MENDOCINO COUNTY CANNABIS CULTIVATION PERMIT CEQA GUIDELINES SECTION 15168 REVIEW

Date: (INSERT MONTH) (INSERT YEAR)

Activity Title: INSERT SITE NAME

Lead Agency: County of Mendocino

Contact: Julia Acker Krog, Chief Planner

Mendocino County Planning and Building Services

860 North Bush Street, Ukiah, CA 95482

(707) 234-6650

Location: INSERT ADDRESS

Coastal Zone: No

Affected Parcel(s): INSERT APN

Mendocino County General Plan Land Use Designation: INSERT LAND USE DESIGNATION

Mendocino County Zoning Designation: INSERT ZONING DISTRICT

Purpose

On March 21, 2017, the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors (County) adopted a Program Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (Program MND) (SCH No. 2016112028) for Ordinance No. 4381, known as the Medical Cannabis Cultivation Regulations (MCCR; subsequently renamed the Mendocino Cannabis Cultivation Regulations), which added Chapters 10A.17 [Mendocino County Cannabis Ordinance (MCCO)] and 20.242 (Cannabis Cultivation Sites) to the Mendocino County Code (Code). The Initial Study prepared for the Program MND in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) identified the existing baseline set of physical characteristics for the inland unincorporated area of Mendocino County. The Program MND, in accordance with Section 15158 of the State CEQA Guidelines, evaluated the potential impacts associated with implementation of the MCCR with regard to the following environmental resources:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture and Forestry Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality

- Land Use and Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

The Program MND evaluated the direct and indirect impacts, in addition to the activity-specific and cumulative impacts, that would result from implementation of the MCCR. The Program MND identified potentially significant impacts related to aesthetics, agriculture and forestry resources, air quality, biological resources, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, and utilities and service systems.

However, feasible mitigation measures were identified that would reduce all potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Several addenda have been completed for minor modifications to the MCCR approved by the County since adoption of the Program MND in March 2017, under the following ordinances: Ordinance No. 4392, adopted on August 9, 2017; Ordinance No. 4405, adopted on March 13, 2018; Ordinance No. 4408, adopted on April 28, 2018; Ordinance No. 4411, adopted on June 5, 2018; Ordinance No. 4413, adopted on July 10, 2018; Ordinance No. 4420, adopted on December 4, 2018; Ordinance No. 4422, adopted on December 18, 2018; and Ordinance No. 4438, adopted on October 1, 2019. Since no substantial changes were proposed which would require major revisions to the previously approved MND, none of the proposed changes to the Activity would increase the severity of previously identified significant effects, result in a new environmental effect, affect the effectiveness of the mitigation measures, or require additional mitigation is required, subsequent MNDs were not required pursuant to Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

As each activity established under the MCCR involves site-specific operations, this written checklist has been prepared to document the evaluation of the site and the activity to demonstrate that the environmental effects of the activity were evaluated and within the scope of the Program MND, in accordance with Section 15168(c)(4) of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Activity Description: [TO BE INSERTED BY PLANNER]

I.	AESTHETICS . Are the environmental effects related to aesthetics within the scope of impacts analyzed by the Program MND, including the following:	Yes	No
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?		
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?		
c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?		

I.a-b) Mendocino County is predominantly rural with a very scenic and visually diverse aesthetic character. Scenic resources within the County include redwood and other forests, natural open space and rangeland, and agricultural areas. However, the proposed activity is not located within a City- or County-mapped or designated scenic vista or within a scenic resources area. The MCCR, specifically Chapter 20.242 (Cannabis Cultivation Sites), has identified the zoning districts where cannabis cultivation is allowed to occur, in addition to specific standards and requirements with which existing and proposed cannabis cultivation sites must comply. Based on review of the proposed activity, the activity is found to be consistent with all requirements outlined in the MCCR and the activity, including associated cannabis-related infrastructure, would be compatible with the surrounding area. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

