



**COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO**  
**INITIAL STUDY SUMMARY - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST**  
 (ver 2.1) [Using Form](#)

**Project Title & No.** Corral de Piedra (Cold Canyon Landfill) Conditional Use Permit ED06-126 (DRC2005-00170)

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:** The proposed project could have a "Potentially Significant Impact" for at least one of the environmental factors checked below. Please refer to the attached pages for discussion on mitigation measures or project revisions to either reduce these impacts to less than significant levels or require further study.

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

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

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

- The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- The proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

John McKenzie

Prepared by (Print)

Signature

Date

Ellen Carroll,  
Environmental Coordinator

Reviewed by (Print)

Signature

(for)

Date

### **Project Environmental Analysis**

The County's environmental review process incorporates all of the requirements for completing the Initial Study as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines. The Initial Study includes staff's on-site inspection of the project site and surroundings and a detailed review of the information in the file for the project. In addition, available background information is reviewed for each project. Relevant information regarding soil types and characteristics, geologic information, significant vegetation and/or wildlife resources, water availability, wastewater disposal services, existing land uses and surrounding land use categories and other information relevant to the environmental review process are evaluated for each project. Exhibit A includes the references used, as well as the agencies or groups that were contacted as a part of the Initial Study. The Environmental Division 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 Environmental Division, Rm. 200, County Government Center, San Luis Obispo, CA, 93408-2040 or call (805) 781-5600.

## **A. PROJECT**

**DESCRIPTION:** Request by Cold Canyon Landfill, Inc. for a Conditional Use Permit to allow for a 46-acre expansion of an existing landfill operation. This request includes the following significant changes:

- 1) Existing **landfill** would expand
  - a. the existing "Resource Recovery Park" (which includes a Public Drop-Off facility, construction and demo debris recycling (expansion proposed), household hazardous waste drop-off, universal and electronic waste processing and recycling) from 2 to 4 acres,
  - b. increase landfill volume/ capacity from 6.09 to 12.9 million cubic yards;
  - c. Increase disposal operation area by 46 acres (existing overall facility size would change from 121 to 209 acres).
- 2) Existing **composting facility** would extend hours from 8 am - 3 pm to 7 am - 4:30 pm, expand compost volume from 300 to 450 tons per day; expand acceptable compost materials to include food waste from residential/ industrial/ commercial sources and additional ag by-products; expand compost area from 14 to up to 25 acres for storage and processing; and
- 3) Existing **material recovery/sort facility** would reclassify from Recycling Center to Large Volume Processing Facility to allow for commercial recyclables and additional residential recyclables, expand from 120 tons/ day to 400 tons /day; increase hours of operation would change from 8 am – 4:30 pm to 7 am – 10 pm that would accommodate a second shift, and enlarge facility; add pole barn to cover material storage area.
- 4) Public entrance location would be moved approximately 2,800 feet to the southeast on Highway 227.
- 5) The expansion will result in up to 41 additional employees.

Processing and storing of hazardous wastes has not changed and is limited to household sources. Approval of this expansion would add approximately 37 years of life/capacity to the landfill. The project is located at 2268 Carpenter Canyon Road (Highway 227), approximately one mile southeast of Corbett Canyon Road, approximately five miles south of the City of San Luis Obispo, in the San Luis Obispo planning area

ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER(S): 044-171-014, 044-261-014,  
044-261-047, 044-261-048

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT # 4

**B. EXISTING SETTING**

PLANNING AREA: San Luis Obispo, Rural

LAND USE CATEGORY: Public Facilities, Agriculture

COMBINING DESIGNATION(S): None

EXISTING USES: Vineyard, grazing, landfill sort facility, undeveloped

TOPOGRAPHY: Nearly level to moderately sloping

VEGETATION: Grasses , oak woodland , vineyards

PARCEL SIZE: 206 acres

**SURROUNDING LAND USE CATEGORIES AND USES:**

<i>North:</i> Agriculture; undeveloped, residential	<i>East:</i> Agriculture; residential, agricultural uses, undeveloped
<i>South:</i> Agriculture; agricultural uses, residential, undeveloped	<i>West:</i> Agriculture; residential, agricultural uses, undeveloped

**C. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

During the Initial Study process, several issues were identified as having potentially significant environmental effects (see following Initial Study). Where possible, mitigation measures will be applied to potentially significant impacts in an effort to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

**History**

On October 1, 1991, a Final EIR was prepared by ERCE for the Cold Canyon Landfill Expansion, which was subsequently approved by the Planning Commission. It considered the following twelve environmental issues: geology/soils, water resources, air quality, traffic and circulation, biology, litter and disease vectors, visual resources, low level nuclear waste, land use, hazardous/infectious materials, cancer risk, and noise.

**COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO  
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST**

1. <b>AESTHETICS - <i>Will the project:</i></b>	<b>Potentially Significant</b>	<b>Impact can &amp; will be mitigated</b>	<b>Insignificant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
a) <b><i>Create an aesthetically incompatible site open to public view?</i></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <b><i>Introduce a use within a scenic view open to public view?</i></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

**Setting.** The project will be visible primarily from Highway 227, a major public roadway and will be silhouetting against ridgelines as viewed from the Highway. Other heavily traveled public roadways where the project will be visible is from Price Canyon and Corbett Canyon Roads. The landfill is in a rural portion of the county and is surrounded primarily by large lots with single-family residences, in addition to a small amount of agricultural activities (e.g., vineyards, grazing). Oak woodlands and chaparral habitats are found on the surrounding hillsides.

The previously approved expansion allowed for a 490-foot elevation cap and a volume capacity of 6.09 million cubic yards over a 117-acre parcel. Previous approvals include the existing landfill, a sort facility, and compost facility.

The San Luis Obispo Area Plan includes the following Vision Statement:

This plan's vision for the future includes continued opportunities for economic vitality and growth, along with the opportunity to maintain the environmental attributes that have themselves contributed to the area's historically healthy economy. The community's excellent living environment and educational opportunities can act to attract or retain businesses providing high quality job opportunities for local residents, enabling them to afford housing within the area, while also enhancing local tax revenues needed for public services.

The planning area should maintain a rural character in harmony with agriculture, business, recreational, environmental and residential opportunities.

San Luis Obispo Area Plan Goals relating to visual aspects are as follows:

2. Protect and, where it has been degraded, enhance wildlife habitat areas.
3. Protect the scenic values of natural landforms.
4. Protect important historic or archaeological resources.
6. Focus urban development within established urban and village areas.
7. Devote the remainder of the planning area to a "greenbelt" consisting of production agriculture and low-density development. (Also see Framework for Planning).
15. Encourage economic development balanced with the natural resources that enhance the natural beauty and character, and supports the social and environmental health of the planning

area.

