

CALIFORNIA
HISTORICAL
RESOURCES
INFORMATION
SYSTEM



ALAMEDA
COLUSA
CONTRA COSTA
DEL NORTE

HUMBOLDT
LAKE
MARIN
MENDOCINO
MONTEREY
NAPA
SAN BENITO

SAN FRANCISCO
SAN MATEO
SANTA CLARA
SANTA CRUZ
SOLANO
SONOMA
YOLO

Northwest Information Center
Sonoma State University
1400 Valley House Drive, Suite 210
Rohnert Park, California 94928-3609
Tel: 707.588.8455
nwic@sonoma.edu
<https://nwic.sonoma.edu>

April 18, 2024

File No.: 23-1405

Laura Hall, Project Planner
Lake County
Community Development Department
255 N. Forbes Street
Lakeport, CA. 95453

re: Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project/ 22000 Butts Canyon Road, Middletown/
Lotusland Investment Holdings Inc.

Dear Laura Hall:

Records at this office were reviewed to determine if this project could adversely affect cultural resources.

Please note that use of the term cultural resources includes both archaeological sites and historical buildings and/or structures. The review for possible historic-era building/structures, however, was limited to references currently in our office and should not be considered comprehensive.

Project Description:

The applicant is requesting approval of General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Amendments, Rezoning, a General Plan of Development, a Major Use Permit for a Specific Plan of Development (SPOD) to allow a Mixed-Use Commercial Resort, tentative subdivision maps, for which phased final maps would be recorded in the future, and a Development Agreement. The General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Amendments and Rezoning would allow a mixed-use development and zoning district which could permit a total of 400 hotel units, 450 resort residential units, and 1,400 residential estate villas at the maximum buildout of the entire proposed Guenoc Valley District ("GVD") (i.e., the entire Guenoc Ranch Project site). The other entitlements listed above would allow for the first phase of development (Phase 1), consisting of four separate subdivisions with approximately 385 residential estate villas, 141 resort residential units, 147 hotel rooms, and 100 on-site co-housing workforce bedroom units (equivalent to 35 housing units), and associated infrastructure. Phase 1 will be constructed in the near term and future phases will be built out based on market demands. In addition, the applicant is requesting approvals related to the development of workforce housing at the Middletown Housing Site (also referred to as the Santa Clara Housing Site), including a rezone of approximately 3.5 acres from Single-Family Residential to Two-Family Residential, a Tentative Subdivision Map, and a use permit for a community center (also referred to as a community clubhouse) to serve the housing site. The Middletown Housing Site would accommodate 21 single family residences with optional accessory dwelling units, 29 duplex units in 15 structures. The Middletown Housing Site is located on 21000 Santa Clara Road, accessed off Hwy 171, approximately 0.4 miles from its intersection with State Route 29. This property was the subject of a 50-lot subdivision approved in 2006, which has expired; the requested Santa Clara subdivision follows a similar lot layout. The applicant is also requesting approval for the development of an off-site water supply well and pipeline along Butts Canyon Road to the Detert Reservoir within the Guenoc Valley Site.

Previous Studies:

XX This office has record of the below listed previous cultural resource studies by a professional archaeologist or architectural historian that include portions of the proposed project areas:

Report No.	Authors	Year	Title
S-000082	Michael J. Moratto and Lynn M. Riley	1974	An Evaluation of the Archaeological Resources Near Middletown, California.
S-000639	Roger Werner	1977	An Archaeological Reconnaissance of the Proposed Expansion of Detert Reservoir, Guenoc Valley, Lake County, California.
S-001681	William E. Soule	1979	Cultural Resource Survey Report, Application 25911 and 25912, Magoon Estate Limited, Lake County, California
S-002847	William E. Soule	1982	Cultural Resources Survey Report, Application 26492, Magoon Estate Limited, c/o James C. Hanson, 921 Eleventh Street, Suite 400, Sacramento CA 95814 (California Division of Water Rights)
S-004944	Roger H. Werner	1982	An Archaeological Survey of a Proposed Occidental Petroleum Corporation Yard, Middletown, CA
S-006343	John Parker	1984	Archaeological Inventory of 65 + Acres of the Diamond "D" Ranch, Middletown, California
S-007989	Robert I. Orlins	1986	An Archaeological Survey of the Proposed Cassidy Reservoir, Lake County, California.
S-009469		1987	Cultural Resource Assessment for the Proposed Middletown Wastewater Treatment Facilities Project, Lake County, California
S-009794	Robert I. Orlins	1986	Preliminary Report on the Archaeological Mitigation of the Cassidy Creek Site (CA-LAK-1495), Guenoc Ranch, Lake County, California
S-012398	Mark Gary	1991	Archaeological Review of Guenoc VMP (RX-I-008-LNU) (letter report)
S-012420	Jay M. Flaherty	1990	An Archaeological Survey of 47+/- Acres, near Middletown, Lake County, California (AP# 14-140-04) (letter report)
S-013607	Marlene L. Greenway	1992	Cultural Resources Inventory for Scattered Parcels in the Clear Lake Basin (Cache Creek Exchange IV)
S-016195	Thomas M. Origer	1994	A Cultural Resources Survey for the Guenoc Ranch Vineyard Driveway, Lake County, California
S-020737	Patti J. Johnson and Ann S. Peak	1974	Survey of Cultural Resources, Guenoc Ranch, Lake and Napa Counties, California
S-021248	Vicki R. Beard	1997	A Cultural Resources Study of Portions of the Guenoc Ranch, Lake and Napa Counties, California
S-023131	Thomas Origer and Sue-Ann Schroder	2000	A Cultural Resources Survey of Selected Portions of Guenoc Ranch, Lake and Napa Counties, California
S-023965	Thomas Origer and Nelson "Scotty" Thompson	2001	A Cultural Resources Survey and Site Flagging for the Enlargement of Wastewater Ponds at Guenoc Ranch, Lake County, California
S-025338	Vicki R. Beard	2002	A Cultural Resources Survey for the Geothermal, Inc. Landfill Closure, Southeast of Middletown, Lake County, California

S-028254	Stephen Bryne	2004	Cultural Resources Monitoring of Construcaiotn during 2003, Geothermal Inc. Facility Closure Project, Lake County, California (Draft)
S-028455	Stephen Bryne	2003	Archaeological Survey Report of Additional Areas for the Geothermal Inc. Landfill Closure Project, Lake County, California.
S-029744	Stephen Bryne and Erica Maier	2005	Cultural Resources Monitoring of Construction during 2004, Geothermal Inc. Facility Closure Project, Lake County, California.
S-031276	Jay M. Flaherty	2005	Cultural Resource Reconnaissance of 110.67 Acres Near Middletown, Lake County, California (APN 014-003-83)
S-031562	Miley Paul Holman	2005	A Report of Findings of the Archaeological Field Inspection of the Proposed Vintage Faire Subdivision, Middletown, Lake County, California
S-031650	Michael Desilets, Kruger Frank, Stephen Bryne, and Esme Hammerle	2006	Cultural Resource Construction Monitoring and Extended Phase I Studies at Loci E and F of the Freeman Lake Site (CA-LAK-1976), Geothermal Inc. Facility Closure Project, Lake County, California
S-032228	Douglas S. Prather	2006	Mozier Subdivision 2006, Archaeological Survey Report, T11N, R7W, MDM, 21112 Highway 175, Middletown, Lake County, CA, APN 024-421-07
S-032559	J. Charles Whatford	2006	Archaeological Survey Report, Guenoc VMP, RX North-061 LNU
S-034193	Miley Paul Holman	2006	Cultural Resources Study of the Butts Canyon Road/Highway 29 Signalization Project, Middletown, Lake County, California (letter report)
S-034465	Jay M. Flaherty	2006	Cultural Reconnaissance of 29.5+/- Acres, Middletown, Lake County, California (APN 014-003-78)
S-035818	Jeff Haney	2009	Historic Property Survey Report, 03-LAK-20, 29,175, K.P./P.M. various, EA 01-464400
S-036591	Lauren Del Bondio and Thomas Origer	2009	A Cultural Resources Survey for the Minnie Cannon Elementary School Project, Middletown, Lake County, California
S-037564	Jay M. Flaherty	2008	Cultural Resource Reconnaissance of 420 +/- Acres Near Middletown, Lake County, California. (APN 014-140-05)
S-038865	Laura Leach-Palm, Paul Brady, Pat Mikkelsen, Libby Seil, Darla Rice, Bryan Larson, Joseph Freeman, and Julia Costello	2011	Cultural Resources Inventory of Caltrans District 1 Rural Conventional Highways in Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino and Lake Counties, Contract No. 01A1056, Expenditure Authorization No. 01-453608
S-047017	J. Charles Whatford	2015	Jerusalem Fire, Cultural Resources Narrative
S-047190	J. Charles Whatford	2015	Valley Fire Cultural Resources Narrative
S-047663	Michael Darcangelo and Jennifer Thomas	2016	Cultural Resources Monitoring for the Valley Fire in Lake, Napa, and Sonoma Counties, California
S-047875	Douglas S. Prather	2016	Confidential Archaeological Letter for the Valley Fire #5 - Langtry Project, Lake County, California

S-047910	Jennifer Thomas, John Berg, and Naomi Scher	2016	Cultural Resources Survey Report for PG&E's Konocti-Middletown 60kV and Konocti-Eagle Rock 60kV Reliability Project, Lake and Mendocino Counties, California
S-048345	Mark Walker	2016	Historic Property Survey Report, Archaeological Survey Report, ESA Action Plan, Finding of No Adverse Effects with Standard Conditions for the Valley Fire Emergency Response, State Route 01-LAK-29, PM 4.0-17.0 and 01-LAK-175, PM 16.0-28.0, Valley Fire Emergency Response, Project 2015, District 1, Lake County, California, EA 01-0F6700, EFIS: 0116000043
S-048518	Taylor Alshuth, Jacqueline Farrington, Mark Arsenault, and Thomas M. Origer	2016	A Historical Resources Study of the LORAN Coast Guard Station, Middletown, Lake County, California
S-049335		2017	Cultural Resources Inventory Report, Emergency Hazardous Tree Removal Project, Lake County, California, FEMA-4240-DR-CA PW 33-A
S-051359		2017	Cultural Resource Inventory, Hazardous Tree Removal Project, Lake County, California, FEMA-4240-DR-CA PW 33-B

Archaeological and Native American Resources Recommendations:

XX The proposed project area contains or is adjacent to the archaeological sites. When development is planned, it is recommended that a qualified professional archaeologist update the conditions of these sites on Office of Historic Preservation's DPR 523 resource recordation forms, assess potential impacts of the proposed project activities on these resources, and provide project-specific recommendations as warranted

Primary Number	Trinomial
P-17-000115	CA-LAK-000090
P-17-000116	CA-LAK-000091
P-17-000252	CA-LAK-000230
P-17-000253	CA-LAK-000232
P-17-000255	CA-LAK-000234
P-17-000256	CA-LAK-000235
P-17-000314	CA-LAK-000298
P-17-000399	CA-LAK-000387/H
P-17-000400	CA-LAK-000388
P-17-000401	CA-LAK-000389

P-17-000402	CA-LAK-000390
P-17-000403	CA-LAK-000391
P-17-000404	CA-LAK-000392
P-17-000405	CA-LAK-000393
P-17-000406	CA-LAK-000394H
P-17-000407	CA-LAK-000395
P-17-000408	CA-LAK-000396H
P-17-000409	CA-LAK-000397
P-17-000410	CA-LAK-000398H
P-17-000411	CA-LAK-000399
P-17-000412	CA-LAK-000400H
P-17-000414	CA-LAK-000402

P-17-000415	CA-LAK-000403
P-17-000416	CA-LAK-000404
P-17-000417	CA-LAK-000405
P-17-000418	CA-LAK-000406
P-17-000419	CA-LAK-000407
P-17-000420	CA-LAK-000408
P-17-000421	CA-LAK-000409
P-17-000422	CA-LAK-000410H
P-17-000423	CA-LAK-000411
P-17-000424	CA-LAK-000412
P-17-000425	CA-LAK-000413H
P-17-001239	CA-LAK-001495
P-17-001363	CA-LAK-001821

P-17-001470	CA-LAK-000231
P-17-001957	
P-17-001958	
P-17-001959	CA-LAK-001885
P-17-001960	CA-LAK-001886
P-17-001961	CA-LAK-001887
P-17-001962	CA-LAK-001888
P-17-001963	CA-LAK-001889
P-17-001964	
P-17-001965	CA-LAK-001890
P-17-001966	
P-17-001967	
P-17-001968	
P-17-001969	
P-17-001970	
P-17-001971	
P-17-001972	
P-17-001973	
P-17-001974	
P-17-001975	
P-17-001976	
P-17-001977	
P-17-001978	
P-17-002022	CA-LAK-001923H
P-17-002023	CA-LAK-001924H
P-17-002024	CA-LAK-001925
P-17-002025	CA-LAK-001926
P-17-002026	CA-LAK-001927
P-17-002027	CA-LAK-001928
P-17-002028	CA-LAK-001929
P-17-002029	CA-LAK-001930H
P-17-002030	CA-LAK-001931
P-17-002031	CA-LAK-001932

P-17-002032	CA-LAK-001933
P-17-002033	CA-LAK-001934
P-17-002034	CA-LAK-001935
P-17-002035	CA-LAK-001936
P-17-002036	CA-LAK-001937
P-17-002037	CA-LAK-001938
P-17-002038	
P-17-002039	
P-17-002040	CA-LAK-001939
P-17-002041	
P-17-002042	
P-17-002043	
P-17-002044	CA-LAK-001940
P-17-002045	CA-LAK-001941
P-17-002046	CA-LAK-001942/H
P-17-002070	
P-17-002071	
P-17-002072	
P-17-002121	CA-LAK-001975
P-17-002672	CA-LAK-002154
P-17-002946	CA-LAK-002260H
P-17-002947	CA-LAK-002261
P-17-002948	CA-LAK-002262
P-17-002949	CA-LAK-002263
P-17-002950	CA-LAK-002264H
P-17-002951	CA-LAK-002265H

P-17-002952	CA-LAK-002266H
P-17-002953	
P-17-002954	
P-17-002955	CA-LAK-002267
P-17-002956	CA-LAK-002268H
P-17-002957	CA-LAK-002269H
P-17-002958	CA-LAK-002270
P-17-002959	CA-LAK-002271H
P-17-002960	CA-LAK-002272H
P-17-003012	CA-LAK-002310H
P-17-003013	CA-LAK-002311
P-17-003014	CA-LAK-002312

XX Given that the purpose of this plan is to provide a planning document that will guide future development, and given the presence of known cultural resources and the likelihood of additional resources in unsurveyed areas, it is recommended that future projects be considered on an individual basis through the existing agreement between the County and the Northwest Information Center.

XX We recommend the lead agency contact the local Native American tribe(s) regarding traditional, cultural, and religious heritage values. For a complete listing of tribes in the vicinity of the project, please contact the Native American Heritage Commission at 916/373-3710.

Built Environment Recommendations:


XX Since the Office of Historic Preservation has determined that any building or structure 45 years or older may be of historical value, if the project area contains such properties, it is recommended that prior to commencement of project activities, a qualified professional familiar with the architecture and history of Lake County conduct a formal CEQA evaluation.

Due to processing delays and other factors, not all of the historical resource reports and resource records that have been submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation are available via this records search. Additional information may be available through the federal, state, and local agencies that produced or paid for historical resource management work in the search area. Additionally, Native American tribes have historical resource information not in the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) Inventory, and you should contact the California Native American Heritage Commission for information on local/regional tribal contacts.

The California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) contracts with the California Historical Resources Information System's (CHRIS) regional Information Centers (ICs) to maintain information in the CHRIS inventory and make it available to local, state, and federal agencies, cultural resource professionals, Native American tribes, researchers, and the public. Recommendations made by IC coordinators or their staff regarding the interpretation and application of this information are advisory only. Such recommendations do not necessarily represent the evaluation or opinion of the State Historic Preservation Officer in carrying out the OHP's regulatory authority under federal and state law.

For your reference, a list of qualified professionals in California that meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards can be found at <http://www.chrisinfo.org>. If archaeological resources are encountered during the project, work in the immediate vicinity of the finds should be halted until a qualified archaeologist has evaluated the situation. If you have any questions please give us a call (707) 588-8455.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bryan Much", with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

Bryan Much
Coordinator

From: [Ham, Sateur](#)
To: [Laura Hall](#)
Subject: Automatic reply: [EXTERNAL] Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:
Date: Thursday, March 28, 2024 9:59:55 AM

I will be out of the office from March 14th through April 1st. I will return April 2nd. Thank you. If you need to reach someone, please contact Colin Davis, Assistant Field Manager (Resource), at CDavis@blm.gov

From: [William Collins](#)
To: [Laura Hall](#)
Subject: RE: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:
Date: Tuesday, April 2, 2024 1:05:32 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Please see Building's comments below.

1. Please make sure they get all applicable building permits.
2. The project is also located in flood zones A and D.
 - a. 44 CFR 60.3 (a)(3) requires any construction in either of these zones to be "Reasonably Safe" from flooding.
 - b. 44 CFR 60.3 (b)(3) Require that all new subdivision proposals and other proposed developments (including proposals for manufactured home parks and subdivisions) greater than 50 lots or 5 acres, whichever is the lesser, include within such proposals base flood elevation data;
3. PRC 4290/4291 compliance will be required. Including the Grange Road Connector.
4. This area is located in moderate to very high fire hazard severity. WUI/Ignition Resistant Construction standards will apply.
5. On Pg 2 of the Wildfire Prevention Plan it shows fire hydrants on the resort side of Butts Canyon Rd, But I do not see any across the road where the onsite workforce housing is proposed. Will there be fire hydrants in this area or is there a plan to provide onsite water storage for fire suppression calculated per NFPA 1142?
6. On Draft Design Guidelines section 4.5 Setbacks it states, "Setbacks from individual property lines will be dictated by the planned development zoning of this area and shall follow the minimum fire code clearance from structures." this project is in the SRA and the setback requirements will need to comply with PRC 4290.
7. On Draft Design Guidelines section 4.8 Roofs & Rooflines talks about green roofs. WUI areas require a class A fire rating for roof materials. We will need some type of documentation showing these green roofs designs meet a class A fire rating.
8. Landscaping will need to comply with MWELo requirements.