I.c) The activity would occur in a non-urbanized area and would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. Although the activity may include new cannabis-related infrastructure such as new structures, fencing, and grading that may be visible, these types of improvements are consistent with other types of infrastructure found within rural residential or agricultural areas. Based on review of the proposed activity, the activity is found to be consistent with all requirements outlined in the MCCR and the activity, including associated cannabis-related infrastructure, would be compatible with the surrounding area. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

I.d) Fencing requirements, setbacks, lighting restrictions, and sensitivity to nearby receptors are all considered in the MCCO per Section 10A.17.040(A). These regulations include requiring all outdoor security lighting be downward facing and shielded in order to minimize visual effects. Additionally, any indoor and mixed light cultivation operations that have artificial lighting shall be downcast and fully contained within structures or otherwise be shielded to fully contain any light or glare involved in the cultivation process. Based on review of the proposed activity, the activity is found to be consistent with all requirements outlined in the MCCR and the activity, including associated cannabis-related infrastructure, would be compatible with the surrounding area. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

II.	AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES . Are the environmental effects related to agriculture and forestry resources within the scope of impacts analyzed by the Program MND, including the following:	Yes	No
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?		
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?		
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 PRC section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?		
d)	Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?		
e)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?		

II.a-c) The activity would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, conflict with or cause rezoning of existing zoning for agricultural use or forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production, or conflict with an existing Williamson Act contract. The County's Williamson Act Policies and Procedures include cannabis cultivation as a compatible use. For the purposes of Division 10 of the Business and Professions Code (the Medicinal and Adult-Use Cannabis Regulation and Safety Act; "MAUCRSA") cannabis is an agricultural product. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

II.d) The activity would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use. MCCO Section 10A.17.090(T) prohibits removal of any commercial tree species as defined by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (Cal Fire) and the removal of any true oak species for the purposes of developing a cannabis cultivation site. Based on review of the proposed activity, the activity is found to be consistent with all requirements outlined in the MCCR. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the program MND.

II.e) The activity would not involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use. As discussed above, cannabis is an agricultural product for purposes of MAUCRSA and its cultivation is consistent with and similar to other agricultural activities that occur on agricultural lands. Additionally, pursuant to MCCO Section 10A.17.090(T), tree removal for the purpose of developing a cultivation site is prohibited. Review of the proposed activity indicates the activity would be consistent with all requirements outlined in the MCCR and would be compatible with the surrounding area. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the program MND.

III.	AIR QUALITY. Are the environmental effects related to air quality within the scope of impacts analyzed by the Program MND, including the following:	Yes	No
a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?		
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or activityed air quality violation?		
c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the activity region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?		
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?		
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?		

III.a-c) The proposed activity would not obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality control plan, violate any air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. The entire County has been determined to be in attainment for all Federal criteria air pollutants and in attainment for all State standards except Particulate Matter less than 10 microns in size (PM₁₀). In January of 2005, MCAQMD adopted a Particulate Matter Attainment Plan establishing a policy framework for the reduction of PM₁₀ emissions, and has adopted Rule 1-430 which requires specific dust control measures during all construction operations, the grading of roads, or the clearing of land. The activity is required to obtain all approvals and permits required by the respective agencies, including but not limited to MCAQMD. {Planner to insert additional site specific information} In addition, the proposed activity is required to meet all requirements of the MCCR and MCAQMD, which include provisions to minimize emissions and fugitive dust impacts. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

III.d and e) Cannabis cultivation is identified as an agricultural product for purposes of MAUCRSA. Odors and associated pollutants from agricultural operations on appropriately zoned parcels are a typical and anticipated circumstance and are not typically defined as a nuisance. The proposed activity meets all standards of the MCCR. As a result, the activity would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or created objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

IV.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES . Are the environmental effects related to biological resources within the scope of impacts analyzed by the Program MND, including the following:	Yes	No
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		
b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		
c)	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?		
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?		
e)	Conflict with any local policies or Ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or Ordinance?		
f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?		

