

Tommy Gong
San Luis Obispo
County Clerk-Recorder
Main Office: (805) 781-5080
Atascadero: (805) 461-6041
www.slovote.com

Receipt: 19-35669

ProductName	Extended
FISH FISH AND WILDLIFE FILING	\$2,404.75
# Pages	43
Document #	40-10022019-270
Document Info: COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO	
Filing Type	ND
<hr/>	
Total	\$2,404.75
Tender (On Account)	\$2,404.75
Account#	CTY
Account Name	JE except TX & DSS
Balance	\$22,174.25
Comment	1002022152

PLEASE KEEP FOR REFERENCE

10/2/19 2:45 PM nbalseiro
San Luis Obispo

Tommy Gong

San Luis Obispo

County Clerk-Recorder

Main Office: (805) 781-8080

Alisal: (805) 481-8041

www.slo.courts.ca.gov

Receipt # 15-00000

Extended Production

\$2,404.75 FISH AND WILDLIFE

FILING

43

% Pages

40-1003018-370

Document #

COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO

Document #

ND

Filing Type

\$2,404.75 Total

\$2,404.75 Tender (On Account)

Account # QTY

Account items to exceed TX & DTS

Balance \$2,174.25

Comment 100503182

PLEASE KEEP FOR REFERENCE

100503182 FISH AND WILDLIFE

San Luis Obispo



State of California - Department of Fish and Wildlife
2019 ENVIRONMENTAL FILING FEE CASH RECEIPT
 DFW 753.5a (REV. 12/01/18) Previously DFG 753.5a

RECEIPT NUMBER: 40-10022019-270
STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER (If applicable) 2019079003

SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON REVERSE. TYPE OR PRINT CLEARLY.

LEAD AGENCY COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO	LEAD AGENCY EMAIL hhipps@co.slo.ca.us	DATE 10/02/2019
COUNTY/STATE AGENCY OF FILING SAN LUIS OBISPO		DOCUMENT NUMBER

PROJECT TITLE
CALLERY MINOR USE PERMIT DRC2018-00189

PROJECT APPLICANT NAME LENA CALLERY	PROJECT APPLICANT EMAIL nelson@nrbdrafting.biz	PHONE NUMBER (805) 237-3746
PROJECT APPLICANT ADDRESS 4170 WHISPERING OAK WAY	CITY PASO ROBLES	STATE CA
		ZIP CODE 93446

PROJECT APPLICANT (Check appropriate box)

Local Public Agency
 School District
 Other Special District
 State Agency
 Private Entity


CHECK APPLICABLE FEES:

<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Impact Report (EIR)	\$3,271.00	\$ _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mitigated/Negative Declaration (MND)(ND)	\$2,354.75	\$ <u>2,354.75</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Regulatory Program (CRP) document - payment due directly to CDFW	\$1,112.00	\$ _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Exempt from fee		
<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Exemption (attach)		
<input type="checkbox"/> CDFW No Effect Determination (attach)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee previously paid (attach previously issued cash receipt copy)		

<input type="checkbox"/> Water Right Application or Petition Fee (State Water Resources Control Board only)	\$850.00	\$ _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> County documentary handling fee		\$ <u>50.00</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Other		\$ _____
PAYMENT METHOD:	TOTAL RECEIVED	\$ <u>2,404.75</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Cash <input type="checkbox"/> Credit <input type="checkbox"/> Check <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other		

SIGNATURE x <i>Naomi Balseiro</i>	AGENCY OF FILING PRINTED NAME AND TITLE Naomi Balseiro, Deputy County Clerk-Recorder
--------------------------------------	---

Filed in County Clerk's Office
 Tommy Gong
 San Luis Obispo - County Clerk-Recorder
40-10022019-270
 10/02/2019
 FISH
 Pages: 43
 Fee: \$ 2404.75
 By nbalseiro, Deputy





Negative Declaration & Notice Of Determination

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND BUILDING
976 OSOS STREET • ROOM 200 • SAN LUIS OBISPO • CALIFORNIA 93408 • (805) 781-5600

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION NO. ED18-033

DATE: June 25, 2019

PROJECT/ENTITLEMENT: Gallery Minor Use Permit DRC2018-00189

APPLICANT NAME: Lena Callery **Email:** nelson@nrbdrafting.biz
ADDRESS: 4170 Whispering Oak Way, Paso Robles, CA, 93446
CONTACT PERSON: Nelson Bernal **Telephone:** 805-237-3746

PROPOSED USES/INTENT: A request by Lena Callery for a Minor Use Permit (DRC2018-00189) to allow the construction of a 551-square-foot guest house that will be attached to a 1,178-square-foot garage/workshop. The applicant is requesting a modification of the distance requirement that requires a guest house to be located within 50 feet of the primary residency to allow the guest house to be located 150 feet from the primary residence.

LOCATION: The project is located on the east side of Whispering Oaks Way (at 4170 Whispering Oaks Way), approximately 1,050 feet, east of Jardine Road, approximately 4.5 miles east of the City of Paso Robles, in the Salinas River Sub Area of the North County planning area.

(ENDORSED)
FILED

LEAD AGENCY: County of San Luis Obispo
Dept of Planning & Building
976 Osos Street, Rm. 200
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040
Website: <http://www.sloplanning.org>

OCT 02 2019

TOMMY GONG, COUNTY CLERK
NAOMI DALSEN
DEPUTY CLERK

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW: YES NO

OTHER POTENTIAL PERMITTING AGENCIES: CA Department Fish and Wildlife, Environmental Health

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: Additional information pertaining to this Environmental Determination may be obtained by contacting the above Lead Agency address or (805)781-5600.

COUNTY "REQUEST FOR REVIEW" PERIOD ENDS AT4:30 p.m. (2 wks from above DATE)

30-DAY PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD begins at the time of public notification

Notice of Determination

State Clearinghouse No. 2019079063

This is to advise that the San Luis Obispo County _____ as Lead Agency Responsible Agency approved/denied the above described project on 8/13/19, and has made the following determinations regarding the above described project:

The project will not have a significant effect on the environment. A Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the provisions of CEQA. Mitigation measures and monitoring were made a condition of approval of the project. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was not adopted for this project. Findings were made pursuant to the provisions of CEQA.

This is to certify that the Negative Declaration with comments and responses and record of project approval is available to the General Public at the 'Lead Agency' address above.

	Holly Phipps	8/23/19	County of San Luis Obispo
Signature	Project Manager Name	Date	Public Agency



Initial Study Summary – Environmental Checklist

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND BUILDING
976 OSOS STREET • ROOM 200 • SAN LUIS OBISPO • CALIFORNIA 93408 • (805) 781-5600

(ver 6.1)2ma.6cm

Project Title & No. Callery Minor Use Permit/DRC2018-00189 ED18-133

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 study.

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology and Soils	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation
<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Wastewater
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Water /Hydrology
<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services/Utilities	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation, the Environmental Coordinator finds that:

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

Holly Phipps (hhipps@co.slo.ca.us)		May 9, 2019
Prepared by (Print)	Signature	Date
Kate Shea		June 25, 2019
Reviewed by (Print)	Signature	Date

Project Environmental Analysis

The County'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 surroundings and a detailed review of the information in the file for the project. In addition, available background information is reviewed for each project. Relevant information regarding soil types and characteristics, geologic information, significant vegetation and/or wildlife resources, water availability, wastewater disposal services, 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 the Initial Study. The County Planning Department 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 County of San Luis Obispo Planning Department, 976 Osos Street, Rm. 200, San Luis Obispo, CA, 93408-2040 or call (805) 781-5600.

A. PROJECT

DESCRIPTION: A request by Lena Callery for a Minor Use Permit (DRC2018-00189) to allow the construction of a 551-square-foot guest house that will be attached to a 1,178-square-foot garage/workshop. The applicant is requesting a modification of the distance requirement that requires a guest house to be located within 50 feet of the primary residency to allow the guest house to be located 150 feet from the primary residence. The project would result in the disturbance of approximately 0.19 acres (8,276 square feet) of a 2.0 acre parcel. The proposed project is within the Residential Suburban and Airport Review land use category. The project is located on the east side of Whispering Oak Way, approximately 1,050 feet, east of Jardine Road, approximately 4.5 miles east of the City of Paso Robles, in the Salinas River Sub Area of the North County planning area.

ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER(S): 015-082-022

Latitude: 35 degrees 39' 44.26365" N Longitude: 120 degrees 36' 7.11764" W

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT # 1

B. EXISTING SETTING

PLAN AREA: North County

SUB: Salinas River

COMM:

LAND USE CATEGORY: Residential Suburban

COMB. DESIGNATION: Airport Review

PARCEL SIZE: 1.95 acres

TOPOGRAPHY: Nearly level to gently rolling

VEGETATION: Urban-built up

EXISTING USES: Single-family residence(s)

SURROUNDING LAND USE CATEGORIES AND USES:

<i>North:</i> Residential Suburban; residential	<i>East:</i> Residential Suburban; residential
<i>South:</i> Residential Suburban; residential	<i>West:</i> Residential Suburban; residential

C. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

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



COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1. AESTHETICS	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
<i>Will the project:</i>				
a) Create an aesthetically incompatible site open to public view?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Introduce a use within a scenic view open to public view?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Change the visual character of an area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create glare or night lighting, which may affect surrounding areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Impact unique geological or physical features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Aesthetics

Setting. The project will not be visible from any major public roadway or silhouette against any ridgelines as viewed from public roadways. The project is considered compatible with the surrounding uses.

Impact. No significant visual impacts are expected to occur.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No mitigation measures are necessary.

2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
<i>Will the project:</i>				
a) Convert prime agricultural land, per NRCS soil classification, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

Will the project:

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
b) <i>Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Impair agricultural use of other property or result in conversion to other uses?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or Williamson Act program?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Agricultural Resources

Setting. Project Elements. The following area-specific elements relate to the property's importance for agricultural production:

Land Use Category: Residential Suburban

Historic/Existing Commercial Crops: None

State Classification: Not prime farmland

In Agricultural Preserve? Yes, Estrella
Agricultural Preserve Area

Under Williamson Act contract? No

The soil type(s) and characteristics on the subject property include:

Ayar and Diablo soils (9 - 15 % slope).

Ayar. This moderately sloping clayey soil is considered very poorly drained. The soil has moderate erodibility and high shrink-swell characteristics, as well as having potential septic system constraints due to: shallow depth to bedrock, slow percolation. The soil is considered Class IV without irrigation and Class III when irrigated.

Sesame sandy loam (9 - 30 % slope). This moderately sloping, coarse loamy soil is considered not well drained. The soil has moderate erodibility and low shrink-swell characteristics, as well as having potential septic system constraints due to: steep slopes, shallow depth to bedrock. The soil is considered Class IV without irrigation and Class IV when irrigated.

Impact. The project is located in a predominantly non-agricultural area with no agricultural activities occurring on the property or immediate vicinity. No significant impacts to agricultural resources are anticipated.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No mitigation measures are necessary.

3. AIR QUALITY

Will the project:

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Violate any state or federal ambient air quality standard, or exceed air quality emission thresholds as established by County Air Pollution Control District?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Expose any sensitive receptor to substantial air pollutant concentrations?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Create or subject individuals to objectionable odors?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Be inconsistent with the District's Clean Air Plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant either considered in non-attainment under applicable state or federal ambient air quality standards that are due to increased energy use or traffic generation, or intensified land use change?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GREENHOUSE GASES				
f) <i>Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) <i>Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ENERGY				
h) <i>Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) <i>Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Air Quality

Setting. The Air Pollution Control District (APCD) has developed and updated their CEQA Air Quality Handbook (2012) to evaluate project specific impacts and help determine if air quality mitigation measures are needed, or if potentially significant impacts could result. To evaluate long-term emissions, cumulative effects, and establish countywide programs to reach acceptable air quality levels, a Clean Air Plan has been adopted (prepared by APCD).

The project proposes to disturb soils that have been given a wind erodibility rating of 4, which is considered “moderate”.

Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth’s average surface temperature. This is commonly referred to as global warming. The rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth’s climate system. This is also known as climate change. These changes are now thought to be broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels.

The passage of AB32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act (2006), recognized the need to reduce GHG emissions and set the greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal for the State of California into law. The law required that by 2020, State emissions must be reduced to 1990 levels. This is to be accomplished by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from significant sources via regulation, market mechanisms, and other actions. Subsequent legislation (e.g., SB97-Greenhouse Gas Emissions bill) directed the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop statewide thresholds.

In March 2012, the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) approved thresholds for GHG emission impacts, and these thresholds have been incorporated the APCD’s CEQA Air Quality Handbook. APCD determined that a tiered process for residential / commercial land use projects was the most appropriate and effective approach for assessing the GHG emission impacts. The tiered approach includes three methods, any of which can be used for any given project:

1. **Qualitative GHG Reduction Strategies** (e.g. Climate Action Plans): A qualitative threshold that is consistent with AB 32 Scoping Plan measures and goals; or,
2. **Bright-Line Threshold**: Numerical value to determine the significance of a project’s annual GHG emissions; or,
3. **Efficiency-Based Threshold**: Assesses the GHG impacts of a project on an emissions per capita basis.

For most projects the Bright-Line Threshold of 1,150 Metric Tons CO₂/year (MT CO₂e/yr) will be the most applicable threshold. In addition to the residential/commercial threshold options proposed above, a bright-line numerical value threshold of 10,000 MT CO₂e/yr was adopted for stationary source (industrial) projects.

It should be noted that projects that generate less than the above mentioned thresholds will also participate in emission reductions because air emissions, including GHGs, are under the purview of the California Air Resources Board (or other regulatory agencies) and will be “regulated” either by CARB, the Federal Government, or other entities. For example, new vehicles will be subject to increased fuel economy standards and emission reductions, large and small appliances will be subject to more strict emissions standards, and energy delivered to consumers will increasingly come from renewable sources. Other programs that are intended to reduce the overall GHG emissions include Low Carbon Fuel Standards, Renewable Portfolio standards and the Clean Car standards. As a result, even the emissions that result from projects that produce fewer emissions than the threshold will be subject to emission reductions.

Under CEQA, an individual project’s GHG emissions will generally not result in direct significant impacts. This is because the climate change issue is global in nature. However, an individual project could be found to contribute to a potentially significant cumulative impact. Projects that have GHG emissions above the noted thresholds may be considered cumulatively considerable and require mitigation.

Impact. As proposed, the project will result in the disturbance of approximately square feet. This will result in the creation of construction dust, as well as short- and long-term vehicle emissions. The project will be moving less than 1,200 cubic yards/day of material and will disturb less than four acres of area, and therefore will be below the general thresholds triggering construction-related mitigation. The project is also not in close proximity to sensitive receptors that might otherwise result in nuisance complaints

and be subject to limited dust and/or emission control measures during construction.

From an operational standpoint, based on Table 1-1 of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook (2012), the project will not exceed operational thresholds triggering mitigation. The project is consistent with the general level of development anticipated and projected in the Clean Air Plan. No significant air quality impacts are expected to occur.

This project is a development of one 551 square foot guest house unit with a 1178 sf garage/workshop. Using the GHG threshold information described in the Setting section, the project is expected to generate less than the Bright-Line Threshold of 1,150 metric tons of GHG emissions. Therefore, the project's potential direct and cumulative GHG emissions are found to be less significant and less than a cumulatively considerable contribution to GHG emissions. Section 15064(h)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines provide guidance on how to evaluate cumulative impacts. If it is shown that an incremental contribution to a cumulative impact, such as global climate change, is not 'cumulatively considerable', no mitigation is required. Because this project's emissions fall under the threshold, no mitigation is required.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No mitigation measures are necessary.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Will the project:

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Result in a loss of unique or special status species* or their habitats?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Reduce the extent, diversity or quality of native or other important vegetation?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Impact wetland or riparian habitat?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Interfere with the movement of resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or factors, which could hinder the normal activities of wildlife?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Conflict with any regional plans or policies to protect sensitive species, or regulations of the California Department of Fish & Wildlife or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

* Species – as defined in Section 15380 of the CEQA Guidelines, which includes all plant and wildlife species that fall under the category of rare, threatened or endangered, as described in this section.

Biological Resources

Setting. The following are existing elements on or near the proposed project relating to potential biological concerns:

On-site Vegetation: Urban Built Up

Name and distance from blue line creek(s): greater than 750 feet

Habitat(s): Southern California Coastal Scrub

Site's tree canopy coverage: Approximately 0%.

The Natural Diversity Database (or other biological references) identified the following species potentially existing within approximately one mile of the proposed project:

Wildlife:

San Joaquin kit fox (*Vulpes macrotis mutica*) FE, ST

San Joaquin kit fox (*Vulpes macrotis mutica*) has been found about 1.8 miles to the north. The San Joaquin kit fox is Federal Endangered and California Threatened. The kit fox is uncommon to rare. They reside in arid regions of the southern half of the state (Grinnell et al. 1937, Wilson and Ruff 1999:150). This usually nocturnal mammal lives in annual grasslands or grassy open stages of vegetation dominated by scattered brush, shrubs, and scrub. Kit foxes primarily are carnivorous, subsisting on black-tailed jackrabbits and desert cottontails, rodents (especially kangaroo rats and ground squirrels), insects, reptiles, and some birds, bird eggs, and vegetation (Egoscue 1962, Laughrin 1970, Morrell 1971, 1972, Orloff et al. 1986). Their cover is provided by dens they dig in open, level areas with loose-textured, sandy and loamy soils (Laughrin 1970, Morrell 1972). Pups are born in these dens in February through April. Pups are weaned at about 4-5 months. May not require a source of drinking water. Some agricultural areas may support these foxes. Potential predators are coyotes, large hawks and owls, eagles, and bobcats. Cultivation has eliminated much habitat. Kit foxes are vulnerable to many human activities, such as hunting, use of rodenticides and other poisons, off-road vehicles, and trapping.

The project site occurs within the Carrizo Vernal Pool Region, as designated by the California Department of Fish and Game

Impact. The proposed project will result in the disturbance of approximately 8,276 square feet on a 2.0 acre parcel. The project would result in the permanent site disturbance (due to structures, access driveway, and leach fields) of 0.19 acres (8,276 square feet) being removed from kit fox habitat.

With regards to the San Joaquin Kit Fox, based on the results of previous Kit Fox Habitat Evaluations that have been conducted for the Paso Robles area, the standard mitigation ratio for projects on parcels less than 40 acres in size has been established as 3:1. This means that all impacts to kit fox habitat must be mitigated at a ratio of 3 acres conserved for each acre impacted (3:1). The project will result in the permanent disturbance of less than one acre of kit fox habitat, resulting in a significant but mitigable impact.

Applicants have the option of hiring a qualified biologist to conduct a Kit Fox Habitat Evaluation of the project site if the applicant believes that the evaluation would lower the score and reduce the required mitigation ratio. The applicant has chosen to accept the standard mitigation ratio of 3:1, which requires that a total compensatory acreage of **0.57** (8,276 square feet multiplied by a 3:1 ratio) be mitigated.

Mitigation/Conclusion. With regards to the San Joaquin Kit Fox, the applicant will be required to mitigate the loss of 8,276 square feet of kit fox habitat at a 3:1 ratio by one of the following ways:

- ✓ Deposit of funds to an approved in-lieu fee program;
- ✓ provide for the protection of kit foxes in perpetuity through acquisition of fee or conservation easement of suitable habitat in the kit fox corridor area; or
- ✓ purchase credits in an approved conservation bank.

To prevent inadvertent harm to kit fox, the applicant shall be required to retain a biologist for a pre-construction survey, a pre-construction briefing for contractors, and monitoring activities in addition to implementing cautionary construction measures. These mitigation measures are listed in detail in Exhibit B Mitigation Summary Table.

The implementation of the above measures will mitigate biological impacts to a level of insignificance.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Disturb archaeological resources?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Disturb historical resources?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Disturb paleontological resources?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Cause a substantial adverse change to a Tribal Cultural Resource?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Cultural Resources

Setting. The project is located in an area historically occupied by the . No historic structures are present and no paleontological resources are known to exist in the area.

In July, 2015, the legislature added the new requirements to the CEQA process regarding tribal cultural resources in Assembly Bill 52 (Gatto, 2014). By including tribal cultural resources early in the CEQA process, the legislature intended to ensure that local and Tribal governments, public agencies, and project proponents would have information available, early in the project planning process, to identify and address potential adverse impacts to tribal cultural resources. By taking this proactive approach, the legislature also intended to reduce the potential for delay and conflicts in the environmental review process.

Impact. The project is not located in an area that would be considered culturally sensitive due to lack of physical features typically associated with prehistoric occupation. No evidence of cultural materials was noted on the property. Per AB52, tribal consultation was performed and no resources were identified. Impacts to historical or paleontological resources are not expected.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No significant cultural resource impacts are expected to occur, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Result in exposure to or production of unstable earth conditions, such as landslides, earthquakes, liquefaction, ground failure, land subsidence or other similar hazards?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Will the project:

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
b) <i>Be within a California Geological Survey "Alquist-Priolo" Earthquake Fault Zone", or other known fault zones*?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Result in soil erosion, topographic changes, loss of topsoil or unstable soil conditions from project-related improvements, such as vegetation removal, grading, excavation, or fill?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Include structures located on expansive soils?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Be inconsistent with the goals and policies of the County's Safety Element relating to Geologic and Seismic Hazards?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) <i>Preclude the future extraction of valuable mineral resources?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

* Per Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication #42

Setting. The following relates to the project's geologic aspects or conditions:

Topography: Project Manager complete

Within County's Geologic Study Area?: No

Landslide Risk Potential: Low

Liquefaction Potential: Low

Nearby potentially active faults?: No Distance? Not applicable

Area known to contain serpentine or ultramafic rock or soils?: No

Shrink/Swell potential of soil: Not known

Other notable geologic features? None

Due to the distance of any known fault (at least three miles away) or serpentine rock outcrop (at least three miles away), it is not expected that any naturally occurring asbestos would be encountered during any earthmoving activities.

Geology and Soils

A sedimentation and erosion control plan is required for all construction and grading projects (LUO Sec. 22.52.120) to minimize these impacts. When required, the plan is prepared by a civil engineer to address both temporary and long-term sedimentation and erosion impacts.

Impact. As proposed, the project will result in the disturbance of approximately 8,276 square feet.

Mitigation/Conclusion. There is no evidence that measures above what will already be required by ordinance or codes are needed.

7. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Will the project:

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Create a hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>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?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼-mile of an existing or proposed school?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Be located on, or adjacent to, a site which is included on a list of hazardous material/waste sites compiled pursuant to Gov't Code 65962.5 ("Cortese List"), and result in an adverse public health condition?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Impair implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) <i>If within the Airport Review designation, or near a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) <i>Increase fire hazard risk or expose people or structures to high wildland fire hazard conditions?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) <i>Be within a 'very high' fire hazard severity zone?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) <i>Be within an area classified as a 'state responsibility' area as defined by CalFire?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) <i>Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



7. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Will the project:

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
k) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Setting. The project is not located in an area of known hazardous material contamination. The project is not within a 'high' or 'very high' severity risk area for fire. The project is within the Airport Review area.

Due to location, fire hazard severity data is unavailable. Based on the County's fire response time map, it will take approximately 0-5 minutes to respond to a call regarding fire or life safety. Refer to the Public Services section for further discussion on Fire Safety impacts.

Impact. The project does not propose the use of hazardous materials, nor the generation of hazardous wastes. The proposed project is not found on the 'Cortese List' (which is a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5). The project does not present a significant fire safety risk. The project is not expected to conflict with any regional emergency response or evacuation plan.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No significant impacts as a result of hazards or hazardous materials are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

8. NOISE

Will the project:

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) Expose people to noise levels that exceed the County Noise Element thresholds?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. NOISE

Will the project:

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
b) <i>Generate permanent increases in the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Cause a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise in the project vicinity?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Expose people to severe noise or vibration?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>If located within the Airport Review designation or adjacent to a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to severe noise levels?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Noise

Setting. The project is not within close proximity of loud noise sources and will not conflict with any sensitive noise receptors (e.g., residences). Based on the Noise Element's projected future noise generation from known stationary and vehicle-generated noise sources, the project is within an acceptable threshold area.

The project is within the Airport Review designation and the area is subject to relatively low aircraft flyovers.

Impact. The project is not expected to generate loud noises, nor conflict with the surrounding uses.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No significant noise impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

9. POPULATION/HOUSING

Will the project:

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Induce substantial growth in an area either directly (e.g., construct new homes or businesses) or indirectly (e.g., extension of major infrastructure)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Displace existing housing or people, requiring construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Create the need for substantial new housing in the area?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Population/Housing

Setting In its efforts to provide for affordable housing, the county currently administers the Home Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program and the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, which provides limited financing to projects relating to affordable housing throughout the county. The County's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance requires provision of new affordable housing in conjunction with both residential and nonresidential development and subdivisions.

Impact. The project will not result in a need for a significant amount of new housing and will not displace existing housing.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No significant population and housing impacts are anticipated. No mitigation measures are necessary.

10. PUBLIC SERVICES/UTILITIES

Will the 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 can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection (e.g., Sheriff, CHP)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Solid Wastes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Setting. The project area is served by the following public services/facilities:

<u>Police:</u> City of Paso Robles	Location: 840 10 th St. (Approximately 5.6 miles to the southwest)
<u>Fire:</u> Cal Fire (formerly CDF)	Hazard Severity: Data Response Time: 0-5 minutes Unavailable
Location: (Approximately 1.3 miles to the east)	
<u>School District:</u> Paso Robles Joint Unified School District.	

Public Services

For additional information regarding fire hazard impacts, go to the 'Hazards and Hazardous Materials' section

Impact. No significant project-specific impacts to utilities or public services were identified. This project, along with others in the area, will have a cumulative effect on police/sheriff and fire protection, and schools. The project's direct and cumulative impacts are within the general assumptions of allowed use for the subject property that was used to estimate the fees in place.

Mitigation/Conclusion. Regarding cumulative effects, public facility (County) and school (State Government Code 65995 et seq.) fee programs have been adopted to address this impact and will reduce the cumulative impacts to less than significant levels.

11. RECREATION

<i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Increase the use or demand for parks or other recreation opportunities?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Affect the access to trails, parks or other recreation opportunities?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Other _____</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Recreation

Setting. The County’s Parks and Recreation Element does not show that a potential trail goes through the proposed project. The project is not proposed in a location that will affect any trail, park, recreational resource, coastal access, and/or Natural Area.

Impact. The proposed project will not create a significant need for additional park, Natural Area, and/or recreational resources.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No significant recreation impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

12. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

<i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Increase vehicle trips to local or areawide circulation system?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Reduce existing “Level of Service” on public roadway(s)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Create unsafe conditions on public roadways (e.g., limited access, design features, sight distance, slow vehicles)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Provide for adequate emergency access?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Conflict with an established measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system considering all modes of transportation (e.g. LOS, mass transit, etc.)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) <i>Conflict with an applicable congestion management program?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

12. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

<i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Result in a change in air traffic patterns that may result in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Transportation

Setting. The County has established the acceptable Level of Service (LOS) on roads for this urban area as "D" or better. The existing road network in the area (Whispering Oak Way and Adams Avenue) is operating at acceptable levels.

Airport Review Combining Designation. The project is within the County's Airport Review combining designation (AR). The AR is used to recognize and minimize the potential conflict between new development around the Paso Robles airport and the ability of aircraft to safely and efficiently maneuver to and from this airport. This includes additional standards relating to limiting structure/vegetation heights as well as avoiding airport operation conflicts (e.g., exterior lighting, radio/electronic interference, etc.). The Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) provides guidance for and limitations to the type of development allowed within the AR designation. Per the ALUP, the proposed use is considered compatible. All projects within the AR designation are required to obtain an avigation easement to secure avigable airspace.

As required by the Land Use Ordinance, the property owner shall grant an avigation easement to the county of San Luis Obispo. The avigation easement document shall be prepared, reviewed and approved by County Counsel.

Impact. The proposed project is estimated to generate about 10 trips per day, based on the Institute of Traffic Engineer's manual of 10/unit. This small amount of additional traffic will not result in a significant change to the existing road service or traffic safety levels. The proposed project is considered a compatible use.

Mitigation/Conclusion. As conditioned, the property owner shall grant an avigation easement to the county of San Luis Obispo. No significant traffic impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures above what are already required by ordinance are necessary.

13. WASTEWATER

<i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) Violate waste discharge requirements or Central Coast Basin Plan criteria for wastewater systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. WASTEWATER

<i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
b) <i>Change the quality of surface or ground water (e.g., nitrogen-loading, day-lighting)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Adversely affect community wastewater service provider?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Other: _____</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Wastewater

Setting. Regulations and guidelines on proper wastewater system design and criteria are found within the Water Quality Control Policy for Siting, Design, Operation, and Maintenance of Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems (California OWTS Policy), and the California Plumbing Code. These regulations include specific requirements for both on-site and community wastewater systems and are applied to all new wastewater systems.

The California OWTS Policy includes the option for public agencies in California to prepare and implement a Local Agency Management Program (LAMP), subject to approval by the Central Coast Water Board. Once adopted, the LAMP will ensure local agency approval and permitting of onsite wastewater treatment systems protective of groundwater quality and public health and will incorporate updated standards applicable to onsite wastewater treatment systems. At this time, the California OWTS Policy standards supercede San Luis Obispo County Codes in Title 19. Until the County's LAMP is approved, the County permitting authority is limited to OWTS that meet Tier 1 requirements, as defined by the California OWTS Policy and summarized in the County's **Updated Criteria Policy Document BLD-2028 (dated 06/21/18)**. All other onsite wastewater disposal systems, including all seepage pit systems, must be approved and permitted through the Central Coast Water Board.

For onsite wastewater treatment (septic) systems, there are several key factors to consider for a system to operate successfully, including the following:

- ✓ Sufficient land area to meet the criteria for as currently established in Tier 1 Standards of the California OWTS Policy; depending on rainfall amount, and percolation rate, required parcel size minimums will range from one acre to 2.5 acres;
- ✓ The soil's ability to percolate or "filter" effluent before reaching groundwater supplies (30 to 120 minutes per inch is ideal);
- ✓ The soil's depth (there needs to be adequate separation from bottom of leach line to bedrock [at least 10 feet] or high groundwater [5 feet to 50 feet depending on percolation rates]);
- ✓ The soil's slope on which the system is placed (surface areas too steep creates potential for daylighting of effluent);
- ✓ Distance from existing or proposed wells (between 100 and 250 feet depending on circumstances); and
- ✓ Distance from creeks and water bodies (100-foot minimum).

To assure a septic system can meet existing regulation criteria, proper conditions are critical. Above-ground conditions are typically straight-forward and most easily addressed. Below ground criteria may require additional analysis or engineering when one or more factors exist:

- ✓ the ability of the soil to “filter” effluent is either too fast (percolation rate is faster or less than 30 minutes per inch and has “poor filtering” characteristics) or is too slow (slower or more than 120 minutes per inch);
- ✓ the topography on which a system is placed is steep enough to potentially allow “daylighting” of effluent downslope; or
- ✓ the separation between the bottom of the leach line to bedrock or high groundwater is inadequate.

Based on Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Soil Survey map, the soil type(s) for the project as provided in the previous Agricultural Resource section is Ayar and Sesame sandy loam. The main limitation(s) of this soil for wastewater effluent include:

The proposed 2-bedroom guest house is estimated to generate up to 240 gallons of wastewater per day. Project plans indicate 300 linear feet of leachfield trenches proposed, with 100% expansion area identified. No additional measures above what is already required for a standard septic system is needed.

Impacts/Mitigation. Based on the following project conditions or design features, wastewater impacts are considered less than significant:

- ✓ The project has sufficient land area per the County's Land Use Ordinance to support an on-site system;
- ✓ The soil's percolation rate is between 30 to 60 minutes per inch;
- ✓ There is adequate soil separation between the bottom of the leach line to bedrock or high groundwater;
- ✓ The soil's slope is less than 20%
- ✓ The leach lines are outside of the 100-year flood hazard area;
- ✓ There is adequate distance between proposed leach lines and existing or proposed wells;
- ✓ The leach lines are at least 100 feet from creeks and water bodies.

Conclusion. Based on the above discussion and information provided, there appears to be adequate evidence showing that on-site disposal systems can be designed to meet the CPC/California OWTS Policy Tier 1 Criteria. Prior to building permit issuance and/or final inspection of the wastewater system, the applicant will need to show to the county compliance with the California OWTS Policy Tier 1 Criteria, including any above-discussed information relating to potential constraints, or obtain approval from the Central Coast Water Board for the OWTS in the event that the design does not meet Tier 1 criteria. Therefore, based on the project being able to comply with these regulations, potential groundwater quality impacts are considered less than significant.

14. WATER & HYDROLOGY

Will the project:

QUALITY

a) *Violate any water quality standards?*

Potentially Significant

Impact can & will be mitigated

Insignificant Impact

Not Applicable

14. WATER & HYDROLOGY

<i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
b) <i>Discharge into surface waters or otherwise alter surface water quality (e.g., turbidity, sediment, temperature, dissolved oxygen, etc.)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Change the quality of groundwater (e.g., saltwater intrusion, nitrogen-loading, etc.)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide additional sources of polluted runoff?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Change rates of soil absorption, or amount or direction of surface runoff?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) <i>Change the drainage patterns where substantial on- or off-site sedimentation/ erosion or flooding may occur?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) <i>Involve activities within the 100-year flood zone?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
QUANTITY				
h) <i>Change the quantity or movement of available surface or ground water?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) <i>Adversely affect community water service provider?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) <i>Expose people to a risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding (e.g., dam failure, etc.), or inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
k) <i>Other: _____</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Water

Setting. The project proposes to obtain its water needs from an on-site well. Based on available information, the proposed water source is not known to have any significant availability or quality problems.

The topography of the project is gently sloping. The closest creek from the proposed development is 769 feet away. As described in the NRCS Soil Survey, the soil surface is considered to have low erodibility.

Projects involving more than one acre of disturbance are subject to preparing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to minimize on-site sedimentation and erosion. When work is done in the rainy season, the County's Land Use Ordinance requires that temporary erosion and sedimentation measures to be installed.



DRAINAGE – The following relates to the project's drainage aspects:

Within the 100-year Flood Hazard designation? No

Closest creek? unnamed Distance? 769 feet

Soil drainage characteristics: Well drained

For areas where drainage is identified as a potential issue, the Land Use Ordinance (LUO Sec. 22.52.110) includes a provision to prepare a drainage plan to minimize potential drainage impacts. When required, this plan would need to address measures such as: constructing on-site retention or detention basins, or installing surface water flow dissipaters. This plan would also need to show that the increased surface runoff would have no more impacts than that caused by historic flows.

SEDIMENTATION AND EROSION – Soil type, area of disturbance, and slopes are key aspects to analyzing potential sedimentation and erosion issues. The project's soil types and descriptions are listed in the previous Agriculture section under "Setting". As described in the NRCS Soil Survey, the project's soil erodibility is as follows:

Soil erodibility: Low

A sedimentation and erosion control plan is required for all construction and grading projects (LUO Sec. 22.52.120) to minimize these impacts. When required, the plan is prepared by a civil engineer to address both temporary and long-term sedimentation and erosion impacts. Projects involving more than one acre of disturbance are subject to the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which focuses on controlling storm water runoff. The Regional Water Quality Control Board is the local extension who monitors this program.

Impact – Water Quality/Hydrology

With regards to project impacts on water quality the following conditions apply:

Approximately 8,276-square-feet of site disturbance is proposed;

- ✓ The project will be subject to standard County requirements for drainage, sedimentation and erosion control for construction and permanent use;
- ✓ The project is not on highly erodible soils, nor on moderate to steep slopes;
- ✓ The project is not within a 100-year Flood Hazard designation;
- ✓ The project is more than 100 feet from the closest creek or surface water body;
- ✓ All disturbed areas will be permanently stabilized with impermeable surfaces and landscaping;
- ✓ The project is subject to the County's Plumbing Code (Chapter 7 of the Building and Construction Ordinance [Title 19]), and/or the "Water Quality Control Plan, Central Coast Basin" for its wastewater requirements, where wastewater impacts to the groundwater basin will be less than significant;

Water Quantity

Based on the project description, as calculated on the County's water usage worksheet, the project's water usage is estimated as follows:

Indoor: 16 acre feet/year (AFY)

Sources used for this estimate include one or more of the following references: County's Land Use Ordinance, 2000 Census data, Pacific Institute studies (2003), City of Santa Barbara Water Demand Factor & Conservation Study 'User Guide' (1989).

Based on the latest Annual Resource Summary Report, the project's water source is adequate to provide for the project's water needs. OR (when in rural area outside of known groundwater basins)

Based on available water information, there are no known constraints to prevent the project from obtaining its water demands.

Mitigation/Conclusion. As specified above for water quality, existing regulations and/or required plans will adequately address surface water quality impacts during construction and permanent use of the project. No additional measures above what are required or proposed are needed to protect water quality. Based on the proposed amount of water to be use and the water source, no significant impacts from water use are anticipated.

15. LAND USE

Will the project:

	Inconsistent	Potentially Inconsistent	Consistent	Not Applicable
a) <i>Be potentially inconsistent with land use, policy/regulation (e.g., general plan [County Land Use Element and Ordinance], local coastal plan, specific plan, Clean Air Plan, etc.) adopted to avoid or mitigate for environmental effects?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Be potentially inconsistent with any habitat or community conservation plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Be potentially inconsistent with adopted agency environmental plans or policies with jurisdiction over the project?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Be potentially incompatible with surrounding land uses?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Land Use

Setting/Impact. Surrounding uses are identified on Page 2 of the Initial Study. The proposed project was reviewed for consistency with policy and/or regulatory documents relating to the environment and appropriate land use (e.g., County Land Use Ordinance, Local Coastal Plan, etc.). Referrals were sent to outside agencies to review for policy consistencies (e.g., CAL FIRE for Fire Code, APCD for Clean Air Plan, etc.). The project was found to be consistent with these documents (refer also to Exhibit A on reference documents used).

The project is not within or adjacent to a Habitat Conservation Plan area. The project is consistent or compatible with the surrounding uses as summarized on page 2 of this Initial Study.

The proposed project is subject to the following Planning Area Standard(s) as found in the County's Land Use Ordinance:

1. LUO Section 22.94.020 A – Combining Designations Standards
2. LUO Section 22.94.086– Combining Designations-Airport Review Area

Land Use Ordinance Standards.

Section 22.30.470.C.1.c.-Does not allow secondary dwellings in Tract 7.

Guesthouses and home offices. A guesthouse or home office (sleeping or home office facilities without indoor connection to the living area of a principal residence) may be established as a use accessory to a residence as follows:

1. Limitation on use. A guesthouse or home office:
 - a. May contain living area, a maximum of two bedrooms and one bathroom. The living area may include a wet bar, limited to a single sink and an under-counter refrigerator that are not located in a separate room;
 - b. Shall not be designed to contain or accommodate cooking or laundry facilities, and shall not be used for residential occupancy independent from the principal residence or as a dwelling unit for rental;
 - c. Shall not be allowed on any site containing a secondary dwelling established in compliance with Section 22.30.470;
 - d. In the Residential Multi-Family land use category, shall satisfy the residential density provisions of Section 22.10.130 (Multi-Family Dwellings); and
 - e. Shall not be provided an electric meter separate from the principal residence.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No inconsistencies were identified and therefore no additional measures above what will already be required were determined necessary.

16. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Potentially Significant Impact can & will be mitigated Insignificant Impact Not Applicable

Will the project:

- a) *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 pre-history?*
- b) *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)*
- c) *Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

For further information on CEQA or the County's environmental review process, please visit the County's web site at "www.sloplanning.org" under "Environmental Information", or the California Environmental Resources Evaluation System at: <http://resources.ca.gov/ceqa/> for information about the California Environmental Quality Act.

Exhibit A - Initial Study References and Agency Contacts

The County Planning Department has contacted various agencies for their comments on the proposed project. With respect to the subject application, the following have been contacted (marked with an) and when a response was made, it is either attached or in the application file:

<u>Contacted</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Response</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	County Public Works Department	Attached
<input type="checkbox"/>	County Environmental Health Services	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	County Agricultural Commissioner's Office	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	County Airport Manager	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	Airport Land Use Commission	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Pollution Control District	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	County Sheriff's Department	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	Regional Water Quality Control Board	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	CA Coastal Commission	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	CA Department of Fish and Wildlife	Not Applicable
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CA Department of Forestry (Cal Fire)	Attached
<input type="checkbox"/>	CA Department of Transportation	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	Community Services District	Not Applicable
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other <u>Native Americans (NCTC)</u>	Attached
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____	Not Applicable

**** "No comment" or "No concerns"-type responses are usually not attached**

The following checked ("") 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 County Planning and Building Department.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project File for the Subject Application	<input type="checkbox"/> Design Plan
<u>County documents</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Specific Plan
<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Plan Policies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual Resource Summary Report
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Framework for Planning (Coastal/Inland)	<input type="checkbox"/> Circulation Study
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan (Inland/Coastal), includes all maps/elements; more pertinent elements:	<u>Other documents</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Element	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clean Air Plan/APCD Handbook
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conservation & Open Space Element	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional Transportation Plan
<input type="checkbox"/> Economic Element	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Uniform Fire Code
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing Element	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Quality Control Plan (Central Coast Basin – Region 3)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise Element	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Archaeological Resources Map
<input type="checkbox"/> Parks & Recreation Element/Project List	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Area of Critical Concerns Map
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safety Element	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Special Biological Importance Map
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use Ordinance (Inland/Coastal)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CA Natural Species Diversity Database
<input type="checkbox"/> Building and Construction Ordinance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fire Hazard Severity Map
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Facilities Fee Ordinance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flood Hazard Maps
<input type="checkbox"/> Real Property Division Ordinance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for SLO County
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affordable Housing Fund	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GIS mapping layers (e.g., habitat, streams, contours, etc.)
<input type="checkbox"/> Airport Land Use Plan	<input type="checkbox"/> Other
<input type="checkbox"/> Energy Wise Plan	
<input type="checkbox"/> North County Area Plan/EI Pomar-Estrella SA and Update EIR	

In addition, the following project specific information and/or reference materials have been considered as a part of the Initial Study:

Not Applicable.

Exhibit B - Mitigation Summary Table

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

Biological Resources

San Joaquin Kit Fox

The project **Callery Minor Use Permit / DRC2018-00189**, will impact **0.19** acres of San Joaquin kit fox habitat. Based on the results of previous Kit Fox Habitat Evaluations that have been conducted for the Paso Robles area, Bob Stafford from the Department of Fish and Game (Department) has determined that the standard mitigation ratio for projects on parcels less than 40 acres in size has been established as **3:1**. This means that for every acre of disturbance resulting from project activities (e.g. pad for buildings, access roads, leach fields etc.), the applicant would be required to mitigate a total of **0.57** acres of habitat. Applicants have the option of hiring a qualified biologist to conduct a Kit Fox Habitat Evaluation of the project site if the applicant believes that the evaluation would lower the score and reduce the required mitigation ratio. However, the applicant has chosen to accept the standard mitigation ratio of **(3:1)** which requires that a total compensatory acreage of **0.57** acres based on 3 times **0.19** acres impacted. The mitigation options identified in BR-1 through BR-11 apply to the **proposed project only**; should the project change, the mitigation obligation may also change, and a reevaluation of the mitigation measures would be required.

BR-1 Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits, the applicant shall submit evidence to the County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building, Environmental and Resource Management Division (County) (see contact information below) that states that one or a combination of the following three San Joaquin kit fox mitigation measures has been implemented:

a. Provide for the protection in perpetuity, through acquisition of fee or a conservation easement of **0.57** acres of suitable habitat in the kit fox corridor area (e.g. within the San Luis Obispo County kit fox habitat area, northwest of Highway 58), either on-site or off-site, and provide for a non-wasting endowment to provide for management and monitoring of the property in perpetuity. Lands to be conserved shall be subject to the review and approval of the California Department of Fish and Game (Department) and the County.

This mitigation alternative (a.), requires that all aspects of this program must be in place before County permit issuance or initiation of any ground disturbing activities.

b. Deposit funds into an approved in-lieu fee program, which would provide for the protection in perpetuity of suitable habitat in the kit fox corridor area within San Luis Obispo County, and provide for a non-wasting endowment for management and monitoring of the property in perpetuity.

Mitigation alternative (b) above, can be completed by providing funds to The Nature Conservancy (TNC) pursuant to the Voluntary Fee-Based Compensatory Mitigation Program (Program). The Program was established in agreement between the Department and TNC to preserve San Joaquin kit fox habitat, and to provide a voluntary mitigation alternative to project proponents who must mitigate the impacts of projects in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The fee, payable to "The Nature Conservancy," would total **\$1,425.00**. This fee is calculated based on the current cost-per-unit

of \$2500 per acre of mitigation, which is scheduled to be adjusted to address the increasing cost of property in San Luis Obispo County; your actual cost may increase depending on the timing of payment. This fee must be paid after the Department provides written notification identifying your mitigation options but prior to County permit issuance and initiation of any ground disturbing activities.

c. Purchase **0.57** credits in a Department-approved conservation bank, which would provide for the protection in perpetuity of suitable habitat within the kit fox corridor area and provide for a non-wasting endowment for management and monitoring of the property in perpetuity.

Mitigation alternative (c) above, can be completed by purchasing credits from the Palo Prieto Conservation Bank (see contact information below). The Palo Prieto Conservation Bank was established to preserve San Joaquin kit fox habitat, and to provide a voluntary mitigation alternative to project proponents who must mitigate the impacts of projects in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The cost for purchasing credits is payable to the owners of The Palo Prieto Conservation Bank, and would total **\$1,425.00**. This fee is calculated based on the current cost-per-credit of \$2500 per acre of mitigation. The fee is established by the conservation bank owner and may change at any time. Your actual cost may increase depending on the timing of payment. Purchase of credits must be completed prior to County permit issuance and initiation of any ground disturbing activities.

BR-2 Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits, the applicant shall provide evidence that they have retained a qualified biologist acceptable to the County Division of Environmental and Resource Management. The retained biologist shall perform the following monitoring activities:

a. **Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits and within 30 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction**, the biologist shall conduct a pre-activity (i.e. pre-construction) survey for known or potential kit fox dens and submit a letter to the County reporting the date the survey was conducted, the survey protocol, survey results, and what measures were necessary (and completed), as applicable, to address any kit fox activity within the project limits.

b. The qualified biologist shall conduct weekly site visits during site-disturbance activities (i.e. grading, diking, excavation, stock piling of dirt or gravel, etc.) that proceed longer than 14 days, for the purpose of monitoring compliance with required Mitigation Measures BR-3 through BR11. Site-disturbance activities lasting up to 14 days do not require weekly monitoring by the biologist unless observations of kit fox or their dens are made on-site or the qualified biologist recommends monitoring for some other reason (see BR-2-c3). When weekly monitoring is required, the biologist shall submit weekly monitoring reports to the County.

c. **Prior to or during project activities**, if any observations are made of San Joaquin Kit fox, or any known or potential San Joaquin kit fox dens are discovered within the project limits, the qualified biologist shall re-assess the probability of incidental take (e.g. harm or death) to kit fox. At the time a den is discovered, the qualified biologist shall contact the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department for guidance on possible additional kit fox protection measures to implement and whether or not a Federal and/or State incidental take permit is needed. If a potential den is encountered during construction, work shall stop until such time the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service/Department determine it is appropriate to resume work.

If incidental take of kit fox during project activities is possible, **before project activities commence**, the applicant must consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department (see contact information below). The results of this consultation may require the applicant to obtain a Federal and/or State permit for incidental take during project activities. The applicant should be aware that the

presence of kit foxes or known or potential kit fox dens at the project site could result in further delays of project activities.

In addition, the qualified biologist shall implement the following measures:

1. **Within 30 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction**, fenced exclusion zones shall be established around all known and potential kit fox dens. Exclusion zone fencing shall consist of either large flagged stakes connected by rope or cord, or survey laths or wooden stakes prominently flagged with survey ribbon. Each exclusion zone shall be roughly circular in configuration with a radius of the following distance measured outward from the den or burrow entrances:

- a) Potential kit fox den: 50 feet
- b) Known or active kit fox den: 100 feet
- c) Kit fox pupping den: 150 feet

2. All foot and vehicle traffic, as well as all construction activities, including storage of supplies and equipment, shall remain outside of exclusion zones. Exclusion zones shall be maintained until all project-related disturbances have been terminated, and then shall be removed.

3. If kit foxes or known or potential kit fox dens are found on site, daily monitoring during ground disturbing activities shall be required by a qualified biologist.

BR-3 Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits, the applicant shall clearly delineate as a note on the project plans, that: "*Speed signs of 25 mph (or lower) shall be posted for all construction traffic to minimize the probability of road mortality of the San Joaquin kit fox*". Speed limit signs shall be installed on the project site **within 30 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction**,

In addition, **prior to permit issuance and initiation of any ground disturbing activities**, conditions BR-3 through BR-11 of the Developer's Statement/Conditions of Approval shall be clearly delineated on project plans.

BR-4 During the site disturbance and/or construction phase, grading and construction activities after dusk shall be prohibited unless coordinated through the County, during which additional kit fox mitigation measures may be required.

BR-5 Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permit and within 30 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction, all personnel associated with the project shall attend a worker education training program, conducted by a qualified biologist, to avoid or reduce impacts on sensitive biological resources (i.e. San Joaquin kit fox). At a minimum, as the program relates to the kit fox, the training shall include the kit fox's life history, all mitigation measures specified by the county, as well as any related biological report(s) prepared for the project. The applicant shall notify the County shortly prior to this meeting. A kit fox fact sheet shall also be developed prior to the training program, and distributed at the training program to all contractors, employers and other personnel involved with the construction of the project.

BR-6 During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, to prevent entrapment of the San Joaquin kit fox, all excavation, steep-walled holes or trenches in excess of two feet in depth shall be covered at the close of each working day by plywood or similar materials, or provided with one or more escape ramps constructed of earth fill or wooden planks. Trenches shall also be inspected for entrapped kit fox each morning prior to onset of field activities and immediately prior to covering with plywood at the end of each working day. Before such holes or trenches are filled, they shall be thoroughly inspected

for entrapped kit fox. Any kit fox so discovered shall be allowed to escape before field activities resume, or removed from the trench or hole by a qualified biologist and allowed to escape unimpeded.

BR-7 During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, any pipes, culverts, or similar structures with a diameter of four inches or greater, stored overnight at the project site shall be thoroughly inspected for trapped San Joaquin kit foxes before the subject pipe is subsequently buried, capped, or otherwise used or moved in any way. If during the construction phase a kit fox is discovered inside a pipe, that section of pipe will not be moved, or if necessary, be moved only once to remove it from the path of activity, until the kit fox has escaped.

BR-8 During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, all food-related trash items such as wrappers, cans, bottles, and food scraps generated shall be disposed of in closed containers only and regularly removed from the site. Food items may attract San Joaquin kit foxes onto the project site, consequently exposing such animals to increased risk of injury or mortality. No deliberate feeding of wildlife shall be allowed.

BR-9 Prior to, during and after the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, use of pesticides or herbicides shall be in compliance with all local, state and federal regulations. This is necessary to minimize the probability of primary or secondary poisoning of endangered species utilizing adjacent habitats, and the depletion of prey upon which San Joaquin kit foxes depend.


BR-10 During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, any contractor or employee that inadvertently kills or injures a San Joaquin kit fox or who finds any such animal either dead, injured, or entrapped shall be required to report the incident immediately to the applicant and County. In the event that any observations are made of injured or dead kit fox, the applicant shall immediately notify the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department by telephone (see contact information below). In addition, formal notification shall be provided in writing within three working days of the finding of any such animal(s). Notification shall include the date, time, location and circumstances of the incident. Any threatened or endangered species found dead or injured shall be turned over immediately to the Department for care, analysis, or disposition.

BR-11 Prior to final inspection, or occupancy, whichever comes first, should any long internal or perimeter fencing be proposed or installed, the applicant shall do the following to provide for kit fox passage:


- a. If a wire strand/pole design is used, the lowest strand shall be no closer to the ground than 12".
- b. If a more solid wire mesh fence is used, 8" x 12" openings near the ground shall be provided every 100 yards.

Upon fence installation, the applicant shall notify the County to verify proper installation. Any fencing constructed after issuance of a final permit shall follow the above guidelines.

Vicinity Map:



Floor Plans:



May 7, 2019

**DEVELOPER'S STATEMENT FOR
CALLERY / MINOR USE PERMIT / DRC2018-000189**

The applicant agrees to incorporate the following 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 following mitigation measures. These measures shall be perpetual and run with the land. These measures are binding on all successors in interest of the subject property.

Note: The items contained in the boxes labeled "Monitoring" describe the County procedures to be used to ensure compliance with the mitigation measures.

The following mitigation measures address impacts that may occur as a result of the development of the project.

Biological Resources
San Joaquin Kit Fox

The project **Callery Minor Use Permit / DRC2018-00189**, will impact **0.19** acres of San Joaquin kit fox habitat. Based on the results of previous Kit Fox Habitat Evaluations that have been conducted for the Paso Robles area, Bob Stafford from the Department of Fish and Game (Department) has determined that the standard mitigation ratio for projects on parcels less than 40 acres in size has been established as **3:1**. This means that for every acre of disturbance resulting from project activities (e.g. pad for buildings, access roads, leach fields etc.), the applicant would be required to mitigate a total of **0.57** acres of habitat. Applicants have the option of hiring a qualified biologist to conduct a Kit Fox Habitat Evaluation of the project site if the applicant believes that the evaluation would lower the score and reduce the required mitigation ratio. However, the applicant has chosen to accept the standard mitigation ratio of **(3:1)** which requires that a total compensatory acreage of **0.57** acres based on 3 times **0.19** acres impacted. The mitigation options identified in BR-1 through BR-11 apply **to the proposed project only**; should the project change, the mitigation obligation may also change, and a reevaluation of the mitigation measures would be required.

BR-1 Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits, the applicant shall submit evidence to the County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building, Environmental and Resource Management Division (County) (see contact information below) that states that one or a combination of the following three San Joaquin kit fox mitigation measures has been implemented:

a. Provide for the protection in perpetuity, through acquisition of fee or a conservation easement of **0.57** acres of suitable habitat in the kit fox corridor area (e.g. within the San Luis Obispo County kit fox habitat area, northwest of Highway 58), either on-site or off-site, and provide for a non-wasting endowment to provide for management and monitoring of the property in perpetuity. Lands to be conserved shall be subject to the review and approval of the California Department of Fish and Game (Department) and the County.

This mitigation alternative (a.), requires that all aspects of this program must be in place before County permit issuance or initiation of any ground disturbing activities.

b. Deposit funds into an approved in-lieu fee program, which would provide for the protection in perpetuity of suitable habitat in the kit fox corridor area within San Luis Obispo County, and provide for a non-wasting endowment for management and monitoring of the property in perpetuity.

Mitigation alternative (b) above, can be completed by providing funds to The Nature Conservancy (TNC) pursuant to the Voluntary Fee-Based Compensatory Mitigation Program (Program). The Program was established in agreement between the Department and TNC to preserve San Joaquin kit fox habitat, and to provide a voluntary mitigation alternative to project proponents who must mitigate the impacts of projects in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The fee, payable to "The Nature Conservancy," would total \$1,425.00. This fee is calculated based on the current cost-per-unit of \$2500 per acre of mitigation, which is scheduled to be adjusted to address the increasing cost of property in San Luis Obispo County; your actual cost may increase depending on the timing of payment. This fee must be paid after the Department provides written notification identifying your mitigation options but prior to County permit issuance and initiation of any ground disturbing activities.

c. Purchase 0.57 credits in a Department-approved conservation bank, which would provide for the protection in perpetuity of suitable habitat within the kit fox corridor area and provide for a non-wasting endowment for management and monitoring of the property in perpetuity.