Article 9 of the County’s LUO for the San Luis Obispo planning area includes areawide “Highway corridor design standards”. These standard apply to the following uses: residences, residential accessory structures, residential access roads, signs, and certain agricultural accessory structures. These corridor standards apply to specific areas within the following public view corridors that are outside of urban areas: Highways 101, 227 and 1; Los Osos Valley Road, O’Connor Way, Orcutt Road, and Prefumo Canyon Road. For projects that fit into the above-mentioned criteria, standards would apply relating to road setbacks, ridgetop development, slope limitation, preserving landmark features, limit building height and color, provide for landscaping, and protect biological habitats.

The previous EIR evaluated the current facility for visual impacts and identified potentially significant visual effects from the public roadways identified above.

**Impact.** The project proposes to expand the existing landfill by 46 acres to the southeast. Final volume capacity will double, increasing from 6.09 million cubic yards to 12.9 million cubic yards. Maximum height of the previous project will increase from 490 feet to 500 feet mean sea level (MSL), which will also extend into the expansion area. This will further result in a permanent alteration of landform. During the course of operation and over most of the life of the project, active working areas may be highly visible from public roadways and silhouette against the ridgeline. Extension of hours of operation (primarily the sort facility) may introduce additional night lighting in a rural environment. Ultimately, the landfill will be covered with small shrubs and grasses (no trees to avoid potential root puncture of protective cover/liner).

**Mitigation/Conclusion.** The Land Use Ordinance includes several standards relating to screening for the recycling aspects of the project. Due to the potentially significant impacts to public views of the landfill expansion, a viewshed analysis from public highways and major roads shall be prepared by qualified persons and shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Development of ratings and recommendations for the assignment of aesthetic values to protect views from Highway 227, Corbett Canyon Road and Price Canyon Road, and to identify other, if any, potentially significant key viewing areas.
2. Mapping of the Highway 227, Corbett Canyon Road and Price Canyon Road viewshed, and the viewshed(s) of other key viewing areas, if any.
3. Discussion of all related county ordinance provisions relating to visual resources (e.g., goals, Highway Corridor Design Standards, screening requirements, etc.)
4. Recommendation and discussion of adequate and feasible mitigation measures, if any, to ensure that visual resources are adequately protected.

**2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES**  
*- Will the project:*

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Convert prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Impair agricultural use of other property or result in conversion to other uses?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## 2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

- Will the project:

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
c) <b>Conflict with existing zoning or Williamson Act program?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <b>Other:</b> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Setting.** Project Elements. The project area is bordered on the north by existing vineyards and on the east and south by grazing areas. The area around the subject development is within the Agriculture land use category. The soil type(s) on the subject property include:

Arnold loamy sand, (5 - 15 % slope). This gently to moderately sloping soil is considered moderately drained. The soil has low erodibility and low shrink-swell characteristics, as well as having potential septic system constraints due to: poor filtering capabilities. The soil is considered Class IV without irrigation and Class IV when irrigated.

Arnold loamy sand, (15 - 50 % slope). This moderately to very steeply sloping soil is considered moderately drained. The soil has low erodibility and low shrink-swell characteristics, as well as having potential septic system constraints due to: poor filtering capabilities. The soil is considered Class VII without irrigation and Class is not rated when irrigated.

Lodo clay loam, (30 - 50 % slope). This steeply to very steeply sloping soil is considered very poorly 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. The soil is considered Class VI without irrigation and Class is not rated when irrigated.

Lodo clay loam, (50 - 75 % slope). This very steeply sloping soil is considered very poorly 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. The soil is considered Class VII without irrigation and Class is not rated when irrigated.

Pismo loamy sand, (9 - 30 % slope). This gently to steeply sloping soil is considered Very poorly drained. The soil has low erodibility and low shrink-swell characteristics, as well as having potential septic system constraints due to: steep slopes, shallow depth to bedrock. The soil is considered Class VII without irrigation and Class is not rated when irrigated.

Salinas loam, (0 - 2 % slope). This nearly level sloping soil is considered not well drained. The soil has moderate erodibility and low shrink-swell characteristics, as well as having potential septic system constraints due to: slow percolation. The soil is considered Class III without irrigation and Class I when irrigated.

Xererts-Xerolls-Urban land complex, (0 - 15% slope). This nearly level to moderately sloping soils is poorly drained. The soil has unrated erodibility and unrated shrink-swell characteristics, as well as having unrated septic system constraints. The soil is considered Class is not rated without irrigation and Class is not rated when irrigated.

A referral response has been received from the County's Ag Commissioner's Office expressing concern over the subject development with the following concerns: additional dust, noise, odor and lighting that may affect existing or future surrounding agricultural activities; adverse changes to water quality and quantity; loss of ag potential on expansion area of which portions are considered "soils of statewide importance"; and inconsistencies with several policies of the County's Ag and Open Space Element.

**Impact.** The project is located in a mixed-agricultural area with agricultural activities (vineyards,

grazing) occurring in the immediate vicinity. A small vineyard exists within the expansion area. The project will result in a permanent loss of potential ag use over the expansion area. Proposed landfill/recycling activities may have a significant, indirect effect on surrounding ag lands (e.g., dust, vector introduction, etc.). Based on the response received from the Ag Commissioner's Office potentially significant impacts to agricultural resources are anticipated.

**Mitigation/Action Required.** Due to the potentially significant impacts to agricultural resources, additional analysis is needed by a qualified individual. The agricultural resource analysis should include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Consultation with the County Agricultural Commissioner's Office, County Planning & Building (Ag Preserve Program), and the California Department of Food and Agriculture.
2. A description of the existing and historical agricultural setting, uses and practices including an emphasis on the unique rainfall, climatic, topographic and vegetative characteristics of the site.
3. A description of adjacent and regional agricultural uses. "Regional" will need to be defined as a "study area" by the consultant, in consultation with the County Agricultural Commissioner's Office and the State Department of Food and agriculture.
4. A description of the agricultural suitability of the site, including soil types, soil capabilities, and the productivity of agricultural soils both for irrigated and non irrigated uses, and an analysis of crops and livestock uses suited to the site.
5. Identification and description of current and potential future water sources suitable for agricultural uses (see Water Resources).
6. Evaluation of the potential adverse impacts to agricultural capability resulting from the project.
7. Evaluation of the potential adverse impacts to the agricultural capability of adjacent or near by lands currently enrolled in the Agricultural Preserve Program, if any.
8. Evaluation of the potential for the loss of agriculturally productive soils as a result of the proposed development.
9. Evaluation of the potential for incompatibilities between adjacent agricultural operations on the site as a result of the landfill expansion.
10. Recommendation and discussion of adequate and feasible mitigation measures, if any, to ensure that agricultural resources are adequately protected.

