



**Project Title & No. Moreno, Major Grading Permit (ED23-027) GRAD2022-00111**

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:** The proposed project could have a "Potentially Significant Impact" for 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"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forestry Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems
<input type="checkbox"/> Energy	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire
<input type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils	<input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance

**DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)**

Based on 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.

Andy Knighton  aknighton@co.slo.ca.us 9/18/2023  
 Prepared by (Print) Signature Date

Eric Hughes, Principal  ehughes@co.slo.ca.us 9/18/2023  
 Environmental Specialist Signature Date

Reviewed by (Print)

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

### Project Environmental Analysis

The County's environmental review process incorporates all 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 Gerzon Moreno for a major grading permit (GRAD2022-00111) to allow the grading for a new 1,391 square-foot single-family residence, a 568 square-foot attached garage, a 712 square-foot covered porch, 210 linear feet of retaining wall with a maximum height of 8 feet, 7,353 square-feet of impervious driveway, and an onsite wastewater system. The project will result in the disturbance of approximately 25,000 square-feet, including 530 cubic yards of cut and 400 cubic yards of fill, on a 1.07-acre parcel. The project will result in the permanent disturbance of 0.57 acres (25,000 square-feet) of kit fox habitat. The proposed project is located within the Agricultural land use category at 5825 Black Tail Place (APN: 015-143-010) approximately 5.5 miles east of the City of Paso Robles. The project site is in the El Pomar –Estrella Sub Area of the North County Planning Area.

**ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER:** 015-143-010

**Latitude:** 35.63448° N      **Longitude:** 120.54574° W      **SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT #:** 5

### B. Existing Setting

**Plan Area:** North County      **Sub:** El Pomar / Estrella      **Comm:** Ground Squirrel Hollow

**Land Use Category:** Agriculture

**Combining Designation:** Renewable Energy Overlay

**Parcel Size:** 1.07 acres

**Topography:** Moderately sloping

**Vegetation:** Grasses

**Existing Uses:** Undeveloped parcel.

#### Surrounding Land Use Categories and Uses:


**North:** Agriculture and single-family residences      **East:** Agriculture and single-family residences

# Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

**South:** Agriculture and single-family residences

**West:** Agriculture and single-family residences

**Figure 1. Vicinity Map**




Imagery provided by OpenStreetMap and its licensors ©.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

Figure 2. Project Boundary Aerial



Imagery provided by ESRI and its licensors © 2021

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

### C. Environmental Analysis

The Initial Study Checklist provides detailed information about the environmental impacts of the proposed project and mitigation measures to lessen the impacts.

#### I. AESTHETICS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:</i>				
(a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Setting

CEQA establishes that it is the policy of the state to take all action necessary to provide people of the state “with... enjoyment of aesthetic, natural, scenic and historic environmental qualities” (Public Resources Code Section 21001(b)).

A scenic vista is generally defined as a high-quality view displaying good aesthetic and compositional values that can be seen from public viewpoints. Some scenic vistas are officially or informally designated by public agencies or other organizations. A substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista would occur if the project would significantly degrade the scenic landscape as viewed from public roads or other public areas. A proposed project’s potential effect on a scenic vista is largely dependent upon the degree to which it would complement or contrast with the natural setting, the degree to which it would be noticeable in the existing environment, and whether it detracts from or complements the scenic vista.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

California's Scenic Highway Program was created by the State Legislature in 1963 with the intention of protecting and enhancing the natural scenic beauty of California highways and adjacent corridors. There are several officially designated state scenic highways and several eligible state scenic highways within the county. State Route 1 is an Officially Designated State Scenic Highway and All-American Road from the City of San Luis Obispo to the northern San Luis Obispo County boundary. A portion of Nacimiento Lake Drive is an Officially Designated County Scenic Highway. Portions of Highway 101, Highway 46, Highway 41, Highway 166, and Highway 33 are also classified as Eligible State Scenic Highways – Not Officially Designated.

The County of San Luis Obispo Inland Land Use Ordinance (LUO) establishes regulations for exterior lighting (LUO 22.10.060), height limitations for each land use category (LUO 22.10.090), scenic highway corridor standards (LUO 22.10.095), and other visual resource protection policies. These regulations are intended to help the County achieve its Strategic Growth Principles of preserving scenic natural beauty and fostering distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place as set forth in the County Land Use Element.

The LUO also maps portions of the Salinas River Highway Corridor, the San Luis Obispo Highway Corridor, and the South County Highway Corridor to comply with County highway corridor design standards. These standards include but are not limited to setbacks from highway rights-of-way, guidelines for development along ridgelines, limitations on graded slopes, protection of landmark features, and standards for building height and color (LUO 22.10.095).

The County of San Luis Obispo LUO defines a Sensitive Resource Area (SRA) combining designation that applies to areas having high environmental quality and special ecological or educational significance. These designated areas are considered visual resources by the County and the LUO establishes specific standards for projects located within these areas. These standards include but are not limited to set back distances from public viewpoints, prohibition of development that silhouettes against the sky, grading slope limitations, set back distances from significant rock outcrops, design standards including height limitations and color palette, and landscaping plan requirements.

In addition to policies set forth in the LUO, the County Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE) provides guidelines for the appropriate placement of development so that the natural landscape continues to be the dominant view in rural parts of the county and to ensure the visual character contributes to a robust sense of place in urban areas. The COSE provides a number of goals and policies to protect the visual character and identity of the county while protecting private property rights, such as the identification and protection of community separators (rural-appearing land located between separate, identifiable communities and towns), designation of scenic corridors along public roads and highways throughout the county, retaining existing access to scenic vista points, and setting the standard that new development in urban and village areas shall be consistent with the local character, identify, and sense of place.

The project is located in Ground Squirrel Hollow, approximately 5.5 miles east of the city of Paso Robles and approximately 9 miles west of the community of Shandon. The parcel is in a predominately residential rural and agricultural area characterized by single family structures on 1 acre rectangular lots that are roughly 450 feet in length. Ground Squirrel Hollow is surrounded by agricultural uses, mostly vineyard operations. The project itself is currently undeveloped and is surrounded by single family residences and other undeveloped lots. The topography of the parcel consists of gently rolling hills. The project will be shielded from public views due to the existing topography surrounding Ground Squirrel Hollow, and would not likely be visible, or might be slightly visible, from the nearest public road (Geneseo Road). The project will likely be visible by some neighboring residences; however, the proposed development is similar in size and nature to the residential character of the surrounding area.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

### Discussion

(a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

The project is not located within an identified scenic vista, visually sensitive area, scenic corridor, or an area of high scenic quality that would be seen from key public viewpoints. Therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista and no impacts would occur.

(b) *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?*

The project is not located within the viewshed of a designated or eligible state scenic highway and implementation of the project would not result in damage to scenic resources within the viewshed of a state scenic highway, nor would it result in damage or removal of trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

(c) *In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?*

The project is located in a non-urbanized area and would be visually consistent with the type and extent of development in the surrounding area. The project would not result in a noticeable change to public views of the area and, therefore, would not result in the degradation of the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings. Impacts would be less than significant.

(d) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

The project does not propose the use or installation of highly reflective materials that would create a substantial source of glare. The project would generally be consistent with the level of existing development in the project vicinity and does not propose the installation or use of outdoor lighting that would differ substantially from other proximate development. Additionally, County Code requires all lighting to be downcast and shielded. Therefore, the project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area, and potential impacts would be less than significant.

### Conclusion

The project is not located within view of a scenic vista and would not result in a substantial change to scenic resources in the area. The project would be consistent with existing policies and standards in the County LUO and COSE related to the protection of scenic resources. Potential impacts to aesthetic resources would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### Mitigation

None necessary.

### Sources

See Exhibit A.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

### II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<p><i>In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</i></p>				
(a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### Setting

The County of San Luis Obispo supports a unique, diverse, and valuable agricultural industry that can be attributed to its Mediterranean climate, fertile soils, and sufficient water supply. Wine grapes are regularly the top agricultural crop in the county. Top value agricultural products in the county also include fruit and nuts, vegetables, field crops, nursery products, and animals. The County of San Luis Obispo Agriculture



## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

Element includes policies, goals, objectives, and other requirements that apply to lands designated in the Agriculture land use category. In addition to the Agriculture Element, in accordance with Sections 2272 and 2279 of the California Food and Agriculture Code, the County Agricultural Commissioner releases an annual report on the condition, acreage, production, pest management, and value of agricultural products within the county. The most recent annual crop report can be found here:

<https://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Departments/Agriculture-Weights-and-Measures/All-Forms-Documents/Information/Crop-Report.aspx>.

The California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) produces maps and statistical data used for analyzing impacts on California's agricultural resources. Agricultural land is rated according to soil quality and current land use. For environmental review purposes under CEQA, the FMMP categories of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, and Grazing Land are considered 'agricultural land'. Other non-agricultural designations include Urban and Built-up Land, Other Land, and Water.

The project parcel is within the agricultural land use category, but is not under a Williamson Act contract. The parcel does not currently support any crops.

According to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, the proposed project would be located atop "Not Prime Farmland". The soil type and characteristics subject to disturbance from this project include:

Nacimiento-Los Osos complex (9 to 30 percent slopes).

Nacimiento. This moderately sloping, fine loamy soil is considered not well drained. The soil has moderate erodibility and moderate shrink-swell characteristics, as well as having potential septic system constraints due to: steep slopes, shallow depth to bedrock, slow percolation. The soil is considered Class IV without irrigation and Class IV when irrigated.

Los Osos. This moderately sloping, fine loamy soil is considered not well drained. The soil has moderate erodibility and moderate shrink-swell characteristics, as well as having potential septic system constraints due to: steep slopes, shallow depth to bedrock, slow percolation. The soil is considered Class IV without irrigation and Class IV when irrigated.

According to Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), forest land is defined as land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits.

Timberland is defined as land, other than land owned by the federal government and land designated by the board as experimental forest land, which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of a commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees. The project site does not support any forest land or timberland.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

### Discussion

- (a) *Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?*

The project site does not contain land classified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance pursuant to the FMMP. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of Farmland pursuant to the FMMP to a non-agricultural use. *No impacts would occur.*

- (b) *Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?*

The project site is within the Agricultural land use designation but is not land subject to a Williamson Act contract. Single Family Dwellings, such as the one proposed, is principally allowed in the Agricultural land use designation. Therefore, the project would not result in a conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract and *no impacts would occur.*

- (c) *Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?*

The project site does not include land use designations or zoning for forest land or timberland; *no impacts would occur.*

- (d) *Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?*

The project site does not support forest land or timberland and would not result in the loss or conversion of these lands to non-forest use; *no impacts would occur.*

- (e) *Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?*

The project is located 0.5 miles away from Farmland or forest land, and the nature of the project would not conflict with existing agricultural uses. The project would not increase demand on agricultural water supplies or facilities and would not affect proximate agricultural support facilities. Therefore, the project would not result in changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses or forest land to non-forest uses. *No impacts would occur.*

### Conclusion

The project would not directly or indirectly result in the conversion of farmland, forest land, or timber land to non-agricultural uses or non-forest uses and would not conflict with agricultural zoning or otherwise adversely affect agricultural resources or uses. There are no potential impacts to agricultural resources and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### Mitigation

None necessary.

### Sources

See Exhibit A.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

### III. AIR QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:</i>				
(a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Setting

##### Regulatory Agencies and Standards

San Luis Obispo County is part of the South Central Coast Air Basin, (SCCAB) which also includes Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties. Air quality within the SCCAB is regulated by several jurisdictions including the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), California Air Resources Board (ARB), and the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD). Each of these jurisdictions develops rules, regulations, and policies to attain the goals or directives imposed upon them through legislation. The California ARB is the agency responsible for coordination and oversight of state and local air pollution control programs in California and for implementing the California Clean Air Act (CAA) of 1988. The State Department of Public Health established California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) in 1962 to define the maximum amount of a pollutant (averaged over a specified period of time) that can be present without any harmful effects on people or the environment. The California ARB adopted the CAAQS developed by the Department of Public Health in 1969, which had established CAAQS for 10 criteria pollutants: particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>), ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), sulfate, carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), visibility reducing particles, lead (Pb), hydrogen sulfide (H<sub>2</sub>S), and vinyl chloride.

The Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA) later required the U.S. EPA to establish National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for pollutants considered harmful to public health and the environment, and also set deadlines for their attainment. The U.S. EPA has established NAAQS for six criteria pollutants (all of which are also regulated by CAAQS): CO, lead, NO<sub>2</sub>, ozone, PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>, and SO<sub>2</sub>.

California law continues to mandate compliance with CAAQS, which are often more stringent than national standards. However, California law does not require that CAAQS be met by specified dates as is the case

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

with NAAQS. Rather, it requires incremental progress toward attainment. The SLOAPCD is the agency primarily responsible for ensuring that NAAQS and CAAQS are not exceeded and that air quality conditions within the county are maintained.

### *SLOAPCD Thresholds*

The SLOAPCD has developed and updated their CEQA Air Quality Handbook (most recently updated with a November 2017 Clarification Memorandum) to help local agencies evaluate project specific impacts and determine if air quality mitigation measures are needed, or if potentially significant impacts could result.

The APCD has established thresholds for both short-term construction emissions and long-term operational emissions. Use of heavy equipment and earth moving operations during project construction can generate fugitive dust and engine combustion emissions that may have substantial temporary impacts on local air quality and climate change. Combustion emissions, such as nitrogen oxides (NOx), reactive organic gases (ROG), greenhouse gases (GHG) and diesel particulate matter (DPM), are most significant when using large, diesel-fueled scrapers, loaders, bulldozers, haul trucks, compressors, generators and other heavy equipment. SLOAPCD has established thresholds of significance for each of these contaminants.

The project will result in approximately 25,000 square feet of site disturbance on a 1.07 acre parcel, and the proposed grading will result in 530 cubic yards of cut and 400 cubic yards of fill.

Operational impacts are focused primarily on the indirect emissions (i.e., motor vehicles) associated with residential, commercial, and industrial development. Certain types of project can also include components that generate direct emissions, such as power plants, gasoline stations, dry cleaners, and refineries (source emissions).

General screening criteria is used by the SLOAPCD to determine the type and scope of air quality assessment required for a particular project (Table 1-1 in the APCD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook). These criteria are based on project size in an urban setting and are designed to identify those projects with the potential to exceed the APCD's significance thresholds. A more refined analysis of air quality impacts specific to a given project is necessary for projects that exceed the screening criteria below or are within ten percent (10%) of exceeding the screening criteria.

### *Air Quality Monitoring*

The county's air quality is measured by a total of 10 ambient air quality monitoring stations, and pollutant levels are measured continuously and averaged each hour, 24 hours a day. The significance of a given pollutant can be evaluated by comparing its atmospheric concentration to state and federal air quality standards. These standards represent allowable atmospheric containment concentrations at which the public health and welfare are protected, and include a factor of safety. The SLOAPCD prepares an Annual Air Quality Report detailing information on air quality monitoring and pollutant trends in the county. The most recent Annual Air Quality Report can be found here: <https://storage.googleapis.com/slocleanair-org/images/cms/upload/files/2017aqrt-FINAL2.pdf>.

In the county of San Luis Obispo, ozone and fine particulates (particulate matter of 10 microns in diameter or smaller; PM10) are the pollutants of main concern, since exceedances of state health-based standards for these pollutants are experienced in some areas of the county. Under federal standards, the county has non-attainment status for ozone in eastern San Luis Obispo County.

### *San Luis Obispo County Clean Air Plan*

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

The SLOAPCD's San Luis Obispo County 2001 Clean Air Plan (CAP) is a comprehensive planning document intended to evaluate long-term emissions and cumulative effects and provide guidance to the SLOAPCD and other local agencies on how to attain and maintain the state standards for ozone and PM10. The CAP presents a detailed description of the sources and pollutants which impact the jurisdiction's attainment of state standards, future air quality impacts to be expected under current growth trends, and an appropriate control strategy for reducing ozone precursor emissions, thereby improving air quality.

### *Naturally Occurring Asbestos*

Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) is identified as a toxic air contaminant by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Serpentine and other ultramafic rocks are fairly common throughout the county and may contain NOA. If these areas are disturbed during construction, NOA-containing particles can be released into the air and have an adverse impact on local air quality and human health. The project is not in an area known to contain NOA.

### *Sensitive Receptors*

Sensitive receptors are people that have an increased sensitivity to air pollution or environmental contaminants, such as the elderly, children, people with asthma or other respiratory illnesses, and others who are at a heightened risk of negative health outcomes due to exposure to air pollution. Some land uses are considered more sensitive to changes in air quality than others, due to the population that occupies the uses and the activities involved. Sensitive receptor locations include schools, parks and playgrounds, day care centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residences. There are approximately 33 sensitive receptors (residences) within a 1,000-foot radius of the project site.

