



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

**Phone: (760) 878-0263
FAX: (760) 872-2712
E-Mail: inyoplaning@inyocounty.us**

**DRAFT NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT AND
INITIAL STUDY**

**PROJECT TITLE: Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 2021-02/Cook – Hemp Cultivation and Variance
(VAR) 2021-02/Cook**

PROJECT LOCATION: 1 Hidden Valley Ranch Road, south of Lone Pine, California

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project consists of 11,410 ft² of outdoor hemp cultivation. This project has been applied for concurrently with a Variance to encroach 295 feet into the 300-foot setback.

FINDINGS:

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

The 21-day public & State agency review period for this Draft Negative Declaration will expire on July 13, 2021. Inyo County is not required to respond to any comments received after this date.

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

Graham Meese

Name

6/17/2021

Date

INYO COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

CEQA APPENDIX G: INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:

- a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
- b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance issues.



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

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

INYO COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT

APPENDIX G: CEQA INITIAL STUDY & ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project title: CUP 2021-02/Cook – Hemp Cultivation and VAR 2021-02/Cook
2. Lead agency name and address: Inyo County Planning Department, PO Drawer L, Independence, CA 93526
3. Contact person and phone number: Graham Meese: (760) 878-0265
4. Project location: 1 Hidden Valley Ranch Road, southwest of Lone Pine, California
5. Project sponsor's name and address: Reginald Cook, Eastern Sierra Botanical, 1 Hidden Valley Ranch Road Lone Pine, California 93545
6. General Plan designation: Rural Protection (RP)
7. Zoning: Open Space, 40-acre minimum (OS-40)
8. Description of project: The project will develop three areas of outdoor hemp cultivation totaling 11,410 ft² on one privately-owned parcel. This project has been applied for concurrently with a variance to encroach 295 feet into the required 300-foot setback.
9. Surrounding land uses and setting: The proposed hemp cultivation project is located in a small isolated valley surrounded by public lands, approximately two miles southwest of Lone Pine, California. The terrain slopes to the east, and is covered with desert scrub and rock outcroppings, similar to the Alabama Hills to the north.

Location:	Use:	Gen. Plan Designation	Zoning
Site	Residential and agriculture	Rural Protection (RP)	Open Space, 40-acre minimum (OS-40)
North	Vacant	State and Federal Lands (SFL)	Open Space, 40-acre minimum (OS-40)
East	Vacant	State and Federal Lands (SFL)	Open Space, 40-acre minimum (OS-40)
South	Vacant	State and Federal Lands (SFL)	Open Space, 40-acre minimum (OS-40)
West	Vacant	State and Federal Lands (SFL)	Open Space, 40-acre minimum (OS-40)

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

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1? If so, has consultation begun?

Inyo County started the 30-day Tribal Consultation opportunity period, according to Public Resource code section 21080.31, by sending out certified written notices on May 13, 2021, inviting the Tribes to consult on the project. It described the project and location. The tribes that were notified are: Big Pine Tribe of Owens Valley, Bishop Paiute Tribe, Fort Independence Indian Community of Paiutes, Lone Pine Paiute-Shoshone Tribe, Timbisha Shoshone tribe, Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians, Cabazon Band of Mission Indians, and the Torrez Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians. Since no comments have been provided and no formal consultation meeting date requested, staff is submitting this Negative Declaration for a 21-day review and comment period. The County will continue to be open to consultation with the Tribe during this period. If the Tribe does not provide comments or schedule a formal consultation meeting within this 21-day period, the County, per Public Resources Code 21082.3 (d)(2) will consider the consultation process complete and certify the Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact.

Note: Conducting consultation early in the CEQA process allows tribal governments, lead agencies, and project proponents to discuss the level of environmental review, identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources, and reduce the potential for delay and conflict in the environmental review process. (See Public Resources Code section 21083.3.2.) Information may also be available from the California Native American Heritage Commission's Sacred Lands File per Public Resources Code section 5097.96 and the California Historical Resources Information System administered by the California Office of Historic Preservation. Please also note that Public Resources Code section 21082.3(c) contains provisions specific to confidentiality.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Graham Meese
Name

6/17/2021
Date

INYO COUNTY PLANNING DEPARTMENT **ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

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

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project's cultivation areas are located in an isolated valley and cannot be seen from the Alabama Hills, Lone Pine, or Highway 395. The cultivation areas will be located in previously disturbed areas used as a personal garden and orchard and in total are only 11,410 ft². There are no multiuse off-road trails nearby and the road used to access the property does not provide access to any other landowners.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, there are no scenic resources other than views of the desert landscape and surrounding mountains. Highway 395 near the project area is not a designated scenic highway. The project area is not visible from Highway 395, the Alabama Hills, or Lone Pine. There are rock outcroppings and trees located on the property but the project areas will be located in previously disturbed areas used as a personal garden and orchard and no trees or rocks will be removed.