IV.a-c.) The activity would not have a substantial adverse effect on any special status species, riparian habitat, other sensitive natural community, or State or federally protected wetlands. Activity review has included an evaluation of the possibility for presence or habitat suitable for sensitive species and natural communities, including riparian habitat and wetlands. The issuance of a cultivation permit under the MCCR (including MCCO Section 10A.17.100(A)(2)) includes a requirement that a cultivator demonstrate that there would be a less than significant impact to sensitive species and habitats. [Planner to insert additional site specific information] This activity has complied with this requirement and demonstrated that there would not be a significant impact. In addition, Mendocino County General Plan policies mandate that all activities must avoid wetlands, protect stream banks, and riparian corridors. The activity would be located more than 50 feet from any watercourse and would avoid wetlands. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

IV.d) The activity would not 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. {Planner to insert additional site specific information} Cannabis cultivation sites are limited in size (no larger than 1 acre), and therefore would typically not be large enough to substantially interfere with movement of wildlife. Even if multiple cultivation sites were located near one another, they would be unlikely to substantially impede wildlife movement because there would be separation between the cultivation sites, due to required setbacks and limits on the percentage of a parcel that can be dedicated to cannabis cultivation, allowing wildlife to pass through or around the area. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

IV.e-f) The activity would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources including tree preservation, nor would the activity conflict or interfere with provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan. Under the MCCR all applications for a permit must comply with all local ordinances and

regulations, including those intended to protect biological resources. In addition, pursuant to MCCO Section 10A.17.090(T), tree removal for the purpose of developing a cultivation site is prohibited. Review of the proposed activity indicates the activity would be consistent with all requirements outlined in the MCCR and would be compatible with the surrounding area. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.



V.	CULTURAL RESOURCES . Are the environmental effects related to cultural resources within the scope of impacts analyzed by the Program MND, including the following:	Yes	No
a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to §15064.5?		
b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?		
c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		
d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		
e)	Would the activity cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code 21074?		

V.a-e) The activity would not cause a substantial adverse impact to historical and archaeological resources, directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, or cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource. Assembly Bill (AB) 52 amended CEQA to address California Native American tribal concerns regarding how cultural resources of importance to tribes are treated under CEQA. Consultation with California Native American tribes was completed pursuant to AB 52 during development of the MCCR. No responses were received during the consultation process that indicate that the MCCR may have an effect on tribal or other cultural resources.

A search of the University of California Museum of Paleontology (UCMP) collections database identified 193 paleontological resources in Mendocino County, with the majority of the resources found in coastal areas. The MCCR currently allows cultivation sites only within land subject to the Inland Zoning Code of the County. As a result, due to the activity's location, it is unlikely that any paleontological resources exist within the activity site.

All activities carried out pursuant to the MCCR are subject to the requirements of Division IV – Archaeological Discoveries of the Mendocino County Archaeological Ordinance (Chapter 22.12 of the Code) which provides guidance to property owners and others in the event of the unexpected or inadvertent discovery of any archaeological, paleontological, or tribal cultural resources, including human remains, during grading or similar activities. All activities carried out by permittee pursuant to the MCCR will be subject to the requirements and guidance of the Mendocino County Archaeological Ordinance. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

VI.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS . Are the environmental effects related to geology and soils within the scope of impacts analyzed by the Program MND, including the following:	Yes	No
a)	Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:		
	i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.		
	ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?		
	iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?		
	iv) Landslides?		
b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		
c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the activity, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?		
d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?		
e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?		