Sincerely

Bill Collins, CBO, CASp, CFM

Chief Building Official

County of Lake

255 N. Forbes St.

Lakeport, CA 95453

707-263-2221 ex 38123 (Office)

william.collins@lakecountyca.gov



From: Laura Hall <laura.hall@lakecountyca.gov>

Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2024 9:54 AM

To: Katherine Vanderwall <Katherine.Vanderwall@lakecountyca.gov>; Douglas Gearhart <doug@lcaqmd.net>; Elizabeth Knight <elizabethk@lcaqmd.net>; Ryan Lewelling <Ryan.Lewelling@lakecountyca.gov>; William Collins <William.Collins@lakecountyca.gov>; Scott DeLeon <Scott.DeLeon@lakecountyca.gov>; David Bingham <David.Bingham@lakecountyca.gov>; Katherine Schaefers <Katherine.Schaefers@lakecountyca.gov>; Craig Wetherbee <Craig.Wetherbee@lakecountyca.gov>; Lars Ewing <Lars.Ewing@lakecountyca.gov>; Lori Baca <Lori.Baca@lakecountyca.gov>; Vance Ricks <Vance.Ricks@lakecountyca.gov>; Greg Peters <Greg.Peters@lakecountyca.gov>; bruce.mccracken@wasteconnections.com; mrsnelsanders@gmail.com; raeebycarl@hotmail.com; deanie82@sbcglobal.net; ryan_olah@fws.gov; frank.aebly@usda.gov; timchiara@hotmail.com; maacamax@att.net; genepaleno@gmail.com; roberta.lyons@att.net; redbud.audubon@gmail.com; debsal14@gmail.com; korinn.woodard@ca.usda.gov; michael.parker@countyofnapa.org; donnammackiewicz@gmail.com; elioth@sscra.org; wshock@mchsi.com; jruygt@comcast.net; vbrandon95457@gmail.com; spkregulatorymailbox@usace.army.mil; gdm@paratransit.net; pgeplanreview@pge.com; mathtownhall@gmail.com; rvineyards@sonic.net; catherine.stone@middletownusd.org; j.benoit4@icloud.com; benjamin.huffer@wildlife.ca.gov; r2ceqa@wildlife.ca.gov; jesse.robertson@dot.ca.gov; skrul@chp.ca.gov; michaela.moser@slc.ca.gov; centralvalleysac@waterboards.ca.gov; janae.fried@waterboards.ca.gov; jason.schroeder@waterboards.ca.gov; cdph-Incsantarosa@cdph.ca.gov; adye@chp.ca.gov; nwc@sonoma.edu; sham@blm.gov; rlk7@pge.com

Cc: Mireya Turner <Mireya.Turner@lakecountyca.gov>; Michelle Irace <Michelle.Irace@lakecountyca.gov>

Subject: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:

Good afternoon, Fellow Agencies and Others,

This is a request for review (RFR) for the following planning entitlements to allow for development of the proposed Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project. Please note that this project was previously approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2020, but due to legal challenges it was rescinded June 14, 2022. Included in this RFR are several attachments, however, documents "PV08-23 - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Development Project Master Transmittal Letter" and "Project Description 2-21-2024 and PV08-23 – GVD – A5 - Key Project Modifications Exhibit - REVISED 2023" include specific information pertaining to project changes. Please also note that staff will be setting up a meeting in the next two weeks to go over the project and any questions you may have will be presented to the applicant at that time. Finally, the CEQA analyses will come later

for review, as staff only has an Admin Draft at this time. The planning entitlements include the following:

Guenoc Ranch Site:

Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment AM 24-01

Development Agreement DA 24-01

General Plan Amendment GPAP (Map) 24-01

General Plan Amendment (Text) 24-02

Rezone 24-01,

General Plan of Development GPD 24-01

Subdivision Map SD 24-01

Subdivision Map SD 24-02

Subdivision Map SD 24-03

Subdivision Map SD 24-04

Use Permit UP 24-05

Middletown Site:

General Plan Amendment GPAP (Map) 24-03

General Plan Amendment (Text) 24-04

Rezone RZ 24-02

Subdivision Map SD 24-05

CEQA: Environment Impact Report EIR 24-01

Please advise us if additional information is needed, which permits are required from your agency (if any), and/or of your environmental concerns. Additionally, please advise if your agency recommends any modifications to the project that would reduce potential environmental impacts. Due to the provisions of state law, it is essential that we receive your comments as soon as possible, but no case later than April 12, 2024. Please email your comments to laura.hall@lakecountycalifornia.gov, or mail them to the address listed in the letterhead of the RFR.

Sincerely,

Laura Hall,
Senior Planner

Download Files

Reply to this Secure Message

Secure Message Info

Message ID	RGCblobBKybKNjuFvTelvu
Message Expires	Thursday, 4 April
Message URL	https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us/message/RGCblobBKybKNjuFvTelvu
Permission	If you forward this email with the secure random download link, whomever you forward this to can download the files attached to this message.

Files attached to this message

Filename	Size
RFR Agency Notification_Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project.pdf	138 KB
PV08-23 - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Development Project Master Transmittal Letter and Project Description 2-21-2024.pdf	320 KB

PV08-23 - GVD - A1 - Full Planning Application - Signed.pdf	2.26 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – A2 - Project APN List & Ownership.pdf	35.4 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - A3 - Guenoc Ownership Map.pdf	762 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A4 - Surrounding & Proposed Land Use Maps.pdf	430 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A5 - Key Project Modifications Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	10.1 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - A6 - Originally Adopted Resolutions & Ordinances.pdf	205 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A7 - Grange Road Emergency Access Connector Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	11.3 MB
PV08-23 – GVD - A8 - Roads Added & Removed Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	46.7 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - A9 - Maha Wildfire Prevention Plan DRAFT - REVISED 2023.pdf	13 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - B1 - General Plan Amendment Guenoc Valley 11x17 - REVISED 2023.pdf	280 KB
PV08-23 – GVD - B2 - General Plan Amendment Guenoc Valley 18x26 - REVISED 2023.pdf	381 KB
PV08-23 – GVD - C1 - Zoning Map Guenoc Valley District - REVISED 2023.pdf	797 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – C2 - Regulations and Development Standards for the Guenoc Valley Zoning District.pdf	179 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – C3 - Design Guidelines for the Guenoc Valley District.pdf	414 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - D1 - Maha Farm Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	40.2 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D2 - Equestrian Center Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	34 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D3 - Denniston Golf Estates Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	36.9 MB

PV08-23 – GVD – D4 - Bohn Ridge Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	29.7 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – E1 - General Plan of Development (Vision Book).pdf	120 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – E2 - Specific Plan of Development (SPD).pdf	342 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G1 - Technical Memorandum - Water Demand.pdf	183 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G2 - Technical Memorandum - Wastewater Feasibility Study.pdf	542 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G3 - Technical Memorandum - Fire Water System Planning.pdf	964 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G4 -Technical Memorandum - Stormwater Plan.pdf	25.7 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G5 - Technical Memorandum - Water Infrastructure.pdf	7.58 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G6 - Technical Memorandum - Utility Formation.pdf	257 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G7 - Technical Memorandum - Electrical.pdf	11.1 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G8 - Technical Memorandum - Geotechnical.pdf	3.83 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - H - Santa Clara Zoning Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	509 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - I - Santa Clara Tentative Map.pdf	3.47 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - J - Santa Clara Concept Design.pdf	2.33 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - K - Callayomi Will-Serve Letter from Draft EIR - Volume II Appendices February 2020.pdf	687 KB

[Download Files](#)

Reply to this Secure Message

If you need assistance accessing or using this system, please contact support at
fileTransferService@co.lake.ca.us.

County of Lake Secure File Transfer — Secure File Transfer System:
<https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us>

Memorandum

To: MATT BRADY
TOM FITZGERALD
RICHARD MULLEN
DERECK GOODWIN

Date: February 12, 2024

File: Growth Factors

From: BRANDON LARSEN
Deputy District Director,
Planning and Local Assistance

Subject: 2024 Growth Factors

Attached are the 2024 District 1 growth factor summary, the 2024 District Growth Factor Map, and a “Using D1 Growth Factors” tutorial.

Prior to 1984, Caltrans District 1 projected future traffic volumes based solely on historical growth. Future volumes were calculated using an annual percent increase that was derived from historical traffic volumes. We found that this method produced acceptable results in the short to mid-term, but due to compounding, long-range predictions (20 years or more) tended to be overestimated.

In 1984, in order to eliminate the long-range distortion noted above, we began calculating growth factors as a 20-year straight-line determinant. For example, a segment of highway with a growth factor of 1.4 is predicted to have a 40% increase in traffic over the next 20-years. Likewise, it is predicted to have a 20% increase over 10 years.

Historically, District staff has developed growth factors based on both projected travel trends and historical growth from two data sources—the “California Motor Vehicle Stock Travel and Fuel Forecast” (CMVSTAFF) and historical Average Vehicle Mile Traveled (AVMT) comparisons from “Traffic Volumes on the California State Highway System.” Since CMVSTAFF was not available for more recent updates, county growth factor targets were developed based on California Air Resources Board traffic growth projections and historic traffic growth data, as well as other factors such as land use/potential development.

For the 2024 Growth Factor update, since CMVSTAFF is no longer produced, we undertook an extensive analysis of historical volumes on District 1 routes (using Caltrans Traffic Volumes). We also consulted the California Statewide Travel Demand Model, as well as Department of Finance population statistics for all four counties in District 1.

BRANDON LARSEN

January 31, 2024

Page 2

Growth Factors were adjusted, primarily using growth trends from 1990-2020. The result was an overall (approximately 35% from previous) reduction in forecasted growth for District 1 routes.

Our growth factors are applied over highway segments that were determined using observed conditions; these segments vary in length, but they are not longer than fifty miles. Traffic volumes over segments are based on a calculated weighted average to reflect volumes (Annual Average Daily Traffic) for the entire segment. While actual growth at the local level can vary considerably, we are looking at overall growth over the long-term. If more specific data or information are available for a particular location (actual counts, planned development, etc.) it may be advisable to calculate a location-specific rate. However, for the purposes of facility design (20-year, or greater, design-life) our generalized segment growth factors are appropriate. It should be noted that our growth factors forecast traffic growth only for the mainline (State Routes); local streets should be examined separately.

If you have any questions regarding the growth factors, please contact District 1 System Planning Branch.


Attachments:

Using District 1 Growth Factors Tutorial
2024 Growth Factor Summary
2024 Growth Factor Map


c:

SHERI RODRIGUEZ
LISA BUGLEWICZ
BRYAN THOMAS
JESSE ROBERTSON
HQ System Planning
North Region Travel Forecasting

2024 Growth Factor Map



Growth Factor 2024



District Growth Factor: 1.13

Growth Factors Represent a 20 year straight line growth pattern.
(Not annual percent growth)



District 1 - Growth Factor Summary

20-Year Growth Factors

Segment	2024 GF
MEN-1-0.00/40.27	1.03
MEN-1-40.27/64.86	1.10
MEN-1-64.86/105.57	1.03
MEN-20-0.00/33.16	1.03
MEN-20-33.22/44.11	1.29
LAK-20-0.00/8.34	1.29
LAK-20-8.34/31.62	1.20
LAK-20-31.62/46.48	1.23
LAK-29-0.00/5.81	1.29
LAK-29-5.81/20.31	1.26
LAK-29-20.31/48.40	1.29
LAK-29-48.40/52.54	1.23
HUM-36-0.00/45.68	1.13
LAK-53-0.00/7.45	1.36
HUM-96-0.00/16.00	1.10
HUM-96-16.00/44.98	1.03
MEN-101-0.10/47.27	1.20
MEN-101-47.27/55.90	1.07
MEN-101-55.90/104.15	1.03
HUM-101-0.00/51.84	1.03
HUM-101-51.84/100.71	1.16
HUM-101-100.71/137.14	1.03
DN-101-0.00/23.85	1.03
DN-101-23.85/39.98	1.07
DN-101-39.98/46.49	1.10
MEN-128-0.00/29.58	1.10
MEN-128-29.58/50.90	1.07
MEN-162-0.00/34.05	1.07
DN-169-0.0/3.52	1.00
HUM-169-13.20/33.84	1.07
MEN-175-0.00/9.85	1.26
LAK-175-0.00/8.19	1.29
LAK-175-8.25/28.04	1.26
DN-197-0.00/7.08	1.10
DN-199-0.51/36.41	1.10
HUM-200-0.00/2.68	1.10
HUM-211-73.20/79.16	1.13
MEN-222-0.00/2.15	1.03
MEN-253-0.00/17.18	1.20
HUM-254-0.00/46.53	1.03
HUM-255-0.0/8.80	1.13
MEN-271-0.0/22.72	1.03
HUM-271-0.00/0.31	1.07
LAK-281-14.00/17.00	1.33
HUM-283-0.00/0.36	1.03
HUM-299-0.00/5.93	1.16
HUM-299-5.93/38.83	1.03
HUM-299-38.83/43.04	1.10
District Growth Factor	1.13

Using District 1 Growth Factors

- To project volumes **20 years** into the future, multiply the base year traffic volume by the growth factor (GF).

Formula: $(GF) * (\text{Base Year Volume}) = \text{Projected Volume}$

Example: The base year volume (2012) is 1500 AADT. The 20-year growth factor for that segment of highway is 1.3. What is the 2032 volume?

$(1.3) * (1500) = 1950$ The projected 2032 traffic volume (AADT) for this segment is 1950.

- To project volumes **Less than or greater than 20 years** into the future, use the following formula:

Formula: $\left[1 + \frac{(GF-1) * (\# \text{ of years into future})}{20}\right] * (\text{starting volume}) = \text{Projected Volume}$

Example: The Base year volume in 2012 is 700 AADT. The 20- year growth factor is 1.4.

A) What is the volume in 27 years?

$$\left[1 + \left(\frac{(1.4-1) * (27)}{20}\right)\right] * (700) = 1078 \quad \text{The projected volume in 2039 is 1078.}$$

B) What is the volume in 7 years?

$$\left[1 + \left(\frac{(1.4-1) * (7)}{20}\right)\right] * (700) = 798 \quad \text{The projected volume in 2019 is 798.}$$

California Department of Transportation

DISTRICT 1
P.O. BOX 3700 | EUREKA, CA 95502-3700
(707) 445-6600 | FAX (707) 441-6314 TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov



April 12, 2024

1-LAK-29-6.36
SCH# 2019049134
Guenoc Valley Planned Development

Ms. Laura Hall
Community Development Dept.
County of Lake
255 N. Forbes Street
Lakeport, CA 95453

Dear Ms. Hall:

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on the Administrative Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report (Admin RDEIR) for the proposed Guenoc Valley Mixed-Use Planned Development Project that is situated in southeast Lake County. The Guenoc Ranch consists of 69 existing parcels comprising approximately 16,000 acres of land. The Guenoc Ranch is located on Butts Canyon Road, approximately four miles east of its intersection with State Route 29 (SR 29).

The General Plan and Zoning Ordinance Amendments and Rezoning would allow a mixed-use development and zoning district which could permit a total of 400 hotel units, 450 resort residential units, and 1,400 residential estate villas at the maximum buildout of the entire proposed Guenoc Ranch Project site. The first phase of development consists of four separate subdivisions with approximately 385 residential estate villas, 141 resort residential units, 147 hotel rooms, and 100 on-site co-housing workforce bedroom units. Phase 1 will be constructed in the near-term and future phases will be built out based on market demand.

In addition, the applicant is requesting approvals related to the development of workforce housing at the Middletown Housing Site, including a rezone of approximately 3.5 acres from Single-Family Residential to Two-Family Residential, a Tentative Subdivision Map, and a use permit for a community center to serve the housing site. The Middletown Housing Site would accommodate 21 single family residences with optional accessory dwelling units, 29 duplex units in 15 structures. The Middletown Housing Site is located on 21000 Santa Clara Road, accessed off of State Route 175 (SR 175), approximately 0.4 miles from its intersection with SR 29.

The proposed project has been modified and redesigned from the approved proposal concept in 2020 in order to reduce the exposure of project features to wildfire hazards.

One of the three primary modifications of the Project involves the addition of an emergency ingress and egress road. This additional emergency access route provides a third means of ingress and egress in the event of an emergency, connecting to Grange Road to the northwest of the Project site.

The Traffic Impact Analysis for the project completed by Abrahms Associates in February of 2020 did not evaluate transportation conditions or impacts at Grange Road. We request that the Traffic Impact Analysis be updated to evaluate the intersection of Grange Road and SR 29. With the development of a commercial center at Hartman Road, there is expected to be an increased demand to use Grange Road to access local commercial destinations to the north. The intersection evaluation should assess conditions during peak periods and during emergency evacuations. In terms of CEQA, the intersection of Grange Road and SR 29 will need to identify potential impacts to transportation as a result of inadequate emergency access and a substantial increase in hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses (e.g., emergency response vehicles). Any mitigation required can potentially be phased to coincide with traffic demand generated by future phases of development.

We request the opportunity to review the scope of work for the TIA update before the analysis is conducted to ensure that the scope of the analysis and methods utilizes State thresholds and standards for State facilities. Consistency with State standards will be needed to ensure that the mitigation measures for SR 29 can be permitted.

Since the original TIA was completed for the proposed project, Caltrans updated the growth factors for SR 29, which affects the forecast traffic volumes for future years. The updated growth factor for Caltrans District 1 is enclosed.

Caltrans provided extensive comments in April of 2020 for the project in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Our conclusions in response to the 2020 Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), transportation impact findings, and proposed transportation mitigation measures are re-stated below:

We concur with the TIA's central findings and recommendations: that the Project will generate significant transportation impacts, and that it will require certain key measures in order to address and mitigate those impacts. Notably, the Project will be responsible for an intersection control improvement, to be completed at the intersection of State Route (SR) 29 and Butts Canyon Rd. as a condition of approval for the first phase of the Project.

Due to the substantially similar trip generation rates anticipated with the revised project description, we do not consider the findings for traffic impacts or proposed traffic mitigation (MM 3.13-1) at the intersection of Butts Canyon Road and SR 29 likely to change. The updated TIA need not re-evaluate traffic impacts at the intersection

per se, but may need to evaluate the roadway capacity of Butts Canyon Road to ensure that the intersection improvement will adequately accommodate all modes of travel and consider emergency access needs.

Construction-related truck traffic at Butts Canyon Road and SR 29 should be evaluated for significant impacts to traffic safety. It may be necessary to construct the intersection mitigation with the initial infrastructure outlay in order to safely serve construction-related traffic.

Pursuant to the 2008 Complete Streets Act, the County is required to plan for a roadway network that considers the needs of all users at all ability levels. The proposed project will need to consider non-motorized travel modes (bicycle and pedestrian) in the design and improvements of the public roadways serving the project, including the proposed intersection improvement/s at SR 29.

Based on an incomplete search of our extensive files for the proposed Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development, we were unable to find a completed Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) for the proposed mitigation measure, MM 3.13-1, for project safety impacts at Butts Canyon Road and SR 29. If, in fact, an ICE has not yet been completed, the applicant will need to resume collaboration with Caltrans to complete this work. Work within State right of way is expected to follow the Caltrans Quality Management Approval Process (QMAP), which is a time-consuming and costly process. The number of steps involved, from completing the ICE, to entering into a Cooperative Agreement, to design approval, have the potential to introduce delays to the proposed project if not initiated at the earliest possible date.

Mitigation measure MM 3.13-2 requires payment, or provides bonding for, a proportionate share of the construction costs for improvements at Hartman Lane, Spruce Grove Road South, and Hidden Valley Road. We recommend revisiting the TIA's evaluation and determination of these intersections on SR 29 again in light of new information and/or change in conditions. The emergency access at Grange Road as well as proposed Caltrans' proposed improvements to SR 29 may impact the mitigation findings and requirements.

Mitigation measure MM 3.13-3 requires a subsequent Traffic Study and Mitigation for future project phases. CEQA case law precludes the use of future studies to be adopted as project mitigation. This is generally because a study will not mitigate for the physical impacts of a project, although it may also be argued that deferring project studies constitutes a failure to disclose project impacts at the time of project approval. Traffic growth projections do allow for impacts to be assessed for future phases of development as reasonably foreseeable consequences stemming from predictable increases in trip generation from new development and the application

of growth factors to existing roadway volumes. Caltrans' growth factors for SR 29 were updated in February of 2024, which allows for transportation impacts to be forecast to the year 2044. We request that the updated TIA evaluate transportation impacts at twenty-years out for full build-out. If market conditions do not permit full build out within a 20-year period, future phases can be re-examined prior to construction permits being issued. Mitigation can be revised based upon the updated information.

Mitigation measure MM 3.13-4 implements a Transportation Demand Management program. We recommend that the applicant and the traffic consultant consider the need for, and benefit of, employing Travel Demand Management (TDM) measures that minimize the need for transportation infrastructure as traffic mitigation. Caltrans can provide sample TDM measures for rural regions at the outset of the Traffic Impact Analysis update.

The application cover letter for the Admin DEIR states:

8. Development Agreement. Although the exhibits to the Development Agreement will be updated, mutatis mutandis, no substantive changes have been made to the body of the agreement since the original approval of the Project in 2020.

We request that the Development Agreement between the County and the applicant be revisited to ensure that mitigation measures MM 3.13-2 and MM 3.13-3 accurately reflect the revised findings and recommendations of the TIA.

Please contact me with questions or for further assistance at (707) 684-6879 or by email at: <jesse.robertson@dot.ca.gov>.

Sincerely,

Jesse G. Robertson

Jesse Robertson
Transportation Planning
Caltrans District 1

Enclosed: Caltrans District 1 2024 Growth Factor Update

From: Huffer, Benjamin@Wildlife
To: [Laura Hall](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:
Date: Wednesday, April 10, 2024 2:41:39 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Good afternoon Laura,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project. Based on available information and the described project activities, the forthcoming CEQA document should detail how revisions to the original project may impact biological resources including an analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts, as well as mitigation measures for project impacts. Specific discussions should include but are not limited to, any changes in survey protocols, impacts to protected plant and wildlife species, proposals to mitigation requirements, and activities subject to Fish and Game code 1600. CDFW looks forward to reviewing and commenting on the future environmental document described in the RFR. Thank you and have a great day!

