FILED JAN 19 2022 INYO CO. CLERK



)

)

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

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY AND INTENT

Notice is hereby given that a Draft Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact has been prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Inyo County CEQA Procedures, and are available for public review for the following application:

Reclamation Plan 2020-01/Southwest Pumice LLC

The Bureau of Land Management has awarded Southwest Global Pumice a Pumice Materials-Sale Contract. Southwest Global Pumice has applied for a reclamation plan near Coso Junction as required by Surface Mining And Reclamation Act. The proposal consists of a previously approved 12.23 exploratory drilling project that transitions into an active open-pit pumice mine. The applicant also proposes expanding an additional 11.98 acres for a total disturbance of 25 Acres. APN 037-270-02

The 30-day review period for this Draft Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact begins on January 19, 2022 and expires on February 18, 2022. During this period comments may be submitted regarding the Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration. Inyo County is not required to respond to any comments received after this date. Written comments and all questions should be addressed to the Inyo County Planning Department at P.O. Drawer "L," Independence, CA 93526, faxed to (760) 878-0382, or emailed to inyoplanning@inyocounty.us.

Copies of the Initial Study and Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact for this project are available for review at the Inyo County Planning Department (168 N. Edwards Street, Independence), County libraries, and the Inyo County Planning Department's website at <u>www.inyoplanning.org</u>.

22-00003



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

DRAFT NEGATIVE DECLARATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT AND INITIAL STUDY

PROJECT TITLE: Reclamation Plan 2020-01/SouthwestPumice LLC.

PROJECT LOCATION: Pumice Mine Road is located on BLM land approximately 6 miles NorthEast of Coso Junction, California. The proposed mine reclamation located in section 22, Township 21S North, Range 38E, Mount Diablo Meridian with Tax Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 037-270-02.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The Bureau of Land Management has awarded Southwest Global Pumice a Pumice Materials-Sale Contract. Southwest Global Pumice has applied for a reclamation plan near Coso Junction as required by Surface Mining And Reclamation Act. The proposal consists of a previously approved 12.23 exploratory drilling project that transitions into an active open-pit pumice mine. The applicant also proposes expanding an additional 11.98 acres for a total disturbance of 25 Acres.

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 30-day public & State agency review period for this Draft Negative Declaration will expire on February 18, 2022 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.

Kyn Standnidy

1/19/22

J

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, zoming 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: Reclamation Plan 2020-01/SouthwestPumice LLC.

2. Lead agency name and address: Inyo County Planning Department, PO Drawer L, Independence, CA 93526

3. Contact person and phone number: Ryan Standridge: (760) 878-0405

4. <u>Project location</u>: Pumice Minc Road is located on BLM land approximately 6 miles NorthEast of Coso Junction, California. The proposed minc reclamation located in section 22, Township 21S North, Range 38E, Mount Diablo Meridian with Tax Assessor Parcel Number (APN) 037-270-02.

5. <u>Project sponsor's name and address</u>: Thomas Hrubik, Southwest Global Pumice LLC, P.O. Box 174 Apple Valley, CA 92307.

6. General Plan designation: State and Federal Land (SFL)

7. Zoning: Open Space, 40-acre minimum (OS-40)

8. <u>Description of project</u>: The applicant has applied for a reclamation plan near Coso Junction. The proposal consists of a previously approved 12.23 exploratory drilling project and transitioning into an active open-pit pumice mine. The applicant also proposes expanding an additional 11.98 acres for a total disturbance of 25 Acres.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: The Property is surrounded by Vacant Public lands.

Location:	Use:	Gen. Plan Designation	Zoning
Site	Mine	State and Federal Lands (SFL)	Open Space, 40-acre minimum (OS-40)
North	Vacant Public Land	State and Federal Lands (SFL)	Open Space, 40-acre minimum (OS-40)
East	Naval Weapons Center Vacant Land	State and Federal Lands (SFL)	Open Space, 40-acre minimum (OS-40)
South	Naval Weapons Center Vacant Land	State and Federal Lands (SFL)	Open Space, 40-acre minimum (OS-40)
West	Vacant Land	State and Federal Lands (SFL)	Open Space, 40-acre minimum (OS-40)

10. <u>Other public agencies whose approval is required:</u> Inyo County Environmental Health, Department of Conservation, Bureau of Land Management.

<u>11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area</u> 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-Sbosbone 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 30-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 30-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.



Air Quality Energy Hazards & Hazardous Materials Mineral Resources Public Services Tribal Cultural Resources Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

 \Box I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

 \boxtimes 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 logal 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.

1/19/22

Name

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?				\boxtimes
No, the project's mining reclamation areas location is isolated near C	actus peak and	l not visible from H	lighway 395.	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				
No, the proposed expansion will not damage scenic resources; there a general area.	re no nearby t	rees rock outcroppi	ngs or historic b	uildings in the
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?				
No, the mining reclamation area is in an isolated area near Cactus per mining reclamation might be visible from the relocation of a small por lands, it will not affect the overall scenic integrity of the area as the vi	ak that is not v tion of the SE- ews would be j	visible from Highwa 431 route or high p from a considerable	y 395. Although points on surrou distance.	views of the nding public
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glarc which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				\boxtimes
No, the proposed mining reclamation will not create a new source of s daylight. The applicant has not submitted any security lighting at this outdoor light fixtures use low-energy, shielded light fixtures which diri II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES : In determining environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agrico prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and including The Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Le methodology Provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Agrico presented by the California Agrico and the Forest Le	ubstantial ligh time, but the re- ect light down g whether impa- ultural Land E to use in asse , are significar Fire Protectio gacy Assessm hir Resources I	at or glare as site op eclamation plan wil ward and fully shiel acts to agricultural re- valuation and Site A ssing impacts on ag at environmental eff n regarding the state ent Project; and fore Board. Would the pr	<i>erations are con</i> <i>l be conditioned</i> <i>ided.</i> esources are sign Assessment Mod riculture and far fects, lead agenci- e's inventory of est carbon measu- roject:	aducted during that all nificant el (1997) mland. In ies may refer forest land, irement
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?				
No, the project is not located on farmland.				
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				\boxtimes

No, the proposed mining reclamation will not be located on land zoned for agriculture. There are no Williamson Act contracts in Inyo County.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	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))?				
	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?				\boxtimes
	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?				\boxtimes
	No, the project is not located on farmland.				
	III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria es management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to	tablished by the ap make the followin	plicable air quality g determinations. V	Vould the projec	:t:
	a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air guality plan?		X		
	No, although there are portions of Inyo County within non-attainm nicrons or less in diameter) ambient air quality standards, the pro- approximately 25-miles from the project site. The applicant will a regulations regarding dust mitigation during operation and all pro- Pollution Control District.	nent areas for Fedu imary source for th lso be subject to G ocessing equipmen	eral and State PM1 is pollution is the C reat Basin Unified . It is permitted with a	0 (particulate m Owens dry lake, Air Pollution Co the Great Basin	atter I0 located ontrol District Unified Air
	b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		\boxtimes		
	No, although there are portions of Inyo County within non-attainn microns or less in diameter) ambient air quality standards, the pro approximately 25-miles from the project site. The applicant will a regulations regarding dust mitigation during operation and all pr Pollution Control District.	nent areas for Fede imary source for th lso be subject to G ocessing equipmen	eral and State PMI is pollution is the C reat Basin Unified . It is permitted with i	0 (particulate m Twens dry lake, Air Pollution Co the Great Basin	atter 10 located ontrol District Unified Air
	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)?				
	No, although there are portions of Inyo County within non-attain microns or less in diameter) ambient air quality standards, the pro- approximately 25-miles from the project site. The applicant will a regulations regarding dust mitigation during operation and all pr Pollution Control District.	nent areas for Fedi imary source for th lso be subject to G ocessing equipmen	eral and State PM1 iis pollution is the C reat Basin Unified . it is permitted with .	0 (particulate m Twens dry lake, Air Pollution Co the Great Basin	atter 10 located ontrol District Unified Air
	d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			\boxtimes	
~	$\frac{1}{N}$ No, there are no sensitive receptors near the project location. The	e nearest communi	ty is Olancha 20 m	iles away.	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	c) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?			\boxtimes	

Less ThanSignificantPotentiallyWithLess ThanSignificantMitigationSignificantNoImpactImpactImpactImpact

 \square

 \boxtimes

П

 \boxtimes

 \Box

П

No, the pumice mine does not create odor affecting a substantial number of people. Also, there are no sensitive receptors near the project location. The nearest community is Olancha 20 miles away.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES;

Would the project:		
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or	\boxtimes	
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?		

Applicant-supplied biologists conducted the biological analysis with RCA Associates, Inc. (RCA). RCA performed CNNDB and California Native Plant Society (CNPS) database queries to identify special-status plant and wildlife species that could potentially be found in the project impact area. RCA conducted field surveys for special status species between the 23rd and 29th of May 2019. This query found potential habitat for the following species: Boothe's Primrose, Pinyon Rock Cress, Death Valley beardtongue, Charlette's phacelia, Joshua tree, Desert tortoise, LeConte's Thrasher, Burrowing owl, Mojave ground squirrel. The Ridgecrest BLM reviewed this project under NEPA for the mining of pumice and granted Southwest Global Pumice a sales contract. The applicant will apply for a 2081 Incidental Take Permit to mitigate the impacts to less than significant as a condition of approval for issuing their permit. The applicant proposed a silt fence or a 3-foot berm around the mining area (1) and the production plant to reduce the risk of the Mojave Ground Squirrel or Dessert Tortoise coming onto the site. See the attached site plan. Under a qualified biologist's supervision, Southwest Global Pumice will relocate 8 Joshua trees on the proposed site plan and relocate 2 Boothe's Primrase plants with BLM approval. Inyo County will condition the reclamation plan with the same conditions.

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?

No, the project site has no identified riparian habitat based on the USFWS National Wetlands Inventory Mapping Tool or any nearby riparian habitat affected by the project.

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

No, the project site has no identified riparian habitat based on the USFWS National Wetlands Inventory Mapping Tool or federally protected wetland habitats affected by the project.

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?