VI. a and c) The risk of people or structures experiencing substantial adverse effects associated with seismic ground shaking, ground failure, liquefaction, landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse as a result of the activity is minor. The primary land use contemplated in the MCCR is agricultural in nature. Any associated structures are required to be permitted in accordance with the California Building Code. Any existing structures that were built without the benefit of a permit are required to receive after-the-fact permitting. Any new development is required to comply with the seismic zone standards of the California Building Code. These standards are in place to ensure that structures are designed and built to withstand strong seismic ground shaking and minimize potential geological risks. In addition, the MCCR requires compliance with the standards of the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (NCRWQCB) Order 2015-0023 or any substantially equivalent rule that may be subsequently adopted by the County of Mendocino or other responsible agency to remedy unstable conditions on existing sites and to mitigate the exposure of people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects related to landslides and unstable areas. Since the adoption of the MCCR, the NCRWQCB General Order has been replaced by the Cannabis Cultivation General Order of the State Water Resources Control Board (General Order). Based on review of the proposed activity, the activity is found to be consistent with all requirements outlined in the MCCR and the activity, including associated cannabis-related infrastructure, would be compatible with the surrounding area. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

VI.b) The proposed activity may have areas that result in temporarily exposed bare soil or disturbed soil and that are prone to erosion or loss of topsoil.

The MCCR includes requirements for implementation of appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) from the "Best Management Practices for Discharges of Waste Resulting from Cannabis Cultivation and Associated Activities or Operations with Similar Environmental Effects", as presented in Appendix B of the

General Order (pursuant to Section 10A.17090) to prevent and minimize erosion of soils from wind and water, which include but are not limited to the following:

- 1) Installation of adequate road ditch relief drains or rolling dips only where necessary since frequent routine grading can cause the ditch to erode;
- 2) Use of sediment control devices such as check dams or sandbag barriers when necessary to disperse ditch water, which would otherwise cause further erosion; and
- 3) Compaction and contouring of stored soil spoil piles to mimic natural slope contours, which reduces the potential for fill saturation and failure.

Based on review of the proposed activity, the activity is found to be consistent with requirements outlined in the MCCR to prevent and minimize erosion of soils. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

VI.d) Any proposed development on-site would be required to meet all requirements and standards specified in the California Building Code, including foundation design. Even if expansive clay soils are present, building code requirements will ensure that development is appropriate for the site. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

VI.e) Any activity requiring use of a septic system would be required to be sited, designed, and constructed in accordance with County rules and regulations regarding soils, siting, and slope. In addition, existing and new cultivation facilities would be required to comply with the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) policy. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

VII	. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS . Are the environmental effects related to greenhouse gas emissions within the scope of impacts analyzed by the Program MND, including the following:	Yes	No
a)	Generate greenhouse gas emissions (GHG), either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?		
b)	Conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?		

VII.a) The MCCR contains provisions to reduce potential greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions associated with cannabis cultivation. Per the MCCR, the activity would ultimately be required to utilize power from the PG&E grid or have a source of on-site energy generation such as solar. Generators may be used in the short term, but must be phased out within approximately 6 years. Based on review of the proposed activity, the activity is found to be consistent with all requirements to reduce GHG emissions outlined in the MCCO. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

VII.b) The proposed activity would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs. Currently, there is no adopted plan or policy in Mendocino County specifically related to GHG emissions. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

VII.	HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Are the environmental effects		
	related to hazards and hazardous materials within the scope of	Yes	No
	impacts analyzed by the Program MND, including the following:		
a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the		
	routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Ш	
b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release		
	of hazardous materials into the environment?		
c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?		
d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?		
e)	For an activity 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 activity result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the activity area?		
f)	For an activity within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the activity result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the activity area?		
g)	Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?		
g)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to an urbanized area or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?		