### *Discussion*

(a) *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

The project would not result in a new or substantially different use in the project area. The project would not generate a substantial increase in population or employment opportunities and would not result in a significant increase in vehicle trips. The proposed project would not contribute to the generation of significant levels of any air contaminants and would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the San Luis Obispo County Clean Air Plan or other applicable regional and local planning documents. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

(b) *Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?*

The County is within the South-Central Coast Air Basin, which is currently considered by the state as being in "non-attainment" (exceeding acceptable thresholds) for particulate matter (PM10, or fugitive dust). Dust or particulate matter less than ten microns (PM10) that becomes airborne and finds its way into the lower atmosphere, can act as the catalyst in this chemical transformation to harmful ozone. The proposed project would result in the creation of dust through construction activities however, activity would be short term and would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in PM10. Additionally, the project is small in scale and nature and is not expected to result in any other activities which may otherwise result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in PM10.

### *Construction Impacts*

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

The SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook provides thresholds of significance for construction related emissions. Table 1 lists SLOAPCD's general thresholds for determining whether a potentially significant impact could occur as a result of a project's construction activities.

**Table 1. SLOAPCD Thresholds of Significance for Construction Activities**

Pollutant	Threshold <sup>(1)</sup>		
	Daily	Quarterly Tier 1	Quarterly Tier 2
Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM)	7 lbs	0.13 tons	0.32 tons
Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) + Oxides of Nitrogen (NO <sub>x</sub> )	137 lbs	2.5	6.3 tons
Fugitive Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> ), Dust <sup>(2)</sup>		2.5 tons <sup>(2)</sup>	

1. Daily and quarterly emission thresholds are based on the California Health and Safety Code and the CARB Carl Moyer Guidelines.
2. Any project with a grading area greater than 4.0 acres of worked area can exceed the 2.5-ton PM<sub>10</sub> quarterly threshold.

The SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook also provides preliminary screening construction emission rates based on the proposed volume of soil to be moved and the anticipated area of disturbance. Table 2 lists the SLOAPCD's screening emission rates that would be generated based on the amount of material to be moved. The APCD's CEQA Handbook also clarifies that any project that would require grading of 4.0 acres or more can exceed the 2.5-ton PM<sub>10</sub> quarterly threshold listed above.

**Table 2. Screening Emission Rates for Construction Activities**

Pollutant	Grams/Cubic Yard of Material Moved	Lbs/Cubic Yard of Material Moved
Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM)	2.2	0.0049
Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	9.2	0.0203
Oxides of Nitrogen (NO <sub>x</sub> )	42.4	0.0935
Fugitive Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )	0.75 tons/acre/month of construction activity (assuming 22 days of construction per month)	

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

Based on estimated cut and fill estimates and the construction emission rates shown in Table 2, construction-related emissions that would result from the project were calculated and are shown in Table 3 below.

**Table 3. Proposed Project Estimated Construction Emissions.**

Pollutant	Total Estimated Emissions	SLOAPCD Threshold		Daily Threshold Exceeded?	Quarterly Threshold Exceeded?
		Daily	Quarterly (Tier 1)		
ROG + NO <sub>x</sub> (combined)	(530 CY x 0.0203 lbs / CY) + (530 CY x 0.0935 lbs / CY) = 10.76 lbs + 49.56 lbs = <b>60.32 lbs (0.027 tons)</b>	137 pounds	2.5 tons	No	No
Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM)	(530 CY x 0.0049 lbs / CY) = <b>2.60 lbs (0.0013 tons)</b>	7 pounds	0.13 tons	No	No
Fugitive Particulate Matter (PM <sub>10</sub> )	(0.57 acres x 0.75 tons / acre) = 0.43 tons		2.5 tons	No	No

For projects involving construction and/or grading activities, the LUO requires that all surfaces and materials shall be managed to ensure that fugitive dust emissions are adequately controlled to below the 20% opacity limit and to ensure dust is not emitted offsite. The LUO includes a list of primary fugitive dust control measures required for all projects involving grading or site disturbance. The LUO also includes an expanded list of fugitive dust control measures for projects requiring site disturbance of greater than four acres or which are located within 1,000 feet of any sensitive receptor location. All applicable fugitive dust control measures are required to be shown on grading and building plans and monitored by a designated monitor to minimize dust complaints, reduce visible emissions below the 20% opacity limit, and to prevent transport of dust offsite (LUO 22.52.160.C).

The California Code of Regulations (Section 2485 of Title 13) also prohibits idling in excess of 5 minutes from any diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles with gross vehicular weight ratings of 10,000 pounds or more or that must be licensed for operation on highways.

Based on the volume of proposed grading, area of project site disturbance, estimated duration of the construction period, and the APCD’s screening construction emission rates identified above, the project would not result in the emission of criteria pollutants that would exceed construction-related

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

thresholds established by the SLOAPCD. The project does not exceed the daily or quarterly thresholds for construction emissions, and therefore *impacts are less than significant*.

### *Operational Impacts*

The SLOAPCD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook provides operational screening criteria to identify projects with the potential to exceed APCD operational significance thresholds (refer to Table 1-1 of the CEQA Handbook). Based on Table 1-1 of the CEQA Handbook, the project does not propose a use that would have the potential to result in operational emissions that would exceed APCD thresholds. The project would not generate substantial new long-term traffic trips or vehicle emissions and does not propose construction of new direct (source) emissions. Therefore, potential operational emissions would be *less than significant*.

(c) *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

The proposed project would require disturbance within 1,000 feet of a sensitive receptor (i.e. single-family residence). Implementation of the proposed project would result in the generation of dust, potentially affecting local residents and businesses in close proximity to the project site. Dust complaints could result in violation of the APCD's nuisance rules, a potentially significant air quality impact. As such, the project would be subject to expanded fugitive dust control measures in addition to primary measures pursuant to Land Use Ordinance Section 22.52.160.C (Construction Procedures, Air Quality Controls). These measures shall be shown on all grading and building plans in accordance with LUO Section 22.53.160C. Compliance with these measures would ensure fugitive dust emissions are adequately controlled to below 20 percent opacity limit as identified in the APCD's 401 Visible Emissions rule and that dust is not emitted offsite. Through the incorporation of mitigation measure AQ-1, impacts would be *less than significant levels with mitigation*.

(d) *Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?*

Construction could generate odors from heavy diesel machinery and materials used for excavation and construction of the project. The generation of odors during the construction period would be temporary, would be consistent with odors commonly associated with typical construction equipment and activities, and would dissipate within a short distance from the active work area. The project site is in a rural residential area and no significant long-term operational emissions or odors would be generated by the project. Therefore, impacts related to other emissions adversely affecting a substantial number of people would be *less than significant*.

### *Conclusion*

Mitigation Measure AQ-1 have been identified to reduce construction-related emissions. With implementation of these measures, potential impacts to air quality would be less than significant with mitigation.

### *Mitigation*

**AQ-1** **Prior to issuance of construction permits**, the following measures related to fugitive dust emissions shall be incorporated into the construction phase of the project and shown on all applicable construction plans:

- a) Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible;
- b) Use of water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever



## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

- wind speeds exceed 15 mph. Reclaimed (non-potable) water should be used whenever possible;
- c) All dirt stock pile areas should be sprayed daily as needed;
  - d) Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans should be implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities;
  - e) Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading should be sown with a fast germinating, non-invasive grass seed and watered until vegetation is established;
  - f) All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the APCD;
  - g) All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used;
  - h) Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site;
  - i) All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with CVC Section 23114;
  - j) Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site;
  - k) Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water should be used where feasible;
  - l) All of these fugitive dust mitigation measures shall be shown on grading and building plans; and
  - m) The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the fugitive dust emissions and enhance the implementation of the measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints, reduce visible emissions below 20% opacity, and to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the APCD Compliance Division prior to the start of any grading, earthwork or demolition.

### *Sources*

See Exhibit A.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

### *Sensitive Resource Area Designations*

The County of San Luis Obispo Land Use Ordinance (LUO) Sensitive Resource Area (SRA) combining designation applies to areas of the county with special environmental qualities, or areas containing unique or sensitive endangered vegetation or habitat resources. The combining designation standards established in the LUO require that proposed uses be designed with consideration of the identified sensitive resources and the need for their protection.

### *Federal and State Endangered Species Acts*

The Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (FESA) provides legislation to protect federally listed plant and animal species. The California Endangered Species Act of 1984 (CESA) ensures legal protection for plants listed as rare or endangered, and wildlife species formally listed as endangered or threatened, and maintains a list of California Species of Special Concern (SSC). SSC status is assigned to species that have limited distribution, declining populations, diminishing habitat, or unusual scientific, recreational, or educational value. Under state law, the CDFW has the authority to review projects for their potential to impact special-status species and their habitats.

### *Migratory Bird Treaty Act*

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) protects all migratory birds, including their eggs, nests, and feathers. The MBTA was originally drafted to put an end to the commercial trade in bird feathers, popular in the latter part of the 1800s. The MBTA is enforced by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and potential impacts to species protected under the MBTA are evaluated by the USFWS in consultation with other federal agencies and are required to be evaluated under CEQA.

### *Oak Woodland Ordinance*

The County of San Luis Obispo Oak Woodland Ordinance was adopted in April 2017 to regulate the clear-cutting of oak woodlands. This ordinance applies to sites located outside of Urban or Village areas within the inland portions of the county (not within the Coastal Zone). "Clear-cutting" is defined as the removal of one acre or more of contiguous trees within an oak woodland from a site or portion of a site for any reason, including harvesting of wood, or to enable the conversion of land to other land uses. "Oak woodland" includes the following species: Blue oak (*Quercus douglasii*), coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), interior live oak (*Quercus wislizeni*), valley oak (*Quercus labata*), and California black oak (*Quercus kelloggii*). The ordinance applies to clear-cutting of oak woodland only and does not apply to the removal of other species of trees, individual oak trees (except for Heritage Oaks), or the thinning, tree trimming, or removal of oak woodland trees that are diseased, dead, or creating a hazardous condition. Heritage oaks are any individual oak species, as defined in the Oak Woodland Ordinance, of 48 inches diameter at breast height (dbh) or greater, separated from all Stands and Oak Woodlands by at least 500 feet. Minor Use Permit approval is required to remove any Heritage Oak. The project is in an area known to support Oak Woodland. The project does not propose the removal of any trees.

### *Clean Water Act and State Porter Cologne Water Quality Control Act*

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) regulates discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. These waters include wetland and non-wetland water bodies that meet specific criteria. USACE jurisdiction regulates almost all work in, over, and under waters listed as "navigable waters of the U.S." that results in a discharge of dredged or fill material within USACE regulatory jurisdiction, pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). Under Section 404, USACE regulates traditional navigable waters, wetlands adjacent to traditional navigable waters, relatively permanent non-navigable tributaries that have a

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

continuous flow at least seasonally (typically 3 months), and wetlands that directly abut relatively permanent tributaries.

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) regulate discharges of fill and dredged material in California, under Section 401 of the CWA and the State Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, through the State Water Quality Certification Program. State Water Quality Certification is necessary for all projects that require a USACE permit, or fall under other federal jurisdiction, and have the potential to impact waters of the State. Based on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory, the project site does not support wetlands, riparian or deep-water habitats (USFWS 2019).

### *Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE)*

The intent of the goals, policies, and implementation strategies in the COSE is to identify and protect biological resources that are a critical component of the county's environmental, social, and economic well-being. Biological resources include major ecosystems; threatened, rare, and endangered species and their habitats; native trees and vegetation; creeks and riparian areas; wetlands; fisheries; and marine resources. Individual species, habitat areas, ecosystems and migration patterns must be considered together in order to sustain biological resources. The COSE identifies Critical Habitat areas for sensitive species including California condor, California red legged frog, vernal pool fairy shrimp, La Graciosa thistle, Morro Bay kangaroo rat, Morro shoulderband snail, tiger salamander, and western snowy plover. The COSE also identifies features of particular importance to wildlife for movement corridors such as riparian corridors, shorelines of the coast and bay, and ridgelines.

### *Site Setting*

The subject property is currently undeveloped and is characterized by moderate to steep rolling hills with grassland habitats. A field survey of the project site performed by Andy Knighton confirmed that there are no oak trees on site.

### Special Status Plants

Based on searches of the CDFW California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) and California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California, the following special status plant species were identified within a 5 mile radius of the project site:

- Shining navarretia (*Navarretia nigelliformis ssp. Radians*)

The potential for the shining navarretia (*Navarretia nigelliformis ssp. radians*) has been identified about 3.5 miles from the project site. This annual herb is found in cismontane woodland, valley and foothill grasslands and vernal pool areas between the 200 and 1000-meter elevations (650 to 3,280 feet). The typical blooming period is May-July. The shining navarretia is considered rare by CNPS (List 1B, RED 2-2-3).

Shining navarretia has low potential to occur on the project site since there is no suitable habitat available. This species is found near vernal pools or clay depressions, neither of which are present on the project site (Johnson, 2013). See the discussion on Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp for more information on vernal pools. Additionally, this plant was not observed within 1 mile of the project site. The nearest observation was approximately 3.5 miles away.

### Special Status Wildlife

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

Based on the CNDDDB query, several special-status wildlife species were identified within a 5 mile radius of the project site. However, none of these species were observed within 1 mile of the project site. The following is a list of the species identified:

- Northern California Legless Lizard (*Anniella pulchra*)
- American Badger (*Taxidea taxus*)
- San Joaquin Kit Fox (*Vulpes macrotis mutica*)
- Swainson's Hawk (*Buteo Swainsoni*)
- Northern California legless lizard (*Anniella pulchra*)
- Western Spadefoot (*Spea hammondi*)
- Tricolored Blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*)
- Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*)
- San Joaquin Antelope Squirrel (*Ammospermophilus nelson*)
- Crotch Bumblebee (*Bombus crotchii*)

### Northern California Legless Lizard (*Anniella pulchra*)

The potential for the silvery legless lizard (*Anniella pulchra pulchra*) has been identified about 4.7 miles to the West. The silvery legless lizard is a federal and California Species of Special Concern. The species inhabits sandy or loose loamy soils under sparse vegetation. The lizard prefers soils with high moisture content.

### American Badger (*Taxidea taxus*)

The potential for the American badger (*Taxidea taxus*) has been identified about 4.25 miles to the Northeast. In California, Badgers range throughout the state except for the humid coastal forests of northwestern California (Del Norte and Humboldt Co). Badger populations have declined drastically in California within the last century (Grinnell et al., 1937; Longhurst, 1940), where they now survive only in low numbers in peripheral parts of the central valley and adjacent lowlands to the west in eastern Monterey, Mendocino, San Benito and San Luis Obispo counties. In California, Badgers occupy a diversity of habitats. The principal requirements seem to be sufficient food, friable soils, and relatively open, uncultivated ground. Grasslands, savannas, and mountain meadows near timberline are preferred. Badgers prey primarily on burrowing rodents such as Gophers (*Thomomys*), Ground Squirrels (*Spermophilus*, *Ammospermophilus*), Marmots (*Marmota*), and Kangaroo Rats (*Dipodomys*). They are predatory specialists on these rodents, although they will eat a variety of other animals, including mice, Woodrats, reptiles, birds and their eggs, bees and other insects, etc.

Deliberate killing probably has been a major factor in the decline of Badger populations with many people regarding them as detrimental to their interests. Cultivation is adverse to Badgers, as they do not survive on cultivated land. Agricultural and urban developments have been the primary causes of decline and extirpation of populations of Badgers in California. Rodent and predator poisoning pose double threats through direct and secondary poisoning of Badgers and elimination of the food Badgers are dependent upon. Shooting and trapping of Badgers for animal "control" is another source of mortality.

### Swainson's Hawk (*Buteo Swainsoni*)

The potential for the Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*) has been identified about 4.3 miles to the Northeast. The species is listed as threatened at the state level. While these hawks were once found throughout lowland California, today they are restricted to portions of the Central Valley and Great Basin regions. Swainson's hawks require large, open grasslands with abundant prey in association with suitable nest trees. Suitable foraging areas include native grasslands or lightly grazed pastures, alfalfa and other hay crops, and certain grain and row croplands. The majority of Swainson's hawk territories in the Central Valley

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

are in riparian systems adjacent to suitable foraging habitats. Swainson's hawks often nest in proximity to riparian systems as well as utilizing lone trees or groves of trees in agricultural fields. The loss and conversion of native grasslands and agricultural lands to various residential and commercial developments is the primary threat to Swainson's hawk populations throughout California. Additional threats are habitat loss caused by riverbank protection projects; conversion from agricultural crops that provide abundant foraging opportunities to crops such as vineyards and orchards, which provide fewer foraging opportunities; shooting; pesticide poisoning of prey animals and hawks on foraging and wintering grounds; competition from other raptors; and human disturbance at nest sites.

### Western Spadefoot (*Spea hammondi*)

The potential for the western spadefoot toad (*Spea hammondi*) has been identified about 4 miles to the project site. The western spadefoot toad is a federal species of concern, and a California species of special concern. The species occurs primarily in grassland habitats but can be found in valley-foothill hardwood woodlands. Vernal pools are essential for breeding and egg-laying.