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

No, the project's cultivation areas are located in an isolated valley that cannot be seen from the Alabama Hills, Lone Pine, or Highway 395. There are no multi-use off-road trails nearby and the road used to access the property does not provide access to any other landowners. Although views to the project might be possible from high points on surrounding public lands, it will not affect the overall scenic integrity of the area as the views would be from a considerable distance. In addition, the proposed cultivation sites are small, the largest being 10,000 ft², and are surrounded by a small vineyard, trees, and buildings on the property.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project does not use any artificial lighting and is not visible from Lone Pine, Alabama Hills, Highway 395, or nearby roads. The project is required to meet State regulations and County General Plan policy, related to light and glare; therefore, will not affect day or nighttime views.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including The Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment Project; and forest carbon measurement methodology Provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

No, the project is not located on farmland.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

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

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

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

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

No, the project is not located on timberland.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

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

No, the project is not located on forestland.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

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

No, the project is not located on farmland.

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

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

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

No, although the project area is located within a non-attainment area defined in the Owens Valley PM₁₀ State Implementation Plan, no actions proposed in this project could significantly impact the air quality in the region. Dust from project operations will be minimal and primarily from vehicle use. Due to the small scale of the project (11,410 ft²) and no paid employees, increased travel to and from the project area will be minimal.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

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

No, although the project area is located within the Owens Valley non-attainment area for Federal and State PM₁₀ (particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter) ambient air quality standards, the primary source for this pollution is the Owens dry lake, located approximately 6-miles southeast of the project site. Dust from project operations will be minimal and primarily from vehicle use. Due to the small scale of the project (11,410 ft²) and no paid employees, increased travel to and from the project area will be minimal. The best practices for dust control and emissions being followed will cause the project to be less than significant.

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

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

No, although the project area is located within the Owens Valley non-attainment area for Federal and State PM₁₀ (particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter) ambient air quality standards, the primary source for this pollution is the Owens dry lake, located approximately 6-miles southeast of the project site. The best practices for dust control and emissions being followed will cause the project to be less than significant.

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

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

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

No, existing sensitive receptors consist of the community of Alabama Hills, 1 mile to the southwest, and Lone Pine, 2 miles to the northeast. There are no hospitals or other non-residence sensitive receptors within 1 mile of the project area. The project is located in a rural location where traffic volumes related to project operations will be negligible and no sensitive receptors are close enough to the project area to be significantly impacted.

e) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?

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

No, the proposed project will not produce objectionable odors during the life of the operation. The project will naturally result in odors from hemp cultivation, but due to the small scale of this project and the remote nature of the project location, the odors produced from the project will not adversely affect the surrounding communities of Alabama Hills, Lone Pine, or any nearby roads.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

Would the project:

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

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

Presence/Absence of species database searches was conducted with US Fish & Wildlife (ECOS), and the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB). This research showed no special status species are located in the project area. A CNDDDB query was performed to encompass a radius of "twelvemile" USGS quad, to identify special-status plant and wildlife species that could potentially be found in the project impact area. The following species have the potential to occur within the project area: Bombus morrisoni, and Pyrgulopsis wongi, neither of which are listed as threatened or endangered. As stated above, the proposed project site has been previously cleared of plant and animal habitats for personal agricultural production. No new disturbance will occur and no impacts to critically listed plants or animals are expected.

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

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

No, there is a small section of riparian habitat that is located on the parcel based on the USFWS National Wetlands Inventory Mapping Tool but the project area does not overlap with the riparian habitat. The applicant stated that this riparian area only has water once every few years when a large rainstorm occurs. There is also a Freshwater Emergent Wetland habitat mapped near the project boundary but this Freshwater Emergent wetland is a developed spring comprised of a spring box and a 40,000-gallon concrete reservoir used to provide potable water to the property and irrigate the existing crops. The flow from the spring, under natural conditions at any time during the year, would not create surface flow off of the property and thus is exempt from needing a water right. The project will be located in an area previously disturbed and irrigated as a personal garden and orchard.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

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

No, the Freshwater Emergent Wetland habitat mapped near the project boundary is not a federally protected wetland. The Freshwater Emergent wetland on the parcel is a developed spring comprised of a spring box and a 40,000-gallon concrete reservoir used to provide potable water to the property and irrigate the existing crops. The flow from the spring under natural conditions at any time during the year would not create surface flow off of the property and thus is exempt from needing a water right.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native

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

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

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?