Although the project site could potentially have wildlife species, the project will not interfere with migratory fish or wildlife species under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA). The BLM's pumice sales contract requires a survey when mining occurs between April 15th and July 15th. A qualified biologist must conduct a pre-mining study and determine the presence/absence of active nests within or adjacent to the area to be mined. A pre-mining survey will not be required if mining activities occur between July 16th and April 14th. Inyo County will condition the reclamation plan with the same condition.

e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

No, there are no local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources that pertain to the project site. Ocnifics with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state babitat conservation plan? No, there are no adopted habitat or conservation plans that affect the project site. Yould the project: Ocnservation Plan; No, there are no adopted habitat or conservation plans that affect the project site. No, there are no adopted habitat or conservation plans that affect the project site. Store a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15664.5? No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. A has already been reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. An archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of 10ml, including and surrounding the proposed nitting reclamation arcs, and determined that there are no revolub the defined per 150504.5. In the unlikely event an archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of 10ml, including and surrounding the proposed mining reclamation arcs, and determined that there are are or eyould be defined per 150504.5. In the unlikely event an archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of 10ml, including and surrounding the proposed mining reclamation arcs, and determined that there are no revolub the defined per 150504.5. In the unlikely event an archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of 10ml, including and surrounding the prop		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? No, there are no adopted habitat or conservation plans that affect the project site. Y.CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project: a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? No, the compt approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. J. As diready heen reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. An archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of land, tuchuding and surrounding the proposed mining reclamation area, and determined that there are no re would be defined per 15064.5? No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. J. Section 15064.5? No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. J. Section 15064.5? No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. J. Section 15064.5? No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. J. Section 15064.5? No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. J. Section 15064.5? No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. J. Section 15064.5? No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. J. Section 15064.5? No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. J. Section 15064.5? No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. J. Section 15064.5? No, the county ap	No, there are no local policies or ordinances protecting biolog	gical resources that pe	ertain to the project	site.	
No, there are no adopted habitat or conservation plans that affect the project site. Y.CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project: a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the b) cause a substantial adverse change in the BLM. An archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app cares of lond, including and surrounding the proposed mining reclamation area, and determined that there are no re would be defined per 15064.5. In the unlikely event an archaeological or cultural resource is discovered on the site d development, work shall immediately isop and Inyo County staff shall be notified per Inyo County Code. b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. J has already been reviewed mater NEPA by the BLM. An archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app cares of land, including and surrounding the proposed mining reclamation area, and determined that there are no re would be defined per 15064.5. In the unlikely event an archaeological or cultural resource is discovered on the site d development, work shall immediately stop and Inyo County staff shall be notified per Inyo County Code. c) Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the hyo County Code. c) Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the hyo County Code. c) Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the hyo County Code. c) Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the hyo County Code. c) Disturbance of Archaeological, P) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				
Y. CILITURAL RESOURCES: Would the project: a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. <i>J</i> has already been reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. An archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of land, including and surrounding the proposed mining reclamation area, and determined that there are no re would be defined per 15064.5? No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.33 acres. <i>J</i> has already seen an archaeological or cultural resource is discovered on the site d development, work shall immediately stop and Inyo County staff shall be notified per Inyo County Code (ICC) Chapte Disturbance of Archaeological Peleotucological and Historical Features of the byto County Code (ICC) Chapte Disturbance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5? No, the county approved the original explaratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.33 acres. <i>J</i> has already been reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. An archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of land, including and surrounding the proposed mining reclamation area, and determined that there are no re would be defined per 15064.5. In the unlikely event an archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of decised cemeteries? No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. J No, the county approved the using infoant exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance estricted in 2019 for app acres o	No, there are no adopted habitat or conservation plans that a <u>f</u>	ffect the project site.			
 a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5? No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. A has already been reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. An archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of land, including and surrounding the proposed mining reclamation area, and determined that there are no re. Would be defined per 15064.5? No, the county approved the original exploratory staff shall be notified per layo County Code (ICC) Chapte Disturbance of Archaeological. Peleotnological and Historical Features of the bayo County Code (ICC) Chapte Disturbance of Archaeological. Peleotnological and Historical Features of the bayo County Code (ICC) Chapte Disturbance of Archaeological exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. A has already been reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. An archaeological or cultural resource is discovered on the site d development, work shall immediately stop and Inyo County staff shall be notified per Inyo County Code. b) Cause a substantial exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. A has already been reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. An archaeological or cultural resource is discovered on the site d development, work shall immediately stop and Inyo County staff shall be notified per Inyo County Code. c) Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County Code. c) Disturbance of development and the reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. An archaeological norestigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of land, including and surrounding the proposed mining reclamation area, and determined that there are no re would be defined per 15064.5. In the unlikely event an archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of land, including and surrounding	V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:				
No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. A has already been reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. An archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of land, including and surrounding the proposed mining reclamation area, and determined that there are no rewould be defined per 15064.5. In the unlikely event an archaeological or cultural resource is discovered on the site development, work shall immediately stop and Invo County staff shall be notified per hypo County Code (ICC) Chapted Disturbance of Archaeological, Peleontological and Historical Features of the bryo County Code (ICC) Chapted Disturbance of Archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.? No, the county approved the original explanatory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. A has already been reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. An archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of land, including und surrounding the proposed mining reclamation area, and determined that there are nor evented be defined per 15064.5. In the unlikely event an archaeological or cultural resource is discovered on the site d levelopment, work shall immediately stop and Invo County staff shall be notified per hypo County Code. c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred Implement of the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. A has already been reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. An archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of Ind. Including and surrounding the Proposed mining reclamation area, and determined that there are no rewould be defined per 15064.5. In the unlikely event an archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of Ind. Including and surrounding the Proposed mining reclamation area, and deter	a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the ignificance of a historical resource as defined in Section 5064.5?			\boxtimes	
No, the county approved the original explaratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. <i>A</i> has already been reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. An archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of land, including and surrounding the proposed mining reclamation area, and determined that there are no ree. would be defined per 15064.5. In the unlikely event an archaeological or cultural resource is discovered on the site d development, work shall immediately stop and hyo County staff shall be notified per Inyo County Code (ICC) Chapter Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County Code. () outside of dedicated cemeteries? No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. <i>A</i> has already been reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. An archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of land, including and surrounding the proposed mining reclamation area, and determined that there are no re would be defined per 15064.5. In the unlikely event an archaeological or cultural resource is discovered on the site d development, work shall immediately stop and Inyo County staff shall be notified per Inyo County Code (ICC) Chapter Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County Code (ICC) Chapter Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County Code (ICC) Chapter Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County Code. (ICC) Chapter Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County Code (ICC) Chapter Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County Code. (ICC) Chapter Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County Code. (ICC) Chapter Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological on the site does not inpact the construction	tas already been reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. An archa- taces of land, including and surrounding the proposed mining would be defined per 15064.5. In the unlikely event an archaet levelopment, work shall immediately stop and Inyo County sta Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historica () Cause a substantial adverse change in the ignificance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?	aeological investigation reclamation area, and ological or cultural re aff shall be notified per al Features of the Inyo	nuce restricted to m was conducted in d determined that th source is discovere r Inyo County Code County Code.	12.23 deres. Al a 2019 for appro here are no reso ed on the site dur e (ICC) Chapter	in this priximately . urces tha ing any fi 9.52,
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries? No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. A has already been reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. An archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of land, including and surrounding the proposed mining reclamation area, and determined that there are no re- would be defined per 15064.5. In the unlikely event an archaeological or cultural resource is discovered on the site d development, work shall immediately stop and Inyo County staff shall be notified per Inyo County Code (ICC) Chapter Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County Code 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? No, the project is mining reclamation; the site does not have buildings or power poles that require electricity; therefor reclamation area does not impact the consumption of energy resources during operations. b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency No, the project is not located in one of the County's Solar Energy Development Areas (SEDA). 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	No, the county approved the original explaratory drilling in Au as already been reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. An archa- access of land, including and surrounding the proposed mining would be defined per 15064.5. In the unlikely event an archae levelopment, work shall immediately stop and Inyo County sto Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historica	ugust 1997 with distur aeological investigatio reclamation area, and ological or cultural re aff shall be notified per al Features of the Inyo	bance restricted to m was conducted in d determined that the source is discovere r Inyo County Code County Code	12.23 acres. Al: 2019 for appro here are no reso of on the site dur e (ICC) Chapter	so, this pr ximately . urces tha ing any f 9.52,
No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in August 1997 with disturbance restricted to 12.23 acres. A has already been reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. An archaeological investigation was conducted in 2019 for app acres of land, including and surrounding the proposed mining reclamation area, and determined that there are no rewould be defined per 15064.5. In the unlikely event an archaeological or cultural resource is discovered on the site d development, work shall immediately stop and Inyo County staff shall be notified per Inyo County Code (ICC) Chapter Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historical Features of the Inyo County Code. VI. ENERGY: Would the project: a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due nergy resources, during project construction or operation? No, the project is mining reclamation; the site does not have buildings or power poles that require electricity; therefor reclamation area does not impact the consumption of energy resources during operations. b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency No, the project is not located in one of the County's Solar Energy Development Areas (SEDA). 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 carthquake fault, as delineated on) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?			\boxtimes	
VI. ENERGY: Would the project: a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due b) wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation? No, the project is mining reclamation; the site does not have buildings or power poles that require electricity; therefore reclamation area does not impact the consumption of energy resources during operations. b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency No, the project is not located in one of the County's Solar Energy Development Areas (SEDA). Y Y IL GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project: a) Directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss injury, or death involving:	No, the county approved the original exploratory drilling in As has already been reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. An archa heres of land, including and surrounding the proposed mining would be defined per 15064.5. In the unlikely event an archae levelopment, work shall immediately stop and Inyo County sta Disturbance of Archaeological, Paleontological and Historica	ugust 1997 with distur aeological investigatio reclamation area, and ological or cultural re aff shall be notified per al Features of the Inyo	bance restricted to m was conducted if d determined that th source is discovere r Inyo County Code County Code.	12.23 acres. Al. n 2019 for appro here are no reso ed on the site dur e (ICC) Chapter	so, this pr ximately urces tha ing any f 9.52,
 b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable No, the project is not located in one of the County's Solar Energy Development Areas (SEDA). 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 	/ I. ENERGY : Vould the project:) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due				M
No, the project is mining reclamation; the site does not have buildings or power poles that require electricity; therefore reclamation area does not impact the consumption of energy resources during operations. b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency No, the project is not located in one of the County's Solar Energy Development Areas (SEDA). 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	o wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of nergy resources, during project construction or operation?				
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency No, the project is not located in one of the County's Solar Energy Development Areas (SEDA). 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 i) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable 	No, the project is mining reclamation; the site does not have b eclamation area does not impact the consumption of energy r	ouildings or power polo resources during opera	es that require elec ations.	tricity; therefore	, the prop
No, the project is not located in one of the County's Solar Energy Development Areas (SEDA). 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	•) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable nergy or energy efficiency				\boxtimes
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	No, the project is not located in one of the County's Solar Ene	ergy Development Area	as (SEDA).		
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	/II. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on) Directly or indirectly cause substantial adverse effects, inclu he risk of loss injury, or death involving:	uding			
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated	lon 🗌			\boxtimes