A site visit of the project site was made by staff to inspect the project site's topography for the potential to support vernal pool habitat (e.g. low-elevation areas, depressions, natural or man-made ponded areas, etc.). There was no evidence of vernal pools or potential areas for water to pond observed on the project site. The sloping topography and loamy soils in the project area are features that would prevent water from pooling in a manner consistent with the characteristics of vernal pools or seasonal wetlands. Therefore, there is no indication of habitat suitable for supporting Western Spadefoot, or sensitive aquatic animal or plant species associated with vernal pools.

### Tricolored Blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*)

The potential for the tricolored blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*) has been identified about 4.75 miles to the South of the project site. The Tricolored Blackbird forages in flocks while walking on the ground, eating mostly insects and seeds. This species has highly social nesting and nests can be densely packed (only 1 or 2 feet apart). They form large colonies of about 50 pairs when they nest and breed throughout mid-April into late July. Tricolored Blackbird breed in emergent wetlands near freshwater within tall dense cattails or tules, and in thickets of willow, blackberry, wild rose and tall herbs- none of which found on or near the project site. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that this species will be impacted by this project.

### San Joaquin Antelope Squirrel (*Ammospermophilus nelson*)

The San Joaquin Antelope Squirrel (SJAS) is a small ground-dwelling squirrel that resides in arid grasslands, shrublands and alkali sink habitats of the San Joaquin valley and its adjacent foothills. The diet of SJAS vary depending on what food is available, which includes vegetation, fungi, seeds and more commonly, insects. According to the CNDDDB, the nearest occurrence of SJAS is approximately 3.5 miles away from the project site. In order to avoid impacts to this species, surveys would be performed prior to ground disturbing activities.

### Crotch Bumblebee (*Bombus crotchii*)

Crotch Bumblebee is considered a Special Animal and is tracked by the CNDDDB. Crotch bumble bee is known from California and western Nevada and inhabits open grassland and scrub habitats. In general, bumble bees forage from a diversity of plants, although individual species can vary greatly in their plant preferences, largely due to differences in tongue length (Hatfield et al. 2015). Crotch bumble bees are classified as a short-tongued species, whose food plants include *Asclepias*, *Chaenactis*, *Lupinus*, *Medicago*, *Phacelia*, and *Salvia* (Williams et al.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

2014). The species is primarily active in the spring and summer. Nesting occurs underground, often in abandoned rodent burrows.

### Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*)

The project site occurs within the Carrizo Vernal Pool Region, as designated by the California Department of Fish and Game. Furthermore, the project site is in an area designated as critical habitat for the vernal pool fairy shrimp, a small aquatic crustacean that is listed as a federal threatened species and is associated with vernal pool habitat. A site visit of the project site was made by staff to inspect the project site's topography for the potential to support vernal pool habitat (e.g. low-elevation areas, depressions, natural or man-made ponded areas, etc.). There was no evidence of vernal pools or potential areas for water to pond observed on the project site. The sloping topography and loamy soils in the project area are features that would prevent water from pooling in a manner consistent with the characteristics of vernal pools or seasonal wetlands. Therefore, there is no indication of habitat suitable for supporting fairy shrimp, or sensitive aquatic animal or plant species associated with vernal pools.

### San Joaquin Kit Fox (*Vulpes macrotis mutica*)

The San Joaquin kit fox (SJKF) is a wide-ranging species known from northeastern and southeastern San Luis Obispo County. The SJKF occupies open country grassland, open scrubland, and oak savannah where there are friable soils for burrowing and an abundant rodent prey base. The project site falls within the SJKF corridor between the Carrizo Plain and Camp Roberts. Most of the occurrences are on Camp Roberts, where they have not been seen in many years. The Chandler Ranch observations south of Highway 46 is dated from the 1990's with no recent records of observations. There are 2014 observations of scat from a scent station study updating previous observations near Shandon.

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) requires the completion of a SJKF habitat evaluation form to evaluate potential impacts on the SJKF resulting from discretionary projects. Typically, evaluation scores above 50 require compensatory mitigation for the loss of habitat resulting from project implementation with scores in the 70's equating to a 3:1 ratio. The Study Area is within a 3:1 mitigation ratio area designated by the San Luis Obispo County's map of Standard SJKF Mitigation Ratios. This means that all impacts to SJKF habitat must be mitigated at a ratio of three (3) acres conserved for each acre impacted. The site plans state that the proposed project would disturb 0.57 acres of SJKF habitat. No direct take (i.e. mortality, destruction of active dens, etc.) is allowed under the habitat mitigation fee program.

### Discussion

- (a) *Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*

The CNDDDB search found special-status plant species nearby, however it was determined that the species are not expected to occur onsite due to lack of habitat (e.g., vernal pools) as a result of the existing subdivision, vegetation maintenance (e.g., weed whacking), and anthropogenic disturbance. As a precaution, mitigations BR-1 through BR-18 have been added to require measures such as contractor training, pre-construction surveys, and avoidance and relocation (relocation only for non-listed species). With the implementation of mitigation measures BR-1 through BR-18, impacts on listed species to less than significant with mitigation.

If construction activities are initiated within the nesting bird season, impacts to protected nesting bird could occur. While the project is not proposing any tree removals, the proximity of construction to

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

offsite trees could affect the behavior of nesting birds. Possible impacts to nesting birds are addressed through mitigation BR-14.

American Badgers are transitory individuals that would likely avoid construction activities. However, due to the potential presence of American Badger, possible impacts are addressed in mitigation measure BR-13.

SJKF are unlikely to be present onsite due to the lack of suitable habitat and nearby occurrences. However, the project site is within the County's standard SJKF Mitigation Area, which requires all impacts to SJKF habitat be mitigated at a ratio of three acres conserved for each acre impacted (3:1). The project will result in the permanent disturbance of 0.57-acres of Kit Fox habitat based on the current grading plans being evaluated.

Possible impacts to SJKF habitat have been addressed with mitigation measures BR-1 through BR-12.

- (b) *Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?*

The proposed project is not located in an area identified as a riparian habitat and is not expected to have a substantial adverse effect on any other sensitive natural community. However, the project is within 100 feet of a mapped blue line stream, and there is potential for sediment and erosion. Compliance with existing County Code, including the need for an erosion and sediment control plan will minimize potential impacts. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

- (c) *Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?*

The project site does not support state or federal wetlands or other jurisdictional areas. Therefore, the project would not result in an adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands and *no impacts would occur*.

- (d) *Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?*

The project would not result in disturbance to native resident or migratory fish habitat. The project has the potential to interfere with the movement of the San Joaquin Kit Fox, however, using the proposed mitigation measures (BR-1 through BR-12), this interference impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

- (e) *Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*

No oak trees are located on site or adjacent to the parcel. Oak tree impacts and removal are not proposed for this project.

- (f) *Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?*

The project is not within or adjacent to a Habitat Conservation Plan area or the Natural Community Conservation Plan. Therefore, *no impacts would occur*.



## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

### *Conclusion*

Upon implementation of mitigation measures BR-1 through BR-18, impacts to biological resources would be less than significant.

### *Mitigation*

#### **San Joaquin Kit Fox Habitat Protection and Mitigation Measures**

**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) which 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 1.71 acres (0.57 acres multiplied by 3 for acreage mitigation ratio) 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) (see contact information below) 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). 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 1.71 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. This fee is calculated based on the current cost-per-

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

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, disking, 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 BR-12. 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 per 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

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

- 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 put all San Joaquin Kit Fox protection measures required before construction (prior to any project activities) and during construction shall be included as a note on all project plans.

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-12 of the Developer's Statement/Conditions of Approval shall be clearly delineated on project plans.

**BR-4 Environmental Awareness Training. Prior to the start of any project activities**, an environmental awareness training shall be presented to all personnel by a qualified biologist. The training shall include color photographs and a description of the ecology of all special-status species known or with potential to occur on-site, as well as other sensitive resources requiring avoidance near the project site. The training shall include a description of protection measures required by discretionary permits, an overview of the Federal and State Endangered Species Acts, and implications of noncompliance with these regulations. The biologist shall provide an overview of the required avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures. A sign-in sheet with the name and signature of the qualified biologist who presented the training and the names and signatures of the environmental awareness trainees shall be kept. A fact sheet conveying the information provided in the environmental awareness training shall be provided to all project personnel and anyone else who may enter the project site. If new personnel join the project after the initial training period, they shall receive the environmental awareness training from the qualified biologist or their designee before beginning work. A qualified biologist shall provide refresher trainings during site visits or other monitoring events.

**BR-5 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-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

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

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/animal proof 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 comply 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 County and other responsible agencies (e.g., CDFW and USFWS). 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.
- 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:
- If a wire strand/pole design is used, the lowest strand shall be no closer to the ground than 12".
  - If a more solid wire mesh fence is used, 8" x 12" openings near the ground shall be provided every 100 yards.
  - Other fencing as recommended by a County-qualified biologist and approved by the County.
- 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.
- BR-12 Throughout the life of the project**,
- If a SJKF is discovered at any time to be occupying an area within the project boundaries, all work must stop. The County will be notified, and they will consult with other agencies as needed.
  - To prevent entrapment of SJKF and other special-status wildlife, all excavations, steep-walled holes or trenches greater than two feet deep shall be completely covered at the end of each work day by plywood or similar materials, or one or more escape ramps constructed of earth fill or wooden planks shall be installed a minimum of every 200 feet. All escape ramps shall be angled such that wildlife can feasibly use it to climb out of an area. All excavations, holes, and trenches shall be

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

inspected daily for SJKF or other special-status species and immediately prior to being covered or filled. If a SJKF is entrapped, CDFW, USFWS, and the County will be contacted immediately to document the incident and advise on removal of the entrapped SJKF.

- c) Water sources shall be managed to ensure no leaks occur or are fixed immediately upon discovery in order to prevent SJKF from being drawn to the project area to drink water.
- d) Materials or other stockpiles will be managed in a manner that will prevent SJKF from inhabiting them. Any materials or stockpiles that may have had SJKF take up residence shall be surveyed (consistent with pre-construction survey requirements) by a qualified biologist before they are moved.

### **American Badger (*Taxidea taxus*) Protection Measures**

**BR-13 Pre-construction Survey for American Badger.** A qualified biologist shall complete a pre construction survey for badgers no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days prior to the start of initial project activities to determine if badgers are present within proposed work areas, in addition to a 200-foot buffer around work areas. The results of the survey shall be provided to the County prior to initial project activities.

- a) If a potential den is discovered, it shall be inspected to determine whether they are occupied. The survey shall cover the entire property and shall examine both old and new dens. The den will be monitored for 3 consecutive nights with an infra-red, motion-triggered camera, prior to any project activities, to determine if the den is being used by an American badger. If potential badger dens are too long to completely inspect from the entrance, a fiber optic scope shall be used to examine the den to the end. Inactive dens may be excavated by hand with a shovel to prevent re-use of dens during construction.
- b) If an active badger den is found, an exclusion zone shall be established around the den. A minimum of a 50-foot exclusion zone shall be established during the non-reproductive season (July 1 to January 31) and a minimum 100-foot exclusion zone during the reproductive season (February 1 to June 30). Each exclusion zone shall encircle the den and have a radius of 50 feet (non-reproductive season) or 100 feet (reproductive season, nursing young may be present), measured outward from the burrow entrance. To avoid disturbance and the possibility of direct take of adults and nursing young, and to prevent badgers from becoming trapped in burrows during construction activity, no grading shall occur within 100 feet of active badger dens between February and July. All project activities, including foot and vehicle traffic and storage of supplies and equipment, are prohibited inside exclusion zones. Exclusion zones shall be maintained until all project-related disturbances have been terminated, or it has been determined by a qualified biologist that the den is no longer in use. If avoidance is not possible during project construction or continued operation, the County shall be contacted. The County will coordinate with appropriate resource agencies for guidance.
- c) If more than 30 days pass between construction phases (e.g., vegetation trimming and the start of grading), during which no or minimal work activity occurs, the badger survey shall be repeated.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

### Nesting Birds Protection Measures

**BR-14 Pre-construction Survey for Sensitive and Nesting Birds.** If work is planned to occur between February 1 and September 15, a qualified biologist shall survey the area for nesting birds within one week prior to initial project activity beginning, including ground disturbance and/or vegetation removal/trimming. This includes nests of all common bird species (under the MBTA), as well as special status birds and raptor nests. If nesting birds are located on or near the proposed project site, they shall be avoided until they have successfully fledged, or the nest is no longer deemed active.

- a) A 250-foot exclusion zone shall be placed around non-listed, passerine species, and a 500-foot exclusion zone will be implemented for raptor species. Each exclusion zone shall encircle the nest and have a radius of 250 feet (non-listed passerine species) or 500 feet (raptor species). All project activities, including foot and vehicle traffic and storage of supplies and equipment, are prohibited inside exclusion zones. Exclusion zones shall be maintained until all project-related disturbances have been terminated, or it has been determined by a qualified biologist that the young have fledged or that proposed project activities would not cause adverse impacts to the nest, adults, eggs, or young.
- b) If special status avian species (aside from the burrowing owl) are identified and nesting within the work area, no work will begin until an appropriate exclusion zone is determined in consultation with the County and any relevant resource agencies.
- c) The results of the survey shall be provided to the County prior to initial project activities. The results shall detail appropriate fencing or flagging of exclusion zones and include recommendations for additional monitoring requirements. A map of the project site and nest locations shall be included with the results. The qualified biologist conducting the nesting survey shall have the authority to reduce or increase the recommended exclusion zone depending on site conditions and species (if non-listed).
- d) If two weeks lapse between different phases of project activities (e.g., vegetation trimming and the start of grading), during which no or minimal work activity occurs, the nesting bird survey shall be repeated.

### Reptile and Amphibian Protection Measures

**BR-15 Pre-construction Survey for Special-status Reptiles and Amphibians.** Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits and immediately prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey immediately before any initial ground disturbances (i.e., the morning of the commencement of disturbance). Construction monitoring shall also be conducted by a qualified biologist during all initial ground-disturbing and vegetation removal activities (e.g., grading, grubbing, vegetation trimming, vegetation removal, etc.). To minimize the potential for impacts to dispersing amphibians, work within 100 feet of drainages and swales shall occur during dry conditions. If special-status wildlife is found within the work area, it shall be allowed to leave on its own volition and as appropriate, the resource agencies shall be contacted. If any additional ground- or vegetation-disturbing activities occur on the project site, the above surveys and monitoring shall be repeated. The results of the survey shall be provided to the County of San Luis Obispo within 1 week of monitoring.

### Tricolored Blackbird

---

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

**BR-16 Pre-construction Survey for Tri-colored Blackbird.** If work is planned to occur during the typical nesting bird season (i.e., February 1 through September 15), a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for nesting tricolored blackbirds within 10 days prior to the start of initial project activities.

- a) If an active tricolored blackbird nesting colony is found, a minimum 300-foot exclusion zone shall be observed in accordance with “Staff Guidance Regarding Avoidance of Impacts to Tricolored Blackbird Breeding Colonies on Agricultural Fields in 2015” (CDFW 2015). The exclusion zone shall encircle the nesting colony and have a radius of 300 feet from the outside border of the colony. All foot and vehicle traffic, as well as all project activities, including storage of supplies and equipment, shall remain outside of exclusion zones. Exclusion zones shall be maintained for the duration of the breeding season or until a qualified biologist has determined that nesting has ceased, the birds have fledged, and are no longer reliant upon the colony or parental care for survival.
- b) If 10 days lapse between project phases (e.g., vegetation trimming and the start of grading), during which no or minimal work activity occurs, the tricolored blackbird survey shall be repeated.

### Special-status Small Mammals Protection Measures.

**BR-17 Preconstruction Survey for Special-status Small Mammals (e.g. San Joaquin Antelope Squirrel).** Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits and within 14 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction, a qualified biologist shall complete a preconstruction survey for special-status small mammal species (e.g. giant kangaroo rat and Tulare grasshopper mouse) no more than 14 days prior to the start of initial project activities to ensure special-status small mammal species are not present within proposed works areas. The survey will include mapping of all potentially active special-status mammal burrows within the proposed work areas, access routes, and staging areas plus a 50-foot buffer. All potentially active burrows will be mapped and flagged. If avoidance of the burrows is not feasible, the appropriate resource agency shall be contacted for further guidance.