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

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

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

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:

Would the project:

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

No, the project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5, as the cultivation areas will be located in previously disturbed areas used as a personal garden and orchard.

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

No, the project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in Section 15064.5 as the cultivation areas will be located in previously disturbed areas used as a personal garden and orchard. No archaeological resources have been identified in any records of the site or immediate surrounding area. Local tribes and tribes that have notified Inyo County that County lands are within the geographic area that is traditionally and culturally associated with their tribe were notified about this project through the request for Tribal Consultation process. Should any archaeological or cultural resource be discovered on the site during any future development, work shall immediately desist and Inyo County staff immediately be notified per Chapter 9.52, Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County Code.

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

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

VI. ENERGY:

Would the project:

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

No, the project is an outdoor hemp cultivation site. It will not require large amounts of energy and does not include any new structures.

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

No, the project is not located in one of the County's Solar Energy Development Areas (SEDA).

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

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:

a) Directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the project is not in an Alquist-Priolo zone. No structures are proposed as part of this project.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, no structures are proposed as part of this project. Also, the California Building Code ensures that structures be built according to required seismic standards, designed to withstand such events.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the project site is not in an area known to be prone to ground failure. No structures are proposed as part of this project.

iv) Landslides?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the project area is located in a small valley surrounded by stable rock formations. The proposed cultivation areas are located on a slope of less than five percent.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the proposed project is located in a previously disturbed area used as a personal garden and orchard. The hemp plants will be drip-irrigated from the developed spring on the property. The applicant has previously improved the soil in the proposed sites with natural soil amendments such as leaf litter, and cow and horse manure. No new structures are proposed with this project. Potential future development will require compliance with the California Building Standards that require Best Management Practices be implemented to minimize erosion and keep all site materials from leaving the site.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the proposed project is not located in an area with a geologic unit or soil that is known to be unstable. The proposed project is located in a relatively flat previously disturbed area used as a personal garden and orchard. The NRCS web soil survey delineates the project area as a "rock outcrop" although the actual cultivation areas are located in the sandy soils beneath the nearby rock outcrops.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the proposed project is not located in an area with a known expansive soil type. The proposed project is located in a previously disturbed area used as a personal garden and orchard. No structures are proposed as part of this project. If any questions arise about the quality of the soil during the development of the property, the applicant/developer shall work with Inyo County's Building and Safety Department to employ the proper design standards that mitigate for expansive soils.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

No, the project does not include the construction of any waste water disposal systems. There is an existing septic system on the property. Any future addition or modification to existing waste water disposal systems will require a County approved waste handling system. Septic systems are common in the area and the soils are capable of supporting them.

f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the project site does not include a unique paleontological or geologic feature and the cultivation sites are located in previously disturbed areas used as a vegetable garden and orchard. No new ground disturbance is proposed.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:

Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the proposed hemp cultivation project will not generate greenhouse gas emissions that will have a significant impact.

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the outdoor hemp cultivation will only use natural soil amendments such as leaf mulch, and cow and horse manure. If fertilizers and/or pesticides are needed, they will be regulated by the County Department of Environmental Health and the applicant must apply for a permit and will be required to follow all State and local regulations regarding hazardous materials.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the outdoor hemp cultivation will only use natural soil amendments such as leaf mulch, and cow and horse manure. If fertilizers and/or pesticides are needed, they will be regulated by the County Department of Environmental Health and the applicant must apply for a permit and will be required to follow all State and local regulations regarding hazardous materials.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the proposed project is not within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school, nor will it emit hazardous emissions, or handle acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

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

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the proposed project is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip and poses no danger to anyone working at the proposed project site.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

h) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

No, the risk of loss, injury, and death involving wildland fires is minimal from this project. Fire risks are moderate at the project site, and no areas in proximity to it can be considered urbanized. The land surrounding the project site is sparsely vegetated and there are no residences in the proximity of the project other than the owner himself; therefore, the risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires is less than significant at this site, and any potential risk is further mitigated by compliance with California Building Standards. The project site is located within the CAL FIRE San Bernadino Unit.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:

Would the project:

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

No, the project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The hemp plants will be drip-irrigated from the developed spring and any potential runoff from the process does not have the potential to connect to another live waterbody. The project only proposes to use natural soil amendments such as leaf mulch, and cow and horse manure and will not degrade ground water quality. If fertilizers and/or pesticides are needed, they will be regulated by the County Department of Environmental Health and the applicant must apply for a permit and will be required to follow all State and local regulations regarding hazardous materials.