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact		
*	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.						
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?			\boxtimes			
Grouna an iden require	shaking may occur anywhere in the region, due to numerous tified Alquist-Priolo zone or not. However, the Uniform Build d seismic standards (Level IV) in order to withstand such shak	earthquake fault: ling Code ensure. ling, so this poter	s, regardless of wh s that future struct atial impact is cons	ether the projec ures shall const sidered less that	ct site is within ructed to n significant.		
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				\boxtimes		
No the j	project area is not within an area of soils know to be subject to	o liquefaction.					
	iv) Landslides?				\boxtimes		
No, the	project area is not subject to landslides.						
b) Resu	lt in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?			\boxtimes			
No, the as set fo yesult o	No, the proposed mining reclamation shall conform to all drainage, grading, and "Best Management Practice (BMP)" requirements as set forth by BLM and all other associated regulatory agencies, will be written into the Conditions of Approval for the permit. As a result of these regulations, potential impacts are considered less than significant.						
c) Be lo or that y and pot spreading	cated on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, would become unstable as a result of the project, entially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral ng, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?						
No, the	project is not located on a geologic anit or soil that is conside	ered unstable.					
d) Be lo 1-B of t substan	cated on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18- he Uniform Building Code (1994), creating tial risks to life or property?						
No, the	project is not located on a geologic unit or soil that is conside	ered expansive.					
e) Have of septi- where s water?	soils incapable of adequately supporting the use c tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems ewers are not available for the disposal of waste						
No, the upgrade	site has portable toilets on-site and is serviced by a commerci as to the existing waste disposal systems as it will not create a	al vendor; therej dditional waste.	fore, the project wi	ill not create a r	need for		
f) Direct resource	tly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological e or site or unique geologic feature?						
No, the	project site does not include a unique paleontological or geol	ogic feature.					
VIII. G	REENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:						
a) Gene directly	are project: rate greenhouse gas emissions, either or indirectly, that may have a significant			\boxtimes			

	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impa
impact on the environment?				
No, all equipment used at the mining site meet California's CO be subject to Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control Distric required to obtuin all necessary permits from Great Basin Unij	2 emission requireme t regulations regardi fied Air Pollution Cor	ents, follow best mai ng dust mitigation a atrol District.	nugenient practi luring operation	ces, and s and sł
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?				۵
No, all equipment used at the mining site meet Californio's CO be subject to Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control Distric required to obtain all necessary permits from Great Basin Unij	2 emission requireme t regulations regardi fied Air Pollution Cor	ents, follow best man ng dust mitigation a ntrol District.	nagement practi luring operation	ces, and s and si
IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				D
No, Chemicals are not used on-site; no chemical processing oc waste or pollution from the mining operation.	curs on-site only c ru s	shing and screening	. There will be n	io chem
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous				۵
materials into the environment?	u shan for standard m	aintanance Emerc	ana) m aintanan	aa and
materials into the environment? No, equipment and vehicles get transported to the Apple Valley refueling comply with all rules and regulations regarding impli- control measures, and employee training per their Emergency. Environmental Health Services (EHS). EHS is the Certified Un storage, use, generation, and disposal. EHS will continue to pe	y shop for standard m ementing proper fueli Response Plans and I ified Program Agency rmit.	aintenance. Emerg ng procedures, fuel Procedures on file w y (CUPA) that over.	ency maintenan , waste oil stara vith the Inyo Cou sees hazardous v	ce and ge, spil mty materia
materials into the environment? No, equipment and vehicles get transported to the Apple Valley refueling comply with all rules and regulations regarding impli- control measures, and employee training per their Emergency. Environmental Health Services (EHS). EHS is the Certified Un storage, use, generation, and disposal. EHS will continue to pe c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	y shop for standard m ementing proper fueli Response Plans and I ified Program Agency rmit.	aintenance. Emerg ng procedures, fuel Procedures on file w y (CUPA) that over.	ency maintenan , waste oil stara oith the Inyo Cou sees hazardous i	ce and ge, spil. inty materia
materials into the environment? No, equipment and vehicles get transported to the Apple Valle refueling comply with all rules and regulations regarding impli- control measures, and employee training per their Emergency. Environmental Health Services (EHS). EHS is the Certified Un storage, use, generation, and disposal. EHS will continue to pe 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 ex-	y shop for standard m ementing proper fueli Response Plans and I ified Program Agency rmit.	aintenance. Emerging procedures, fuel Procedures on file w (CUPA) that over.	ency maintenan , waste oil stara vith the Inyo Cou sees hazardous v	ce and ge, spili mty materia
materials into the environment? No, equipment and vehicles get transported to the Apple Valle refueling comply with all rules and regulations regarding impli- control measures, and employee training per their Emergency. Environmental Health Services (EHS). EHS is the Certified Un storage, use, generation, and disposal. EHS will continue to pe 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 e. 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?	y shop for standard m ementing proper fueli Response Plans and I ified Program Agency rmit.	aintenance. Emerging procedures, fuel Procedures on file w (CUPA) that over.	ency maintenan , waste oil stara , whe Inyo Cou sees hazardous i	ce and ge, spil. nty nateria
 materials into the environment? No, equipment and vehicles get transported to the Apple Valley refueling comply with all rules and regulations regarding implicant of measures, and employee training per their Emergency . Environmental Health Services (EHS). EHS is the Certified Un storage, use, generation, and disposal. EHS will continue to peee) 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 e. 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? No, the proposed project is not located on a site included on a . Code Section 65962.5. There are no DTSC sites mapped within the site vicinity on Geotracker and EnviroStor databases. 	y shop for standard m ementing proper fueli Response Plans and I ified Program Agency rmit.	aintenance. Emerging procedures, fuel Procedures on file w (CUPA) that over.	ency maintenan , waste oil stara, vith the Inyo Con sees hazardous i	vce and ge, spili inty materia N E N E S Vernme ident
 materials into the environment? No, equipment and vehicles get transported to the Apple Valley refueling comply with all rules and regulations regarding implecentrol measures, and employee training per their Emergency. Environmental Health Services (EHS). EHS is the Certified Un storage, use, generation, and disposal. EHS will continue to peee) 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 of proposed project is not within one-quarter mile of an exist 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? No, the proposed project is not located on a site included on a site within 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? 	y shop for standard m ementing proper fueli Response Plans and I ified Program Agency rmit.	aintenance. Emerg ng procedures, fuel Procedures on file w y (CUPA) that over.	ency maintenan , waste oil stara , waste oil stara , waste oil stara , waste in stara , waste oil star	vce and ge, spil. inty materia [2 [2 overnme re iden.
materials into the environment? No, equipment and vehicles get transported to the Apple Valley refueling comply with all rules and regulations regarding impli- control measures, and employee training per their Emergency. Environmental Health Services (EHS). EHS is the Certified Un storage, use, generation, and disposal. EHS will continue to pe 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 e. 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? No, the proposed project is not located on a site included on a Code Section 65962.5. There are no DTSC sites mapped within 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 mining reclamution is not included in an airport land use	y shop for standard m ementing proper fueli Response Plans and I ified Program Agency rmit.	maintenance. Emergeng procedures, fuel Procedures on file w (CUPA) that over.	ency maintenan , waste oil stara , waste oil stara , waste oil stara sees hazardous i	vee and ge, spili inty materia [2 [2 overnme ire ident [2 overnme re ident

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
residing	or working in the project area?				
No, the i	mining reclamation is not located in the vicinity of a private a	irstrip.			
g) Impai an adopt evacuati	ir implementation of or physically interfere with ted emergency response plan or emergency on plan?				\boxtimes
No, the i	mining reclamation will not physically interfere with an adopt	ed emergency pla	n or emergency ev	acuation plan.	
h) Expo to a sign wildland residenc	se people or structures, either directly or indirectly, ificant risk of loss, injury or death involving I fires are adjacent to urbanized areas or where wes are intermixed with wildlands?			\boxtimes	
No, the i	mining reclamation location is not adjacent to any urbanized i	area and the surro	unding area is BL	M vacant land,	
X. HYD Would t a) Viola requiren	PROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: he project: te any water quality standards or waste discharge nents or otherwise substantially degrade surface or			\boxtimes	
ground v	water quality?				
No, the c relocatio 4,000-go gallons Southwe	currently approved Makayla I mine site will be in reclamation on to the Makayla II site. Water supply is from an existing off- allon truck) wets down material and roads during mining activ of water for dust suppression activities around 200 days per y est Global Pumice will continue to provide emplayees with bot	, and the existing v site well located a vities. Southwest G ear, which amount tled water.	water policy will r cross highway 39: flobal Pumice may ts to approximatel	emain in place v 5. A water truck v use approxima v 17.2 acre-feet	vith the ccurrently a tely 28,000 annually.
b) Subst substant may imp	antially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere ially with groundwater recharge such that the project bede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?				
No, the o operatio (current appraxin acre-fee	currently approved Makayla I site will be in reclamation, and on relocating to the Makayla II site. Water supply is from an ex- ly a 4,000-gallon truck)wets down material and roads during mately 28,000 gallons of water for dust suppression activities t annually. Southwest Global Pumice will continue to provide	the existing water kisting off-site well mining activities. around 200 days p employees with bo	policy will remain l located across hi Southwest Global per year, which an pottled water.	t in place with th ighway 395. A v Pumice may use tounts to approx	he mining vuter truck vinutely 17.2
c) Subst includin or through manner	antially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, g through the alteration of the course of a stream or river gh the addition of impervious surfaces, in a which would: i) result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site:	Π	Π	-	X
		, ,		ш ,.	
	No, the project site is composed of volcanic cinder gravels and drainages or impervious surfaces on-site. Erosion is not an is	nd sands. This mat ssue of concern on	erial is very poroi i-site.	is a n d there are	no
	ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;				
No the	protect site is composed of volcanic cinder gravels and sands	This motorial is y	an norous and th	ara ara no drai	10005 04

No, the project site is composed of volcanic cinder gravels and sands. This material is very porous, and there are no drainages or impervious surfaces on-site. Erosion is not a concern on-site. The mining reclamation is required to conform to all drainage, grading, and "Best Management Practice" (BMP) requirements set forth by the Inyo County Public Works Department, Inyo County of Inyo Environmental Health Services Department, and other associated regulatory agencies. As a result of this regulation, potential impacts are considered less than significant.

