other resources that would categorize it as being 'significant' in terms of cultural value.  Less than Significant Impact	1, 2, 5, 9, 11, 12, 13
<b>VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</b> <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?			X		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 from building pad preparation; deliveries, employee trips to and from the site during construction.  The webpage for the California Air Quality Resource (URL <a href="https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/">https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/</a> ) lists a chart showing 18 air emissions and gasses that have global warming potential. Each type of gas has identified thresholds of 'significance' that range from 1 (CO <sub>2</sub> ) to 23,900 (Tetrafluoromethane). Gasses also have impact durations. CO <sub>2</sub> has no measurable life-span of impacts; other gasses such as Tetrafluoromethane (PFC-14) can impact the environment for as long as 50,000 years.  A typical car generates 404 grams of CO <sub>2</sub> gas for each mile traveled. Source: EPA website. It is anticipated that vehicles used during construction would be roughly the equivalent of 5 miles of emissions per car per day, or about 1616 grams of CO <sub>2</sub> per vehicle per day. Truck and site preparation equipment would generate more emissions than a car, so the assumption for construction vehicles is double the amount projected for cars, or 3232 grams of CO <sub>2</sub> per vehicle per day. The applicant has stated that construction will last for about three to six months, but would occur over a two-year period with each year having approximately three months of construction. The County anticipates two construction vehicles per day being used for a three month period during each of the two years that construction would take place, amounting to 6464 grams of CO <sub>2</sub> per vehicle per day for a period of 90 days per year. A total of 581,760 grams of CO <sub>2</sub> per year would result; this amounts to about 1282 pounds of carbon dioxide per year for two years during construction. Operations would generate an estimated	2, 10

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p>25% of the total daily construction CO<sub>2</sub> emissions based on an estimated 12 trips per day during normal operations, and 24 trips per day during peak harvest season.</p> <p>Although the County of Lake has no thresholds for 'significant levels' of greenhouse gas emissions, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District has adopted standards for air emissions which are used informally by the County of Lake. This threshold of significance is 1100 metric <i>tons</i> of emissions per year per project. The estimated amount of CO<sub>2</sub> being generated over a 90 day construction period is 581,760 grams of CO<sub>2</sub> (per year), or about 1282 pounds of carbon dioxide per construction year. This is well under the threshold of significance of 1100 metric <i>tons</i> of emissions established by the Bay Area Air Quality Board.</p> <p>Operational emissions would be considerably lower. The greenhouses and processing buildings are equipped with carbon filtration systems, and a total of up to 24 daily vehicle trips to and from the site is projected during peak harvest season.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?			X		<p>The construction and operation of the proposed project would generate a small amount of GHG emissions. Lake County has not adopted a Climate Action Plan, so the proposed project could not conflict with a local plan. Energy for the proposed project would come entirely from electricity provided by PG&amp;E, which is required to comply with the requirements of the California Renewable Energy Portfolio Standard, so the project would be consistent with that plan. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	2, 10
<b>IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b> <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>Materials associated with the proposed cultivation of commercial cannabis, such as pesticides, fertilizers, gasoline, and cleaning materials. The applicant has stated that all potentially harmful chemicals will be stored in a locked, secured building on site. All pesticides and fertilizers to be used are organic, which will reduce the potential for damaging chemical infiltration into the atmosphere or soil.</p> <p>Routine construction materials and all materials associated with the proposed cultivation of commercial cannabis shall be transported and disposed of properly in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, and Local regulations.</p> <p>The project shall comply with Section 41.7 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance that specifies that all uses involving the use or storage of combustible, explosive, caustic or otherwise hazardous materials shall comply with all applicable local, state and federal safety standards and shall be provided with adequate safety devices against the hazard of fire and explosion, and adequate firefighting and fire suppression equipment. The applicant has stated that they will place two 5,000 gallon water tanks on site for fire suppression if needed, and there is an above-ground reservoir on site that holds 4 acre-feet of water.</p> <p>All equipment shall be maintained and operated in a manner that minimizes any spill or leak of hazardous materials. Hazardous materials and adequate firefighting and fire suppression equipment.</p>	2, 6, 16, 19, 20


IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					Less than Significant Impact	
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		The applicant has stated the chemicals that will be used on site will be organic, and will be stored in a secure and lockable building. The site is located within a flood inundation area, so the foundation footings for every building will need to be engineered. The site is not located within an area mapped as unstable soil according to County GIS data and the USDS Soil Survey for Lake County.  Less than Significant Impact	2, 6, 16, 19, 20
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	There are no schools within ¼ mile of the project site.  No Impact	2, 6, 16, 19, 20
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				X	The project site does not contain any sites identified on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to California Government Code Section 65962.5. The proposed project will not be sited in or disturb an area containing hazardous materials.  No Impact	2, 6, 16, 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	The project site is not with an airport land use plan, nor within 2 miles of an airport.  No Impact	2, 6, 16, 19, 20
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. The evacuation route would be Soda Bay Road, a County collector street with paved 10' travel lanes and a 2' shoulder on either side of the road. The applicant shall adhere to all applicable local and state emergency access requirements.  Less Than Significant Impact	2, 6, 16, 19, 20
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?			X		The project parcel's fire hazard severity zone is 'low' and it is not located within the State Responsibility Area. The applicant shall adhere to all Federal, State, and Local fire requirements/regulations.  Less Than Significant Impact	2, 6, 16, 19, 20

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
<b>X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b> <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 project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. One new septic system is needed to serve the restrooms proposed inside the 6,000 sq. ft. manufacturing building. Lake County Environmental Health Department regulates septic systems and wells inside the County (excluding the cities of Lakeport and Clear Lake). The Department submitted comments that did not indicate that a new septic system would be problematic at this location. The project will employ Best Management Practices (BMP's) related to erosion and water quality to reduce impacts related to storm water and water quality and adhere to all federal, state, and local requirements, as applicable; this is evidenced by the engineered Drainage and Erosion Control Plan submitted.  Less Than Significant Impact	2, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?			X		<p><i>Water Analysis</i></p> <p>A Hydrology Report ("Report") was prepared for this project by Realm Engineering and is dated May 20, 2022. The Report evaluates annual water demand for the project; aquifer capacity and recharge rate during drought and non-drought years; evaluates drought management actions needed, and provides well data on the two on-site wells.</p> <p>There are two existing permitted on-site wells, identified as Well #1 and Well #2. Well #1 produced about 300 gallons of water per minute during the four hour well test. Well #2 produced 6.1 gallons per minute, and would be used as a back-up water source if needed.</p> <p>The applicants have an on-site water reservoir that holds 4.0 acre feet (1,303,000 gallons). This will be the primary water storage area. The applicant will also install two 5,000 gallon water tanks for emergency use in the event of a fire.</p> <p>There is an existing 24 acre vineyard on site, as well as a hemp field. The hemp field and 3 acres of vineyard will be removed to accommodate the cannabis project. The applicants have not monitored water usage for the vineyard, so that is estimated in the Report. The Report estimates that 21.6 acre feet of water are needed for the 24 acre vineyard based on an industry standard of 0.9 acre-feet per year needed to grow wine grapes.</p> <p>The project would remove 4.62 acres of wine grapes and hemp; this will offset any new impacts of the cannabis cultivation to an extent. Removing this amount of hemp and vineyard will cause 3.87 less acre-feet per year to be used. Further, the applicants have indicated that they will 'dry-farm' the remaining vineyard, further reducing the water demand for the vineyard. The Report estimates that a total of 12 acre-feet of water will be needed for the vineyard and the cannabis cultivation per year; this is a reduction of about half of what had been used annually for the vineyard.</p> <p>The Report estimates that 6.2 acre feet per year of water would be needed for the cannabis operation (about 2,020,000 gallons). The Report also estimates that the manufacturing activities proposed would require about 208,000 gallons per year; about 2/3 acre foot. Employee water usage would be about 60,000 gallons per year. Total projected water usage is 2,287,850 gallons per year.</p> <p><i>Well Test</i></p> <p>A well test was performed on the primary well (identified as Well #1 in this document) by Stevenson Water Treatment and Distribution Systems, Inc. on February 2, 2022. This 6-hour test yielded an average of 266 gallons per minute over a 6 hour time-frame. The water level dropped by 26 feet during the test, and fully recovered within 17 hours of shut down.</p> <p><i>Aquifer Data</i></p> <p>The Report provides data on the aquifer serving the site. The site is located in the Big Valley Water Basin. There are two distinct areas that comprise the basin; the younger alluvial basin to the north (at the well site), and the older portion of the aquifer to the south. The primary aquifer for this project is identified in the Report as being the A1 aquifer, which is found about 72 feet below ground surface and is composed of gravel. The two aquifer sections were divided by the Kelseyville fault.</p> <p>The California Department of Water Resources estimates the A1 aquifer to have a total storage capacity of about 105,000 acre feet of water, with a usable capacity of about 60,000 acre feet. Total water usage within the A1 aquifer is estimated to be 12,944 acre-feet per year taking into consideration all existing wells that draw from this aquifer. The Report states that, despite occasional fluctuations in the aquifer's recharge rate, groundwater levels in the A1 aquifer have remained stable over the past three decades.</p>	2, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
					<p>The majority of Big Valley Basin recharge appears to occur through Manning and Thompson Creeks. The estimated rainfall recharge rate of the basin with regards to the subject site is as follows: the 44.3 acre property x 2.8 feet of annual precipitation (non drought year) = 124 acre feet per year of total rainfall on the site. Because the site is flat, it is estimated that about 15% of the rainfall reaches the aquifer. The equals 18.6 acre-feet of aquifer recharge per year due to on-site water percolation into the aquifer. This amount is greater than the projected annual water usage of the project.</p> <p><i>Drought Management</i> Ordinance 3106, adopted in July 2021, requires a Drought Management Plan for all land use applications that require water. The applicants have provided this Plan, which includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Regularly inspect the entire water delivery system for leaks and immediately repair any leaky faucets, pipes, connectors, or other leaks;</li> <li>● Apply weed-free mulch in cultivation areas that do not have ground cover to conserve soil moisture and minimize evaporative loss;</li> <li>● Implement water conserving irrigation methods (drip or trickle and micro-spray irrigation);</li> <li>● Maintain daily records of all water used for irrigation of cannabis. Daily records will be calculated by using a measuring device (inline water meter) installed on the main irrigation supply line between the water storage area and cultivation area(s);</li> <li>● Install float valves on all water storage tanks to keep them from overflowing onto the ground.</li> </ul> <p>With the Water Conservation and Use requirements outlined above, the proposed cultivation operation would efficiently use water resources at all times. Additionally, Article 27 Section 27.11 of the Lake County Zoning Ordinance requires commercial cannabis cultivators using water from a groundwater well to install a water level monitor on their water supply well, and to regularly record readings from the continuous water level monitor.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	



IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on-site or off-site;</li> <li>ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;</li> <li>iii) create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or</li> <li>iv) impede or redirect flood flows?</li> </ul>			X		<p>The applicant has provided an engineered Drainage and Erosion Control plan that shows Best Management Practices by channelling the stormwater into a confined area within the cultivation site, and allowing stormwater to infiltrate the soil within the cultivation area boundary.</p> <p>Figure 5 – Portion of Drainage and Erosion Control Plan</p>  <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	<p>2, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24</p>
<p>d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?</p>			X		<p>The project parcels are located in a mapped flood plain. The footings for all buildings must be engineered to withstand potential flooding. This is required for any building located within an AO or AE flood plain, and will be added as a condition of approval for this project.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	<p>2, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24</p>
<p>e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?</p>			X		<p>There are no water quality control plans or sustainable groundwater management plants in place for these parcels.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	<p>2, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24</p>
<p><b>XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING</b> <i>Would the project:</i></p>						
<p>a) Physically divide an established community?</p>				X	<p>The project is for a commercial cannabis cultivation operation. No division of an established community will occur.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	<p>1, 2, 4, 16, 18</p>
<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 mitigating an environmental effect?</p>				X	<p>This project is consistent with the Lake County General Plan, the Lakeport Area Plan, the Lake County Zoning Ordinance, and the Lake County Hazard Mitigation Plan.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	<p>1, 2, 4, 16, 18</p>
<p><b>XII. MINERAL RESOURCES</b> <i>Would the project:</i></p>						
<p>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?</p>				X	<p>The project site is not located on a mapped mineral resource area.</p> <p>No Impact</p>	<p>1, 2, 4, 24, 25</p>

