NOTICE OF INTENT TO ADOPT MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

This page was added to the posting in order to place the Clerk's office label on the document without obstructing any of the documentation within the notice.

> Filed in County Clerk's Office Tommy Gong San Luis Obispo - County Clerk-Recorder PST201900040

06/13/2019 CLKPOST Pages: 138 Fee: \$ 0.00

By nbalseiro, Deputy





JUN 1 3 2019

Notice of Intent to Adopt **Mitigated Negative Declaration**

TOMMY GONG, COUNTY CLERK NAOMI BALSEINO

DEPUTY CLERK

| PROJECT NO. | DEV18-0103 | Environmental | Document | No. | 2019-0007 |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------|------------------------------------|--------|---------------------------------|
| PROJECT TITLE | Mini Storage | | | | |
| APPLICANT NAME & PHONE NUMBER | Scott Newton | | Email | | |
| MAILING ADDRESS: | | | | | |
| STAFF CONTACT: | Kelly Gleason | (805) 4 | 70-3446 | kgleas | on@atascadero.org |
| PROJECT ADDRESS: | 11450 Viejo Camino 11505 El Camino Real | Atasca | Atascadero, CA 93422 APN: 045-045- | | APN: 045-342-009 045-341-010 |

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project is an 81,000+ square foot mini-storage facility on a 4.2 acre site which includes indoor storage units. an office, a workshop and a caretaker's residence in a total of 9 buildings. Paved drive aisles and four parking spaces are included. The project site is designated with 1.8 acres of wetland habitat however; recent drought conditions and annual animal grazing have denuded the habitat vegetation. The property contains an identified blue-line creek with a clearly defined flow path. Water enters the site from an existing culvert under El Camino Real and exits through existing culverts under Vieio Camino. The applicant proposes to realign the creek to accommodate the site development and adjust the flood plain designation of the site. The realigned creek would run parallel to El Camino Real into a 0.77 acre wetland restoration area and then flow in a straight path to the Viejo Camino culverts. The realigned creek channel will be constructed with a retaining wall on one side and naturalized slope on the other. The project requires California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Federal Emergency Management Agency permits.

The project will require approximately 8,000 cubic yards of cut and 12,000 cubic yards of fill material in order to create a level development area. One of the existing properties hosts a single family residence.

General Plan Designation: Public Facilities (PUB) Zoning District: Public (P)

City of Atascadero **LEAD AGENCY: Community Development Department** 6500 Palma Avenue Atascadero, CA 93422

| DOCUMENT AVAILABLE ONLINE: http://www.atascadero.org/environmentaldocs | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| STATE CLEARING | HOUSE REVIEW: | 🛛 Yes | NO 🗌 | |
| REVIEW PERIOD BI | EGINS: | 06/14/2019 | REVIEW PERIOD ENDS: | 07/16/2019 |
| PUBLIC HEARING I | REQUIRED: | □No ⊠ Yes | 3 | |
| PUBLIC NOTICE: | The City of Atasca review and comm Reviewers should upon the environ Environmental Qu | dero is releasing a ment to all effec focus on the conte ment. The notice ality Act (CEQA). | draft Initial Study and Mitigate ted agencies, organizations, ent and accuracy of the report for this project is in compli Persons responding to this ne | d Negative declaration for and interested parties. and the potential impacts ance with the California otice are urged to submit |

their comments in writing. Written comments should be delivered the City (lead agency) no later than 5pm on the date listed as "review period ends". Submittal of written comments via email is also accepted and should be directed to the Staff contact at the above email address. This document may be viewed by visiting the Community Development. Department, listed under the lead agency address, or accessed via the City's website.



CITY OF ATASCADERO

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Initial Study Summary – Environmental Checklist

| PROJECT NO. | DEV2018-010 | Biggin Servironmental Docume No. | nt 2019-0007 | | |
|--|--------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| PROJECT TITLE: | Mini Storage | | | | |
| Environmental Factors Potentially Affected: The proposed project could have a "Potentially Significant Impact" for at least one of the environmental factors checked below. Please refer to the attached pages for discussion on mitigation measures or project revisions to either reduce these impacts to less than significant levels or require further analysis. | | | | | |
| ⊠ Aesthetics | X | Geology and Soils | □ Recreation | | |
| □ Agricultural Re | sources 🛛 🖂 | Hazards / Hazardous Material | s 🗆 Transportation | | |
| 🛛 Air Quality | \boxtimes | Noise | ⊠ Wastewater | | |

☑ Air Quality
 ☑ Biological Resources
 ☑ Population / Housing

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation, the Community Development Director finds that:

□ Public Services / Utilities

The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

⊠ Water / Hydrology

 \boxtimes Land Use

Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

| _ | | |
|---|--|---|
| | | 1 |
| | | I |
| | | |
| | | |
| _ | | |

 \boxtimes Cultural Resources

The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

| Reviewed by (Print) | Signature | Date |
|---------------------|-----------|----------|
| Phil Dunsmore | the i Jum | 06/12/19 |
| Prepared by (Print) | Signature | Date |
| Kelly Gleason | ALO | 06/12/19 |

PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The City of Atascadero's environmental review process incorporates all of the requirements for completing the Initial Study as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines. The Initial Study includes Staff's on-site inspection of the project site and surrounding and a detailed review of the information on file for the proposed project. In addition, available background information is reviewed for each project. Relevant information regarding soil types and characteristics, geological information, significant vegetation and/or wildlife resources, water availability, wastewater disposal service, existing land uses and surrounding land use categories and other information relevant to the environmental review process are evaluated for each project. Exhibit A includes the references used, as well as the agencies or groups that were contacted as a part of this initial study. The City of Atascadero uses the checklist to summarize the results of the research accomplished during the initial environmental review of the project.

Persons, agencies, or organizations interested in obtaining more information regarding the environmental review process for a project should contact the Community Development Department, 6500 Palma Avenue, Atascadero, CA 93422 or call (805) 461-5000.

A. PROPOSED PROJECT

| Description: | The project is an 81,000+ square foot mini-storage facility on a 4.2 acre site which |
|---------------------|--|
| | includes indoor storage units, an office, a workshop and a caretaker's residence in a |
| | total of 9 buildings. Paved drive aisles and four parking spaces are included. The |
| | project site is designated with 1.8 acres of wetland habitat however; recent drought |
| | conditions and annual animal grazing have denuded the habitat vegetation. The |
| | property contains an identified blue-line creek with a clearly defined flow path. Water |
| | enters the site from an existing culvert under El Camino Real and exits through existing |
| | culverts under Viejo Camino. The applicant proposes to realign the creek to |
| | accommodate the site development and adjust the flood plain designation of the site. |
| | The realigned creek would run parallel to El Camino Real into a 0.77 acre wetland |
| | restoration area and then flow in a straight path to the Viejo Camino culverts. The |
| | realigned creek channel will be constructed with a retaining wall on one side and |
| | naturalized slope on the other. The project requires California Department of Fish and |
| | Wildlife, Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Federal |
| | Emergency Management Agency permits. |
| | |
| | The project will require approximately 8,000 cubic yards of cut and 12,000 cubic yards |
| | of fill material in order to create a level development area. One of the existing |
| | properties hosts a single family residence. |
| | |
| | General Plan Designation: Public Facilities (PUB) |
| | Zoning District: Public (P) |
| | |

THAT PORTION OF LOT 7 OF BLOCK 66 OF ATASCADERO COLONY, IN THE CITY OF ATASCADERO, COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ACCORDING TO MAP RECORDED OCTOBER 14, 1914 IN BOOK 3, PAGE 97 OF MAPS, AND AS SHOWN ON THE RECORD OF SURVEY MAP RECORDED MARCH 26, 1980 IN BOOK 37, PAGE 69 OF RECORDS OF SURVEYS

Legal Description:

ALL THAT PORTION OF THAT PART OF LOTS 5 AND 6 IN BLOCK 66 OF ATASCADERO COLONY, IN THE CITY OF ATASCADERO, COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ACCORDING TO MAP RECORDED OCTOBER 21, 1914 IN BOOK 3 PAGE 1 ET SEQ., OF MAPS, WHICH WAS CONVEYED TO GERTRUDE HOPPER, BY DEED RECORDED SEPTEMBER 13, 1918 IN BOOK 117, PAGE 331 OF DEEDS, WHICH LIES NORTHEASTERLY OF THE NORTHEASTERLY LINE OF



| | THE RIGHT OF WAY FOR STATE HIGHWAY PURPOSES CONVEYED TO THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, BY DEED RECORDED FEBRUARY 24, 1931 IN BOOK 108, PAGE 161 OF OFFICIAL RECORDS | | | | | |
|---|---|------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Assessor parcel number(s): | 045-342-009, 045-341-010 | | | | | |
| Latitude: | 5,776,235 | Longitude: | 2,361,703 | | | |
| Other public agencies whose approval is required: | California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW), Army Corps of Engineers (ACE), Water Quality Control Board (WQCB), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) | | | | | |

B. EXISTING SETTING

| Land use designation: | Public Facilities | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Zoning district: | Public | | | | | | |
| Parcel size: | 4.2 acres | | | | | | |
| Topography: | Flat | Average Slope: | <5% with 12-15% at the location of the existing residence | | | | |
| Vegetation: | Annual grasses | | | | | | |
| Existing use: | 11450 Viejo Camino: Si | ingle Family Reside | nce | | | | |
| | 11505 El Camino Real: V | acant Lot | | | | | |
| Surrounding land use: | Paloma Park, Residential, C | hurches and other | related facilities, School | | | | |
| North: | South: | East: | West: | | | | |
| Commercial Multi-Family | Public Zone Existing Residence | Recreation Multi-Family | Residential PUD Open Space | | | | |

C. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

During the initial study process, at least one issue was identified as having a potentially significant environmental effect (see following Initial Study). The potentially significant items associated with the proposed project can be minimized to less than significant levels.



CITY OF ATASCADERO INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. AESTHETICS – Will the project:

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on an adopted scenic vista? | | | | \boxtimes |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | | | \boxtimes | |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | | \boxtimes | | |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | | \boxtimes | | |

EXISTING SETTING:

The City of Atascadero reviews all new projects for appropriate building design. New projects must have a design that is sensible within the context of the community. The design must be similar or complimentary to the surrounding developments. Additionally, developers must consider how a project may affect historical and natural resources in and around their site. The promotion of purposeful design helps preserve community character and aesthetic as well as prevent negative impacts on surrounding property values.

The subject properties total 4.2-acres consisting of one undeveloped parcel and one single family residential parcel which are both located in the Public (P) zoning district just south of the Viejo Camino and El Camino Real intersection. The surrounding area is composed of mostly Multi-Family Residential, and Public zoning designations. There is also approximately 2.2 acres of public recreational facilities just south east of the project boundary, across Viejo Camino Rd. There is an existing Historic Colony Home adjacent to the project site. The property is located in the Paloma Creek watershed. The property contains designated wetland habitat and has historically had flooding occur during wet years.

The General Plan Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element provide policies regarding the preservation of natural habitats and the rural character in Atascadero.

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The project is a mini-storage facility with more than 81,000 square feet of storage buildings, office, workshop, and caretaker's residence in a total of 9 buildings. Paved drive aisles and 4 parking spaces are included. The subject properties are a combined total of 4.2 acres. One of the existing properties is currently developed with a single family residence. The proposed use includes perimeter walls that range from 160-feet to 200-feet in length along the visible project edges. The proposed walls are minimally articulated and will create a visual impact to the surrounding residential, open space, and park facilities. The realigned creek and wetland restoration area are proposed for the southern portion of the property adjacent to the existing Historic Colony Home on the adjacent property.

The Atascadero General Plan and Atascadero Municipal Code (AMC) provide thresholds of significance for the aesthetic qualities of new developments. The General Plan Land Use Conservation Element Policies 1.4 and 2.1 specify the avoidance of light pollution and compatibility with existing surrounding neighborhoods. Section 9.4.137 of the AMC regulates exterior lighting to avoid light pollution onto neighboring properties.

The Atascadero Municipal Code requires that any exterior lighting by fully shielded and directed in such a way that no glare occurs and that no light source is visible from off-site. All proposed lighting must comply with this code requirement. The City focuses on maintaining a rural character and this is partly achieved by minimizing street lights to only those areas where a need is dictated by safety. There are currently no street lights along the project frontage on El Camino Real and none along the Viejo Camino Frontage. Overall surrounding ambient lighting is relatively low and only includes minimal building mounted lighting on adjacent commercial and residential developments.

AES Impact-1: The nature of the proposed mini-storage use provides largely vacant and walledin areas, thus, safety lighting is expected, and therefore, *this impact requires mitigation*.

AES Impact-2: The project is surrounded by long minimally articulated perimeter walls that are highly visible from El Camino Real and Viejo Camino, thus, *this impact requires mitigation.*

MITIGATION / CONCLUSION:

AES 1.1: All exterior lights shall be turned off between the hours of 11pm and 6am. Lights may turn on when motion is sensed. All lighting must be dimmable to maintain the low light levels of the surrounding residential and open space areas.

AES 1.2: The wall shall be constructed of medium toned split face block with darker contrasting pilasters. Where any wall is constructed that is not a side of a building, a decorative cap shall be included. The portion of the wall used to create one side of the realigned creek channel shall be constructed of a natural rock or stone appearing material with color variations. Medium to tall landscaping shall be placed adjacent to the wall. If this is not possible due to wetland restoration requirements, metal trellis features shall be provided at regular intervals with appropriate landscape material. The shelf between the back of building and the creek channel wall shall include space and depth for landscape material that will trail over the wall.

2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES – Will the project:

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to nonagricultural use? | | | | \boxtimes |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | | | | \boxtimes |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland or timberland zoned Timberland Production? | | | | \boxtimes |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | | | | \boxtimes |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | | | | \boxtimes |

EXISTING SETTING:

Preservation of agricultural lands is important to the State of California as they provide economic benefits and important ecosystem services. Historically, urban development in the state has correlated with diminishing farmlands. This trend has led to various legislative measures at the state and local levels to protect vulnerable agricultural resources (California Department of Food and Agriculture, 2015). The California State Department of Conservation identifies, categorizes, and helps preserve important farmland. Their Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program tracks and maps the conversion of farmland into urban development. In particular, those areas that fall under the categories of "Prime Farmland," "Farmland of Statewide Importance," or "Unique Farmland" may have an opportunity to receive state funding or take advantage of incentive programs for the if preservation.

Currently, the subject property is a 4.2 acre underdeveloped property located in the Public zoning district. The properties are surrounded by development and are located between El Camino Real and Viejo Camino. The surrounding parcels include residential, commercial, parks, and quasipublic uses. The site contains designated wetland habitat and an identified blue-line creek that flows to Paloma Creek and onward to the Salinas River ¼ mile to the east. The site has historically been grazed for weed control by the neighboring residents.

The project site is not designated as farmland by the California State Department of Conservation and has minimal agricultural potential based on the creek and wetland presence (Figure 6).

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The applicant is proposing an 81,000+ square foot indoor mini-storage facility with caretaker's residence and associated improvements. The project is located in a flood hazard area and portions are within the 100-year flood plain. The proposal includes modifications to the flood plain and realignment of the identified creek. The project also includes wetland restoration.

The site is categorized as "Urban and Built-Up Land" by the California Department of Conservation (Figure 6).

MITIGATION / CONCLUSION:

There are no impacts expected to occur.

3. AIR QUALITY – Will the project:

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? | | | | \boxtimes |
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? | | \boxtimes | | |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non- attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | | \boxtimes | | |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | | \boxtimes | | |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | | | | \boxtimes |

EXISTING SETTING:

All new developments have impacts on local air quality that vary in extent depending on construction practices, land use, size, and vehicle trip generation. Poor air quality can have adverse effects on public health including increases in cardio respiratory diseases (World Health Organization, 2018). The City of Atascadero and the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD) work to create policies and programs to maintain air quality in a healthy state. Furthermore, the Federal Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) helps regional agencies monitor and regulate air quality by identifying and classifying target air pollutants.

The existing site is composed of two parcels which span approximately 4.2 acres of land the Public zoning district, south of the El Camino Real and Viejo Camino Road intersection. There is currently a single family residence developed on one of the parcels and the other remains

undeveloped. The surrounding parcels include residential, commercial, parks, and quasi-public uses.

The EPA ranks levels of specific air pollutants in a region as being at "attainment" or "nonattainment." Nonattainment status is given to regions where the air quality does not meet the national primary or secondary standards provided in the EPA Green Book. According to SLOAPCD, San Luis Obispo County is at nonattainment for ozone (O2) and respiratory particulate matter (PM10) (Table 1). Atascadero General Plan Land Use, Open Space and Conservation Element program 10.3.1 requires dust control and emissions regulation during the construction phases of any project. The associated policy aims to support regional efforts to maintain clean air.

SLO County APCD provides operational and construction screening criteria for new projects to analyze them for potential impacts. These criteria are used predict the gravity of impacts from additional Ozone (O2) and greenhouse gas emissions generated with a new project (SLOAPCD, 2017). According to SLOAPCD, a new ministorage facility would need to be 467,000 square feet in size to meet the significance threshold for Ozone Precursors.

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The applicant is proposing to develop a ministorage facility with more than 81,000 square feet of indoor facilities including a caretaker's residence associated site improvements. The project will require grading of the entire 4.2 acre property, including 6,523 cubic yards of cut and 13,438 cubic yards of fill cubic yards of fill material in order to create a level development area. Additionally, the project site is within 1,000 feet of single family residences, apartment buildings, and three parks (Figure 7).

Table 2 below from the *CEQA Air Quality Handbook* (2012) and 2017 clarification memo provides threshold significance of 2.5/Tons for PM10 for construction operations of any new project. The document also states that any grading of an area larger than 4 acres or within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors requires mitigation. Sensitive receptor locations include spaces where the youth, elderly, and other vulnerable populations may spend a considerable amount of time including, but not limited to, residences, schools, parks, hospitals, and daycare centers.

AQ Impact-1: The San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD) reports that the county is at nonattainment for Ozone (O3) emissions. They provide a 447,000 square foot threshold of significance for storage facilities expected to contribute to Ozone Precursor emissions. The Newton project will not exceed this threshold. Since the project will not exceed 447,000 square feet, then *the impact is insignificant.*

AQ Impact-2: The San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD) reports that the county is at nonattainment for Particulate Matter (PM10) emissions. The CEQA Air Quality Handbook (APCD, 2012) provides a 2.5 ton per quarter threshold for significance which can be met by a project with grading on greater than 4 acres. Additionally, mitigation is required for properties with 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors. The mini-storage facility will require grading of the entire 4.2 acre site and is located within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors, thus, *the impact requires mitigation.*

MITIGATION / CONCLUSION:

AQ 2.1: Use of water trucks or sprinkler systems, in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site and from exceeding the APCD's limit of 20% opacity for greater than 3minutes in any 60-minute period. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever

wind speeds exceed 15 mph. Reclaimed (non-potable) water should be used whenever possible. Please note that during drought conditions, water use may be a concern and the contractor or builder shall consider the use of an APCD-approved dust suppressant where feasible to reduce the amount of water used for dust control.

AQ 2.2: All dirt stock pile areas should be sprayed daily as needed.

AQ 2.3: Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans should be implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities. Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading should be sown with a fast germinating, non-invasive grass seed and watered until vegetation is established.

AQ 2.4: All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the APCD.

AQ 2.5: All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

AQ 2.6: Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with CVC Section 23114.

AQ 2.7: "Track-Out" is defined as sand or soil that adheres to and/or agglomerates on the exterior surfaces of motor vehicles and/or equipment (including tires) that may then fall onto any highway or street as described in California Vehicle Code Section 23113 and California Water Code 13304. To prevent Track Out, designate access points and require all employees, subcontractors, and others to use them. Install and operate a "track-out prevention device" where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved streets. The track-out prevention device can be any device or combination of devices that are effective at preventing track out, located at the point of intersection of an unpaved area and a paved road. Rumble strips or steel plate devices require periodic cleaning to be effective. If paved roadways accumulate tracked out soils, the track-out prevention device may need to be modified.

AQ 2.8: Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water should be used where feasible.

AQ 2.9: All of these fugitive dust mitigation measures shall be shown on grading and building plans. The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the fugitive dust emissions and enhance the implementation of the measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints, reduce visible emissions below 20% opacity, and to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the APCD.

4. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Will the project:

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | | | \boxtimes | |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | | | \boxtimes | |

EXISTING SETTING:

Greenhouse gases (GHG) including carbon dioxide (CO2), Methane (CH4), Nitrous Oxide(N2O), fluorinated gases, and water vapor, can cause significant harm to the environment and have adverse effects public health. The City of Atascadero and the State of California attempt regulate GHG emissions to promote environmental and public health as well as energy efficiency. SLO County APCD expects mini-storage facilities in excess of 267,000 square feet to exceed thresholds for GHG, as stated in the 2017 clarification to the 2012 CEQA Handbook.

The site where the mini-storage is proposed is located on a 4.2 acre parcel in Public zoning district of Atascadero. The surrounding parcels include multi-family and single-family residential developments, commercial uses, parks, and quasi-public uses. Currently, one of the subject properties is undeveloped and does not contribute GHG emissions to the environment; the other is developed with a single family residence.

In 2014, the City of Atascadero adopted a climate action plan (CAP) to help guide the city in reducing their GHG emissions in accordance with California Assembly Bill 32 (AB32). AB32 aims at a reduction of 15% in GHG emissions by 2020. According to this plan, in 2005 the City of Atascadero produced 141,428 metric tons (MT) of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO2e) in GHG emissions. Commercial and Industrial land uses contributed 14% of the total emissions (Rincon Consultants, Inc., 2014). Figure 17 below shows the portion of total emissions contributed by each sector of the community in 2005. The City aims to reduce their community-wide emission levels to 120,214 MT CO2e by 2020.

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The applicant is proposing mini-storage facilities in excess of 81,000 square feet. The facility would include a caretaker's residence and associated improvements. The parcels being developed total to 4.2 acres in size.

SLO County APCD provides operational and construction screening criteria for new projects to analyze them for potential impacts. These criteria are used predict the gravity of impacts from additional Ozone (O2) and greenhouse gas emissions generated with a new project (SLOAPCD, 2017). According to SLOAPCD, a new ministorage facility would need to be 267,000 square feet in size to meet the 1,150 MT of CO2e per year significance threshold for GHG emissions. The project area for the ministorage facility will be below that which is expected to exceed the threshold of signifance.

The City of Atascadero CAP is the approved GHG reduction plan for the City and provides guidelines and measures to achieve the City's reduction goal. According to the SLO Air Pollution Control District Greenhouse Gas Thresholds handbook, stationary industrial uses have an annual

threshold of 10,000 MT of CO2e per year. Any projects that exceed this threshold must take action to mitigate their level of emission. The project is not expected to surpass more than 1,150 MT of CO2e per year based on the SLOAPCD screening criteria described above.

GHG Impact 1: The ministorage facility does not conflict with the City of Atascadero's Climate Action Plan (CAP). Since there is no conflict with the adopted CAP, then *the impact is insignificant.*

GHG Impact 2: The ministorage facility will exceed 81,000 square feet but not surpass 267,000 square feet in building area. The San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD) provides a threshold of 1,150 MT of CO2e per year which is expected to be exceeded by projects with a project area of 267,000 square feet or more (SLOAPCD, 2017). Since the project does not surpass the threshold provided by SLOAPCD, then *the impact is insignificant*.

MITIGATION / CONCLUSION: No further mitigation is required.

5. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Will the project:

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)? | | | | |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or CDFW and USFWS? | | \boxtimes | | |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on State or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | | | | |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | | | \boxtimes | |
| e) Conflict with policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as the native tree ordinance? | | \boxtimes | | |

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | | | | \boxtimes |

EXISTING SETTING:

The City of Atascadero as well as San Luis Obispo County and the state of California emphasize the protection of their diverse ecosystems and the vulnerable species to which they provide habitats.