		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	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 there ar	project site is composed of volcanic cinder gravels and sands. e no drainages or impervious surfaces on-site. Erosion is not a	This material is an issue on-site.	very porous, and		
	iv) impede or redirect flood flows?				\boxtimes
The pro	ject area is not located in any flood hazard areas and will not	potentially redi	rect flood flows.		
d) Conf plan or	lict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control sustainable groundwater management plan?				\boxtimes
No, the	project is not proposed in an area that is included in a water q	vality control o	r sustainable grou	nd water manag	gement plan.
e) Place mapped Insuranc map?	housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood e Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation				
No, the	proposed mining reclamation is not in a 100-year flood hazard	t area.			
f) Place which w	within a 100-year flood hazard area structures yould impede or redirect flood flows?				\boxtimes
No, the	project is not in a 100-year flood hazard area.				
g) Expo injury o result of	se people or structures to a significant risk of loss, r death involving flooding, including flooding as a the failure of a levee or dam?				
No, the j in this a	proposed mining reclamation is not in an area subject to flood rea is 7-inches to 10-inches.	ling due to the fa	uilure of a levee or	dam. Average c	annual rainfall
h) Inunc	lation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				\boxtimes
No, the	proposed mining reclamation is not in an area sabject to seich	hes, tsunamis, oi	r mudflows.		
<u>XI. LAI</u> Would t	ND USE AND PLANNING: he project:				
a) Physi	cally divide an established community?				\boxtimes
No, the j	proposed reclamation plan does not physically divide an estab	lished communi	ty.		
b) Cause any land avoiding	e a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of or mitigating an environmental effect?				

The proposed project is consistent with the County Zoning Ordinance designation of 'Open Space (OS). The OS designation conditionally allows mining uses (Inyo County Code, Title 18, Section 18.12.040 I. Mining uses are also allowed if approved by the Bureau of Land Management accompanied by a reclamation plan approved by Inyo County under a Memorandum of Understanding between the County and the BLM). These include the mining and processing of natural resources, including open pits. The proposed mining reclamation plan is a continued mining use. The General Plan consists of a policy that protects the current and future extraction of mineral resources essential to the County's economy while minimizing impacts of this use on the public and the environment.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
) c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				\boxtimes
No, the proposed project will not conflict with any habitat conservati is located in a previous exploratory mining area that has been distur-	on plan or natura bed.	al community conse	ervation plan—t	he project site
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, this project is the mining of a mineral; however, this mineral is in deplete the mineral resource. The Inyo County General Plan encoura considering the great quantities of it that are available within Inyo C	n abundance in th 1ges such mining. County.	e area and mining The impact to thi	this small depo s resource is ver	sit will not ry small
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?				
No, the project will have no impact on the resource.				
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?				
No, the proposed reclantation plan can increase the ambient noise le secluded in the Coso Mountains range near cactus peak, and the nea	vel in the project rest community is	's vicinity; however Olancha, approxi	r, the proposed : mately 20 miles	site is away.
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			\boxtimes	
No, although the mining operation requires the use of heavy construct away.	ction equipment ti	he nearest comunit	y is approximat	ely 20 miles
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 pla	ın, or within 2-mi	iles of a public airp	vort.	
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)?				

 \sim No, the proposed project transitions from exploratory to active mining with an expansion. It does not include housing and is not an infrastructure improvement that would cause a population increase.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				\boxtimes

No, the proposed project transitions from exploratory to active mining with an expansion will not result in a loss of housing units or the displacement of people.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES: Would the project: a) Result in substantial adverse physical inpacts 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?			\boxtimes	
No, the proposed project transitions from exploratory drilling t additional services, resulting in an overall loss in service provi	o active mining wit sion.	h an expansion. It	will not cause hig	h demand for
Police protection?				\boxtimes
No, the proposed project transitions from exploratory drilling t	o active mining wit	h an expansion. It	will not cause hig	h demand for
Schools?	sion.			\boxtimes
No new school service will be required because of this project.				
Parks?				\boxtimes
No new parks will be required because of this project.				
Other public facilities?				\boxtimes
No, the propased project will not create a need for additional p	ublic 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?				
No, the proposed project will not increase the use of existing re in the level of service required.	creational facilitie	s. No portion of th	ls project anticipa	tes any change
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?				\boxtimes
No, the proposed project does not include, nor will it cause, a n have an adverse physical effect on the environment.	eed for an increase	e in parks or other	recreational facil	ities that might
XVII. TRANSPORTATION: a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy			ΓΊ	

a) contlict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit,

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?				
No, the proposed project transitions from exploratory drilling to acti transportation plans, policies, or programs.	ive mining with an	expansion. It will	have no impact	on adopted
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)? No, The project is consistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subd currently reclaiming the Makayla I site. Production will resume after vehicle miles traveled will remain the same.	ivision (b). the app the approval of M	licant has stopped lakayla II expansi	d production of , ion reclamation	⊠ pumice and is plan , and
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				
No, the proposed project transitions from exploratory drilling to actu to the roads in the area.	ive mining with an	expansion. It will	not cause a nee	d for changes
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?			\boxtimes	
No, the proposed project transitions from exploratory drilling to ac emergency access.	tive mining with a	n expansion. It wi	ll not create loss	ses of
 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 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 				
No, this project has already been reviewed under NEPA by the BLM. listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or a local r Code section 5020.1(k). If any archaeological or cultural resources shall be immediately notified per Chapter 9.52, Disturbance of Archa County Code.	. The proposed pro register or historica are discovered on aeological, Paleon	iject does not enco al resources as de the site, work sha tological and His	ompass a resour fined in Public I Il stop and Inyo torical Features	ce eligible for Resource County staff of the Inyo
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its				\boxtimes

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.

No, the proposed project transitions from exploratory drilling to active mining with an expansion 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. If cultural resources are discovered in the project area, work will be stopped and a local Tribal representative will be consulted with to determine the significance of the finding and the proper handling of the resource will be required.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?				
No, the proposed project will not result in the construction of new or not require electricity or waste facilities. All stormwater received at the drainage channels and will not require new or an expansion of existing	expanded utility or his site will be con ng storntwater dra.	r service systems. tained on-site or a inage facilities.	The proposed pr liverted into exis	oject does ting
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?				
Yes, the proposed project transitions from exploratory drilling to acti the new Makayla II site upon approval and closure of the Makayla I s remain the same. The water supply is from an existing off-site well.	ve mining with an ite. The water use	expansion. The mi con-site minimizes	ning operations dust generation	will move to and will
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?				
No, the proposed project will not be serviced by a wastewater treatme	ent facility.			
a) 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?				\boxtimes
No, the project is served by a county landfill that has the capacity to a is disposed into approved trash bins and removed by a commercial ga	accommodate the p arbage hauler.	project's solid was	te disposal need.	s. All refuse
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				\boxtimes
Yes, the applicant will be required to comply with federal, state and le	ocal statues and re	gulations related	to solid waste.	
XX. WILDFIRE: Would the project: a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				
No, the project will not interfere with the implementation of an adopted	ed emergency plan			
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, the project site is comprised of pumice, gravel, and sand. The site occurs, and final slope, seed distribution has been accomplished to re	's vegetation will educe the risk of w	remain sparse unt. ildfire.	il the completion	of mining
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				\boxtimes

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

 \Box

 \boxtimes

 \boxtimes

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 a Federal 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 nearest community is Olancha 20 miles away. The site consists of 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

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 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. Southwest Global Pumice can mitigate the project area's resource impacts to less than significant. Inyo County will write mitigation measures into the Conditions of Approval for the permit. The applicant shall work with the Great Basin Air Pollution Control District (GBAPCD) to operate in such a way us to minimize potential air quality effects from the mining operation ond reclamation plan. The applicant shall work with CDFW to mitigate the special status species' impacts and obtain a 2081 Incidental Take permit. If any vegetation removal activities occur between March 15 – September 15. A pre-construction survey shall be conducted for nesting birds, no more than 3-days before construction, and submitted to the Planning Department and the BLM. A qualified avian biologist shall prepare and implement a Nesting Bird Plan if active nests are found, per CDFW requirements. Any grubbing or vegetations regarding hazardous materials. The proposed project does not encompass a resource eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or a local register or historical resources defined in Public Resource Code section 5020.1(k). Work shall stop if any archaeological or cultural resources are discovered on the site. Inyo County staff shall be immediately notified per Chapter 9.52, Distarbance 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)?

The proposed mining reclamation is located in a remote location and none of the impacts of this project will be cumulatively considerable.

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

No, Southwest Global Punice will remove all equipment and debris from the site upon completion of mining. The site perimeter berm will restrict public access to the site for the life of the mine operation. Warning signs with contrasting background lettering shall install at access points into the quarries stating "No Trespassing - Keep Out; Surface Mining Operation" or similar. Also, the reclaimed 2H: IV slopes will be of sufficient low gradient to not cause a hazard to public safety.

Makayla II Vicinity map



)

0 2.5 5 10 Miles H.







FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Makayla 2 Pumice Mine Plan of Operations CACA-58637 and Right-of-Way CACA-56716

Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-CA-D050-2021-0019-EA

Introduction:

)

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has conducted an environmental assessment (DOI-BLM-CA-D050-2021-0019-EA) to analyze the potential effect(s) of authorizing Southwest Global Pumice LLC to mine approximately 25 acres and remove 100,000 tons of pumice from BLM-managed public lands located in the Coso Mountains north and east of Coso Junction, Inyo County, California. See location map attached below.

The need for this action is established by the BLM's responsibility under FLPMA to respond to a request for mineral materials made under Title 43, Part 3600 of the Code of Federal Regulations. These regulations specify that: (1) it is BLM's policy to make mineral materials available unless it is detrimental to the public interest to do so (43 CFR 3601.6(a)), and; (2) that BLM will not dispose of mineral materials if it is determined that the aggregate damage to public lands and resources will exceed the expected public benefits (43 CFR 3611).

Plan Conformance and Consistency:

The proposed authorization is consistent with the California Desert Conservation Area Management Plan of 1980 (CDCA Plan) and its amendment, the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan (DRECP) because:

The involved lands are within the Mohave Ground Squirrel Area of Critical Environmental Concern, which objective(s) include to "Support the national need for reliable and sustainable domestic minerals while protecting the sensitive resources in the area." See Appendix B of the *Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan* Amendment of the California Desert Conservation Area Management Plan.¹

The proposed project site is within California Desert National Conservation Lands (CDNCL). The Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan Land Use Plan Amendment provides that CDNCL land may be made available for mineral material sales subject to mitigation requirements, including compensatory mitigation (reference Conservation Management Action NLCS-MIN-3).