VIII.a) Hazardous materials, such as gasoline, diesel fuel, hydraulic fluids, oils, lubricants, and cleaning solvents, would be anticipated to be used at the activity site. The transport of hazardous materials by trucks is regulated by federal safety standards under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of Transportation. The use and disposal of hazardous materials is controlled in accordance with the standards of the General Order. Compliance with the General Order is a requirement of the MCCR. With the implementation of these standard ordinance requirements and required compliance with federal, State, and local standards, the transport, use, and disposal of such materials under the activity would not create a significant hazard to the public. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

VIII.b) The types and quantities of hazardous materials to be used on-site are not expected to pose a significant risk to the public and/or environment. The transport, use, and storage of any hazardous materials at the activity site would be required to be conducted in accordance with all federal, State, and local regulations. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

VIII.c) Although cannabis cultivation is permitted within one-quarter mile of a school, in accordance with the MCCR [MCCO Section 10A.17.040(A)(1) and (B)], cultivation activities would be required to comply with the standards of the General Order which establishes BMP for handling and controlling hazardous materials. In addition, cannabis cultivation activities would not routinely involve emitting hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

VIII.d) The location of the proposed activity and has been checked against the lists of hazardous materials sites maintained by the State of California (Cortese List) as required by Section 10A.17.090 of the MCCO. The proposed activity is not located on a site included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5, or is otherwise in compliance and compatible with any cleanup and

abatement order established for the site. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

VIII.e-f) While there is the potential for cannabis cultivation facilities to be proposed within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip, the heights and density of structures associated with these operations will not conflict with an airport plan. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

VIII.g) The proposed activity is subject to the Mendocino County Building Regulations, CBC, and any new development and commercial cannabis activities, such as the activity, would be required to meet California Fire Code standards and requirements, as well as comply with the standards outlined in Public Resources Code 4290, included under Section 10A.17.110(H) of the MCCO, which includes the following:

- 1) Road standards for fire equipment access;
- 2) Standards for signs identifying streets, roads, and buildings;
- 3) Minimum private water supply reserves for emergency fire use; and
- 4) Fuel breaks and greenbelts.

The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

IX.h) As discussed above, the proposed activity would be subject to the requirements of the MCCR, Mendocino County Building Regulations, the CBC, the California Fire Code, and Public Resources Code 4290 [included under Section 10A.17.110(H) of the MCCO], which include standards and requirements to ensure fire risks are minimized. Based on compliance with these measures, the proposed activity would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

IX.	HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY . Are the environmental effects related to hydrology and water quality within the scope of impacts analyzed by the Program MND, including the following:	Yes	No
a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		
b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?		
c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?		
d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a matter which would result in flooding on- or off-site?		
e)	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?		
f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		
g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary of Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?		
h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows?		
i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?		
j)	Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?		

IX.a and c-f) The proposed activity would not violate any water quality standards, waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality. Cultivators are required by the County and State to implement management practices that minimize impacts to the water quality. Per Sections 10A.17.090 (W) and 10A.17.110 (G) of the MCCO, the proposed activity would be required to comply with the standard conditions contained in Order 2015-0023 of the NCRWQCB or any substantially equivalent rule that may be subsequently adopted by the County of Mendocino or other responsible agency The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

IX.b) The proposed activity would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the activity may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin. The General Order requires the implementation of water conservation measures, irrigation at agronomic rates, and limiting groundwater withdrawals in consideration of beneficial uses by other water users in the same watershed. Also, the proposed activity would not introduce a significant amount of new impervious area that would substantially impact groundwater recharge. Based on review of the proposed activity, the activity is found to be consistent with all requirements outlined in the MCCR and the General Order. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

IX.g-i) The activity would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other hazard delineation map. Measures included in the MCCO include measures to stabilize soil and prevent mudflow. All existing and proposed structures associated with cultivation are required to comply with the Mendocino County Flood Plain Ordinance. The

proposed activity is not within the coastal zone, and according to the Department of Conservation's Planning Scenario Tsunami Inundation Map, the proposed activity is outside the tsunami inundation zone. The proposed activity would not involve any alterations that would increase the potential for inundation. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.



Χ.	LAND USE AND PLANNING. Are the environmental effects related to hydrology and water quality within the scope of impacts analyzed by the Program MND, including the following:	Yes	No
a)	Physically divide an established community?		
b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?		
c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?		