<b>3. AIR QUALITY - <i>Will the project:</i></b>	<b>Potentially Significant</b>	<b>Impact can &amp; will be mitigated</b>	<b>Insignificant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>a) <i>Violate any state or federal ambient air quality standard, or exceed air quality emission thresholds as established by County Air Pollution Control District?</i></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3. AIR QUALITY - <i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
b) <i>Expose any sensitive receptor to substantial air pollutant concentrations?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Create or subject individuals to objectionable odors?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Be inconsistent with the District's Clean Air Plan?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Setting.** 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 (PM<sub>10</sub>, or fugitive dust). The project is nearest to the San Luis Obispo Air Quality Monitoring Station. Based on the latest annual air monitoring station information (2003), state or federal standards for ozone have not been exceeded. The general trend in air quality over the last 10 years at this station is relatively flat with no exceedance of state or federal standards.

The Air Pollution Control District (APCD) estimates that automobiles currently generate about 40% of the pollutants responsible for ozone formation. Nitrous oxides (NOx) and reactive organic gasses (ROG) pollutants (vehicle emission components) are common contributors towards this chemical transformation into ozone. Dust, or particulate matter less than ten microns (PM<sub>10</sub>) that become airborne and which find their way into the lower atmosphere, can act as the catalyst in this chemical transformation to harmful ozone. In part, the land use controls currently in place for new development relating to ROG and NOx (e.g., application of the [2003 CEQA Air Quality Handbook](#)) have helped reduce the formation of ozone.

The proposed project was referred to the County of San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (APCD) for review and determination of any air quality impacts potentially resulting during both the construction and operational phases of the proposed project.

The previous EIR evaluated the following air quality impacts for the existing facility: on-site vehicle emissions, fugitive dust, landfill gas, existing off-site sources, and odor. All of these would be relevant to the proposed expansion. The previous EIR identified fugitive dust as a Class I impact.

**Impact.** As identified by the APCD, air quality impacts during construction include: the creation of fugitive dust (PM<sub>10</sub>), the potential release of asbestos during demolition and removal of pipelines, and the potential release of naturally occurring asbestos during grading/placement of fill. Operational emissions need further analysis once additional information is provided relating to vehicle and equipment emissions for each aspect of the proposed expansion. The following list of impact areas will need further evaluation.

Nearby Residences - The proposed project site is located adjacent to existing rural residential development. Residential areas are sensitive to air pollution, including both construction and operational emissions.

Fugitive Dust (PM<sub>10</sub>). Implementation of the proposed project would result in the generation of dust, potentially affecting local residents and agriculture in close proximity to the project site. Dust complaints could result in violation of the APCD’s nuisance rules. This project activity is considered having a potentially significant impact to air quality.

Material-Containing Asbestos. Asbestos-containing materials could be encountered during the demolition, relocation, or remodeling of existing buildings. Asbestos can also be found in utility pipes/pipelines. If asbestos is present in onsite structures, proposed demolition activities would result in a release of asbestos, and a potentially significant air quality impact. Waste materials brought to the landfill may also inadvertently contain asbestos, and should be discussed in the analysis.

Naturally-Occurring Asbestos. According to the APCD, the project site is located in an area containing potential naturally occurring asbestos, serpentine or ultramafic rock. A potential fault exists in the area that could contain ultramafic material. The State Air Resources Board considers asbestos a toxic air contaminant. If asbestos is present within the soil underlying the project site, future grading and site disturbance activities into native material could release the asbestos into the air, resulting in a potentially significant air quality impact. Since native material will be used as landfill cover, this issue will need further analysis.

Developmental Burning. On February 5, 2000, the APCD prohibited developmental burning of vegetative material within San Luis Obispo County; however, in certain situations where no technically feasible alternative is available, limited burning under restrictions may be allowed. Unregulated burning would result in a potentially significant air quality impact. Burning is not proposed within the existing landfill or proposed expansion.

Vehicle Emissions. Air Quality impacts will occur from both on- and off-site vehicle emissions. Based on existing operation analysis from the previous EIR, the following on-site vehicles/equipment are expected on a daily basis: tractor, scraper, motor grader, water truck, compactor. The following activities would generate additional emissions that will need to be included in the analysis: Landfill cover material being transported from off-site; finished products needing to be transported off-site (e.g., compost, sorted recyclables, etc.), employee vehicles.

Clean Air Plan Consistency. The proposed project would be located within a rural area, and is considered by APCD as inconsistent with the Clean Air Plan.

Permits. The existing landfill holds several permits with APCD, including three relating to composting. APCD has indicated that additional permits may be necessary. Further analysis should include discussion about the existing and possible permitting requirements.

**Mitigation/ Action Required.** Due to the project's potential impacts to air quality and that San Luis Obispo County has been designated non-attainment for PM<sub>10</sub> (fine particulate), additional analysis of air quality impacts shall be accomplished by a qualified air quality specialist and shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following:

1. Consultation with the Air Pollution Control District.
2. A description of the existing air quality in the project area, including:
  - a. Discussion of applicable State and Federal air quality standards.
  - b. Local climate and air pollution meteorology.
  - c. Local trends and patterns of air pollutant concentrations including air quality monitoring data from local monitoring stations.
3. Discussion of State and Federal attainment status and current air quality planning efforts within the County.
4. Discussion of County air quality policies relative to development, using thresholds of significance derived from the adopted Clean Air Plan, and other sources, as applicable.
5. Summary of the thresholds and air quality constraints for development of the property.
6. Recommendation and discussion of adequate and feasible mitigation measures, if any, to address air quality impacts.

4. <b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -</b> <i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Result in a loss of unique or special status species or their habitats?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Reduce the extent, diversity or quality of native or other important vegetation?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Impact wetland or riparian habitat?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Introduce barriers to movement of resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or factors, which could hinder the normal activities of wildlife?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Setting.** The following habitats were observed on the proposed project: Grasses , oak woodland, riparian.

Based on the latest California Diversity database, and other biological references, the following is a list of sensitive vegetation, wildlife and/or habitat that have been identified as potentially being within the vicinity of the proposed project:

Plants- Pismo clarkia (*Clarkia speciosa ssp. immaculate*) is known to exist in four locations within 0.8 miles of the property. Pismo clarkia is listed as a Federal endangered species, as a rare species by the State, and is included on CNPS List 1B. It has a R-E-D (Rarity-Endangerment-Distribution) code of 3-3-3. This annual herb occurs on low, sandy hills (<100 meters), from Pismo to Edna Valley, in southern San Luis Obispo County. Most Pismo clarkia populations are found in valley and foothill grasslands, and in the margins between chaparral and oak woodland communities near the coast.

Natural populations observed in the Arroyo Grande and Nipomo Mesa areas appear to flourish in open areas located on northerly or easterly facing sandy slopes, which have experienced some form of soil disturbance. A recovery plan for Pismo clarkia has been prepared (USFWS 1998) that documents distribution patterns, principal threats, conservation efforts, habitat management, and recovery strategies for the species. The principal threat to the Pismo clarkia is habitat destruction and degradation due to development.

Obispo indian paintbrush (*Castilleja densiflora ssp. obispoensis*) is known to occur within 0.3 miles of the property. Obispo Indian paintbrush (*Castilleja densiflora ssp. obispoensis*) is a CNPS List 1B annual herb. This species occurs in valley and foothill grasslands and occasional intergrades with other subspecies. The elevation range for this species is 10 to 400 meters, and the blooming period is April through May.

Wells's manzanita (*Arctostaphylos wellsii*) is known to occur about 0.6 miles west and 0.6 miles south of the property. Wells's manzanita (*Arctostaphylos wellsii*) is an evergreen shrub that is found on sandstone soils in closed cone coniferous forests and chaparral. The typical flowering period is December through April. The species grows from 30 m to

400 m (98 ft to 1,312 ft) elevations. Wells's manzanita is considered rare by CNPS (List 1B, RED 2-3-3).

Brewer's spineflower (*Chorizanthe breweri*) is known to occur about 0.7 miles west of the property. Brewer's spineflower (*Chorizanthe breweri*) is a member of the buckwheat family, and is endemic to San Luis Obispo County. It is generally found growing on serpentinite, rock or gravelly substrates within closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral, cismontane woodland, or coastal scrub plant communities. It is an annual herb with a blooming period from May through August and is considered rare by CNPS (List 1B).

San Luis Obispo County lupine (*Lupinus ludovicianus*) is known to occur about 0.6 miles south of the property. San Luis Obispo County lupine (*Lupinus ludovicianus*) is a perennial herb that is found on sandstone or sandy soils and in chaparral and cismontane woodland habitats. The species generally blooms from April through July. The lupine is the official flower of San Luis Obispo County. The plant is primarily threatened by grazing and trampling. The CNPS considers this plant to be endangered in portions of its range in California and elsewhere (List 1B, 3-2-3)

Wildlife-Southwestern pond turtle (*Emys (=Clemmys) marmorata pallida*) is found on site, as well as two other locations about ½ mile away. Southwestern pond turtle (*Emys (=Clemmys) marmorata pallida*) prefers slow-water aquatic habitat with available basking sites nearby. Hatchlings require shallow water habitat with relatively dense submergent vegetation for foraging. Southwestern pond turtle is a federal and California Species of Special Concern.

American badger (*Taxidea taxus*) is known to occur about 0.05 miles south of the property.

South/Central Coast Steelhead Trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) is known to occur about 0.5 miles west of the property. South/Central Coast Steelhead Trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) require cool, deep pools for holding through the summer, prior to spawning in the winter. Such pools were not encountered on the subject property. Generally, the fish is found in shallow areas, with cobble or boulder bottoms at the tails of pools. South/Central Coast Steelhead Trout is considered federally threatened and a California species of Special Concern.

The applicant has recently completed or is in the process of providing several biological assessments to address impacts associated with biological resources.

**Impact.** The project proposes grading, filling or vegetation removal for much of the site. As described in the setting section, the impact area supports multiple sensitive species. Without adequate controls the project could result in adverse indirect impacts to surface water entering nearby creeks and impacted related biological resources (e.g., sediment entering waterway, chemically-based wastes impacting plants and wildlife, etc.). As a part of the composting effort, problematic vectors could be introduced (e.g., pine pitch canker, sudden oak death syndrome, etc.) to the area that could have a significant impact to nearby sensitive biological resources.

**Mitigation/Conclusion.** Potentially significant impacts to biological resources must be identified and evaluated by a qualified biologist. The biological resource analysis should include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Consultation with the State Department of Fish and Game and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.
2. Consultation with the California Native Plant Society, the Audubon Society, and other conservation organizations as appropriate.
3. Any biological reports prepared for the applicant shall be reviewed for accuracy and adequacy, and incorporated into subsequent analysis;
4. Identification of all rare, threatened and/or endangered plant and wildlife species on site.

5. Identification of all rare, threatened and/or endangered plant and wildlife species off-site which could potentially be affected by the proposed project.
6. Identification of other sensitive, unique or important plant and wildlife species and communities of the project area.
7. The consultant shall prepare mapping that illustrates the locations of the following (if any):
  - a. Location of individuals and groups of rare, threatened, and/or endangered plant species.
  - b. Habitat for rare, threatened and/or endangered plant and animal species.
  - c. Wetlands and riparian areas.
  - d. Other areas of sensitive, unique or important biological resources.
8. Identification of short-term and long-term impacts on rare, threatened, and/or endangered species and species habitat.
9. Identification of cumulative impacts on the area's ecosystem, which could result from the project.
10. Identification and discussion of feasible mitigation measures, if any, which could be included in the project to minimize potential adverse biological impacts to less than significant levels.

<b>5. CULTURAL RESOURCES -</b> <i>Will the project:</i>	<b>Potentially Significant</b>	<b>Impact can &amp; will be mitigated</b>	<b>Insignificant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>a) Disturb pre-historic resources?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>b) Disturb historic resources?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>c) Disturb paleontological resources?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>d) Other: _____</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Setting - Cultural Resources.** The project is located in an area historically occupied by the Obispeno Chumash. . No historic structures are present or known to exist in the area.

**Paleontological Resources.** Paleontological resources are the fossilized remains of prehistoric plant and animal organisms, as well as the mineralized impressions (trace fossils) left as indirect evidence of the form and activity of such organisms. Under state and federal law, paleontological resources are considered to be nonrenewable resources.

Paleontologic sensitivity is the potential for a geologic unit to produce scientifically significant fossils, as determined by rock type, past history of the rock unit in producing fossil materials, and fossil sites that are recorded in the unit. A paleontologic sensitivity rating is derived from fossil data from the entire geologic unit, not just from a specific survey area. However, it does not measure the significance of individual fossils present within the County, because it is impossible to accurately predict what individual fossils may be discovered. The significance of an individual fossil can only be determined after it is found and evaluated.

A three-fold classification of sensitivity, labeled as high, low and indeterminate, is used in California and recommended by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, as follows:

- High Sensitivity- Indicates fossils are currently observed onsite, localities are recorded within the study area and/or the unit has a history of producing numerous significant fossil remains.
- Low Sensitivity- Indicates significant fossils are not likely to be found because of random fossil distribution pattern, extreme youth of the rock unit and/or the method of rock formation, such as alteration by heat and pressure.

- Indeterminate Sensitivity- Unknown or undetermined status indicates that the rock unit either has not been sufficiently studied or lacks good exposures to warrant a definitive rating. This rating is treated initially as having a high sensitivity or potential. After study or monitoring, the unit may fall into one of the other categories.

Other professionals expand the previous classification to include up to three additional ratings of very high, moderate and no sensitivity, as follows:

- No Sensitivity- Some paleontologists use this for crystalline rock units such as igneous rocks, where the rock forms from molten magma, which would preclude fossil preservation.
- Moderate Sensitivity- Applied by some to geologic units that have a history of producing meager fossil collections.
- Very High Sensitivity- May be warranted for a project that contains very well known and scientifically important localities. Another example would be if a known fossil bone bed is present or is predicted to be present.

Paleontological resources are generally found in sedimentary rock units in which the boundaries of a sedimentary rock unit define the limits of paleontologic sensitivity in a given region. In a sense, volcanic ash eruptions into a lake or ocean basin also constitute sedimentary rock units that may contain fossil material. Most fossil material is found where bedrock is exposed on the surface, typically in mountainous terrain or in areas where erosion has removed the soil or regolith surface. As a result, paleontological sites are normally discovered in cliffs, ledges, steep gullies, or along wave-cut terraces where vertical rock sections are exposed. Fossil material may be exposed by a trench, ditch, or channel caused by construction. Regional geologic papers usually present numerous invertebrate fossil sites especially in marine rocks. Some invertebrate fossil sites are more productive than others. It is the richness of invertebrate fossils in marine rocks that make a particular invertebrate fossil discovery of less critical concern and significance. Vertebrate fossil sites are usually found in non-marine or continental deposits. 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. Scattered vertebrate remains (mammoth, mastadon, horse, ground sloth, camel, and rodents) have been identified from the Pleistocene non-marine continental terrace deposits on Vandenberg Air Force Base to the south (Harz 2003). Presently none of these sites have been published in the literature but known through fossil catalogues (Jefferson 2001, Revised).

**Impact.** The project may be in an area that would be considered culturally sensitive due to proximity of unique landforms, water and other known resources. The Cold Canyon Landfill site is underlain primarily by the Monterey formation and flanked on the north and south by deposits of the Pismo formation. The potential exists for paleontological resources to be encountered from soil disturbing or removal activities and will need further analysis. No structures exist within the expansion area and impacts to historical resources are not expected.

**Mitigation/Action Required.** Due to the potentially significant impacts to cultural and paleontological resources, additional analysis is needed by a qualified archaeologist/ paleontologist and shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. A review of archaeological records to identify known archaeological sites.
2. Any archaeological or paleontological reports prepared for the applicant shall be reviewed for accuracy and adequacy, and incorporated into subsequent analysis;
2. As needed, survey of areas of the project site that are most likely to contain archaeological resources and be subject to future development.
3. An evaluation and discussion of the cultural importance of on site and/or surrounding

archaeological resources.

4. A survey of geological maps, and evaluation and discussion of the importance of potential on site and/or surrounding paleontological resources.
5. Recommendation and discussion of adequate and feasible mitigation measures, if any, to ensure that known and unknown paleontological and archaeological resources are adequately protected.

The location and detailed descriptions of pre-historic archaeological resources, if found, will be contained in an appendix to be published under separate cover and clearly marked "Confidential, Not For Public Review".

<b>6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -</b> <i>Will the project:</i>	<b>Potentially Significant</b>	<b>Impact can &amp; will be mitigated</b>	<b>Insignificant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
a) <i>Result in exposure to or production of unstable earth conditions, such as landslides, earthquakes, liquefaction, ground failure, land subsidence or other similar hazards?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Be within a California Geological Survey "Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone"?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Result in soil erosion, topographic changes, loss of topsoil or unstable soil conditions from project-related improvements, such as vegetation removal, grading, excavation, or fill?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Change rates of soil absorption, or amount or direction of surface runoff?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Include structures located on expansive soils?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) <i>Change the drainage patterns where substantial on- or off-site sedimentation/ erosion or flooding may occur?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) <i>Involve activities within the 100-year flood zone?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) <i>Be inconsistent with the goals and policies of the County's Safety Element relating to Geologic and Seismic Hazards?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) <i>Preclude the future extraction of valuable mineral resources?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -**  
***Will the project:***

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

j) *Other:* \_\_\_\_\_

**Setting.** Regulatory Policies. The County's Safety Element includes the following goal: "Minimize the potential for loss of life and property resulting from geologic and seismic hazards". This Element also includes policies and standards intended on achieving this goal. The County's Land Use Ordinance includes provisions to address drainage, as well as sedimentation and erosion control.

Subject Property. The topography of the project is nearly level to steeply sloping with a low-laying area (wetland) at the southern edge of the expansion area. The area proposed for development is outside of the Geologic Study Area designation. The landslide risk potential is considered low to high. The liquefaction potential during a ground-shaking event is considered low.. Active faulting is known to exist on the subject property. The project is within a known geologic formation area containing ultramafic rock or soils.

*Seismicity.* Portions of the Coast Range of California lie within the County. This range is considered a geologically complex and seismically active region that is subject to earthquakes and potentially significant groundshaking, fault rupture, liquefaction, tsunami, and seiche hazards. Active, potentially active, and inactive faults are located throughout the County.

Within the County, the Coast Range is further divided into four distinct seismotectonic domains including the Santa Maria-San Luis Range, Coastal Franciscan, Salinian, and the Western San Joaquin Valley. The project is within the Santa Maria-San Luis Range.

*Santa Maria Basin-San Luis Range Domain.* Comprising the southwestern area of the County, this range covers several planning areas, including San Luis Bay (Inland and Coastal), South County (Inland and Coastal), southwestern portions of Estero, and the western portions of San Luis Obispo. Two recognized active faults are located in this domain, the Hosgri and the Los Osos. Geologic hazards within this domain include groundshaking, liquefaction, seismic related settlement of alluvium in low-lying areas, and tsunamis and coastal erosion in ocean front areas. The majority of the range has a low landslide potential, however, steeper terrain areas and the less developed areas of the Santa Lucia Range and Irish Hills have the potential for severe landslides.

*Groundshaking.* Groundshaking (or seismic shaking) caused by fault movement during an earthquake has the potential to result in the damage or destruction of buildings, infrastructure, and possible injury or loss of life throughout the County. Groundshaking may occur as a result of movement along a fault located within the County or along a more distant fault. The intensity of groundshaking in a particular area is dependent on several factors, including: the earthquake magnitude, distance from the epicenter, duration of strong ground motion, local geologic conditions, and the fundamental period of the structure. Groundshaking can also trigger secondary seismic phenomenon such as liquefaction, lateral spreading, seismically induced settlement and slope instability, tsunami and seiche, and other forms of ground rupture and seismic responses (SLO County 1999). Based on the previous EIR, which considered a number of fault zones as far as 42 miles away, it was determined that a Maximum Probable Earthquake would range between 6.3 to 8.3 on the Richter scale.

*Fault Rupture.* Fault rupture refers to displacement of the ground surface along a fault trace, and is a potential hazard where future development would cross or be constructed astride known fault zones. Damage associated with fault-related ground rupture is normally confined to a narrow band along the trend of the fault, and fault displacement usually involves forces so great that it is generally not feasible (structurally and economically) to design and build structures to accommodate this rapid displacement. The greatest risk for fault displacement is generally thought to be along historically

active and potentially active faults. A portion of the subject property is located over the Indian Knob fault. Based on the previous EIR, this fault is not considered to be active (not of Holocene age).

*Clean Water Act.* The Clean Water Act has established a regulatory system for the management of storm water discharges from construction, industrial and municipal sources. The California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) has adopted a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water General Permit that requires the implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for discharges regulated under the SWRCB program. Currently, construction sites of one acre and greater may need to prepare and implement a SWPPP which focuses on controlling storm water runoff. Municipal and industrial sources are also regulated under separate NPDES general permits. The Regional Water Quality Control Board is the local extension of the SWRCB, who currently monitors these SWPPPs.

**DRAINAGE** – The area proposed for development is outside/within the 100-year Flood Hazard designation. The closest creek an unnamed stream from the proposed development is approximately 0.05 miles feet to the south. As described in the Natural Resource Conservation Service Soil Survey, the soil is considered very poorly to moderately drained. For areas where drainage is identified as a potential issue, the LUO (Sec. 22.52.080) includes a provision to prepare a drainage plan to minimize potential drainage impacts. This plan would need to address measures such as: constructing on-site retention or detention basins, or installing surface water flow dissipaters. This plan would also need to show that the increased surface runoff would have no more impacts than that caused by historic flows.

**SEDIMENTATION AND EROSION** – The soil types and descriptions are listed in the previous Agriculture section under “Setting”. As described in the NRCS Soil Survey, the soil surface is considered to have low to moderate erodibility and low to moderate shrink-swell characteristics.

Erosion of graded and active landfill areas and discharge of sediment down gradient will likely result, if adequate temporary and permanent measures are not taken before, during and after vegetation removal and grading, as well as from ongoing landfill operations. If not properly mitigated, these impacts both on the project site and within surrounding areas may be significant.

A sedimentation and erosion control plan shall be prepared per County Land Use Ordinance [(Inland), Sec. 22.52.090] and incorporated into the project to minimize sedimentation and erosion. The plan will need to be prepared by a registered civil engineer and address the following to minimize temporary and long-term sedimentation and erosion: slope surface stabilization, erosion and sedimentation control devices and final erosion control measures. When highly erosive conditions exist, a sedimentation and erosion control plan is required (LUO Sec. 22.52.090) to minimize these impacts. When required, the plan is prepared by a civil engineer to address both temporary and long-term sedimentation and erosion impacts. As previously stated, projects involving more than one acre of disturbance are subject to the preparation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which focuses on controlling storm water runoff.

**Impact.** As proposed, the project will ultimately result in the disturbance of over 50 acres. This request includes the following significant changes:

- 1) Existing **landfill** would expand
  - a. the existing “Resource Recovery Park” (which includes a Public Drop-Off facility, construction and demo debris recycling (expansion proposed), household hazardous waste drop-off, universal and electronic waste processing and recycling) from 2 to 4 acres,
  - b. increase landfill volume/ capacity from 6.09 to 12.9 million cubic yards;
  - c. Increase disposal operation area by 46 acres (existing overall facility size would change from 121 to 209 acres).

- 2) Existing **composting facility** would extend hours from 8 am - 3 pm to 7 am - 4:30 pm, expand compost volume from 300 to 450 tons per day; expand acceptable compost materials to include food waste from residential/ industrial/ commercial sources and additional ag by-products; expand compost area from 14 to up to 25 acres for storage and processing; and
- 3) Existing **material recovery/sort facility** would reclassify from Recycling Center to Large Volume Processing Facility to allow for commercial recyclables and additional residential recyclables, expand from 120 tons/ day to 400 tons /day; increase hours of operation would change from 8 am – 4:30 pm to 7 am – 10 pm that would accommodate a second shift, and enlarge facility; add pole barn to cover material storage area.
- 4) Public entrance location would be moved approximately 2,800 feet to the southeast on Highway 227.
- 5) The expansion will result in up to 41 additional employees.

Processing and storing of hazardous wastes has not changed and is limited to household sources. Seismic impact analysis will need to focus on the protective liner installed (existing and future) to keep leachate from entering the groundwater, and after a seismic event, how it will be effectively monitored and repaired to avoid significant impacts to groundwater resources.

Numerous soils and geological reports for the applicant have been completed for the existing site.

### **Mitigation/Action Required**

Drainage, Erosion, and Sedimentation. A registered engineer must evaluate potentially significant drainage, erosion, and sedimentation impacts. The analysis should include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Consultation with the County Public Works Department, the United States Natural Resource Conservation Service, and the Resource Conservation District.
2. Identification and mapping of significant drainage courses and watersheds.
3. Identification and mapping of all areas within the project boundaries that currently experience drainage and/or flooding conditions.
4. Identification and mapping of all areas that could potentially be adversely affected by drainage, erosion, or sedimentation impacts resulting from the development the proposed project.
5. Identification of cumulative impacts on the area's ecosystem, which could result from the project.
6. Identification and discussion of feasible mitigation measures, if any, which could be included in the project to minimize potential adverse drainage, erosion, and sedimentation impacts.
7. Evaluate any existing reports previously prepared for the applicant for accuracy or adequacy that relate to the above issues.