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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	There are no mineral resources identified on either parcel.  No Impact	1, 2, 4, 24, 25
<b>XIII. NOISE</b> <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 project construction. Mitigation measures will decrease these noise levels to an acceptable level. 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 7:00am and 7:00pm 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.  <u>NOI-3:</u> The operation of the Air Filtration System shall not exceed levels of 57 dBA between the hours of 7:00AM to 10:00PM and 50 dBA from 10:00PM to 7:00AM within residential areas as specified within Zoning Ordinance Section 21-41.11 (Table 11.2) measured at the property lines.  Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	2, 4
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		X			The construction of the proposed project would generate some groundborne vibration and noise through the operation of construction equipment, but these vibrations would be relatively small and temporary lasting an estimated 90 days per year. Operation of the proposed project would generate some ground-borne vibration and noise as a result of truck trips to the site for the delivery of materials and shipment of products. Construction hours must be limited from 8 am to 5 pm Monday through Saturday in order to minimize potential ground-borne vibration impacts in this area.  NOI-4: Construction shall only occur Monday through Saturday, from 8 am to 5 pm.  Less Than Significant Impact with mitigation measures added	2, 4
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 proposed project is not within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport.  No Impact	2, 4

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
<b>XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING</b> <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	This project is limited to commercial cannabis cultivation. No new housing is proposed or necessary for this project to occur.  No Impact	1, 2, 4
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X	The proposed project is not in an urban area, so the proposed project would not lead to the displacement of any existing people or housing. There would be no impact and no mitigation measures are required.  No Impact	1, 2, 4
<b>XV. PUBLIC SERVICES</b> <i>Would the project:</i>						
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: - Fire Protection? - Police Protection? - Schools? - Parks? - Other Public Facilities?			X		The project does not propose housing or other uses that would necessitate the need for new or additional governmental or quasi-public services. There will not be a need to increase fire or police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities as a result of the project's implementation.  Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 4, 16, 26, 27, 28
<b>XVI. RECREATION</b> <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	No changes to any recreational facility are needed for this project. No additional housing is proposed, and no usage of public parks is anticipated by employees during project operation hours.  No Impact	1, 2
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	No recreation facilities are proposed with this project.  No Impact	1, 2

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
<b>XVII. TRANSPORTATION</b> <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 proposed project site is accessible off of Soda Bay Road, a paved County-maintained road at this location. The interior driveway is shown to be a width of 20'. Gates on the site are not shown on the site plans, but will need to be at least 22' wide to meet Public Resource Code 4290 and 4291 width requirements for a gate. An increase in traffic is anticipated during construction, and incoming and outgoing employees with between 16 to 24 average daily trips during construction, with a similar number of daily trips during operations.  Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 4, 16, 18, 26, 27
b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?			X		CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b) lists thresholds that would trigger a traffic impact study (TIS). Because the site is located near Lakeport (a population base) where employees are expected to come from, the proposed project would result in only a minimal increase in vehicle miles travelled (VMT), and would thus not trigger the need to prepared a TIS. It would therefore, also not conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3.  Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 4, 16, 18, 26, 27
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X	The proposed project would not result in any change to the geometry of any roadways or intersections, and thus would not result in an increased hazard related to geometric design.  No Impact	1, 2, 4, 16, 18, 26, 27
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X	The proposed project would not result in the blockage of any roadways, nor any changes to the roadways other than to upgrade the interior driveway to meet PRC 4290 and 4291 road standards, which will enhance emergency services to the site if any are needed. This is a standard condition of approval for all commercial cannabis projects. There would be no adverse impact to emergency access.  No Impact	1, 2, 4, 16, 18, 26, 27

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
<b>XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>						
<i>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</i>						
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or			X		<p>A Cultural Resource Evaluation was prepared for this project by Wolf Creek Archaeology and dated March 17, 2018.</p> <p>The background research indicated that there no pre-historic sites located within 1 mile of the project areas.</p> <p>During the field inspection, some remnants of the 1918 Black Bart Mine were discovered and recorded. The Evaluation states that "though the Black Bart Mine is historical and represents a significant period in the economic development of Lake County, there was a lack of historic material and features conducive to its study." The Assessment concludes that even though the mine has some historical significance, that the mine as a whole should not be considered a significant historic cultural resource.</p> <p>Several old home foundations were discovered, but were not regarded as having historical significance. The author theorized that based on how the foundations were constructed, they were probably placed on the ground in the 1960s. The site is not eligible for inclusion onto any Historic Registry.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	2, 9, 11, 16, 18
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.			X		<p>The site was surveyed in 2018 for potential historic finds. There was no evidence of tribal activity on the ground, and the evidence of the Black Bart Mine that had been on the site is not significant to the point that this site can be considered to be of significant historic value. Mitigation measures have been added as CUL-1 and CUL-2 in the event of inadvertent discovery of potentially significant relics or other tribal activity.</p> <p>Less than Significant Impact</p>	2, 9, 11, 16, 18
<b>XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</b>						
<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		<p>The subject parcel is served by two existing wells. The applicant shall adhere to all Federal, State and Local regulations regarding wastewater treatment and water usage requirements. One new septic system is needed to serve the restrooms inside the 6,000 sq. ft. manufacturing building. No adverse comments on this new septic system were received from the Lake County Department of Environmental Health, who regulates these systems inside the County.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	1, 2, 4, 16, 26, 27, 28