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

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

No, the project proposes approximately 0.68-acre feet of water annually will be used for hemp cultivation. The property utilizes a spring located on the property for both potable and irrigation uses that produces on average 3 gallons per minute or 4.8 acre-feet, per year, with a 40,000-gallon storage tank. The flow from the spring under natural conditions at any time during the year would not create surface flow off of the property and thus is exempt from needing a water right. The project area was previously an irrigated vegetable garden and orchard, thus the conversion from one crop to another will not cause a substantial change in the demand on

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

groundwater supplies. The parcel of land that the project is proposed for is zoned for residential use. In California, each person uses about 108-gallons of water per day (US EPA). The average California household size is 2.9 people (US Census). The OS-40 zone allows for two-units, which would consume about 0.70-acre feet of water could be used on the same project area without discretionary review. Also, the project is located outside of any SGMA delineated groundwater basin (State Sustainable Groundwater Management Act Basin Prioritization Map, May 2020).

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:

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

No, the project is proposed in an area that that had previously been used as a vegetable garden and orchard and the hemp plants will be watered using drip irrigation, which will create little to no surface runoff. The project has been reviewed by the County Public Works Department and they found no issues. The flow from the spring under natural conditions at any time during the year would not create surface flow off of the property.

ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the project is proposed in an area that that had previously been used as a vegetable garden and orchard and the hemp plants will be watered using drip irrigation, which will create little to no runoff. The project does not increase the area of impermeable surfaces and will not result in an increased amount of surface runoff that could result in flooding. The flow from the spring under natural conditions at any time during the year would not create surface flow off of the property.

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 ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the project is proposed in an area that that had previously been used as a vegetable garden and orchard and the hemp plants will be watered using drip irrigation, which will create little to no runoff. The project has been reviewed by the County Public Works Department and they found no issues regarding grading and runoff. The flow from the spring under natural conditions at any time during the year would not create surface flow off of the property.

iv) impede or redirect flood flows? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the project is proposed in an area that that had previously been used as a vegetable garden and orchard and the hemp plants will be watered using drip irrigation, which will create little to no runoff. The project area is not located in any flood hazard areas and will not have the potential to redirect flood flows. The project has been reviewed by the County Public Works Department and they found no issues regarding grading and runoff.

d) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the project is not proposed in an area that is included in a water quality control or sustainable ground water management plan.

e) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the proposed project is not in a 100-year flood hazard area.

f) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

No, the project is not in a 100-year flood hazard area.

g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the proposed project site is not in an area subject to flooding due to the failure of a levee or dam. Average annual rainfall in this area is 6-inches.

h) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the proposed project site is not in an area subject to seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows.

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING:

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the applicant is requesting a conditional use permit to grow hemp, which is required by the County's zoning code. The project site is located in the Open Space zoning designation, with a Rural Protection General Plan designation. Both allow for hemp cultivation. Due to the shape of the parcel and underlying geology, the applicant has also applied for a Variance to encroach 295 feet into the required 300-foot setback. The CUP is being requested contingent on the Variance.

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the proposed project will not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. The project site is located on a previously disturbed area used as a personal vegetable garden and orchard.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES:

Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the project makes use of land previously used for agricultural purposes and no known mineral resources are located on it. No extraction of known mineral resources is being foregone by this project. No known mines past or present have operated within the project area as documented in the USGS Mineral Resource Data System (USGS MRDS, 2021).

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?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

XIII. NOISE: Would the project result in the:

a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

No, there is no construction or proposed use of any heavy equipment associated with this project. No proposed actions have the potential to increase the ambient noise level in the vicinity of the project.

b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, exposure to noise levels will be primarily generated from light-duty vehicle use.

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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The proposed project is not likely to induce population growth. The applicant does not intend to have any paid employees.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the proposed project will not displace existing housing or create a situation where replacement housing will be necessary. It is in an area of sparse residential development surrounded by state and federal land.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES: Would the project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

No, the project is located within the CAL FIRE San Bernadino Unit. Fire risks are moderate at the project site. The project site and land surrounding the project site is sparsely vegetated. The proposed project does not include the construction of any new structures. The risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires is less than significant at this site.

Police protection? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No new police service will be required because of this project. The project area is located off of major roads and will be fenced off for protection from wildlife.

Schools? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No new parks will be required because of this project.