Best regards,
Ben

Ben Huffer
Environmental Scientist
(916) 216-6253
1701 Nimbus Rd.
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670



From: Laura Hall <laura.hall@lakecountyca.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2024 9:54 AM
To: katherine.vanderwall@lakecountyca.gov; doug.gearhart@lakecountyca.gov; elizabethk@lcaqmd.net; ryan.lewelling@lakecountyca.gov; william.collins@lakecountyca.gov; scott.deleon@lakecountyca.gov; david.bingham@lakecountyca.gov; katherine.schaefer@lakecountyca.gov; craig.wetherbee@lakecountyca.gov; lars.ewing@lakecountyca.gov; lori.baca@lakecountyca.gov; vance.ricks@lakecountyca.gov; greg.peters@lakecountyca.gov; bruce.mccracken@wasteconnections.com; mrsmsanders@gmail.com; raebycarl@hotmail.com; deanie82@sbcglobal.net; ryan_olah@fws.gov; frank.aebly@usda.gov; timchiara@hotmail.com; maacamax@att.net; genepaleno@gmail.com; roberta.lyons@att.net; redbud.audubon@gmail.com; debsal14@gmail.com; korinn.woodard@ca.usda.gov; michael.parker@countyofnapa.org; donnamackiewicz@gmail.com; elioth@sscra.org; wshock@mchsi.com; jruygt@comcast.net; vbrandon95457@gmail.com; spkregulatorymailbox@usace.army.mil; gdm@paratransit.net; pgeplanreview@pge.com; mathtownhall@gmail.com; rvineyards@sonic.net; catherine.stone@middletownusd.org; j.benoit4@icloud.com; Huffer, Benjamin@Wildlife <Benjamin.Huffer@Wildlife.ca.gov>; Wildlife R2 CEQA <R2CEQA@wildlife.ca.gov>; ROBERTSON, JESSE GRAHAM@DOT <jesse.robertson@dot.ca.gov>; Krul, Steven@CHP <SKrul@chp.ca.gov>; Moser, Michaela@SLC <Michaela.Moser@slc.ca.gov>;

centralvalleysac@waterboards.ca.gov; Fried, Janae@Waterboards <Janae.Fried@Waterboards.ca.gov>; Schroeder, Jason@Waterboards <Jason.Schroeder@Waterboards.ca.gov>; cdph-Incsantarosa@cdph.ca.gov; Dye, Arthur J@CHP <ADye@chp.ca.gov>; nwic@sonoma.edu; sham@blm.gov; rlk7@pge.com
Cc: mireya.turner@lakecountycalifornia.gov; michelle.irace@lakecountycalifornia.gov
Subject: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:

WARNING: This message is from an external source. Verify the sender and exercise caution when clicking links or opening attachments.

Good afternoon, Fellow Agencies and Others,

This is a request for review (RFR) for the following planning entitlements to allow for development of the proposed Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project. Please note that this project was previously approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2020, but due to legal challenges it was rescinded June 14, 2022. Included in this RFR are several attachments, however, documents “PV08-23 - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Development Project Master Transmittal Letter” and “Project Description 2-21-2024 and PV08-23 – GVD – A5 - Key Project Modifications Exhibit - REVISED 2023” include specific information pertaining to project changes. Please also note that staff will be setting up a meeting in the next two weeks to go over the project and any questions you may have will be presented to the applicant at that time. Finally, the CEQA analyses will come later for review, as staff only has an Admin Draft at this time. The planning entitlements include the following:

Guenoc Ranch Site:

Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment AM 24-01

Development Agreement DA 24-01

General Plan Amendment GPAP (Map) 24-01

General Plan Amendment (Text) 24-02

Rezone 24-01,

General Plan of Development GPD 24-01

Subdivision Map SD 24-01

Subdivision Map SD 24-02

Subdivision Map SD 24-03

Subdivision Map SD 24-04

Use Permit UP 24-05

Middletown Site:

General Plan Amendment GPAP (Map) 24-03

General Plan Amendment (Text) 24-04

Rezone RZ 24-02

Subdivision Map SD 24-05

CEQA: Environment Impact Report EIR 24-01

Please advise us if additional information is needed, which permits are required from your agency (if any), and/or of your environmental concerns. Additionally, please advise if your agency recommends any modifications to the project that would reduce potential environmental impacts. Due to the provisions of state law, it is essential that we receive your comments as soon as possible, but no case later than April 12, 2024. Please email your comments to laura.hall@lakecountyca.gov, or mail them to the address listed in the letterhead of the RFR.

Sincerely,

Laura Hall,
Senior Planner

[Download Files](#)

[Reply to this Secure Message](#)

Secure Message Info

Message ID	RGCblobBKybKNjuFvTelvu
Message Expires	Thursday, 4 April
Message URL	https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us/message/RGCblobBKybKNjuFvTelvu
Permission	If you forward this email with the secure random download link, whomever you forward this to can download the files attached to this message.

Files attached to this message

Filename	Size
RFR Agency Notification_Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project.pdf	138 KB
PV08-23 - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Development Project Master Transmittal Letter and Project Description 2-21-2024.pdf	320 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - A1 - Full Planning Application - Signed.pdf	2.26 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – A2 - Project APN List & Ownership.pdf	35.4 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - A3 - Guenoc Ownership Map.pdf	762 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A4 - Surrounding & Proposed Land Use Maps.pdf	430 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A5 - Key Project Modifications Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	10.1 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - A6 - Originally Adopted Resolutions & Ordinances.pdf	205 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A7 - Grange Road Emergency Access Connector Exhibit	11.3

- REVISED 2023.pdf	MB
PV08-23 – GVD - A8 - Roads Added & Removed Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	46.7 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - A9 - Maha Wildfire Prevention Plan DRAFT - REVISED 2023.pdf	13 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - B1 - General Plan Amendment Guenoc Valley 11x17 - REVISED 2023.pdf	280 KB
PV08-23 – GVD - B2 - General Plan Amendment Guenoc Valley 18x26 - REVISED 2023.pdf	381 KB
PV08-23 – GVD - C1 - Zoning Map Guenoc Valley District - REVISED 2023.pdf	797 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – C2 - Regulations and Development Standards for the Guenoc Valley Zoning District.pdf	179 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – C3 - Design Guidelines for the Guenoc Valley District.pdf	414 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - D1 - Maha Farm Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	40.2 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D2 - Equestrian Center Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	34 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D3 - Denniston Golf Estates Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	36.9 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D4 - Bohn Ridge Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	29.7 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – E1 - General Plan of Development (Vision Book).pdf	120 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – E2 - Specific Plan of Development (SPD).pdf	342 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G1 - Technical Memorandum - Water Demand.pdf	183 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G2 - Technical Memorandum - Wastewater Feasibility Study.pdf	542 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G3 - Technical Memorandum - Fire Water System Planning.pdf	964 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G4 -Technical Memorandum - Stormwater Plan.pdf	25.7

	MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G5 - Technical Memorandum - Water Infrastructure.pdf	7.58 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G6 - Technical Memorandum - Utility Formation.pdf	257 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G7 - Technical Memorandum - Electrical.pdf	11.1 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G8 - Technical Memorandum - Geotechnical.pdf	3.83 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - H - Santa Clara Zoning Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	509 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - I - Santa Clara Tentative Map.pdf	3.47 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - J - Santa Clara Concept Design.pdf	2.33 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - K - Callayomi Will-Serve Letter from Draft EIR - Volume II Appendices February 2020.pdf	687 KB

[Download Files](#)

[Reply to this Secure Message](#)

If you need assistance accessing or using this system, please contact support at fileTransferService@co.lake.ca.us.

County of Lake Secure File Transfer — Secure File Transfer System:
<https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us>

From: Krul, Steven@CHP
To: [Laura Hall](#)
Cc: Fansler, Daniel@CHP
Subject: [EXTERNAL] RE: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:
Date: Thursday, March 28, 2024 9:59:26 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Laura,

I am no longer assigned to the CHP in Lake County. Can you remove me from your email list? I have include Lt. Dan Fansler, the Commander of the Clear Lake CHP, so your email goes to the appropriate person.

Thank you,

Steve Krul, Lt. Commander
California Highway Patrol
Cottonwood CVEF
Office (530) 377-8030
skrul@chp.ca.gov



From: Laura Hall <laura.hall@lakecountycalifornia.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2024 9:54 AM
To: katherine.vanderwall@lakecountycalifornia.gov; doug.gearhart@lakecountycalifornia.gov; elizabethk@lcaqmd.net; ryan.lewelling@lakecountycalifornia.gov; william.collins@lakecountycalifornia.gov; scott.deleon@lakecountycalifornia.gov; david.bingham@lakecountycalifornia.gov; katherine.schaefer@lakecountycalifornia.gov; craig.wetherbee@lakecountycalifornia.gov; lars.ewing@lakecountycalifornia.gov; lori.baca@lakecountycalifornia.gov; vance.ricks@lakecountycalifornia.gov; greg.peters@lakecountycalifornia.gov; bruce.mccracken@wasteconnections.com; mrsmsanders@gmail.com; raeebycarl@hotmail.com; deanie82@sbcglobal.net; ryan_olah@fws.gov; frank.aebly@usda.gov; timchiara@hotmail.com; maacamax@att.net; genepaleno@gmail.com; roberta.lyons@att.net; redbud.audubon@gmail.com; debsal14@gmail.com; korinn.woodard@ca.usda.gov; michael.parker@countyofnapa.org; donnamackiewicz@gmail.com; elioth@sscra.org; wshock@mchsi.com; jruygt@comcast.net; vbrandon95457@gmail.com; spkregulatorymailbox@usace.army.mil; gdm@paratransit.net; pgeplanreview@pge.com; mathtownhall@gmail.com; rvineyards@sonic.net; catherine.stone@middletownusd.org; j.benoit4@icloud.com; Huffer, Benjamin@Wildlife <Benjamin.Huffer@Wildlife.ca.gov>; Wildlife R2 CEQA <R2CEQA@wildlife.ca.gov>; ROBERTSON, JESSE GRAHAM@DOT <jesse.robertson@dot.ca.gov>; Krul, Steven@CHP <SKrul@chp.ca.gov>; Moser, Michaela@SLC <Michaela.Moser@slc.ca.gov>; centralvalleysac@waterboards.ca.gov; Fried, Janae@Waterboards <Janae.Fried@Waterboards.ca.gov>; Schroeder, Jason@Waterboards <Jason.Schroeder@Waterboards.ca.gov>; cdph-Incsantarosa@cdph.ca.gov; Dye, Arthur J@CHP <ADye@chp.ca.gov>; nwc@sonoma.edu; sham@blm.gov; rlk7@pge.com
Cc: mireya.turner@lakecountycalifornia.gov; michelle.irace@lakecountycalifornia.gov

Subject: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:

[Warning: This email originated outside of CHP. Do not click links or attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.]

Good afternoon, Fellow Agencies and Others,

This is a request for review (RFR) for the following planning entitlements to allow for development of the proposed Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project. Please note that this project was previously approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2020, but due to legal challenges it was rescinded June 14, 2022. Included in this RFR are several attachments, however, documents “PV08-23 - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Development Project Master Transmittal Letter” and “Project Description 2-21-2024 and PV08-23 – GVD – A5 - Key Project Modifications Exhibit - REVISED 2023” include specific information pertaining to project changes. Please also note that staff will be setting up a meeting in the next two weeks to go over the project and any questions you may have will be presented to the applicant at that time. Finally, the CEQA analyses will come later for review, as staff only has an Admin Draft at this time. The planning entitlements include the following:

Guenoc Ranch Site:

Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment AM 24-01

Development Agreement DA 24-01

General Plan Amendment GPAP (Map) 24-01

General Plan Amendment (Text) 24-02

Rezone 24-01,

General Plan of Development GPD 24-01

Subdivision Map SD 24-01

Subdivision Map SD 24-02

Subdivision Map SD 24-03

Subdivision Map SD 24-04

Use Permit UP 24-05

Middletown Site:

General Plan Amendment GPAP (Map) 24-03

General Plan Amendment (Text) 24-04

Rezone RZ 24-02

Subdivision Map SD 24-05

CEQA: Environment Impact Report EIR 24-01

Please advise us if additional information is needed, which permits are required from your agency (if any), and/or of your environmental concerns. Additionally, please advise if your agency recommends any modifications to the project that would reduce potential environmental impacts. Due to the provisions of state law, it is essential that we receive your comments as soon as possible, but no case later than April 12, 2024. Please email your comments to laura.hall@lakecountycalifornia.gov, or mail them to the address listed in the letterhead of the RFR.

Sincerely,

Laura Hall,
Senior Planner

[Download Files](#)

[Reply to this Secure Message](#)

Secure Message Info

Message	RGCblobBKybKNjuFvTelvu
---------	------------------------

ID	
Message Expires	Thursday, 4 April
Message URL	https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us/message/RGCblobBKybKNjuFvTelvu
Permission	If you forward this email with the secure random download link, whomever you forward this to can download the files attached to this message.

Files attached to this message

Filename	Size
RFR Agency Notification_Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project.pdf	138 KB
PV08-23 - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Development Project Master Transmittal Letter and Project Description 2-21-2024.pdf	320 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - A1 - Full Planning Application - Signed.pdf	2.26 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – A2 - Project APN List & Ownership.pdf	35.4 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - A3 - Guenoc Ownership Map.pdf	762 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A4 - Surrounding & Proposed Land Use Maps.pdf	430 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A5 - Key Project Modifications Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	10.1 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - A6 - Originally Adopted Resolutions & Ordinances.pdf	205 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A7 - Grange Road Emergency Access Connector Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	11.3 MB
PV08-23 – GVD - A8 - Roads Added & Removed Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	46.7 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - A9 - Maha Wildfire Prevention Plan DRAFT - REVISED	13

2023.pdf	MB
PV08-23 - GVD - B1 - General Plan Amendment Guenoc Valley 11x17 - REVISED 2023.pdf	280 KB
PV08-23 – GVD - B2 - General Plan Amendment Guenoc Valley 18x26 - REVISED 2023.pdf	381 KB
PV08-23 – GVD - C1 - Zoning Map Guenoc Valley District - REVISED 2023.pdf	797 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – C2 - Regulations and Development Standards for the Guenoc Valley Zoning District.pdf	179 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – C3 - Design Guidelines for the Guenoc Valley District.pdf	414 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - D1 - Maha Farm Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	40.2 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D2 - Equestrian Center Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	34 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D3 - Denniston Golf Estates Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	36.9 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D4 - Bohn Ridge Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	29.7 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – E1 - General Plan of Development (Vision Book).pdf	120 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – E2 - Specific Plan of Development (SPD).pdf	342 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G1 - Technical Memorandum - Water Demand.pdf	183 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G2 - Technical Memorandum - Wastewater Feasibility Study.pdf	542 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G3 - Technical Memorandum - Fire Water System Planning.pdf	964 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G4 -Technical Memorandum - Stormwater Plan.pdf	25.7 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G5 - Technical Memorandum - Water Infrastructure.pdf	7.58 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G6 - Technical Memorandum - Utility Formation.pdf	257

	KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G7 - Technical Memorandum - Electrical.pdf	11.1 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G8 - Technical Memorandum - Geotechnical.pdf	3.83 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - H - Santa Clara Zoning Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	509 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - I - Santa Clara Tentative Map.pdf	3.47 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - J - Santa Clara Concept Design.pdf	2.33 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - K - Callayomi Will-Serve Letter from Draft EIR - Volume II Appendices February 2020.pdf	687 KB

[Download Files](#)

[Reply to this Secure Message](#)

If you need assistance accessing or using this system, please contact support at
fileTransferService@co.lake.ca.us.

County of Lake Secure File Transfer — Secure File Transfer System:
<https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us>

Lenihan, Rachel x4760

From: Laura Hall <Laura.Hall@lakecountyca.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2024 10:21 PM
To: Lenihan, Rachel x4760
Cc: Mireya Turner; Michelle Irace; cm@mahaman.com; Philippakis, Katherine x4434; jb@mahaman.com; kc@mahaman.com
Subject: FW: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:

External Sender

Rachel,

Please see the comments below from the Lake County Assessor's Office.

Thank you,

Laura

From: Ryan Lewelling <Ryan.Lewelling@lakecountyca.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2024 5:24 PM
To: Laura Hall <Laura.Hall@lakecountyca.gov>
Cc: Vance Ricks <Vance.Ricks@lakecountyca.gov>; Cara Salmon <cara.salmon@lakecountyca.gov>
Subject: RE: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:

Laura,

This Assessor's Office review of proposed Maha Farms Subdivision Map, SD-01, (Ownership, APNs identified below), has the following comments:

- No Tax Rate Area conflicts were identified.
 - o All development currently within TRA 062-003.
 - o Is LAFCO involved in the proposed Guenoc Valley Planning District (GVPD)?
- Property taxes are current for all assessed property as of 3/28/2024 and 4/8/2024.
- Ownership confirmed per doc nos. 2023013471, 2024000447, and 2024000448.
 - o Certificates of Compliance for the assessments (listed below) have been reviewed.
 - o Lot Line Adjustment doc no. 1998003880, recorded 3/12/1998, was recorded without deeds. Please review requirements of Subdivision Map Act regarding the number of lots that can be adjusted/re-configured. The Certificate calls out 10 exhibits for how the original lands were to be reconfigured.
- Easements of record are noted in the Official Records of the County of Lake.
 - o Roadways, except entry roads up to first gate, are identified as being separate parcels and private without dedication of public right for use (Page G0.01, Note GN #8). Roads are currently identified by number with names being identified on separate submittal.
 - o Easements are to be identified on Final Map (Page G0.01, Notes E #1-3).
- Tentative Subdivision Map for Maha Farms has been reviewed and located, with the following issues to be addressed prior to recording of Final Map:
 - o 185 non-road parcels identified of which 177 parcels identified by name and 8 peripheral parcels by number (see sheet MF1.20). An unknown number of private road parcels or portions thereof are indicated on this plan.