The existing site is composed of two parcels which span approximately 4.2 acres of land the Public zoning district, south of the El Camino Real and Viejo Camino Road intersection. There is currently a single family residence developed on one of the parcels and the other remains undeveloped. A biological resources assessment prepared for the project by Terra Verde Environmental Consulting provides existing biologic characteristics of the site. According to the assessment, the site hosts a blue line creek and State recognized wetlands. According to the wetland delineation performed by Terra Verde, the existing site does not meet the criteria for federally recognized wetlands.

The site is designated with 1.8 acres of freshwater emergent wetland habitat according to the US Fish and Wildlife Service Wetland Inventory Mapper (Figure 8); however, recent drought conditions and annual animal grazing have denuded the habitat vegetation. There are existing restored wetlands to the west of the project across El Camino Real from the project site. The property also contains an identified blue-line creek with a clearly defined flow path (Figure 9). Water enters the site from an existing culvert under El Camino Real and exits through existing culverts under Viejo Camino. The site has low suitability for hosting special status species due to past land uses. However, the site may potentially serve as seasonal habitat for nesting birds and roosting bats. Nonnative plant species compose the majority of the vegetation on the site (75%) but native plant species are still present.

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The project proposes the construction of a mini-storage facility that exceeds 81,000 square feet. The facility includes a caretaker's residence, workshop, and associated site improvements. The applicant proposes to realign the creek to accommodate the site development and adjust the flood plain designation of the site. A biological assessment and federal wetland assessment was completed by Terra Verde Environmental Consulting in January and March of 2019. Soil samples and hydrology were assessed at locations containing visible wetland vegetation, limiting the scope of the analysis to the creek channel. Based on this analysis, it was determined that no federal wetlands exist at the time of assessment as the test areas only met 2 of the 3 qualifying criteria for federal wetlands. However, since the State of California recognizes single criteria wetlands, this area was determined to meet guidelines for State recognized wetland habitat. According the biological assessment, a total of 0.14 acres of the ephemeral drainage channel where wetland indicators were present will be permanently lost or altered by the proposed development. However, these losses are expected to be accounted for through the proposed dedication of wetland open space.

The creek would be realigned to run parallel to El Camino Real into a 0.77 acre wetland restoration area and then flow in a straight path to the existing Viejo Camino culverts. The realigned creek channel will be bordered on one side by a retaining wall that defines the limits of the development

area with the opposite bank constructed of a 2:1 vegetated slope. The channel is proposed to have a natural bottom. The project requires California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Army Corps of Engineers, Regional Water Quality Control Board, and Federal Emergency Management Agency permits.

The Atascadero General Plan provides thresholds of significance for impacts to biological resources. The following policies from the Atascadero General Plan Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation (LOC) Element address development of sensitive, natural areas:

- 1. LOC 6.1: Ensure that development does not degrade scenic and sensitive areas, including historic sites, creeks, riparian corridors, wetlands, woodlands, hillsides and other valuable habitats.
- 2. LOC Policy 8.1: Ensure that development along Atascadero Creek, Graves Creeks, the Salinas River, blue line creeks, and natural springs, lakes, or other riparian areas does not interrupt natural flows or adversely impact riparian ecosystems and water quality.

The implementation programs associated with these policies call for the preservation of sensitive areas, minimization of land disturbance, and support of floodable terraces. LOC Program area 8.1.3 specifically requires for waterways to be maintained in their natural state and prohibits concrete channelization. Additionally, LOC Program Area 8.2.2 requires a 20-foot setback from any blue-line creek to proposed grading and development. The Regional Quality Control Board has requested that the City adopt a 30-foot setback to maintain water quality and watershed health. The proposed project includes realignment of the creek at accommodate development of the site. The creek channel will be reconstructed in a semi-natural state with one vegetated bank.

The construction of the project may impact trees on the property that are potential nesting and roosting sites for special status species.

BIO Impact-1: Demolition of the existing residence and any planned removal of ornamental trees may result in direct or indirect impacts to nesting birds if construction occurs during the typical avian nesting period (February 01 through August 31), as well as roosting bats. Further, the grassland habitat areas on site, although disturbed, may provide suitable nesting habitat for ground-nesting species. Impacts may occur due to habitat loss or construction related disturbances that may deter roosting or nesting, or cause nests to fail, thus *this impact is requires mitigation.*

BIO Impact-2: The biological assessment of the site determined that approximately 0.8 acres fall under the jurisdiction of the United States Army Corps of engineers and 0.14 acres of existing ephemeral drainage will be altered to accommodate development of the site. The development of the property will require grading on the entire site including 6,523 cubic yards of cut and 13,438 cubic yards of fill, including the area containing State recognized wetland habitat, thus *the impact requires mitigation*.

BIO Impact-3: The project proposed to realign an existing jurisdictional creek to accommodate development of the project site. The City's General Plan requires waterways to be maintained in a natural state and that development adhere to a 20-foot setback from the ordinary high water mark, thus, *the impact requires mitigation.*

MITIGATION / CONCLUSION:

BIOn1-1: Pre Construction Surveys for Roosting Bats: Within 30 days prior to removal of existing structures and/or mature trees, a sunset survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist

to determine if bats are roosting on site. If bats are present, a follow-up acoustic monitoring survey shall be completed to determine, if feasible, which species are present. If roosts of special-status bat species are identified and will be impacted during the proposed project, CDFW will be consulted to determine appropriate measures to be implemented. If it is determined that no special-status bats are present, the project shall proceed under the guidance of a qualified biologist, in a manner that minimizes impacts to individual bats and roosts (e.g., conducting work only during the day or installing one-way exclusions prior to work).

BIO 1-2: Pre Construction Surveys for Nesting Birds: If work is planned to occur between February 1 and September 15, a qualified biologist shall survey the area for nesting birds within one week prior to activity beginning on site. If nesting birds are located on or near the proposed project site, they shall be avoided until they have successfully fledged or the nest is no longer deemed active. A non-disturbance buffer of 50 feet will be placed around non-listed, passerine species, and a 250-foot buffer will be implemented for raptor species. All activity will remain outside of that buffer until a qualified biologist has determined that the young have fledged or that proposed construction activities would not cause adverse impacts to the nest, adults, eggs, or young. If special-status avian species are identified, no work will begin until an appropriate buffer is determined in consultation CDFW, and/or the USFWS.

BIO 2-1: Protection of Hydrologic Resources: Construction within and immediately adjacent to the drainage shall occur only when conditions are dry. For short-term, temporary stabilization, an erosion and sedimentation control plan shall be developed outlining Best Management Practices (BMPs), which shall be implemented to prevent erosion and sedimentation into the channel during construction. Acceptable stabilization methods include the use of weed-free, natural fiber (i.e., nonmonofilament) fiber rolls, jute or coir netting, and/or other industry standards. BMPs shall be installed and maintained for the duration of the construction period. In addition, the following general measures shall be implemented during construction:

- The limits of disturbance within the existing drainage feature shall be clearly shown on all sites plans and flagged within the drainages prior to project implementation. All construction personnel shall be directed to avoid impacts to the areas immediately upstream and downstream of the proposed development including the existing culvert features located at El Camino Real and Viejo Camino.
- All equipment and materials shall be stored out of the streambed at the end of each working day, and secondary containment shall be used to prevent leaks and spills of potential contaminants from entering the stream.
- During construction, washing of concrete, paint, or equipment and refueling and maintenance of equipment shall occur only in designated areas a minimum of 50 feet from all drainages and aquatic features. Sandbags and/or sorbent pads shall be available

to prevent water and/or spilled fuel from entering drainages.

• Construction equipment shall be inspected by the operator on a daily basis to ensure that equipment is in good working order and no fuel or lubricant leaks are present.

BIO 2-2: Compensatory Mitigation Plan: A compensatory mitigation plan shall be developed to offset permanent impacts to jurisdictional areas. The exact details and performance criteria of the restoration plan shall be determined during agency coordination with CDFW, RWQCB, and the Corps, as necessary. Stabilization and restoration measures may include the installation of BMPs and/or revegetation using native seed mixes and plantings. Prior to project initiation, all applicable agency permits with jurisdiction over the project area (i.e., Corps, CDFW, and RWQCB) should be obtained. Additional mitigation measures required by these agencies would be implemented as necessary.

BIO 2-3: Agency Permitting: Prior to issuance of any permits for grading or construction on-site, the applicant shall obtain permits from the following agencies, and any other agencies as necessary:

- California Department of Fish and Wildlife
- US Army Corps of Engineers
- Regional Water Quality Control Board

Any mitigation measures required by the above listed permits shall be implemented to their fullest extent.

BIO 3-1: Creek Channel Naturalization: The realigned creek shall be constructed in a manner which maintains and enhances natural flows and vegetation. The creek shall interface with the proposed development in a way which maintains appropriate setbacks and naturalization.

BIO 3-2: Wetland Restoration: The wetlands shall be monitored for a period of not less than 5years. Annual reports from a qualified biologist shall be submitted to the City addressing any irrigation modifications or replanting that may be required to ensure successful naturalization of the restored wetland habitat. A contract with a qualified biologist shall be entered into prior to final of the development permit.

6. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Will the project:

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource? | | | | \boxtimes |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource? | | | \boxtimes | |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | | | \boxtimes | |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | | | \boxtimes | |

EXISTING SETTING:

The City of Atascadero recognizes the impact of various cultures and ecosystems that have shaped it over generations. Therefore, the City as well as the county and state make an effort to preserve cultural resources, known or discovered, during the development of new projects.

The existing property is a 4.2 acre, underdeveloped parcel located in the Public zoning district between El Camino Real and Viejo Camino. The surrounding area is composed of residential, commercial, public park, and quasi-public uses such as churches and child care facilities. An existing ephemeral creek meanders through the project site, flows into Paloma Creek and subsequently the Salinas River approximately ¹/₄ mile to the east. The site contains identified

wetlands. There is an existing Historic Colony Home located on the parcel directly adjacent to the project site to the south.

The City of Atascadero's General Plan Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element Programs 6.2.4-6 require the mitigation and noticing of pertinent parties when archaeological discoveries are made in the city. The AMC lists standards to be adhered to should archeological remains be discovered during the development process which include the cessation of all construction activity until proper local, state, and federal protocol is completed. (AMC 9-4.162)

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The applicant is proposing an 81,000+ square foot mini-storage facility with an associated care taker's residence, workshop, and parking lot. The project includes 6,523 cubic yards of cut and 13,438 cubic yards of fill. The existing creek is proposed to be realigned to accommodate the development. Approximately 0.77 acres of restored wetland will be constructed on the south-eastern portion of the project site. The realigned creek and reconstructed wetlands are proposed on the portion of the property adjacent to the Historic Colony Home, creating a buffer between the proposed mini-storage development and the historic residential property.

According to the city's internal database, the nearest known archeological site is located 1/3 of a mile from the site. The site contains an ephemeral drainage and identified wetlands. The site has been grazed for a number of years and is subject to annual flooding. In accordance with AB52, early notification was send to all tribal communities claiming jurisdiction over the area. No additional archeological reconnaissance was requested.

CR Impact-1: The city of Atascadero's GIS database does not list archaeological sites on or adjacent to the subject property. This does not eliminate the possibility of new resources being discovered. AMC 9-4.162 requires the applicant to stop work and notify interested parties if archeological or historical resources are discovered during construction, *thus the impact is insignificant.*

MITIGATION / CONCLUSION: No further mitigation is necessary.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Will the project:

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a) Result in the exposure to or production of unstable earth conditions including the following: Landslides; Earthquakes; Liquefaction; Land subsidence or other similar hazards? | | | | |
| b) Be within a California Geological Survey "Alquist-Priolo" Earthquake Fault Zone, or other known fault zone? (consultant Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication #42) | | | | |

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| c) Result in soil erosion, topographic changes, loss of topsoil or unstable soil conditions from proposed improvements such as grading, vegetation removal, excavation or use of fill soil? | | | \boxtimes | |
| d) Include any structures located on known expansive soils? | | | \boxtimes | |
| e) Be inconsistent with the goals and policies of the City's Safety element relating to geologic and seismic hazards? | | | | \boxtimes |
| f) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | | | | \boxtimes |

EXISTING SETTING:

Developing on land with unsuitable soil or geologic conditions can create hazardous environments for people, structures, and infrastructure on and around a site. The environmental review process helps to promote safe building and development practices by ensuring precautions are taken to minimize risk where necessary.

The site spans two parcels and is approximately 4.2 acres of underdeveloped land in the Public zoning district between Viejo Camino and El Camino Real. There is an existing single family residence on one parcel and the other parcel is vacant with 1.8 acres of historic wetlands identified. Due to the low-lying nature of the site, the property is subject to annual seasonal flooding. Approximately 50% of the site is within the FEMA mapped flood zone A with Base Flood Elevations (BFE) determined (Figure 15). This project is subject to and must comply with the Flood damage Prevention Regulations as adopted bythe City of Atascadero.

The USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service provides GIS data regarding the site's stability, and risk of hazards. The biological assessment of the site identified three soil types: 1) still clay loam; 2) Santa Lucia-Lopez Complex; and 3) San Andreas-Arujo Complex. Each of these soil types is associated with their own slope average (Figure 10) The USDA GIS data classifies the site's soil drainage as "Moderately Drained" with "Moderate" erodibility (Figure 12) and shrink-swell capacity, and slow percolation. Additionally, this data also shows that approximately 3.6 acres of the property are at high risk for liquefaction and another 1.4 acres are at high risk for landslide (Figure 13). The average slope of the site is less than 10% according to estimations from the City's GIS data base.

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The applicant is proposing to develop a ministorage facility with more than 81,000 square feet of indoor facilities including storage units, a workshop and care taker facilities. The project will be located on two existing parcels southwest of Paloma Creek Park between El Camino Real and Viejo Camino that are covered with moderately expansive soil. The site is composed of two parcels and spans approximately 4.2 acres. Preliminary earthwork estimates in the project plans

call for 6,523 cubic yards of cut and 13,438 cubic yards of fill. There is 1.8 acres of historically identified wetland on the project site; however, the recent drought conditions and grazing activities have affected this resource. The biological assessment prepared for the project in early 2018 identified 0.14 acres of ephemeral drainage on site and no federally recognized triple criteria wetlands. The project proposed to realign the existing creek and modify the existing floodway.

The Atascadero General Plan and Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) list and map the potential ground shaking sources that can threaten developments within its boundaries as seen on Table 3. The California Department of Conservation developed the Earthquake Hazard Zone Application which allows users to determine if a parcel is located in an earthquake fault zone. The subject parcel is not within an identified Earthquake Fault Zone.

The Atascadero Municipal Code (AMC) establishes the Geologic Hazard (GH) Overlay Zone for areas with high risk of landslide and liquefaction. The standards for this zone are meant promote the cautious development of areas prone to geologic hazards including landside, liquefaction, and seismic hazards. Specifically, projects located in the GH overlay zone must submit a geologic report with the official project application (AMC 9-3.613). AMC 9-4.139 requires a grading plan for a project that involves an excess of 50 cubic yards of earth movement. Furthermore, AMC 9-4.145 requires a sedimentation and erosion control plan for any nonagricultural project where land is disturbed. These plans must be submitted to and reviewed by the City engineer for project approval or modification.

The Atascadero Municipal Code also addresses most issues related to geologic impacts prior to approval of any project. The site is subject to the GH overlay zone standard in AMC 9-3.613. These standards address issues related to landslide, liquefaction, and land subsidence by requiring geologic report applicable sites. AMC 9-4.139 & 9-4.145 address issues related to soil erosion and topsoil loss by requiring a grading plan and a sedimentation and erosion control plan. AMC and building code regulations would also ensure that the project is consistent with General Plan and LHMP policy regarding geologic and Seismic hazards.

Finally, the General Plan Safety and Noise Element Goal 4 and its respective policies and programs address geologic and seismic hazards as they affect development and emergencies. The Atascadero Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) also provides mitigation strategies addressing geologic hazards. Mitigation Goals 4, 5, and 7 promote the enforcement of safe building design, proper environmental studies and documentation, and feasible mitigation strategies for all new developments. Project consistency with these requirements and standards are addressed as part of the building permit process prior to construction.

GEO Impact-1: GIS Data from the United States Geologic Survey characterizes soil on the property as having high risk of landslide and liquefaction with moderate shrink-swell capacity. The site is therefore subject GH Overlay zone and associated development standards. The Atascadero Municipal Code requires a geologic report to be submitted prior to permits being approved. The Atascadero Municipal Code requires a sedimentation and erosion control plan to be submitted to the city engineer for revision and approval review. Since the Atascadero Municipal Code addresses issues geologic hazards, then *the impact is insignificant.*

GEO Impact -2: The project site contains areas mapped by FEMA as flood zone A with Base Flood elevations determined. The City has adopted Flood damage Prevention Regulations as established by FEMA. The project is subject to compliance with these adopted regulations; therefore, *the impact is insignificant*.

MITIGATION / CONCLUSION: No further mitigation is required.

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Will the project:

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | | | | \boxtimes |
| b) Create a hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | | | | |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | | | | \boxtimes |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | | | | \boxtimes |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | | | | |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | | | | \boxtimes |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | | | | \boxtimes |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | | | | \boxtimes |

EXISTING SETTING:

The City of Atascadero attempts to regulate land-use in a way that reduces risk for damage during disasters as well exposure to hazardous materials. Where this cannot be achieved, the City has created regulations and standards to protect public health and safety as much as possible.

The existing property is a 4.2 acre, underdeveloped parcel located in the Public zoning district between El Camino Real and Viejo Camino. The surrounding area is composed of residential, commercial, public park, and quasi-public uses such as churches and child care facilities. The site is in an urbanized area and is not adjacent to any wildland areas. The nearby park is an active recreation park with groomed ball fields and irrigated grass areas. The San Luis Obispo County Fire Department categorizes the site as at a high risk for fire (Figure 14), however, this map has not been updated in many years and the surrounding area has been developed with higher intensity residential and commercial uses which reduce the wildland fire risk of the site. The Atascadero Fire Department estimates response time for an emergency on the site would be less than 5 minutes.

The Atascadero General Plan anticipates the full development of the site and the fire department has created an evacuation plan for the community should there be a need to evacuate. The General Plan also addresses the construction of new developments in high fire risk areas by requiring fire resistant material to be used in construction as well as the use of defensible spaces around all structures. Furthermore, AMC requires compliance to fire code standards and review of new projects by the Atascadero Fire Department.

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The applicant is proposing mini-storage facilities in excess of 81,000 square feet. The facility would include a caretaker's residence and associated improvements. The parcels being developed total to 4.2 acres in size.

City and State building regulation provide thresholds of significance for the project. The AMC requires that all new projects be reviewed by the fire department for compliance with the California fire code or to make modifications where necessary. All new projects are expected to conform to the California Fire Code as well as the local modifications found in AMC 4-7.

HAZ Impact-1: The mini-storage facility is proposed on a site identified as being at high risk for fire hazards. The project will be reviewed by the local fire marshal for compliance with local and state fire codes prior to building permits being issued. Since the Atascadero Municipal code addresses fire hazards before building permits are issued, the *impact is insignificant*.

MITIGATION / CONCLUSION: No further mitigation is necessary.

9. WATER QUALITY / HYDROLOGY – Will the project:

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | | | \boxtimes | |

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | | | \boxtimes | |
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | | \boxtimes | | |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off- site? | | | | |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? | | | \boxtimes | |
| f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | | | \boxtimes | |
| g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | | | | \boxtimes |
| h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | | \boxtimes | | |
| i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | | | \boxtimes | |

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| | | | | \boxtimes |
| j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | | | | |

EXISTING SETTING:

Alterations to existing landscapes developed or otherwise, can impact hydrology on the site by increasing run off, risk of flooding, or contaminating ground water. These impacts to the hydrologic cycle can have adverse effects on human health as well as the health of existing ecosystems.

The site currently contains an identified jurisdictional creek and historic wetlands. Drought conditions and grazing activities over the past years have degraded the habitat value of the site but seasonal flooding during average rainfall years occurs over a large portion of the site. Approximately 50% of the site is mapped as floodway and flood zone by FEMA.

The urbanized areas of the Central Coast are divided into ten water management zones (WMZs) based on the receiving water type and common watershed processes. The California Regional Water Quality Control Board (CRWQCB) provides maps showing that the site is located in Water WMZ 1 (CRWQCB, 2013) (Figure 11). The California Department of Water Resources provides a tool to assess the boundaries of significant groundwater basins in California. The subject site is not within any significant groundwater basin. The nearest basin is the Atascadero Subbasin of the Salinas Valley Basin on the eastern side of the city approximately 0.68 miles from the project site.

That Atascadero Storm Water Management Program (SWMP) (Wallace Group, 2009) and the central coast post construction stormwater requirements (CRWQCB, 2013) provide standards to protect water quality and control runoff from new developments. These documents require mitigation or alterations in design for projects that significantly increase the amount of impervious surfaces. Additionally, they address erosion control for new developments. Moreover, The SWMP accounts for all current and future development slated to impact the existing drainage infrastructure.

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The applicant is proposing mini-storage facilities in excess of 81,000 square feet. The facility would include a caretaker's residence and associated improvements. The parcels being developed total to 4.2 acres in size. Preliminary earthwork estimates in the project plans call for 6,523 cubic yards of cut and 13,438 cubic yards of fill. There is 1.8 acres of historically identified wetland on the project site; however, the recent drought conditions and grazing activities have affected this resource. The biological assessment prepared for the project in early 2018 identified 0.14 acres of ephemeral drainage on site and no federally recognized triple criteria wetlands. The project proposed to realign the existing creek and modify the existing floodway.

Regulations created by City of Atascadero SWMP, AMC, and the CRWQCB are used as thresholds of significance regulation for issues concerning water quality and hydrology for the proposed project. In addition, CDFW, and ACE have permitting authority over the project due to the proposed realignment of the existing creek and modifications to the mapped floodway.

The City of Atascadero Storm Water Management Plan provides goals and implementation measures for run off control through best practices. Many of these goals are achieved through following state standards for storm water runoff. The central coast post construction stormwater

requirements provide standards to protect water quality and ensure runoff control from new developments (CRWQCB, 2013). The proposed mini-storage facility is subject to post-construction requirements for stormwater rate control and water quality.

Development of the subject property will modify the existing flood zone as delineated on the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM).

WQH Impact-1: The applicant is proposing to realign an existing jurisdictional drainage and recontour the site to accommodate the proposed development. Grading includes elimination of the existing creek channel and fill of the existing mapped wetland area, thus **this impact requires mitigation**.

WQH Impact-2: The project is proposing to place fill in the existing FEMA mapped flood zone A, which has the potential to increase flooding on adjacent properties; therefore, the *impact requires mitigation*.

MITIGATION / CONCLUSION:

WQH 1-1: The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits form the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

WQH 2-1: Prior to issuance of any building permits, a FEMA Conditional Letter Of Map Revision (CLOMR) must be issued and received by the City Engineer.

WQH 2-2: The project design and construction shall comply with the CLOMR. Prior to a final inspection or Occupancy release, the developer must apply for and be issued a FEMA Letter Of Map Revision (LOMR) and a copy filed in the Office of the City Engineer.

10. LAND USE & PLANNING – Will the project:

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | | | | \boxtimes |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | | \boxtimes | | |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | | | | \boxtimes |

EXISTING SETTING:

The City of Atascadero regulates land uses in attempt to create a sensible, safe, and healthy landscape for the residents of the city. Policies regarding land use planning and conservation can be found in the Atascadero General Plan and associated documents. The City's General plan calls for a 20-foot setback from all jurisdictional creeks and watercourses. The RWQCB has requested a more stringent setback of 30-feet.

According to the Atascadero General Plan Land Use, Open Space and Conservation Element, the Public zoning district is designated for public and quasi-public land uses such as churches, child care facilities, schools, parks, membership organizations, etc. Mini-Storage is listed as a conditionally allowed use, requiring certain findings to be made to determine compatibility with the site environment and surrounding neighborhood character. The surrounding parcels include multi-family and single-family residential developments, commercial uses, parks, and quasi-public uses.