¹ Available at https://eplanning.blm.gov/eplanning-ui/project/66459/510

Finding of No Significant Impact:

Based on a review of the Environmental Assessment and supporting referenced documents, I have determined the project is not a major federal action and will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment, individually or cumulatively with other actions in the general area. No environmental effects meet the definition of significance in context or intensity as defined in 40 CFR 1508.27 and none exceed those effects as described in the California Desert Conservation Area Management Plan of 1980, as amended. An environmental impact statement is not required and will not be prepared.

This finding is based on the context and intensity of the project as explained below.

Context:

This project involves an area of up to 25 acres to be mined for pumice, and a right-of-way for access to the site. 'Significance' in this context means effects in the locale rather than in the world as a whole (40 CFR 1508.27(a)). The impacts associated with this project are short-term and local, and not likely in & of themselves to have international, national, regional or statewide impacts.

Intensity:

)

Intensity refers to the severity of impact. The NEPA criteria for evaluating intensity under 43 CFR 1508.27(b) include:

1. Impacts may be both beneficial and adverse.

The proposed action may have impacts to resources as described in Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-CA-DOI-D050-2021-0019-EA. The proponent has incorporated measures to reduce or mitigate impacts into the proposed action, with further stipulations recommended by BLM in Chapter 3 of the Environmental Assessment (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences).

2. The degree to which the selected alternative will affect public health or safety.

No potentially hazardous substances will be left on or in the vicinity of the project area. No hazard to the general public is anticipated from this action.

3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farm lands, wetlands, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.

The action has no effect to any prime farm lands, wilderness, or wild/scenic rivers. A class III cultural survey was completed for the project in accordance with Conservation Management Action CMA-LUPA-CUL-4. The Area of Potential Effect was surveyed by Duke Resources Cultural Management. Four prehistoric archeological sites identified, chiefly of lithic debitage, recommended as ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places, and BLM concurs with this recommendation. Approval of this project will not cause any adverse effects to any National Register eligible Historic Properties.

4. The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.

BLM received many comments expressing concern or opposition to the project, and also received a comment expressing support. Controversy in this context means disagreement about the nature of the effects, not expressions of opposition to the proposed action or preference among the alternatives.

5. The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.

The pumice mining program is not unique or unusual. The effects to the human environment are fully analyzed and disclosed in this environmental assessment. No unique or unknown risks are identified by this assessment. The likely effects of the proposed action to air quality, water, wildlife, heritage resources, Native American values and recreation are adequately disclosed in the Environmental Consequences chapter of this Environmental Assessment. No unique, unusual or unknown risks to these resources are identified by this assessment.

6. The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.

The proposed action (including issuance of a mineral material sale contract and a rightof-way for access) are common actions on public land and would not set a precedent for future actions with significant impact.

7. Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.

)

The proposed action was considered by the interdisciplinary team with the context of past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions. Significant cumulative effects are not anticipated. An analysis of the effects of the proposed action is described in the EA.

8. The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or other objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.

The project will not adversely affect scientific, cultural, or historic resources, including those eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. An analysis of the effects of alternatives is described in the EA.

9. The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

The area is not within designated critical habitat for any species listed as threatened or

eudangered under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. The BLM has made a No Effect call for federally listed species, so long as the proposed protective measures found in the EA and Decision Record are followed.

10. Whether the action threatens violation of a federal, state, local, or tribal law, regulation or policy imposed for the protection of the environment.
BLM's authorization of the proposed action will not violate any federal, state, local, or tribal laws, regulation or policy imposed for protection of the environment.

FONSI for DOI-BLM-CA-D050-2021-0019-EA

Signed: CARL SYMONS

)

Digitally signed by CARL SYMONS Date: 2021.07.19 07:20:27 -07'00'

Carl B. Symons BLM, Ridgecrest Field Manager

Date



RARE PLANT AND WILDLIFE SURVEY REPORT

 10^{-1}

MAKAYLA 2 MINE EXPANSION PROJECT INYO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Prepared for:

Global Purnice, LLC

Prepared by:

RCA Associates, Inc. 15555 Main Street, #D4-235 Hesperia, California 92345

Principal Investigator: Randall C. Arnold, Jr.

Report prepared by: R. Arnold Project: #2019-37

June 18, 2019

TITLE PAGE

-5

Date Report Written: June 18, 2019 Date Field Work Completed: May 23 and 28, 2019 Report Title: **Rare Plant Survey Report** Prepared for; **Global Pumice**, LLC Principal Investigators: Randall C. Arnold, Jr., Principal Biologist **Contact Information:** Randall C. Arnold, Jr. RCA Associates, Inc. 15555 Main Street, #D4-235 Hesperia, CA 92345 (760) 956-9212 rarnold a reaassociateslic.com www.rcanssociatesllc.com

Table of Contents

Section	n		Page			
1.0	Introduction and Project Description					
2.0	Enviro	nmental Setting	3			
3.0	Regula	tory Setting	4			
4.0	Metho	dologies	7			
	4.1	General Plant and Animal Surveys	7			
	4.2	Special Status Wildlife Species	8			
	4.3	Special Status Plant Species	10			
5.0	Literat	ure Search	12			
6.0	Results	3	15			
	6.1	General Biological Resources	15			
	6.2	Federal and State Listed Species	16			
	6.3	Wildlife Species of Concern and Special Status Plants	17			
	6.4	Other Special Status Species	18			
7.0	Impact	s and Recommendations	19			
	7.1	Potential Impacts	19			
	7.2	Recommendations	20			
8.0	Bibliog	graphy	21			

.

Appendix A - Tables and Figures

.

_

)

ł

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Biological surveys were conducted on May 23 and 28, 2019 within the project area which is located approximately 4-miles east of Oso Junction. California and Highway 395 and 2.5-miles north of Gill Station Coso Road (Township 21 South, Range 38 East, Section 22) (Figures 1 and 2). The primary emphasis was to survey the site for the presence of any special status plant and/or wildlife species which have a moderate potential for occurring on the site. The proposed expansion area is approximately 25-acres in size and encompasses an existing mine area along with additional acreage that may be mined for pumice following completion of exploratory investigations and upon project approval (Figure 3). The project site is located within "Areas of Critical Environmental Concern" (ACBC) and "National Conservation Lands" (NCL). As part of the environmental assessment process, data sources were reviewed prior to the start of field investigations including the California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB), CALFORA, and the Biogeographic Information & Observation Systems (BIOS). In addition, other technical reports previously prepared for the existing Makayla Mine 1 were also reviewed.

This report includes a discussion of the existing conditions within the houndaries of the proposed expansion area; as well as a discussion of federal. State, and county guidelines and policies which may affect project implementation. Mitigation measures which may be required are also discusses.

Following completion of the comprehensive data review, surveys were performed on the site during which the biological resources on the property and in the surrounding areas were documented by biologists from RCA Associates, Inc. As part of the surveys, the property site and the adjoining lands were evaluated for the presence of native habitats which could potentially support populations of special status species which have been documented in the region based on the background data review. A focused survey was also conducted for the desert tortoise and burrowing owl, and a habitat assessment was also performed for the Mohave ground squirrel.

The property was also evaluated for the presence of sensitive habitats including stream channels, wetlands, vernal pools, riparian habitats, and potential jurisdictional areas.

)

)

Based on data from CNDDB, CALFLORA, and BIOS for the region, there are fourteen special status plants and thirteen special status wildlife species in the region. Of these species only one special status plant (i.e., Camassonia boothii ssp. Boothii) was observed within the boundaries of the proposed expansion area and three other plants could potentially occur on the site (Pinyon rock cress [Arghis dispur]. Death Valley beardtongue Penstemon finicijormis var omargosae], and Charlotte's phacelia [Phacelia nashiana]). Only four special status wildlife species (i.e., desert tortoise [Gopherus agassizii]. LeConte's thrasher [Toxostoma lecontei], burrowing owl [Athene *cunicularia*], and Mohave ground squirrel [Spermophilus mohavensis]) have a moderate potential for occurring on the site of in the immediate area. However, none of these wildlife species were observed during the May 2019 field investigations. The special status plant and wildlife species which have been documented in the region are presented in Table 5-1 and a discussion is provided in Sections 4.2 and 4.3 for those species observed on the site, and those which could potentially occur on the site. Scientific nomenclature for this report is based on the following references: Hickman (1993). Munz (1974). Stebbins (2003), Sibley (2000) and Whitaker (1980).

The Project Proponent is proposing to abandon the existing mine (Makayla 1) and expand the mining operation into an area immediately east of the existing mine. The necessity for the change in the mining position is due to extreme overburden in the Makayla 1 mine area. The proposed new mine area will be designated as Makayla 2 where exploratory work will be conducted to assess the economic viability of the area. The project area which will encompass Makayla 2 will be approximately 25-acres: however, the initial exploratory work will be confined to a 5-acre portion as depicted in Figure 3.

2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

)

The mine area is approximately 25-acres in size and consists of steep sloping hills covered in sand and pumice. The area in question encompasses the existing Makayla 1 Mine and additional areas which will be mined upon approval of the proposed expansion area. The proposed expansion is depicted in Figure 3 and as shown includes an existing mine area (Makayla Mine 1) in the southern portion of the site, as well as a smaller mine area in the northern part. The mine site is located about four miles east of Coso Junction. California and State Highway 395 and about 2.5 miles north of Gill Station Coso Road (Township 21 South, Range 38 East, Section 22, USGS Cactus Peak, CA Quadrangle) (Figures 1 and 2).

The undisturbed areas of the 25-acre parcet supports a low to moderately Alkali Desert Scrub and Joshua tree plant community (CDFG, 2005). A total of 45 plants were identified during the field investigations with creosote bush (*Larrea tridentata*), saltbush (*Atriplex* sp.), ephedra (*Ephedra nevadensis*) and Fremont's indigo bush (*Psorothamnus fremontif*) the dominant plant species. The site supports a variety of wildlife species; however, only six species were observed including antelope ground squirrel (*Antmopspermophilus lencurus*), jackrabbit (*Lepus californicus*), coyote (*Canis latrans*), kit fox (racks (*Vulpes macrotis*), side-blotched lizard (*Uta stansburiana*), western whiptail (*Chemidophorus tigris*), and raven (*Carvus corax*).

Tables 1 and 2 (Appendix A) provide a list of the plants and wildlife observed. No sensitive habitats such as blueline channels, wetlands, or critical habitats for sensitive species were present on the property.