- o Benchmark and monument references – there are no ties nor identification of monumentation
 - Where are the notes on how parcels will be monumented and the symbolization (legend) of monumentation existing/to-be-monumented?
- o Inconsistent and non-sequential numbering of proposed parcels; no block numbering
- o Sheet MF1.01
 - Missing courses for Parcel 8 and Road 1
 - Parcel 1 and 8 portions are not labeled
- o Sheet MF1.02
 - Missing courses for Road 1
 - Parcel 1 and 8 portions are not labeled
- o Sheet MF1.03
 - Missing parcel data for proposed parcels:
 - Parcel 1 portion and Parcel 4 are not labeled. (Parcel 4 bounded by HBV-32, HBV-34, HBV-38, and Road 37A)
 - Northerly course of parcel HBV-32
 - Southwesterly curve of parcel HBV-32
 - Courses for the following roadways:
 - Southwesterly curve of Road 34 between parcels HBV-32 and HBV-34
 - Road 37A
- o Sheet MF1.04
 - Missing parcel data for proposed parcels:
 - Parcel 1 portion and Parcel 5 are not labeled
 - Northwesternly course of parcel HBV-64
 - Gap in parcel numbering? Parcel between HBV-61 and HBV-62? Is this an independent parcel or a portion of another?
 - Northeasterly course of parcel HBV-63
 - Southwesterly course of parcel HBV-61
 - Southerly curve of parcel HBV-49
 - Westerly curve of parcel HBV-50
 - Courses for intersections of the following roadways:
 - Beginning of Road 6 at Road 1
 - Cul-de-sac and southerly courses of end of Road 37 adjacent to parcels HBV-52 and HBV-53
- o Sheet MF1.05
 - Missing parcel data for proposed parcels:
 - Napa County is not identified
 - Parcel 7, Parcels 2 and 8 portions are not labeled
 - Westerly course of parcel HBR-15
 - Courses for intersections of the following roadways:
 - Beginning of Road 6A at Road 6
- o Sheet MF1.06
 - Parcels 1 and 2 portions are not labeled
 - Missing parcel data and linework for proposed parcel HBV-1, northerly course of HBV-8 and HBV-21, and easterly course of HBV-24.
 - There is no parcel HBV-7 identified on map (between HBV-6 and HBV-8).
 - Parcel surrounded by HBV-16, HBV-17, and Road 34 is not separately identified (is it a portion of Parcel 1?)
- o Sheet MF1.07
 - Parcels 2 and 3 portions are not labeled
 - Missing parcel data for proposed parcels:
 - Westerly course of parcel HBV-27

- Easterly course of HBV-58
- Southerly course of HBR-40
- Northerly course of HBR-77
- Courses for Road 9 and frontage course of parcels HBR-32, HBR-40, HBR-73, HBR-77, HBR-78, HBR-92, HBR-94, HBR-96, and HBR-91.
- Courses for intersections of the following roadways:
 - o End of Road 34 at Road 2
 - o End of Road 38 at Road 2
 - o End of Road 39 at Road 38
- o Sheet MF1.08
 - Parcels 2 and 3 portions are not labeled
 - Missing parcel data for proposed parcels:
 - Courses for intersections of the following roadways:
 - o Beginning of Road 12 at Road 3
 - o Beginning of Road 58 at Road 3
 - o Beginning of Road 7 at Road 3
 - o Beginning of Road 29 at Road 2
 - o Road 29A
- Upon revision of the tentative subdivision map that addresses the comments/issues presented here as well as those of the County Surveyor, please make available a copy of the draft Final Map for review and comments.
- Upon recording of the Final Map, please provide the Assessor's Office with a digital version of the Final Map datasets.
- Tentative Subdivision Maps – SD 24-02, SD 24-03, and SD 24-04 – have not been reviewed at this time in favor of addressing issues with finalizing SD 24-01 for recording.
 - o Please provide timeframes for when SD 24-02, SD 24-03, and SD 24-04 need to be reviewed by this Office.

ASSESSMENT PLAT	APN	CC/LLA DOC REF#	OWNER	OWNERSHIP DOC REF#	RECORDING DATE
013-022	013-022-011-000 PTN, 013-022-020-000 PTN, 013-022-051-000 PTN	2012006005	BOHN VALLEY 1 LLC	2023013471	12/18/2023
013-022	013-022-011-000 PTN, 013-022-150-000	2012006013	BOHN VALLEY 1 LLC	2023013471	12/18/2023
013-022	013-022-051-000 PTN, 013-022-140-000 PTN	2012006003	BOHN VALLEY 1 LLC	2023013471	12/18/2023
013-022	013-022-020-000 PTN, 013-022-140-000 PTN	2012017321	BOHN VALLEY 1 LLC	2023013471	12/18/2023
013-022	013-022-080-000	1998003880	BUTTS CREEK LLC	2024000448	1/12/2024
013-022	013-022-090-000	2012006007	BUTTS CREEK LLC	2024000448	1/12/2024
013-022	013-022-100-000	1998003880	BUTTS CREEK LLC	2024000448	1/12/2024

013-022	013-022-110-000	1998003880	BUTTS CREEK LLC	2024000448	1/12/2024
013-022	013-022-120-000	1998003880	BUTTS CREEK LLC	2024000448	1/12/2024
013-022	013-022-130-000	1998003880	BOHN VALLEY 1 LLC	2023013471	12/18/2023
013-022	013-022-140-000 PTN	2012017320	BOHN VALLEY 1 LLC	2023013471	12/18/2023
013-022	013-022-140-000 PTN	2012006024	BOHN VALLEY 1 LLC	2023013471	12/18/2023

013-023	013-023-071-000 PTN	2012006012	BOHN VALLEY 1 LLC	2023013471	12/18/2023
013-023	013-023-071-000 PTN, 013-023-101-000 PTN	2012006017	BOHN VALLEY 1 LLC	2023013471	12/18/2023
013-023	013-023-091-000 PTN	2012006007	BOHN VALLEY 1 LLC	2023013471	12/18/2023
013-023	013-023-101-000 PTN, 013-023-150-000 PTN	2012006011	BOHN VALLEY 1 LLC	2023013471	12/18/2023
013-023	013-023-120-000	1998003880	BUTTS CREEK LLC	2024000448	1/12/2024
013-023	013-023-130-000	1998003880	BOHN VALLEY 1 LLC	2023013471	12/18/2023
013-023	013-023-140-000	1998003880	BOHN VALLEY 1 LLC	2023013471	12/18/2023
013-023	013-023-150-000 PTN	2012006010	BOHN VALLEY 1 LLC	2023013471	12/18/2023
013-023	013-023-150-000 PTN	2012005990	BOHN VALLEY 1 LLC	2023013471	12/18/2023

013-024	013-024-330-000	1998003880	BUTTS CREEK LLC	2024000448	1/12/2024
013-024	013-024-340-000	1998003880	BUTTS CREEK LLC	2024000448	1/12/2024

014-340	014-340-041-000	15PM46 LOT 1 PTN PER 2005021960	GUENOC VALLEY LLC	2024000447	1/12/2024
---------	-----------------	--	-------------------	------------	-----------

Ryan Lewelling
Cadastral Mapping Specialist,
Assessor-Recorder, County of Lake, California
707-263-2302 | Ryan.Lewelling@LakeCountyCA.gov

From: Laura Hall <laura.hall@lakecountyca.gov>

Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2024 9:54 AM

To: Katherine Vanderwall <Katherine.Vanderwall@lakecountyca.gov>; Douglas Gearhart <doug@lcaqmd.net>; Elizabeth Knight <elizabethk@lcaqmd.net>; Ryan Lewelling <Ryan.Lewelling@lakecountyca.gov>; William Collins

<William.Collins@lakecountyca.gov>; Scott DeLeon <Scott.DeLeon@lakecountyca.gov>; David Bingham <David.Bingham@lakecountyca.gov>; Katherine Schaefer <Katherine.Schaefer@lakecountyca.gov>; Craig Wetherbee <Craig.Wetherbee@lakecountyca.gov>; Lars Ewing <Lars.Ewing@lakecountyca.gov>; Lori Baca <Lori.Baca@lakecountyca.gov>; Vance Ricks <Vance.Ricks@lakecountyca.gov>; Greg Peters <Greg.Peters@lakecountyca.gov>; bruce.mccracken@wasteconnections.com; mrsmsanders@gmail.com; raeeycarl@hotmail.com; deanie82@sbcglobal.net; ryan_olah@fws.gov; frank.aebly@usda.gov; timchiara@hotmail.com; maacamax@att.net; genepaleno@gmail.com; roberta.lyons@att.net; redbud.audubon@gmail.com; debsal14@gmail.com; korinn.woodard@ca.usda.gov; michael.parker@countyofnapa.org; donnamackiewicz@gmail.com; eliath@sscra.org; wshock@mchsi.com; jruygt@comcast.net; vbrandon95457@gmail.com; spkregulatorymailbox@usace.army.mil; gdm@paratransit.net; pgeplanreview@pge.com; mathtownhall@gmail.com; rvineyards@sonic.net; catherine.stone@middletownusd.org; j.benoit4@icloud.com; benjamin.huffer@wildlife.ca.gov; r2cega@wildlife.ca.gov; jesse.robertson@dot.ca.gov; skrul@chp.ca.gov; michaela.moser@slc.ca.gov; centralvalleysac@waterboards.ca.gov; janae.fried@waterboards.ca.gov; jason.schroeder@waterboards.ca.gov; cdph-lncsantarosa@cdph.ca.gov; adye@chp.ca.gov; nwic@sonoma.edu; sham@blm.gov; rlk7@pge.com

Cc: Mireya Turner <Mireya.Turner@lakecountyca.gov>; Michelle Irace <Michelle.Irace@lakecountyca.gov>

Subject: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:

Good afternoon, Fellow Agencies and Others,

This is a request for review (RFR) for the following planning entitlements to allow for development of the proposed Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project. Please note that this project was previously approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2020, but due to legal challenges it was rescinded June 14, 2022. Included in this RFR are several attachments, however, documents "PV08-23 - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Development Project Master Transmittal Letter" and "Project Description 2-21-2024 and PV08-23 – GVD – A5 - Key Project Modifications Exhibit - REVISED 2023" include specific information pertaining to project changes. Please also note that staff will be setting up a meeting in the next two weeks to go over the project and any questions you may have will be presented to the applicant at that time. Finally, the CEQA analyses will come later for review, as staff only has an Admin Draft at this time. The planning entitlements include the following:

Guenoc Ranch Site:

Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment AM 24-01

Development Agreement DA 24-01

General Plan Amendment GPAP (Map) 24-01

General Plan Amendment (Text) 24-02

Rezone 24-01,

General Plan of Development GPD 24-01

Subdivision Map SD 24-01

Subdivision Map SD 24-02

Subdivision Map SD 24-03

Subdivision Map SD 24-04

Use Permit UP 24-05

Middletown Site:

General Plan Amendment GPAP (Map) 24-03

General Plan Amendment (Text) 24-04

Rezone RZ 24-02

Subdivision Map SD 24-05

CEQA: Environment Impact Report EIR 24-01

Please advise us if additional information is needed, which permits are required from your agency (if any), and/or of your environmental concerns. Additionally, please advise if your agency recommends any modifications to the project that would reduce potential environmental impacts. Due to the provisions of state law, it is essential that we receive your comments as soon as possible, but no case later than April 12, 2024. Please email your comments to laura.hall@lakecountyca.gov, or mail them to the address listed in the letterhead of the RFR.

Sincerely,

Laura Hall,
Senior Planner

Download Files

Reply to this Secure Message

Secure Message Info

Message ID	RGCblobBKybKNjuFvTelvu
Message Expires	Thursday, 4 April
Message URL	https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us/message/RGCblobBKybKNjuFvTelvu
Permission	If you forward this email with the secure random download link, whomever you forward this to can download the files attached to this message.

Files attached to this message

Filename	Size
RFR Agency Notification_Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project.pdf	138 KB

PV08-23 - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Development Project Master Transmittal Letter and Project Description 2-21-2024.pdf	320 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - A1 - Full Planning Application - Signed.pdf	2.26 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – A2 - Project APN List & Ownership.pdf	35.4 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - A3 - Guenoc Ownership Map.pdf	762 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A4 - Surrounding & Proposed Land Use Maps.pdf	430 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A5 - Key Project Modifications Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	10.1 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - A6 - Originally Adopted Resolutions & Ordinances.pdf	205 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A7 - Grange Road Emergency Access Connector Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	11.3 MB
PV08-23 – GVD - A8 - Roads Added & Removed Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	46.7 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - A9 - Maha Wildfire Prevention Plan DRAFT - REVISED 2023.pdf	13 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - B1 - General Plan Amendment Guenoc Valley 11x17 - REVISED 2023.pdf	280 KB
PV08-23 – GVD - B2 - General Plan Amendment Guenoc Valley 18x26 - REVISED 2023.pdf	381 KB
PV08-23 – GVD - C1 - Zoning Map Guenoc Valley District - REVISED 2023.pdf	797 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – C2 - Regulations and Development Standards for the Guenoc Valley Zoning District.pdf	179 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – C3 - Design Guidelines for the Guenoc Valley District.pdf	414 KB

PV08-23 - GVD - D1 - Maha Farm Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	40.2 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D2 - Equestrian Center Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	34 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D3 - Denniston Golf Estates Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	36.9 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D4 - Bohn Ridge Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	29.7 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – E1 - General Plan of Development (Vision Book).pdf	120 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – E2 - Specific Plan of Development (SPD).pdf	342 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G1 - Technical Memorandum - Water Demand.pdf	183 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G2 - Technical Memorandum - Wastewater Feasibility Study.pdf	542 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G3 - Technical Memorandum - Fire Water System Planning.pdf	964 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G4 -Technical Memorandum - Stormwater Plan.pdf	25.7 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G5 - Technical Memorandum - Water Infrastructure.pdf	7.58 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G6 - Technical Memorandum - Utility Formation.pdf	257 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G7 - Technical Memorandum - Electrical.pdf	11.1 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G8 - Technical Memorandum - Geotechnical.pdf	3.83 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - H - Santa Clara Zoning Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	509 KB

PV08-23 - GVD - I - Santa Clara Tentative Map.pdf	3.47 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - J - Santa Clara Concept Design.pdf	2.33 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - K - Callayomi Will-Serve Letter from Draft EIR - Volume II Appendices February 2020.pdf	687 KB

Download Files

Reply to this Secure Message

If you need assistance accessing or using this system, please contact support at
fileTransferService@co.lake.ca.us.

County of Lake Secure File Transfer — Secure File Transfer System:
<https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us>

From: [Lake County Community Development - Resource Planning](#)
To: [Laura Hall](#)
Cc: [Lake County Community Development - Resource Planning](#)
Subject: RE: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:
Date: Wednesday, April 3, 2024 2:57:03 PM
Attachments: [Grading Permits 2024.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

Good afternoon Laura,

All grading activities must abide by Chapter 30 of the Lake County Municipal Code. Please pass on the attached "Grading Permits 2024" to the applicant as part of this RFR project.

Please include an analysis on grading impacts in the development permit's environmental document, so that this analysis may also be used for the subsequent grading permit's environmental review requirement pursuant to Lake County Municipal Code Chapter 30, Section 26.1. The grading permit must be consistent with and satisfy all conditions of the development permit pursuant to Lake County Municipal Code Chapter 30, Section 18.1. If the materials submitted for grading permit processing differ significantly from those analyzed under the development permit's environmental document, then an additional CEQA analysis may need to be performed.

Thank you,



Katherine Schaefer, MA
Resource Planner
Community Development Department
255 N. Forbes St.
Lakeport, CA 95453
Phone: (707) 263-2221
Fax: (707) 262-1843
Email: ResourcePlanning@lakecountyca.gov

CONFIDENTIAL OR PRIVILEGED:

This communication contains information intended only for the use of the individuals to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from other disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any disclosure, printing, copying, distribution or use of the contents is prohibited. If you have received this in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone or by returning it by reply e-mail and then permanently deleting the communication from your system.

From: Laura Hall <laura.hall@lakecountyca.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2024 9:54 AM
To: Katherine Vanderwall <Katherine.Vanderwall@lakecountyca.gov>; Douglas Gearhart <doug@lcaqmd.net>; Elizabeth Knight <elizabethk@lcaqmd.net>; Ryan Lewelling <Ryan.Lewelling@lakecountyca.gov>; William Collins <William.Collins@lakecountyca.gov>; Scott DeLeon <Scott.DeLeon@lakecountyca.gov>; David Bingham <David.Bingham@lakecountyca.gov>; Katherine Schaefer <Katherine.Schaefer@lakecountyca.gov>; Craig Wetherbee <Craig.Wetherbee@lakecountyca.gov>; Lars Ewing <Lars.Ewing@lakecountyca.gov>; Lori Baca <Lori.Baca@lakecountyca.gov>; Vance Ricks <Vance.Ricks@lakecountyca.gov>; Greg Peters

<Greg.Peters@lakecountyca.gov>; bruce.mccracken@wasteconnections.com; mrsmelsanders@gmail.com; raebycarl@hotmail.com; deanie82@sbcglobal.net; ryan_olah@fws.gov; frank.aebly@usda.gov; timchiara@hotmail.com; maacamax@att.net; genepaleno@gmail.com; roberta.lyons@att.net; redbud.audubon@gmail.com; debsal14@gmail.com; korinn.woodard@ca.usda.gov; michael.parker@countyofnapa.org; donnammackiewicz@gmail.com; elioth@sscra.org; wshock@mchsi.com; jruygt@comcast.net; vbrandon95457@gmail.com; spkregulatorymailbox@usace.army.mil; gdm@paratransit.net; pgeplanreview@pge.com; mathtownhall@gmail.com; rvineyards@sonic.net; catherine.stone@middletownusd.org; j.benoit4@icloud.com; benjamin.huffer@wildlife.ca.gov; r2ceqa@wildlife.ca.gov; jesse.robertson@dot.ca.gov; skrul@chp.ca.gov; michaela.moser@slc.ca.gov; centralvalleysac@waterboards.ca.gov; janae.fried@waterboards.ca.gov; jason.schroeder@waterboards.ca.gov; cdph-lncsantarosa@cdph.ca.gov; adye@chp.ca.gov; nwc@sonoma.edu; sham@blm.gov; rlk7@pge.com

Cc: Mireya Turner <Mireya.Turner@lakecountyca.gov>; Michelle Irace <Michelle.Irace@lakecountyca.gov>

Subject: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:

Good afternoon, Fellow Agencies and Others,

This is a request for review (RFR) for the following planning entitlements to allow for development of the proposed Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project. Please note that this project was previously approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2020, but due to legal challenges it was rescinded June 14, 2022. Included in this RFR are several attachments, however, documents "PV08-23 - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Development Project Master Transmittal Letter" and "Project Description 2-21-2024 and PV08-23 – GVD – A5 - Key Project Modifications Exhibit - REVISED 2023" include specific information pertaining to project changes. Please also note that staff will be setting up a meeting in the next two weeks to go over the project and any questions you may have will be presented to the applicant at that time. Finally, the CEQA analyses will come later for review, as staff only has an Admin Draft at this time. The planning entitlements include the following:

Guenoc Ranch Site:

Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment AM 24-01

Development Agreement DA 24-01

General Plan Amendment GPAP (Map) 24-01

General Plan Amendment (Text) 24-02

Rezone 24-01,

General Plan of Development GPD 24-01

Subdivision Map SD 24-01

Subdivision Map SD 24-02

Subdivision Map SD 24-03

Subdivision Map SD 24-04

Use Permit UP 24-05

Middletown Site:

General Plan Amendment GPAP (Map) 24-03

General Plan Amendment (Text) 24-04

Rezone RZ 24-02

Subdivision Map SD 24-05

CEQA: Environment Impact Report EIR 24-01

Please advise us if additional information is needed, which permits are required from your agency (if any), and/or of your environmental concerns. Additionally, please advise if your agency recommends any modifications to the project that would reduce potential environmental impacts. Due to the provisions of state law, it is essential that we receive your comments as soon as possible, but no case later than April 12, 2024. Please email your comments to laura.hall@lakecountycalifornia.gov, or mail them to the address listed in the letterhead of the RFR.

Sincerely,

Laura Hall,
Senior Planner

[Download Files](#)

[Reply to this Secure Message](#)

Secure Message Info

Message ID	RGCblobBKybKNjuFvTelvu
Message Expires	Thursday, 4 April
Message URL	https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us/message/RGCblobBKybKNjuFvTelvu
Permission	If you forward this email with the secure random download link, whomever you forward this to can download the files attached to this message.

Files attached to this message

Filename	Size
RFR Agency Notification_Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project.pdf	138 KB
PV08-23 - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Development Project Master Transmittal Letter and Project Description 2-21-2024.pdf	320 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - A1 - Full Planning Application - Signed.pdf	2.26 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – A2 - Project APN List & Ownership.pdf	35.4 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - A3 - Guenoc Ownership Map.pdf	762 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A4 - Surrounding & Proposed Land Use Maps.pdf	430 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A5 - Key Project Modifications Exhibit - REVISED	10.1

2023.pdf	MB
PV08-23 - GVD - A6 - Originally Adopted Resolutions & Ordinances.pdf	205 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A7 - Grange Road Emergency Access Connector Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	11.3 MB
PV08-23 – GVD - A8 - Roads Added & Removed Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	46.7 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - A9 - Maha Wildfire Prevention Plan DRAFT - REVISED 2023.pdf	13 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - B1 - General Plan Amendment Guenoc Valley 11x17 - REVISED 2023.pdf	280 KB
PV08-23 – GVD - B2 - General Plan Amendment Guenoc Valley 18x26 - REVISED 2023.pdf	381 KB
PV08-23 – GVD - C1 - Zoning Map Guenoc Valley District - REVISED 2023.pdf	797 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – C2 - Regulations and Development Standards for the Guenoc Valley Zoning District.pdf	179 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – C3 - Design Guidelines for the Guenoc Valley District.pdf	414 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - D1 - Maha Farm Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	40.2 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D2 - Equestrian Center Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	34 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D3 - Denniston Golf Estates Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	36.9 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D4 - Bohn Ridge Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	29.7 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – E1 - General Plan of Development (Vision Book).pdf	120 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – E2 - Specific Plan of Development (SPD).pdf	342 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G1 - Technical Memorandum - Water Demand.pdf	183 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G2 - Technical Memorandum - Wastewater Feasibility	542

Study.pdf	KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G3 - Technical Memorandum - Fire Water System Planning.pdf	964 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G4 -Technical Memorandum - Stormwater Plan.pdf	25.7 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G5 - Technical Memorandum - Water Infrastructure.pdf	7.58 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G6 - Technical Memorandum - Utility Formation.pdf	257 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G7 - Technical Memorandum - Electrical.pdf	11.1 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G8 - Technical Memorandum - Geotechnical.pdf	3.83 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - H - Santa Clara Zoning Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	509 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - I - Santa Clara Tentative Map.pdf	3.47 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - J - Santa Clara Concept Design.pdf	2.33 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - K - Callayomi Will-Serve Letter from Draft EIR - Volume II Appendices February 2020.pdf	687 KB

[Download Files](#)

[Reply to this Secure Message](#)

If you need assistance accessing or using this system, please contact support at fileTransferService@co.lake.ca.us.