The site where the mini-storage is proposed is located on a 4.2 acre parcel in Public zoning district of Atascadero. There is an existing ephemeral creek running through the project site. The property has historically flooded during the rainy season and wetlands have been identified in the past. The current drought and grazing practices has diminished wetland characteristics.

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The applicant is proposing mini-storage facilities in excess of 81,000 square feet. The facility would include a caretaker's residence and associated improvements. The parcels being developed total to 4.2 acres in size. Preliminary earthwork estimates in the project plans call for 6,523 cubic yards of cut and 13,438 cubic yards of fill. There is 1.8 acres of historically identified wetland on the project site; however, the recent drought conditions and grazing activities have affected this resource. The biological assessment prepared for the project in early 2018 identified 0.14 acres of ephemeral drainage on site and no federally recognized triple criteria wetlands. The project proposed to realign the existing creek and modify the existing floodway. The proposal includes the construction of 0.77 acres of wetland habitat.

MITIGATION:

LUP 1: see BIO-3-1

11. MINERAL RESOURCES – Will the project:

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | | | | \boxtimes |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | | | | \boxtimes |

EXISTING SETTING:

Mineral resources are protected in the state of California for their economic benefits.

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The project site is a historic low point and subject to annual flooding. There have historically been mapped wetlands on the site. The applicant is proposing an 81,000+ square foot mini-storage facility with a care-taker's residence and associated site improvements. There are no known mineral resources in the area of the proposed project.

MITIGATION / CONCLUSION: No impacts are expected to occur.

12. NOISE – Will the project result in:

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | | | | |
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | | | | \boxtimes |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | | \boxtimes |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | | |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | | |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | | \boxtimes |

EXISTING SETTING:

The City of Atascadero regulates noise pollution from any given development because of the potential for adverse effects on human health and safety.

The existing property is a 4.2 acre, underdeveloped parcel located in the Public zoning district between El Camino Real and Viejo Camino. The surrounding area is composed of residential, commercial, public park, and quasi-public uses such as churches and child care facilities. The site is in an urbanized area. The nearby park is an active recreation park.

The Atascadero Municipal code provides the threshold of significance for noise created during the construction process of new developments. The AMC states that all noises created by construction activities are exempt from city regulation as long as the activities occur between seven AM and nine PM. During the hours of nine PM to seven AM the maximum allowable decibel range for all noise created is sixty-five decibels.

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The applicant is proposing mini-storage facilities in excess of 81,000 square feet. The facility would include a caretaker's residence and associated improvements. The parcels being developed total to 4.2 acres in size. Preliminary earthwork estimates in the project plans call for 6,523 cubic yards of cut and 13,438 cubic yards of fill. Large grading equipment will be needed to complete site development. Fill dirt will be brought to the site during grading construction activities. Impacts related to construction will be temporary. The continued operation of a mini-storage facility is not expected to generate high volumes of noise.

NOI Impact-1: The ministorage facility will create a temporary source of noise pollution during the construction process. The Atascadero Municipal Code exempts construction activities from the city's noise regulations during the hours of 7am and 9pm, and limits noise to a maximum of sixty-five decibels during the hours of nine PM and seven AM. Since the Atascadero Municipal code address noise concerns, the *impact is insignificant*.

MITIGATION / CONCLUSION: No further mitigation is necessary.

13. POPULATION & HOUSING – Will the project:

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | | | | |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | | \boxtimes |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | | \boxtimes |

EXISTING SETTING:

The State of California aims to ensure adequate housing and quality living environments by requiring cities to take detailed accounts of current housing stock and needs as well as projections of expected future needs. The Atascadero General Plan Housing Element identifies housing related goals for the city and methods by which to achieve them.

The General Plan Housing Element and existing data from the 2000 and 2010 United States Censuses provide a snapshot of population growth in the City of Atascadero. The city's population grew by about 14.1 percent in the 1990s. From 2000 to 2010 city population grew by only 7.2% percent. Housing needs are reported by the San Luis Obispo County Council of Governments (SLOCOG). SLOCOG provides the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for incorporated areas of San Luis Obispo County. Allotments are further categorized into affordability types. Each city is then responsible for dedicating the needed resources and amending their General Plan Housing Element to attain their allotment of housing.

The existing property is a 4.2 acre, underdeveloped site located in the Public zoning district between El Camino Real and Viejo Camino. The project site is currently comprised of 2 parcels, one is vacant and the other contains a non-conforming single-family dwelling. The surrounding area is composed of residential, commercial, public park, and quasi-public uses such as churches and child care facilities. The site is in an urbanized area. The nearby park is an active recreation park. According to the Atascadero General Plan Land Use, Open Space and Conservation Element, the Public zoning district is designated for public and quasi-public land uses such as churches, child care facilities, schools, parks, membership organizations, etc.

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The proposed project consists of an 81,000+ square foot mini-storage facility with caretaker's residence and associated improvements. The existing non-conforming residence will be demolished to accommodate the proposed development.

PH Impact-1: The proposed project will eliminate one single-family residence and replace the underdeveloped land with a mini-storage facility and caretaker's residence. The property is zoned "Public" which anticipates non-residential land-uses; *The impact of the project on population and housing is insignificant.*

MITIGATION / CONCLUSION: No further mitigation is necessary.

14. PUBLIC SERVICE:

| Will the proposed project have an effect upon, or result in the need for new or altered public services in any of the following areas: | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a) Emergency Services (Atascadero Fire)? | | | \boxtimes | |
| b) Police Services (Atascadero Police)? | | | \boxtimes | |
| c) Public Schools? | | | \boxtimes | |
| d) Parks? | | | \boxtimes | |
| e) Other public facilities? | | | \boxtimes | |

EXISTING SETTING:

New developments in the City of Atascadero place increased demand on local public service. For this reason, the city must ensure that existing services and future service and facility expansions can accommodate expected new developments.

The existing property is a 4.2 acre, underdeveloped site located in the Public zoning district between El Camino Real and Viejo Camino. The project site is currently comprised of 2 parcels, one is vacant and the other contains a non-conforming single-family dwelling. The surrounding area is composed of residential, commercial, public park, and quasi-public uses such as churches and child care facilities. The site is in an urbanized area. The nearby park is an active recreation

park. According to the Atascadero General Plan Land Use, Open Space and Conservation Element, the Public zoning district is designated for public and quasi-public land uses such as churches, child care facilities, schools, parks, membership organizations, etc.

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The proposed project consists of an 81,000+ square foot mini-storage facility with caretaker's residence and associated improvements. The existing non-conforming residence will be demolished to accommodate the proposed development.

The project will increase the intensity of uses on the subject parcel; however, this increase is anticipated in the General Plan. The project is commercial in nature and will not place a burden on existing City services or facilities.

MITIGATION / CONCLUSION: No impacts are expected to occur.

15. RECREATION:

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | | | | |
| b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | | | | \boxtimes |

EXISTING SETTING:

The City of Atascadero attempts to provide quality open spaces and recreation areas for its residents as it continues to grow.

The Atascadero General Plan recognizes the importance of access to parks and recreation areas. The General Plan Land Use, Conservation and Open Space Element Program areas 11.1.3-5 promote this access and aim for a ration of five acres of open space for every one thousand residents. Associated development impact fees are used to fund maintenance of existing parks and potential acquisition of new open spaces to make these goals achievable.

The existing property is a 4.2 acre, underdeveloped site located in the Public zoning district between El Camino Real and Viejo Camino. The project site is currently comprised of 2 parcels, one is vacant and the other contains a non-conforming single-family dwelling. The surrounding area is composed of residential, commercial, public park, and quasi-public uses such as churches and child care facilities. The site is in an urbanized area. The nearby park is an active recreation park. According to the Atascadero General Plan Land Use, Open Space and Conservation Element, the Public zoning district is designated for public and quasi-public land uses such as churches, child care facilities, schools, parks, membership organizations, etc.

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The proposed project consists of an 81,000+ square foot mini-storage facility with caretaker's residence and associated improvements. The existing non-conforming residence will be demolished to accommodate the proposed development. The use is commercial in nature and will not increase demands on existing recreation facilities.

MITIGATION / CONCLUSION: No impacts are expected to occur.

16. TRANSPORTATION / TRAFFIC – Will the project:



| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | | | | |
| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | | | | |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | | | | \boxtimes |
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | | | | \boxtimes |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | | | | \boxtimes |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | | | \boxtimes | |

EXISTING SETTING:

The City of Atascadero strives to provide a quality transportation network that is feasible and practical for the needs of the city.

The Atascadero General Plan Circulation Element sets policies aimed at encouraging use of different transportation modalities and ensuring network efficiency. Regional highways and county roads fall under the jurisdiction of CalTrans and the County of San Luis Obispo. . SLOCOG provides standards and regulations for countywide transportation networks.

The City of Atascadero General Plan Circulation Element provides the threshold of significance for transportation and traffic. The City has designated level C as the minimum level of service require of all city facilities. The Circulation Element accounts for expected future land uses as projected by the Land Use, Conservation and Open Space Element. Additionally, the City of Atascadero requires impact fees to be paid towards public services that include the local circulation system.

The existing property is a 4.2 acre, underdeveloped site located in the Public zoning district between El Camino Real and Viejo Camino. The project site is currently comprised of 2 parcels, one is vacant and the other contains a non-conforming single-family dwelling. The surrounding area is composed of residential, commercial, public park, and quasi-public uses such as churches and child care facilities. The site is in an urbanized area. According to the Atascadero General Plan Land Use, Open Space and Conservation Element, the Public zoning district is designated for public and quasi-public land uses such as churches, child care facilities, schools, parks, membership organizations, etc.

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The proposed project consists of an 81,000+ square foot mini-storage facility with caretaker's residence and associated improvements. The existing non-conforming residence will be demolished to accommodate the proposed development. The proposed caretaker's residence is projected to generate 6.72 trips a day, and the mini-storage is expected to generate 146 trips a day according to the 7th Edition of the Institute of Transportation Engineers' Trip Generation Manual.

The project includes improvements to Viejo Camino that include a new sidewalk and bus stop. This will increase opportunities for multi-modal travel throughout the City and provide a safe path for pedestrians to travel in the area.

As proposed, with the improvements to Viejo Camino, the project is not expected to create significant issues or conflicts with current traffic patterns or programs laid out by the City or SLOCOG.

TRT Impact-1: The proposed mini-storage facility will incrementally increase demand on the Atascadero transportation network by generating new trips and contributing to infrastructure usage. The City requires impact fees from new developments that cover impacts to the circulation system. Since the City addresses concerns regarding transportation and traffic before development, then *the impact is insignificant.*

MITIGATION / CONCLUSION: No further mitigation is necessary.

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Will the project:

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | | | | \boxtimes |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | \boxtimes | |

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | \boxtimes | |
| d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | | | \boxtimes | |
| e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | | | | |
| f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | | | \boxtimes | |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | | | \boxtimes | |

EXISTING SETTING:

The City of Atascadero must account for all impacts to infrastructure and utilities to ensure that existing infrastructure is able to handle current and future demands. Sewer connection and usage fees go toward any necessary improvements or upgrades to the City's wastewater treatment plant. The AMC sets standards for addressing drainage as well as waste and wastewater disposal from all developments in the City.

The existing property is a 4.2 acre, underdeveloped site located in the Public zoning district between El Camino Real and Viejo Camino. The project site is currently comprised of 2 parcels, one is vacant and the other contains a non-conforming single-family dwelling. The surrounding area is composed of residential, commercial, public park, and quasi-public uses such as churches and child care facilities. According to the Atascadero General Plan Land Use, Open Space and Conservation Element, the Public zoning district is designated for public and quasi-public land uses such as churches, child care facilities, schools, parks, membership organizations, etc. City sewer is available for the project site. There is an existing single-family residence on-site that is currently served by an on-site wastewater system.

The site currently contains an ephemeral creek that qualifies as a jurisdictional watercourse. Water flows onto the site from an existing culvert under El Camino Real and meanders east to a culvert under Viejo Camino where the creek joins with Paloma creek and flows into the Salinas River located approximately ¼ mile from the project site. Historically the site was designated with

1.8 acres of wetland. Recent drought conditions and consistent annual livestock grazing have decreased the wetland vegetation and habitat of the site.

The Atascadero Mutual Water Company (AMWC) provides water to the City. The company's service area is shown in Figure 16; the site is within the service area. The AMWC's Urban Water Management Plan provides regulations based on SLOCOG population projections and historic water use for their service areas. Their projections for water supply and demand, assuming normal conditions through 2040, can be seen in Table 4. These projections go beyond the time period of the most recent General Plan in which the City anticipates build out by the year 2025. Their projections show that they will have sufficient water supplies to meet the demand.

Waste Management, Inc. (WM) is the city's contracted waste management service. Approximately 99% of Atascadero's solid waste is taken to the Chicago Grade Landfill in Templeton, California (Wallace Group, 2012). CalRecycle monitors and collects data on all permitted landfills in the state of California. According to CalRecycle the Chicago Grade Landfill had a remaining capacity of 6,022,396 cubic yards as of November of 2017 with an operations estimated to cease by 2039.

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The proposed project consists of an 81,000+ square foot mini-storage facility with caretaker's residence and associated improvements. The existing non-conforming residence will be demolished to accommodate the proposed development. The project includes the realignment of a natural ephemeral creek and reconstruction of 0.77 acres of wetland habitat area. Water is proposed to enter the site from the existing culverts under El Camino Real and be directed to the constructed wetland at the southern tip of the site. Flows will than continue toward Viejo Camino into an existing culvert. The water flow path will include vegetation on one side of the channel, which is expected to provide filtration and enhance water quality.

Construction of new drainage infrastructure is expected to conform to city policies and AMC requirements. All new run off created by the site will be directed towards proposed on-site water storage cisterns and/or the constructed wetland habitat area. Construction efforts on the property are expected to abide by waste collection standards stated in the AMC.

A new mini-storage and caretaker's residence is not expected to impose demands above anticipated projections on the AMWC water resources or the landfill capacity at Chicago Grade Landfill, nor will impacts exceed the capacity of the City's wastewater treatment plant.

USS Impact-1: The mini-storage facility will be connected to City sewer. The City's wastewater treatment plant is nearing capacity, however, upgrades and new infrastructure is slated to begin over the next few years. The General Plan anticipates development of this parcel and the existing treatment plan is able to accommodate the small loads generated by the proposed use, thus *the impact is insignificant.*

USS Impact-2: The project has the potential to add a new under-road culvert to the drainage under Viejo Camino. The drainage originates from a jurisdictional ephemeral creek and wetland area upstream. The installation of a new culvert will impact the post-construction hydrology of the site. The City requires all projects to provide an analysis of post-construction hydrology to ensure that no increase in flows or flooding will occur downstream, thus *the impact is insignificant*.

USS Impact-3: The mini-storage facility will create new demand on existing water resources provided by the Atascadero Mutual Water Company. The Atascadero Mutual Water Company is projected to be able to meet water needs for all new uses expected within the City through the year 2040. Since adequate water resources are available, *the impact is insignificant.*
MITIGATION / CONCLUSION: No further mitigation is needed.

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES – Will the project:

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe?: | | | \boxtimes | |
| b) Impact a listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as define in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)? | | | | \boxtimes |
| c) Impact a resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California native American Tribe? | | | | \boxtimes |

EXISTING SETTING:

San Luis Obispo County and the surrounding region is an ancestral home to various Native American tribes. This leads to the occasional discovery of tribal artifacts during development. Local and State regulation recognize the importance of coordinating with local tribes and archeological services to preserve these resources.

The City of Atascadero's General Plan Land Use, Open Space, and Conservation Element Programs 6.2.4-6 require the mitigation and noticing of pertinent parties when archaeological discoveries are made in the city. The AMC lists standards to be adhered to should archeological remains be discovered during the development process which include the cessation of all construction activity until proper local, state, and federal protocol is completed. (AMC 9-4.162) Finally, The California Environmental Quality Act requires the lead agency to notify regional tribes about projects that trigger environmental review. After notifying the regional tribes, they are allowed to require further studies to be administered during any project if they believe that there is potential for cultural artifacts to be found.

The existing property is a 4.2 acre, underdeveloped site located in the Public zoning district between El Camino Real and Viejo Camino. The project site is currently comprised of 2 parcels, one is vacant and the other contains a non-conforming single-family dwelling. The surrounding

area is composed of residential, commercial, public park, and quasi-public uses such as churches and child care facilities. The site currently contains an ephemeral creek that qualifies as a jurisdictional watercourse. Water flows onto the site from an existing culvert under El Camino Real and meanders east to a culvert under Viejo Camino where the creek joins with Paloma creek and flows into the Salinas River located approximately ¼ mile from the project site. Historically the site was designated with 1.8 acres of wetland. Recent drought conditions and consistent annual livestock grazing have decreased the wetland vegetation and habitat of the site.

A known historic cemetery for the rural community of Dove was located approximately 600-feet from the proposed development. The dove community was in existence the latter portion of the nineteenth century. No other remnants are known to exist within the vicinity, nor have the native tribes of the area requested any additional reconnaissance for archeological purposed on the project site.

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The proposed project consists of an 81,000+ square foot mini-storage facility with caretaker's residence and associated improvements. The existing non-conforming residence will be demolished to accommodate the proposed development. The project includes the realignment of a natural ephemeral creek and reconstruction of 0.77 acres of wetland habitat area.

Consultation in accordance with AB52 were completed and it was determined that no further study was necessary.

MITIGATION / CONCLUSION: No impacts are expected to occur

19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self- sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | | | | |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects) | | | | |

| | Potentially Significant | Impact Requires Mitigation | Insignificant Impact | Not Applicable |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | | | \boxtimes | |

EXISTING SETTING:

The existing property is a 4.2 acre, underdeveloped site located in the Public zoning district between El Camino Real and Viejo Camino. The project site is currently comprised of 2 parcels, one is vacant and the other contains a non-conforming single-family dwelling. The surrounding area is composed of residential, commercial, public park, and quasi-public uses such as churches and child care facilities.

PROPOSED PROJECT:

The proposed project consists of an 81,000+ square foot mini-storage facility with caretaker's residence and associated improvements. The existing non-conforming residence will be demolished to accommodate the proposed development. The project includes the realignment of a natural ephemeral creek and reconstruction of 0.77 acres of wetland habitat area.

MFS Impact-1: Since the project is expected to comply with policies, regulations and mitigations provided by the city, then *there is no significant impact*.

MITIGATION / CONCLUSION: No further mitigation is necessary.

For further information on California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) or the City's environmental review process, please visit the City's website at <u>www.atascadero.org</u> under the Community Development Department or the California Environmental Resources Evaluation System at: <u>http://resources.ca.gov/cega/</u> for additional information on CEQA.

Exhibit A – Initial Study References & Outside Agency Contacts

The Community Development Department of the City of Atascadero has contacted various agencies for their comments on the proposed project. With respect to the proposed project, the following outside agencies have been contacted (marked with an \boxtimes) with a notice of intent to adopt a proposed negative / mitigated negative declaration.

🔀 Atascadero Mutual Water Company 🛛 🛛 Native American Heritage Commission

| \boxtimes | Atascadero Unified School District | | San Luis Obispo Council of Governments |
|-------------|---|-------------|--|
| \boxtimes | Atascadero Waste Alternatives | \boxtimes | San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District |
| \boxtimes | AB 52 – Salinan Tribe | \boxtimes | San Luis Obispo Integrated Waste Management Board |
| \boxtimes | AB 52 – Northern Chumash Tribe | \boxtimes | Regional Water Quality Control Board District 3 |
| \boxtimes | AB 52 – Xolon Salinan Tribe | \boxtimes | HEAL SLO – Healthy Communities Workgroup |
| | AB 52 – Other | \boxtimes | US Postal Service |
| | California Highway Patrol | \boxtimes | Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) |
| \boxtimes | California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Region 4) | \boxtimes | Southern California Gas Co. (SoCal Gas) |
| \boxtimes | California Department of Transportation (District 5) | \boxtimes | San Luis Obispo County Assessor |
| \boxtimes | Pacific Gas & Electric | | LAFCO |
| | San Luis Obispo County Planning & Building | | Office of Historic Preservation |
| | San Luis Obispo County Environmental Health Department | | Charter Communications |
| | Upper Salians – Las Tablas RCD | | CA Housing & Community Development |
| | Central Coast Information Center (CA. Historical Resources Information System) | | CA Department of Toxic Substances Control |
| | CA Department of Food & Agriculture | \boxtimes | US Army Corp of Engineers |
| | CA Department of Conservation | \boxtimes | Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) |
| | CA Air Resources Board | | Other: |
| | Address Management Service | | Other: |

The following checked (" \boxtimes ") reference materials have been used in the environmental review for the proposed project and are hereby incorporated by reference into the Initial Study. The following information is available at the Community Development Department and requested copies of information may be viewed by requesting an appointment with the project planner at (805) 461-5000.

Project File / Application / Exhibits / Adopted Atascadero Capital Facilities Fee \times \mathbf{X} Studies Ordinance \mathbf{X} \square Atascadero General Plan 2025 / Final EIR Atascadero Inclusionary Housing Policy \boxtimes Х SLO APCD Handbook Atascadero Municipal Code \times \square Atascadero Appearance Review Manual **Regional Transportation Plan** Atascadero Urban Stormwater \boxtimes \boxtimes Flood Hazard Maps Management Plan \boxtimes \square Atascadero Hillside Grading Guidelines CDFW / USFW Mapping Atascadero Native Tree Ordinance & \mathbf{X} \square CA Natural Species Diversity Data Base Guidelines Х Atascadero Climate Action Plan (CAP) Х Archeological Resources Map Atascadero Mutual Water Company Urban Atascadero Downtown Revitalization Plan \times \square Water Management Plan \square \boxtimes Atascadero Bicycle Transportation Plan CalEnvironScreen Department of Conservation Fault Zone \times Х Atascadero GIS mapping layers Application \mathbf{X} SLO APCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook \square Other

EXHIBIT B – MITIGATION SUMMARY TABLE Dove Creek Mino-Storage DEV18-0103

Per Public Resources Code § 21081.6, the following measures also constitutes the mitigation monitoring and/or reporting program that will reduce potentially significant impacts to less than significant levels. The measures will become conditions of approval (COAs) should the project be approved. The City of Atascadero, as the Lead Agency, or other responsible agencies, as specified, are responsible to verify compliance with these COAs.

| | MITIGATION MEASURE | TIMING |
|----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Aesthet | ics | |
| AES- 1.1 | All exterior lights shall be turned off between the hours of 11pm and 6am. Lights may turn on when motion is sensed. All lighting must be dimmable to maintain the low light levels of the surrounding residential and open space areas. | Ongoing |
| AES- 1.2 | The wall shall be constructed of medium toned split face block with darker contrasting pilasters. Where any wall is constructed that is not a side of a building, a decorative cap shall be included. The portion of the wall used to create one side of the realigned creek channel shall be constructed of a natural rock or stone appearing material with color variations. Medium to tall landscaping shall be placed adjacent to the wall. If this is not possible due to wetland restoration requirements, metal trellis features shall be provided at regular intervals with appropriate landscape material. The shelf between the back of building and the creek channel wall shall include space and depth for landscape material that will trail over the wall. | Prior to permit issuance |
| Air Qua l AQ 2-1 | lity Use of water trucks or sprinkler systems, in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site and from exceeding the APCD's limit of 20% opacity for greater than 3minutes in any 60-minute period. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 mph. Reclaimed (non-potable) water should be used whenever possible. Please note that during drought conditions, water use may be a concern and the contractor or builder shall consider the use of an APCD-approved dust suppressant where feasible to reduce the amount of water used for dust control. | During construction |
| AQ 2-2 | All dirt stock pile areas should be sprayed daily as needed. | During construction |



MITIGATION MEASURE

- AQ 2-3 Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans should be implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities. Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading should be sown with a fast germinating, noninvasive grass seed and watered until vegetation is established.
- AQ 2-4 All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the APCD.
- AQ 2-5 All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- AQ 2-6 Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with CVC Section 23114.
- AQ 2-7 "Track-Out" is defined as sand or soil that adheres to and/or agglomerates on the exterior surfaces of motor vehicles and/or equipment (including tires) that may then fall onto any highway or street as described in California Vehicle Code Section 23113 and California Water Code 13304. To prevent Track Out, designate access points and require all employees, subcontractors, and others to use them. Install and operate a "track-out prevention device" where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved streets. The track-out prevention device can be any device or combination of devices that are effective at preventing track out, located at the point of intersection of an unpaved area and a paved road. Rumble strips or steel plate devices require periodic cleaning to be effective. If paved roadways accumulate tracked out soils, the track-out prevention device may need to be modified.
- AQ 2-8 Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is Durina carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water should be used where feasible.
- AQ 2-9 All of these fugitive dust mitigation measures shall be shown on grading and building plans. The contractor or builder shall issuance designate a person or persons to monitor the fugitive dust emissions and enhance the implementation of the measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints, reduce visible emissions below 20% opacity, and to prevent transport of

TIMING

Prior to permit issuance

Durina construction

During construction

Durina construction

Durina construction

construction

Prior to permit

MITIGATION MEASURE

dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the APCD.