3.0 REGULATORY SETTING

)

West Mojave Plan (WMP): The West Mojave Plan (WMP) is an environmental planning document designed to streamline the permitting process and compliance with the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) and California Endangered Species Act (CESA) for projects. The WPA includes the West Mojave Desert area encompassing 9.3 million acres in luyo. Kern, Los Angeles, and San Bernardino counties, as wells as 3.3 million acres of public tands administered by BLM. 3.0 million acres of private lands. 102.000 acres administered by the State of California, and military lands administered by the Department of Defense. Compliance with the WPA covers all permitting requirements normally covered under FESA and CESA.

Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA): The USFWS administers the federal endangered species act which was passed in 1973, and has since been amended and reauthorized. The ESA provides a process for listing species as either threatened or endangered as well as a process for protecting listed species and to prevent the "take" of a listed species, unless authorized through Section 10 or Section 7 consultations with the federal agencies.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBT): Native Migratory Birds are protected by international treaty under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-711). The MB1A makes it unlawful to take, possess, buy, sell, purchase, or barter any migratory bird listed in 50 C.F.R. Part 10. Any disturbances that may cause abandonment of nests and/or loss of reproductive effort maybe be considered "take" and potentially punishable by fines or imprisonment. Project related disturbance at active nesting territories must be reduced or climinated during the nesting cycle (February 1 to August 31) to avoid violation of the MBTA.

California Endangered Species Act (CESA): The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) administers the California Endangered Species Act. This Act prohibits . the "take" of any plant or animal species which has been designated by the Fish and

Wildlife Commission as either threatened or endangered in the state of California, Section 2080 of the Fish and Wildlife code prohibits "take" of any species that the commission determines to be an endangered or threatened species, and early consultation with the CDFW is required to avoid potential impacts to endangered or threatened species, as well as to develop an appropriate mitigation plan to avoid or minimize impacts to listed species.

California Fish and Game Code: All birds (especially raptors) and their nests are protected under Section 3503 of the California Fish and Game Code. Under the code, the take, possession, or destruction of birds, their nests or eggs is prohibited. To avoid violation of the "take" provisions of the code, project impacts at active nesting territories must be reduced or eliminated during the nesting period.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

}

)

Whenever a California public agency determines that a project may have significant environmental consequences, a formal evaluation is required under CEQA to evaluate the potential environmental impacts of a project. Under CEQA guidelines, a proposed project would result in a potentially significant impact if it were to have any of the following impacts:

- Hove a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, 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;
- Have a substantial adverse effect on any riporian 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 FWS.

- Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal. Filling, hydrological interruption, or other means:
- 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;
- 5. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance: or
- 6. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

}

.

.

4.0 METHODOLOGIES

)

Biological surveys were conducted on May 23 and 28, 2019 during which biologists from RCA Associates, inc. initially walked meandering transects throughout the site to collect data on the plant and wildlife communities. Following completion of the initial recommissance surveys, comprehensive (i.e., 100 percent coverage) pedestrian surveys were performed throughout the site to document the vegetation present on the property and the wildlife species which inhabit the area. The surveys were conducted as per the survey protocol requirements for NEPA/ESA compliance for BLM special status plant species, and as required by CDFW for special status plant n animal species.

In addition to the general biological investigations, focused/protocol surveys were also conducted to determine if desert tortoises or burrowing owls were present on the site. Although burrowing owls have not been documented in the region, given the mobility of the species and distribution of the species throughout California, focused surveys were conducted in conjunction with the other surveys performed. In addition, a habitat assessment was also performed for the Mohave ground squirrel. The applicable methodologies for the various field investigations performed are summarized below.

Pedestrian surveys were performed on the site and in the surrounding area from approximately 0700 to about 1350 hours on each survey day (May 23, and 28, 2019). During the field investigations, focused surveys were performed for the desert tortoise and burrowing owl and the habitat present on the site was evaluated for the presence of Mohave ground squirrel and desert tortoise. Weather conditions during the surveys consisted of winds ranging from 5 to 15 mph, temperatures from the low 70°s (F) to low-80°s (AM) (°F) with cloud cover ranging from 5 to 10 percent. All plants and wildlife detected during the field investigations were recorded and are provided in Tables 1 & 2 along with other species that have been documented in the area (Appendix A).

4.1 General Plant and Animal Surveys

Meandering pedestrian transects were walked throughout the site at a pace that allowed for careful documentation of the plant and animal present on the site. All plants observed were identified in the field and wildlife were identified through visual observations and/or by vocalizations. Tables 1 and 2 (Appendix A) provide a comprehensive compendium of the species observed and those expected to occur in the region. As part of the general plant surveys, the entire 25-acres was also surveyed for the presence of any sensitive plan species that have been documented in the region. The sensitive plants which have been documented in the region are discussed in Sections 4.0 and 5.0.

4.2 Special Status Wildlife Species

)

Based on the literature review there are fourteen special status plants and nine special status wildlife species which have been documented in the region. However, only five of these species either occur on the site or have a moderate likelihood of occurring on the property. These species include desert tortoise, Mohave ground squirrel, burrowing owl. LeConte's thrasher, and Booth's evening primrose. These species are discussed below in more detailed.

Desert Tortnise (*Gopherus agassizii*): A protocol survey was conducted for the desert tortoise in conjunction with the general biological surveys and the focused owl survey. The purpose of the protocol sorvey was to evaluate the site for the presence of tortoises, as well as the presence of any tortoise sign such as burrows, seats, carcasses, etc. USFWS and CDFW specify when protocol surveys for protocol surveys for tortoises should be conducted (i.e., April through May and September through October), therefore: the surveys were conducted on May 28, 2019.

As part of the surveys, 10-meter belt transects were walked throughout the site during which the entire 25-acre area was evaluated for the presence of any undisturbed areas

which might support vegetation typically associated with the desert tortoise, as well as the presence of tortoises and/or tortoise sign. Zone of influence surveys were also performed in the surrounding area.

Mohave Ground Squirrel (*Xerospermophilus mohavensis*): A habitat assessment was performed for the Mohave ground squirret as per CDFW protocol including an analysis of the on-site habitat, evaluation of local populations, and assessment of connectivity with habitats in the surrounding area which might support populations of the Mohave ground squirrel. If a site supports suitable habitat for the Mohave ground squirrel. CDFW may require payment of a mitigation fee for acquisition of mitigation lands to compensate for impacts to the species. In lieu of payment of mitigation fees, the proponent may conduct a live trapping survey to definitively determine the presence/absence following consultations with CDFW.

γ

Burrowing Owl (Athene cunicularia): The site was evaluated for owls and/or owl sign given the mobility and wide spread distribution of the species throughout California. The site was evaluated on May 23, 2019 for the presence of suitable habitat for the species. Owls utilize a variety of natural and modified habitats for nesting and foraging where the vegetation is low-growing. Typical habitats for the species include native and non-native grasslands, interstitial grassland within shrub lands, shrubs lands with low density cover, drainage ditches, earthern berms, pasture lands, and fatlow fields (CDFW, 1992). Burrowing owls typically utilize abandoned fossorial burrows which have been excavated by various mammals such as coyotes, foxes, ground squirrels, badgers, and dogs since they are no capable of excavating their own burrows. Owls may also use man-made structures such as electrical vaults, cement culverts, man-made structures, and large debris piles.

As part of the field investigations, the site was surveyed for the presence of owls and potential (i.e., occupiable) owl burrows. As required by survey protocol, belt transects

were walked in a north-south direction until the entire property had been checked for owls, potential burrows, as well as owl sign (burrows, tracks, whitewash, etc.). All transects were walked at a pace that allowed careful observations along the transect routes and in the immediate vicinity. Field notes were recorded regarding native plant assemblages, wildlife sign, and human affects in order to determine the presence or absence of suitable burrowing owl habitat.

LeConte's Thrasher (*Toxostoma lecontei*): The site was surveyed for LeConte's thrashers in conjunctions with the tortoise protocol surveys. The species is typically associated with desert scrub communities and is uncommon throughout the Mojave Desert.

4.3 Special Status Plant Species

As noted above, the site was evaluated for the presence of special status plant species which have been documented in the region according to CNDDB, CALFLORA, and BIOS. Special status species in the region are threatened by road construction, mining, orbanization, and grazing with some of the species listed as endangered by the State of California. As noted above, comprehensive surveys (100 percent coverage) were conducted throughout the entire 25-acres to determine if any specials status plants were present with emphasis placed on evaluating the site for the presence of sensitive plants which were previously observed on the site (i.e., Booth's Evening Primrose).

The rare plant survey performed included 10-meter pedestrian surveys throughout 100 percent of the 25-acre site in order to document the presence/absence of any special status plant species. Annual rainfall in 2019 fur California was above average; therefore, surveys were conducted at a time (May) when most plants, including special status plants, were expected to be flowering or at least identifiable. Fourteen special status plant species have been observed in the general region and of these four have the potential to occur on the site. These are discussed below.

Booth's Evening Primrose (*Camissonia boothii spp. Boothii***)**: This primrose species is an annual herb and is native to California. Nevada, and Arizona. It is found primarily in desert washes and desert scrub plant communities. It is a CNPS List 2.3 species and a BLM sensitive species. List 2 species are defined as 'rare, threatened, or endangered in California. This species has been documented east of the Sierra Nevda in Inyo, Mono, and San Bernardino Counties and was observed on the project site in 2006 (UltraSystems, June 21, 2006).

Pinyon rock cress (Arabis dispar): This species is a perennial herb typically occurring in Joshua tree woodland, juniper woodland communities, and Mojavean desert scrub communities. The elevational range of the plant is about 3,900 to 7,800 feet. It is a CNPS List 2 species, as well as, a BLM sensitive species.

Death Valley Beardtongue (*Penstemon fructiciformis var. amargosae***):** This perennial herb is a CNPS List 1B.3 and a BLM sensitive species. It is normally found in Mojavean desert scrub communities in sandy and gravely washes at an elevational range of 3,200 to 3,900 feet.

)

Charlotte's Phacelia (*Phacelia nashiana*): This Phacelia is an annual herb found in Mojavean desert scrub. Joshua tree woodlands, and pinyon-juniper woodlands on granitic and sandy soils. The plant normally occurs at an elevation of 1,900 to 7,200 feet.

5.0 LITERATURE SEARCH

)

As part of the environmental process, a search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB, 2019), CALFLORA, and BIOS was performed. The data base search included the USGS Cactus Peak, California quadrangle and the eight surrounding quadrangles in order to fully evaluate the existing conditions in the region in regards to special status species. Based on this review, it was determined that twelve special status plant species and nine special status wildlife species have been documented within the Region. The following tables provide data on each special status species.