X.a) There is no subdivision of land, installation of new infrastructure, or changes to general plan land use or zoning designations proposed that would divide an established community as a result of the activity. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

X.b) The proposed activity would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation as it has been found to be in conformance with the MCCR. The MCCR was adopted in conformance with the Mendocino County General Plan and the Ukiah Valley Area Plan (UVAP). The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

X.c) According to the United States Fish and Wildlife Environmental Conservation Online System, there are two Habitat Conservation Plans for Mendocino County covering a total of 35.2 acres. The activity site is not included under a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Additionally, the MCCR does not authorize any property owner to avoid or alter the requirements of an adopted habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan if they are applicable to a site. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

XI.	MINERAL RESOURCES . Are the environmental effects related to mineral resources within the scope of impacts analyzed by the Program MND, including the following:	Yes	No
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?		
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?		

XI.a-b) Mineral extraction is not an activity covered by the MCCR. Cannabis cultivation is generally an agricultural-type activity which does not render the locations on which it occurs unavailable for future mineral extraction. The proposed activity would not 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, as the site is not identified as such. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

XII.	NOISE . Are the environmental effects related to noise within the scope of impacts analyzed by the Program MND, including the following:	Yes	No
a)	Expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		
b)	Expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		
c)	Result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the activity vicinity above levels existing without the activity?		
d)	Result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the activity vicinity above levels existing without the activity?		
e)	For an activity 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 activity expose people residing or working in the activity area to excessive noise levels?		
f)	For an activity within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the activity expose people residing or working in the activity area to excessive noise levels?		

XII.a, c, and d) The proposed activity would not expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. Pursuant to Section 10.A.17.040(F) of the MCCO:

"All activities associated with the cultivation of medical cannabis shall not exceed the noise level standards as set forth in the County General Plan Policies DE100, 101 and 103."

Policies DE-100, DE-101, and DE-103 of Chapter 3 (Development Element) of the Mendocino County General Plan provide the County's standards for maximum exterior noise levels for residential land uses, the noise compatibility guidelines for use in determining the general compatibility of planned land uses, and the County's standards for acceptable indoor intermittent noise levels for various types of land uses, respectively.

Construction and installation of cultivation materials at the activity site has the potential to result in increased noise levels in the activity vicinity (although temporary in nature), as well as operation of the proposed activity. Any sites utilizing generators (prior to phasing them out) must, at a minimum, be equipped with a muffler to lessen potential noise impacts. Review of the proposed activity indicates the activity would be in conformance with all established policies and regulations. Continued conformance is a requirement of the MCCR. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

XII.b) With the exception of temporary vibrations created during construction and installation of cultivation materials at approved medical cannabis cultivation sites, there are no elements of the proposed activity that would expose persons to or generate excessive ground borne vibration or groundborne noise levels. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

XII.e-f) Nine (9) airports (6 public use and 3 private use airports) are located within the County of Mendocino. Although aircraft may travel overhead of the site, there are no elements of the proposed activity that would expose people residing or working in the activity area to excessive noise levels due to proximity to airports. Review of the proposed activity indicates the activity would be in conformance with all established polices and regulations. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

to	POPULATION AND HOUSING . Are the environmental effects related o population and housing within the scope of impacts analyzed by he Program MND, including the following:	Yes	No
(6	nduce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly e.g., by proposing new homes and/or businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?		
	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?		
	Displace substantial numbers people, necessitating the construction of eplacement housing elsewhere?		

XIII.a) The proposed activity would not induce substantial population growth in the vicinity of the activity or within the County. Although employees associated with the activity would be anticipated to live locally, it is possible for workers to relocate from another area. Although new employees may be associated with the activity, housing can be provided within areas planned and zoned for residential development. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

XIII.b-c) The proposed activity would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing. Therefore, the activity would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES . Are the environmental effects related to public services within the scope of impacts analyzed by the Program MND, including the following:	Yes	No
Would the activity result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:		
a) Fire protection?		
b) Police protection?		
c) Schools?		
d) Parks?		
e) Other public facilities?		