Biological Resources

- BIO 1-1 **Pre Construction Surveys for Roosting Bats:** Within 30 days prior to removal of existing structures and/or mature trees, a sunset survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if bats are roosting on site. If bats are present, a follow-up acoustic monitoring survey shall be completed to determine, if feasible, which species are present. If roosts of special-status bat species are identified and will be impacted during the proposed project, CDFW will be consulted to determine appropriate measures to be implemented. If it is determined that no special-status bats are present, the project shall proceed under the guidance of a qualified biologist, in a manner that minimizes impacts to individual bats and roosts (e.g., conducting work only during the day or installing one-way exclusions prior to work).
- BIO 1-2 Pre Construction Surveys for Nesting Birds: If work is planned to occur between February 1 and September 15, a qualified biologist shall survey the area for nesting birds within one week prior to activity beginning on site. If nesting birds are located on or near the proposed project site, they shall be avoided until they have successfully fledged or the nest is no longer deemed active. A non-disturbance buffer of 50 feet will be placed around non-listed, passerine species, and a 250-foot buffer will be implemented for raptor species. All activity will remain outside of that buffer until a qualified biologist has determined that the young have fledged or that proposed construction activities would not cause adverse impacts to the nest, adults, eggs, or young. If special-status avian species are identified, no work will begin until an appropriate buffer is determined in consultation CDFW, and/or the USFWS.
- BIO 2-1 **Protection of Hydrologic Resources:** Construction within and immediately adjacent to the drainage shall occur only when conditions are dry. For short-term, temporary stabilization, an erosion and sedimentation control plan shall be developed outlining Best Management Practices (BMPs), which shall be implemented to prevent erosion and sedimentation into the channel during construction. Acceptable stabilization methods include the use of weed-free, natural fiber (i.e., nonmonofilament) fiber rolls, jute or coir netting, and/or other industry standards. BMPs shall be installed and maintained for the duration of the construction period. In addition, the following general measures shall be implemented during construction:

TIMING

Prior to permit issuance

Prior to permit issuance

Prior to permit issuance/During construction

MITIGATION MEASURE

TIMING

- The limits of disturbance within the existing drainage feature shall be clearly shown on all sites plans and flagged within the drainages prior to project implementation. All construction personnel shall be directed to avoid impacts to the areas immediately upstream and downstream of the proposed development including the existing culvert features located at El Camino Real and Viejo Camino.
- All equipment and materials shall be stored out of the streambed at the end of each working day, and secondary containment shall be used to prevent leaks and spills of potential contaminants from entering the stream.
- During construction, washing of concrete, paint, or equipment and refueling and maintenance of equipment shall occur only in designated areas a minimum of 50 feet from all drainages and aquatic features. Sandbags and/or sorbent pads shall be available to prevent water and/or spilled fuel from entering drainages.
- Construction equipment shall be inspected by the operator on a daily basis to ensure that equipment is in good working order and no fuel or lubricant leaks are present.

Prior to permit issuance

- BIO 2-2 **Compensatory Mitigation Plan:** A compensatory mitigation plan shall be developed to offset permanent impacts to jurisdictional areas. The exact details and performance criteria of the restoration plan shall be determined during agency coordination with CDFW, RWQCB, and the Corps, as necessary. Stabilization and restoration measures may include the installation of BMPs and/or revegetation using native seed mixes and plantings. Prior to project initiation, all applicable agency permits with jurisdiction over the project area (i.e., Corps, CDFW, and RWQCB) should be obtained. Additional mitigation measures required by these agencies would be implemented as necessary.
- BIO 2-3 **Agency Permitting:** Prior to issuance of any permits for Prior to permit grading or construction on-site, the applicant shall obtain permits from the following agencies, and any other agencies as necessary:
 - California Department of Fish and Wildlife
 - US Army Corps of Engineers
 - Regional Water Quality Control Board

TIMING

MITIGATION MEASURE Any mitigation measures required by the above listed permits shall be implemented to their fullest extent.

| Water Q | uality and Hydrology | |
|------------|---|--------------------------|
| WQH 1-1 | The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits form the Regional Water Quality Control Board. | Prior to permit issuance |
| WQH 2-1 | Prior to issuance of any building permits, a FEMA Conditional Letter Of Map Revision (CLOMR) must be issued and received by the City Engineer. | Prior to permit issuance |
| WQH 2-2 | The project design and construction shall comply with the CLOMR. Prior to a final inspection or Occupancy release, the developer must apply for and be issued a FEMA Letter Of Map Revision (LOMR) and a copy filed in the Office of the City Engineer. | Prior to C of O |
| | | |

LUP See BIO 3-1

1-1

The applicant agrees to incorporate the above measures into the project. These measures become a part of the project description and therefore become a part of the record of action upon which the environmental determination is based. All development activity must occur in strict compliance with the above mitigation measures. The measures shall be perpetual and run with the land. These measures are binding on all successors in interest of the subject property.

The applicant understands that any changes made to the project description subsequent to this environmental determination must be reviewed by the Community Development Director or their designee and may require a new environmental analysis for the project. By signing this agreement, the owner(s) agrees to and accepts the incorporation of the above mitigation measures into the proposed project description.

Signature of Owner

Name (Print)

6-12-19 Date







Environmental Review | City of Atascadero | www.atascadero.org | fb.me/planningatascadero Page 43







Figure 5 – Landscape Plan





Figure 6 – Farmland Monitoring



Figure 7 – 1,000 Foot Buffer and Surrounding Land Uses





Figure 8 – USFWS Wetland Mapper

| 20 Dec 2018 | Viejo Cami- | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | | | 14 10 1 10 |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | Citear da Source E Source E Cisercom | a Count of San Lib Odeso of r Digital one Go Fiel Perio S. A.S. Cettrapoint Actually munity age Project - Waters a Figure 2: Project S | Ot course Recury 2014 r Course like, OFF Altrus De tail 1951 cutotics on the Gas and Wetlands Delineation site and Survey Area Map |
| Survey Area Unnamed Blue Line Drainage | 0 125 | Feet 250 | |

Figure 9 – Blue Line Creek

20 Dec 2018 Viejo Camino Dove Creek Self-storage Project - Waters and Wetlands Delineation Figure 4: Soil Units Map Santa Lucia-Lopez Complex, 15-50% Slopes Survey Area Unnamed Blue Line Drainage Still Clay Loam, 0-2% Slopes Soi Units □ Feet San Andreas-Arujo Complex, 9-15% Slopes 0 125 250 TERRA - VERDE

Figure 10 – Soils and Slopes



Figure 11 – Flood Zones, Hydrology, & Water Management Zones





LOW LOW TO MOD MODERATE MOD TO HIGH HIGH



Figure 13 – Liquefaction and Landslide Risk



Figure 14 – Fire Hazard



Figure 15 – FEMA Floodway



Figure 16 – Atascadero Mutual Water Company Service Area



Environmental Review | City of Atascadero | <u>www.atascadero.org</u> | <u>fb.me/planningatascadero</u> Page 58



Figure 17 – Atascadero Community Wide Emissions by Sector



| San Luis Obispo County Attainment Status | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|-------------------------------|---------------|--|
| | | California Stan | dards**** | Federal Standa | ards**** | | |
| Pollutant | Averaging Time | Concentration | Attainment Status | Concentration | Attainment Status | | |
| | 1 Hour | 0.09 ppm (180 µg/m ³) | | - | Non-Attainment Eastern SLO | | |
| Ozone (O3) | Os) 8 Hour 0.070 ppm (137 µg/m ³) Non-Attainment | | 0.070 ppm (137 µg/m ³)***** | County - Attainment Western SLO County*** | | | |
| Respirable | 24 Hour | 50 µg/m ³ | | 150 µg/m ³ | Unclassified*/ | | |
| Matter (PM10) | Annual Arithmetic Mean | 20 µg/m ³ | Non-Attainment | - | Attainment | | |
| Fine Particulate | 24 Hour | No State Standard | Attainment | 35 μg/m³ | Unclassified*/ | | |
| Matter (PM2.5) | Annual Arithmetic Mean | 12 µg/m ³ | | 12.0 µg/m ³ **** | Attainment | | |
| Carbon | 8 Hour | 9.0 ppm (10 mg/m ³) | | 9 ppm (10 mg/m ³) | | | |
| Monoxide (CO) | 1 Hour | 20 ppm (23 mg/m ³) | Attainment | Attainment 35 ppm (40 mg/m ³) | | Unclassified* | |
| Nitrogen | Annual Arithmetic Mean | 0.030 (57 µg/m ³) | Attainment | 0.053 ppm (100 µg/m ³) | Unclassified* | | |
| Dioxide (NO ₂) | 1 Hour | 0.18 ppm (330 µg/m ³) | | 100 ppb (196 mg/m ³) | Shousened | | |
| | Annual Arithmetic Mean | - | | 0.030 ppm (80 µg/m ³) | - Unclassified* | | |
| Sulfur Dioxide | 24 Hour | 0.04 ppm (105 µg/m ³) | Attainment | 0.14 ppm (365 µg/m ³) | | | |
| (SO ₂) | 3 Hour | - | , the second | 0.5 ppm (1300 µg/m ³)** | | | |
| | 1 Hour | 0.25 ppm (655 µg/m ³) | | 75 ppb (196 mg/m ³) | | | |
| | 30 Day Average | 1.5 µg/m ³ | | - | | | |
| Lead* | Calendar Quarter | - | Attainment | 1.5 µg/m ³ | No Attainment | | |
| | Rolling 3-Month Average* | - | | 0.15 µg/m ³ | | | |
| Visibility Reducing Particles | 8 Hour | Extinction coefficient of 0.23 per kilometer – visibility of ten miles or more (0.07-30 miles or more for Lake Tahoe) due to particles when relative humidity is less than 70 percent. Method: Beta Attenuation and Transmittance through Filter Tape. | Attainment | No Federal | | | |
| Sulfates | 24 Hour | 25 µg/m ³ | Attainment | | | | |
| Hydrogen Sulfide | 1 Hour | 0.03 ppm (42 µg/m ³) | Attainment | Standard | S | | |
| Vinyl Chloride* | 24 Hour | 0.01 ppm (26 µg/m ³) | No Attainment Information | | | | |

Table 1 – San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Attainment Status

* Unclassified (EPA/Federal definition): Any area that cannot be classified on the basis of available information as meeting or not meeting the national primary or

secondary ambient air quality standard for that pollutant. ** Secondary Standard *** San Luis Obispo County has been designated non-attainment east of the -120.4 deg Longitude line, in areas of SLO County that are south of latitude 35.45 degrees, and east of the -120.3 degree Longitude line, in areas of SLO County that are north of latitude 35.45 degrees. Map of non-attainment area is available upon request from the APCD. **** For more information on standards visit: http://www.arb.ca.gov.research/aags/aags2.pdf Attainment (EPA/Federal definition): Any area that meets the national primary or secondary ambient air quality standard for that pollutant. (CA definition): State standard was not exceeded during a three year period. ***** Federal PM2.5 Secondary Standard is 15µg/m³ Non-Attainment (EPA/Federal definition): Any area that does not meet, or contributes to an area that does not meet the national primary or secondary ambient air quality standard for that pollutant. (CA definition): State standard was exceeded at least once during a three year period. ******The 2008 NAAQS for 8hr ozone is 0.075 ppm. The 2015 NAAQS for 8hr ozone is 0.070 ppm. The attainment status shown in this table relates to the 2008 NAAQS. SLO County has not been officially designated for the 2015 NAAQS. NAAQS is National Ambient Air Quality Standards IFOUTREACHAR Revised February 22, 2017



Table 2 – APCD Thresholds of Significance

Construction Operations Thresholds

| | Threshold ⁽¹⁾ | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Pollutant | Daily | Quarterly Tier 1 | Quarterly Tier 2 | | |
| $ROG + NO_x$ (combined) | 137 lbs | 2.5 tons | 6.3 tons | | |
| Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) | 7 lbs | 0.13 tons | 0.32 tons | | |
| Fugitive Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀), Dust ⁽²⁾ | | 2.5 tons | | | |
| Greenhouse Gases (CO ₂ , CH ₄ , N20, HFC, CFC, F6S) | Amortized and Combined with Operational Emissions (See Below) | | | | |

1. Daily and quarterly emission thresholds are based on the California Health & Safety Code and the CARB Carl Moyer Guidelines. 2. Any project with a grading area greater than 4.0 acres of worked area can exceed the 2.5 ton PM_{10} quarterly threshold.

Screening Criteria for Project Air Quality Analysis

| INDUSTRIAL | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------|-----|-----|
| General Heavy Industry | | 159 | 423 |
| General Light Industry | | 92 | 172 |
| Industrial Park | | 81 | 189 |
| Manufacturing | | 123 | 262 |
| Mini Storage (6) | 1,000 SF | 267 | 447 |
| Refrigerated Warehouse-No Rail | | 176 | 453 |
| Refrigerated Warehouse-Rail | | 176 | 453 |
| Unrefrigerated Warehouse-No Rail | | 245 | 454 |
| Unrefrigerated Warehouse-Rail | | 245 | 454 |

| Table 3 – Potential Ground Shaking sources | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Fault | Distance* (miles) | Maximum Earthquake | Maximum Probable Earthquake | Anticipated Acceleration Range (g) | | |
| Rinconada and Jolon | 2 | 7.5 | 7.0 | 0.4-0.6 | | |
| Black Mountain | 3 | 7.5 | 5.75 | 0.1-0.5 | | |
| La Panza | 9 | 7.5 | Unknown, but assumes 5 | 0.1-04 | | |
| Los Osos | 14 | 7 | Unknown, but assumes 5 | 0.1-0.2 | | |
| Hosgri | 22 | 7.5 | 6.5-7.5 | 0.1-0.2 | | |
| San Andreas | 27 | 8.25 | 8 | 0.1-0.2 | | |
| San Simeon | 35 | unknown | 6.5 | unknown | | |

*from El Camino Real/Traffic Way

Γ

Table 4 – Atascadero Mutual Water Company Supply/DemandProjection

| | | | | V.V | | |
|---|-----------|-------------|---------------|--------------|---------|--------|
| | Table 3-1 | Retail: Pop | ulation - Cur | rent and Pro | ojected | |
| Population | 2015 | 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 |
| Served | 29,870 | 32,372 | 33,521 | 34,711 | 35,943 | 37,219 |
| NOTES: 2015 population are based on DWR population tool and future population projections are based on AMWC Demand Study | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

This page intentionally left blank



January 28, 2019

Mr. Scott Newton Arroyo Grande, California Sent via email: scott@sole2soulsports.com

RE: Biological Resources Assessment Memorandum for the Dove Creek Self-storage Development Project, 11505 El Camino Real and 11450 Viejo Camino, Atascadero, California (APN 045-342-009 and 045-342-010)

Dear Mr. Newton,

Terra Verde Environmental Consulting, LLC (Terra Verde) completed a biological resources assessment of the property located at 11505 El Camino Real and 11450 Viejo Camino (APN 045-342-009 and 045-342-010) in the City of Atascadero, San Luis Obispo County, California (see Attachment A – Figure 1: Site Location and Overview Map). The biological assessment was completed in support of a permit application for a proposed development project which includes the construction of approximately 71,000 square feet of new buildings, including self-storage units and a business operations office building with attached, two-story residential dwelling. An existing, single-family residence located on the western edge of the property will be demolished as part of the proposed project. Current development plans also include realignment of an ephemeral drainage that currently flows northeast across the site, in order to convey storm water flows around the proposed development. Approximately 0.77 acre of the total 4.15-acre lot has been designated as a wetland open space preservation area that will be planted with a mix of native species appropriate for the site. This area will receive storm water run-off from the development and any storm water overflow from the re-aligned drainage feature, and will also serve as mitigation for proposed impacts to the existing drainage.

The purpose of the biological resources assessment completed by Terra Verde is to identify sensitive biological resources that occur, or have potential to occur, within the proposed project site. A sensitive resource is defined here as one that is of management concern to local, county, state, and/or federal resource agencies. The existing site conditions, survey methods, and results of the assessment are described in detail below, as well as recommended avoidance and minimization measures, which are intended to reduce potential impacts to sensitive biological resources to the extent feasible. As necessary, this report may be used to support the environmental review and regulatory agency permitting process.



Existing Conditions

The project site is located within the Atascadero U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle, on the eastern edge of the Santa Lucia Mountain Range. It is situated within the Upper Salinas Watershed and the Upper Salinas River Valley, approximately 0.85 mile west of the Salinas River. Topography at the site is flat to gently sloping with elevations ranging from approximately 271 to 280 meters (890 to 920 feet). An unnamed USGS blue line drainage feature flows northeast across the site. The project site is largely undeveloped, with one single-family residence located along the western edge of the project site, which is accessed from Viejo Camino. A review of historical aerial imagery indicates that mowing or other vegetation management activities have been occurring intermittently at this site since at least 2007 (Google Earth, 1989-2017). Further, a herd of goats has been grazed on the property for the past several years.

Methodology

Prior to conducting field surveys of the subject property, Terra Verde staff reviewed the following resources:

- Aerial photographs (Google Earth, 1994-2017) and preliminary site plans
- USGS Atascadero 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle map
- Online Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, California, (Natural Resources Conservation Service [NRCS, 2018])
- Consortium of California Herbaria (CCH) online database of plant collections (CCH, 2018)
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) CNDDB list of state and federally listed special-status species documented within the Atascadero 7.5-minute quadrangle and the surrounding eight quadrangles (Templeton, Creston, Santa Margarita, Lopez Mountain, San Luis Obispo, Morro Bay South, Morro Bay North and York Mountain) (CDFW, 2018)
- CNDDB map of special-status species that have been documented within a 2-mile radius of the project site (CDFW, 2018) (see Attachment A – Figure 2: 2-mile CNDDB and Critical Habitat Map)
- California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants for the Atascadero 7.5-minute quadrangle and the surrounding eight quadrangles (CNPS, 2018)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) map (USFWS, 2018a)
- USFWS Critical Habitat Portal (USFWS, 2018b)

A list of regionally-occurring, special-status species was compiled based on records reported in the scientific database queries. This species list was utilized to focus the field survey efforts as well as to determine appropriate survey periods for special-status botanical species that have the potential to occur on site. Following the literature review and desktop analysis, Terra Verde completed field surveys of the site, which focused on the identification of sensitive habitats and special-status species, as well as a jurisdictional determination and formal wetland delineation



of hydrologic features. Surveys were completed on May 17 and July 10, 2018, and included the entire approximately four-acre parcel, a 100-foot buffer on all sides where access was feasible, and a visual scan of the surrounding landscape.

During each survey, all detected plant and wildlife species and their sign (e.g., tracks, scat, vocalizations, etc.) were documented (see Attachment B – Wildlife and Botanical Species Observed). Botanical species identifications and taxonomic nomenclature followed *The Jepson Manual: Vascular Plants of California*, 2nd edition (Baldwin et al., 2012), as well as taxonomic updates provided in the Jepson eFlora (Jepson Flora Project, 2018). The second edition of *A Manual of California Vegetation* (MCV; Sawyer et al., 2009) was referenced for vegetation community classification; however, no natural vegetation communities occur on site.

The habitat requirements for each regionally-occurring, special-status species were analyzed and compared to the type and quality of habitats observed on site during the field surveys. The potential for many species to occur within the project site was eliminated due to a lack of suitable habitat, elevation, appropriate soils/substrate, and/or known distribution of the species within the project site. Special-status species for which suitable habitat was identified on site are discussed below.

Results

Hydrologic Resources

As noted previously, an ephemeral, USGS blue line drainage flows northeast across the survey area. This drainage enters the subject property via a culvert located under El Camino Real, conveying storm flows and surface runoff from the adjacent areas. The drainage exits the subject property via a second culvert located under Viejo Camino at the northeastern corner of the property, and converges with Paloma Creek approximately 0.25 mile east of the project site. Paloma Creek flows directly into the Salinas River and eventually to the traditionally navigable waters of the Pacific Ocean. No flowing or standing water was present at the time of the surveys. However, a clearly-defined channel and evidence of an ordinary high water mark (OHWM) were observed within the ephemeral drainage. Based on the results of the jurisdictional determination completed by Terra Verde, it is assumed that this drainage would be considered waters of the state under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) and the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and waters of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps).

In addition, a historical wetland feature mapped in the USFWS NWI online database covers approximately 1.80 acres of the proposed project site (USFWS, 2018a). This area is classified as a freshwater emergent wetland, dominated by persistent emergent vegetation, with temporary flooding during the growing season (USFWS, 2018a). As such, a formal wetland delineation was completed to document the current extent of federal and/or state wetlands on the site, the results of which are summarized in a separate report (*Waters and Wetlands Delineation Report*,



Dove Creek Self-Storage Development Project; Terra Verde, 2019). Although the channel bottom supports a dominance of wetland-indicator (i.e., hydrophytic) plant species throughout much of its length, no hydric soils were observed on site. Therefore, no federal wetlands (i.e., three-parameter wetlands defined by presence of hydric soils, wetland hydrology, and dominance of hydrophytic vegetation) were documented within the survey area.

It is important to note that, though generally accurate, the spatial data housed in the NWI is acquired through analysis of high-altitude imagery and therefore, may not accurately reflect current conditions on the ground (USFWS, 2018a). Although historical site conditions may have supported federal wetlands, current conditions do not support a sufficient hydroperiod to create or sustain hydric soils. Thus, the freshwater emergent wetland feature previously mapped within the proposed project site may have transitioned to more xeric conditions as a result of current and past land uses, as well as changes in the local climate and site hydrology.

Vegetation Communities

Vegetation communities and land cover types were assessed and classified based on vegetation composition, structure, and density, with consideration of known land management practices. The survey area consists primarily of ruderal, herbaceous vegetation that is periodically mowed and regularly grazed by goats. A single-family residence, with associated driveway and ornamental landscaping, occupy approximately 0.30 acre of the project site and survey area (see Attachment C – Representative Site Photographs).

A total of 44 vascular plant species were identified within the survey area, of which 33 (75 percent) are non-native and 20 (45 percent) are listed on the California Invasive Plant Council's (Cal-IPC) Invasive Plant Inventory (Cal-IPC, 2018), with native species observed only at very low cover. The number and abundance of non-native taxa substantially exceeds that of native taxa, and many of the native species documented are known to be disturbance tolerant (e.g., western ragweed [*Ambrosia psilostachya*], common fiddleneck [*Amsinckia intermedia*], common lippia [*Phyla nodiflora*], etc.), reflecting the high level of disturbance and extremely ruderal nature of vegetation on site.

None of the land cover types observed on site correspond to a natural vegetation community as defined in the MCV classification system. The land cover types observed on site are briefly described below, and illustrated in Figure 3 (Vegetation Communities Map) in Attachment A.