County of Lake Secure File Transfer — Secure File Transfer System:

<https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us>

Grading in Lake County, CA

Purpose

The Lake County Grading Ordinance was added as [Chapter 30](#) to the Lake County Code in July 2007 to provide guidelines and regulation for grading on public and private lands within the unincorporated areas of Lake County.

The goals of the Grading Ordinance are to:

- Minimize hazards to life and property
- Protect against soil erosion
- Protect waterways
- Protect fish, wildlife, and sensitive vegetation
- Maintain consistency with the County's General Plan
- Protect cultural resources
- Protect air quality from dust and asbestos

Determining if you Need a Permit

To determine if you need a permit, please submit a “**General Grading Questionnaire**” along with a brief project description to:

ResourcePlanning@lakecountyca.gov. Grading Permit

Questionnaires may be obtained from a Planning Technician at the Lake County Community Development Department at 255 N. Forbes Street in Lakeport, or by emailing

ResourcePlanning@lakecountyca.gov

Grading is regulated under [Chapter 30 of the Lake County Municipal Code](#).

If your project requires a development permit (e.g. a Use Permit or a Zoning Permit), the development permit’s conditions of approval may specify that a grading permit will need to be obtained. In this case, the grading permit will be processed *after* the development permit’s approval, and *before* any building permits are obtained. The grading permit will also include all the conditions of the development permit, along with the requirements of Chapters 29 and 30 of the Lake County Municipal Code and any other additional project-specific mitigation.

Submissions

Request/submit the **General Grading Questionnaire** via:

ResourcePlanning@lakecountyca.gov

Request/submit the **Grading Permit Application** via a Planning Technician at:

Community Development
Department
255 N. Forbes St.
Lakeport, CA 95453
(707) 263-2221

Submit the **Grading Plans**, the **Erosion Control and Sediment Detention Plan**, and the **Grading Project Description**, along with any other requested materials to:

ResourcePlanning@lakecountyca.gov

If the files are overly large, please submit these to our Resource Planning filetransfer here:

<https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us/filedrop/ResourcePlanning>

In the Description, please include:

- Applicant Name
- Project Location
- Project APN (Assessor’s Parcel Number)
- Brief Description of Grading work (1 or 2 sentences)

Grading Application Requirements

Grading Permit Application

If you have been notified that your project will need a grading permit, please request a Grading Permit Application from a Planning Technician at the Lake County Community Development Department.

Submit a grading permit application with the fee listed at the top (\$1,871) to a Planning Technician at the Community Development Department. Planning Technician windows are located on the far left.

Grading Plans

Submit a digital version of grading plans that contain the following information:

1. Map of the area to be graded, to scale, with north arrow
2. Name and address of property owner and the individual who prepared the plans.
3. Assessors parcel number and address of the project site.
4. Vicinity map indicating location of project site in relation to adjacent roads, and mapped NOA area(s).
5. Site plan accurately detailing the area to be graded, existing and proposed roads/driveways, structures, watercourses, drainage ditches and drainage structures, springs, seeps, existing drainage patterns and proposed changes to existing drainage pattern, location of large trees, easements/right-of-ways, wells and sewage disposal systems, topographical features such as existing rock outcroppings, type of existing vegetation, and other geologic features.
6. Existing and proposed land contours with cross-sections showing depths and volumes of cuts and fills, clearly indicating the top and toe of slopes. Contours shall be shown at intervals suitable to ensure clarity.
7. Estimate of the total surface area to be disturbed, represented in square feet, as well as the estimated volume of earth to be moved, expressed as cubic yards. This may require calculations to support the estimate if deemed necessary by the Administrative Official. Calculations should separately specify amounts of cut and fill.
8. Schedule for major stages of grading activities
9. Source location for any fill material imported to the site or destination location of material to be exported from the site.
10. Locations of access routes to the site as well as proposed haul routes for import/export of materials.
11. Excess soil stockpile location, if applicable.

Erosion Control and Sediment Detention Plan

Submit a digital version of an erosion control and sediment detention plan that describes the measures, where applicable, to:

1. Protect native and naturalized vegetation.
2. Minimize disturbance or removal of native vegetation.
3. Revegetate disturbed area.
4. Detain sediment.
5. Protect drainages.
6. Protect cut and fill slopes.
7. Dispose of spoil material.
8. Protect stockpile material.
9. Control fugitive dust.
10. Minimize the generation, transport and discharge of other construction-related pollutants.
11. Monitor the site after construction.

Grading Project Description

Submit a digital version of the grading project description (may be presented in narrative and/or graphic form) that covers both construction and post-construction measures, including the following:

1. Schedule for the implementation of the control measures.
2. Description of methods to be used to protect exposed, unstable areas during and post-construction including mulching, seeding, and other BMP surface soil stabilization measures.
3. Description of temporary and permanent methods to prevent erosion and surface water runoff from cut and fill slopes, including interceptors, diversions, energy dissipaters, and other BMP velocity reducing measures.
4. Description of temporary and permanent measures to retain sediment onsite, including sediment traps and basins, vegetative filter strips, and other BMP sediment retention measures. Included shall be a schedule for the maintenance of these devices.
5. Description of temporary and permanent measures for revegetation of surfaces that will not be developed including proposed seed mix, types of plants to be installed, application technique, seed and fertilizer rate, and other BMP revegetation measures. Included shall be a schedule for implementation and maintenance of vegetation.
6. Descriptions of measures to limit access to the project site, stabilize access points, and limit tracking of sediment onto roadways.
7. Erosion Hazard Rating (EHR) for the site.

Potential Additional Application Requirements

Upon review of these materials, you may be asked to also provide the following:

- For projects that trigger regulation under the Construction General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water administered by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Erosion Control and Sediment Detention Plan may be incorporated as part of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan.
- Grading applications **proposing earth disturbance within an NOA area** shall submit an **Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan**.
- Additional plans, calculations, drawings, or information requested by the Community Development Department, which are necessary to adequately review and evaluate the proposed erosion control measures, including but not limited to:
 - [California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley - Waste Discharge Permit or Waiver, Water Quality Certification \(401 Permit\)](#), or [Construction General Permit](#) including a [Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan \(SWPPP\)](#) for any project that disturbs one or more acres of soil.
 - California Department of Fish and Wildlife - [Streambed Alteration Agreement](#)
 - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers - [Nationwide Permit](#) for work within any designated Waters of the United States under the [Clean Water Act](#)
 - Calfire - [Timberland Conversion Permit \(PDF\)](#)
 - [Lake County Air Quality Management District](#) - Dust Control or Asbestos Dust Control Plan
 - Appropriate Lake County Fire Protection District
 - [Lake County Division of Environmental Health](#)
 - [Agricultural Commissioner's Office](#)
 - [Lake County Water Resources Division](#)

Grading Permit Processing STEPS

The following is an overview of how your Grading Permit will be processed.

STEP 1 - Zoning Clearance

The first thing we do is check the zoning on the parcel to make sure it is a legal lot of record and what is being proposed, is allowed. If the grading is tied to a Use Permit or other Planning Permit, we will also check the conditions to ensure that the proposed grading is aligned with the permit.

STEP 2 – CEQA*

The State requires the County to ensure all permitted projects are compliant with CEQA. Grading projects may vary significantly depending on numerous factors, including; the quantity of material moved/filled, the sensitivity of the biosphere, slopes and erosion hazard of the soil, vicinity of waterways, the presence of archaeological/cultural resources, the time of year the work is to be done, etc.

During the CEQA analysis, your project will be determined to fall under one of the four categories listed below from [Chapter 30 \(Lake County Grading Ordinance\)](#):

Simple Grading (Section 30.20)

If your project requires a simple grading permit, please submit a completed grading permit application and the necessary application materials (permit requirements). Simple Grading Permits can typically be issued within a few days.

Standard Grading (Section 30.21)

If your project requires a standard grading permit, please submit a completed grading permit application and the necessary application materials (permit requirements) and include the fees for a Categorical Exemption and Archaeological Review by Sonoma State pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Public notice will be sent to neighboring property owners, then a CEQA Categorical Exemption will be filed with the County Clerk.

Complex Grading (Section 30.22)

If your project exceeds the limits for simple or standard grading, then the project shall be designated as complex grading and will require submitting a completed grading permit application and the necessary application materials (permit requirements) and include the fees for an Initial Study and Archaeological Review by Sonoma State pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Certain types of grading (described in Sec 30.22.1) will require the submission of engineered plans. Complex Grading may also require the submission of additional reports such as:

- Biological Resources Survey
- Cultural Resources Survey
- Geotechnical Report
- Hydrologic Study

- Other site-specific analyses as deemed necessary by the Administrative Official

**When a determination has been made as to which CEQA category your project belongs, an additional fee for your Grading Permit Application may be collected.*

- *Simple Grading Permit*
 - *Fees associated with a Zoning Clearance: \$91.50-\$154.33*
- *Standard Grading Permit*
 - *Fees associated with a Categorical Exemption and Zoning Clearance: \$776.53*
- *Complex Grading Permit*
 - *Fees associated with an Initial Study: \$3,247 (Unless project was already analyzed under a development permit)*

The CEQA review is a time-consuming process and can be expedited by submitting the necessary documents along with the application. If your project requires an Initial Study (typically with Complex Grading Permits), an environmental analysis will then be performed and uploaded to the CEQA State Clearinghouse. Upon completion of the CEQA review, public notice will be sent to neighboring property owners. The public has 20 days in which to review the project and make any comments, or request a public hearing. If no hearing is requested, the CEQA findings will be filed with the County Clerk.

STEP 4 – Post-Grading Permit Issuance

Do not begin any earth-moving work until your Grading Permit is paid for and issued! When your Grading Permit is issued, you will receive written conditions regarding the requirements for erosion control measures and inspections. Please take note that all grading activities must be completed between April 15 and October 15.

Unpermitted Grading

If grading is performed without a permit or in violation of an active permit's conditions, the property owner will be subject to the enforcement actions pursuant to [Article XI of the Lake County Grading Ordinance](#) and is deemed a public nuisance (Section 30-44.1), and may be punishable as an infraction or misdemeanor (section 30-44.5).

If you have been issued a Stop Work Order, there are two paths to corrective action. A **Grading Permit** may be obtained for work that has not yet been undertaken. For grading activities that have already occurred, fines will be levied according to the Lake County Grading Ordinance and Master Fee Schedule, and submission of a **Corrective Action** plan will be necessary.

Grading Permit – for work not yet undertaken

- Grading Permits are assessed and issued for work that has not already been undertaken.
- Follow the “Determining if you Need a Permit” and “Grading Permit Requirements” sections on the previous pages. In the **General Grading Questionnaire, Grading Plans, Erosion Control Plan, and Grading Project Description**, it will be important to differentiate work that has already been completed, vs. proposed work.
- Only the proposed work will be assessed.
- If, after review of your questionnaire and brief project description, your proposed work is exempt from Grading Permit requirements (e.g. falling under one of the [Exemption](#) categories), your proposed work must still abide by the standards set forth in [Chapter 29 of the Lake County Code – The Lake County Stormwater Ordinance](#)
- If, after review, your proposed work requires a grading permit, the procedures on the previous pages will apply.

Corrective Actions - for grading work that has already been completed

- Pursuant to [Chapter 30-47 Corrective Action](#), for the grading activities that have already been completed, you will need to submit for approval, a detailed schedule of specific remedies that can be undertaken immediately to bring the work into compliance with [Chapter 30](#).
 - This detailed schedule should address those standards found in [Chapter 30, Article IV. – Grading Design Standards](#)
 - If the remedial actions require additional emergency grading, you may apply for an Emergency Grading Permit pursuant to [Chapter 30-23](#)
 - In the event that an Emergency Grading Permit is needed for corrective actions, you will need to abide by the winter grading guidelines of [Chapter 30-24](#)
 - Within twenty four hours after acceptance of this detailed schedule by our Grading and Stormwater Inspector, you may undertake the remedial actions.

Unpermitted Grading

Grading Complaints

Submit to:

Tod.Elliott@lakecountycal.gov

Grading and Stormwater

Inspector

(707) 263-2309

Or submit an online grading complaint here: [Accela Citizen Access](#)

Emergency Grading Permits

For corrective action on unpermitted grading, please contact:

ResourcePlanning@lakecountycal.gov



COUNTY OF LAKE
SPECIAL DISTRICTS ADMINISTRATION
230 N. Main Street
Lakeport, California 95453
Telephone 707/263-0119
Fax 707/263-3836

Scott Harter
Special Districts Administrator

CAPACITY ANALYSIS/HYDRAULIC MODEL POLICY

Special Districts maintains four wastewater treatment facilities and five water systems. Each system is unique so far as when it was constructed, treatment methods and available capacity to serve new development.

The District requires that developers wishing to construct four single-family equivalent units or more, submit a capacity analysis to the District for review. Please note that in the area served by the **Southeast Regional Wastewater and Northwest Regional Treatment Facilities, the number of proposed single-family dwelling equivalent units that require the submittal of an analysis, is twenty.** The analysis is to be prepared by a licensed civil engineer and will examine water distribution, storage and treatment as well as sewer collection, pumping and treatment as is applicable to the project area. The purpose of the analysis is to identify deficiencies, (if any) in the system(s) from the project site to the treatment plant(s).

Calculations demonstrating discharge less than one single-family dwelling equivalent unit as defined by ordinance, can be submitted by a licensed Civil Engineer registered in the State of California and will be reviewed by the District Engineer. Installation of low flow, low flush plumbing fixtures, gray water systems, and central laundry facilities are examples of opportunities to reduce the number of single-family dwelling equivalent units by reducing discharge to the sewage collection system.

The developer will be required to reimburse the District for hours billed by Department of Public Works engineering staff and/or the District's engineering consultant for review of the Capacity Analysis. The developer will also be required to mitigate impacts to the collection and/or distribution system(s) specifically attributable to the project and as identified in the approved Capacity Analysis. Once approved, A Capacity Analysis shall remain in effect and valid for a period not to exceed two (2) years, unless an extension is granted by the Administrator.

.Please note that for development in the area served by LACOSAN from Lower Lake to Clearlake Park, as well as from Beach Street to Paradise Valley, hydraulic models are available. The developer provides a project description, the information from which is "plugged into" the model and an analysis is provided to the developer for a fee. (Revised 7/2/09)

Connections to all District maintained water and/or sewer systems will be made in accordance with the rules, regulations, policies, procedures and ordinances in effect at the time of connection application.

Special Districts Administrator

Date

Lenihan, Rachel x4760

From: Laura Hall <Laura.Hall@lakecounttyca.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2024 3:20 PM
To: Lenihan, Rachel x4760
Cc: Mireya Turner; Michelle Irace; cm@mahaman.com; Philippakis, Katherine x4434; jb@mahaman.com; kc@mahaman.com
Subject: FW: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:
Attachments: Cap Analysis Policy signed by Scott H 2020_12.pdf

External Sender

Rachel,

Please see the attached and the comments below.

Thank you,

Laura

From: Lori Baca <Lori.Baca@lakecounttyca.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 18, 2024 2:31 PM
To: Laura Hall <Laura.Hall@lakecounttyca.gov>
Subject: RE: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:

Laura,

Im not sure what happened but my response didn't end up sending and was sitting as a draft. I've been between desks covering for a few employees who have been out and have had issues with my email at the other desk. It looks like I am past the date, I am very sorry that I just now see this didn't send.

The proposed Off-Site Workforce Housing site at 21000 Santa Clara Road/ APN 014-380-09 in Middletown is within our Assessment District 2-2 LACOSAN Middletown Sewer service are. It is within Floodway Fringe and has not been assessed for sewer service.

Projects of four single family dwelling equivalent units or greater will require the submittal of a Capacity Analysis/Hydraulic Model Policy. The analysis is to be prepared by a licensed civil engineer and will be reviewed and approved by the District, or our office can facilitate this at the Developers request. Please see the attached Capacity Analysis/Hydraulic Model Policy for review.

Also, before the issuance of any building permits, Capacity Expansion fees as well as Buy-In fees per single family equivalent will be due and paid to the District. Current fees are listed below:

Buy-In Fee per SFD equivalent is \$2397.10

Capacity Expansion Fee per SFD equivalent is currently \$6209.27

(50% of the Capacity Expansion fee is due for units 720 square feet or less)

The Capacity Expansion Fee increases by the Consumer Price Index at the beginning of every calendar year.

****Connections to LACOSAN will be made in accordance with the rules, regulations, policies, and procedures and ordinances in effect at the time of application****

Lori A. Baca

Customer Service Supervisor

Lori.Baca@lakecountyca.gov

Office Number (707) 263-0119

Fax (707) 263-3836



From: Laura Hall [<mailto:laura.hall@lakecountyca.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2024 9:54 AM

To: Katherine Vanderwall <Katherine.Vanderwall@lakecountyca.gov>; Douglas Gearhart <dougg@lcaqmd.net>; Elizabeth Knight <elizabethk@lcaqmd.net>; Ryan Lewelling <Ryan.Lewelling@lakecountyca.gov>; William Collins <William.Collins@lakecountyca.gov>; Scott DeLeon <Scott.DeLeon@lakecountyca.gov>; David Bingham <David.Bingham@lakecountyca.gov>; Katherine Schaefer <Katherine.Schaefer@lakecountyca.gov>; Craig Wetherbee <Craig.Wetherbee@lakecountyca.gov>; Lars Ewing <Lars.Ewing@lakecountyca.gov>; Lori Baca <Lori.Baca@lakecountyca.gov>; Vance Ricks <Vance.Ricks@lakecountyca.gov>; Greg Peters <Greg.Peters@lakecountyca.gov>; bruce.mccracken@wasteconnections.com; mrsnelsanders@gmail.com; raeebycarl@hotmail.com; deanie82@sbcglobal.net; ryan_olah@fws.gov; frank.aebly@usda.gov; timchiara@hotmail.com; maacamax@att.net; genepaleno@gmail.com; roberta.lyons@att.net; redbud.audubon@gmail.com; debsal14@gmail.com; korinn.woodard@ca.usda.gov; michael.parker@countyofnapa.org; donnamackiewicz@gmail.com; elioth@sscra.org; wshock@mchsi.com; jruygt@comcast.net; vbrandon95457@gmail.com; spkregulatorymailbox@usace.army.mil; gdm@paratransit.net; pgeplanreview@pge.com; mathtownhall@gmail.com; rvineyards@sonic.net; catherine.stone@middletownusd.org; j.benoit4@icloud.com; benjamin.huffer@wildlife.ca.gov; r2ceqa@wildlife.ca.gov; jesse.robertson@dot.ca.gov; skrul@chp.ca.gov; michaela.moser@slc.ca.gov; centralvalleysac@waterboards.ca.gov; janae.fried@waterboards.ca.gov; jason.schroeder@waterboards.ca.gov; cdph-lncsantarosa@cdph.ca.gov; adye@chp.ca.gov; nwic@sonoma.edu; sham@blm.gov; rlk7@pge.com

Cc: Mireya Turner <Mireya.Turner@lakecountyca.gov>; Michelle Irace <Michelle.Irace@lakecountyca.gov>

Subject: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:

Good afternoon, Fellow Agencies and Others,

This is a request for review (RFR) for the following planning entitlements to allow for development of the proposed Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project. Please note that this project was previously approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2020, but due to legal challenges it was rescinded June 14, 2022. Included in this RFR are several attachments, however, documents “PV08-23 - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Development Project Master Transmittal Letter” and “Project Description 2-21-2024 and PV08-23 – GVD – A5 - Key Project Modifications Exhibit - REVISED 2023” include specific information pertaining to project changes. Please also note that staff will be setting up a meeting in the next two weeks to go over the project and any questions you may have will be presented to the applicant at that time. Finally, the CEQA analyses will come later for review, as staff only has an Admin Draft at this time. The planning entitlements include the following:

Guenoc Ranch Site:

Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment AM 24-01

Development Agreement DA 24-01

General Plan Amendment GPAP (Map) 24-01

General Plan Amendment (Text) 24-02

Rezone 24-01,

General Plan of Development GPD 24-01

Subdivision Map SD 24-01

Subdivision Map SD 24-02

Subdivision Map SD 24-03

Subdivision Map SD 24-04

Use Permit UP 24-05

Middletown Site:

General Plan Amendment GPAP (Map) 24-03

General Plan Amendment (Text) 24-04

Rezone RZ 24-02

Subdivision Map SD 24-05

CEQA: Environment Impact Report EIR 24-01

Please advise us if additional information is needed, which permits are required from your agency (if any), and/or of your environmental concerns. Additionally, please advise if your agency recommends any modifications to the project that would reduce potential environmental impacts. Due to the provisions of state law, it is essential that we receive your comments as soon as possible, but no case later than April 12, 2024. Please email your comments to laura.hall@lakecountycalifornia.gov, or mail them to the address listed in the letterhead of the RFR.