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?			X		The subject parcel is served by two existing wells. Cannabis cultivation will minimize water use by using a low-pressure drip irrigation system. The Water Analysis provided demonstrates that the recharge rate of the aquifer is significantly more than the drawdown requirements for this project during drought years. There is adequate water to serve the project without depleting area water resources.  Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 4, 16, 26, 27, 28
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		Restrooms are proposed within the 6,000 sq. ft. manufacturing building; these will require a new septic system to be installed. The 44 acre site is large enough to support a new septic system if this is needed, and comments received by the Department of Environmental Health, who regulates septic systems in Lake County, did not indicate that a new septic system would be problematic.  Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 4, 16, 26, 27, 28
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		South Lake Refuse & Recycling is an existing landfill that would support the waste disposal capacity for the proposed project.  According to the applicant's Property Management Plan – Waste Management Plan, the plan has been developed to minimize the generation of waste and dispose of such waste properly to prevent the release of hazardous waste into the environment, also to minimize the generation of cannabis vegetative waste and dispose of cannabis vegetative waste properly, and manage and dispose the growing medium. All employees will be required to follow procedures outlined in this plan.  Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 4, 16, 26, 27, 28
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X		The proposed project would generate a relatively small amount of solid waste, with green waste being chipped and composted onsite. Therefore, the proposed project would not impact the provision of solid waste services or impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. This impact would be less than significant, and no mitigation measures are required.  Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 4, 16, 26, 27, 28
<b>XX. WILDFIRE</b> <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 subject site is located near Clear Lake in an area that is not mapped as being 'high fire'. The site is accessed by a driveway off of Soda Bay Road. The project parcel is located within the Lakeport Fire District's boundary. The driveway serving the site is shown to have an emergency vehicle turn-around in the cultivation area. The site will also contain two 5,000 gallon water storage tanks for fire suppression, and the site has a reservoir that holds 4 acre feet of water (1,303,405 gallons).  Less than Significant Impact	1, 2, 4, 16, 18, 23, 26

IMPACT CATEGORIES*	1	2	3	4	All determinations need explanation. Reference to documentation, sources, notes and correspondence.	Source Number**
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		As previously stated, the fire rating on the site is 'Low', and the slope on the site averages well under 10%. The fuel load on the site is minimal, and adequate fire protection measures are proposed.  Less than Significant Impact	1, 2, 4, 16, 18, 23, 26
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 proposed project would have two 5,000 gallon water tanks placed on site for fire suppression. The driveway is shown to be PRC 4290 and 4291 compliant. There is an existing above-ground reservoir that holds 4 acre-feet of water, and there are emergency vehicle turn-arounds shown on the site plan. The site will be PRC 4290 and 4291 compliant.  Less than Significant Impact	1, 2, 4, 16, 18, 23, 26
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 project would have a positive effect on wildfire risks for the reasons stated above, and would slightly reduce the risk of wildfire by using water tanks and with the site having a significant water storage source (the reservoir). The applicant is proposing to improve the interior of the site to meet PRC 4290 and 4291 (CalFire) standards for roads and defensible space as shown on the site plans submitted.  Less Than Significant Impact	1, 2, 4, 16, 18, 23, 26
<b>XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE</b>						
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 has some potential to adversely impact the quality of the environment in several of the categories listed in this document. Mitigation measures and conditions of approval will reduce potential impacts to 'less than significant' in all 21 categories that are evaluated herein.  Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation 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 proposed project is in a semi-urbanized area on a 44 acre lot. There is some potential for impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources and noise, and mitigation measures have been added into each potentially impactful categories which will reduce the potential for cumulatively considerable impacts to less than significant levels.  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**
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			X		<p>Each of the environmental impacts listed in this document can be mitigated to being 'less than significant' with certain mitigation measures added. Because of existing federal, state, and local regulation and monitoring of many potential environmental impacts, and with the implementation of mitigation measures identified in this report, the proposed project would not have the potential to cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.</p> <p>Less Than Significant Impact</p>	All