Ruderal Herbaceous (3.85 acres)

A vast majority of the site is characterized by ruderal herbaceous vegetation dominated by wall barley (*Hordeum murinum*), Mediterranean barley (*Hordeum marinum* subsp. *gussoneanum*), and heart-podded hoary cress (*Lepidium draba*), with dense patches of yellow star-thistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*). The channel bottom of the ephemeral, blue line drainage supports a distinct assemblage of species dominated by common lippia, with Mediterranean barley present at high cover in occasional patches. The composition of


ruderal herbaceous vegetation observed is typical of grazed, agricultural, and urban sites and may provide limited foraging habitat for birds, small mammals, and other wildlife.

Developed/Ornamental (0.30 acre)

This land cover type is associated with the existing residence and associated driveway. Ornamental trees, including pine (*Pinus* sp.), Mexican fan palm (*Washingtonia robusta*), and coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) border the home. Anthropogenic/Developed areas observed on site may provide suitable habitat for nesting birds, roosting bats, and limited wildlife foraging and cover.

Special-status Botanical Species

Based on a review of the range and habitat requirements for regionally-occurring special-status species, it was determined that seven special-status botanical species have the potential to occur within the proposed development area. Surveys were timed to occur during the typical blooming and/or fruiting period for these species, which are listed below with special-status rankings:

- Cambria morning-glory *(Calystegia subacaulis* subsp. *episcopalis),* California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) 4.2
- San Luis Obispo owl's-clover (*Castilleja densiflora* subsp. *obispoensis*), CRPR 1B.2
- Congdon's tarplant (Centromadia parryi subsp. congdonii), CRPR 1B.1
- Paniculate tarplant (*Deinandra paniculata*), CRPR 4.2
- San Joaquin spearscale (*Extriplex joaquinana*), CRPR 1B.2
- Spreading navarretia (*Navarretia fossalis*), federal threatened / CRPR 1B.1
- Shining navarretia (*Navarretia nigelliformis* subsp. *radians*), CRPR 1B.2

Although low suitability habitat is present for these species on the project site, none were identified during appropriately-timed surveys and, as such, none are expected to occur within the proposed development area.

Special-status Wildlife Species

Based on a review of the range and habitat requirements for regionally-occurring species, it was determined that four special-status wildlife species have the potential to occur within the proposed development area. These wildlife species and their special-status rankings include:

- Grasshopper sparrow (*Ammodramus savannarum*), California Species of Special Concern (CSC)
- Pallid bat (Antrozous pallidus), CSC
- Townsend's big-eared bat (Corynorhinus townsendii), CSC
- Big free-tailed bat (*Nyctinomops macrotis*), CSC

In addition to these special-status wildlife species, suitable habitat for resident and migratory nesting birds is present on site. Although no nesting birds or roosting bats were detected during



the field surveys, they may utilize the site for nesting purposes on an annual basis and be present prior to the start of construction.

Impact Assessment and Recommended Avoidance and Minimization Measures

The following section includes a summary of potential impacts to sensitive resources as a result of the proposed development. Recommended avoidance and minimization measures (AMMs) are provided, which are intended to reduce or mitigate expected impacts to sensitive biological resources including the existing blue line drainage feature.

Hydrologic Resources

Current development plans include the re-alignment and partial channelization of the blue line drainage through a box culvert, in order to direct and slow storm water flows around the proposed development and reduce flood potential on the site. In addition, sections of the re-aligned channel will be lined with concrete and/or riprap. This will result in the permanent loss of approximately 0.14 acre of ephemeral drainage channel. The proposed wetland open space area included as part of the proposed development will offset the permanent losses. In addition, the following protection measures should be implemented to protect aquatic resources on site during and following construction.

AMM 1: Protection of Hydrologic Resources

Construction within and immediately adjacent to the drainage shall occur only when conditions are dry. For short-term, temporary stabilization, an erosion and sedimentation control plan shall be developed outlining Best Management Practices (BMPs), which shall be implemented to prevent erosion and sedimentation into the channel during construction. Acceptable stabilization methods include the use of weed-free, natural fiber (i.e., non-monofilament) fiber rolls, jute or coir netting, and/or other industry standards. BMPs shall be installed and maintained for the duration of the construction period. In addition, the following general measures shall be implemented during construction:

- The limits of disturbance within the existing drainage feature shall be clearly shown on all sites plans and flagged within the drainages prior to project implementation. All construction personnel shall be directed to avoid impacts to the areas immediately upstream and downstream of the proposed development including the existing culvert features located at El Camino Real and Viejo Camino.
- All equipment and materials shall be stored out of the streambed at the end of each working day, and secondary containment shall be used to prevent leaks and spills of potential contaminants from entering the stream.
- During construction, washing of concrete, paint, or equipment and refueling and maintenance of equipment shall occur only in designated areas a minimum of 50 feet from all drainages and aquatic features. Sandbags and/or sorbent pads shall be available to prevent water and/or spilled fuel from entering drainages.



• Construction equipment shall be inspected by the operator on a daily basis to ensure that equipment is in good working order and no fuel or lubricant leaks are present.

AMM 2: Compensatory Mitigation Plan

A compensatory mitigation plan shall be developed to offset permanent impacts to jurisdictional areas. The exact details and performance criteria of the restoration plan shall be determined during agency coordination with CDFW, RWQCB, and the Corps, as necessary. Stabilization and restoration measures may include the installation of BMPs and/or revegetation using native seed mixes and plantings. Prior to project initiation, all applicable agency permits with jurisdiction over the project area (i.e., Corps, CDFW, and RWQCB) should be obtained. Additional mitigation measures required by these agencies would be implemented as necessary.

Special-status Botanical Species

No special-status botanical species were documented on site during appropriately-timed spring and summer surveys. As such, it is assumed that no special-status botanical species currently exist on site, and no impacts to special-status plant populations will occur as a result of the proposed development.

Special-status Wildlife Species

Demolition of the existing residence and any planned removal of ornamental trees may result in direct or indirect impacts to nesting birds if construction occurs during the typical avian nesting period (generally February 01 through August 31), as well as roosting bats. Further, the grassland habitat areas on site, although disturbed, may provide suitable nesting habitat for ground-nesting species. Impacts may occur due to habitat loss (e.g., removal of trees) or construction-related disturbances that may deter roosting or nesting, or cause nests to fail. Increased short- and long-term anthropogenic activity including increased light pollution may also result in nest failures or deterring nesting and roosting behavior.

AMM 3: Pre-construction Surveys for Roosting Bats

Within 30 days prior to removal of existing structures and/or mature trees, a sunset survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if bats are roosting on site. If bats are present, a follow-up acoustic monitoring survey shall be completed to determine, if feasible, which species are present. If roosts of special-status bat species are identified and will be impacted during the proposed project, CDFW will be consulted to determine appropriate measures to be implemented. If it is determined that no special-status bats are present, the project shall proceed under the guidance of a qualified biologist, in a manner that minimizes impacts to individual bats and roosts (e.g., conducting work only during the day or installing one-way exclusions prior to work).

AMM 4: Pre-construction Surveys for Nesting Birds

If work is planned to occur between February 1 and September 15, a qualified biologist shall survey the area for nesting birds within one week prior to activity beginning on site. If



nesting birds are located on or near the proposed project site, they shall be avoided until they have successfully fledged or the nest is no longer deemed active. A non-disturbance buffer of 50 feet will be placed around non-listed, passerine species, and a 250-foot buffer will be implemented for raptor species. All activity will remain outside of that buffer until a qualified biologist has determined that the young have fledged or that proposed construction activities would not cause adverse impacts to the nest, adults, eggs, or young. If special-status avian species are identified, no work will begin until an appropriate buffer is determined in consultation CDFW, and/or the USFWS.

Conclusion

No special-status species were observed during field surveys. Although low suitability habitat is present on site for seven regionally-occurring special-status species, none were observed during appropriately-timed surveys in May and July. As such, none are expected to occur. In addition, it was determined that four special-status wildlife species, as well as nesting birds, may utilize existing structures and trees/grassland at the site. Further, proposed impacts to an ephemeral blue line drainage will result in the permanent loss of jurisdictional areas and associated habitat. An approximately 0.77-acre wetland and open space preservation area has been incorporated into the site development plants, which will offset these permanent losses.

Based on the current proposed preliminary designs, it is expected that implementation of the recommended mitigation measures will avoid and/or minimize impacts to potentially occurring sensitive biological resources to a less than significant level. If you should have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at knelson@terraverdeweb.com or (702) 596-5038.

Sincerely,

Kristen Nelson Botanist

Attachments:

- A Figures
 - Figure 1: Site Location and Overview Map
 - Figure 2: 2-mile CNDDB and Critical Habitat Map
 - Figure 3: Vegetation Communities Map
- B Wildlife and Botanical Species Observed
- C Representative Site Photographs



References

- Baldwin, Bruce G., D.H. Goldman, D.J. Keil, R. Patterson, T.J. Rosatti, and D.H. Wilken. *The Jepson Manual: Vascular Plants of California,* Second Edition. University of California Press. Berkeley, California. 2012.
- California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW). 2018. California Natural Diversity Database: RareFind 5. Accessible online with subscription at: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/mapsanddata.asp. Accessed May - August 2018.
- California Invasive Plant Council. 2018. The Cal-IPC Inventory. Available online at: http://www.cal-ipc.org/plants/inventory/. Accessed August 2018.
- California Native Plant Society. 2018. Online Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants. Sacramento, California. Available Online at: http://www.rareplants.cnps.org/. Accessed May - August 2018.
- Google Earth Pro V 7.1.8.3036 (June 2017). 1994-2017. Atascadero, California. 35.453427, -120.637521. DigitalGlobe. Accessed May - September 2018.
- Jepson Flora Project. 2018. Jepson eFlora. Regents of the University of California. Available online at: http://ucjeps.berkeley.edu/eflora/. Accessed May August 2018.
- Natural Resources Conservation Service/U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2018. Available Online at: http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx. Accessed July 2018.
- Sawyer, John O., Todd Keeler-Wolf, and Julie M. Evens. 2009. A Manual of California Vegetation, Second Edition. California Native Plant Society Press: Sacramento, California.
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service. 2018a. National Wetland Inventory Mapper. Available online at: https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html. Accessed June 2018.
- ------. 2018b. USFWS Threatened and Endangered Species Active Critical Habitat Portal. Available online at: http://crithab.fws.gov/ecp/report/table/critical-habitat.html. Accessed July 2018.





ATTACHMENT A – Figures

Figure 1: Site Location and Overview Map Figure 2: 2-mile CNDDB and Critical Habitat Map Figure 3: Vegetation Communities Map













ATTACHMENT B – Wildlife and Botanical Species Observed

| Table A.2. List of Wildlife Species | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Order | Scientific Name | Common Name | Origin/Listing Status* | |
| Avifauna | Cathartes aura | Turkey vulture | | |
| | Corvus brachyrhynchos | American crow | | |
| | Haemorhous mexicanus | House finch | | |
| | Melozone crissalis | California towhee | | |
| | Passer domesticus | House sparrow | Non-native | |
| | Sayornis saya | Say's phoebe | | |
| | Spinus psaltria | Lesser goldfinch | | |
| Mammals | Thomomys bottae | Botta's pocket gopher | | |
| Reptiles | Sceloporus occidentalis | Coast range fence lizard | | |

Table A.2. List of Wildlife Species

| Table A.1. List of Botanical Species | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Family | Scientific Name | Common Name | Indicator Status ¹ | Origin |
| Apiaceae, Carrot Family | Conium maculatum | Poison hemlock | FACW | Naturalized |
| Arecaceae, Palm Family | Washingtonia robusta | Mexican fan palm | FACW | Naturalized (Ornamental) |
| Asteraceae, | Ambrosia psilostachya | Western ragweed | | Native |
| Sunflower Family | Anthemis cotula | Mayweed | | Naturalized |
| | Capsella bursa-pastoris | Shepherd's purse | | Naturalized |
| | Carduus pycnocephalus subsp. pycnocephalus | Italian thistle | | Naturalized |
| | Centaurea solstitialis | Yellow star-thistle | | Naturalized |
| | Erigeron bonariensis | Flax-leaved horseweed | | Naturalized |
| | Silybum marianum | Milk thistle | | Naturalized |
| | Sonchus asper subsp. asper | Prickly sow thistle | FAC | Naturalized |
| Boraginaceae, | Amsinckia intermedia | Common fiddleneck | | Native |
| Borage Family | Amsinckia menziesii | Small-flowered fiddleneck | | Native |
| | Plagiobothrys canescens | Valley popcornflower | | Native |
| Brassicaceae, | Brassica nigra | Black mustard | | Naturalized |



| Table A.1. List of Botanical Species | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| Family | Scientific Name | Common Name | Indicator Status ¹ | Origin |
| Mustard Family | Capsella bursa-pastoris | Shepherd's purse | | Naturalized |
| | Hirschfeldia incana | Mediterranean hoary mustard | | Naturalized |
| | Lepidium draba | Heart-podded hoary cress | | Naturalized |
| Convolvulaceae, Morning-glory Family | Convolvulus arvensis | Bindweed | | Naturalized |
| Cupressaceae, Cypress Family | Sequoia sempervirens | Coast redwood | | Native (Ornamental) |
| Fabaceae, Legume Family | Acmispon americanus var. americanus | American bird's foot trefoil | | Native |
| | Lotus corniculatus | Bird's-foot trefoil | FAC | Naturalized |
| | Medicago polymorpha | California burclover | | Naturalized |
| | Vicia villosa | Hairy vetch | | Naturalized |
| Geraniaceae, | Erodium botrys | Big heron bill | | Naturalized |
| Geranium Family | Erodium cicutarium | Redstem filaree | | Naturalized |
| | Erodium moschatum | Greenstem filaree | | Naturalized |
| | Geranium molle | Crane's bill geranium | | Naturalized |
| Juncaceae <i>,</i> Rush Family | Juncus cf patens | Spreading rush | FACW | Native |
| Lamiaceae <i>,</i> Mint Family | Marrubium vulgare | White horehound | | Naturalized |
| Myrsinaceae, Myrsine Family | Lysimachia arvensis | Scarlet pimpernel | FAC | Naturalized |
| Papaveraceae, Poppy Family | Eschscholzia californica | California poppy | | Native |
| Poaceae, | Avena barbata | Slender wild oat | | Naturalized |
| Grass Family | Bromus catharticus | Rescue Grass | | Naturalized |
| | Bromus diandrus | Ripgut grass | | Naturalized |
| | Bromus hordeaceus | Soft chess | | Naturalized |
| | Bromus madritensis subsp. rubens | Red brome | | Naturalized |
| | Cynodon dactylon | Bermuda grass | | Naturalized |
| | Elymus triticoides | Beardless wild rye | FAC | Native |



| Table A.1. List of Botanical Species | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| Family | Scientific Name | Common Name | Indicator Status ¹ | Origin |
| | Festuca perennis | Rye grass | FAC | Naturalized |
| | Hordeum marinum subsp. gussoneanum | Mediterranean barley | FAC | Naturalized |
| | Hordeum murinum | Wall barley | | Naturalized |
| | Pennisetum clandestinum | Kikuyu grass | | Naturalized |
| Polygonaceae, Buckwheat Family | Rumex crispus | Curly dock | FAC | Naturalized |
| Rubiaceae, Madder Family | Galium aparine | Goose grass | | Native |
| Rubiaceae, Madder Family | Galium aparine | Goose grass | | Native |
| Salicaceae, Willow Family | Salix laevigata | Red willow | FACW | Native |
| Verbenaceae, Vervain Family | Phyla nodiflora | Common lippia | FACW | Native |

¹Listing Status: Indicates listing status for taxa that are included on the National Wetland Plant List (NWPL) for the Arid West region (USFWS, 2016), as well as taxa that are considered noxious/invasive weeds in California. No special-status species were documented. Taxa that are considered wetland-indicators are included on the NWPL and assigned one of the following wetland indicator statuses:

- Obligate (OBL): plants that almost always occur in wetlands.
- Facultative Wetland (FACW): plants that usually occur in wetlands, but may occur in non-wetlands.
- Facultative (FAC): plants that are equally likely to occur in wetlands and non-wetlands.

²cf (=conforms to): indicates provisional species determination based on the observed pheno-phase, but in the absence of diagnostic features (e.g., desiccated or undeveloped reproductive structures).





ATTACHMENT C - Representative Site Photographs







Photo 1. View west showing the narrow channel of the blue line drainage (May 17, 2018).



Photo 2. View north toward private residence and landscape trees present on western site boundary (May 10, 2017).





Photo 3. View west of the culvert under Viejo Camino, with a debris rack just downstream of the culvert outlet (May 17, 2018).



Photo 4. View east of the downstream end of the drainage where it flows under Viejo Camino (May 17, 2018).

Attachment 2: Federal Wetland Delineation Report



Waters and Wetlands Delineation Report

Dove Creek Self-Storage Development Project Atascadero, San Luis Obispo County, California



Prepared for:

Mr. Scott Newton Arroyo Grande, California

Prepared by:

Terra Verde Environmental Consulting, LLC 3765 South Higuera Street, Suite 102 San Luis Obispo, California 93401

March 2019





DISCLAIMER

Terra Verde Environmental Consulting, LLC (hereafter, Terra Verde) has prepared this waters and wetlands delineation report for use by Mr. Scott Newton (owner). The results and conclusions of this report are conditional upon final approval by the United States Army Corps of Engineers. Results and conclusions presented in this report are based upon information available in the public domain (e.g., United States Geological Survey 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle maps, the Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Surveys, aerial photographs from various sources, etc.), as well as Terra Verde's on-site reconnaissance, data collection, and analyses, which were completed using standard methods. Results and conclusions presented herein represent the best professional judgment of Terra Verde technical staff. In this context, surveying/boundary locations developed by Terra Verde are assumed to be true and correct.

Brian Dugas

Principal Biologist Terra Verde Environmental Consulting, LLC

Kristen Nelson

Botanist Terra Verde Environmental Consulting, LLC

<u>March 05, 2019</u> Date

<u>March 05, 2019</u> Date

Dove Creek Self-storage Development Project Waters and Wetlands Delineation Report Atascadero, San Luis Obispo County, California



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Terra Verde Environmental Consulting, LLC (Terra Verde) was retained by Mr. Scott Newton (owner) to complete a formal delineation of waters and wetlands under the jurisdiction of federal resource agencies for the proposed Dove Creek Self-storage Development (project), located at 11505 El Camino Real and 11450 Viejo Camino (APN 045-342-009 and 045-342-010) in the City of Atascadero, San Luis Obispo County (County), California. Field surveys included a delineation of all federal waters and wetlands, as defined by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). The survey area encompassed the entire proposed project area and the immediately surrounding wetland and riparian habitats.

This report has been developed by Terra Verde using current Corps guidance concerning waters and wetlands delineations. Determinations are based on field observations made in 2018. Information offered in this report is arranged to describe the delineation objectives, discuss pertinent regulatory contexts, explain the approach and methodology used by Terra Verde in this delineation, and provide a summary of technical results. This report is intended to provide details regarding aquatic resources on site and may be used to support permit application(s) to the Corps, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, and the Regional Water Quality and Control Board for the proposed development

Terra Verde determined that no federal wetlands are present on the project site; however, 581 linear feet of non-wetland waters of the U.S. were mapped on the subject property. As necessary, this information may be used to support regulatory permits and/or project approvals from the Corps, the City of Atascadero and other resource agencies. The results of the delineation, as described in this report, are conditional upon a review and final jurisdictional determination by the Corps.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| 1.0 INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND | . 1 |
|--|-----|
| 1.1 Overview of Site Characteristics | . 1 |
| 1.1.1 Current and Historical Land Uses | . 1 |
| 1.1.2 Geomorphology and Landscape Context | . 2 |
| 1.1.3 Regional Climate | . 2 |
| 2.0 REGULATORY CONTEXTS | . 2 |
| 2.1 Rationale for the Determination of the Geographic Extent of Waters of the U.S. | . 2 |
| 2.2 Consistency with SWANCC & Rapanos Guidance | . 3 |
| 3.0 Field Delineation Methods | . 4 |
| 3.1 Overview of Methodology | . 4 |
| 3.1.1 Delineation of Wetlands | . 5 |
| 3.1.2 Delineation of Non-wetland Waters | . 8 |
| 4.0 Results | . 8 |
| 4.1 Wetlands Determination | . 8 |
| 4.1.1 Hydrology | . 9 |
| 4.1.2 Soils | . 9 |
| 4.1.3 Vegetation | . 9 |
| 4.2 Non-Wetland Waters Determination | . 9 |
| 5.0 Summary of Jurisdictional Findings | 10 |
| 6.0 References | 11 |



LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A – Report Figures

- Figure 1: Site Vicinity and Topographic Map
 Figure 2: Project Site and Survey Area Map
 Figure 3: Hydrologic Connectivity Map
 Figure 4: Soil Units Map
 Figure 5: Waters and Wetlands Delineation Map

 Appendix B Wetland Determination Data Forms
 Appendix C Arid West Ephemeral and Intermittent Streams OHWM Datasheets
- **Appendix D** Representative Site Photographs



1.0 INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

This waters and wetlands delineation report was prepared by Terra Verde Environmental Consulting, LLC (Terra Verde) on behalf of Mr. Scott Newton (owner) in support of the proposed Dove Creek Self-storage Development Project (project) located at 11505 El Camino Real and 11450 Viejo Camino (APN 045-342-009 and 045-342-010) in the City of Atascadero, San Luis Obispo County (County), California (see Appendix A - Figure 1: Site Vicinity and Topographic Map). This report summarizes the regulatory context, methods, and results of field surveys, which focused on the delineation of federal wetlands and waters of the United States (waters of the U.S.), as defined by section 404 of the Clean Water Act. The survey area included the entire proposed project area, as well as immediately adjacent wetland and riparian habitats (see Appendix A – Figure 2: Project Site and Survey Area Map).

The project site encompasses approximately 4.15 acres of grazed grassland, which is bisected by an unnamed United States Geological Survey (USGS) blue line drainage. This drainage enters the property via a culvert under El Camino Real and meanders generally northeast across the project site before entering a second culvert under Viejo Camino. This drainage eventually discharges into Paloma Creek approximately 0.25 mile northeast of the project site. Paloma Creek flows directly to the Salinas River and eventually the traditionally navigable waters of the Pacific Ocean (see Appendix A – Figure 3: Hydrologic Connectivity Map).

This report has been developed following guidance from the San Francisco District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) (EPA and Corps, 2008) pertaining to wetland delineations. The results of the delineation are based on field observations made in April and June 2017, and are subject to final review and approval by the Corps. As needed, this report may be used in acquiring regulatory permits and/or project approvals.

1.1 Overview of Site Characteristics

1.1.1 Current and Historical Land Uses

The project site is undeveloped and used as a grazing pasture for a herd of goats. The site is immediately bordered by two public roads – El Camino Real and Viejo Camino, as well as an empty lot on the northwest, and a single-family residence on the southeast. The surrounding landscape consists of residential and commercial developments at variable densities (see Figure 2). The topography, soils, and vegetation of the proposed project site and surrounding areas have been altered considerably through past land conversion, construction of adjacent residential areas, and other anthropogenic alterations (e.g., goat grazing, culverts/stormwater



infrastructure, etc.). A review of historical aerial imagery indicates the condition of the site has remained relatively unchanged since at least 1994 (Google Earth, 1994-2018).

1.1.2 Geomorphology and Landscape Context

The project site is located in the Salinas USGS Hydrologic Unit and the Santa Margarita Creek-Salinas River watershed, which includes Paloma Creek and associated tributaries (see Appendix A – Figure 3). Elevations within the survey area range from 271 to 280 meters (890 to 920 feet). The project site is situated just west of the Rinconada Fault line in a valley between unnamed ridgelines of the San Luis Ranges (Wiegers and Hart, 2015; USGS, 2018). The geology of the project site consists of young alluvial floodplain deposits, comprised of silty sand and sandy gravel with cobbles deposited along the valley floor (Wiegers and Hart, 2015). Hydrologic resources on the property are limited to a single, ephemeral drainage that conveys surface runoff and storm flows from adjacent areas.