Sincerely,

Laura Hall,
Senior Planner

Download Files

Reply to this Secure Message

Secure Message Info

Message ID	RGCblobBKybKNjuFvTelvu
Message Expires	Thursday, 4 April
Message URL	https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us/message/RGCblobBKybKNjuFvTelvu
Permission	If you forward this email with the secure random download link, whomever you forward this to can download the files attached to this message.

Files attached to this message

Filename	Size
RFR Agency Notification_Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project.pdf	138 KB
PV08-23 - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Development Project Master Transmittal Letter and Project Description 2-21-2024.pdf	320 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - A1 - Full Planning Application - Signed.pdf	2.26 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – A2 - Project APN List & Ownership.pdf	35.4 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - A3 - Guenoc Ownership Map.pdf	762 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A4 - Surrounding & Proposed Land Use Maps.pdf	430 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A5 - Key Project Modifications Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	10.1 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - A6 - Originally Adopted Resolutions & Ordinances.pdf	205 KB

PV08-23 – GVD – A7 - Grange Road Emergency Access Connector Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	11.3 MB
PV08-23 – GVD - A8 - Roads Added & Removed Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	46.7 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - A9 - Maha Wildfire Prevention Plan DRAFT - REVISED 2023.pdf	13 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - B1 - General Plan Amendment Guenoc Valley 11x17 - REVISED 2023.pdf	280 KB
PV08-23 – GVD - B2 - General Plan Amendment Guenoc Valley 18x26 - REVISED 2023.pdf	381 KB
PV08-23 – GVD - C1 - Zoning Map Guenoc Valley District - REVISED 2023.pdf	797 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – C2 - Regulations and Development Standards for the Guenoc Valley Zoning District.pdf	179 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – C3 - Design Guidelines for the Guenoc Valley District.pdf	414 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - D1 - Maha Farm Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	40.2 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D2 - Equestrian Center Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	34 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D3 - Denniston Golf Estates Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	36.9 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D4 - Bohn Ridge Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	29.7 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – E1 - General Plan of Development (Vision Book).pdf	120 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – E2 - Specific Plan of Development (SPD).pdf	342 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G1 - Technical Memorandum - Water Demand.pdf	183 KB

PV08-23 – GVD – G2 - Technical Memorandum - Wastewater Feasibility Study.pdf	542 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G3 - Technical Memorandum - Fire Water System Planning.pdf	964 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G4 -Technical Memorandum - Stormwater Plan.pdf	25.7 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G5 - Technical Memorandum - Water Infrastructure.pdf	7.58 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G6 - Technical Memorandum - Utility Formation.pdf	257 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G7 - Technical Memorandum - Electrical.pdf	11.1 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G8 - Technical Memorandum - Geotechnical.pdf	3.83 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - H - Santa Clara Zoning Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	509 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - I - Santa Clara Tentative Map.pdf	3.47 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - J - Santa Clara Concept Design.pdf	2.33 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - K - Callayomi Will-Serve Letter from Draft EIR - Volume II Appendices February 2020.pdf	687 KB

[Download Files](#)

[Reply to this Secure Message](#)

If you need assistance accessing or using this system, please contact support at
fileTransferService@co.lake.ca.us.

County of Lake Secure File Transfer — Secure File Transfer System:
<https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us>

From: [Ryan Lewelling](#)
To: [Laura Hall](#)
Cc: [Vance Ricks](#); [Cara Salmon](#)
Subject: RE: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:
Date: Monday, May 6, 2024 12:03:41 PM

Laura,

This Assessor's Office review of tentative Subdivision Map MAHA SANTA CLARA SUBDIVISION, L I H S C R HOLDINGS, APN 014-380-090-000, has the following comments:

- No Tax Rate Area conflicts identified (TRA 062-008).
- Property taxes current as of 4/8/2024.
- Ownership confirmed per doc no. 2018015454, 12/10/2018.
 - NOTE: assessed parcel may not be a legal lot of record. A 1992 Lot Line Adjustment was recorded Oct 13, 1992, as doc no. 1992021672, without following deeds.
- Easements of record exist – doc nos. 1991008953, 1991008954, 1991008955, 1991021543, 2004013909
- A draft of the tentative subdivision map (38 lots, 2 roadways) was reviewed and located, with the following issues to be resolved:
 - Draft does not indicate if roadways will be private or offered for dedication to the public.
 - Draft does not indicate who is the subdivider/owner of record.
 - Draft does not identify a "Lot 22".

Please proceed accordingly.

Ryan Lewelling
Cadastral Mapping Specialist,
Assessor-Recorder, County of Lake, California
707-263-2302 | Ryan.Lewelling@LakeCountyCA.gov

From: Laura Hall <Laura.Hall@lakecountyca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2024 4:37 PM
To: Ryan Lewelling <Ryan.Lewelling@lakecountyca.gov>
Cc: Mireya Turner <Mireya.Turner@lakecountyca.gov>; Michelle Irace <Michelle.Irace@lakecountyca.gov>
Subject: RE: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:

Ryan,

I just dropped off the maps at your department.

Thank you,

Laura

From: Ryan Lewelling <Ryan.Lewelling@lakecountyca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2024 4:35 PM
To: Laura Hall <Laura.Hall@lakecountyca.gov>

Subject: RE: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:

Laura,

Thank you for the link, and the plan sets.

Ryan Lewelling

Cadastral Mapping Specialist,

Assessor-Recorder, County of Lake, California

707-263-2302 | Ryan.Lewelling@LakeCountyCA.gov

From: Laura Hall <laura.hall@lakecountyca.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2024 4:30 PM

To: Ryan Lewelling <Ryan.Lewelling@lakecountyca.gov>

Cc: Mireya Turner <Mireya.Turner@lakecountyca.gov>; Michelle Irace <Michelle.Irace@lakecountyca.gov>

Subject: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:

Good afternoon, Fellow Agencies and Others,

This is a request for review (RFR) for the following planning entitlements to allow for development of the proposed Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project. Please note that this project was previously approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2020, but due to legal challenges it was rescinded June 14, 2022. Included in this RFR are several attachments, however, documents “PV08-23 - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Development Project Master Transmittal Letter” and “Project Description 2-21-2024 and PV08-23 – GVD – A5 - Key Project Modifications Exhibit - REVISED 2023” include specific information pertaining to project changes. Please also note that staff will be setting up a meeting in the next two weeks to go over the project and any questions you may have will be presented to the applicant at that time. Finally, the CEQA analyses will come later for review, as staff only has an Admin Draft at this time. The planning entitlements include the following:

Guenoc Ranch Site:

Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment AM 24-01

Development Agreement DA 24-01

General Plan Amendment GPAP (Map) 24-01

General Plan Amendment (Text) 24-02

Rezone 24-01,

General Plan of Development GPD 24-01

Subdivision Map SD 24-01

Subdivision Map SD 24-02

Subdivision Map SD 24-03

Subdivision Map SD 24-04

Use Permit UP 24-05

Middletown Site:

General Plan Amendment GPAP (Map) 24-03

General Plan Amendment (Text) 24-04

Rezone RZ 24-02

Subdivision Map SD 24-05

CEQA: Environment Impact Report EIR 24-01

Please advise us if additional information is needed, which permits are required from your agency (if any), and/or of your environmental concerns. Additionally, please advise if your agency recommends any modifications to the project that would reduce potential environmental impacts. Due to the provisions of state law, it is essential that we receive your comments as soon as possible, but no case later than April 12, 2024. Please email your comments to laura.hall@lakecountyca.gov, or mail them to the address listed in the letterhead of the RFR.

Sincerely,

Laura Hall,

Senior Planner

[Download Files](#)

[Reply to this Secure Message](#)

Secure Message Info

Message ID	3vbNhl7n7o8jThG94ZEsel
Message Expires	Wednesday, 17 April
Message URL	https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us/message/3vbNhl7n7o8jThG94ZEsel
Permission	If you forward this email with the secure random download link, whomever you forward this to can download the files attached to this message.

Files attached to this message

Filename	Size
PV08-23 - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Development Project Master Transmittal Letter and Project Description 2-21-2024.pdf	320 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - A1 - Full Planning Application - Signed.pdf	2.26 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – A2 - Project APN List & Ownership.pdf	35.4 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - A3 - Guenoc Ownership Map.pdf	762 KB

PV08-23 – GVD – A4 - Surrounding & Proposed Land Use Maps.pdf	430 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A5 - Key Project Modifications Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	10.1 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - A6 - Originally Adopted Resolutions & Ordinances.pdf	205 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A7 - Grange Road Emergency Access Connector Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	11.3 MB
PV08-23 – GVD - A8 - Roads Added & Removed Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	46.7 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - A9 - Maha Wildfire Prevention Plan DRAFT - REVISED 2023.pdf	13 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - B1 - General Plan Amendment Guenoc Valley 11x17 - REVISED 2023.pdf	280 KB
PV08-23 – GVD - B2 - General Plan Amendment Guenoc Valley 18x26 - REVISED 2023.pdf	381 KB
PV08-23 – GVD - C1 - Zoning Map Guenoc Valley District - REVISED 2023.pdf	797 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – C2 - Regulations and Development Standards for the Guenoc Valley Zoning District.pdf	179 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – C3 - Design Guidelines for the Guenoc Valley District.pdf	414 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - D1 - Maha Farm Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	40.2 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D2 - Equestrian Center Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	34 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D3 - Denniston Golf Estates Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	36.9 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D4 - Bohn Ridge Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	29.7 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – E1 - General Plan of Development (Vision Book).pdf	120 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – E2 - Specific Plan of Development (SPD).pdf	342 MB

PV08-23 – GVD – G1 - Technical Memorandum - Water Demand.pdf	183 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G2 - Technical Memorandum - Wastewater Feasibility Study.pdf	542 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G3 - Technical Memorandum - Fire Water System Planning.pdf	964 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G4 -Technical Memorandum - Stormwater Plan.pdf	25.7 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G5 - Technical Memorandum - Water Infrastructure.pdf	7.58 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G6 - Technical Memorandum - Utility Formation.pdf	257 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G7 - Technical Memorandum - Electrical.pdf	11.1 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G8 - Technical Memorandum - Geotechnical.pdf	3.83 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - H - Santa Clara Zoning Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	509 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - I - Santa Clara Tentative Map.pdf	3.47 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - J - Santa Clara Concept Design.pdf	2.33 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - K - Callayomi Will-Serve Letter from Draft EIR - Volume II Appendices February 2020.pdf	687 KB

[Download Files](#)

[Reply to this Secure Message](#)

fileTransferService@co.lake.ca.us.

County of Lake Secure File Transfer — Secure File Transfer System:

<https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us>

To: Laura Hall, Senior Planner, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, Planning Division
From: Butts Canyon Residents, Middletown Ca
Re: RFR of proposed Guenoc Valley Mixed Used Planned Development Project
Date: April 11, 2024

We, the undersigned residents of Butts Canyon Rd near the Maha project would like to express our views on this project and how it could impact our daily lives.






We think the project could be an asset to our community of Middletown and Lake County as a whole. However, the size and scope of the project requires a close-up lens, through the eyes of residents that will be affected the most-its immediate neighbors.

We have concerns regarding the traffic on Butts Canyon Rd for sometime now at the current traffic levels. The traffic between 6 and 9 am and 3:30 to 6:30pm is currently exceptionally busy. It is very fast and congested, with often little regard to double yellow lines and curves. Butts Canyon is a major artery to and from Napa County. The County of Lake needs to take measures now to slow people down and improve the road. There are a cluster of homes from the Circle D Ranch (19750 Butts Canyon) near the intersection of Butts Canyon and Oat Hill Mine Rd and Hockenson's (19298 Butts Canyon). During these congested commute hours, it is particularly dangerous for these residents when pulling on to Butts Canyon. The prospect of adding hundreds of more cars is intimidating and needs to be mitigated. This also adds to the issue of Hwy 29 and Butts Canyon and evacuation concerns in an emergency situation. Are there any plans to improve the bridge? Has there been a traffic study? What are the proposed improvements?

Additionally, the revised project is proposing a helipad on the shores of Dietert Reservoir. This, unfortunately, is poor planning. Dietert Reservoir has an extremely high concentration of wildlife. There are Bald Eagles, Osprey, Canadian Geese, Blue Heron, American coots, etc. that reside and nest in this pristine area. "We have had biologists come out to our property (Hodges) and say that this area has the highest raptor concentrations in the state". The Department of Fish and Wildlife are currently conducting a study on the Hodges/Donley and Hockenson's properties. Not only will air traffic in the area disturb the wildlife and the residents, it could endanger the potential guests and staff. Could we get clarification of the specific proposed use of aircraft with this project? Are both Helicopters and float planes proposed. Why isn't the helipad located in the proposed housing area of this project?

Many of us have lived here for decades. Living in a beautiful rural area, one becomes a steward of the land. You become part of it. Maha purports to have the same goals at heart. I hope that we can work together to find a reasonable solution to our concerns and our safety, and life style are not compromised.

Signed:

	Printed Name <u>Bill S. Gail Wright</u> Address <u>19491 Butts Cyn Rd</u>
	Printed Name <u>Judson Hodges</u> Address <u>19750 Butts Cyn</u>
	Printed Name <u>Rebecca Pledger</u> Address <u>19455 Butts Cyn Rd</u>
	Printed Name <u>Randy Pledger</u> Address <u>19455 Butts Cyn Rd</u>
	Printed Name <u>JENNIFER Cisi</u> Address <u>19536 BUTTS CYN RD</u>

From: [Northwest Information Center](#)
To: [Laura Hall](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:
Date: Thursday, March 28, 2024 12:34:07 PM

Thank you for your request. We have added it to our queue and we will be in touch if any questions arise. Please contact us via email (nwic@sonoma.edu) or at 707.588.8455 if you need to follow-up regarding this request.

Your record search has been assigned NWIC File#: 23-1405

Thanks,

Dana Marty

Northwest Information Center

1400 Valley House Drive, Suite 210, Rohnert Park, CA 94928

T: (707) 588-8455

nwic@sonoma.edu

www.nwic.sonoma.edu

On Thu, Mar 28, 2024 at 9:54 AM Laura Hall <laura.hall@lakecountyca.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon, Fellow Agencies and Others,

This is a request for review (RFR) for the following planning entitlements to allow for development of the proposed Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project. Please note that this project was previously approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2020, but due to legal challenges it was rescinded June 14, 2022. Included in this RFR are several attachments, however, documents "PV08-23 - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Development Project Master Transmittal Letter" and "Project Description 2-21-2024 and PV08-23 – GVD – A5 - Key Project Modifications Exhibit - REVISED 2023" include specific information pertaining to project changes. Please also note that staff will be setting up a meeting in the next two weeks to go over the project and any questions you may have will be presented to the applicant at that time. Finally, the CEQA analyses will come later for review, as staff only has an Admin Draft at this time. The planning entitlements include the following:

Guenoc Ranch Site:

Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment AM 24-01

Development Agreement DA 24-01

General Plan Amendment GPAP (Map) 24-01

General Plan Amendment (Text) 24-02

Rezone 24-01,

General Plan of Development GPD 24-01

Subdivision Map SD 24-01

Subdivision Map SD 24-02

Subdivision Map SD 24-03

Subdivision Map SD 24-04

Use Permit UP 24-05

Middletown Site:

General Plan Amendment GPAP (Map) 24-03

General Plan Amendment (Text) 24-04

Rezone RZ 24-02

Subdivision Map SD 24-05

CEQA: Environment Impact Report EIR 24-01

Please advise us if additional information is needed, which permits are required from your agency (if any), and/or of your environmental concerns. Additionally, please advise if your agency recommends any modifications to the project that would reduce potential environmental impacts. Due to the provisions of state law, it is essential that we receive your comments as soon as possible, but no case later than April 12, 2024. Please email your comments to laura.hall@lakecountyca.gov, or mail them to the address listed in the letterhead of the RFR.

Sincerely,

Laura Hall,
Senior Planner

Download Files

Reply to this Secure Message

Secure Message Info

Message ID	RGCblobBKybKNjuFvTelvu
Message Expires	Thursday, 4 April
Message URL	https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us/message/RGCblobBKybKNjuFvTelvu
Permission	If you forward this email with the secure random download link, whomever you forward this to can download the files attached to this message.

Files attached to this message

Filename	Size
RFR Agency Notification_Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project.pdf	138 KB
PV08-23 - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Development Project Master Transmittal Letter and Project Description 2-21-2024.pdf	320 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - A1 - Full Planning Application - Signed.pdf	2.26 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – A2 - Project APN List & Ownership.pdf	35.4 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - A3 - Guenoc Ownership Map.pdf	762 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A4 - Surrounding & Proposed Land Use Maps.pdf	430 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A5 - Key Project Modifications Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	10.1 MB

PV08-23 - GVD - A6 - Originally Adopted Resolutions & Ordinances.pdf	205 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – A7 - Grange Road Emergency Access Connector Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	11.3 MB
PV08-23 – GVD - A8 - Roads Added & Removed Exhibit - REVISED 2023.pdf	46.7 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - A9 - Maha Wildfire Prevention Plan DRAFT - REVISED 2023.pdf	13 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - B1 - General Plan Amendment Guenoc Valley 11x17 - REVISED 2023.pdf	280 KB
PV08-23 – GVD - B2 - General Plan Amendment Guenoc Valley 18x26 - REVISED 2023.pdf	381 KB
PV08-23 – GVD - C1 - Zoning Map Guenoc Valley District - REVISED 2023.pdf	797 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – C2 - Regulations and Development Standards for the Guenoc Valley Zoning District.pdf	179 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – C3 - Design Guidelines for the Guenoc Valley District.pdf	414 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - D1 - Maha Farm Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	40.2 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D2 - Equestrian Center Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	34 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D3 - Denniston Golf Estates Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	36.9 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – D4 - Bohn Ridge Subdivision Tentative Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	29.7 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – E1 - General Plan of Development (Vision Book).pdf	120 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – E2 - Specific Plan of Development (SPD).pdf	342 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G1 - Technical Memorandum - Water Demand.pdf	183 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G2 - Technical Memorandum - Wastewater Feasibility Study.pdf	542 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G3 - Technical Memorandum - Fire Water System	964

Planning.pdf	KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G4 -Technical Memorandum - Stormwater Plan.pdf	25.7 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G5 - Technical Memorandum - Water Infrastructure.pdf	7.58 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G6 - Technical Memorandum - Utility Formation.pdf	257 KB
PV08-23 – GVD – G7 - Technical Memorandum - Electrical.pdf	11.1 MB
PV08-23 – GVD – G8 - Technical Memorandum - Geotechnical.pdf	3.83 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - H - Santa Clara Zoning Map - REVISED 2023.pdf	509 KB
PV08-23 - GVD - I - Santa Clara Tentative Map.pdf	3.47 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - J - Santa Clara Concept Design.pdf	2.33 MB
PV08-23 - GVD - K - Callayomi Will-Serve Letter from Draft EIR - Volume II Appendices February 2020.pdf	687 KB

[Download Files](#)

[Reply to this Secure Message](#)

If you need assistance accessing or using this system, please contact support at
fileTransferService@co.lake.ca.us.