### Crotch Bumble Bee

**BR-18 Crotch Bumble Bee Survey and Minimization Measures.** Within 30 days prior to initiation of ground disturbance between March and September, the project footprint will be surveyed for Crotch bumble bee using a photograph survey methodology. The site will be slowly walked by two biologists equipped with >8-megapixel point and shoot or DSLR cameras using transects to obtain 100% coverage of the project site. All insects observed during the survey will be photographed with attention to family Apidae (bees). All bees observed will be photographed to the greatest extent feasible without handling. Photographs should clearly show the entire top side of the abdomen, the side of the thorax/abdomen and the face/head. Several photos should be taken of each specimen to obtain an identification. If a bee is observed entering a burrow or other cavity, a Global Positioning System (GPS) point should be recorded and attention should be focused on the cavity to determine if multiple individuals may be entering/exiting, indicating the potential presence of a colony. Biologists will submit photos to Bumble Bee Watch ([www.bumblebeewatch.org](http://www.bumblebeewatch.org)), BeeSpotter (<https://beespotter.org>), or a similar website that employs bumble bee experts to verify the identifications. Qualified scientific experts may also be used to verify photographic records. CDFW will be notified as soon as possible if a *B. crotchii* observation is verified. If a *B. crotchii* colony is detected on the project site, the colony will be mapped and avoided. No vegetation or soil

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

disturbance will be permitted within a 50-foot radius of the colony. If avoidance is infeasible, the applicant will contact the County and CDFW regarding potential conservation measures.

### Sources

See Exhibit A.

## V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

San Luis Obispo County possesses a rich and diverse cultural heritage and therefore has a wealth of historic and prehistoric resources, including sites and buildings associated with Native American inhabitation, Spanish missionaries, and immigrant settlers.

As defined by CEQA, a historical resource includes:

1. A resource listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).
2. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant. The architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural records of California may be considered to be a historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence.

The County of San Luis Obispo LUO Historic Site (H) combining designation is applied to areas of the county to recognize the importance of archeological and historic sites and/or structures important to local, state, or national history. Standards are included regarding minimum parcel size and permit processing requirements for parcels with an established structure and Historic Site combining designation. For example, all new structures and uses within an H combining designation require Minor Use Permit approval, and applications for such projects are required to include a description of measures proposed to protect the historic resource identified by the Land Use Element (LUO 22.14.080).



## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

San Luis Obispo County was historically occupied by two Native American tribes: the northernmost subdivision of the Chumash, the Obispeño (after Mission San Luis Obispo de Tolosa), and the Salinan. However, the precise location of the boundary between the Chumashan-speaking Obispeño Chumash and their northern neighbors, the Hokan-speaking Playanos Salinan, is not known, as those boundaries may have changed over time.

The COSE identifies and maps anticipated culturally sensitive areas and historic resources within the county and establishes goals, policies, and implementation strategies to identify and protect areas, sites, and buildings having architectural, historical, Native American, or cultural significance. Based on the COSE, the project is not located in a designated Archaeological Sensitive Area or Historic Site.

### Discussion

(a) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?*

The project site does not contain, nor is it located near, any historic resources identified in the National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historic Resources. The project site does not contain a site under the Historic Site (H) combining designation and does not contain other structures of historic age (50 years or older) that could be potentially significant as a historical resource. Therefore, the project would not result in an adverse change in the significance of a historical resources and *no impacts would occur*.

(b) *Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?*

Based on a review of past archaeological surveys conducted in the project vicinity, there are no previously identified archaeological resources within 0.5 miles of the project site. In addition, the project site is not located in an area that would be considered culturally sensitive due to lack of physical features typically associated with prehistoric occupation. The project does not propose substantial earthmoving activities that would have the potential to disturb subsurface archaeological resources.

In the unlikely event that resources are uncovered during grading activities, implementation of LUO 22.10.040 (Archaeological Resources) would be required. This section requires that in the event archaeological resources are encountered during project construction, construction activities shall cease, and the County Planning and Building Department must be notified of the discovery so that the extent and location of discovered materials may be recorded by a qualified archaeologist, and the disposition of artifacts may be accomplished in accordance with state and federal law. Therefore, impacts related to a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources would be *less than significant*.

(c) *Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?*

Based on existing conditions, buried human remains are not expected to be present in the site area. In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and LUO 22.10.040 (Archaeological Resources) require that no further disturbances shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. With adherence to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and County LUO, impacts related to the unanticipated disturbance of archaeological resources and human remains would be reduced to less than significant; therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

### Conclusion

No archaeological or historical resources are known or expected to occur within or adjacent to the project site. In the event unanticipated sensitive archaeological resources or human remains are discovered during project construction activities, adherence with County LUO standards and State Health and Safety Code procedures would reduce potential impacts to less than significant; therefore, potential impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### Mitigation

None necessary.

### Sources

See Exhibit A.

## VI. ENERGY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) is the primary electricity provider for urban and rural communities within the County of San Luis Obispo. Approximately 33% of electricity provided by PG&E is sourced from renewable resources and an additional 45% is sourced from greenhouse gas-free resources (PG&E 2017).

The County COSE establishes goals and policies that aim to reduce vehicle miles traveled, conserve water, increase energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The COSE provides the basis and direction for the development of the County’s EnergyWise Plan (EWP), which outlines in greater detail the County’s strategy to reduce government and community-wide greenhouse gas emissions through a number of goals, measures, and actions, including energy efficiency and development and use of renewable energy resources.

In 2010, the EWP established a goal to reduce community-wide greenhouse gas emissions to 15% below 2006 baseline levels by 2020. Two of the six community-wide goals identified to accomplish this were to “[a]ddress future energy needs through increased conservation and efficiency in all sectors” and “[i]ncrease the production of renewable energy from small-scale and commercial-scale renewable energy installations to account for 10% of local energy use by 2020.” In addition, the County has published an EnergyWise Plan 2016

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

Update to summarize progress toward implementing measures established in the EWP and outline overall trends in energy use and emissions since the baseline year of the EWP inventory (2006).

The California Building Code (CBC) contains standards that regulate the method of use, properties, performance, or types of materials used in the construction, alteration, improvement, repair, or rehabilitation of a building or other improvement to real property. The CBC includes mandatory green building standards for residential and nonresidential structures, the most recent version of which are referred to as the 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards. These standards focus on four key areas: smart residential photovoltaic systems, updated thermal envelope standards (preventing heat transfer from the interior to the exterior and vice versa), residential and nonresidential ventilation requirements, and non-residential lighting requirements.

The County LUO includes a Renewable Energy Area combining designation to encourage and support the development of local renewable energy resources, conserving energy resources and decreasing reliance on environmentally costly energy sources. This designation is intended to identify areas of the county where renewable energy production is favorable and establish procedures to streamline the environmental review and processing of land use permits for solar electric facilities (SEFs). The LUO establishes criteria for project eligibility, required application content for SEFs proposed within this designation, permit requirements, and development standards (LUO 22.14.100).

### Discussion

- (a) *Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?*

Project implementation would require minimal consumption of energy resources. During construction, fossil fuels, electricity, and natural gas would be used by construction vehicles and equipment. The energy consumed during construction would be temporary and would not represent a significant or wasteful demand on available resources. Energy demands during project operation would be provided through existing infrastructure and would not substantially increase over existing demands. Operational energy use would be consistent with that of similar facilities and would not be wasteful or inefficient. Additionally, the project will be required to comply with Title 24 of the CBC which requires energy efficient structures, and compliance will be verified during the construction permitting process. There are no unique project characteristics that would result in a significant increase in energy usage, or an inefficient, wasteful use, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

- (b) *Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?*

Implementation of the project would not result in a significant new energy demand and there are no project components or operations that would conflict with the EWP or any other state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Compliance with State laws and regulations, including the most recent Building Code requirements will ensure the project continues to reduce energy demands and greenhouse gas emissions through, for example, increasing state-wide requirements that energy be sourced from renewable resources. Therefore, *no impact would occur*.

### Conclusion

The project would not result in a significant energy demand during short-term construction or long-term operations and would not conflict with state or local renewable energy or energy efficiency plans. Therefore, potential impacts related to energy would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

---

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

### Mitigation

None necessary.

### Sources

See Exhibit A.

## VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (Alquist-Priolo Act) is a California state law that was developed to regulate development near active faults and mitigate the surface fault rupture potential and other hazards. The Alquist-Priolo Act identifies active earthquake fault zones and restricts the construction of habitable structures over known active or potentially active faults. San Luis Obispo County is located in a geologically complex and seismically active region. The Safety Element of the County of San Luis Obispo General Plan identifies three active faults that traverse through the County and that are currently zoned under the Alquist-Priolo Act: The San Andreas, the Hosgri-San Simeon, and the Los Osos. The San Andreas Fault zone is located along the eastern border of San Luis Obispo County and has a length of over 600 miles. The Hosgri-San Simeon fault system generally consists of two fault zones: the Hosgri fault zone that is mapped off the San Luis Obispo County coast; and the San Simeon fault zone, which appears to be associated with the Hosgri, and comes onshore near San Simeon Point. Lastly, the Los Osos Fault zone has been mapped generally in an east/west orientation along the northern flank of the Irish Hills.

The County Safety Element also identifies 17 other faults that are considered potentially active or have uncertain fault activity in the County. The Safety Element establishes policies that require new development to be located away from active and potentially active faults. The element also requires that the County enforce applicable building codes relating to seismic design of structures and require design professionals to evaluate the potential for liquefaction or seismic settlement to impact structures in accordance with the Uniform Building Code. The nearest potentially capable fault zone is approximately 9 miles West of the project site.

Groundshaking refers to the motion that occurs in response to local and regional earthquakes. Seismic groundshaking is influenced by the proximity of the site to an earthquake fault, the intensity of the seismic event, and the underlying soil composition. Groundshaking can endanger life and safety due to damage or collapse of structures or lifeline facilities. The California Building Code includes requirements that structures be designed to resist a certain minimum seismic force resulting from ground motion.

Liquefaction is the sudden loss of soil strength due to a rapid increase in soil pore water pressures resulting from groundshaking during an earthquake. Liquefaction potential increases with earthquake magnitude and groundshaking duration. Low-lying areas adjacent to creeks, rivers, beaches, and estuaries underlain by unconsolidated alluvial soil are most likely to be vulnerable to liquefaction. The CBC requires the

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

assessment of liquefaction in the design of all structures. The project is located in an area with low potential for liquefaction to occur.

Landslides and slope instability can occur as a result of wet weather, weak soils, improper grading, improper drainage, steep slopes, adverse geologic structure, earthquakes, or a combination of these factors. Despite current codes and policies that discourage development in areas of known landslide activity or high risk of landslide, there is a considerable amount of development that is impacted by landslide activity in the County each year. The County Safety Element identifies several policies to reduce risk from landslides and slope instability. These policies include the requirement for slope stability evaluations for development in areas of moderate or high landslide risk, and restrictions on new development in areas of known landslide activity unless development plans indicate that the hazard can be reduced to a less than significant level prior to beginning development. The project is located in an area with low to moderate potential for landslides.

Shrink/swell potential is the extent to which the soil shrinks as it dries out or swells when it gets wet. Extent of shrinking and swelling is influenced by the amount and kind of clay in the soil. Shrinking and swelling of soils can cause damage to building foundations, roads, and other structures. A high shrink/swell potential indicates a hazard to maintenance of structures built in, on, or with material having this rating. Moderate and low ratings lessen the hazard accordingly. As referenced in the Agricultural Resources section, the soil description for this site is Nacimiento-Los Osos complex (9 to 30 percent slopes)

The County LUO identifies a Geologic Study Area (GSA) combining designation for areas where geologic and soil conditions could present new developments and/or their occupants with potential hazards to life and property. All land use permit applicants located within a GSA are required to include a report prepared by a certified engineering geologist and/or registered civil/soils engineer as appropriate, except for construction of one single-story single-family residence, agricultural uses not involving a building, agricultural accessory structures, and alterations or additions to any structure which does not exceed 50 percent of the assessed value of the structure. In addition, all uses within a GSA are subject to special standards regarding grading and distance from an active fault within an Earthquake Fault Zone (LUO 22.14.070).

Paleontological resources are fossilized remains of ancient environments, including fossilized bone, shell, and plant parts; impressions of plant, insect, or animal parts preserved in stone; and preserved tracks of insects and animals. Paleontological resources are considered nonrenewable resources under state and federal law. Paleontological sensitivity is defined as the potential for a geologic unit to produce scientifically significant fossils, as determined by rock type, history of the rock unit in producing fossil materials, and fossil sites that have been recorded in the unit. Paleontological resources are generally found below ground surface in sedimentary rock units. The boundaries of the sedimentary rock unit is used to define the limits of paleontological sensitivity in a given region.

In the county, the Coastal Franciscan domain generally lies along the mountains and hills associated with the Santa Lucia Range. Fossils recorded from the Coastal Franciscan formation include trace fossils (preserved tracks or other signs of the behaviors of animals), mollusks, and marine reptiles. Nonmarine or continental deposits are more likely to contain vertebrate fossil sites. Occasionally vertebrate marine fossils such as whale, porpoise, seal, or sea lion can be found in marine rock units such as the Miocene Monterey Formation and the Pliocene Sisquoc Formations known to occur throughout Central and Southern California. Vertebrate fossils of continental material are usually rare, sporadic, and localized.

The County COSE identifies a policy for the protection of paleontological resources from the effects of development by avoiding disturbance where feasible. Where substantial subsurface disturbance is proposed in paleontologically sensitive units, Implementation Strategy CR 4.5.1 (Paleontological Studies) requires a paleontological resource assessment and mitigation plan be prepared, to identify the extent and potential

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

significance of resources that may exist within the proposed development and provide mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources.

### *Discussion*

(a) *Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*

(a-i) *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.*

Based on the California Department of Conservation Earthquake Zone Map, the project site is not located within a mapped Alquist-Priolo earthquake hazard zone (CGS 2018). Based on the County Safety Element Fault Hazards Map, the project site is not located within 1 mile of a known active or potentially active fault. Therefore, the project would not have the potential to result in substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault and impacts would be *less than significant*.

(a-ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

Based on the County Safety Element Fault Hazards Map, the project site is not located within 1 mile of a known active or potentially active fault. However, San Luis Obispo County is located in a seismically active region and there is always a potential for seismic ground shaking. The project would be required to comply with the California Building Code (CBC) and other applicable standards to ensure the effects of a potential seismic event would be minimized through compliance with current engineering practices and techniques. The project does not include unique components that would be particularly sensitive to seismic ground shaking or result in an increased risk of injury or damage as a result of ground shaking. Implementation of the project would not expose people or structures to significant increased risks associated with seismic ground shaking; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

(a-iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*

Based on the County Safety Element Liquefaction Hazards Map, the project site is located in an area with low potential for liquefaction. In addition, the project would be required to comply with CBC seismic requirements to address the site's potential for seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction; therefore, the potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

### *Landslides?*

The project site is moderately sloped, and based on the County Safety Element Landslide Hazards Map is located in an area with moderate potential for landslide risk. Therefore, the project would not result in significant adverse effects associated with landslides and impacts would be *less than significant*.

(b) *Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

The project does not include substantial vegetation removal or grading. Preparation and approval of an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan is required for all construction and grading projects (LUO 22.52.120) to minimize potential impacts related to erosion, sedimentation, and siltation. The plan would be prepared by a civil engineer to address both temporary and long-term sedimentation and erosion impacts. Compliance with existing regulations would reduce potential impacts related to soil erosion and loss of topsoil to *less than significant*.

(c) *Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?*

Landslides typically occur in areas with steep slopes or in areas containing escarpments. Based on the Landslide Hazards Map provided in the County Safety Element, the project site is not located in an area with slopes susceptible to local failure or landslide.

The project would be required to comply with CBC seismic requirements to address potential seismic-related ground failure including lateral spread. Based on the County Safety Element and USGS data, the project is not located in an area of historical or current land subsidence (USGS 2019). Based on the County Safety Element Liquefaction Hazards Map, the project site is located in an area with low potential for liquefaction risk and the project is not located within the GSA combining designation. Therefore, impacts related to on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse would be *less than significant*.

(d) *Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?*

Based on the Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County and Web Soil Survey, the project site is not located within an area known to contain expansive soils as defined in the Uniform Building Code. In addition, all future development would be required to comply with the most recent CBC requirements, which have been developed to properly safeguard structures and occupants from land stability hazards, such as expansive soils. Therefore, potential impacts related to expansive soil would be *less than significant*.

(e) *Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?*

The project site does not have soils that are incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks and no other wastewater disposal system is proposed to be installed for this project. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.



## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

(f) *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?*

No known paleontological resources are known to exist in the project area and the project site does not contain any unique geologic features. Additionally, bedrock is not anticipated due to the depth of grading. Therefore, potential impacts on paleontological resources would be *less than significant*.

### Conclusion

The project site is not within the GSA combining designation or an area of high risk of landslide, liquefaction, subsidence, or other unstable geologic conditions. The project would be required to comply with CBC and standard LUO requirements which have been developed to properly safeguard against seismic and geologic hazards. Therefore, potential impacts related to geology and soils would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary

### Mitigation

None necessary.

### Sources

See Exhibit A.

## VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

Greenhouse gases (GHG) are any gases that absorb infrared radiation in the atmosphere, and are different from the criteria pollutants discussed in Section III, Air Quality, above. The primary GHGs that are emitted into the atmosphere as a result of human activities are carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), and fluorinated gases. These are most commonly emitted through the burning of fossil fuels (oil, natural gas, and coal), agricultural practices, decay of organic waste in landfills, and a variety of other chemical reactions and industrial processes (e.g., the manufacturing of cement).