1.1.3 Regional Climate

The regional climate is Mediterranean, with mild, rainy winters and hot, dry summers. Historical temperature and precipitation data was acquired from the Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC) for Paso Robles (Station No. 046730). According to available data, average annual precipitation for a 122-year (1894 to 2016) period for the project region is 15.21 inches (WRCC, 2018). The average minimum and maximum temperatures calculated for the same time period are 60°F in January and 93°F in July and August (WRCC, 2012).

2.0 REGULATORY CONTEXTS

2.1 Rationale for the Determination of the Geographic Extent of Waters of the U.S.

Delineation of the geographic extent of waters of the U.S., including wetlands, within the survey area was consistent with definitions provided in 33 CFR 328.3 (a) (1-8), 328.3 (b, c, and e), as well as routine procedures detailed in the *U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual* (1987 Manual) (Corps, 1987) and the Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region, Version 2.0 (2008 Arid West Regional Supplement) (Corps, 2008). As defined in Section 404 of the CWA, the limits of Corps jurisdiction in non-tidal waters extends to the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) and includes all adjacent wetlands. The following definitions are used by the Corps and EPA for the identification of wetlands and, as such, were used for the identification and delineation of wetlands at the project site:



Waters of the U.S. are defined in Section 404 of the CWA as:

"All waters which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible to use in interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide; including all interstate waters including interstate wetlands, all other waters such as intrastate lakes, rivers, streams, mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds, the use, degradation or destruction of which could affect interstate or foreign commerce."

Further, wetlands are considered waters of the U.S., and are identified as:

"Those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support, and that under normal circumstances do support, a prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas."

The Corps uses a three-parameter approach for identifying and delineating jurisdictional wetlands, where a wetland is defined as a feature associated with waters of the U.S., which is characterized by a dominance of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, and wetland hydrology.

2.2 Consistency with SWANCC & Rapanos Guidance

Following U.S. Supreme Court rulings in two prominent court cases addressing the extent of federal jurisdiction (i.e., Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County [SWANCC] v. Corps et al. [531 U.S. 159, 2001]; and Rapanos et ux., et al. v. United States [547 U.S. 715, 2006]) led to the development of federal guidance that requires careful examination and documentation of the physical location(s) of and hydrologic connections among waters and wetlands. To determine federal jurisdiction, emphasis is given to surface hydrologic connections between a wetland and "navigable waters" or "adjacency" of a wetland to traditionally navigable waters, and, thus, a "significant nexus" to interstate commerce. In addition, waters and wetland features can be determined to be under federal jurisdiction by the Corps or EPA if a significant nexus can be shown between the wetland feature in question and its contribution to the maintenance or restoration of the physical, chemical, or biological integrity of downstream waters that are traditionally navigable. Federal guidance for field delineation procedures that address the Rapanos decision has been offered by the EPA and the Corps in a joint memorandum issued on June 5, 2007 (EPA and Corps, 2008).



3.0 FIELD DELINEATION METHODS

3.1 Overview of Methodology

Prior to conducting field surveys, a desktop review was completed, which included a review of current and historical aerial imagery (Google Earth, 1994 - 2018), an online Soil Survey for the County of San Luis Obispo (U.S. Dept. of Ag., 2018), USGS topographic maps (USGS, 2018), regional weather data (WRCC, 2012), the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) (USFWS, 2018), and preliminary site development plans.

Terra Verde botanists Kristen Nelson and Amy Golub completed a formal wetland delineation on May 17, 2018 along the vegetated channel bottom and lower floodplain terrace associated with the drainage on site. Delineation methods followed routine procedures detailed in the *1987 Manual* (Corps, 1987) and the *2008 Arid West Regional Supplement* (Corps, 2008). In addition, wetlands were classified based on hydrogeomorphic classes (e.g., riverine, slope, etc.) described by Brinson (1993) and Brinson et al. (1995).

Field delineation of wetlands included an assessment of the hydrology, soil characteristics, and vegetation at three sampling points (i.e., SP-01, SP-02, and SP-03). Data was recorded using the Wetland Determination Data Form provided in the *2008 Arid West Regional Supplement* (Corps, 2008). At each sampling point, a soil test pit was excavated to a depth of at least 12 inches, vegetation was characterized within a 5-foot radius of the excavated soil test pit, and indicators of wetland hydrology were documented (see Appendix B – Wetland Determination Data Forms). Sampling was conducted in areas that displayed apparent indicators of wetland hydrology and vegetation.

The assessment of non-wetland waters included identifying the presence of field indicators for OHWM within the subject drainage. This assessment followed guidelines provided in *A Field Guide to the Identification of the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) in the Arid West Region of the Western United States (OHWM Manual)* (Lichvar and McColley, 2008). In addition, all waters and wetlands were assessed for hydrologic connectivity and/or adjacency to traditionally navigable waters and their tributaries. Connectivity was confirmed by determining that the unnamed drainage on site is hydrologically connected to Paloma Creek and the traditionally navigable waters of the Pacific Ocean via the Salinas River (see Appendix A – Figure 3). The limits of waters and wetlands of the U.S. were pin-flagged in the field and then recorded using a Trimble Global Positioning System (GPS) unit.



3.1.1 Delineation of Wetlands

Evidence of Wetland Hydrology

Consistent with the 1987 Manual (Corps, 1987), the 2008 Arid West Regional Supplement (Corps, 2008), and current regulatory guidance (Corps, 1992), wetland hydrology can be identified by evaluating a variety of direct and indirect indicators, including stream gauge or well data, flood predictions (i.e., FEMA maps), historic records pertaining to the study area, and visual observation of field indicators for the identification of jurisdictional waters and wetlands. Field indicators may include inundation and/or saturation, sediment deposition, drainage patterns, hydric soil characteristics, watermarks, drift lines, presence of oxidized pores associated with living roots and rhizomes (i.e., rhizospheres), and water-stained leaves (Corps, 1987).

Wetland hydrology is present at a location if field observations indicate the area has a high probability of being periodically inundated or saturated to the soil surface for a sufficient duration during the growing season to develop anaerobic conditions in the surface soil environment (i.e., root zone) (Corps, 1987). According to guidance provided in the *2008 Arid West Regional Supplement*, if at least one primary indicator or at least two secondary indicators of hydrology are present at a sample point, the wetland hydrology criterion is met (Corps, 2008). Observations of wetland hydrology were recorded at each sample point to document evidence of inundation or soil saturation.

Several types of evidence were examined to determine whether wetland hydrology previously existed or currently exists. In addition, the type and frequency of site manipulation and anthropogenic disturbances were considered for their potential to impact or alter current and historical site hydrology.

Identification of Hydric Soils

The presence of hydric soils was assessed based on the criteria outlined in the *1987 Manual* (Corps, 1987) and the *2008 Arid West Regional Supplement* (Corps, 2008). Hydric soils are defined as soils "*that formed under conditions of saturation, flooding, or ponding long enough during the growing season to develop anaerobic conditions in the upper part*" (U.S. Dept. of Ag., 1994). Determination of whether or not a soil is hydric is based on the fulfillment of at least one of four technical criteria (U.S. Dept. of Ag., 2002), which can be satisfied using a combination of published soils information and field indicators. Field indicators for determining whether a soil satisfies the hydric soil definition and the technical criteria for hydric soils are listed in *Field Indicators of Hydric Soils in the United States* (U.S. Dept. of Ag., 2006).

Following the guidance provided in the above-referenced documents, the presence of hydric soils within the survey area was determined using a combination of direct field observations and a



review of available online resources, including the Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, Web Soil Survey (U.S. Dept. of Ag., 2018) and the USFWS NWI (USFWS, 2018). In the field, soil test pits were excavated at each of three sampling points to examine the upper 12 inches of the soil profile for hydric soil indicators. Specifically, a Munsell Soil Color Book (2000) was used to classify the colors of matrix soils and redoximorphic (redox) concentrations within the matrix. The *2017 Pocket Guide to Hydric Soil Indicators* (Wetland Training Institute [WTI], 2017) was used to determine the texture of soils, and to assess the location, type, and extent of matrix soil colors and redox concentrations, to determine whether they qualified as hydric soils.

According to the NRCS online soil survey of San Luis Obispo County, three soil units occur within the survey area (U.S. Dept. of Ag., 2018). These include: Unit 193 (San Andreas-Arujo complex, 9 to 15 percent slopes), Unit 198 (Santa Lucia-Lopez complex, 15 to 50 percent slopes), and Unit 208 (Still clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes) (see Figure 4 – Soil Units Map). These soil units are not listed as hydric soils (U.S. Dept. of Ag., 2018). A summary of the dominant characteristics of these soil types is provided below.

Soil Unit 193 – San Andreas-Arujo complex, 9 to 15 percent slopes

The parent material of this soil type is residuum weathered from sandstone. The drainage class of this unit is well drained, and it is composed of sandy loam over weathered bedrock. This soil type tends to occur on back slopes and side slopes and is designated as farmland of statewide importance.

Soil Unit 198 – Santa Lucia-Lopez complex, 15 to 50 percent slopes

The parent material of this soil type is residuum weathered from shale. The drainage class of this unit is well drained, and it is composed of channery clay loam over weathered bedrock. This soil type tends to occur on back slopes and side slopes.

Soil Unit 208 – Still clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

The parent material of this soil is alluvium derived from sedimentary rock. The drainage class of this unit is well drained, and it is composed mostly of clay loam and stratified loam to clay loam. This soil type tends to occur on toe slopes and treads and is considered prime farmland if irrigated.

Dominance of Hydrophytic Vegetation

On June 1, 2012, the 2012 National Wetland Plant List (NWPL) (Lichvar et al., 2012) replaced the 1988 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's National list of plant species that occur in wetlands for use under the CWA, Swamp Buster, and National Wetland Inventory programs. The NWPL and regional supplements have since been revised with updated plant listings. The Arid West 2016 Regional Wetland Plant List (2016 Regional List) (Lichvar et al., 2016) is the most current version



available for use in the Arid West region, including coastal areas of California. The updated 2016 *Regional List* indicates the relative frequency that a species occurs in wetland habitats and is used to determine whether the hydrophytic vegetation parameter is met when conducting wetland delineations under the CWA.

Species included on the *2016 Regional List* are assigned one of the following wetland indicator statuses (Lichvar et al., 2012):

- **Obligate (OBL)**: plants that almost always occur in wetlands.
- Facultative Wetland (FACW): plants that usually occur in wetlands but may occur in non-wetlands.
- Facultative (FAC): plants that are equally likely to occur in wetlands and non-wetlands.
- Facultative Upland (FACU): plants that usually occur in non-wetlands but may occur in wetlands.
- **Upland (UPL)**: plants that almost never occur in wetlands; plants not included on the list are considered UPL.

Dominance of hydrophytic vegetation is determined by identifying all plant species within a 5foot radius surrounding each soil excavation pit for herbaceous and shrub cover, and a 30-foot radius for tree and woody vine cover; documenting the absolute percent cover of each species within each stratum (i.e., herb, shrub, tree, and woody vine) for the sampling plot; and noting the indicator status for each (i.e., UPL, FACU, FAC, FACW, or OBL). None of the sampling points supported tree, shrub, or woody vine cover. Dominant species were then determined using the 50/20 rule, as recommended in the 2008 Arid West Regional Supplement (Corps, 2008). Based on this method, dominant species are those species that individually or collectively constitute more than 50 percent of the total vegetative cover (i.e., relative cover) within each stratum, in addition to those species that individually constitute 20 percent or more of the relative cover within each vegetation stratum. Species identifications and taxonomic nomenclature followed the second edition of *The Jepson Manual: Vascular Plants of California* (Baldwin et al., 2012), as well as taxonomic updates provided in the Jepson eFlora (Jepson Flora Project, 2018).

According to both the Corps' *1987 Manual* (Corps, 1987) and *2008 Arid West Regional Supplement* (Corps, 2008), the hydrophytic vegetation parameter for wetlands is met when, under normal circumstances, *more than* 50 percent of the dominant species across all strata have an indicator status of OBL, FACW, or FAC.

Connectivity/Adjacency

As noted above, particular emphasis is given to surface hydrologic connectivity of wetlands to traditionally navigable waters, including adjacency of wetlands to jurisdictional waters.



Connectivity of wetlands was established via field work, a review of aerial imagery, and an assessment of site-specific topography.

3.1.2 Delineation of Non-wetland Waters

Within the project site, the unnamed drainage exhibits a narrow, gently-sloped channel that meanders across an open grassy field. Despite grazing impacts, the banks and channel bottom are vegetated with herbaceous species, with a clear change in the composition and cover from the channel bottom to the bank and adjacent low terrace. As such, these areas were assessed for evidence of an OHWM to determine the presence of waters of the U.S. The *OHWM Manual* (Lichvar and McColley, 2008) provides guidance on identifying field indicators of OHWM, including protocols for characterizing the overall system. Data was recorded using the *Updated Datasheet for the Identification of the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) in the Arid West Region of the Western United States* (OHWM Data Sheet) (Curtis and Lichvar, 2010). Completed data sheets are provided in Appendix C (Arid West Intermittent and Ephemeral Streams OHWM

Cross-sectional Analysis

Cross sectional analyses were conducted at three locations along each drainage feature where there was a clear change in the limits of either the OHWM or the top of bank. The physical and biological characteristics present at each cross section were documented on OHWM Data Sheets, including a sketch of the site topography at each cross section. Specifically, the floodplain units were described for each cross section through the vegetation cover, sediment texture, and hydrology indicators at that location. The limits of OHWM were determined based on the presence of hydrology indicators such as debris wracking, shelving, water marks, and change in sediment texture/substrate.

Connectivity/Adjacency

Connectivity to adjacent traditional navigable waters was assessed via field investigations, a review of aerial photography, and information obtained regarding storm water and other underground water collection systems.

4.0 RESULTS

4.1 Wetlands Determination

Terra Verde completed a wetland delineation in May 2018 and determined that no federal wetlands are present within the project site. The results of the delineation and sampling point data was documented on Wetland Determination Data Forms (Appendix B) and is detailed below.



4.1.1 Hydrology

Field observations of wetland hydrology were limited to secondary indicators, including: riverine drift deposits (B3), drainage patterns (B10), and saturation visible on aerial imagery (C9). In addition, the FAC-Neutral Test (D5) was documented as a secondary indicator at SP-02. Wetland hydrology was determined to be present at all three sampling points (see Figure 5: Waters and Wetlands Delineation Map).

4.1.2 Soils

Soil test pits were excavated at each sampling point to classify the color and texture of the soil horizons down to at least 12 inches. Soil textures consisted of clay loam with a significant component of organic matter at all three sampling points. No hydric soils were identified on site. A soil color of 10YR 2/1 was documented at all three sampling points, with no redox features present (see Appendix D – Representative Site Photographs, Photo 1).

4.1.3 Vegetation

Greater than 50 percent relative cover of hydrophytic vegetation was documented at all three sampling points, which was dominated by common lippia (*Phyla nodiflora*; FACW), Mediterranean barley (*Hordeum marinum* subsp. *gussoneanum*; FAC), and beardless wild rye (*Elymus triticoides*; FAC). Vegetation on the banks of the drainage and adjacent areas transitions to a composition of non-wetland species dominated by wall barley (*Hordeum murinum*), heart-podded hoary cress (*Lepidium draba*), and occasional dense patches of yellow star-thistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*), as well as other grazed grasses.

4.2 Non-Wetland Waters Determination

The unnamed drainage is likely considered non-wetland waters of the U.S. based on the presence of a clearly-defined OHWM, indicated by a distinct transition in vegetative cover and composition between the channel bottom and gently-sloped bank, and connectivity to traditionally navigable waters. Based on a review of aerial imagery, this drainage appears to originate somewhere in the foothills of the San Luis Range Mountains west of Atascadero. It flows through areas of rural residential, agricultural, and commercial developments, and has been substantially modified in the areas upstream of the project site. It enters the project site through a partially impeded culvert under El Camino Real, and exits the site through another partially blocked culvert under Viejo Camino. Due to the historical alterations of natural flow patterns in the surrounding landscape, the project site is occasionally subject to temporary inundation and ponding following significant precipitation events. However, the drainage system is generally ephemeral and a lack


of hydric soils indicates that the site is well drained, likely only ponding for brief periods following significant rain events.

5.0 SUMMARY OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS

The jurisdictional waters identified on the project site fall under the regulatory jurisdiction of the Corps. A summary of the type and extent of jurisdictional waters and wetlands is presented in Table 1 - Extent and Location of Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands.

| Feature Type | Location | Acres | Length (feet) |
|--------------------|--------------------|-------|---------------|
| Waters of the U.S. | Ephemeral drainage | 0.08 | 581 |
| Federal Wetlands | None | N/A | N/A |

Table 1. Extent and Location of Jurisdictional Waters and Wetlands

Table 2 (Summary of Sampling Point Data for Wetland Delineation), provides a summary of the data collected at each of the three sampling points during the wetland delineation.

| Sample Point | Wetland Vegetation | Hydric Soils | Wetland Hydrology | Connectivity/ Adjacency | Federal Wetland |
|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| SP-01 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| SP-02 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |
| SP-03 | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No |

Table 2. Summary of Sampling Point Data for Wetland Delineation

The geographic extent of waters of the U.S. totals approximately 581 linear feet and 0.08 acre within the project site, but no federal wetlands are present. Section 404 of the CWA requires authorization from the Corps for the discharge of dredged or fill material into all waters of the U.S., including adjacent wetlands. The findings of this federal waters and wetlands delineation is subject to review and final concurrence by the Corps.



6.0 **REFERENCES**

- Baldwin, Bruce G., D.H. Goldman, D.J. Keil, R. Patterson, T.J. Rosatti, and D.H. Wilken. 2012. *The Jepson Manual: Vascular Plants of California*. University of California Press. Berkeley, California.
- Brinson, M. 1993. A hydrogeomorphic classification for wetlands. Technical Report WRP-DE-4, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.
- Brinson, M., F. R. Hauer, L. C. Lee, W. L. Nutter, R. D. Rheinhardt, R. D. Smith, and Whigham, D. 1995. A guidebook for application of hydrogeomorphic assessments to riverine wetlands, Technical Report WRP-DE-11, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS. NTIS No. AD A308 365.
- Google Earth Pro V 7.1.8.3036 (1994-2018). San Luis Obispo County, California. 35.453629 /

-120.637411. Google 2018. Accessed May through December 2018.

- Jepson Flora Project, Regents of the University of California. 2018. Jepson eFlora. Available online at: http://ucjeps.berkeley.edu/eflora/. Accessed May 2018.
- Lichvar, R.W. and S.M. McColley. 2008. A field Guide to the Identification of the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) in the Arid West Region of the Western United States. A Delineation Manual. Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
- Lichvar, R.W., N.C. Melvin, M.L. Butterwick, and W.N Kirchner. 2012. National Wetland Plant List Indicator Rating Definitions. Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
- Lichvar, R.W., D.L. Banks, W.N. Kirchner, and N.C. Melvin. 2016. *The National Wetland Plant List:* 2016 wetland ratings – Arid West 2016 Regional Wetland Plant List. Phytoneuron 2016-30: 1-17. Published 28 April 2016. ISSN 2153 733X.
- Munsell. 2000. Munsell Soil Color Charts. Munsell Color, Macbeth Division of Kollmorgen Instruments Corp., New Windsor, NY.
- Rapanos et ux., at al. v. United States. 547 U.S. 715, 2006. The United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. (June 19, 2006). JUSTIA US Supreme Court. Available online at: https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/547/715/opinion.html.
 Accessed September 28, 2017.
- Solid Waste Agency of Northern Cook County (SWANCC) v. United States Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) et al. 531 U.S. 15, 2001. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. (January 9, 2001). JUSTIA US Supreme Court. Available online at: https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/531/159/case.html. Accessed: September 28, 2017.



- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 1987. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. Technical Report Y-87-1. Environmental Laboratory. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.
 - _____. 1992. "Clarification and Interpretation of the *1987 Manual*." 3-92 Memorandum.
- _____. 2008. Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Arid West Region (Version 2.0). Environmental Laboratory, Wetland Regulatory Assistance Program.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. 1994. Changes in Hydric Soils of the United States. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. Federal Register. Washington, D.C.
 - _____. 2002. Changes in Hydric Soils of the United States. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. Federal Register. Washington, D.C.
- . 2006. Field Indicators of Hydric Soils in the United States, Version 6.0. G.W. Hurt, L.M. Vasilas, editors. United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, in cooperation with the National Technical Committee for Hydric Soils, Fort Worth, TX.
 - ______. 2018. Custom Soil Resources Report for San Luis Obispo County, California. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. United States Department of Agriculture.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. 2008. Clean Water Act Jurisdiction Following the U.S. Supreme Court's Decision in Rapanos v. United States & Carabell v. United States. Joint memorandum issued June 5, 2007. Washington, D.C.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2018. National Wetland Inventory Mapper. Available online at: https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html. Accessed May through December 2018.
- U.S. Geological Survey. 2018. The National Map. San Luis Obispo County, 35.453629 /

-120.637411. Available online at: https://viewer.nationalmap.gov/advanced-viewer/. Accessed December 2018.

- Western Regional Climate Center (WRCC). 2018. Paso Robles, California (046730) Period of Record Monthly Climate Summary (01/01/1894 06/10/2016). Available online at: https://wrcc.dri.edu/cgi-bin/cliMAIN.pl?ca6730. Accessed December 2018.
- Wetland Training Institute, Inc. 2017. 2017 Pocket Guide to Hydric Soil Field Indicators: Field Indicators of Hydric Soils in the United States, Version 8.0.
- Wiegers, M.O. and E.W. Hart. 2015. Preliminary Geologic Map of the Santa Margarita 7.5' Quadrangle, San Luis Obispo County, California. Available online at: ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dmg/rgmp/Prelim_geo_pdf/SantaMargarita_24k_v1.0.pdf.



APPENDIX A: Report Figures

Figure 1: Site Vicinity and Topographic Map
Figure 2: Project Site and Survey Area Map
Figure 3: Hydrologic Connectivity Map
Figure 4: Soil Units Map
Figure 5: Waters and Wetlands Delineation Map

















APPENDIX B: Wetland Determination Data Forms



WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Arid West Region

| Project/Site: DOVE CREEK SELF STORAG | E | City/County: ATASC | ADTRO, SLO Sampling Date: 05/17/18 |
|---|------------------------------|---|--|
| Applicant/Owner: Scott NEWTON | | | State: CA Sampling Point: P1 |
| Investigator(s): KNELSON, A. GOLUB, | B. DUG | Section Township Ra | nge: CA T295 RIZE |
| Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): SWALE | | Local relief (concave | conver none): CONCAVE Slone (%): 0-2 |
| Subregion (LBB): RR C | Lat 3 | 5453961 | Long: 170 (36(27) Datum: NADB3 |
| Soil Map Unit Name: Still Clay bar | | -, 15 - [6] | NWI classification: Datum: |
| Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this | s time of ye | ar? Yes 📈 No _ | (If no, explain in Remarks.) |
| Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology s | ignificantly | disturbed? Are " | Normal Circumstances" present? Yes Ver No |
| Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology n | naturally pro | blematic? (If ne | eded, explain any answers in Remarks.) |
| SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map | showing | sampling point le | ocations, transects, important features, etc. |
| Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes N Hydric Soil Present? Yes N Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes N | 0 0 | Is the Sampled within a Wetlan | Area nd? Yes No |
| Remarks: Undeveloped lot bordered by residentia grassland, currently a historicall crosses property, which occusionally or | l develo y gia: erteps | pments a pub zed by goats a floods port | lie roads. Site is an open, weedy s. Ephemeral blue line drainage tions of the field following storms. |
| VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plan | ts. | | |
| | Absolute | Dominant Indicator | Dominance Test worksheet: |
| Tree Stratum (Plot size://////////////////////////////// | % Cover | Species? Status | Number of Dominant Species |
| 2 | | | That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: (A) |
| 3. | | | Total Number of Dominant |
| 4 | | | Species Across Air Strata (B) |
| Sapling/Shruh Stratum (Plot size: N/A) | | = Total Cover | Percent of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: <u>67</u> (A/B) |
| 1. | | | Prevalence Index worksheet |
| 2. | | | Total % Cover of: Multiply by: |
| 3. | | | OBL species O x 1 = O |
| 4 | | | FACW species $42 \times 2 = 84$ |
| 5 | | | FAC species 39 x 3 = 117 |
| 45' x70' | | = Total Cover | FACU species x 4 = |
| Herb Stratum (Plot size: 7.5 h 20) | N7 | 1 EACUL | UPL species 33 x 5 = 165 |
| 2 HODALIAA WAARIA HOAA | 12 | - Incw | Column Totals: (A) 378 (B) |
| 3 LENTINGPER CONSTITUTIS | 25 | VIL | Prevalence index = $B/A = 3.23$ |
| 4. FESTULA PERENNIS | 8 | FAC | Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators: |
| 5. HIRSCHFELDIA INCANA | 5 | UPL | ✓ Dominance Test is >50% |
| 6. ANTHEMIS COTULA | 2 | FACU | Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹ |
| 7. LOTUS CORNICULATUS | 1 | FAC | Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting |
| 18. BROMUS CATHMETICUS | l | UPL | data in Remarks or on a separate sheet) |
| 9. GERANIUM MOLLE _ UPL | 117- | = Total Cover | Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation' (Explain) |
| "+ HORDERIA ANUR ANUR | 1 | FALLA | ¹ Indicators of hydric coil and watland hydrology must |
| BRASSIUM NILLOA | | 1101 | be present, unless disturbed or problematic. |
| F. M.F. Markey I. a 150 Berlin | | = Total Cover | Hydrophytic |
| % Bare Ground in Herb Stratum % Cover | of Biotic Cr | ust | Vegetation Present? Yes <u>No</u> |
| Remarks: | | | |
| AREA BEAZED KEBULAKUT | 1346 | OATS ; NOTAL | BLE TRANSITION IN SPECIES |
| TROM DRAINAGE BOTTOM TO | ADJ | ACENT, SLI | OHILY ELEVATED UPLAND |
| TRANSITIONAL MIX OF WETLAN | AD 4 | NON - WETL | AND SPP. IN CHANNEL. |

ADDAY-

US Army Corps of Engineers

SOIL

| 6 | - | 577 |
|----------|--------|-----|
| Sampling | Point: | V |

| Profile Description: (Describe to the depth | needed to document the indicator or co | onfirm the absence of | indicators.) | |
|---|--|-------------------------------|---|----|
| Depth Matrix | Redox Features | | | |
| (inches) Color (moist) % | Color (moist) % Type ¹ Lo | | Remarks | - |
| 0-12" IOVR 211 100 | | CLLO + | HGH OM | - |
| | | | 2 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | - |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | - |
| | | | | |
| | | | <u>ئار</u> | - |
| | advard Matrix CS=Covered or Costad Sa | and Grains ² Locat | ion: PL-Pore Lining M=Matrix | |
| Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LE | educed Matrix, CS=Covered or Coaled Sa Rs. unless otherwise noted.) | Indicators fo | r Problematic Hydric Soils ³ : | |
| Historol (A1) | Sandy Redox (S5) | 1 cm Mui | ck (A9) (LBB C) | |
| Histic Epipedon (A2) | Stripped Matrix (S6) | 2 cm Mu | ck (A10) (LRR B) | |
| Black Histic (A3) | Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) | Reduced | Vertic (F18) | |
| Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) | Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) | Red Pare | ent Material (TF2) | |
| Stratified Layers (A5) (LRR C) | Depleted Matrix (F3) | Other (Ex | xplain in Remarks) | |
| 1 cm Muck (A9) (LRR D) | Redox Dark Surface (F6) | | | |
| Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) | Depleted Dark Surface (F7) | 3 | | |
| Thick Dark Surface (A12) | Redox Depressions (F8) | Indicators of | hydrophytic vegetation and | |
| Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) | Vernal Pools (F9) | wetland ny | urbed or problematic | |
| Sandy Gleyed Matrix (34) | | uness dist | arbed of problematic. | |
| Type: | | | | |
| Depth (inches): | - | Hydric Soil P | resent? Yes No | |
| Depart (inches). | | Tryune oon Th | | _ |
| HIGH CONC. OF O.M. ROCKS ALLUVIUM. SITE WELL- DRAIN | NO KEDOX LONG | BSERVED | IN UPPER 12-14" | |
| HYDROLOGY | | | | |
| Wetland Hydrology Indicators: | | | 1.0.1 | |
| Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; | check all that apply) | Seconda | ary Indicators (2 or more required) | |
| Surface Water (A1) | Salt Crust (B11) | Wat | er Marks (B1) (Riverine) | |
| High Water Table (A2) | Biotic Crust (B12) | Sed | liment Deposits (B2) (Riverine) | |
| Saturation (A3) | Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) | Drift | t Deposits (B3) (Riverine) | |
| Water Marks (B1) (Nonriverine) | Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) | Dra | inage Patterns (B10) | |
| Sediment Deposits (B2) (Nonriverine) | Oxidized Rhizospheres along Livin | ig Roots (C3) Dry- | -Season Water Table (C2) | |
| Drift Deposits (B3) (Nonriverine) | Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) | Cra | yfish Burrows (CB) | |
| Surface Soil Cracks (B6) | Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled So | ils (C6)/ Satu | uration Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) |) |
| Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) | Thin Muck Surface (C7) | Sha | illow Aquitard (D3) | |
| Water-Stained Leaves (B9) | Other (Explain in Remarks) | FAC | C-Neutral Test (D5) | |
| Field Observations: | / | | | |
| Surface Water Present? Yes No | Depth (inches): | | | |
| Water Table Present? Yes No | Depth (inches): | | | 1 |
| Saturation Present? Yes No | Depth (inches): | Wetland Hydrology | Present? Yes No | - |
| (Includes capillary fringe) | toring well, aerial photos, previous inspect | ions), if available: | | |
| | | | | |
| Remarks: | | | | |
| EPHEMERAL DRAIN | IAGE CHANNEL IN | SEASONAU | FLOODED FLELT | ≥j |
| INUNDATION SATURATI | ON ARE EPHEMER | nc, Follor | NING SIGNIFICAT | 17 |
| WINTER PRECIPITATIO | N. | | | |

Arid West - Version 2.0

| WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM | I – Arid West Region |
|--|--|
| WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM Project/Site: Dove Greek Self-Storage City/County: Atal Applicant/Owner: Scott Newton City/County: Atal Investigator(s): K. Nelson, A. Golub, B. Dugas Section, Township, F Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): SWale Local relief (concave Subregion (LRR): LPLC Lat: 35, 453727 Soil Map Unit Name: Still Clay IDAM Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes No Are Vegetation, Soil, or Hydrology significantly disturbed? Are SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site map showing sampling point | I - Arid West Region Icadeto SL0 Sampling Date: 05 17 18 State: CA Sampling Point: 02 Range: CA T29 S P12 E e, convex, none): (UMCAVE Slope (%): 0-2 State: 05 0.02 |
| Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes No Is the Sample within a Wetl Hydric Soil Present? Yes No No Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes No within a Wetl Remarks: | ed Area and? Yes No / |
| undeveloped lot bordered by residential developme open, weedy field, currently a historically grazed drainage crosses the property which preasinguly over | tops of floods portions of the field |
| VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants. following | Sterms. |
| VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants. The Wing Dominant Indicator 1. Absolute Dominant Indicator 2. Absolute Dominant Indicator 3. Absolute Dominant Indicator 4. Absolute Dominant Indicator 3. Absolute Dominant Indicator 4. Absolute Dominant Indicator 5. Absolute Dominant Indicator 1. Absolute Dominant Indicator 2. Absolute Dominant Indicator 3. Absolute Dominant Indicator 4. Absolute Dominant Indicator 5. Absolute Dominant Indicator 1. Absolute Absolute Dominant Indicator 5. Absolute Absolute Absolute Dominant Indicator 1. Absolute Absolute Absolute Absolute Absolute 1. Absolute Absolute Absolute Absolute Absolute Absolute Index Stratum (Plot size: $b \times [5 \times [5 \times [5 \times [5 \times $ | Dominance Test worksheet: Number of Dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: |
| 1 | ¹ Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic. Hydrophytic |
| % Bare Ground in Herb Stratum % Cover of Biotic Crust | Vegetation Present? Yes No |
| Remarks: Area giazed regularly by gosts. Slight elevati bottom and adjacent upleind is marked by Channel bottom supports transitional mix | in change between drainager transition in regetation. of wetland a non-wetland spp. |

| | | n |
|----------|--------|-----|
| Compling | Point. | 111 |
| Sampling | i Ont. | V |

| Depth Matrix Redox Features (inches) Color (moist) % Type1 $3 - 1 \mathcal{U}''$ $1\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{U}$ $2/1$ $1\mathcal{O} \mathcal{U}'$ | Texture Remarks CLLO HIGH O.M. |
|---|--|
| $\begin{array}{c c} \hline \text{(inches)} & \hline \text{Color (moist)} & \% & \hline \text{Color (moist)} & \% & \hline \text{Type}^1 & \text{Loc}^2 \\ \hline $ | <u>Texture</u> <u>CLLO</u> <u>HIOHO.M.</u> |
| | CLLO HIGH O.M. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand | Grains. ² Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix. |
| ydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.) | Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ : |
| Histosol (A1) Sandy Redox (S5) | 1 cm Muck (A9) (LRR C) |
| Histic Epipedon (A2) Stripped Matrix (S6) | 2 cm Muck (A10) (LRR B) |
| Black Histic (A3) Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) | Reduced Vertic (F18) |
| Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) | Red Parent Material (TF2) |
| Stratified Layers (A5) (LRR C) Depleted Matrix (F3) | |
| _ 1 CM MUCK (A9) (LKK D) Kedox Dark Surface (Fb) | |
| Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) Depleted Dark Surface (F7) | ³ Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and |
| Thick Dark Surface (A12) Redux Depressions (10) | wetland hydrology must be present. |
| Sandy Mucky Millerar (01) vernar ools (10) | unless disturbed or problematic. |
| testrictive Laver (if present): | |
| Type: | |
| Depth (inchas): | Hydric Soil Present? Yes No |
| Deput (notes). | |
| DEPOSITS OF SMALL - MEDIUM ROCKS (CON DES NOT SUPPORT HYDRIC SOILS. | BLE.SITE WELL-DRAINED |
| TUROLOGI | |
| Netland Hydrology Indicators: | Quere destruction (2 as more required) |
| Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; check all that apply) | Secondary Indicators (2 or more required) |
| Surface Water (A1) Salt Crust (B11) | Water Marks (B1) (Riverine) |
| High Water Table (A2) Biotic Crust (B12) | Sediment Deposits (B2) (Riverine) |
| Saturation (A3) Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) | Drift Deposits (B3) (Riverine) |
| Water Marks (B1) (Nonriverine) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) | ✓ Drainage Patterns (B10) |
| Sediment Deposits (B2) (Nonriverine) Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living I | Roots (C3) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) |
| Drift Deposits (B3) (Nonriverine) Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) | Crayfish Burrows (C8) |
| Surface Soil Cracks (B6) Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils | (C6) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9 |
| Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7) Thin Muck Surface (C7) | Shallow Aquitard (D3) |
| Water-Stained Leaves (B9) Other (Explain in Remarks) | V FAC-Neutral Test (D5) |
| ield Observations: | |
| Surface Water Present? Yes No V Depth (inches): | |
| Nater Table Present? Yes No Depth (inches): | |
| Saturation Present? No Ves No Ves Depth (inches): Ves | Vetland Hydrology Present? Yes No |
| | ns), if available: |
| (includes capillary fringe) . Describe Recorded Data (support uge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspection | |
| (includes capillary fringe) | |
| Remarks: EPHEMERAL DRAINAGE CHANNEL IN SEASONAL | -14 FLOODED FIELD; |
| Remarks: EPHEMERAL DRAMMAGE CHANNEL IN SEASONAL NVN DATION ISTATURATION ARE EPHEMERAL | -LY FLOODED FIELD; L, FOLLOWING SIGNIFICANT |
| Remarks: PHEMERAL DRAINAGE CHANNEL IN SEASONAL NVN DATION ISTATULIATION ARE EPHEMERAL UNTER STORMS. | -LY FLOODED FIELD; L, FOLLOWING SIGNVIFICANT |

| WEILAND DEI | FERMINATION DATA FOR | RM – Arid West Region |
|---|---|--|
| Project/Site: DOVE Creek Self-Ston | age City/County: Ate | ascader 0/510 Sampling Date: 05/17/19 |
| Applicant/Owner:) (61) Newfor | | State: Sampling Point:3 |
| Investigator(s): K. NUSON, A. Golub | Section, Township | , Range: CA T295 RIZE |
| Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): SWAVe | Local relief (conca | ave, convex, none): (ONCAVE Slope (%): 0-2 |
| Subregion (LRR): LFR C | Lat: 35.453245 | Long: -120.637836 Datum: NAD8 |
| Soil Map Unit Name: Still Clary Loam | | NWI classification: PEM-A |
| Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the site typical for | this time of year? Yes | (If no explain in Remarks) |
| Are Vegetation Soil or Hydrology | significantly disturbed? | |
| Are Vegetation Soil or Hydrology | | |
| | | in heeded, explain any answers in Remarks.) |
| SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – Attach site ma | ip showing sampling poin | nt locations, transects, important features, etc. |
| Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes Hydric Soil Present? Yes | No Is the Sam | pled Area |
| Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes | No | |
| open, weedy field, currently in | evidential develo | pments & public roads. Site is a by goats. Ephenicial blue line |
| /EGETATION – Use scientific names of pla | ants. field follow | ring starms |
| Tree Stratum (Plot size: N/A) | Absolute Dominant Indicat | tor Dominance Test worksheet: |
| 1/ | <u>Nover</u> openes: Otatu | Number of Dominant Species |
| 2. | | |
| 3 | | Total Number of Dominant |
| 4 | | |
| Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: ~ ~ A) | = Total Cover | Percent of Dominant Species 100 (A/B) |
| 1 | · · | Prevalence Index worksheet: |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | \bigcirc OBL species \bigcirc $x = \bigcirc$ |
| 4 | | - FACW species - x 2 = 0 |
| 5 | | FAC species 9 + x3 = 201 |
| Herb Stratum (Plot size: 6' XIS') | = Total Cover | FACU species $x_4 = 3C_4$ |
| 1. HORDEVAN MARINUM | 86 V FAC | UPL species $12 \times 5 = 12$ |
| 2. LEPIDIUM PEABA | to upl | $\frac{1}{2} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{Column Fotals:} & 110 \\ Co$ |
| 3. ADEDEUM MURINUM | 6 FACI | Prevalence Index = B/A = 3.35 |
| 4. MEDICAGO POLYMORPHA | FACI | Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators: |
| 5. CONVOLVULUS ARVENSIS | I UPL | ✓ Dominance Test is >50% |
| 6. BROMUS CATHARTICUS | -1 UPL | Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 ¹ |
| 7. DENTAUKEA SOLSTIMALIS | 2 UPL | Morphological Adaptations ¹ (Provide supporting |
| 8. ANTHEMIS COTULA | FACI | Drahlamatia Hudaaskutia Yasutatia 1 |
| Weeder View Ottoburg (Dist strength | Total Cover | Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation' (Explain) |
| FESTICA PERTALANE | 1 EA. | Indicators of hydric soil and walland hydrology |
| RICOLUCT PERCIVINI | | be present, unless disturbed or problematic. |
| * BRANING DIANDRUG | | |
| 2 BROMUS DIANDRUS | = Total Cover | Hydrophytic / |
| 2. BROMUS DIANDRUS | = Total Cover | Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes <u>No</u> |
| 2. BROMUS DIANDRUS % Bare Ground in Herb Stratum & % Con Remarks: Area grazed regularly by goat | = Total Cover ver of Biotic Crust | Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes <u>No</u> <u>No</u> change between diainage pottern |
| 2. BROMUS DIANDRUS % Bare Ground in Herb Stratum _ Ø % Con Remarks: Arta grazed regularly by goal and adjacent upland is Mark | = Total Cover ver of Biotic Crust IS.Slight elevation ed by fransition | Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes No change between diainage pottern in vegetation. channel bottom |

SOIL

| Sampling | Point: | 0 | < |
|----------|---------|---|---|
| Jumping | · onic. | | _ |

| Depth Matrix | Redox Features | Tautura |
|--|--|--|
| $\frac{\text{(inches)}}{0- 2''} \frac{\text{Color (moist)}}{ 0' ^2} \frac{\%}{ 0' ^2}$ | Color (moist)%Type'Loc" | CLLO High O.M. |
| | | J |
| | | |
| | =Reduced Matrix_CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grai | ns. ² Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix. |
| lydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all | LRRs, unless otherwise noted.) | Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils ³ : |
| Histosol (A1) | Sandy Redox (S5) | 1 cm Muck (A9) (LRR C) |
| Histic Epipedon (A2) | Stripped Matrix (S6) | 2 cm Muck (A10) (LRR B) |
| Black Histic (A3) | Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) | Reduced Vertic (F18) |
| Hydrogen Sulfide (A4) | Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2) | Red Parent Material (TF2) |
| Stratified Layers (A5) (LRR C) | Depleted Matrix (F3) | |
| 1 CM MUCK (A9) (LKR D) Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11) | Redox Dark Surface (F0) | |
| Thick Dark Surface (A12) | Redox Depressions (F8) | ³ Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and |
| Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) | Vernal Pools (F9) | wetland hydrology must be present, |
| Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4) | | unless disturbed or problematic. |
| lestrictive Layer (if present): | | |
| Туре: | | |
| | | |
| Depth (inches): Remarks: HIGH CONC. OF O.M | A. IN TOP 2", DARK, | UNIFORM SOIL, WITH N |
| Depth (inches): Remarks: HIGH CONC. OF O.M BEDOX CONCENTRAT SITE IS WELL - PRAINE | A. IN TOP 2", DARK, TOMS. ALLWIAL DEPOSITS DE DOES NOT SUPPORT P | WIFORM SOIL, WITH NO OF SMALL-MED RUN |
| Depth (inches): Remarks: HIGH CONC. OF O.M BEDOX CONCENTRAT SITE IS WELL - PRAINE YDROLOGY | 1. IN TOP 2", DARK, TONS. ALLWIAL DEPOSITS DE DES NOT SUPPORT H | Hydric Soil Present? Yes No V UNIFORM SOIL, WITH N OF SMALL-MED ROU HYDRIC SOLLS |
| Depth (inches): Remarks: HIGH CONC. OF O.M BEDOX CONCENTRAT SITE IS WELL - PRAIME YDROLOGY Vetland Hydrology Indicators: | 1. IN TOP 2", DARK, TOMS. ALLWIAL DEPOSITS DE DOES NOT SUPPORT H | Hydric Soil Present? Yes <u>No</u> UN IFORM JOIL, WITH N OF SMALL-MED ROU MPRIC SOLLS |
| Depth (inches): Remarks: HIGH CONC. OF O.M REDOX CONCENTRAT SITE IS WELL - PRAINE YDROLOGY Vetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one required) | A. IN TOP 2", DARK, TOMS. ALLWIAL DEPOSITS D & DOES NOT SUPPORT H ed; check all that apply) | Hydric Soil Present? Yes <u>No</u> UN IFORM SOIL, WITH N OF SMALL-MED ROU Marke (B1) (Piverine) |
| Depth (inches): Remarks: HIGH CONC. oF O.M BEDOX CONCENTRAT SITE IS WELL - PRAINE YDROLOGY Vetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one required Surface Water (A1) | A. IN TOP 2", DARK, TOMS. ALLWIAL DEPOSITS D & DAES NOT SUPPORT H ed; check all that apply) Salt Crust (B11) Sit Crust (B12) | Hydric Soil Present? Yes No UN IFORM SOIL, WITH NO OF SMALL-MED Roll OF SMALL-MED Roll Roll Marks (B1) (Riverine) Sediment Denosite (B2) (Riverine) |
| Depth (inches): Remarks: HIGH CONC. oF O.M BEDOX CONCENTRAT SITE IS WELL - DEAINE YDROLOGY Vetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one required Surface Water (A1) High Water Table (A2) | A. IN TOP 2", DARK, 1000S. ALLWIAL DEPOSITS D & DAES NOT SUPPORT + ed; check all that apply) Salt Crust (B11) Biotic Crust (B12) Acutic Invotebrates (B12) | Hydric Soil Present? Yes No UN IFORM Soil, WITH NOF SMALL-MED Room OF SMALL-MED Room |
| Depth (inches): Remarks: HIGH CONC. OF O.M BEDOX CONCENTRAT SITE IS WELL - PRAIME YDROLOGY Netland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one required Surface Water (A1) High Water Table (A2) Saturation (A3) Welland Michaeler (A1) | A. IN TOR 2", DARK, 1 2005. ALLWIAL DEPOSITS D & DAES NOT SUPPORT H ed; check all that apply) Salt Crust (B11) Biotic Crust (B12) Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) Hudrogon Sulfide Odgr (C1) | Hydric Soil Present? Yes No UN IFORM SOIL, WITH N OF SMALL-MED Run YPRIC Soils Secondary Indicators (2 or more required) Water Marks (B1) (Riverine) Sediment Deposits (B2) (Riverine) Drift Deposits (B3) (Riverine) WDrainage Patterns (B10) |
| Depth (inches): Remarks: HIGH CONC. oF O.M BEDOX CONCENTRAT SITE IS WELL - PRAINE YDROLOGY Wetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one required Surface Water (A1) High Water Table (A2) Saturation (A3) Water Marks (B1) (Nonriverine) Sediment Deposite (B2) (Nonriverine) | A. IN TOR 2 th PARK, 1.2005. ALLWIAL DEPOSITS D + DAES NOT SUPPORT H ed; check all that apply) Salt Crust (B11) Biotic Crust (B12) Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) Ovidized Bhizospheres along Living Roots | Hydric Soil Present? Yes No UN IFORM JOIL, WITH No OF SMALL-MED Root Market Secondary Indicators (2 or more required) Root Water Marks (B1) (Riverine) Sediment Deposits (B2) (Riverine) Drift Deposits (B3) (Riverine) Drift Deposits (B3) (Riverine) Droseason Water Table (C2) |
| Depth (inches): Remarks: HIGH CONC. oF O.M BEDOX CONCENTRAT SITE IS WELL - DEALNE YDROLOGY Wetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one require Surface Water (A1) High Water Table (A2) Saturation (A3) Water Marks (B1) (Nonriverine) Sediment Deposits (B2) (Nonriverine) Drift Deposits (B3) (Nonriverine) | A. IN TOP 2 th PARK, Det S. ALLWIAL DEPOSITS D + DAES NOT SUPPORT H ed; check all that apply) Salt Crust (B11) Biotic Crust (B12) Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) | Hydric Soil Present? Yes No UNIFORM JON, WITH No OF SMALL-MEP Ronger Mater Marks Ronger Water Marks (B1) (Riverine) Riverine) Drift Deposits (B3) (Riverine) Drift Deposits (B3) (Riverine) Varianage Patterns (B10) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Crayfish Burrows (C8) Call |
| Depth (inches): Remarks: HIGH CONC. oF O.M VEDOX CONCENTRAT SITE IS WELL - PEAINE YDROLOGY Wetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one required Surface Water (A1) High Water Table (A2) Saturation (A3) Water Marks (B1) (Nonriverine) Sediment Deposits (B2) (Nonriverine) Drift Deposits (B3) (Nonriverine) Surface Soil Cracks (B6) | A. IN TOP 2 th DARK, Description of the solution of the solu | Hydric Soil Present? Yes No UN IFORM Soil, WITH NOF SMALL-MED Runger OF SMALL-MED Runger Mater Marks (B1) (Riverine) Water Marks (B1) (Riverine) Drift Deposits (B3) (Riverine) Drift Deposits (B3) (Riverine) Drift Deposits (B10) 6 (C3) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Crayfish Burrows (C8) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9) |
| Depth (inches): Remarks: HIGH CONC OF O.M VEDOX CONCENTRAT SITE IS WELL - PRAINE YDROLOGY Wetland Hydrology Indicators: Primary Indicators (minimum of one required Surface Water (A1) High Water Table (A2) Saturation (A3) Water Marks (B1) (Nonriverine) Sediment Deposits (B2) (Nonriverine) Drift Deposits (B3) (Nonriverine) Surface Soil Cracks (B6) Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (F | A. IN TOR 2 th , DARK, 1 2005. ALLWIAL DEPOSITS D & DAES NOT SUPPORT H ed; check all that apply) Salt Crust (B11) Biotic Crust (B12) Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) Thin Muck Surface (C7) | Hydric Soil Present? Yes No UN FORM Soil, WITH No OF SMALL-MED Run Mater Mater Run Water Marks (B1) (Riverine) Sediment Deposits (B2) (Riverine) Drift Deposits (B3) (Riverine) Drift Deposits (B3) (Riverine) Drift Deposits (B3) (Riverine) Crayfish Burrows (C8) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C3) Shallow Aquitard (D3) |
| Depth (inches): | A. IN TOR 2 th DARK, Det S. ALLWIAL DEPOSITS D + DALS NOT SUPPOR H ed; check all that apply) Salt Crust (B11) Biotic Crust (B12) Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) 37) Thin Muck Surface (C7) Other (Explain in Remarks) | Hydric Soil Present? Yes No UN IFORM Jon , WITH No OF SMALL-MEP Ronger |
| Depth (inches): | A. IN TOR 2 th PARK, Det S. ALLWIAL DEPOSITS D + DAES NOT SUPPORT H ed; check all that apply) Salt Crust (B11) Biotic Crust (B12) Aquatic Invertebrates (B13) Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1) Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots Presence of Reduced Iron (C4) Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6) B77) Thin Muck Surface (C7) Other (Explain in Remarks) | Hydric Soil Present? Yes No UNIFORM JON, WITH No OF SMALL-MEP Rode Mathematications (2 or more required) Rode Water Marks (B1) (Riverine) Sediment Deposits (B2) (Riverine) Drift Deposits (B3) (Riverine) Drift Deposits (B10) Crayfish Burrows G(C3) Dry-Season Water Table (C2) Crayfish Burrows (C8) Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery Shallow Aquitard (D3) FAC-Neutral Test |
| Depth (inches): | A. IN TOR 2 th DARK, Description of the second state of the seco | Hydric Soil Present? Yes No UN FORM Soil, WITH No OF SMALL-MED Run |
| Depth (inches): | A. IN TOP 2 th DARK, Define S. Allwial Depositions Define S. Allwial Depositions Define S. Allwial Depositions Define S. Allwial Depositions Define Suppose the second stress of the second stress (B13) | Hydric Soil Present? Yes No UNIFORM Jond, WITH No OF SMALL-MED Run |
| Depth (inches): | A. IN TOR 2^{h} DARK, Description: Depth (inches): | Hydric Soil Present? Yes No UNIFORM Solv, WITH No OF SMALL-MED Room OF SMALL-MED Room Room |
| Depth (inches): | A. IN TOR 2 th PARK, Description of the provided state of the pr | Hydric Soil Present? Yes No UNIFORM Sold, WITH N OF SMALL-MED Room OF SMALL-MED Room Room |
| Depth (inches): | A. IN TOR 2^{h} DARK, Description of the second state of the s | Hydric Soil Present? Yes No UNIFORM Solv, WITH No OF SMALL-MED Room |
| Depth (inches): | A. IN TOR 2^{h} PARK, Description of the provided state of the | Hydric Soil Present? Yes No UN IFORM Sort, WITH NOF SMALL-MED Ready OF SMALL-MED Ready |