County of Lake Secure File Transfer — Secure File Transfer System:
<https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us>



April 3, 2024

Laura Hall
County of Lake
255 N. Forbes Street
Lakeport, California 95453

Ref: Gas and Electric Transmission and Distribution

Dear Laura,

Thank you for submitting the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project plans for our review. PG&E will review the submitted plans in relationship to any existing Gas and Electric facilities within the project area. If the proposed project is adjacent/or within PG&E owned property and/or easements, we will be working with you to ensure compatible uses and activities near our facilities.

Attached you will find information and requirements as it relates to Gas facilities (Attachment 1) and Electric facilities (Attachment 2). Please review these in detail, as it is critical to ensure your safety and to protect PG&E's facilities and its existing rights.

Below is additional information for your review:

1. This plan review process does not replace the application process for PG&E gas or electric service your project may require. For these requests, please continue to work with PG&E Service Planning: https://www.pge.com/en_US/business/services/building-and-renovation/overview/overview.page.
2. If the project being submitted is part of a larger project, please include the entire scope of your project, and not just a portion of it. PG&E's facilities are to be incorporated within any CEQA document. PG&E needs to verify that the CEQA document will identify any required future PG&E services.
3. An engineering deposit may be required to review plans for a project depending on the size, scope, and location of the project and as it relates to any rearrangement or new installation of PG&E facilities.

Any proposed uses within the PG&E fee strip and/or easement, may include a California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) Section 851 filing. This requires the CPUC to render approval for a conveyance of rights for specific uses on PG&E's fee strip or easement. PG&E will advise if the necessity to incorporate a CPUC Section 851 filing is required.

This letter does not constitute PG&E's consent to use any portion of its easement for any purpose not previously conveyed. PG&E will provide a project specific response as required.

Sincerely,

Plan Review Team
Land Management



Attachment 1 – Gas Facilities

There could be gas transmission pipelines in this area which would be considered critical facilities for PG&E and a high priority subsurface installation under California law. Care must be taken to ensure safety and accessibility. So, please ensure that if PG&E approves work near gas transmission pipelines it is done in adherence with the below stipulations. Additionally, the following link provides additional information regarding legal requirements under California excavation laws: <https://www.usanorth811.org/images/pdfs/CA-LAW-2018.pdf>

1. Standby Inspection: A PG&E Gas Transmission Standby Inspector must be present during any demolition or construction activity that comes within 10 feet of the gas pipeline. This includes all grading, trenching, substructure depth verifications (potholes), asphalt or concrete demolition/removal, removal of trees, signs, light poles, etc. This inspection can be coordinated through the Underground Service Alert (USA) service at 811. A minimum notice of 48 hours is required. Ensure the USA markings and notifications are maintained throughout the duration of your work.
2. Access: At any time, PG&E may need to access, excavate, and perform work on the gas pipeline. Any construction equipment, materials, or spoils may need to be removed upon notice. Any temporary construction fencing installed within PG&E's easement would also need to be capable of being removed at any time upon notice. Any plans to cut temporary slopes exceeding a 1:4 grade within 10 feet of a gas transmission pipeline need to be approved by PG&E Pipeline Services in writing PRIOR to performing the work.
3. Wheel Loads: To prevent damage to the buried gas pipeline, there are weight limits that must be enforced whenever any equipment gets within 10 feet of traversing the pipe.

Ensure a list of the axle weights of all equipment being used is available for PG&E's Standby Inspector. To confirm the depth of cover, the pipeline may need to be potholed by hand in a few areas.

Due to the complex variability of tracked equipment, vibratory compaction equipment, and cranes, PG&E must evaluate those items on a case-by-case basis prior to use over the gas pipeline (provide a list of any proposed equipment of this type noting model numbers and specific attachments).

No equipment may be set up over the gas pipeline while operating. Ensure crane outriggers are at least 10 feet from the centerline of the gas pipeline. Transport trucks must not be parked over the gas pipeline while being loaded or unloaded.

4. Grading: PG&E requires a minimum of 36 inches of cover over gas pipelines (or existing grade if less) and a maximum of 7 feet of cover at all locations. The graded surface cannot exceed a cross slope of 1:4.
5. Excavating: Any digging within 2 feet of a gas pipeline must be dug by hand. Note that while the minimum clearance is only 24 inches, any excavation work within 24 inches of the edge of a pipeline must be done with hand tools. So to avoid having to dig a trench entirely with hand tools, the edge of the trench must be over 24 inches away. (Doing the math for a 24 inch



wide trench being dug along a 36 inch pipeline, the centerline of the trench would need to be at least 54 inches [$24/2 + 24 + 36/2 = 54$] away, or be entirely dug by hand.)

Water jetting to assist vacuum excavating must be limited to 1000 psig and directed at a 40° angle to the pipe. All pile driving must be kept a minimum of 3 feet away.

Any plans to expose and support a PG&E gas transmission pipeline across an open excavation need to be approved by PG&E Pipeline Services in writing PRIOR to performing the work.

6. Boring/Trenchless Installations: PG&E Pipeline Services must review and approve all plans to bore across or parallel to (within 10 feet) a gas transmission pipeline. There are stringent criteria to pothole the gas transmission facility at regular intervals for all parallel bore installations.

For bore paths that cross gas transmission pipelines perpendicularly, the pipeline must be potholed a minimum of 2 feet in the horizontal direction of the bore path and a minimum of 24 inches in the vertical direction from the bottom of the pipe with minimum clearances measured from the edge of the pipe in both directions. Standby personnel must watch the locator trace (and every ream pass) the path of the bore as it approaches the pipeline and visually monitor the pothole (with the exposed transmission pipe) as the bore traverses the pipeline to ensure adequate clearance with the pipeline. The pothole width must account for the inaccuracy of the locating equipment.

7. Substructures: All utility crossings of a gas pipeline should be made as close to perpendicular as feasible ($90^\circ \pm 15^\circ$). All utility lines crossing the gas pipeline must have a minimum of 24 inches of separation from the gas pipeline. Parallel utilities, pole bases, water line 'kicker blocks', storm drain inlets, water meters, valves, back pressure devices or other utility substructures are not allowed in the PG&E gas pipeline easement.

If previously retired PG&E facilities are in conflict with proposed substructures, PG&E must verify they are safe prior to removal. This includes verification testing of the contents of the facilities, as well as environmental testing of the coating and internal surfaces. Timelines for PG&E completion of this verification will vary depending on the type and location of facilities in conflict.

8. Structures: No structures are to be built within the PG&E gas pipeline easement. This includes buildings, retaining walls, fences, decks, patios, carports, septic tanks, storage sheds, tanks, loading ramps, or any structure that could limit PG&E's ability to access its facilities.

9. Fencing: Permanent fencing is not allowed within PG&E easements except for perpendicular crossings which must include a 16 foot wide gate for vehicular access. Gates will be secured with PG&E corporation locks.

10. Landscaping: Landscaping must be designed to allow PG&E to access the pipeline for maintenance and not interfere with pipeline coatings or other cathodic protection systems. No trees, shrubs, brush, vines, and other vegetation may be planted within the easement area. Only those plants, ground covers, grasses, flowers, and low-growing plants that grow unsupported to a maximum of four feet (4') in height at maturity may be planted within the easement area.



11. Cathodic Protection: PG&E pipelines are protected from corrosion with an “Impressed Current” cathodic protection system. Any proposed facilities, such as metal conduit, pipes, service lines, ground rods, anodes, wires, etc. that might affect the pipeline cathodic protection system must be reviewed and approved by PG&E Corrosion Engineering.

12. Pipeline Marker Signs: PG&E needs to maintain pipeline marker signs for gas transmission pipelines in order to ensure public awareness of the presence of the pipelines. With prior written approval from PG&E Pipeline Services, an existing PG&E pipeline marker sign that is in direct conflict with proposed developments may be temporarily relocated to accommodate construction work. The pipeline marker must be moved back once construction is complete.

13. PG&E is also the provider of distribution facilities throughout many of the areas within the state of California. Therefore, any plans that impact PG&E’s facilities must be reviewed and approved by PG&E to ensure that no impact occurs which may endanger the safe operation of its facilities.



Attachment 2 – Electric Facilities

It is PG&E's policy to permit certain uses on a case by case basis within its electric transmission fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) provided such uses and manner in which they are exercised, will not interfere with PG&E's rights or endanger its facilities. Some examples/restrictions are as follows:

1. **Buildings and Other Structures:** No buildings or other structures including the foot print and eave of any buildings, swimming pools, wells or similar structures will be permitted within fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) areas. PG&E's transmission easement shall be designated on subdivision/parcel maps as **"RESTRICTED USE AREA – NO BUILDING."**
2. **Grading:** Cuts, trenches or excavations may not be made within 25 feet of our towers. Developers must submit grading plans and site development plans (including geotechnical reports if applicable), signed and dated, for PG&E's review. PG&E engineers must review grade changes in the vicinity of our towers. No fills will be allowed which would impair ground-to-conductor clearances. Towers shall not be left on mounds without adequate road access to base of tower or structure.
3. **Fences:** Walls, fences, and other structures must be installed at locations that do not affect the safe operation of PG&E's facilities. Heavy equipment access to our facilities must be maintained at all times. Metal fences are to be grounded to PG&E specifications. No wall, fence or other like structure is to be installed within 10 feet of tower footings and unrestricted access must be maintained from a tower structure to the nearest street. Walls, fences and other structures proposed along or within the fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) will require PG&E review; submit plans to PG&E Centralized Review Team for review and comment.
4. **Landscaping:** Vegetation may be allowed; subject to review of plans. On overhead electric transmission fee strip(s) and/or easement(s), trees and shrubs are limited to those varieties that do not exceed 10 feet in height at maturity. PG&E must have access to its facilities at all times, including access by heavy equipment. No planting is to occur within the footprint of the tower legs. Greenbelts are encouraged.
5. **Reservoirs, Sumps, Drainage Basins, and Ponds:** Prohibited within PG&E's fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) for electric transmission lines.
6. **Automobile Parking:** Short term parking of movable passenger vehicles and light trucks (pickups, vans, etc.) is allowed. The lighting within these parking areas will need to be reviewed by PG&E; approval will be on a case by case basis. Heavy equipment access to PG&E facilities is to be maintained at all times. Parking is to clear PG&E structures by at least 10 feet. Protection of PG&E facilities from vehicular traffic is to be provided at developer's expense AND to PG&E specifications. Blocked-up vehicles are not allowed. Carports, canopies, or awnings are not allowed.
7. **Storage of Flammable, Explosive or Corrosive Materials:** There shall be no storage of fuel or combustibles and no fueling of vehicles within PG&E's easement. No trash bins or incinerators are allowed.



8. Streets and Roads: Access to facilities must be maintained at all times. Street lights may be allowed in the fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) but in all cases must be reviewed by PG&E for proper clearance. Roads and utilities should cross the transmission easement as nearly at right angles as possible. Road intersections will not be allowed within the transmission easement.

9. Pipelines: Pipelines may be allowed provided crossings are held to a minimum and to be as nearly perpendicular as possible. Pipelines within 25 feet of PG&E structures require review by PG&E. Sprinklers systems may be allowed; subject to review. Leach fields and septic tanks are not allowed. Construction plans must be submitted to PG&E for review and approval prior to the commencement of any construction.

10. Signs: Signs are not allowed except in rare cases subject to individual review by PG&E.

11. Recreation Areas: Playgrounds, parks, tennis courts, basketball courts, barbecue and light trucks (pickups, vans, etc.) may be allowed; subject to review of plans. Heavy equipment access to PG&E facilities is to be maintained at all times. Parking is to clear PG&E structures by at least 10 feet. Protection of PG&E facilities from vehicular traffic is to be provided at developer's expense AND to PG&E specifications.

12. Construction Activity: Since construction activity will take place near PG&E's overhead electric lines, please be advised it is the contractor's responsibility to be aware of, and observe the minimum clearances for both workers and equipment operating near high voltage electric lines set out in the High-Voltage Electrical Safety Orders of the California Division of Industrial Safety (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/Title8/sb5g2.html>), as well as any other safety regulations. Contractors shall comply with California Public Utilities Commission General Order 95 (http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/gos/GO95/go_95_startup_page.html) and all other safety rules. No construction may occur within 25 feet of PG&E's towers. All excavation activities may only commence after 811 protocols has been followed.

Contractor shall ensure the protection of PG&E's towers and poles from vehicular damage by (installing protective barriers) Plans for protection barriers must be approved by PG&E prior to construction.

13. PG&E is also the owner of distribution facilities throughout many of the areas within the state of California. Therefore, any plans that impact PG&E's facilities must be reviewed and approved by PG&E to ensure that no impact occurs that may endanger the safe and reliable operation of its facilities.

From: [PGE Plan Review](#)
To: [Laura Hall](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Automatic reply: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:
Date: Thursday, March 28, 2024 9:54:44 AM

Hello,

Thank you for contacting PG&E's Plan Review Team. Due to high volumes of requests for review, expect delays in receiving comments or a project specific response from PG&E. Please see PG&E's general construction restrictions and guidelines for proposed projects around gas and electric facilities and incorporate these preliminary notes into your project design.

Gas Facilities

There could be gas transmission pipelines in this area which would be considered critical facilities for PG&E and a high priority subsurface installation under California law. Care must be taken to ensure safety and accessibility. So, please ensure that if PG&E approves work near gas transmission pipelines it is done in adherence with the below stipulations. Additionally, the following link provides additional information regarding legal requirements under California excavation laws: <https://www.usanorth811.org/images/pdfs/CA-LAW-2018.pdf>

1. **Standby Inspection:** A PG&E Gas Transmission Standby Inspector must be present during any demolition or construction activity that comes within 10 feet of the gas pipeline. This includes all grading, trenching, substructure depth verifications (potholes), asphalt or concrete demolition/removal, removal of trees, signs, light poles, etc. This inspection can be coordinated through the Underground Service Alert (USA) service at 811. A minimum notice of 48 hours is required. Ensure the USA markings and notifications are maintained throughout the duration of your work.
2. **Access:** At any time, PG&E may need to access, excavate, and perform work on the gas pipeline. Any construction equipment, materials, or spoils may need to be removed upon notice. Any temporary construction fencing installed within PG&E's easement would also need to be capable of being removed at any time upon notice. Any plans to cut temporary slopes exceeding a 1:4 grade within 10 feet of a gas transmission pipeline need to be approved by PG&E Pipeline Services in writing PRIOR to performing the work.
3. **Wheel Loads:** To prevent damage to the buried gas pipeline, there are weight limits that must be enforced whenever any equipment gets within 10 feet of traversing the pipe.

Ensure a list of the axle weights of all equipment being used is available for PG&E's Standby Inspector. To confirm the depth of cover, the pipeline may need to be potholed by hand in a few areas.

Due to the complex variability of tracked equipment, vibratory compaction equipment, and cranes, PG&E must evaluate those items on a case-by-case basis prior to use over the gas pipeline (provide a list of any proposed equipment of this type noting model numbers and specific attachments).

No equipment may be set up over the gas pipeline while operating. Ensure crane outriggers are at least 10 feet from the centerline of the gas pipeline. Transport trucks must not be parked over the gas pipeline while being loaded or unloaded.

4. Grading: PG&E requires a minimum of 36 inches of cover over gas pipelines (or existing grade if less) and a maximum of 7 feet of cover at all locations. The graded surface cannot exceed a cross slope of 1:4.

5. Excavating: Any digging within 2 feet of a gas pipeline must be dug by hand. Note that while the minimum clearance is only 12 inches, any excavation work within 24 inches of the edge of a pipeline must be done with hand tools. So to avoid having to dig a trench entirely with hand tools, the edge of the trench must be over 24 inches away. (Doing the math for a 24 inch wide trench being dug along a 36 inch pipeline, the centerline of the trench would need to be at least 54 inches [$24/2 + 24 + 36/2 = 54$] away, or be entirely dug by hand.)

Water jetting to assist vacuum excavating must be limited to 1000 psig and directed at a 40° angle to the pipe. All pile driving must be kept a minimum of 3 feet away.

Any plans to expose and support a PG&E gas transmission pipeline across an open excavation need to be approved by PG&E Pipeline Services in writing PRIOR to performing the work.

6. Boring/Trenchless Installations: PG&E Pipeline Services must review and approve all plans to bore across or parallel to (within 10 feet) a gas transmission pipeline. There are stringent criteria to pothole the gas transmission facility at regular intervals for all parallel bore installations.

For bore paths that cross gas transmission pipelines perpendicularly, the pipeline must be potholed a minimum of 2 feet in the horizontal direction of the bore path and a minimum of 12 inches in the vertical direction from the bottom of the pipe with minimum clearances measured from the edge of the pipe in both directions. Standby personnel must watch the locator trace (and every ream pass) the path of the bore as it approaches the pipeline and visually monitor the pothole (with the exposed transmission pipe) as the bore traverses the pipeline to ensure adequate clearance with the pipeline. The pothole width must account for the inaccuracy of the locating equipment.

7. Substructures: All utility crossings of a gas pipeline should be made as close to perpendicular as feasible (90° +/- 15°). All utility lines crossing the gas pipeline must have a minimum of 12 inches of separation from the gas pipeline. Parallel utilities, pole bases, water line 'kicker blocks', storm drain inlets, water meters, valves, back pressure devices or other utility substructures are not allowed in the PG&E gas pipeline easement.

If previously retired PG&E facilities are in conflict with proposed substructures, PG&E must verify they are safe prior to removal. This includes verification testing of the contents of the facilities, as well as environmental testing of the coating and internal surfaces. Timelines for PG&E completion of this verification will vary depending on the type and location of facilities in conflict.

8. Structures: No structures are to be built within the PG&E gas pipeline easement. This includes buildings, retaining walls, fences, decks, patios, carports, septic tanks, storage sheds, tanks, loading ramps, or any structure that could limit PG&E's ability to access its facilities.
9. Fencing: Permanent fencing is not allowed within PG&E easements except for perpendicular crossings which must include a 16 foot wide gate for vehicular access. Gates will be secured with PG&E corporation locks.
10. Landscaping: Landscaping must be designed to allow PG&E to access the pipeline for maintenance and not interfere with pipeline coatings or other cathodic protection systems. No trees, shrubs, brush, vines, and other vegetation may be planted within the easement area. Only those plants, ground covers, grasses, flowers, and low-growing plants that grow unsupported to a maximum of four feet (4') in height at maturity may be planted within the easement area.
11. Cathodic Protection: PG&E pipelines are protected from corrosion with an "Impressed Current" cathodic protection system. Any proposed facilities, such as metal conduit, pipes, service lines, ground rods, anodes, wires, etc. that might affect the pipeline cathodic protection system must be reviewed and approved by PG&E Corrosion Engineering.
12. Pipeline Marker Signs: PG&E needs to maintain pipeline marker signs for gas transmission pipelines in order to ensure public awareness of the presence of the pipelines. With prior written approval from PG&E Pipeline Services, an existing PG&E pipeline marker sign that is in direct conflict with proposed developments may be temporarily relocated to accommodate construction work. The pipeline marker must be moved back once construction is complete.
13. PG&E is also the provider of distribution facilities throughout many of the areas within the state of California. Therefore, any plans that impact PG&E's facilities must be reviewed and approved by PG&E to ensure that no impact occurs which may endanger the safe operation of its facilities.