\* Impact Categories defined by CEQA

## \*\*REFERENCES

### Source Documents

1. Lake County General Plan, 2008.  
[http://www.lakecountyca.gov/Government/Directory/Community\\_Development/Planning/2008FinGP.htm](http://www.lakecountyca.gov/Government/Directory/Community_Development/Planning/2008FinGP.htm).
2. 140 Major Use Permit Application and Supplemental Materials.
3. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2021.
4. Lake County Zoning Ordinance <http://www.lakecountyca.gov/Page2196.aspx>.
5. California Department of Conservation. 2021a. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) website. <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp>.
6. California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2021. Website Maps of State and Federal Area Designations. <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/maps-state-and-federal-area-designations>.
7. Biological Assessment, prepared by Pinecrest Environmental Consulting Inc., and dated July 21, 2019.
8. Site visit, July 31, 2023
9. Cultural Resource Evaluation, prepared by Wolf Creek Archaeology, dated March 17, 2018
10. California Public Utilities Commission. 2021. Renewables Portfolio Standard (RPS) Program webpage. <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/rps/>.
11. National Resources Conservation Service. 2021. Web Soil Survey website. <https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>.
12. United States Geological Service. 2021. Alquist-Priolo Faults webpage. <https://earthquake.usgs.gov/education/geologicmaps/apfaults.php>.
13. California Department of Conservation. 2021b. EQ Zapp: California Earthquake Hazards Zone Application. <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/geohazards/eq-zapp>.
14. California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2021. Envirostor website. <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/map/?myaddress=Lake+County>.
15. State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2021a. GeoTracker. <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>.
16. Google Earth, 2022.
17. Lake County Community Development Department. 2008b. Lake County General Plan-  
[http://www.lakecountyca.gov/Government/Directory/Community\\_Development/Planning/2008FinGP.htm](http://www.lakecountyca.gov/Government/Directory/Community_Development/Planning/2008FinGP.htm).
18. United States, Department of Homeland Security, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), 2020. National Flood Hazard Layer Firmette; Map Number 06033C01654D; Updated October 2020.



19. Lakeport Area Plan.  
[http://www.lakecountyca.gov/Government/Directory/Community\\_Development/Planning/CountyPlans.htm](http://www.lakecountyca.gov/Government/Directory/Community_Development/Planning/CountyPlans.htm).
20. Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board (CVRWQCB). 2018.  
[https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water\\_issues/basin\\_plans/sacsjr\\_2018\\_05.pdf](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/water_issues/basin_plans/sacsjr_2018_05.pdf).
21. State Water Resources Control Board. 2019. Order WQ 2019-0001-DWQ General Waste Discharge Requirements and Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements for Discharges of Waste Associated with Cannabis Cultivation Activities.
22. State Water Resources Control Board. 2020. State Wetland Riparian Area Protection Policy website.  
[https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/cwa401/wrapp.html](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/cwa401/wrapp.html).
23. State Water Resources Control Board. 2021b. Waste Discharge Requirements Program.  
[https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water\\_issues/programs/waste\\_discharge\\_requirements/](https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/waste_discharge_requirements/).
24. Lake County 2018 Hazard Mitigation Plan Update; January 2018 Public review Draft.
25. California Geological Survey. 2021. CGS Information Warehouse: Mineral Land Classification. <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/informationwarehouse/mlc/>.
26. Lake County Aggregate Resource Management Plan.  
[http://www.lakecountyca.gov/Government/Directory/Community\\_Development/Planning/Natural\\_Resources/Aggregate\\_Resources\\_Management.htm](http://www.lakecountyca.gov/Government/Directory/Community_Development/Planning/Natural_Resources/Aggregate_Resources_Management.htm).
27. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protect (Cal Fire). 2021. California Fire Hazard Severity Zone Viewer webpage.  
<https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/789d5286736248f69c4515c04f58f414>.
28. 2010 Lake County Regional Transportation Plan, Dow & Associates, October 2010
29. Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E).