Carbon dioxide is the most abundant GHG and is estimated to represent approximately 80-90% of the principal GHGs that are currently affecting the earth's climate. According to the ARB, transportation (vehicle exhaust) and electricity generation are the main sources of GHGs in the state.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

In March 2012, the SLOAPCD approved thresholds for Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emission impacts, and these thresholds have been incorporated into the CEQA Air Quality Handbook. The Bright-Line Threshold of 1,150 Metric Tons CO<sub>2</sub>/year (MT CO<sub>2</sub>e/yr) is the most applicable GHG threshold for most projects. Table 1-1 in the APCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook provides a list of general land uses and the estimated sizes or capacity of those uses expected to exceed the GHG Bright Line Threshold of 1,150 Metric Tons of carbon dioxide per year (MT CO<sub>2</sub>/yr). Projects that exceed the criteria or are within ten percent of exceeding the criteria presented in Table 1-1 are required to conduct a more detailed analysis of air quality impacts.

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.

In October 2008, ARB published its *Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan*, which is the State's plan to achieve GHG reductions in California required by Assembly Bill (AB) 32. This initial Scoping Plan contained the main strategies to be implemented in order to achieve the target emission levels identified in AB 32. The Scoping Plan included ARB-recommended GHG reductions for each emissions sector of the state's GHG inventory. The largest proposed GHG reduction recommendations were associated with improving emissions standards for light-duty vehicles, implementing the Low Carbon Fuel Standard program, implementation of energy efficiency measures in buildings and appliances, the widespread development of combined heat and power systems, and developing a renewable portfolio standard for electricity production.

Senate Bill (SB) 32 and Executive Order (EO) S-3-05 extended the State's GHG reduction goals and require ARB to regulate sources of GHGs to meet a state goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030, and 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050. The initial Scoping Plan was first approved by ARB on December 11, 2008 and is updated every five years. The first update of the Scoping Plan was approved by the ARB on May 22, 2014, which looked past 2020 to set mid-term goals (2030-2035) toward reaching the 2050 goals. The most recent update released by ARB is the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan, which was released in November 2017. The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan incorporates strategies for achieving the 2030 GHG-reduction target established in SB 32 and EO S-3-05.

When assessing the significance of potential impacts for CEQA compliance, an individual project's GHG emissions will generally not result in direct significant impacts 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. Accordingly, in March 2012, the SLOAPCD approved thresholds for GHG impacts which were incorporated into their 2012 CEQA Air Quality Handbook. The Handbook recommended applying a 1,150 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e per year Bright Line Threshold for commercial and residential projects and included a list of general land uses and estimated sizes or capacities of uses expected to exceed this threshold. According to the SLOAPCD, this threshold was based on a 'gap analysis' and was used for CEQA compliance evaluations to demonstrate consistency with the state's GHG emission reduction goals associated with AB32 and the 2008 Climate Change Scoping Plan which have a target year of 2020. However, in 2015, the California Supreme Court issued an opinion in the case of *Center for Biological Diversity vs California Department of Fish and Wildlife* ("Newhall Ranch") that determined that AB 32 based thresholds derived from a gap analysis are invalid for projects with a planning horizon beyond 2020. Since the bright-line and service population GHG thresholds in the Handbook are AB 32 based, and project horizons are now beyond 2020, the SLOAPCD no longer recommends the use of these thresholds in CEQA evaluations. Instead, the following threshold options are recommended for consideration by the lead agency:

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

- **No-net Increase:** The 2017 Scoping Plan states that no-net increase in GHG emissions relative to baseline conditions “*is an appropriate overall objective for new development*” consistent with the Court’s direction provided by the Newhall Ranch case. Although a desirable goal, the application of this threshold may not be appropriate for a small project where it can be clearly shown that it will not generate significant GHG emissions (i.e., *de minimus*: too trivial or minor to merit consideration).
- **Lead Agency Adopted Defensible GHG CEQA Thresholds:** Under this approach, a lead agency may establish SB 32-based local operational thresholds. As discussed above, SB 32 requires the state to reduce GHG levels by 40 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2030. According to the *California Greenhouse Gas Emissions for 2000 to 2017, Trends of Emissions and Other Indicators* published by the California Air Resources Board, emissions of GHG statewide in 2017 were 424 million MMTCO<sub>2e</sub>, which was 7 million MTCO<sub>2e</sub> below the 2020 GHG target of 431 MMTCO<sub>2e</sub> established by AB 32. Therefore, application of the 1,150 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> Bright Line Threshold in San Luis Obispo County, together with other local and State-wide efforts to reduce GHG emissions, proved to be an effective approach for achieving the reduction targets set forth by AB32 for the year 2020. It should be noted that the 1,150 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year Bright Line Threshold was based on the assumption that a project with the potential to emit less than 1,150 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year would result in impacts that are less than significant and less than cumulatively considerable impact and would be consistent with state and local GHG reduction goals.

Since SB 32 requires the state to reduce GHG levels by 40 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2030, the application of an interim “bright line” SB32-based working threshold that is 40 percent below the 1,150 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> Bright Line threshold ( $1,150 \times 0.6 = 690$  MTCO<sub>2e</sub>) would be expected to produce comparable GHG reductions “in the spirit of” the targets established by SB32. Therefore, for the purpose of evaluating the significance of GHG emissions for a project after 2020, emissions estimated to be less than 690 MTCO<sub>2e</sub> per year GHG are considered *de minimus* (too trivial or minor to merit consideration), and will have a less than significant impact that is less than cumulatively considerable and consistent with state and local GHG reduction goals.

The County Energy Wise Plan (EWP; 2011) identifies ways in which the community and County government can reduce greenhouse gas emissions from their various sources. Looking at the four key sectors of energy, waste, transportation, and land use, the EWP incorporates best practices to provide a blueprint for achieving greenhouse gas emissions reductions in the unincorporated towns and rural areas of San Luis Obispo County by 15% below the baseline year of 2006 by the year 2020. The EWP includes an Implementation Program that provides a strategy for actions with specific measures and steps to achieve the identified GHG reduction targets including, but not limited to, the following:

- Encourage new development to exceed minimum Cal Green requirements;
- Require a minimum of 75% of nonhazardous construction and demolition debris generated on site to be recycled or salvaged;
- Continue to implement strategic growth strategies that direct the county’s future growth into existing communities and to provide complete services to meet local needs;
- Continue to increase the amount of affordable housing in the County, allowing lower-income families to live closer to jobs and activity centers, and providing residents with greater access to transit and alternative modes of transportation;
- Reduce potable water use by 20% in all newly constructed buildings by using the performance methods provided in the California Green Building Code;

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

- Require use of energy-efficient equipment in all new development;
- Minimize the use of dark materials on roofs by requiring roofs to achieve a minimum solar reflectivity index of 10 for high-slope roofs and 68 for low-slope roofs; and
- Use light-colored aggregate in new road construction and repaving projects adjacent to existing cities.

In 2016 the County published the EnergyWise Plan 2016 Update, which describes the progress made toward implementing measures in the 2011 EWP, overall trends in energy use and emissions since the baseline year of the inventory (2006), and the addition of implementation measures intended to provide a greater understanding of the County's emissions status.

### Discussion

- (a) *Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*

Based on the nature of the proposed project and Table 1-1 of the SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the project would generate less than the SLOAPCD Bright-Line Threshold of 1,150 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e metric tons of GHG emissions. The project's construction related and operational GHG emissions and energy demands would be minimal. Therefore, the project's potential direct and cumulative GHG emissions would be less than significant and less than a cumulatively considerable contribution to regional GHG emissions.

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 ARB (or other regulatory agencies) and will be regulated by standards implemented by the ARB, the federal government, or other regulatory agencies. 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. As a result, even the emissions that result from projects that produce fewer emissions than the threshold will be subject to emission reductions. Therefore, potential impacts associated with the generation of greenhouse gas emissions would be *less than significant*.

- (b) *Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

The proposed project would be required to comply with existing state regulations, which include increased energy conservation measures, reduced potable water use, increased waste diversion, and other actions adopted to achieve the overall GHG emissions reduction goals identified in SB 32 and EO S-3-05. The project would not conflict with the control measures identified in the CAP, EWP, or other state and local regulations related to GHG emissions and renewable energy. The project would be generally consistent with the property's existing land use and would be designed to comply with the California Green Building Code standards. Therefore, the project would be consistent with applicable plans and programs designed to reduce GHG emissions and potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

### Conclusion

The project would not generate significant GHG emissions above existing levels and would not exceed any applicable GHG thresholds, contribute considerably to cumulatively significant GHG emissions, or conflict

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

with plans adopted to reduce GHG emissions. Therefore, potential impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### Mitigation

None necessary.

### Sources

See Exhibit A.

## IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Site (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies, and developers to comply with CEQA requirements related to the disclosure of information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. Government Code section 65962.5 requires the California EPA to develop at least annually an updated Cortese List. Various state and local government agencies are required to track and document hazardous material release information for the Cortese List. The California Department of Toxic Substance Control’s (DTSC’s) EnviroStor database tracks DTSC cleanup, permitting, enforcement, and investigation efforts at hazardous waste facilities and sites with known contamination, such as federal superfund sites, state response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, school cleanup sites, school investigation sites, and military evaluation sites. The State Water Resources Control Board’s (SWRCB’s) GeoTracker database contains records for sites that impact, or have the potential to impact, water in California, such as Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) sites, Department of Defense sites, and Cleanup Program Sites. The remaining data regarding facilities or sites identified as meeting the “Cortese List” requirements can be located on the CalEPA website: <https://calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/>. The project site is not located within close proximity to any sites included on the Cortese List, EnviroStor Database, or GeoTracker database.

The California Health and Safety Code provides regulations pertaining to the abatement of fire related hazards and requires that local jurisdictions enforce the California Building Code, which provides standards for fire resistive building and roofing materials, and other fire-related construction methods. The County Safety Element provides a Fire Hazard Zones Map that indicates unincorporated areas in the County within moderate, high, and very high fire hazard severity zones. The project site is located in a high fire severity zone and the emergency response time is approximately 5-10 minutes. For more information about fire-related hazards and risk assessment, see Section XX. Wildfire.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

The County also has adopted general emergency plans for multiple potential natural disasters, including the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, County Emergency Operations Plan, Earthquake Plan, Dam and Levee Failure Plan, Hazardous Materials Response Plan, County Recovery Plan, and the Tsunami Response Plan.

### *Discussion*

- (a) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*

The project does not propose the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous substances. Any commonly used hazardous substances within the project site (e.g., cleaners, solvents, oils, paints, etc.) would be transported, stored, and used according to regulatory requirements and existing procedures for the handling of hazardous materials. *No impacts* associated with the routine transport of hazardous materials would occur.

- (b) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?*

During construction the proposed project would utilize limited quantities of hazardous substances such as gasoline, diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid, solvents, oils, paints, etc. Handling of these materials has the potential to result in an accidental release. Construction contractors would be required to comply with applicable federal and state environmental and workplace safety laws. Additionally, the construction contractor would be required to implement BMPs for the storage, use, and transportation of hazardous materials during all construction activities. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

- (c) *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

The project site is not located within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school facility; therefore, *no impacts would occur*.

- (d) *Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?*

Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substance Control's EnviroStar database, the State Water Resources Control Board's Geotracker database, and CalEPA's Cortese List website, there are no hazardous waste cleanup sites within the project site. Therefore, *no impacts would occur*.

- (e) *For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?*

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or private airstrip; therefore, *no impacts would occur*.

- (f) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant temporary or permanent impact on any adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. *No breaks in utility*

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

service or road closures would occur as a result of project implementation. Any construction-related detours would include proper signage and notification and would be short-term and limited in nature and duration. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

- (g) *Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?*

The project is not located within or adjacent to a wildland area. The project is located within a high or very high fire hazard severity zone; however, the project would be required to comply with all applicable fire safety rules and regulations including the California Fire Code and Public Resources Code prior to issuance of building permits; therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

### Conclusion

The project does not propose the routine transport, use, handling, or disposal of hazardous substances. It is not located within proximity to any known contaminated sites and is not within close proximity to populations that could be substantially affected by upset or release of hazardous substances. Project implementation would not subject people or structures to substantial risks associated with wildland fires and would not impair implementation or interfere with any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Therefore, potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### Mitigation

None necessary.

### Sources

See Exhibit A.

## X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
(i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

The Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) has established Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) thresholds for waterbodies within the County. A TMDL establishes the allowable amount of a particular pollutant a waterbody can receive on a regular basis and remain at levels that protect beneficial uses designated for that waterbody. A TMDL also establishes proportional responsibility for controlling the pollutant, numeric indicators of water quality, and measures to achieve the allowable amount of pollutant loading. Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) requires states to maintain a list of bodies of water that are designated as “impaired”. A body of water is considered impaired when a particular water quality objective or standard is not being met.

The RWQCB’s Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coast Basin (Basin Plan; 2017) describes how the quality of surface water and groundwater in the Central Coast Region should be managed to provide the highest water quality reasonably possible. The Basin Plan outlines the beneficial uses of streams, lakes, and

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

other water bodies for humans and other life. There are 24 categories of beneficial uses, including, but not limited to, municipal water supply, water contact recreation, non-water contact recreation, and cold freshwater habitat. Water quality objectives are then established to protect the beneficial uses of those water resources. The Regional Board implements the Basin Plan by issuing and enforcing waste discharge requirements to individuals, communities, or businesses whose discharges can affect water quality.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), through Section 404 of the CWA, regulates the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S., including wetlands. Waters of the U.S. are typically identified by the presence of an ordinary high-water mark (OHWM) and connectivity to traditional navigable waters or other jurisdictional features. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and nine RWQCBs regulate discharges of fill and dredged material in California, under Section 401 of the CWA and the State Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, through the State Water Quality Certification Program. State Water Quality Certification is necessary for all projects that require a USACE permit, or fall under other federal jurisdiction, or have the potential to impact waters of the State. Waters of the State are defined by the Porter-Cologne Act as any surface water or groundwater, including saline waters, within the boundaries of the state.

The County LUO dictates which projects are required to prepare a drainage plan, including any project that would, for example, change the runoff volume or velocity leaving any point of the site, result in an impervious surface of more than 20,000 square feet, or involve hillside development on slopes steeper than 10 percent. Preparation of a drainage plan is not required where grading is exclusively for an exempt agricultural structure, crop production, or grazing.

The County LUO also dictates that an erosion and sedimentation control plan is required year-round for all construction and grading permit projects and site disturbance activities of one-half acre or more in geologically unstable areas, on slopes steeper than 30 percent, on highly erodible soils, or within 100 feet of any watercourse.

Per the County's Stormwater Program, the Public Works Department is responsible for ensuring that new construction sites implement best management practices during construction, and that site plans incorporate appropriate post-construction stormwater runoff controls. Construction sites that disturb 1.0 acre or more must obtain coverage under the SWRCB's Construction General Permit. The Construction General Permit requires the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to minimize on-site sedimentation and erosion. There are several types of projects that are exempt from preparing a SWPPP, including routine maintenance to existing developments, emergency construction activities, and projects exempted by the SWRCB or RWQCB. Projects that disturb less than 1.0 acre must implement all required elements within the site's erosion and sediment control plan as required by the San Luis Obispo County LUO.

For planning purposes, the flood event most often used to delineate areas subject to flooding is the 100-year flood. The County Safety Element establishes policies to reduce flood hazards and reduce flood damage, including but not limited to prohibition of development in areas of high flood hazard potential, discouragement of single road access into remote areas that could be closed during floods, and review of plans for construction in low-lying areas. All development located in a 100-year flood zone is subject to Federal Emergency Management Act (FEMA) regulations. The County Land Use Ordinance designates a Flood Hazard (FH) combining designation for areas of the County that could be subject to inundation by a 100-year flood or within coastal high hazard areas. Development projects within this combining designation are subject to FH permit and processing requirements, including, but not limited to, the preparation of a drainage plan, implementation of additional construction standards, and additional materials storage and

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

processing requirements for substances that could be injurious to human, animal, or plant life in the event of flooding. The project site is not located within a Flood Hazard combining designation. The nearest watercourse/waterbody is the Huerhuero Creek, located approximately 2.8 miles West of the project site.

### Discussion

- (a) *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?*

The project site is not located in proximity to any mapped creek or surface water bodies that could be adversely affected by project construction or operation. The project site does not contain Waters of the U.S. or the State. Implementation of the project would not substantially change the volume or velocity of runoff leaving any point of the site or result in a significant increase in impervious surface area. The project site is generally flat and does not pose a risk to downslope runoff, sedimentation, erosion, or runoff. The project would not substantially affect surface water or groundwater quality. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

- (b) *Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?*

The project is located within a groundwater basin designated as Level of Severity III per the County's Resource Management System, which means the basin is in severe decline by the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). The project proposed includes a single-family residence. The approximate annual water use for a single-family residence is approximately 0.5 acre-feet of water per year. This is less than the State of California's de minimus of 2 acre-feet per year for a single-family residence within a Level of Severity III Basin. The proposed residence would not substantially increase water demand, deplete groundwater supplies, or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge; therefore, the project would not interfere with sustainable management of the groundwater basin. Potential impacts associated with groundwater supplies would be *less than significant*.

- (c) *Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:*

- (c-i) *Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*

The project site is located within 100 feet of a mapped blue line stream that would be subject to risk associated with erosion or siltation as the result of project construction or operation. Compliance with existing County Code, including the need for an erosion and sediment control plan will minimize potential impacts. Additionally, the project would not result in greater than 1 acre of site disturbance. Therefore, potential impacts related to erosion and siltation would be *less than significant*.

- (c-ii) *Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?*

The project would not substantially increase the amount of impervious surface area or the rate and volume of surface runoff in a manner that could result in flooding on- or off-site. Based on the nature and size of the project, changes in surface hydrology would be negligible. Therefore, potential impacts related to increased surface runoff resulting in flooding would be *less than significant*.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

(c-iii) *Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?*

The project would not substantially increase the amount of impervious surface area or the rate and volume of surface runoff in a manner that could exceed the capacity of existing stormwater or drainage systems. Based on the nature and size of the project, changes in surface hydrology would be negligible. Therefore, potential impacts related to increased surface runoff exceeding stormwater capacity would be *less than significant*.

(c-iv) *Impede or redirect flood flows?*

Based on the County Flood Hazard Map, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone. The project would be subject to standard County requirements for drainage, sedimentation, and erosion control for construction and operation. Therefore, *no impacts would occur*.

(d) *In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?*

Based on the County Safety Element, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone or within an area that would be inundated if dam failure were to occur. Based on the San Luis Obispo County Tsunami Inundation Maps, the project site is not located in an area with potential for inundation by a tsunami (DOC 2019). The project site is not located within proximity to a standing body of water with the potential for a seiche to occur. Therefore, the project site has no potential to release pollutants due to project inundation and *no impacts would occur*.

(e) *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?*

The project is located within a groundwater basin designated as Level of Severity III per the County's Resource Management System, which means the basin is in severe decline by SGMA. The project proposed includes a single-family residence. The approximate annual water use for a single-family residence is approximately 0.5 acre-feet of water per year. This is less than the State of California's de minimus of 2 acre-feet per year for a single-family residence within a Level of Severity III Basin. The proposed residence will not substantially increase water demand, deplete groundwater supplies, impact the basin or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The project would not conflict with SGMA or other local or regional plans or policies intended to manage water quality or groundwater supplies; therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

### Conclusion

The project site is not within the 100-year flood zone and does not include existing drainages or other surface waters. The project would not substantially increase impervious surfaces and does not propose alterations to existing water courses or other significant alterations to existing on-site drainage patterns. Therefore, potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### Mitigation

None necessary.

### Sources

See Exhibit A.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

### XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### Setting

The LUO was established to guide and manage the future growth in the County in accordance with the General Plan, to regulate land use in a manner that will encourage and support orderly development and beneficial use of lands, to minimize adverse effects on the public resulting from inappropriate creation, location, use or design of buildings or land uses, and to protect and enhance significant natural, historic, archeological, and scenic resources within the county. The LUO is the primary tool used by the County to carry out the goals, objectives, and policies of the County General Plan.

The County Land Use Element (LUE) provides policies and standards for the management of growth and development in each unincorporated community and rural areas of the county and serves as a reference point and guide for future land use planning studies throughout the county. The LUE identifies strategic growth principles to define and focus the county's pro-active planning approach and balance environmental, economic, and social equity concerns. Each strategic growth principle correlates with a set of policies and implementation strategies that define how land will be used and resources protected. The LUE also defines each of the 14 land use designations and identifies standards for land uses based on the designation they are located within. The project parcel and surrounding parcels are within the Residential Rural land use designation.

The inland LUE also contains the area plans of each of the four inland planning areas: Carrizo, North County, San Luis Obispo, and South County. The area plans establish policies and programs for land use, circulation, public facilities, services, and resources that apply "areawide", in rural areas, and in unincorporated urban areas within each planning area. Part three of the LUE contains each of the 13 inland community and village plans, which contain goals, policies, programs, and related background information for the County's unincorporated inland urban and village areas. The project is located within the North County Planning Area.

#### Discussion

(a) *Physically divide an established community?*

The project does not propose project elements or components that would physically divide the site from surrounding areas and uses. The project would be consistent with the general level of

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

development within the project vicinity and would not create, close, or impede any existing public or private roads, or create any other barriers to movement or accessibility within the community. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community and no impacts would occur.

- (b) *Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?*

The project would be consistent with the property's land use designation and the guidelines and policies for development within the applicable area plan, inland LUO, and the COSE. The project is consistent with existing surrounding developments and does not contain sensitive on-site resources; therefore, the project would not conflict with policies or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. The project would be consistent with existing land uses and designations for the proposed site and, therefore, would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. No impacts would occur.

### *Conclusion*

The project would be consistent with local and regional land use designations, plans, and policies and would not divide an established community. Therefore, potential impacts related to land use and planning would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### *Mitigation*

None necessary.

### *Sources*

See Exhibit A.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

### XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally- important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### Setting

The California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) requires that the State Geologist classify land into mineral resource zones (MRZ) according to the known or inferred mineral potential of the land (Public Resources Code Sections 2710–2796).

The three MRZs used in the SMARA classification-designation process in the San Luis Obispo-Santa Barbara Production-Consumption Region are defined below (California Geological Survey 2011a):

- **MRZ-1:** Areas where available geologic information indicates that little likelihood exists for the presence of significant mineral resources.
- **MRZ-2:** Areas where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that a high likelihood for their presence exists. This zone shall be applied to known mineral deposits or where well-developed lines of reasoning, based upon economic-geologic principles and adequate data, demonstrate that the likelihood for occurrence of significant mineral deposits is high.
- **MRZ-3:** Areas containing known or inferred aggregate resources of undetermined significance.

The County LUO provides regulations for development in delineated Energy and Extractive Resource Areas (EX) and Extractive Resource Areas (EX1). The EX combining designation is used to identify areas of the county where:

1. Mineral or petroleum extraction occurs or is proposed to occur;
2. The state geologist has designated a mineral resource area of statewide or regional significance pursuant to PRC Sections 2710 et seq. (SMARA); and,
3. Major public utility electric generation facilities exist or are proposed.

The purpose of this combining designation is to protect significant resource extraction and energy production areas identified by the County LUE from encroachment by incompatible land uses that could hinder resource

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

extraction or energy production operations, or land uses that would be adversely affected by extraction or energy production.

### Discussion

- (a) *Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?*

The project is not located within a designated mineral resource zone or within an Extractive Resource Area combining designation. There are no known mineral resources in the project area; therefore, no impacts would occur.

- (b) *Result in the loss of availability of a locally- important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?*

There are no known or mapped mineral resources in the project area and the likelihood of future mining of important resources within the project area is very low. Therefore, no impacts would occur.

### Conclusion

No impacts to mineral resources would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### Mitigation

None necessary.

### Sources

See Exhibit A.

## XIII. NOISE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project result in:</i>				
(a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

The San Luis Obispo County Noise Element of the General Plan provides a policy framework for addressing potential noise impacts in the planning process. The purpose of the Noise Element is to minimize future noise conflicts. The Noise Element identifies the major noise sources in the county (highways and freeways, primary arterial roadways and major local streets, railroad operations, aircraft and airport operations, local industrial facilities, and other stationary sources) and includes goals, policies, and implementation programs to reduce future noise impacts. Among the most significant polices of the Noise Element are numerical noise standards that limit noise exposure within noise-sensitive land uses, and performance standards for new commercial and industrial uses that might adversely impact noise-sensitive land uses.

Noise sensitive uses that have been identified by the County include the following:

- Residential development, except temporary dwellings
- Schools – preschool to secondary, college and university, specialized education and training
- Health care services (e.g., hospitals, clinics, etc.)
- Nursing and personal care
- Churches
- Public assembly and entertainment
- Libraries and museums
- Hotels and motels
- Bed and breakfast facilities
- Outdoor sports and recreation
- Offices

All sound levels referred to in the Noise Element are expressed in A-weighted decibels (dB). A-weighting de-emphasizes the very low and very high frequencies of sound in a manner similar to the human ear. There are approximately thirty-three (33) sensitive receptors (residences) within a 1,000-foot radius of the project site.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

### Discussion

- (a) *Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?*

The County of San Luis Obispo LUO establishes acceptable standards for exterior and interior noise levels and describe how noise shall be measured. Exterior noise level standards are applicable when a land use affected by noise is one of the sensitive uses listed in the Noise Element. Exterior noise levels are measured from the property line of the affected noise-sensitive land use.

**Table 3. Maximum allowable exterior noise level standards<sup>(1)</sup>**

Sound Levels	Daytime 7 a.m. to 10 p.m.	Nighttime <sup>(2)</sup>
Hourly Equivalent Sound Level (L <sub>eq</sub> , dB)	50	45
Maximum level, dB	70	65

(1) When the receiving noise-sensitive land use is outdoor sports and recreation, the noise level standards are increased by 10 db.

(2) Applies only to uses that operate or are occupied during nighttime hours

The County LUO noise standards are subject to a range of exceptions, including noise sources associated with construction, provided such activities do not take place before 7 a.m. or after 9 p.m. on weekdays, or before 8 a.m. or after 5 p.m. on Saturday or Sunday. Noise associated with agricultural land uses (as listed in Section 22.06.030), traffic on public roadways, railroad line operations, and aircraft in flight are also exempt.

Project construction would result in a temporary increase in noise levels associated with construction activities, equipment, and vehicle trips. Construction noise would be variable, temporary, and limited in nature and duration. The County LUO requires that construction activities be conducted during daytime hours to be able to utilize County construction noise exception standards and that construction equipment be equipped with appropriate mufflers recommended by the manufacturer. Compliance with these standards would ensure short-term construction noise would be less than significant.

The project does not propose any uses or features that would generate a significant permanent source of mobile or stationary noise sources. Ambient noise levels at the project site and in surrounding areas after project implementation would not be significantly different than existing levels. Therefore, potential operational noise impacts would be less than significant.

Based on the limited nature of construction activities, and the consistency of the proposed use with existing and surrounding uses, impacts associated with the generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels would be *less than significant*.

- (b) *Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?*

Operation of the proposed project would not result in groundborne vibration. No construction equipment or methods are proposed that would generate substantial ground vibration (blasting, pile

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

driving, demolition, etc.). Therefore, impacts related to temporary or permanent groundborne vibration would be *less than significant*.

- (c) *For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?*

The project site is not located within or adjacent to an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or private airstrip; therefore, *no impact would occur*.

### Conclusion

Short-term construction activities would be limited in nature and duration and conducted during daytime periods per County LUO standards. No long-term operational noise or ground vibration would occur as a result of the project. Therefore, potential impacts related to noise would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### Mitigation

None necessary.

## XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

The County of San Luis Obispo General Plan Housing Element recognizes the difficulty for residents to find suitable and affordable housing within San Luis Obispo County. The Housing Element includes an analysis of vacant and underutilized land located in urban areas that is suitable for residential development and considers zoning provisions and development standards to encourage development of these areas. Consistent with State housing element laws, these areas are categorized into potential sites for very low- and low-income households, moderate-income households, and above moderate-income households.

The County's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance requires the provision of new affordable housing in conjunction with both residential and nonresidential development and subdivisions. In its efforts to provide for affordable

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

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 project is located in a predominantly agricultural area, with few single-family residences located on expansive lots.

### *Discussion*

- (a) *Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?*

The project proposes the construction of one single-family dwelling unit. The project would not result in the extension or establishment of roads, utilities, or other infrastructure that would induce development and population growth in new areas. Nor would the project generate a substantial number of new employment opportunities that would encourage population growth in the area. Therefore, the project would not directly or indirectly induce substantial growth and no impacts would occur.

- (b) *Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?*

The project would not displace existing housing or necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; therefore, no impacts would occur.

### *Conclusion*

No impacts to population and housing would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### *Mitigation*

None necessary.

### *Sources*

See Exhibit A.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

### XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Setting

Fire protection services in unincorporated San Luis Obispo County are provided by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), which has been under contract with the County of San Luis Obispo to provide full-service fire protection since 1930. Approximately 180 full-time state employees operate the County Fire Department, supplemented by as many as 100 state seasonal fire fighters, 300 County paid call and reserve fire fighters, and 120 state inmate fire fighters. CAL FIRE responds to emergencies and other requests for assistance, plans for and takes action to prevent emergencies and to reduce their impact, coordinates regional emergency response efforts, and provides public education and training in local communities. CAL FIRE has 24 fire stations located throughout the county. The project would be served by County Fire Station #36 –Meridian, located approximately 2.6 miles Northwest of the project site. Emergency response time is listed as 10-15 minutes.

Police protection and emergency services in the unincorporated portions of the county are provided by the San Luis Obispo County Sheriff's Office. The Sheriff's Office Patrol Division responds to calls for service, conducts proactive law enforcement activities, and performs initial investigations of crimes. Patrol personnel are deployed from three stations throughout the county, the Coast Station in Los Osos, the North Station in Templeton, and the South Station in Oceano. The project area will be served by the North Station in Templeton/San Luis Obispo County Sheriff North Patrol, approximately 10 miles Southwest of the project site.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

San Luis Obispo County has a total of 12 school districts that currently enroll approximately 34,000 students in over 75 schools. The project area is served by the Paso Robles Joint Unified School District and the San Luis Obispo Joint Community College District.

Within the County's unincorporated areas, there are currently 23 parks, three golf courses, four trails/staging areas, and eight Special Areas that include natural areas, coastal access, and historic facilities currently operated and maintained by the County. The project site is located approximately 0.5 miles from the Creston to Salinas River trail corridor.

Public facilities fees, Quimby fees, and developer conditions are several ways the County currently funds public services. A public facility fee program (i.e., development impact fee program) has been adopted to address impacts related to public facilities (county) and schools (State Government Code 65995 et seq.). The fee amounts are assessed annually by the County based on the type of proposed development and the development's proportional impact and are collected at the time of building permit issuance. Public facility fees are used as needed to finance the construction of and/or improvements to public facilities required to serve new development, including fire protection, law enforcement, schools, parks, and roads.

### *Discussion*

- (a) *Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:*

#### *Fire protection?*

The project would be required to comply with all fire safety rules and regulations including the California Fire Code and Public Resources Code prior to issuance of building permits. Based on the limited nature of development proposed, the project would not result in a significant increase in demand for fire protection services. The project would be served by existing fire protection services and would not result in the need for new or altered fire protection services or facilities. In addition, the project would be subject to development impact fees to offset the project's contribution to demand for fire protection services. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

#### *Police protection?*

The project does not propose a new use or activity that would require additional police services above what is normally provided for similar surrounding land uses. The project would not result in a significant increase in demand for police protection services and would not result in the need for new or altered police protection services or facilities. In addition, the project would be subject to development impact fees to offset the project's contribution to demand on law enforcement services. Therefore, impacts related to police services would be *less than significant*.

#### *Schools?*

As discussed in Section XIV. Population and Housing, the project would not induce a substantial increase in population growth and would not result in the need for additional school services or facilities to serve new student populations. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

*Parks?*

As discussed in Section XIV. Population and Housing, the project would not induce a substantial increase in population growth and would not result in the need for additional parks or recreational services or facilities to serve new populations. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

*Other public facilities?*

As discussed above, the proposed project would be subject to applicable fees to offset negligible increased demands on public facilities; therefore, impacts related to other public facilities would be *less than significant*.

*Conclusion*

The project does not propose development that would substantially increase demands on public services and would not induce population growth that would substantially increase demands on public services. The project would be subject to payment of development impact fees to reduce the project’s negligible contribution to increased demands on public services and facilities. Therefore, potential impacts related to public services would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

*Mitigation*

None necessary.

*Sources*

See Exhibit A.

### XVI. RECREATION

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

*Setting*

The County of San Luis Obispo Parks and Recreation Element (Recreation Element) establishes goals, policies, and implementation measures for the management, renovation, and expansion of existing, and the

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

development of new, parks and recreation facilities in order to meet existing and projected needs and to assure an equitable distribution of parks throughout the county.

Public facilities fees, Quimby fees, and developer conditions are several ways the County currently funds public parks and recreational facilities. Public facility fees are collected upon construction of new residential units and currently provide funding for new community-serving recreation facilities. Quimby Fees are collected when new residential lots are created and can be used to expand, acquire, rehabilitate, or develop community-serving parks. Finally, a discretionary permit issued by the County may condition a project to provide land, amenities, or facilities consistent with the Recreation Element.