XIV.a-b) The proposed activity would not create the need for additional police or fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause a significant environmental impact, as the proposed activity would comply with all standards and requirements. Adherence to measures contained in the activity's security plan (MCCO Section 10.A.17.090(N)), applicable Building Codes (MCCO Section 10.A.17.090(S), and fire safety standards (MCCO Section 10.A.090(U)), including but not limited to proper road widths, road signage, emergency water supply, and fuel breaks, in addition to other performance standards, would improve safety at the activity site and reduce the need for police and fire protection services. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

XIV.c-e) The proposed activity would not cause impacts that would require increased public services related to schools, parks or other public facilities, as there are no activity components that would include any form of development or use that would necessitate the development of such facilities. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

XV	7. RECREATION . Are the environmental effects related to recreation within the scope of impacts analyzed by the Program MND, including the following:	Yes	No
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?		
b)	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?		

XV.a) The proposed activity would not 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. The proposed activity would not induce substantial population growth in the vicinity of the activity or County, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities would not substantially increase. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

XV.b) The proposed activity would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. As noted above, since the proposed activity would not induce substantial population growth in the vicinity of the site or County, the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities would not substantially increase, necessitating the construction or expansion of recreational facilities. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

XV	I. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Are the environmental effects related to transportation/traffic within the scope of impacts analyzed by the Program MND, including the following:	Yes	No
a)	Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?		
b)	Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestions management agency for designated roads or highways?		
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?		
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?		
f)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?		

XVI.a and f) The activity would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation and relevant components of the circulation system, nor would the activity conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. While traffic may potentially increase due to new cannabis cultivation operations, all proposed operations would need to be in conformance with all established policies and regulations in order to be permitted. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

XVI.b) The activity as proposed would not conflict with an applicable congestion management program or standards established by the County. There are no congestion management programs within the County that would be impacted by the proposed activity. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

XVI.c) Although several airports are located within the County, the proposed activity is not expected to impact the circulation or approach patterns of any airports during construction and operation of new and existing medical cannabis cultivation sites permitted under the MCCR. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

XVI.d-e) The proposed activity would not substantially increase hazards due to design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment). The proposed activity, an agricultural use, is compatible with the surrounding area and the activity, including any road design or design features, would be required to adhere to all standards and requirements, including applicable Building Codes (MCCO Section 10.A.17.090(S) and fire safety standards (MCCO Section 10.A.090(U)), including but not limited to proper road widths and road signage, which would ensure adequate emergency access and the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 4290. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Are the environmental effects related to utilities and service systems within the scope of impacts analyzed by the Program MND, including the following:		Yes	No
a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?		
b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		
c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		
d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the activity from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed??		
e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the activity that it has adequate capacity to serve the activity's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?		
f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the activity's solid waste disposal needs?		
g)	Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?		

XVI.a) The activity would not result in applicable RWQCB wastewater treatment requirements being exceeded. The MCCR requires that each applicant seeking to obtain a permit for medical cannabis cultivation demonstrate enrollment and compliance with (or proof of exemption from) the General Order. For cultivation sites which do not require enrollment under the General Order per MCCO Section 10A.17.110(G), they are still required to comply with the standard conditions set forth in the General Order. As part of the standard conditions applied in the General Order (I.A.11 Refuse and Human Waste), disposal of domestic sewage shall meet applicable County health standards, local agency management plans and ordinances, and/or the RWQCB Onsite Wastewater Treatment System policy and shall not present a threat to water or groundwater. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