Geologic Hazards/Site Alteration. A Registered Engineering geologist will be needed to consider the following when evaluating the project's potentially significant impacts to or from geological resources:

1. Consultation with the County Public Works Department, the County Department of Planning and Building, reference to the San Luis Obispo County Land Use Ordinance (including the Safety Element) and County GIS mapping.
2. Incorporate at a minimum the following project setting components:
  - a. Underlying formations
  - b. Faulting
  - c. Slope stability

- d. Potential liquefaction hazards
  - e. Potential landslide hazards
3. Mapping of significant areas that pose geologic hazards.
  4. Evaluation and discussion of the geologic features of the site and surrounding area that may have a significant adverse impact on the development of the project.
  5. Evaluation and discussion of impacts associated with topographical alteration (or saturation of soil, as applicable) including stability of roads, cut slopes, fill slopes, drainage structures, and other improvements.
  6. Identification and discussion of feasible mitigation measures, if any, which could be included in the project to avoid or substantially reduce potentially significant impacts related to geologic hazards or topographic alteration.

<b>7. HAZARDS &amp; HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - <i>Will the project:</i></b>	<b>Potentially Significant</b>	<b>Impact can &amp; will be mitigated</b>	<b>Insignificant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
a) <b><i>Result in a risk of explosion or release of hazardous substances (e.g. oil, pesticides, chemicals, radiation) or exposure of people to hazardous substances?</i></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <b><i>Interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan?</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <b><i>Expose people to safety risk associated with airport flight pattern?</i></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <b><i>Increase fire hazard risk or expose people or structures to high fire hazard conditions?</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <b><i>Create any other health hazard or potential hazard?</i></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) <b><i>Other: <u>Vector &amp; Disease Control</u></i></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Setting.** The existing project is currently approved to collect household hazardous wastes. The project currently includes an approved process to handle the methane gas generated by the project. The collected gas is routed to the Price Canyon oil field natural gas pipelines.

The project is not within a high severity risk area for fire. The existing facility includes an airborne gas emission capture and removal process to eliminate potential for surface explosions or fires. The 7 landfill gas probes are measured quarterly with results submitted to IWMA and APCD.

Litter & Disease Vectors. While the project is not within the Airport Review area, it is below the flight pattern used at the San Luis Obispo airport. In an effort to reduce the scavenging bird (primarily seagulls) population (potential disease vector), a falconry program was established within the last two years. Based on discussions with the operator's representative, this program has proven highly effective. Anecdotal information from neighbors confirms the bird population reduction, but also suggests that the remaining scavenging birds may be pushed higher to avoid the falcons, and

potentially into the flight pattern or potential interference with aircraft. “Whistler” devices are also placed around the facility to further discourage birds from landing at the facility.

On the existing litter control program, it appears to be only partially or intermittently effective, based on staff observations along Highway 227 and anecdotal information. Pine pitch canker, a disease impacting many pine trees in the county, can be spread when dead trees are taken away from their point of origin as firewood or mulch products. Sudden Oak Death syndrome, while not yet in the county, can have the same devastating effects of spreading the disease if diseased tree parts are taken away from the point of origin, as products (firewood, mulch, etc.) that are then transported elsewhere (transporting the disease as well).

**Impact.** Regarding hazardous wastes, the project does not propose any change to its collection of hazardous (household only) wastes materials.

Regarding litter and disease vectors, the composting portion of the project proposes to include food wastes from all sources (residential, commercial, industrial), which may result in additional disease vector issues, above the existing greenwaste composting program. Due to existing and potential tree disease vectors (Pine pitch canker, sudden oak death, etc.), the potential may exist to impact surrounding trees, as well as indirectly contribute to transportation of these pathogens to uninfected parts of the county via finished products (e.g., mulch, etc.).

Undesirable bird attraction will remain a part of the proposed expansion. The bird control aspect will need to be further evaluated, including but not necessarily limited to: effectiveness of the falconry program and if there are any secondary effects (e.g., are scavenging birds being pushed into the flight path of incoming or outgoing aircraft; are “disruptive” devices (e.g., whistler, etc.) effective and do they have any significant adverse secondary effects (e.g., exceed noise thresholds, dangerously distracting to Hwy. 227 motorist, etc.). Additional analysis may consider other feasible alternatives that would be effective for bird control (e.g., tenting active disposal area, etc.).

Based on continued application of measures required from previous permits and fire safety plans, it is not anticipated that the project will present a significant fire safety risk. Also, the project is not expected to conflict with any regional evacuation plan.

**Mitigation/Required Action.** Potentially significant impacts may result for hazards or hazardous wastes generated by the proposed project. The analysis should include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Consultation with the County Health Department (including the Environmental Health Division), Regional Water Quality Control Board, CDF-County Fire Department; SLO County Airport Manager; UC Co-Op Extension; County Department of Agriculture, and County Risk Management Division.
2. Discussion of impacts from: the potential doubling of household hazardous wastes; inclusion of all food wastes being processed as part of the composting facility; additional landfill gases created and how they will be controlled; and on-site storage of any hazardous materials. This effort would need to evaluate the additional human exposure to these elements, and if existing regulation on proper handling and disposal is adequate.
3. Identification and effectiveness of all litter and disease vectors, and any significant adverse secondary effects from the use of such controls.
4. Discuss potential fire hazards associated with the proposed expansion.
5. Discuss the potential explosiveness or other hazards from gas build-up at the landfill, and if the existing gas collection system will significantly reduce this impact. How long will this system need to be in place after landfill closure and how will this be funded? Discussion should include how the moisture content of the waste in the closed landfill will affect the rate of fermentation (gas production) and leaching of contaminants from the wastes?

6. Identification of any cumulative impacts relating to hazards that could result from the project.
7. Identification and discussion of feasible mitigation measures, if any, which could be included in the project to minimize potential hazard-related impacts.

<b>8. NOISE - Will the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant</b>	<b>Impact can &amp; will be mitigated</b>	<b>Insignificant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
a) <i>Expose people to noise levels that exceed the County Noise Element thresholds?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Generate increases in the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Expose people to severe noise or vibration?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Setting. Regulatory - County Noise Element**

The noise standards established by the County Noise Element for sensitive receptors will typically apply to existing or planned residences, residential developments along heavily traveled roadways. Noise is a complex physical phenomenon that varies with time, geographic location, proximity to the source, and duration.

The Noise Element of the County General Plan provides policy framework within which potential future noise impacts are minimized. Many communities and cities within the County have adopted noise ordinances. A noise ordinance may be used to address noise levels generated by existing industrial, commercial and residential uses that are not regulated by federal or state noise level standards. The regulation of noise sources such as traffic on public roadways, railroad line operations and aircraft in flight is preempted by existing federal and/or state regulations, meaning that such sources generally may not be addressed by a noise ordinance. The County Noise Element addresses the prevention of noise conflicts from all of these sources.