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

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

XVI. RECREATION: Would the project:

a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

XVII. TRANSPORTATION:

a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

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

No, the hemp cultivation is not in conflict and is not inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b). The applicant estimates that this hemp cultivation project will generate about 0-1 vehicle trips coming and going per day from suppliers and 0-1 from the owner. Based on this information, it can be determined that the average daily trips are less than the 100 trips that would require a detailed traffic analysis on the project. Therefore, the Project will result in no impact to this resource. The subject site is not within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop or high quality transit corridor.

c) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No, the project is proposed on a site that is about 1 mile off a major road via a local road. The project has been reviewed by the County Public Works Department and they found no issues regarding grading and runoff.

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES:

Would the project:

a) cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is

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

geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

No, the proposed project does not encompass a resource eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register or historical resources as defined in Public Resource Code section 5020.1(k). If any archaeological or cultural resources are discovered on the site, work shall stop and Inyo County staff shall be immediately notified per Chapter 9.52, Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County Code.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

No, the proposed project does not encompass a resource determined by the lead agency to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of the Public Resource Code section 5024.1. The project description was also sent to Tribes requesting AB52 notification. No requests for additional information have been received from the Tribes.

XIX UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

No, the proposed project will not result in the construction of new or expanded utility or service systems. The project area has power provided by LADWP, a septic system, and a developed spring that provides potable and irrigation water.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Yes, The water source for the property is a developed spring located on the property for both potable and irrigation uses that produces on average 3 gallons per minute or 4.8 acre-feet, per year, with a 40,000-gallon storage tank. The project proposes approximately 0.68-acre feet of water annually will be used for hemp cultivation. The project area was previously an irrigated vegetable garden and orchard, thus the conversion from one crop to another will not cause a significant change the amount of water used for crop irrigation. The applicant stated that the spring has never run dry and has never had water supply issues. The flow from the spring under natural conditions at any time during the year would not create surface flow off of the property and thus is exempt from needing a water right. The proposed project will not result in a need for new entitlements of water resources. Current principal uses for the project site, under the County's "Open Space" designation, include not only a primary and secondary dwelling unit, but also orchards, vegetable and field crops. Such land uses would likely have equivalent water usage as the proposed hemp cultivation.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

No, the proposed project's wastewater treatment will not unduly burden the commitments of any potential treatment provider. Wastewater disposal will utilize existing on-site septic systems that are regulated by the Inyo County Environmental Health Department.

d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the proposed project will not create a need for additional solid waste capacity. Solid waste needs for the project will be minimal. Most of the volume from the hemp cultivation will be sold as the entire plant to companies that further process the material. Impacts from future development would be minimal and consistent with the sanitation system.

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

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

XX. WILDFIRE:

Would the project:

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

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

b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, there are no extenuating factors that will expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from wildfire. Fire risks are moderate at the project site. The project site and land surrounding the project site is sparsely vegetated. The proposed project does not include the construction of any new structures. The risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires is less than significant at this site, and any potential risk is further mitigated by compliance with California Building Standards. The project site is also located within the California State Responsibility area.

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the project will not cause the need for additional wildfire-associated infrastructure. The project site is also located within the California State Responsibility area.

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? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the proposed project location is on relatively flat land in highly permeable soils and will not create downslope or downstream flooding or landslides.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

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

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?

No, the project will not impact or degrade the quality of the environment. The limited potential impacts to resources on the project area are less than significant. No special status species are located in the project area based on CNDDB and ECOS database searches. The proposed project site is only 11,410 ft² and has been previously cleared of potential plant and animal habitats for personal agricultural production. No new disturbance will occur and no impacts to critically listed plants or animals are expected. The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. The hemp plants will be drip-irrigated from the developed spring and any potential runoff from the process does not have the potential to connect to another live waterbody. The project only proposes to use natural soil amendments such as leaf mulch, and cow and horse manure and will not degrade ground water quality. If fertilizers and/or pesticides are needed, they will be regulated by the County Department of Environmental Health and the applicant must apply for a permit and will be required to follow all State and local regulations regarding hazardous materials. The proposed project does not encompass a resource eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register or historical resources as defined in Public Resource Code section 5020.1(k). If any archaeological or cultural resources are discovered on the site, work shall stop and Inyo County staff shall be immediately notified per Chapter 9.52, Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County Code.

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)?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the proposed project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable. The conditional use permit was evaluated concurrently with a setback variance. The project area is surrounded by state and federal land and the potential impacts evaluated do not affect any nearby projects. The proposed project site is only 11,410 ft² and has been previously cleared of potential plant and animal habitats for personal agricultural production. No new disturbance will occur and no impacts to any environmental factors are expected.

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

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No, the proposed project has no known environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly.