

Summary Form for Electronic Document Submittal

Form F

Lead agencies may include 15 hardcopies of this document when submitting electronic copies of Environmental Impact Reports, Negative Declarations, Mitigated Negative Declarations, or Notices of Preparation to the State Clearinghouse (SCH). The SCH also accepts other summaries, such as EIR Executive Summaries prepared pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15123. Please include one copy of the Notice of Completion Form (NOC) with your submission and attach the summary to each electronic copy of the document.

SCH #:

2019109057

Project Title: Panoche RV Park

Lead Agency: County of San Benito

Contact Name: Richard Felsing

Email: rfelsing@cosb.us

Phone Number: 831-902-9532

Project Location: 29960 Panoche Road, Paicines, CA 95043

County of San Benito

City

County

Project Description (Proposed actions, location, and/or consequences).

The Panoche RV Resort proposes to construct a 21-stall RV Park behind the Panoche Inn on a maximum 2.5 acres of the same 6.53-acre parcel. Internal circulation consists of aggregate base (AB) drive aisles, RV stalls, and dual access driveways onto Panoche Road located at the northeast and northwest corners of the property. A sewage pump-out station will serve all stalls and the facility as a whole. All stalls will be equipped with water service. The first row of seven (7) RV stalls will have full hookups (water, sewer, electricity); with electrical and sewer to be extended to the last two rows of RV stalls when justified by demand. Septic and water systems improvements include installation of new septic tank and leach field, water well for drinking, and fire suppression equipment such as wharf hydrants. Ninety-one (91) trees will be planted to visually screen the RVs and RV Park, shade the RV stalls, and act as a windbreak. The parcel has been heavily impacted by a century's use as a bar and residence, and a range of accessory uses, including as farm yard, accessor mobile home, equipment storage, sometime gas tanks (removed 1976)—with land in disturbed condition in proportion to these activities.

Identify the project's significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid that effect.

The project's impact would be more minimal than staff expected. Most categories in the CEQA Checklist are rated as either No Impact or Less Than Significant Impact. Largely due to the very small project size, heavily degraded property, and lack of sensitive species or habitats, there would be few or no significant or substantial effects.

Potential significant effects could include:

Biology -- Mitigations / Conditions of Approval applying the biologists' recommendations as requirements will reduce any potential effects below a significant level. sensitive species were found, some could appear.

Air Quality -- NOTE: the CalEEMod didn't function due to project's small-scale with no construction; its parameters could not capture project. MBARD staff stated that emissions inventories accounted for GHG, AQ, & Energy increases.

Water -- Arid grasslands prompt questions about availability and potential effects of increased usage. Hydrological study alleviated this concern.

Aesthetics -- a new facility could change the view. County ordinances require screening, and the applicant proposes planting 91 trees (removing 1) to visually screen the project, provide shade, and act as a windbreak.

Wildland Fires IX(g) -- Panoche Valley carries a "Moderate" Severity Fire Hazard; again, not breaking thresholds

Waste/Materials -- Trash & any vehicle-related hazardous materials (waste oils & etc.) will be secured (against kit fox scavenging) and disposed of pursuant to state statute.

Noise -- will occur; but no nearby sensitive receptors. County Ordinance & GP exempt work from 7am-7pm.

If applicable, describe any of the project's areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

There are no known areas of controversy, as such.

County Planning staff raised concerns relating to the conservation value of the Panoche Valley generally, and specifically concerning the presence of rare, endangered, or federally- or state-listed sensitive species and their unique habitats. These were brought to (new) staff attention via the vast Panoche Valley Solar Farm FEIR, Chapter 6 of which details the sensitive species encountered. THAT project covers 4,885 acres; however, THIS project covers *only* 2.5 acres maximum on a heavily disturbed 6.53-acre parcel that's been used for farm operations, as a service station (tanks removed 1976), and has hosted an operating bar-restaurant/residence for the last 85 years, minimum. The consulting biologist's analysis--I insisted on going along on a second field survey--put any concerns & all doubts to rest, along with staff referencing the USFW's 1998 Plan _Recovery of Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley_. A background in conservation biology & sustainable development enabled staff insight into concerns relating to sensitive species & ecosystem approaches to conservation--and to appreciate the consulting biologist's report. Report recommendations will be applied to the project as mitigation measures &/or conditions of approval.

Other concerns include:

Aesthetics: The Panoche Valley is vast and offers scenic vistas (not registered for protection). Standard County conditions approval require landscape screening to minimize glare by day, and development lighting standards require shielded, downward-directed lighting to protect 'dark skies' and night vision. Ninety-one (91) trees will be planted.

Water: Panoche is an arid valley with sparse vegetation; groundwater concerns were alleviated by referencing the hydrology investigation/analysis

Transportation: Roads are in poor condition, unfamiliar to most drivers, and the location is remote. Little-to-no impact is expected by the light trucks/RVs most likely to make the trip.

Provide a list of the responsible or trustee agencies for the project.

Trustee Agencies:

California Fish & Game

Responsible Agencies:

California Fish & Game

Pursuant to 15381 Responsible Agency, no "public agency is" "propos[ing] to carry out or approve the project."

For CEQA purposes, an agency or agency may wield discretionary powers about which this staffer may be unaware; so, Please Note:

1. County Planning staff welcomes any & all input and feedback from Responsible Agencies with discetionary power over the project;

2. Staff acknowledges that some/many Responsible Agencies may wield discretionary approval power;

3. Staff urges the State Clearinghouse to distribute this IS/MND to any/all colleagues in such agencies.

Thank you!