APPENDIX B: Arid West Intermittent and Ephemeral Streams OHWM Datasheets



| Arid West Ephemeral and Intermi | ittent Streams OHWM Datasheet |
|--|--|
| Project: DOVE CREEK Self-Storage | Date: 05 17118 Time: 1545 |
| Stroom: Univer: DCS> | Town: Atalactero State: UA |
| Investigator(s): V NELSON A (21) | Photo begin file#: Photo end file#: |
| | Location Details: |
| $Y \bigsqcup / N \bigsqcup$ Do normal circumstances exist on the site? | WEST |
| Y N Is the site significantly disturbed? | Projection: Datum: NAD 93 Coordinates: 35.453727 (-120.637320) |
| Potential anthropogenic influences on the channel sys SITE IS BORDERZED BY PUBLIC ROADS OULVERTS ON OPPOSITE ENDS OF THE S DEBIZIS PALK WITH DEBRIS & TRASH A | TE ARE BOTH PARTIALLY BLOCKED COMMUNICATION, SITE GRAZED BY GOAT |
| Brief site description: UNDEVELOPED, OPEN FI TRAINAGE IS NARROW, WITH SHALLOW E LOODS IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING SIG | ELD CONSISTING OF WEEDY GRASSLAN BANKS; MUCH OF THE SITE DOCASIONN MIFICANT PRECIPITATION |
| Checklist of resources (if available): | |
| Aerial photography Stream gag | ge data , |
| Dates: 1994-2017 Gage num | ber: |
| Ceologia mans Period of r | record: |
| Vegetation mans | y of recent effective discharges |
| Soils maps | s of nood nequency analysis |
| Rainfall/precipitation maps | peights for 2-5-10- and 25-year events and the |
| Existing delineation(s) for site | ecent event exceeding a 5-year event |
| Global positioning system (GPS) | |
| Other studies | |
| Hydrogeomorphic F | Floodplain Units |
| Active Floodplain | Low Terrace |
| a company | |
| Low-Flow Channels | / / OHWM Paleo Channel |
| rocedure for identifying and characterizing the flood | plain units to assist in identifying the OHWM: |
| Walk the channel and floodplain within the study area t | to get an impression of the geomorphology and |
| Select a representative cross section porces the abarrel | Draw the group position and labor 14b - 0 - 1.1. |
| Determine a point on the cross section that is characteri | stic of one of the hydrogeomorphic floodplain units. |
| a) Record the floodplain unit and GPS position. | and at one of the hydrogeomorphic hoodplain dilits. |
| b) Describe the sediment texture (using the Wentworth | class size) and the vegetation characteristics of the |
| floodplain unit. | services of the second se |
| | |
| c) Identify any indicators present at the location. | |
| c) Identify any indicators present at the location. Repeat for other points in different hydrogeomorphic flo | oodplain units across the cross section. |
| c) Identify any indicators present at the location. Repeat for other points in different hydrogeomorphic fluidentify the OHWM and record the indicators. Record t | oodplain units across the cross section. he OHWM position via: |
| c) Identify any indicators present at the location. Repeat for other points in different hydrogeomorphic fluidentify the OHWM and record the indicators. Record to Mapping on aerial photograph | oodplain units across the cross section. he OHWM position via: GPS |

| Cross section drawing: | | the alternation of the |
|--|--|--|
| VIELO CAMAINO | | |
| DHWW | 1 | |
| | 1. Os | |
| N. A. | VEGETATED CHANNE | -1 |
| N | | |
| OHWM | | |
| | | |
| GPS point: $D(SS-0)$ | | |
| Indicators: | | 1.0 |
| Change in average sediment texture | Break in bank slope | |
| Change in vegetation species | Other: | |
| Change in vegetation cover | Other: | |
| Comments: | | offer 124 |
| ION FLOW CHNONEL IN | WINT MATELS UPP | 102 AUA AT |
| CIALLY INTO THE | and many the for the state | I Contract Ca |
| CULVER VIDLE VIL | do chamado | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | an a |
| Floodplain unit: I Low-Flow Channel | Active Floodplain | Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: Low-Flow Channel | Active Floodplain | Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: Drow-Flow Channel | Active Floodplain | Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: Descent Low-Flow Channel | Active Floodplain | Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: \square Low-Flow Channel GPS point: $_$ \square | Active Floodplain | Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: \square Low-Flow Channel GPS point: $_$ \square | Active Floodplain | Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: \square Low-Flow Channel GPS point: \square \square \square \square \square Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: \square \square \square \square \square Total veg cover: \square | Active Floodplain $ab: \underline{0}\%$ Herb: $\underline{95}\%$ \Box Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, s | Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: \Box Low-Flow Channel GPS point: $\Box I \le 0$ Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: $\Box A = 0$ Total veg cover: $\P \subseteq \%$ Tree: 0 Community successional stage: \square NA \Box Early (herbaceous & seedlings) | Active Floodplain ab: $ @$ % Herb: $ \frac{95}{5} %$ Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, s Late (herbaceous, shrubs, r | Low Terrace aplings) nature trees) |
| Floodplain unit: \Box Low-Flow Channel GPS point: \Box \Box \Box \Box Characteristics of the floodplain unit: \Box \Box \Box Characteristics of the floodplain unit: \Box \Box \Box \Box Characteristics of the floodplain unit: \Box \Box \Box \Box Characteristics of the floodplain unit: \Box \Box \Box \Box Characteristics of the floodplain unit: \Box \Box \Box \Box Characteristics of the floodplain unit: \Box \Box \Box \Box Characteristics of the floodplain unit: \Box \Box \Box \Box Characteristics of the floodplain unit: \Box \Box \Box \Box Average sediment texture: \Box \Box \Box \Box \Box \Box \Box Total veg cover: \P Ξ % \Box \Box \Box \Box \Box \Box \Box \Box \Box Community successional stage: \Box | □ Active Floodplain ub:% Herb: <u>¶5%</u> □ Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, s □ Late (herbaceous, shrubs, r | Low Terrace aplings) nature trees) |
| Floodplain unit: GPS point: DCSG-01 Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: May Defined Total veg cover: May Defined May Community successional stage: NA Early (herbaceous & seedlings) ndicators: Mudcracks | □ Active Floodplain ub:% Herb: <u>¶5</u> % □ Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, s □ Late (herbaceous, shrubs, r □ Soil development | Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: GPS point: D/S(-0) Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: (DAY 000000000000000000000000000000000000 | Active Floodplain Active Floodplain Active Floodplain Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, s Active Herb: <u>15%</u> Soil development Surface relief | Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Mather Community successional stage: NA Early (herbaceous & seedlings) ndicators: Mudcracks Ripples Drift and/or debris | Active Floodplain Active Floodplain Active Floodplain Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, s Active Floodplain Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, s Soil development Surface relief Other: Scarce | Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Ma Total veg cover: 95% Tree: 0% Shru Community successional stage: NA Early (herbaceous & seedlings) ndicators: Mudcracks Ripples Drift and/or debris Presence of bed and bank Benches | Active Floodplain Active Floodplain Active Floodplain Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, s Active Herb: <u>95%</u> Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, s Late (herbaceous, shrubs, s Soil development Surface relief Other: <u>Scance</u> Other: <u>Conce</u> Other: | Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Ma Total veg cover: 95% Tree: 0% Shru Community successional stage: NA Early (herbaceous & seedlings) indicators: Mudcracks Ripples Drift and/or debris Presence of bed and bank Benches | Active Floodplain Active Floodp | Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: Low-Flow Channel GPS point: DCS-0 Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: MA Total veg cover: 95% Tree: 0% Total veg cover: 95% Tree: 0% Shru Shru Community successional stage: 0% NA Early (herbaceous & seedlings) ndicators: NA Mudcracks Ripples Drift and/or debris Presence of bed and bank Benches Somments: Low FLOW CHANCE LATION | Active Floodplain Active Floodp | Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: Iow-Flow Channel GPS point: DCS Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: MA Total veg cover: 95% Tree: 0% Shru Shru Community successional stage: % NA Early (herbaceous & seedlings) ndicators: Mudcracks Ripples Drift and/or debris Presence of bed and bank Benches Comments: Low FLOW CHANGE of CHANGE INTED BUNCHING of CHANGE INTED BUNCHING of CHANGE INTED | Active Floodplain Active Floodp | LEVAtions (|
| Floodplain unit: Low-Flow Channel GPS point: DCSC-D Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: MA Total veg cover: 95% Tree: 0% Total veg cover: 95% Tree: 0% Shructure: 0% Average sediment texture: 0% Total veg cover: 95% Tree: 0% Shructure: 0% NA 2% Early (herbaceous & seedlings) ndicators: NA Mudcracks Ripples Drift and/or debris Presence of bed and bank Benches 1000000000000000000000000000000000000 | Active Floodplain Active Floodp | LEVATIONS / |

| Cross section drawing: | and the strength of the streng |
|---|--|
| e N | 244 a los A |
| | |
| | 1 million be advantage |
| al al | Are an tradition |
| | CVEGEINTED CHANNEL |
| | |
| <u>OHWM</u> | |
| CBS point: DISC-07 | |
| 95453777 1-12063737 | 5 |
| Indicators: | |
| Change in average sediment texture | Break in bank slope |
| Change in vegetation species | Other: |
| Change in vegetation cover | Other: |
| | |
| comments: | |
| VEGETATED SWALE - LOW | S FLOW CHANNEL DONA BUT. |
| FAC FACE SPELIES | |
| | |
| | |
| and a second | |
| | |
| Floodplain unit: Low-Flow Channel | Active Floodplain Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: E Low-Flow Channel | Active Floodplain Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: DLow-Flow Channel GPS point: DLSS - 02 | Active Floodplain Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: DLow-Flow Channel GPS point: DLSS - OT Characteristics of the floodplain unit: | Active Floodplain Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: DLow-Flow Channel GPS point: DLSS - 02 Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: CLAY LOAN | Active Floodplain Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: Description Channel GPS point: Description Channel Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: CLAN LOAN Total veg cover: NO % Tree: M | Active Floodplain Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: \square Low-Flow Channel GPS point: \square Communit: Average sediment texture: \square Low-Flow Channel Total veg cover: \square % \square Tree: \square % Community successional stage: \square NA | Active Floodplain Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: \square Low-Flow Channel GPS point: \square (Second States of the floodplain unit: Characteristics of the floodplain unit: \square (Second States of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: \square (Second States of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: \square (Second States of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: \square (Second States of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: \square (Second States of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: \square (Second States of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: \square (Second States of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: \square (Second States of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: \square (Second States of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: \square (Second States of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: \square (Second States of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: \square (Second States of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: \square (Second States of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: \square (Second States of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: \square (Second States of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: <th< td=""><td>Active Floodplain Low Terrace Active Floodplain Shrub:% Herb:%</td></th<> | Active Floodplain Low Terrace Active Floodplain Shrub:% Herb:% |
| Floodplain unit: Discourse GPS point: Discourse Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Classical loan Total veg cover: 00 % Tree: % Community successional stage: NA M Early (herbaceous & seedlings) | Active Floodplain Low Terrace Active Floodplain Shrub: |
| Floodplain unit: GPS point: DISS - 02 Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: CLAN LORM Total veg cover: N0 % Tree: % Community successional stage: NA Early (herbaceous & seedlings) andicators: | Active Floodplain Low Terrace Active Floodplain Low Terrace Shrub:% Herb:00_% Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) Late (herbaceous, shrubs, mature trees) |
| Floodplain unit: End provide the floodplain unit: Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Classical veg cover: D % Tree: % Community successional stage: NA Y Early (herbaceous & seedlings) | Active Floodplain Low Terrace Shrub:% Herb:% Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) Late (herbaceous, shrubs, mature trees) Soil development |
| Floodplain unit: End plain unit: Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Chan be way to b | Active Floodplain Low Terrace Shrub:% Herb:00% Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) Late (herbaceous, shrubs, mature trees) Soil development Surface relief |
| Floodplain unit: End of the floodplain unit: Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Classical data Total veg cover: Image: | Active Floodplain Low Terrace Shrub:% Herb:% Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) Late (herbaceous, shrubs, mature trees) Soil development Surface relief Other: |
| Floodplain unit: End of the floodplain unit: Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Classical definition Total veg cover: 00 % Community successional stage: NA Ø Early (herbaceous & seedlings) indicators: Mudcracks Ripples Drift and/or debris Presence of bed and bank | Active Floodplain Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: End of the floodplain unit: Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Class Total veg cover: D % Tree: % Community successional stage: NA Ø Early (herbaceous & seedlings) ndicators: Mudcracks Ripples Drift and/or debris Presence of bed and bank Benches | Active Floodplain Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: Element: Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Class Total veg cover: NA Early (herbaceous & seedlings) indicators: Mudcracks Ripples Drift and/or debris Presence of bed and bank Benches | Active Floodplain Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: Eloodplain unit: GPS point: DCSS-02 Characteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Clay Total veg cover: D % Tree: Ma © Early (herbaceous & seedlings) andicators: Mudcracks Ripples Drift and/or debris Presence of bed and bank Benches comments: LOW | Active Floodplain Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: Element: Description: Description: <td>Active Floodplain Low Terrace</td> | Active Floodplain Low Terrace |
| Floodplain unit: End of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Clay Loan Total veg cover: D % Tree: Ø % Community successional stage: NA Ø Early (herbaceous & seedlings) andicators: Mudcracks Bripples Drift and/or debris Presence of bed and bank Benches omments: Low Flow CHANNEL DEFINE SPECIES & CHANGE IN ELL | Active Floodplain Low Terrace |

| Cross section drawing: | $M_L^2 d^{1-2} M = M_L^2 + 1$ |
|--|--|
| EN OHW | M |
| | 1 is held it is here in the |
| the second second second | A WALL (CHARTER) |
| T | Alexandrey |
| LVE6EIM | FD CHANNEL |
| | and the second |
| DHWM | a set and a set of a set |
| | |
| GPS point: DLSS - 03 | |
| 35.453961 1-120.636670 | 115 ¹ |
| ndicators: | 1 |
| Change in vegetation species | Break in bank slope |
| Change in vegetation species | Other: |
| | |
| omments. CHALL DIAL MALAN DE ON | |
| HANNEL & BUSIES UNCODERING DRAIN | AGE WITH GENTLY SLOPED BANKS |
| UDEVAL WEARING SOLVES | HERBACEOUS COVER - GRASSES & |
| MEETING MEETING OFFICIES. | |
| | |
| n and a second | and the second |
| | and the second secon |
| Low-Flow Channel | Active Floodplain Low Terrace |
| | |
| PS noint: DICS-03 | a de la |
| PS point: DUSS - 03 | La sere a la la sere a la sere de sere |
| PS point: $D(SS - O3)$ | en e |
| PS point: haracteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: | n tha sins the state of the sta |
| PS point: haracteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: <u>CLay Loam</u> Fotal veg cover: <u>45</u> % Tree: <u>20</u> % Shrub: <u>6</u> | 2% Herb: <u>25_</u> % |
| PS point: <u>DUSS - 03</u> haracteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: <u>CLay Loam</u> Total veg cover: <u>45</u> % Tree: <u>20</u> % Shrub: <u>6</u> Community successional stage: | 2_% Herb: <u>25</u> % |
| PS point: haracteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: <u>CLay Laam</u> Total veg cover: <u>45</u> % Tree: <u>20</u> % Shrub: <u>6</u> Community successional stage: NA | 2_% Herb: <u>25</u> % Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) |
| PS point: haracteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: <u>CLay Loan</u> Total veg cover: <u>45</u> % Tree: <u>20</u> % Shrub: <u>6</u> Community successional stage: NA @ Early (herbaceous & seedlings) | 2_% Herb: <u>25</u> % Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) Late (herbaceous, shrubs, mature trees) |
| PS point: haracteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: <u>Chart Laam</u> Total veg cover: <u>45</u> % Tree: <u>20</u> % Shrub: <u>6</u> Community successional stage: NA Early (herbaceous & seedlings) dicators: | 2 % Herb: 25 % Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) Late (herbaceous, shrubs, mature trees) |
| PS point: haracteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: <u>CLay Laam</u> Total veg cover: <u>45</u> % Tree: <u>20</u> % Shrub: <u>C</u> Community successional stage: NA @ Early (herbaceous & seedlings) dicators: | 2_% Herb: <u>∠5_%</u> Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) Late (herbaceous, shrubs, mature trees) Soil development |
| PS point: | <u>2</u>% Herb: <u>25</u>% Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) Late (herbaceous, shrubs, mature trees) Soil development Surface relief |
| PS point: | <u>2</u>% Herb: <u>25</u>% Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) Late (herbaceous, shrubs, mature trees) Soil development Surface relief Other: Scource |
| PS point: | 2_% Herb: <u>25</u> % Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) Late (herbaceous, shrubs, mature trees) Soil development Surface relief Other: <u>SCOUR</u> Other: |
| PS point: | <u>2</u>% Herb: <u>25</u>% Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) Late (herbaceous, shrubs, mature trees) Soil development Surface relief Other: <u>Scoup</u> Other: Other: |
| PS point: DUSS - 03 haracteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Dust for the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Dust for the floodplain unit: Total veg cover: 45 % Tree: 20% Shrub: 6 Community successional stage: 1 1 NA 1 1 1 Yearly (herbaceous & seedlings) 1 1 dicators: 1 1 1 Mudcracks 1 1 1 Presence of bed and bank 1 1 1 Presence of bed and bank 1 1 1 Benches 1 1 1 1 Optimized for the second bank 1 1 1 Mudcracks 1 1 1 1 <t< td=""><td>2_% Herb: 25_% Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) Late (herbaceous, shrubs, mature trees) Soil development Surface relief Other:</td></t<> | 2_% Herb: 25_% Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) Late (herbaceous, shrubs, mature trees) Soil development Surface relief Other: |
| PS point: DUSS - 03 haracteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Dust floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Dust floodplain unit: Total veg cover: 45 % Tree: 20 % Shrub: Community successional stage: Image: Image: Image: NA Image: Image: Image: NA Image: Image: Image: Image: Image: Image: </td <td>2 % Herb: 25 % Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) Late (herbaceous, shrubs, mature trees) Soil development Surface relief Other: <u>Scour</u> Other: Other:</td> | 2 % Herb: 25 % Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) Late (herbaceous, shrubs, mature trees) Soil development Surface relief Other: <u>Scour</u> Other: Other: |
| PS point: DUSS - 03 haracteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Clay Loam Total veg cover: 45 % Tree: 20 % Shrub: Community successional stage: Image: NA Image: Image: NA Image: Image: Image: NA Image: Image: Image: Image: | 2_% Herb: 25_% Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) Late (herbaceous, shrubs, mature trees) Soil development Surface relief Other: Other: Other: Other: |
| PS point: DUSS - 03 haracteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: Duam Total veg cover: 45 % Tree: 20 % Shrub: Community successional stage: Image: NA Image: Image: MA Image: Image: MA Image: Image: Image: Image: Image: | 2 % Herb: 25 % Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) Late (herbaceous, shrubs, mature trees) Soil development Surface relief Other: <u>Scour</u> Other: <u>Scour</u> |
| PS point: DUSS-03 haracteristics of the floodplain unit: Average sediment texture: <u>Chay Learn</u> Total veg cover: <u>45</u> % Tree: <u>20</u> % Shrub: <u>C</u> Community successional stage: NA P Early (herbaceous & seedlings) dicators: Mudcracks Ripples Drift and/or debris Presence of bed and bank Benches MITH HURBACEOUS (OVER; A S | 2_% Herb: <u>25</u> % Mid (herbaceous, shrubs, saplings) Late (herbaceous, shrubs, mature trees) Soil development Surface relief Other: <u>Scour</u> Other: <u>Scour</u> Other: <u>Scour</u> Other: <u>Scour</u> Other: <u>Scour</u> Other: <u>Scour</u> MEL IS SPARSELS MEDIMIED INFORMATIVE WILLOW IS |



APPENDIX D: Representative Site Photographs







Photo 1. View southwest of ephemeral drainage bisecting the proposed development area.



Photo 2. View northeast of the existing culvert under Viejo Camino.





Photo 3. View northwest toward existing structure at the northern property boundary.



Photo 4. View north of the ephemeral drainage with evidence of scour, just upstream of the culvert under Viejo Camino.





Photo 5. View west of the existing culvert under El Camino Real.



Photo 6. Soil plug excavated at SP-02 during the wetland delineation.