The County Bikeways Plan identifies and prioritizes bikeway facilities throughout the unincorporated area of the county, including bikeways, parking, connections with public transportation, educational programs, and funding. The Bikeways Plan is updated every 5 years and was last updated in 2016. The plan identifies goals, policies, and procedures geared towards realizing significant bicycle use as a key component of the transportation options for San Luis Obispo County residents. The plan also includes descriptions of bikeway design and improvement standards, an inventory of the current bicycle circulation network, and a list of current and future bikeway projects within the county.

### *Discussion*

- (a) *Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?*

The project would not result in a substantial growth within the area and would not substantially increase demand on any proximate existing neighborhood or regional park or other recreational facilities. Payment of standard development impact fees would ensure any incremental increase in use of existing parks and recreational facilities would be reduced to less than significant.

- (b) *Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?*

The project does not include the construction of new recreational facilities and would not result in a substantial increase in demand or use of parks and recreational facilities. Implementation of the project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities; therefore, no impacts would occur.

### *Conclusion*

The project would not result in the significant increase in use, construction, or expansion of parks or recreational facilities. Therefore, potential impacts related to recreation would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### *Mitigation*

None necessary.

### *Sources*

See Exhibit A.



## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

### XVII. TRANSPORTATION

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

#### *Setting*

The County Department of Public Works maintains updated traffic count data for all County-maintained roadways. In addition, Traffic Circulation Studies have been conducted within several community areas using traffic models to reasonably simulate current traffic flow patterns and forecast future travel demands and traffic flow patterns. These community Traffic Circulation Studies include the South County Circulation Study, Los Osos Circulation Study, Templeton Circulation Study, San Miguel Circulation Study, Avila Circulation Study, and North Coast Circulation Study. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) maintains annual traffic data on state highways and interchanges within the county. The closest County maintained, paved road is Geneseo Road, which has two way traffic. To access the project site from this Geneseo Road, there are 4 roads that will need to be accessed: Ground Squirrel Hollow, then Forked Horn Place, then Buck Way before reaching Black Tail Place, where the project takes access from. All of these roads are privately maintained and paved.

In 2013, Senate Bill 743 was signed into law with the intent to “more appropriately balance the needs of congestion management with statewide goals related to infill development, promotion of public health through active transportation, and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions” and required the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to identify new metrics for identifying and mitigating transportation impacts within CEQA. As a result, in December 2018, the California Natural Resources Agency certified and adopted updates to the State CEQA Guidelines. The revisions included new requirements related to the implementation of Senate Bill 743 and identified vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita, VMT per employee, and net VMT as new metrics for transportation analysis under CEQA (as detailed in Section 15064.3 [b]). Beginning July 1, 2020, the newly adopted VMT criteria for determining significance of transportation impacts must be implemented statewide.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

The San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG) holds several key roles in transportation planning within the county. As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), SLOCOG is responsible for conducting a comprehensive, coordinated transportation program, preparation of a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), programming of state funds for transportation projects, and the administration and allocation of transportation development act funds required by state statutes. As the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), SLOCOG is also responsible for all transportation planning and programming activities required under federal law. This includes development of long-range transportation plans and funding programs, and the approval of transportation projects using federal funds.

The 2019 RTP, adopted June 5, 2019, is a long-term blueprint of San Luis Obispo County's transportation system. The plan identifies and analyzes transportation needs of the region and creates a framework for project priorities. SLOCOG represents and works with the County of San Luis Obispo as well as the Cities within the county in facilitating the development of the RTP.

The County Department of Public Works establishes bicycle paths and lanes in coordination with the RTP, which outlines how the region can establish an extensive bikeway network. County bikeway facilities are funded by state grants, local general funds, and developer contributions. The RTP also establishes goals and recommendations to develop, promote, and invest in the public transit systems, rail systems, air services, harbor improvements, and commodity movements within the county in order to meet the needs of transit-dependent individuals and encourage the increasing use of alternative modes by all travelers that choose public transportation. Local transit systems are presently in operation in the cities of Morro Bay and San Luis Obispo, and South County services are offered to Grover Beach, Arroyo Grande, Pismo Beach, and Oceano. Dial-a-ride systems provide intra-community transit in Morro Bay, Atascadero, and Los Osos. Inter-urban systems operate between the City of San Luis Obispo and South County, Los Osos, and the North Coast.

The County's Framework for Planning (Inland), includes the Land Use and Circulation Elements of the County's General Plan. The Framework establishes goals and strategies to meet pedestrian circulation needs by providing usable and attractive sidewalks, pathways, and trails to establish maximum access and connectivity between land use designations. The closest proximate pedestrian circulation feature is the Creston to Salinas trail corridor, a proposed San Luis Obispo County trail corridor. There are no public transit facilities or public bikeways/bike facilities within proximity to the project site.

### *Discussion*

- (a) *Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?*

The project does not propose the substantial temporary or long-term alteration of any proximate transportation facilities. Marginal increases in traffic can be accommodated by existing local streets and the project would not result in any long-term changes in traffic or circulation. The project does not propose uses that would interfere or conflict with applicable policies related to circulation, transit, roadway, bicycle, or pedestrian systems or facilities. The project would be consistent with the County Framework for Planning (Inland) and consistent with the projected level of growth and development identified in the 2019 RTP. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

- (b) *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?*

Based on the nature and location of the project, the project would not generate a significant increase in construction-related or operational traffic trips or vehicle miles traveled. The project would not substantially change existing land uses and would not result in the need for additional new or

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

expanded transportation facilities. The project would be subject to standard development impact fees to offset the relative impacts on surrounding roadways. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

- (c) *Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?*

The project would not change roadway design and does not include geometric design features that would create new hazards or an incompatible use. Therefore, *no impacts would occur*.

- (d) *Result in inadequate emergency access?*

The project would not result in road closures during short-term construction activities or long-term operations. Individual access to adjacent properties would be maintained during construction activities and throughout the project area. Project implementation would not affect long-term access through the project area and sufficient alternative access exists to accommodate regional trips. Therefore, the project would not adversely affect existing emergency access and *no impacts would occur*.

### *Conclusion*

The project would not alter existing transportation facilities or result in the generation of substantial additional trips or vehicle miles traveled. Payment of standard development fees and compliance with existing regulations would ensure potential impacts were reduced to less than significant. Therefore, potential impacts related to transportation would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### *Mitigation*

None necessary.

### *Sources*

See Exhibit A.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

### XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
(a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:				
(i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Setting

Approved in 2014, AB 52 added tribal cultural resources to the categories of resources that must be evaluated under CEQA. Tribal cultural resources are defined as either of the following:

- 1) Sites, features, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
  - a. Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources; or
  - b. Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of California Public Resources Code Section 5020.1.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

- 2) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of California Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying these criteria for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.

Recognizing that tribes have expertise regarding their tribal history and practices, AB 52 requires lead agencies to provide notice to tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of a proposed project if they have requested notice of projects proposed within that area. If the tribe requests consultation within 30 days upon receipt of the notice, the lead agency must consult with the tribe regarding the potential for adverse impacts on tribal cultural resources as a result of a project. Consultation may include discussing the type of environmental review necessary, the presence and/or significance of tribal cultural resources, the level of significance of a project's impacts on the tribal cultural resources, and available project alternatives and mitigation measures recommended by the tribe to avoid or lessen potential impacts on tribal cultural resources.

On January 25, 2023, the project was referred to four tribal representatives from the Northern Chumash Tribal Council, Salinan Tribe of San Luis Obispo and Monterey Counties, Xolon Salinan Tribe, and Yak Tityu Tityu Yak Tilhini Northern Chumash Tribe. No requests were received from the representatives.

### Discussion

- (a) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:*

*(a-i) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?*

The County has provided notice of the opportunity to consult with appropriate tribes per the requirements of AB 52. The County only received one response from the Salinian Tribe, asking if a Phase I Arch Report had been performed. The County replied that a Phase I had not been performed and asked if there was anything else they could provide to the Salinian Tribe. No other requests or response was made from the Salinian Tribe following the County's reply. . Potential impacts associated with the inadvertent discovery of tribal cultural resources would be subject to LUO 22.10.040 (Archaeological Resources), which requires that in the event resources are encountered during project construction, construction activities shall cease, and the County Planning and Building Department shall be notified of the discovery so that the extent and location of discovered materials may be recorded by a qualified archaeologist, and the disposition of artifacts may be accomplished in accordance with state and federal law. Therefore, impacts related to a substantial adverse change in the significance of tribal cultural resources would be *less than significant*.

*(a-ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.*

The project site does not contain any resources determined by the County to be a potentially significant tribal cultural resource. Impacts associated with potential inadvertent discovery would be minimized through compliance with existing standards and regulations (LUO 22.10.040). Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

### Conclusion

No tribal cultural resources are known or expected to occur within or adjacent to the project site. In the event unanticipated sensitive resources are discovered during project activities, adherence with County LUO standards and State Health and Safety Code procedures would reduce potential impacts to less than significant; therefore, potential impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### Mitigation

None necessary.

### Sources

See Exhibit A.

## XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

The County Public Works Department provides water and wastewater services for specific County Service Areas (CSAs) that are managed through issuance of water/wastewater “will serve” letters. The Department of Public Works currently maintains CSAs for the communities of Nipomo, Oak Shores, Cayucos, Avila Beach, Shandon, the San Luis Obispo County Club, and Santa Margarita. Other unincorporated areas in the County rely on on-site wells and individual wastewater systems. Regulatory standards and design criteria for onsite wastewater treatment systems are provided by the Water Quality Control Policy for Siting, Design, Operation, and Maintenance of Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems (California OWTS Policy).

Per the County’s Stormwater Program, the Public Works Department is responsible for ensuring that new construction sites implement best management practices during construction, and that site plans incorporate appropriate post-construction stormwater runoff controls. Construction sites that disturb 1.0 acre or more must obtain coverage under the SWRCB’s Construction General Permit. Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) is the primary electricity provider and both PG&E and Southern California Gas Company provide natural gas services for urban and rural communities within the County of San Luis Obispo. The project will result in the installation of a septic system and well construction to serve the residence.

There are three landfills in San Luis Obispo County: Cold Canyon Landfill, located near the City of San Luis Obispo, Chicago Grade Landfill, located near the community of Templeton, and Paso Robles Landfill, located east of the City of Paso Robles. The project’s solid waste needs would be met by Mid-State Solid Waste and Recycling and the Paso Robles Landfill, or other local service provider.

### Discussion

(a) *Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

The proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in demand on water, wastewater, or stormwater collection, treatment, or disposal facilities and would not require the construction of new or expanded water, wastewater, or stormwater facilities. The project would not result in a substantial increase in energy demand, natural gas, or telecommunications and no new, expanded, or relocated facilities would be required to serve the residence; therefore, *no impact would occur.*

(b) *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?*

The project would be consistent with existing and planned levels and types of development in the project area and would not create new or expanded water supply entitlements. Short-term construction activities would require minimal amounts of water, which would be met through

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

available existing supplies. Operational water demands would not be substantially different than existing demands; therefore, potential impacts on water supplies would be *less than significant*.

- (c) *Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?*

The project would not substantially increase demands on existing wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal facilities. The project does not include new connections to wastewater treatment facilities; therefore, *no impact would occur*.

- (d) *Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?*

Construction activities would result in the generation of minimal solid waste materials; no significant long-term increase in solid waste would occur. Local landfills have adequate permit capacity to serve the project and the project does not propose to generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals; therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

- (e) *Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

The project would not result in a substantial increase in waste generation during project construction or operation. Construction waste disposal would comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

### *Conclusion*

The project would not result in significant increased demands on water, wastewater, or stormwater infrastructure and facilities. No substantial increase in solid waste generation would occur. Therefore, potential impacts to utilities and service systems would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### *Mitigation*

None necessary.

### *Sources*

See Exhibit A.



## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

### XX. WILDFIRE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</i>				
(a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) 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"/>
(c) 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"/>
(d) 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"/>

#### Setting

In central California, the fire season usually extends from roughly May through October, however, recent events indicate that wildfire behavior, frequency, and duration of the fire season are changing in California. Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ) are defined by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFIRE) based on the presence of fire-prone vegetation, climate, topography, assets at risk (e.g., high population centers), and a fire protection agency’s ability to provide service to the area (CAL FIRE 2007). FHSZs throughout the County have been designated as “Very High,” “High,” or “Moderate.” In San Luis Obispo County, most of the area that has been designated as a “Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone” is located in the Santa Lucia Mountains, which extend parallel to the coast along the entire length of San Luis Obispo County. The Moderate Hazard designation does not mean the area cannot experience a damaging fire; rather, it indicates that the probability is reduced, generally because the number of days a year that the area has “fire weather” is less than in high or very high fire severity zones. The project site is located in an area designated as high hazard for fire severity.

The County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) addresses several overall policy and coordination functions related to emergency management. The EOP includes the following components:

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

- Identifies the departments and agencies designated to perform response and recovery activities and specifies tasks they must accomplish;
- Outlines the integration of assistance that is available to local jurisdictions during disaster situations that generate emergency response and recovery needs beyond what the local jurisdiction can satisfy;
- Specifies the direction, control, and communications procedures and systems that will be relied upon to alert, notify, recall, and dispatch emergency response personnel, alert the public, protect residents and property, and request aid/support from other jurisdictions and/or the federal government;
- Identifies key continuity of government operations; and
- Describes the overall logistical support process for planned operations.

Topography influences wildland fire to such an extent that slope conditions can often become a critical wildland fire factor. Conditions such as speed and direction of dominant wind patterns, the length and steepness of slopes, direction of exposure, and/or overall ruggedness of terrain influence the potential intensity and behavior of wildland fires and/or the rates at which they may spread (Barros et al. 2013).

The County of San Luis Obispo Safety Element establishes goals, policies, and programs to reduce the threat to life, structures, and the environment caused by fire. Policy S-13 identifies that new development should be carefully located, with special attention given to fuel management in higher fire risk areas, and that new development in fire hazard areas should be configured to minimize the potential for added danger. Implementation strategies for this policy include identifying high risk areas, the development and implementation of mitigation efforts to reduce the threat of fire, requiring fire resistant material to be used for building construction in fire hazard areas, and encouraging applicants applying for subdivisions in fire hazard areas to cluster development to allow for a wildfire protection zone.

The California Fire Code provides minimum standards for many aspects of fire prevention and suppression activities. These standards include provisions for emergency vehicle access, water supply, fire protection systems, and the use of fire-resistant building materials.

The County has prepared an Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) to outline the emergency measures that are essential for protecting the public health and safety. These measures include, but are not limited to, public alert and notifications, emergency public information, and protective actions. The EOP also addresses policy and coordination related to emergency management.

### *Discussion*

(a) *Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

Implementation of the proposed project would not have a permanent impact on any adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. Temporary construction activities and staging would not substantially alter existing circulation patterns or trips. Access to adjacent areas would be maintained throughout the duration of the project. There are adequate alternative routes available to accommodate any rerouted trips through the project area for the short-term construction period. Therefore, the project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

- (b) *Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, would the project exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?*

The project site is moderately sloped and has herbs; however, the site and project scope have similar characteristics to the surrounding residential properties. Proposed uses would not significantly increase or exacerbate potential fire risks and the project does not propose any design elements that would exacerbate risks and expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of wildfire. The residence is required to provide fire sprinklers, in addition to all requirements outline in the project's Fire Safety Plan (Cal Fire/County Fire, July 31, 2019). Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

- (c) *Would the project 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?*

The proposed project sites already have access to all utilities required for their operation and therefore would not require construction of other utilities that could exacerbate fire risk. Furthermore, existing farm roads will be used for access as opposed to construction of new roads for access. Impacts would be *less than significant*.

- (d) *Would the project 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?*

The project is located on a site with moderately sloping topography, is outside of an adjacent flood hazard zone and is in an area with moderate potential for landslide. It is not expected that the project would 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. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

### *Conclusion*

The project would not expose people or structures to new or exacerbated wildfire risks and would not require the development of new or expanded infrastructure or maintenance to reduce wildfire risks. Therefore, potential impacts associated with wildfire would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

### *Mitigation*

None necessary.

### *Sources*

See Exhibit A.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

### XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Discussion

- (a) *Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?*

The project has the potential to impact biological resources, as discussed in each resource section above. Mitigation measures BIO-1 through BIO-15 would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. With the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the project would not result in significant impacts to biological resources and would not significantly 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

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

history or prehistory. Potential impacts to air quality were also evaluated. Mitigation measures have been proposed to prevent or reduce all potential impacts to less than significant; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

- (b) *Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?*

Potential cumulative impacts of the proposed project have been analyzed within the discussion of each environmental resource areas above. Cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

- (c) *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?*

Based on the nature and scale of the project, the project would not result in a substantial adverse direct or indirect effect on human beings.

### *Conclusion*

With the implementation of the mitigation measures listed in Exhibit B – Mitigation Summary Table, impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

### *Sources*

See Exhibit A.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

### 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:

Contacted	Agency	Response
<input type="checkbox"/>	County Public Works Department	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	County Environmental Health Services	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	County Agricultural Commissioner's Office	None
<input type="checkbox"/>	County Airport Manager	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	Airport Land Use Commission	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Pollution Control District	None
<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 type="checkbox"/>	CA Department of Forestry (Cal Fire)	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	CA Department of Transportation	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	Community Services District	Not Applicable
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other <u>Assembly Bill 52 Native American Tribes</u>	Not Applicable
<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.