Electric Facilities

It is PG&E's policy to permit certain uses on a case by case basis within its electric transmission fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) provided such uses and manner in which they are exercised, will not interfere with PG&E's rights or endanger its facilities. Some examples/restrictions are as follows:

1. Buildings and Other Structures: No buildings or other structures including the foot print and eave of any buildings, swimming pools, wells or similar structures will be permitted within fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) areas. PG&E's transmission easement shall be designated on subdivision/parcel maps as **"RESTRICTED USE AREA – NO BUILDING."**
2. Grading: Cuts, trenches or excavations may not be made within 25 feet of our towers. Developers must submit grading plans and site development plans (including geotechnical reports if applicable), signed and dated, for PG&E's review. PG&E engineers must review grade changes in the vicinity of our towers. No fills will be allowed which would impair

ground-to-conductor clearances. Towers shall not be left on mounds without adequate road access to base of tower or structure.

3. Fences: Walls, fences, and other structures must be installed at locations that do not affect the safe operation of PG&E's facilities. Heavy equipment access to our facilities must be maintained at all times. Metal fences are to be grounded to PG&E specifications. No wall, fence or other like structure is to be installed within 10 feet of tower footings and unrestricted access must be maintained from a tower structure to the nearest street. Walls, fences and other structures proposed along or within the fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) will require PG&E review; submit plans to PG&E Centralized Review Team for review and comment.

4. Landscaping: Vegetation may be allowed; subject to review of plans. On overhead electric transmission fee strip(s) and/or easement(s), trees and shrubs are limited to those varieties that do not exceed 10 feet in height at maturity. PG&E must have access to its facilities at all times, including access by heavy equipment. No planting is to occur within the footprint of the tower legs. Greenbelts are encouraged.

5. Reservoirs, Sumps, Drainage Basins, and Ponds: Prohibited within PG&E's fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) for electric transmission lines.

6. Automobile Parking: Short term parking of movable passenger vehicles and light trucks (pickups, vans, etc.) is allowed. The lighting within these parking areas will need to be reviewed by PG&E; approval will be on a case by case basis. Heavy equipment access to PG&E facilities is to be maintained at all times. Parking is to clear PG&E structures by at least 10 feet. Protection of PG&E facilities from vehicular traffic is to be provided at developer's expense AND to PG&E specifications. Blocked-up vehicles are not allowed. Carports, canopies, or awnings are not allowed.

7. Storage of Flammable, Explosive or Corrosive Materials: There shall be no storage of fuel or combustibles and no fueling of vehicles within PG&E's easement. No trash bins or incinerators are allowed.

8. Streets and Roads: Access to facilities must be maintained at all times. Street lights may be allowed in the fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) but in all cases must be reviewed by PG&E for proper clearance. Roads and utilities should cross the transmission easement as nearly at right angles as possible. Road intersections will not be allowed within the transmission easement.

9. Pipelines: Pipelines may be allowed provided crossings are held to a minimum and to be as nearly perpendicular as possible. Pipelines within 25 feet of PG&E structures require review by PG&E. Sprinklers systems may be allowed; subject to review. Leach fields and septic tanks are not allowed. Construction plans must be submitted to PG&E for review and approval prior to the commencement of any construction.

10. Signs: Signs are not allowed except in rare cases subject to individual review by PG&E.

11. Recreation Areas: Playgrounds, parks, tennis courts, basketball courts, barbecue and light trucks (pickups, vans, etc.) may be allowed; subject to review of plans. Heavy equipment access to PG&E facilities is to be maintained at all times. Parking is to clear

PG&E structures by at least 10 feet. Protection of PG&E facilities from vehicular traffic is to be provided at developer's expense AND to PG&E specifications.

12. Construction Activity: Since construction activity will take place near PG&E's overhead electric lines, please be advised it is the contractor's responsibility to be aware of, and observe the minimum clearances for both workers and equipment operating near high voltage electric lines set out in the High-Voltage Electrical Safety Orders of the California Division of Industrial Safety (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/Title8/sb5g2.html>), as well as any other safety regulations. Contractors shall comply with California Public Utilities Commission General Order 95 (http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/gos/GO95/go_95_startup_page.html) and all other safety rules. No construction may occur within 25 feet of PG&E's towers. All excavation activities may only commence after 811 protocols has been followed.

Contractor shall ensure the protection of PG&E's towers and poles from vehicular damage by (installing protective barriers) Plans for protection barriers must be approved by PG&E prior to construction.

13. PG&E is also the owner of distribution facilities throughout many of the areas within the state of California. Therefore, any plans that impact PG&E's facilities must be reviewed and approved by PG&E to ensure that no impact occurs that may endanger the safe and reliable operation of its facilities.

Thank you,

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
Plan Review Team
Email: pgeplanreview@pge.com

You can read about PG&E's data privacy practices at [PGE.com/privacy](https://www.pge.com/privacy).

Lenihan, Rachel x4760

From: Laura Hall <Laura.Hall@lakecountyca.gov>
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2024 4:40 PM
To: Lenihan, Rachel x4760
Cc: Mireya Turner; Michelle Irace; cm@Mahaman.com; cm@mahaman.com; jb@mahaman.com; kc@mahaman.com; KPhilippakis@fbm.com.
Subject: FW: RFR Response - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

External Sender

Rachel,

Please see the comments below from the Lake County Public Works Department.

Thank you,

Laura

From: David Bingham <David.Bingham@lakecountyca.gov>
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2024 4:11 PM
To: Laura Hall <Laura.Hall@lakecountyca.gov>
Subject: RFR Response - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development

Good afternoon, Laura,

The department had previously commented on the Notice of Preparation of an EIR for the proposed project. Here is a reiteration of those comments provided May 17, 2019.

1. Please include a traffic impact analysis that will show how the proposed project will impact the safety, capacity and maintenance of Butts Canyon Road and Santa Clara Road. There are three short segments along Butts Canyon Road where, due to either horizontal alignment issues and/or lack of adequate recovery areas, the collision rates exceed the average collision rates for similar facilities statewide. Please contact this Department for the specific locations.
2. Consider non-regulatory traffic control measures including roundabouts and other traffic calming measures along Butts Canyon Road at project access points rather than regulatory signs and/or traffic signals.
3. Include a walkability analysis for the off-site workforce housing facility to identify improvements needed for residents of the workforce housing to safely walk or bike to businesses and schools within the Middletown area.
4. In consideration of any future development, no additional surface runoff is allowed to be discharged into county drainage facilities.
5. Improvement plans and a cost estimate prepared by a registered Civil Engineer will be required for construction of any road improvements within the existing County right of way or proposed public right of

way. A signed Inspection Agreement and a deposit of 2% of the engineers cost estimate will need to be submitted to the Department of Public Works prior to plan review.

David Bingham
Assistant Engineer I
County of Lake
Office: (707) 263-2341
Cell: (707) 349-1483
Fax: (707) 263-7748

From: redbud.audubon@gmail.com
To: [Laura Hall](#)
Subject: Re: Request for Review of the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project:
Date: Monday, April 1, 2024 7:12:50 AM

Hello Laura,

May we see the updated biological studies?

So much has changed in this area recently. We are very interested in wild land/urban interface, wildlife corridors. It will be very interesting to compare the changes since the original IS was done.

Donna Mackiewicz, Redbud Audubon

March 28, 2024 09:54, laura.hall@lakecountycal.gov wrote:

> Good afternoon, Fellow Agencies and Others,

>

> This is a request for review (RFR) for the following planning entitlements to allow for development of the proposed Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project. Please note that this project was previously approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2020, but due to legal challenges it was rescinded June 14, 2022. Included in this RFR are several attachments, however, documents "PV08-23 - Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Development Project Master Transmittal Letter" and "Project Description 2-21-2024 and PV08-23 – GVD – A5 - Key Project Modifications Exhibit - REVISED 2023" include specific information pertaining to project changes. Please also note that staff will be setting up a meeting in the next two weeks to go over the project and any questions you may have will be presented to the applicant at that time. Finally, the CEQA analyses will come later for review, as staff only has an Admin Draft at this time. The planning entitlements include the following:

>

> Guenoc Ranch Site:

> Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment AM 24-01

> Development Agreement DA 24-01

> General Plan Amendment GPAP (Map) 24-01

> General Plan Amendment (Text) 24-02

> Rezone 24-01,

> General Plan of Development GPD 24-01

> Subdivision Map SD 24-01

> Subdivision Map SD 24-02

> Subdivision Map SD 24-03

> Subdivision Map SD 24-04

> Use Permit UP 24-05

> Middletown Site:

> General Plan Amendment GPAP (Map) 24-03

> General Plan Amendment (Text) 24-04

> Rezone RZ 24-02

> Subdivision Map SD 24-05

> CEQA: Environment Impact Report EIR 24-01

>

> Please advise us if additional information is needed, which permits are required from your agency (if any), and/or of your environmental concerns. Additionally, please advise if your agency recommends any modifications to the project that would reduce potential environmental impacts. Due to the provisions of state law, it is essential that we receive your comments as soon as possible, but no case later than April 12, 2024. Please email your comments to laura.hall@lakecountycalifornia.gov, or mail them to the address listed in the letterhead of the RFR.

>

> Sincerely,

>

>

> Laura Hall,

> Senior Planner

Secure Message Info

Message ID	aJekaPn0OuZhbfuftYPY7E
Message Expires	Monday, 8 April
Message URL	https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us/message/aJekaPn0OuZhbfuftYPY7E
Permission	If you forward this email with the secure random download link, whomever you forward this to can download the files attached to this message.

Files attached to this message

Filename	Size
----------	------

Download Files

Reply to this Secure Message

If you need assistance accessing or using this system, please contact support at
fileTransferService@co.lake.ca.us.

County of Lake Secure File Transfer — Secure File Transfer System:

<https://filetransfer.co.lake.ca.us>

Redbud Audubon Society, Inc.
PO 5780 Clearlake, CA

May 15, 2019

**Lake County community Development Department
255 North Forbes Street
Lakeport, CA 95453**

Attn: Mark Roberts, Senior Planner

As Conservation Chair for the Redbud Audubon Society I'm requesting issues to be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that is being prepared for the Guenoc Valley Mixed Use-Planned Development.

Issues that need to be addressed along with those already mentioned in the scoping document include Habitat Corridors to ensure wildlife habitat connectivity. This issue is becoming a major concern as more of our wildlands are being fenced and developed. Habitat connectivity for wildlife passage is a must to consider in this scoping document. This will require establishing a data base of current wildlife passages.

At the scoping meeting held on May 15 it was discussed that the residential units will be on 5 acres parcels. This is one of the worst scenarios for development to ensure habitat connectivity. Numerous fenced off five acre parcels will block wildlife passage and simply leaving it up to the residents to encourage wildlife is not adequate. Many people do not want deer in their yards. More clustered housing with larger areas of open space makes more sense. This sounds like a development of high end ranchettes which is not a conservation friendly approach to development. I'm wondering if you are familiar with the work of Christopher Duerksen who has written several books on creating Nature-friendly communities. I'm a little surprised that after seven years of work planners are still looking at ranchette style development. The developer is asking residents of Lake County to accept the creation of a new town; if we are to do so, every effort must be made to create a nature-friendly community.

I did not see any mention of Night Sky friendly development. As you know, our Lake County Board of Supervisors recently approved a Resolution in support of lighting ordinances consistent with Dark Sky Certification as a Dark Sky Community for the county. Please address this in the EIR.

Another issue is climate change. What energy use will be required and carbon dioxide releases occur not only in the building and maintaining of this project, but its continued existence. If the EIR is to go out many years, the review of Climate Change is a must; especially considering that new laws and requirements may be established as time goes on. I was at the May 15 meeting so I learned that solar energy is part of the plan, but I still want the specific issue of climate change addressed.

I have a question about the use of animals for vegetation control. This sounds like a great idea and of course is better than herbicides, but how much thought has been given to the care of these herds of animals when it comes to predators? How will the coyotes, cougars and bobcats be kept from attacking the sheep and goats? Also, grazing animals pretty much eat anything, not just what we want them to eat. Has a survey of Native California Bunch grasses been conducted? It seems that much of this territory would be conducive to this type of vegetation.

Requiring only 2,000 plus acres of guaranteed open space is a small requirement for a total acreage of 16,000 acres. Please review this as well.

Sincerely
Roberta Lyons
Conservation Chair, Redbud Audubon Society

Please continue to send all communication to: roberta.lyons@att.net.

COUNTY OF LAKE

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, Planning Division

Courthouse – 255 N. Forbes Street

Lakeport, CA 95453

To: Laura Hall, Senior Planner

Date: April 11, 2024

On behalf of the Middletown Area Town Hall (MATH), thank you for inviting MATH to comment on the 'request for review' (RFR) of the proposed Guenoc Valley Mixed Use Planned Development Project.

We appreciate the numerous changes that have been incorporated into the overall design of the project. The reduced project footprint, emergency access and interior 'looped road' improvements, building development clustered further away from potential wildfire interface, and the new emergency evacuation and access route connecting Grange Road are ideal safety improvements.

While MATH (agency) does not require any permits, MATH is a Municipal Advisory Council appointed by the Lake County Board of Supervisors. Its purpose is to increase participation by Middletown area residents in the decision-making processes that affect their community. The MATH Middletown area includes the boundaries of the South Lake County Fire Protection District (SLCFPD). MATH comments on matters of public health, safety, welfare, public works, planning and land use.

MATH offers the following comments from a community perspective and has several questions regarding the potential environmental impacts that the Guenoc Valley Project may incur during the phases of development or following the completed build out.

Before proceeding, please note that due to the quick response time on this matter, most community members have not had the opportunity to thoroughly read through the many pages of the project. We are aware that some of the concerns or questions presented by MATH may in fact have already been addressed. We apologize for any unintended redundancy.

Water is a valuable resource.

The depletion of that resource or inaccessibility to a water resource can be critical to the Middletown area community. The project applicant is requesting “approval for the development of an off-site water supply well and pipeline along Butts Canyon Road to the Detert Reservoir within the Guenoc Valley Site.”

First question, is it appropriate to extract water from a well located on a parcel in a community and move it to another location six miles away?

How much water is intended to be pulled from that well and when? Seasonal? All year? Will there be a trigger threshold identified or a mechanism put in place to monitor the extraction of water from the well located on the Butts Canyon parcel located within the community growth boundary of Middletown? Have the short-term and long-term potential impacts to the Middletown area been assessed and mitigated?

Are there known or unknown risks to the groundwater supply in Long Valley and throughout the Butts Canyon area that have or have not been considered? What are the potential impacts to the PG&E GI land fill site, the plume, and the water quality in Long Valley when this project reaches full capacity and is drawing groundwater from both the west and east ends of the PG&E GI site?

While it is important to have water and back up water supplies at the site of the Guenoc Valley Planned Development, it is equally important for water to be accessible to the community of Middletown especially when the water source originates within the Middletown community boundary.

Other environmental (and safety) concerns voiced by MATH include:

- Wildlife -- Have the wildlife impacts been reviewed and mitigated?
(Geese, osprey and other birds and species)
- Helicopter Pad -- Have the noise, wind, etc. impacts to residents, property, and wildlife in area been evaluated? Note: this comment refers to the helicopter pad near the winery which will be used for guests; it does not refer to the Emergency Helicopter pad used by emergency personnel. What are the restrictions, limits and mitigation measures planned for the ongoing operation of helicopters near and around the development site and neighboring residents?
- Roads -- Will Butts Canyon Road, in its current state, safely handle the increase in use as development begins on this project? Have the potential impacts of increased traffic on this County maintained road been assessed and mitigated? Are both short-term and long-term Butts Canyon Road improvements included in the project? Will a “round about” be installed at the intersection of Hwy 29 and Butts Canyon? If so, when? Will Grange Road be improved as it becomes part of the new emergency and evacuation route?
- Public transit/reduction of vehicle emissions – Will a shuttle service or other means of public transit and/or emissions free transportation (safe bike lanes) be provided for workers traveling to and from the Butts Canyon project site to the Middletown Santa Clara Workers housing location?
- Infrastructure -- What impacts will the increase in workers and their families have on the school system, roads and other infrastructure including power? What will the impacts be to communication systems, fiber optics and cell towers both at the site of development and surrounding areas?

Regarding the proposed Santa Clara Workers Housing. The proposed site for the workers housing is located in a 'Flood Hazard Area' and borders a 'Very High Fire Hazard Zone,' per the Middletown Area Plan adopted 2010. The site is surrounded by large, spacious rural lots. The applicant is requesting to increase the density of the housing on this parcel.

The parcel is currently zoned R1. The applicant references a previous project that was approved in 2006 for an increase in density totaling 50 units. In 2010, the current Middletown Area Plan was adopted. It speaks to the environmental and safety issues mentioned above—fire and floods—and it proposes that higher density should or may be considered on parcels more centrally located within the unincorporated area of Middletown.

The increased density on this parcel may unintentionally place people at risk.

MATH recommends conforming to the current R1 zoning or finding a more suitable location for a higher density worker housing development. Additionally, should the Worker Housing site be approved as part of the Guenoc Valley Project, MATH would like assurances that the project includes safety elements such as sidewalks, not only within the site boundaries, but to and from the downtown areas and local schools.

The bulk of the Planned Development resort project as presented to be built in the Guenoc Valley offers substantial benefit to the County of Lake. It's beautiful, environmentally compatible and appears to be an ideal Planned Development for the Guenoc site and conforms to Special Study Area No. 3 Langry/Guenoc section of the Middletown Area Plan.

However, the two aspects of the project directly impacting the Middletown Area – the property with the well at the corner of Butts Canyon and the site proposed for Santa Clara workers housing have many MATH members concerned. There is a general MATH consensus that neither of these two locations are provided the same or similar care and commitment as seen in the Planned Development concepts for the Guenoc Valley project site located six miles east on Butts Canyon Road.

To that end, MATH suggests that the request to pipe water from the north end of Middletown at the Hwy 29 intersection down Butts Canyon Road be denied. OR, if approved, a threshold or measurement mechanism be clearly defined in the project permit with a method of monitoring the pumping of ground water from a well located in Middletown to the site of the Guenoc Valley Project six miles east.

Additionally, how will this parcel (where the well is) be used in the future? Are there any plans to develop the lot on the corner of Butts Canyon and Hwy 29? Or will it sit as a vacant parcel of the north end of the Middletown community growth boundary?

MATH also recommends that Middletown community enhancements be incorporated into the project permit to offset the potential impacts to the Middletown area community over the course of the project's development and completion. The Middletown Area Plan references several Policy's regarding 'Parks and Facilities' that provide a variety of ideas for mitigation measures centered around hiking, biking and equestrian usage. Trail development in and around Middletown would have long-term benefits to the project, its workforce, and residents of community of Middletown.

To close, MATH generally approves of the overall Guenoc Valley Project and looks forward to working with the Community Development Department and the applicant and agents of the applicant to ensure the success of this grand project on all levels resulting in a "win win" for all concerned.

Thank you again for allowing MATH to have a voice in this process.

Respectively submitted,

Monica Rosenthal, 707-355-2762, CHAIR

Middletown Area Town Hall (MATH) -- PO Box 5, Middletown, CA 95461

Sally J. Baker Printed Name SALLY BECKNER Address 19648 Butts Canyon Rd
Susan M. Steiner Printed Name Susan M. Steiner Address 19648 Butts Canyon Rd
Jeffrey Griffin Printed Name Jeffrey Griffin Address 19467 Butts Canyon Rd
Lauren Fuller Printed Name Lauren Fuller Address Middletown CA 95461
Lauren Fuller Printed Name Lauren Fuller Address 21125 Loconome Rd
Arlene Hockanson Printed Name Arlene Hockanson Address Middletown, Ca 95461
Gail Wright Printed Name Gail Wright Address 19491 Butts Canyon
Robert H. Donley Printed Name Robert Donley Address 19750 Butts Canyon Rd
Patricia Donley Printed Name Patricia Donley Address 19750 Butts Canyon Rd
Connie Hodges Printed Name Connie Hodges Address 19750 Butts Canyon Rd
Shannon Sanders 27-2nd 19424 Butts Canyon Rd