NAME	NAME STATUS HABITAT REQUIREMENT		OCCURRENCE PROBABILITY
PLANTS			
Booth's evening primrose (Cammissonia boathii ssp. Bothii)	Fed: None State: None CNPS: List 2.3 BLM: S	Mojavean desert serub communities and Joshua tree woodlands from 2,900 to 7,800 feet elevation	Observed on site in 2006 and 2019.
Death Valley beardtongue (Penstemon frueticiformis var. amargosae)	Fed: None State: None CNPS: List 1B.3 BLM: S	Mojavean desert scrub communities from 3.200 to 4,000 feet elevation	Moderate probability of occur on site.
Pinyon rock cress (Arabis dispar)	Fed: None State: None CNPS: List 2 BEM: S	Mojavean desert scrub	Moderate probability of occurring on site.
Charlotte's phacelia (Phacelia nashiana)	Fed: None State: None CNPS: List 1B,2 BLM; S	Mojavean desert serub	Moderate probability of occurring on the site.
Darwin Mesa milk- vetch (Astragalus abratus yar, arensanus)	Fed: None State: None CNPS: List 1B.1 BLM: S	Mojavean desert serub 3900 to 7800 fect elevation	Not expected to occur on site,
Big Bear Valley woollypod (Astragalus leucolobus)	Ecd: None State: None CNPS: 1B.2	Pinyon and juniper woodlands from 5400 to 8,200 fect elevation	Not expected to occur on site.

Table 5-1:	 Special Status 	Plant and	Wildlife S	pecies in th	e Region,
------------	------------------------------------	-----------	------------	--------------	-----------

NAME	STATUS	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS	OCCURRENCI PROBABILITY
Kern County	Fed: None	Mujavean desert	Not expected to
elarkia	State: None	scrub from 2.700 to	occur on site.
(Clarkia santiana	CNPS: List 4.2	3.800 feet elevation.	
ssp. parviflora)			
Sanicle cymopterus	Fed: None	Mojavean desert	Not expected to
(Cymopterus	State: None	serub 3200 to \$400	occur on site.
ripleyi yar.	CNPS: List 1B.2	feet elevation	
suniculoides)	BLM: S		1 A
Inyo hulsea	Fed: None	Great basin scrub	Not to expected to
(Ihulsea vestila var.	State: None	5.400 to 9.800 feet	occur on site.
invoensis)	CNPS: List 1B.3	elevation	
Creamy blazing	Fed: None	Mojavean desett	Low probability of
star	State: None	scrub 2,200 to 3.800	occurrence on site.
(Mentzelia	CNPS: List 1B.3	feet elevation	
tridentata)	BLM: S		
Mono County	Fed: None	Great basin serub	Not expected to
phacetia (<i>Phacelia</i>	State: None	6.200 to 9,500 feet	occur on site.
monocasis)	CNPS: List 1B.1	elevation	
	BLM: S	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Charlotte's	Fed: None	Mojavean desert	Moderate
phacetia	State: None	scrub 1,900 to 7,200	probability of
(Phacelia	CNPS: List 1B.2	feet elevation	occurrence on site
nashiana)	BLM: S		
DeDecker's clover	Fed: None	Pinyon-juniper	Not expected to
(Trifolium	State; None	woodland 6,800 to	occur on site.
dødeckerae)	CNPS: List 1B.3	11.500 feet	
	BLM: S	elevation	
Owens Valley	Fed: None	Occurs in Owens	Not expected to
checkerbloom	State: Endangered	Valley in alkali	occur on site.
(Sidalcea covillei)	CNPS: List 1b.1	meadows	1
	BLM: S		
WILDLIFE			
San Emigdio blue	Fed: None	Desert canyons	Low probability of
butterfly	State: None	<u>д</u>	occurrence on site.
(Pluhulina	1		
emigdionis)			
Wong's springsnail	Fed: None	Freshwater habitats	Not expected to
(Pyrgulopsis wongi)	State: None		occur on site.
	Other: FSS		
Owens speckled	Fed: None	Amargosa River	Not expected to
dace (Rhinichthyes	State: None		occur on site.
osculus)	CDFW: SSC		

٠

•

)

-

NAME	STATUS	HABITAT REQUIREMENTS	OCCURRENCE PROBABILITY
Desert tortoise (<i>Ciopherus</i> agassizii)	Fed: 1 State: T	Mojavean desert scrub and Joshua tree woodlands	Moderate probability of occurrence on site.
Swainson's hawk (Buteo swainsoni)	Fed: None State: T	Varity of habitats throughout California	Low probability of occurrence on site.
Le Conte [°] s thrasher (<i>Toxostama</i> lecontei)	Federal: None State: None CDFW: SSC	Mojavean desert serub	Moderate probability of occurrence on site.
Pallid bat (Antrozous pallidus)	Federal: None State: None CDFW: SSC BLM: S	Chaparral. scrub, grassland, riparian woodland	Low probability of occurrence on site,
Fownsend's big- cared bat (<i>Corynorhinus</i> townsendii)	Federal: None State: None CDFW: SSC BLM: S	Broadleaved upland forests, chaparral, chenopod scrub, and grasslands.	Not expected to occur on site.
Panamint kangaroo att (<i>Dipodomys</i> panamintinus panamintinus)	Fed: None State: None CDFW: \$\$C	Sagebrush and piny on pine	Low probability of occurrence on site.
Silver-haired bat Lasionycteris noctivagans)	Fed: None State: None CDFW: SSC	Sierra Nevada and Great Basin areas	Not expected to occur on site.
Dwens Valley vole Micronus valifornicus valifornicus	Fed: None State: None CDFW; SSC	Variety of habitats in Owens Valley	Not expected to occur on site
Mojave Ground Squirret Spermophilus mohavensis)	Federal: None State: T CDFW: SSC BLM: S	Mojave desert scrub, Joshua tree woodland, chenopod scrub	Moderate probability of occurrence on site.
Golden engle Aquila chrysaetas)	Fed: None State: None CDFW: FP BLM: S	Open habituts	Low probability of occurrence on site.

)

Legend: 1 = Fhreatened F. = Endangered SSC = CDFW Species of Special Concern S = BLM Sensitive Species FSS = Forest Service Sensitive Species FP = Chilfornia Fully Protected

6.0 RESULTS

)

6.1 General Biological Resources

The property supports a desert serub plant community typical of the region with creosote bush (Larrea tridentata) and various saltbush (Atriplex vp.) the dominant species (Figures 3 and 4). A total of 50 plant species were identified during the field investigations. Other species common throughout the site included Indigo bush (Psorothammas fremonii), ephedra (Ephedra nevadensis), cheesebush (Hymenoclea salsola), Cooper's goldenbush (Ericameria cooperi), fiddleneck (Amsinckia tessellata), silver cholla (Opuntia echinocarpa), beavertail cactus (O basilaris), and cottontop cactus (Echinocarpa polycephalus). Other plant species noted included several brome grasses (Bronus sp.), Joshua tree (Yucca brevifolia), California buckwheat (Eriogonum fasciculatum), white bursage (Ambrosia dumosa), and needlegrass (Stipa speciasa), Table I (Appendix A) provides a compendium of all of the plants observed on the site.

The site supports a variety of wildlife species with jackrabbits (Lepus californieus), antelope ground squirrels (Annospermophilus lenetorus), and kangaróo rats (Dipodomys sp.) observed during the surveys. Tracks and sents of kit fox (Tulpes macrotis) and coyote (Canis latrans) were also identified. Reptile observations were limited to a few western whiptails (Cnemidophorus tigris) and side-blotched lizards (Utu stansburiana); although, other reptiles which have been observed in the area include desert spiny lizard (Sceloporus magister) and desert horned lizard (Phrynosoma platyrhinos). The only birds species observed included mourning dove (Zenaida macroura) and common raven (Corvus corax). Table 2 provides a compendium of wildlife which has been observed on the site and those known to occur in the region. No sensitive habitats such as blueline channels, vernal pools, or critical habitats for sensitive species were noted during the field investigations.

6.2 Federal and State Listed Species

J

There are two Federal and/or State listed species which have been documented in the surrounding region within the surrounding region which have a moderate potential for occurring on the site in the future: although, neither species was observed during the May 2019 investigations. These two species include the desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*) and Mohave ground squirret (*Xerospermilus mohavensis*). These two species are discussed below:

Desert Tortoise: Desert tortoises, which are listed as threatened by USFWS and CDFW, have been documented in the region; although, no tortoises have been recently documented in the immediate area. A protocol survey was conducted on May 28, 2019 to determine if the site supports the species. No tortoises were observed during the May 2019 surveys nor were any active tortoise burrows, seats or other sign (e.g., careasses, etc.) observed.

Mohave Ground Squirrel: Mohave ground squirrel (California threatened species) populations have been documented in the region and this species is dependent upon undisturbed desert scrub. Joshua tree woodlands, and chenopod scrub communities. Based on its behavior, the species is infrequently observed above ground except during a small window from about early February to March which is when the breeding season typically occurs.

6.3 Wildlife Species of Special Concern and Special Status Plants

There is one special status wildlife species and four special status plants species which have been documented within the region and which do occur or have a moderate potential for occurring on the site. These species include LeConte's thrasher, Booth's evening primrose, Pinyon rock cress, Death Valley Beardtongue, and Charlotte's phacelia. **Burrowing Owl:** The burrowing owl has a wide spread distribution throughout California: although, populations levels have been declining over the last several decades throughout the state. No owls were observed during the field investigations nor were any owl sign (e.g., whitewash, eastings, etc.) identified. Given the results of the surveys, the site does not currently support any owls and there is a low to moderate probability of the species occurring on the site in the near future.

LeConte's Thrasher: LeConte's thrasher's have been designated as a Species of Special Concern by CDFW, and this species use to have a relatively widespread distribution throughout the Owens Valley. Mojave Desert, Colorado Desert, the Kern River Basin, and the San Joaquin Valley. However, populations of the species have declined significantly over the last few decades with the species infrequently observed. The species has been documented in the region and has a moderate potential for occurring on the site.

¥

Booth's Evening Primrose: This printrose species is a CNPS List 2 species and BLM sensitive species. It is an annual herb found in Inyo, Mono and San Bernardino Counties. This species was previously observed in 2006 on the site and was also identified during the 2019 field investigations. Although rainfall has been above average in California, only three locations of the species were identified, which may be an indication of lower rainfall in the area where mine site is located. The locations of the 2019 observations are shown on Figure 3, and the GPS locations are: 36.098396 117.868392; 36.098221 117.867968; and 36.097458 117.867316.