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project File for the Subject Application</li> <li><b>County Documents</b></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Plan Policies</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Framework for Planning (Inland)</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan (Inland), includes all maps/elements; more pertinent elements:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Element</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Conservation &amp; Open Space Element</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Economic Element</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing Element</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise Element</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parks &amp; Recreation Element/Project List</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safety Element</li> </ul> </li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use Ordinance (Inland/Coastal)</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building and Construction Ordinance</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Public Facilities Fee Ordinance</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Real Property Division Ordinance</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Affordable Housing Fund</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Airport Land Use Plan</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Energy Wise Plan</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> North County Area Plan/El Pomar-Estrella SA</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Design Plan</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Specific Plan</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Annual Resource Summary Report</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Circulation Study</li> <li><b>Other Documents</b></li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clean Air Plan/APCD Handbook</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional Transportation Plan</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Uniform Fire Code</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Water Quality Control Plan (Central Coast Basin – Region 3)</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Archaeological Resources Map</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Area of Critical Concerns Map</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Special Biological Importance Map</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CA Natural Species Diversity Database</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fire Hazard Severity Map</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flood Hazard Maps</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for SLO County</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GIS mapping layers (e.g., habitat, streams, contours, etc.)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Other</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

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

Barros, Ana M.G., Jose M.C. Pereira, Max A. Moritz, and Scott L. Stephens. 2013. Spatial Characterization of Wildfire Orientation Patterns in California. *Forests* 2013, 4; Pp 197-217." 2013.

CAL FIRE. 2007. "Draft Fire Hazard Severity Zones in Local Responsibility Areas." Available at <[http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/san\\_luis\\_obispo/fhszl06\\_1\\_map.40.pdf](http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/san_luis_obispo/fhszl06_1_map.40.pdf)>

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2019. EnviroStor. Available at: <<https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>>

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2008. Scenic Highway Guidelines. October 2008.

California State Water Resources Control Board. 2012. Water Quality Control Policy for Siting, Design, Operation, and Maintenance of Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems. June 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012.

\_\_\_\_. 2015. Geotracker. Available at: <<http://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>>

\_\_\_\_. 2018. Water Quality Control Policy for Siting, Design, Operation, and Maintenance of Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems (OWTUS Policy) Fact Sheet. August 2018.

County of San Luis Obispo. 2007. San Joaquin Kit Fox Standard Mitigation Ratio Areas. Available at: <<https://www.slocounty.ca.gov/getattachment/2c0fc293-eb37-4a0c-af22-5e0992efd025/Kit-Fox-Habitat-Area.aspx>>

\_\_\_\_. 2016. 2015/2016 County Bikeways Plan. July 6<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

\_\_\_\_. 2016. Emergency Operation Plan. December 2016.

\_\_\_\_. 2018. San Luis Obispo County Parks & Recreation Group Day Use & Facilities. Available at: <<https://slocountyparks.com/day-use-parks/>>

County of San Luis Obispo Department of Planning and Building. 2018. Onsite Wastewater Treatment System Local Agency Management Program. January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2018.

Department of Conservation (DOC). 2019. San Luis Obispo County Tsunami Inundation Maps. Available at: <<https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps/San-Luis-Obispo>>.

Hatfield, R., Jepsen, S., Thorp, R., Richardson, L., Colla, S. and Foltz Jordan, S. 2015b. *Bombus occidentalis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2015.

Johnson, L. A. 2013. *Navarretia nigelliformis subsp. radians*, in Jepson Flora Project (eds.) *Jepson eFlora*, Revision 1, [https://ucjeps.berkeley.edu/eflora/eflora\\_display.php?tid=51677](https://ucjeps.berkeley.edu/eflora/eflora_display.php?tid=51677), accessed on April 14, 2023.

Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E). 2019. Delivering Low-Emission Energy. Available at: <[https://www.pge.com/en\\_US/about-pge/environment/what-we-are-doing/clean-energy-solutions/clean-energy-solutions.page](https://www.pge.com/en_US/about-pge/environment/what-we-are-doing/clean-energy-solutions/clean-energy-solutions.page)>.

San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG). 2019. Responsibilities. Available at: <<https://slocog.org/about/responsibilities>>.

---

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

United States Geological Survey (USGS). 2019. Areas of Land Subsidence in California. Available at: <[https://ca.water.usgs.gov/land\\_subsidence/california-subsidence-areas.html](https://ca.water.usgs.gov/land_subsidence/california-subsidence-areas.html)>

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2019. National Wetlands Inventory Surface Waters and Wetlands. May 5, 2019. Available at: <<https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html>>

San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD). 2019. SLO APCD NOA Screening Buffers. Available at <https://www.google.com/maps/d/viewer?mid=1YAKjBzVkwi1bZ4rQ1p6b2OMyvIM&ll=35.66407615333322%2C-120.44668446503107&z=11>

Williams, P., Thorp, R., Richardson, L., and Colla, S. 2014. Bumble Bees of North America: An Identification Guide. 10.1515/9781400851188.



## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

### Exhibit B - Mitigation Summary

The applicant has agreed 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.

#### Air Quality

**AQ-1** **Prior to issuance of construction permits**, the following measures related to fugitive dust emissions shall be incorporated into the construction phase of the project and shown on all applicable construction plans:

- a) Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible;
- b) Use of water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 mph. Reclaimed (non-potable) water should be used whenever possible;
- c) All dirt stock pile areas should be sprayed daily as needed;
- d) Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans should be implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities;
- e) Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading should be sown with a fast germinating, non-invasive grass seed and watered until vegetation is established;
- f) All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the APCD;
- g) All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used;
- h) Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site;
- i) All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with CVC Section 23114;
- j) Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site;
- k) Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water should be used where feasible;
- l) All of these fugitive dust mitigation measures shall be shown on grading and building plans; and

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

- m) The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the fugitive dust emissions and enhance the implementation of the measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints, reduce visible emissions below 20% opacity, and to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the APCD Compliance Division prior to the start of any grading, earthwork or demolition.

### **Biological Resources**

#### **San Joaquin Kit Fox Habitat Protection and Mitigation Measures**

**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) which 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 1.71 acres (0.57 acres multiplied by 3 for acreage mitigation ratio) 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) (see contact information below) 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). 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 1.71 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

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

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. 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, disking, 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 BR-12. 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 per 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

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

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 put all San Joaquin Kit Fox protection measures required before construction (prior to any project activities) and during construction shall be included as a note on all project plans.

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-12 of the Developer's Statement/Conditions of Approval shall be clearly delineated on project plans.

**BR-4 Environmental Awareness Training. Prior to the start of any project activities**, an environmental awareness training shall be presented to all personnel by a qualified biologist. The training shall include color photographs and a description of the ecology of all special-status species known or with potential to occur on-site, as well as other sensitive resources requiring avoidance near the project site. The training shall include a description of protection measures required by discretionary permits, an overview of the Federal and State Endangered Species Acts, and implications of noncompliance with these regulations. The biologist shall provide an overview of the required avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures. A sign-in sheet with the name and signature of the qualified biologist who presented the training and the names and signatures of the environmental awareness trainees shall be kept. A fact sheet conveying the information provided in the environmental awareness training shall be provided to all project personnel and anyone else who may enter the project site. If new personnel join the project after the initial training period, they shall receive the environmental awareness training from the qualified biologist or their designee before beginning work. A qualified biologist shall provide refresher trainings during site visits or other monitoring events.

**BR-5 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-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

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

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/animal proof 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 comply 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 County and other responsible agencies (e.g., CDFW and USFWS). 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.
- 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:
- If a wire strand/pole design is used, the lowest strand shall be no closer to the ground than 12".
  - If a more solid wire mesh fence is used, 8" x 12" openings near the ground shall be provided every 100 yards.
  - Other fencing as recommended by a County-qualified biologist and approved by the County.
- 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.
- BR-12 Throughout the life of the project**,
- If a SJKF is discovered at any time to be occupying an area within the project boundaries, all work must stop. The County will be notified, and they will consult with other agencies as needed.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

- b) To prevent entrapment of SJKF and other special-status wildlife, all excavations, steep-walled holes or trenches greater than two feet deep shall be completely covered at the end of each work day by plywood or similar materials, or one or more escape ramps constructed of earth fill or wooden planks shall be installed a minimum of every 200 feet. All escape ramps shall be angled such that wildlife can feasibly use it to climb out of an area. All excavations, holes, and trenches shall be inspected daily for SJKF or other special-status species and immediately prior to being covered or filled. If a SJKF is entrapped, CDFW, USFWS, and the County will be contacted immediately to document the incident and advise on removal of the entrapped SJKF.
- c) Water sources shall be managed to ensure no leaks occur or are fixed immediately upon discovery in order to prevent SJKF from being drawn to the project area to drink water.
- d) Materials or other stockpiles will be managed in a manner that will prevent SJKF from inhabiting them. Any materials or stockpiles that may have had SJKF take up residence shall be surveyed (consistent with pre-construction survey requirements) by a qualified biologist before they are moved.

### **American Badger (*Taxidea taxus*) Protection Measures**

**BR-13 Pre-construction Survey for American Badger.** A qualified biologist shall complete a pre construction survey for badgers no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days prior to the start of initial project activities to determine if badgers are present within proposed work areas, in addition to a 200-foot buffer around work areas. The results of the survey shall be provided to the County prior to initial project activities.

- a) If a potential den is discovered, it shall be inspected to determine whether they are occupied. The survey shall cover the entire property and shall examine both old and new dens. The den will be monitored for 3 consecutive nights with an infra-red, motion-triggered camera, prior to any project activities, to determine if the den is being used by an American badger. If potential badger dens are too long to completely inspect from the entrance, a fiber optic scope shall be used to examine the den to the end. Inactive dens may be excavated by hand with a shovel to prevent re-use of dens during construction.
- b) If an active badger den is found, an exclusion zone shall be established around the den. A minimum of a 50-foot exclusion zone shall be established during the non-reproductive season (July 1 to January 31) and a minimum 100-foot exclusion zone during the reproductive season (February 1 to June 30). Each exclusion zone shall encircle the den and have a radius of 50 feet (non-reproductive season) or 100 feet (reproductive season, nursing young may be present), measured outward from the burrow entrance. To avoid disturbance and the possibility of direct take of adults and nursing young, and to prevent badgers from becoming trapped in burrows during construction activity, no grading shall occur within 100 feet of active badger dens between February and July. All project activities, including foot and vehicle traffic and storage of supplies and equipment, are prohibited inside exclusion zones. Exclusion zones shall be maintained until all project-related disturbances have been terminated, or it has been determined by a qualified biologist that the den is no longer in use. If avoidance is not possible during project construction or continued operation, the County shall be contacted. The County will coordinate with appropriate resource agencies for guidance.

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

- c) If more than 30 days pass between construction phases (e.g., vegetation trimming and the start of grading), during which no or minimal work activity occurs, the badger survey shall be repeated.

### Nesting Birds Protection Measures

**BR-14 Pre-construction Survey for Sensitive and Nesting Birds.** If work is planned to occur between February 1 and September 15, a qualified biologist shall survey the area for nesting birds within one week prior to initial project activity beginning, including ground disturbance and/or vegetation removal/trimming. This includes nests of all common bird species (under the MBTA), as well as special status birds and raptor nests. If nesting birds are located on or near the proposed project site, they shall be avoided until they have successfully fledged, or the nest is no longer deemed active.

- a) A 250-foot exclusion zone shall be placed around non-listed, passerine species, and a 500-foot exclusion zone will be implemented for raptor species. Each exclusion zone shall encircle the nest and have a radius of 250 feet (non-listed passerine species) or 500 feet (raptor species). All project activities, including foot and vehicle traffic and storage of supplies and equipment, are prohibited inside exclusion zones. Exclusion zones shall be maintained until all project-related disturbances have been terminated, or it has been determined by a qualified biologist that the young have fledged or that proposed project activities would not cause adverse impacts to the nest, adults, eggs, or young.
- b) If special status avian species (aside from the burrowing owl) are identified and nesting within the work area, no work will begin until an appropriate exclusion zone is determined in consultation with the County and any relevant resource agencies.
- c) The results of the survey shall be provided to the County prior to initial project activities. The results shall detail appropriate fencing or flagging of exclusion zones and include recommendations for additional monitoring requirements. A map of the project site and nest locations shall be included with the results. The qualified biologist conducting the nesting survey shall have the authority to reduce or increase the recommended exclusion zone depending on site conditions and species (if non-listed).
- d) If two weeks lapse between different phases of project activities (e.g., vegetation trimming and the start of grading), during which no or minimal work activity occurs, the nesting bird survey shall be repeated.

### Reptile and Amphibian Protection Measures

**BR-15 Pre-construction Survey for Special-status Reptiles and Amphibians.** Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits and immediately prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey immediately before any initial ground disturbances (i.e., the morning of the commencement of disturbance). Construction monitoring shall also be conducted by a qualified biologist during all initial ground-disturbing and vegetation removal activities (e.g., grading, grubbing, vegetation trimming, vegetation removal, etc.). To minimize the potential for impacts to dispersing amphibians, work within 100 feet of drainages and swales shall occur during dry conditions. If special-status wildlife is found within the work area, it shall be allowed to leave on its own volition and as appropriate, the resource agencies shall be contacted. If any additional ground- or vegetation-disturbing activities occur on the project site, the

## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

above surveys and monitoring shall be repeated. The results of the survey shall be provided to the County of San Luis Obispo within 1 week of monitoring.

### Tricolored Blackbird

**BR-16 Pre-construction Survey for Tri-colored Blackbird.** If work is planned to occur during the typical nesting bird season (i.e., February 1 through September 15), a qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct pre-construction surveys for nesting tricolored blackbirds within 10 days prior to the start of initial project activities.

- a) If an active tricolored blackbird nesting colony is found, a minimum 300-foot exclusion zone shall be observed in accordance with “Staff Guidance Regarding Avoidance of Impacts to Tricolored Blackbird Breeding Colonies on Agricultural Fields in 2015” (CDFW 2015). The exclusion zone shall encircle the nesting colony and have a radius of 300 feet from the outside border of the colony. All foot and vehicle traffic, as well as all project activities, including storage of supplies and equipment, shall remain outside of exclusion zones. Exclusion zones shall be maintained for the duration of the breeding season or until a qualified biologist has determined that nesting has ceased, the birds have fledged, and are no longer reliant upon the colony or parental care for survival.
- b) If 10 days lapse between project phases (e.g., vegetation trimming and the start of grading), during which no or minimal work activity occurs, the tricolored blackbird survey shall be repeated.

### Special-status Small Mammals Protection Measures.

**BR-17 Preconstruction Survey for Special-status Small Mammals (e.g. San Joaquin Antelope Squirrel).** Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits and within 14 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction, a qualified biologist shall complete a preconstruction survey for special-status small mammal species (e.g. giant kangaroo rat and Tulare grasshopper mouse) no more than 14 days prior to the start of initial project activities to ensure special-status small mammal species are not present within proposed works areas. The survey will include mapping of all potentially active special-status mammal burrows within the proposed work areas, access routes, and staging areas plus a 50-foot buffer. All potentially active burrows will be mapped and flagged. If avoidance of the burrows is not feasible, the appropriate resource agency shall be contacted for further guidance.

### Crotch Bumble Bee

**BR-18 Crotch Bumble Bee Survey and Minimization Measures.** Within 30 days prior to initiation of ground disturbance between March and September, the project footprint will be surveyed for Crotch bumble bee using a photograph survey methodology. The site will be slowly walked by two biologists equipped with >8-megapixel point and shoot or DSLR cameras using transects to obtain 100% coverage of the project site. All insects observed during the survey will be photographed with attention to family Apidae (bees). All bees observed will be photographed to the greatest extent feasible without handling. Photographs should clearly show the entire top side of the abdomen, the side of the thorax/abdomen and the face/head. Several photos should be taken of each specimen to obtain an identification. If a bee is observed entering a burrow or other cavity, a Global Positioning System (GPS) point should be recorded and attention should be focused on the cavity to determine if multiple individuals may be entering/exiting, indicating the potential presence of a colony. Biologists will submit photos to Bumble Bee Watch ([www.bumblebeewatch.org](http://www.bumblebeewatch.org)), BeeSpotter



## Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

---

(<https://beespotter.org>), or a similar website that employs bumble bee experts to verify the identifications. Qualified scientific experts may also be used to verify photographic records. CDFW will be notified as soon as possible if a *B. crotchii* observation is verified. If a *B. crotchii* colony is detected on the project site, the colony will be mapped and avoided. No vegetation or soil disturbance will be permitted within a 50-foot radius of the colony. If avoidance is infeasible, the applicant will contact the County and CDFW regarding potential conservation measures.