Mitigation alternative (c) above, can be completed by purchasing credits from the Palo Prieto Conservation Bank (see contact information below). The Palo Prieto Conservation Bank was established to preserve San Joaquin kit fox habitat, and to provide a voluntary mitigation alternative to project proponents who must mitigate the impacts of projects in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The cost for purchasing credits is payable to the owners of The Palo Prieto Conservation Bank, and would total \$1,425.00. This fee is calculated based on the current cost-per-credit of \$2500 per acre of mitigation. The fee is established by the conservation bank owner and may change at any time. Your actual cost may increase depending on the timing of payment. Purchase of credits must be completed prior to County permit issuance and initiation of any ground disturbing activities.

BR-2 Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits, the applicant shall provide evidence that they have retained a qualified biologist acceptable to the County Division of Environmental and Resource Management. The retained biologist shall perform the following monitoring activities:

a. **Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits and within 30 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction, the biologist shall conduct a pre-activity (i.e. pre-construction) survey for known or potential kit fox dens and submit a letter to the County reporting the date the survey was conducted, the survey protocol, survey results, and what measures were necessary (and completed), as applicable, to address any kit fox activity within the project limits.**

b. **The qualified biologist shall conduct weekly site visits during site-disturbance activities (i.e. grading, diking, excavation, stock piling of dirt or gravel, etc.) that proceed longer than 14 days, for the purpose of monitoring compliance with required Mitigation Measures BR-3 through BR11. Site-disturbance activities lasting up to 14 days do not require weekly monitoring by the biologist unless observations of kit fox or their dens are made on-site or the qualified biologist recommends monitoring for some other reason (see BR-2-c3). When weekly monitoring is required, the biologist shall submit weekly monitoring reports to the County.**

c. **Prior to or during project activities**, if any observations are made of San Joaquin Kit fox, or any known or potential San Joaquin kit fox dens are discovered within the project limits, the qualified biologist shall re-assess the probability of incidental take (e.g. harm or death) to kit fox. At the time a den is discovered, the qualified biologist shall contact the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department for guidance on possible additional kit fox protection measures to implement and whether or not a Federal and/or State incidental take permit is needed. If a potential den is encountered during construction, work shall stop until such time the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service/Department determine it is appropriate to resume work.

If incidental take of kit fox during project activities is possible, **before project activities commence**, the applicant must consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department (see contact information below). The results of this consultation may require the applicant to obtain a Federal and/or State permit for incidental take during project activities. The applicant should be aware that the presence of kit foxes or known or potential kit fox dens at the project site could result in further delays of project activities.

In addition, the qualified biologist shall implement the following measures:

1. **Within 30 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction**, fenced exclusion zones shall be established around all known and potential kit fox dens. Exclusion zone fencing shall consist of either large flagged stakes connected by rope or cord, or survey laths or wooden stakes prominently flagged with survey ribbon. Each exclusion zone shall be roughly circular in configuration with a radius of the following distance measured outward from the den or burrow entrances:

- a) Potential kit fox den: 50 feet
- b) Known or active kit fox den: 100 feet
- c) Kit fox pupping den: 150 feet

2. All foot and vehicle traffic, as well as all construction activities, including storage of supplies and equipment, shall remain outside of exclusion zones. Exclusion zones shall be maintained until all project-related disturbances have been terminated, and then shall be removed.

3. If kit foxes or known or potential kit fox dens are found on site, daily monitoring during ground disturbing activities shall be required by a qualified biologist.

BR-3 Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits, the applicant shall clearly delineate as a note on the project plans, that: *"Speed signs of 25 mph (or lower) shall be posted for all construction traffic to minimize the probability of road mortality of the San Joaquin kit fox"*. Speed limit signs shall be installed on the project site **within 30 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction**,

In addition, **prior to permit issuance and initiation of any ground disturbing activities**, conditions BR-3 through BR-11 of the Developer's Statement/Conditions of Approval shall be clearly delineated on project plans.

BR-4 During the site disturbance and/or construction phase, grading and construction activities after dusk shall be prohibited unless coordinated through the County, during which additional kit fox mitigation measures may be required.

BR-5 Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permit and within 30 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction, all personnel associated with the project shall attend a worker education training program, conducted by a qualified biologist, to avoid or reduce

impacts on sensitive biological resources (i.e. San Joaquin kit fox). At a minimum, as the program relates to the kit fox, the training shall include the kit fox's life history, all mitigation measures specified by the county, as well as any related biological report(s) prepared for the project. The applicant shall notify the County shortly prior to this meeting. A kit fox fact sheet shall also be developed prior to the training program, and distributed at the training program to all contractors, employers and other personnel involved with the construction of the project.

BR-6 During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, to prevent entrapment of the San Joaquin kit fox, all excavation, steep-walled holes or trenches in excess of two feet in depth shall be covered at the close of each working day by plywood or similar materials, or provided with one or more escape ramps constructed of earth fill or wooden planks. Trenches shall also be inspected for entrapped kit fox each morning prior to onset of field activities and immediately prior to covering with plywood at the end of each working day. Before such holes or trenches are filled, they shall be thoroughly inspected for entrapped kit fox. Any kit fox so discovered shall be allowed to escape before field activities resume, or removed from the trench or hole by a qualified biologist and allowed to escape unimpeded.

BR-7 During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, any pipes, culverts, or similar structures with a diameter of four inches or greater, stored overnight at the project site shall be thoroughly inspected for trapped San Joaquin kit foxes before the subject pipe is subsequently buried, capped, or otherwise used or moved in any way. If during the construction phase a kit fox is discovered inside a pipe, that section of pipe will not be moved, or if necessary, be moved only once to remove it from the path of activity, until the kit fox has escaped.

BR-8 During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, all food-related trash items such as wrappers, cans, bottles, and food scraps generated shall be disposed of in closed containers only and regularly removed from the site. Food items may attract San Joaquin kit foxes onto the project site, consequently exposing such animals to increased risk of injury or mortality. No deliberate feeding of wildlife shall be allowed.

BR-9 Prior to, during and after the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, use of pesticides or herbicides shall be in compliance with all local, state and federal regulations. This is necessary to minimize the probability of primary or secondary poisoning of endangered species utilizing adjacent habitats, and the depletion of prey upon which San Joaquin kit foxes depend.

BR-10 During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, any contractor or employee that inadvertently kills or injures a San Joaquin kit fox or who finds any such animal either dead, injured, or entrapped shall be required to report the incident immediately to the applicant and County. In the event that any observations are made of injured or dead kit fox, the applicant shall immediately notify the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department by telephone (see contact information below). In addition, formal notification shall be provided in writing within three working days of the finding of any such animal(s). Notification shall include the date, time, location and circumstances of the incident. Any threatened or endangered species found dead or injured shall be turned over immediately to the Department for care, analysis, or disposition.

BR-11 Prior to final inspection, or occupancy, whichever comes first, should any long internal or perimeter fencing be proposed or installed, the applicant shall do the following to provide for kit fox passage:

- a. If a wire strand/pole design is used, the lowest strand shall be no closer to the ground than 12".

- b. If a more solid wire mesh fence is used, 8" x 12" openings near the ground shall be provided every 100 yards.

Upon fence installation, the applicant shall notify the County to verify proper installation. Any fencing constructed after issuance of a final permit shall follow the above guidelines.

Monitoring (Biological Resource Measures BR-1 to BR-11) Compliance will be verified by the County Department of Planning and Building, in consultation with the Environmental Coordinator.

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

Leua Callery

5-16-19

Signature of Owner(s)

Date

Leua Callery

Name (Print)



Date: November 21, 2018
To: Holly Phipps, Project Planner
From: David E. Grim, Development Services
Subject: Public Works Project Referral for DRC2018-00189, MUP, 4170 Whispering Oaks Way, Paso Robles, APN 015-082-022

Thank you for the opportunity to provide information on the proposed subject project. It has been reviewed by several divisions of Public Works, and this represents our consolidated response.

Public Works Comments:

- A. The proposed project is within a drainage review area. Drainage plan is required and it will be reviewed at the time of Building Permit submittal by Public Works. The applicant should review Chapter 22.52.110 or 23.05.040 of the Land Use Ordinance prior to future submittal of development permits.
- B. This project may be a regulated project as it is located in a Stormwater Management Area and is therefore required to submit a Stormwater Control Plan (SWCP) Application. The Stormwater Control Plan application, SWCP template, and LID Handbook guidance can be found at:
<https://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Departments/Planning-Building/Stormwater/Services/Stormwater-Requirements-for-New-Construction.aspx>
- C. The applicable Post Construction Stormwater Performance Requirement(s) to fulfill shall be based on cumulative new or replaced impervious surface development on the project site, including the required public improvements to the project frontage. The applicant must prepare a SWCP for all improvements to encompass the entire project site and ensure a decentralized approach. When stormwater management facilities are required:
 - i. Structural Control Measures (SCM) for public or common area improvements (including those for fronting and interior roadways) shall be constructed with those improvements and remain outside the County maintained road right-of-way. Private stormwater systems may use one of two mechanisms for recording an Operation and Maintenance Plan (i.e. Agreement, CCRs)
 - ii. Structural Control Measures (SCMs) and Flood Control Basins shall remain separate unless otherwise approved by the Public Works Department.
- D. If the project site disturbs 1.0 acre or more the applicant must enroll for coverage under California's Construction General Permit, which may require preparation of a project Stormwater Control Plan.
- E. The site is within the Paso groundwater basin and is therefore subject to the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). However, the Groundwater Sustainability Agency responsible for overseeing SGMA compliance has not completed the planning efforts that will define the need for any groundwater mitigation requirements. In the interim, consideration of the project's impacts on the groundwater basin should be included in the project's CEQA analysis.