<u>Pinyon Rock Cress</u>: Pinyon rock cress is a CNPS List 2 plant and BLM sensitive species that is found in Inyo, Mono. San Bernardino, and Tulare Counties, and is also found in Nevada. It is found in Mojavean desert scrub, Pinyon/Juniper woodlands, and Joshua tree woodlands and has a moderate potential for occurring on the site. However, no Pinyon rock cress plants were identified during the May 2019 field investigations, nor

was the species observed during previous surveys conducted in 2006. The species does have a moderate potential for occurring on the site.

Death Valley Beardtongue: This plant is listed as a CNPS List 1B.3 plant, as well as a HLM sensitive species. It occurs in Inyo and San Bernardino counties and in Nevada where it occurs primarily in Mojavean desert scrub communities. The species was not observed in May 2019, nor was it previously observed in 2006; although, there is a moderate potential for the species occurring on the site.

<u>Charlotte's Phacelia:</u> Charlotte's phacelia is a CNPS List 1B.2 species, as well as a BLM sensitive species. It is typically found in Mojavean desert scrub, Pinyon'Juniper woodland, and Joshua tree woodland communities throughout Inyo. Kern, and Tulare Counties. Although the species was not observed during 2019 or in previous surveys, there a moderate potential for the plant to occur on the site

6.4 Other Sensitive Plants

Joshua trees occur throughout the mine site with the highest density in the northern portion of the site. Joshua trees are considered an important component in desert habitats and provide a valuable resource or a variety of wildlife species for nesting, perching, and protection for smaller species such as lizards and rodents. Therefore, impacts to Joshua trees during exploratory activities, as well as any future mining will need to be evaluated and measures implemented to minimize impact to the species.

18

7.0 IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Potential Impacts

)

Special Status Wildlife: As noted above, no desert tortoises were observed during the field investigations nor were any tortoise sign (e.g., seats, active/inactive burrows, etc.) noted. In addition, no Mohave ground squirrels were observed, although the above ground activities of the species are limited to a very narrow window. Based on the focused surveys conducted for the desert tortoises it is the opinion of RCA Associates, luc, that the site does not support tortoises at the present time; furthermore, the likelihood of the site supporting Mnhave ground squirrels is limited.

In addition, no burrowing owls or LeConte's thrashers were seen on the site; although, these species could potentially inhabit the site in the future given the mobility of these two hird species. The proposed exploratory excavations and future mining activities are not expected to impact the desert tortoise, burrowing owl, or LeConte's thrasher given their absence from the site.

Special Status Plants: As noted above, Booth's evening primrose plants (CNPS List 2 and BLM sensitive species) were observed on the site in 2006 and were also identified during the most recent rare plant survey conducted in May 2019. The three documented locations of the species were outside of the proposed 5-acre exploratory area as shown on Figure 3: therefore, the exploratory activities are not expected to impact the species. It's CNPS status (List 2 species) does not provide any legal status for the species; however, any future impacts to a CNPS plant during future mining activities may be considered significant under CEQA. Therefore, implementation of various measures to minimize impacts may be required prior to the start of any mining activities outside of the exploration area. Section 7.0 provides a list of recommendations for the species.

Three other special status plants have a moderate potential for occurring on the site including pinyon rock cress. Death Valley heardtongue, and Charlotte's phacelia.

However, none of these plants have been identified on the site either during previous surveys or during the May 2019 field investigations. Therefore, proposed exploratory activities, as well as future mining, are not expected to have any impacts on any of these species.

Joshua trees occur throughout the site and would likely be impacted by proposed exploratory activities and potential future mining activities. Section 7.0 provides a list of potential measures which may need to be implemented to minimize impacts to Joshua trees.

7.2 Recommendations

)

Outline below are specific measures which may be required to minimize impacts to sensitive plant species.

<u>Special Status Plants:</u> As discussed above, Booth's evening primose plants (CNPS List 2.5 and BLM sensitive species) and Joshua trees were observed on the site; therefore, the following measures may need to be implemented to minimize impacts.

- Booth's evening primrose, and any other special status plants occur in the area where ground disturbance activities will occur, should be avoided. Where avoidance is not possible, the plants should be salvaged prior to ground disturbance activities and relocated to an area approved by BLM.
- Discussions with BLM should be conducted to determine measures which may need to be implemented to avoid and/or relocate any Joshua trees which may be located in the areas where ground disturbance will occur.

7.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baldwin, Bruce G, et. al.

2002. The Jepson Desert Manual. Vascular Plants of Southeastern California, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA,

Biogeographic Information & Observation System (BIOS) 2019. https://wildlife.ca.gov/data/BIOS

Bureau of Land Management January 2005. Final Environmental Impact Report and Statement for the West Mojave Plan. Vol. 1A.

California Burrowing Owl Consortium 1993. Burrowing Owl Survey Protocol and Mitigation Guidelines

California Department of Fish and Game

1990. California Wildlife: Volume 1 (Amphibians and Reptiles), Volume II (Birds), and Volume III (Mammals).

California Department of Fish and Game 1995. Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation.

California Department of Fish and Game March 7, 2012. Staff Report on Burrowing Owl Mitigation. 34 pp.

California Department of Fish and Game 2019. Rarefind 3 Natural Diversity Database. Habitat and Data Analysis Branch Sacramento, CA.

California Native Plant Society

2001. Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California (sixth edition), Rare Plant Scientific Advisory Committee, David P. Tibor, Convening Editor, California Native Plant Society. Sacramento, CA x 4 388 pp.

CAFLORA

)

2019. https://wildlife.ca.gov.

EREMICO, August 2004. Biological Resources Survey on an 80-Acre Parcel (APN 3233-241-01), Victorville, San Bernardino County, California, 38pp.

Ehrlich, P., Dobkin,, Wheye, D.

Birder's Handbook. A Field Guide to the Natural History of North American Birds. Simon & Schuster Building Rockefeller Center 1230 Avenue of the Americas. New York, New York 10020.

Hickman, James C.

The Jepson Manual Higher Plants of California. University of California Press. Berkeley, CA. 3rd Edition. 1996.

Jaeger, Edmund C.

1969. Desert Wild Flowers. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California. 321 pp.

Kays, R. W. & Wildson, D. E.

Mammals of North America. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 2002.

Munz, Philip A.

1974. A Flora of Southern California. University of California Press, Berkeley, California, 1086 pp.

Sibley, David Allen.

National Audubon Society. The Sibley guide to Birds. Alfred A Knopf, Inc. 2000.

Stebbins, Robert C.

A Field Ouide to Western Reptiles and Amphibians. Houghton Mifflin Company, 2003.

UltraSystems

)

June 21, 2006. Rare Plant Survey Report: Makuyla II Exploration Plan. 13pp.

UltraSystems

September 2007. Biological Resources Report: Makayla II Mining Operation, Inyo, California. 18pp.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

2010 Desert Tortoise Survey Protocol.

Whitaker, John O.

The Audubon Society Field Guide to North American Mammals. Alfred A Knopf, Inc. 1980.

y vipuəddy.

sonngi'i bins solda'f

(

SCIENTIFIC NAME	COMMON NAME
mbrosia acamhicarpa	Bursage
mbrosia dimosa 👘 👘	White bursage
msinckia tessellata	Fiddleneck
stragalus cimea	Cima astragalus
stragalus mitans	Providence Mountain milkvetch
stragalus calycosus	Torry's milkytech
triplex canescens	Fourwing saltbush
triplex confertifolia	Shadscale
triplex polycurpa	Saltbush
Bromus madritensis	Red brome
Bromus tectorum	Cheutgrass
Bronnus sp	Unknown
amissonia boothii ssp. boothii	Booth's evening primrose
Chorizanthe rigida	Spineflower
Toreopsis calliopsidea	Coreopsis
Echimocactus polycephulus	Cottomop cactus
phedra nevadensis	Ephedra
Fridstrum diffusum	Woollystar
Ericomeria cooperi Cooper's goldenbush	
Triogonum deflexum	Flat topped buckwheat
riogonum fasiculatum	California buckwheat
riogonum inflatum	Desert trumpet
riogonum sp.	Unknown
riogonum nidularium	Bird nest buckwheat
Trioganum pusillum	Yellow turbon
Trodium circutarium	Ileron's bill
Sschaltzia glyptosperma	Desert poppy
iilia densifolia yar. Mohavensis	Mojave gilia
filio scopularium	Rock gilia
lymenoclea salsola	Cheesebush
arrea tridentata	Creosote bush
yeium andersonii	Anderson's desert thorn
ordylanthuys eremicus	Purple bird's beak
ylorhiza tortifolia	Mojave aster
falacothrix sonchoides	Desert dandelion
)enothera deltoides	Birdcage evening primrose
Ipuntia basilaris	Beavertail cactus
Ipuntia echinocarpa	Silver cholla
hyzopsis hymenoides	Indian ricegrass
The second	

)

Table 1: Plants observed on the site during May 2019 field investigations.

Table 1, continued

)

Phacelia distans	Heliotrope
Poa secunda	Bluegrass
Psorothammus arborescens	Indigo bash
Psorothamnus fremontii	Fremont indigo bush
Salazaria mexicana	Paperbag plant
Salosola tragus	Russian thistle
Salvia columbariae	Sage
Schismus harbatus	Schismus
Sphaeralcea ambigua	Globernallow
Stipa speciosus	Needlegrass
Yucca breviflolia	Joshua tree

NOTE. The above table is not a comprehensive list of every plant species which may occur on the site but it list of those species which were observed during the May 2019 field investigations.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Location
Jackrabbit	Lepus californicus	On site and surrounding area
Antelope ground squirrel	Ammospermophilus leucurus	
Coyotes	Canis latrans	
Kit fox	Vulpes macrotis	
Kangaroo rat	Dipodomys sp.	
Common raven	Corvus corax	
Mourning dove	Zenaida macroura	
Pigeon	Columbalivia domestica	
Northern mockingbird	Minus polyglottus	4+
Desert spiny lizard	Seeloporus magister	
Western whiptail lizard	Cuemidophorus tigris	
Side-blotched lizard	Uta stansburiana	
Desert woodrat	Neotoma lepida	Known to occur in the area.

Table 2 - Wildlife observed on the site and/or in the surrounding region during the field investigations.

Note: The above Table is not a comprehensive list of every animal species which may occur in the general area, but is a fist of those common species which were identified on the site or in the region, or those that have been previously identified in the area.



€ .



{





CENTER OF SITE LOOKING NORTH

)

1



CENTER OF SITE LOOKING EAST





1

)

CENTER OF SITE LOOKING SOUTH



CENTER OF SITE LOOKING WEST