XVII.b-c) The activity would not result in water, wastewater, or storm water drainage facilities being constructed or expanded in a manner that could cause a significant environmental effect. Any associated improvements would be constructed in accordance with all applicable standards and requirements, including but not limited to the MCCR, County health standards, local agency management plans and ordinances, and/or the RWQCB Onsite Wastewater Treatment System policy. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

XVII.d-e) If the activity will receive water or wastewater service from a provider, Section 10A.17.090(Y) of the MCCO requires that a will-serve letter indicating adequate capacity to serve the activity be obtained and submitted. Based on the review of the activity, the environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

XVII.f-g) Solid waste disposal needs of the proposed activity may result in additional waste being brought to local transfer stations and out of county landfills, but this is not expected to occur on a scale that would impact the capacities of the landfills accepting the waste. The activity is found to be in conformance with all standards and requirements, including policies pertaining to solid waste. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.

	. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE. Are the environmental			
	effects related to utilities and service systems within the scope of	Yes	No	
	mpacts analyzed by the Program MND, including the following:			
	Does the activity 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			
	estrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate			
	mportant examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?			
	Does the activity have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively			
. (considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental			
	effects of an activity are considerable when viewed in connection with the			
	effects of past activities, the effects of other current activities, and the effects			
	of probable future activities).			
	Does the activity have environmental effects, which will cause substantial			
Č	adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?			
XVII.a-c) By demonstrating compliance with applicable standards and requirements, including the MCCO, the activity would not degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. Due to the numerous negative environmental impacts associated with legacy cultivation sites, the standards and requirements of the MCCR would reduce the environmental impact of cannabis cultivation by improving the baseline conditions at sites which are being brought into compliance. Compliance with the applicable standards and requirements ensures the activity would be carried out in a manner that does not cause a significant effect on the environment. The environmental effects of the proposed activity are within the scope of the Program MND.				
Deteri	mination:			
Chec	k the appropriate box below, based on the responses to the questions and re	equests for inf	ormation	
	th in this checklist above and pursuant to the requirements set forth in State (CÉQA Guidel	ines §§	
15162	and 15168:			
_				
	All of the environmental impacts of the proposed commercial cannabis of			
	scope of the County's IS/MND, and a subsequent environmental documer	•		
	evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposed commercial cannab	лз ореганогі.		
	The proposed commercial cannabis operation will have environmental eff	ects that we	re not	
	examined in the County's IS/MND, and an initial study must be prepared to			
	subsequent environmental impact report or negative declaration must be			
		•		
_				
Revie	wer name: Signature:			
Date:				
Daie:				

VI. REFERENCES

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region, Order R1-2015-0023, General Waiver of Waste Discharge Requirements and General Water Quality Certification for Dischargers of Waste from Cannabis Cultivation and Associated Activities or Operations with Similar Environmental Effects in the North Coast Region. Available at:

 $http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/northcoast/board_decisions/adopted_orders/pdf/2015/15_0023_Cannabis_Order.pdf.$

County of Mendocino General Plan, August 2009.

Available at: https://www.mendocinocounty.org/government/planning-building-services/plans/mendocinocounty-general-plan

County of Mendocino. March 21, 2017. Mendocino County Medical Cannabis Cultivation Regulation.

Available at:

 $https://library.municode.com/ca/mendocino_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeld=MECOCO_TIT10AAG_CH10A.17MECACUOR_S10A.17.040GELICUCA\\$

County of Mendocino Zoning Ordinance, Inland Zoning Code (Division I of Title 20 of the Mendocino County Code).

Available at:

https://library.municode.com/ca/mendocino_county/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeld=MECOCO_TIT20ZOOR_DIVIMECOZOCO.

County of Mendocino Code of Ordinances, December 31, 2019.

Available at: https://www.municode.com/library/ca/mendocino_county/codes/code_of_ordinances.

County of Mendocino Planning and Building Services, Ukiah Valley Area Plan, August 2011.

State of California. 2016. California Historic Resources Information System. Date accessed: September 28, 2016. Available at: http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=1068.