Recommended Project Conditions of Approval:

Drainage & Flood Hazard

1. **At the time of application for construction permits, the applicant shall submit complete drainage plans for review and approval in accordance with Section 22.52.110 (Drainage) or 23.05.040 (Drainage) of the Land Use Ordinance.**
2. **At the time of application for construction permits, the applicant shall submit complete erosion and sedimentation control plan for review and approval in accordance with 22.52.120.**

Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)

3. **At the time of application for construction permits, if the project disturbs more than 1.0 acre or is part of a common plan of development, the applicant must enroll for coverage under California's Construction General Permit. Sites that disturb less than 1.0 acre must implement all required elements within the site's erosion and sediment control plan as required by San Luis Obispo County Codes.**

Stormwater Control Plan (SWCP):

4. **At the time of application for construction permits, the applicant shall demonstrate whether the project is subject to post-construction stormwater requirements by submitting a Stormwater Control Plan application or Stormwater Post Construction Requirements (PCRs) Waiver Request Form.**
 - a. **The applicant must submit a SWCP for all regulated projects subject to Performance Requirement #2 and above. The SWCP must be prepared by an appropriately licensed professional and submitted to the County for review and approval. Applicants must utilize the County's latest SWCP template.**
 - b. **If post-construction stormwater control measures (SCMs) are proposed, the applicant must submit a draft Stormwater Operations and Maintenance Plan for review by the County. The plan must consist of the following Planning & Building Department forms;**
 1. **Structural Control Measure Description (Exhibit B)**
 2. **Stormwater System Contact Information**
 3. **Stormwater System Plans and Manuals**
 - c. **If applicable, following approval by the County, the applicant shall record with the County Clerk-Recorder the Stormwater Operation and Maintenance Plan and an agreement or provisions in the CCRs for the purpose of documenting on-going and permanent storm drainage control, management, treatment, inspection and reporting.**
5. **Prior to acceptance of the improvements (if applicable), the Stormwater Operations and Maintenance plan and General Notice must be updated to reflect as-built changes, approved by the County, and re-recorded with the County Clerk-Recorder as amendments to the original document.**



COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & BUILDING
TREVOR KEITH, DIRECTOR

THIS IS A NEW PROJECT REFERRAL

DATE: 11/5/2018
TO: 1st District Legislative Assistant, Building Division, CAL FIRE / County Fire, Public Works*, CA Fish & Wildlife, AB52
FROM: Holly Phipps (805-781-1162 or hhipps@co.slo.ca.us)

PROJECT NUMBER & NAME: DRC2018-00189 CALLERY

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed Minor Use Permit for a 551 SF Guest Unit w/ 1178 SF garage/workshop at 4170 Whispering Oaks Way in Paso Robles.

APN(s): 015-082-022

Return this letter with your comments attached no later than 14 days from receipt of this referral. CACs please respond within 60 days. Thank you.

PART I: IS THE ATTACHED INFORMATION ADEQUATE TO COMPLETE YOUR REVIEW?

- YES (Please go on to PART II.)
- NO (Call me ASAP to discuss what else you need. We have only 10 days in which we must obtain comments from outside agencies.)

PART II: ARE THERE SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS, PROBLEMS OR IMPACTS IN YOUR AREA OF REVIEW?

- YES (Please describe impacts, along with recommended mitigation measures to reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels, and attach to this letter.)
- NO (Please go on to PART III.)

PART III: INDICATE YOUR RECOMMENDATION FOR FINAL ACTION.

Please attach any conditions of approval you recommend to be incorporated into the project's approval, or state reasons for recommending denial.

IF YOU HAVE "NO COMMENT," PLEASE SO INDICATE, OR CALL.

SETBACK WAIVER PRESENTS NO FIRE/LIFE SAFETY CONCERN

11/6/18

Date

Name

543-4244

Phone

CAL FIRE / COUNTY FIRE

* PROJECT REVIEWED AND CONDITIONED UNDER PMTR2018-01396.

📧 Reply all | ▼ 🗑 Delete Junk | ▼ ...

Re: DRC2018-00189 CALLERY, North County E-Referral, Minor Use Permit, Paso Robles

MS

Michael Stoker

Wed 11/14/2018, 12:04 PM

Holly Phipps; Cheryl Journey ✉



📧 Reply all | ▼

Referrals

Holly,

Please find buildings recommendations for DRC2018-00189 below. Please let me know if you have any questions.

In regards to this preliminary review, a building permit is required. The drawings specify the work to be completed consists of the construction of a guest unit of 551 sq. ft with an attached garage and workshop of 1,178 sq. ft. The project shall comply with current codes adopted by the County of San Luis Obispo (2016 California Building Standards Codes and Title 19 of the SLO County Codes).

While a thorough plan review will be conducted at time of building permit application, the following items are noted to assist design review;

1. Construction shall comply with the 2016 California Residential Code. Please reference on the cover sheet of the plans.
2. Please revise the occupancy classification on the cover sheet of the plans from an "R-3" to an "R-3/U" for a single family dwelling and attached garage.
3. The design of the openings, projections, wall rating based on fire separation distance will need to be shown on the plans to comply with CRC Section 302, including Table 302.1(2) for buildings with sprinklers.
4. Provide plans which clearly show the structural design to verify compliance with the prescriptive requirements of the 2016 California Residential Code or any structural element not complying with the prescriptive requirements will need to be prepared by a California Licensed Design Professional (Architect or Engineer) justifying the structural design
5. Label all egress windows on the plans to verify compliance with size and height per the California Residential Code.
6. Provide electrical plans with notes to show the location of the main electrical panel, sub-panels, receptacles, lights, switches, and smoke detectors and Co alarms to verify compliance with the 2016 California Electrical Code.
7. Provide notes and information on the plans for the plumbing fixtures requirements, design of the waste lines, vents, and water lines will all need to comply with the 2016 California Plumbing Code.
8. Energy calculation will need to be submitted to verify compliance with the 2016 California Energy Code.
9. The plans will need show compliance with the 2016 California Green Building Code and the County of San Luis Obispo's Green Building Ordinance.

Reply all | Delete | Junk | ...

11. A grading plan may be required depending on the total area of disturbance.

Thanks

County Of San Luis Obispo
Planning & Building
Michael Stoker, CASp
Building Division Supervisor
(p) 805-781-1543
mstoker@co.slo.ca.us

From: Mail for PL_Referrals Group
Sent: Monday, November 5, 2018 4:56 PM
To: Holly Phipps
Cc: Vicki Janssen; Cheryl Journey; Don C. Moore; Michael Stoker; Michelle Freeman; Clint Bullard; Dell McRoberts, Loree; Tony.Gomes_fire.ca.gov; Edward Reading; Glenn D. Marshall; Mark K. Davis; Peter Moreci; brandon.sanderson@wildlife.ca.gov; Linda Moua CDFW; Sarah Paulson CDFW
Subject: DRC2018-00189 CALLERY, North County E-Referral, Minor Use Permit, Paso Robles

County of San Luis Obispo
Department of Planning & Building

DRC2018-00189 CALLERY, North County E-Referral, Minor Use Permit, Paso Robles
APN(s): 015-082-022

This application was recently filed with the Planning Department for review and approval. Because the proposal may be of interest or concern to your agency or community group, we are notifying you of the availability of a referral on the project.

DIRECT LINK to Referral Package

Link to webpage for all referral packages on new website (07/26/2017 and later):

http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Departments/Planning-Building/Forms-Documents/Informational/Planning-Referrals.aspx

Community Advisory Groups: You will want to contact the applicant and/or agent for the project to request a presentation to your group, or simply to answer questions about the project. The telephone number and address for the applicant/agent are provided in the link below.

Please comment on all issues associated with this project within 14 days of receiving this e-mail (Community Advisory Groups: please respond within 60 days)

Direct your comments to the project manager(s):
Holly Phipps (805-781-1162 or hhipps@co.slo.ca.us)

☞ Reply all | ▾  Delete Not junk | ▾ ...

[EXTERNAL]RE: NCTC, AB52 -- DRC2018-00189 CALLERY, North County E-Referral, Minor Use Permit, Paso Robles



Fred Collins <fcollins@northernchumash.org>

Tue 11/13, 6:03 AM

Holly Phipps ▾



☞ Reply all | ▾

Junk Email

This message was moved here because you only trust email from senders in your Safe Senders list. It's not spam

ATTENTION: This email originated from outside the County's network. Use caution when opening attachments or links.

Hello Holly,

NCTC has not comments on this proposed project, thank you.

Fred Collins
NCTC

From: Mail for PL_Referrals Group [mailto:plreferrals@co.slo.ca.us]
Sent: Tuesday, November 6, 2018 11:15 AM
To: fcollins_northernchumash.org
Cc: Holly Phipps
Subject: NCTC, AB52 -- DRC2018-00189 CALLERY, North County E-Referral, Minor Use Permit, Paso Robles

**County of San Luis Obispo
Department of Planning & Building**

**DRC2018-00189 CALLERY, North County E-Referral, Minor Use Permit, Paso Robles
APN(s): 015-082-022**

This application was recently filed with the Planning Department for review and approval. Because the proposal may be of interest or concern to your agency or community group, we are notifying you of the availability of a referral on the project.

[DIRECT LINK to Referral Package](#)

PLEASE CONTACT:
Holly Phipps (805-781-1162 or hhipps@co.slo.ca.us)

**The deadline for consultation request is:
DECEMBER 5th 2018**