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to ambient noise levels than others, due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities involved. 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 (hospitals);
- Nursing and personal care;
- Churches;
- Public assembly and entertainment;
- Libraries and museums;
- Hotels and motels;
- Bed and breakfast facilities;
- Outdoor sports and recreation; and
- Offices.

There are a number of potentially significant sources of community noise within the County and its incorporated cities (County of SLO Noise Element, 1992). These sources include traffic on state highways, major county roadways and city streets, railroad operations, airport operations, military activities and industrial facilities. Specific noise sources selected for study, including stationary sources, are discussed in the following sections.

The County Noise Element indicates that typical noise levels in noise-sensitive areas range from approximately 39-62 dB L<sub>dn</sub>. The quietest areas are those that are removed from major transportation-related noise sources and local industrial or other stationary noise sources. A representative example of these quiet areas include the rural portions of the El Pomar-Estella, Shandon-Carrizo Plain, Adelaida, Los Padres, San Luis Obispo and South County planning areas and some of the County Urban/Village areas such as Heritage Ranch. The noisier locations identified in the County Noise Element are areas located near Highway 101 and major local streets. The County Noise Element indicates that existing background noise levels in many areas of the County that contain noise-sensitive land uses are relatively quiet. To preserve quiet conditions, the County has adopted noise level standards and policies to prevent degradation of the existing noise environment as much as possible.

### **Stationary Noise Sources**

The primary sources of stationary noise within the County include many industrial, commercial and agricultural processes. Federal and State employee health and safety regulations (OSHA and Cal-OSHA) control noise production within an industrial or commercial facility or in close proximity to many types of agricultural equipment. However, exterior noise emissions from such operations have the potential to exceed locally acceptable standards at nearby noise-sensitive land uses.

Stationary noise control issues focus upon two objectives: to prevent the introduction of new noise-producing uses in a noise sensitive area, and to prevent encroachment of noise-sensitive land uses upon existing noise-generating facilities. The County attempts to achieve these objectives by applying performance standards and by requiring that new noise-sensitive uses in proximity to existing noise sources include receiver-based mitigation measures.

Examples of major stationary noise sources identified within the County include:

- Union Asphalt Batch Plant, Ramada Drive-Templeton
- Navajo Concrete Batch Plant, Ramada Drive-Templeton
- Dirtman Sand and Gravel Plant, Templeton Road-Templeton
- Southern Pacific Milling Company Sand and Gravel Plant, Santa Margarita
- Southern Pacific Milling Company Concrete Plant, Suburban Road-San Luis Obispo
- Air-Vol Block, Suburban Road-San Luis Obispo
- Light Industrial Uses along El Camino Real: Brisco Rd. - Hillcrest Dr., Arroyo Grande
- Commercial Uses: Brisco Road and Grand Avenue
- Duke Energy, Morro Bay
- The Cannery, Morro Bay
- Commerce/Chandler Area, Paso Robles
- North River Road Area, Paso Robles
- San Luis Tank, Paso Robles
- Union/Golden Hill Road Area, Paso Robles
- Camp Roberts Military Reservation, San Miguel
- Produce Cold Storage Facilities, Oceano

Project Setting. *Stationary sources:* The project is adjacent to the Agriculture land use category. The ordinance requires that new stationary noise sources shall not exceed a daytime 50 decibel threshold at the property line(s) when it abuts a residential category or residence, nor a 45 decibel threshold at night.

*Agriculture:* Active agricultural operations exist primarily to the east, and consist of vineyards and ag-related warehouses/processing.

*Highway 227:* The project is adjacent to Highway 227, which experiences heavier and noisy traffic levels during commuter peak hour periods in the morning and late afternoon during the work week.

*Surrounding Noise Sensitive receptors:* Surrounding properties are large (21 acres and above) with residences as close as 200 feet from the edge of the landfill.

**Impact.** The project is expected to generate loud vehicular and stationary noises, and potentially conflict with certain surrounding noise-sensitive uses. Vehicular noise would primarily emanate from skiploaders, tractors and garbage trucks placing, moving or consolidating materials brought to the landfill, composting, sorting and recycling staging facilities, as well as ultimate placement of cover material. The cover material is excavated from on-site sources, another potential noise source. Stationary sources include the composting facility, which includes grinders or mulchers to reduce organic material to a relatively small and uniform size for even composting; the recovery/sort facility includes noisy sorting equipment; and vector controls may include loud noises (e.g., sharp sudden noises to scare birds, etc.). The applicant has prepared a technical noise report primarily focusing on the proposed recycling area.

**Mitigation/Action Required.** Through project design, efforts have been made to attenuate potential on-site noise impacts. However, due to the potential for significant impacts from noise, additional analysis of noise impacts shall be accomplished by a qualified person experienced in the field of environmental noise assessment and shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Determining the adequacy of previously completed technical acoustical analyses, and provide supplemental analysis as needed.
2. Establishment and mapping of existing and future (project buildout) stationary and vehicular noise contours from, but not limited to, the following sources:
  - a. Compost facility
  - b. Sort Facility
  - c. Landfill expansion area
  - d. Recycling/ Public drop-off area
  - e. Vector control devices
  - f. Excavation area
3. Identification and discussion of significant noise impacts resulting from development in close proximity to identified noise sources, using thresholds based on the adopted Noise Element of the County General Plan.
4. Recommendation and discussion of adequate and feasible mitigation measures, if any, to minimize potential noise impacts to acceptable levels.

<b>9. POPULATION/HOUSING -</b> <i>Will the project:</i>	<b>Potentially Significant</b>	<b>Impact can &amp; will be mitigated</b>	<b>Insignificant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>a) <i>Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. POPULATION/HOUSING - <i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
b) <i>Displace existing housing or people, requiring construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Create the need for substantial new housing in the area?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Use substantial amount of fuel or energy?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Setting.** The proposed project is at the southern edge of the Central County sub-region as identified in the 2005 SLO County Jobs/Housing Balance Report, and just north of the South County sub-region. Based on this report, the Central County area is considered “job heavy” at a jobs/housing balance of 1.72, where the South County area is considered housing rich coming in at 0.72.

In its efforts to provide for affordable housing, the county currently administers the Home Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program and the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, which provides limited financing to projects relating to affordable housing throughout the county.

The County has recently adopted a revised Housing Element. One of the new Housing Element Programs (Program HE 1.9) indicates that the County will prepare an Inclusionary Housing Ordinance during 2006. Upon adoption of the ordinance, future commercial development may be required to pay a fee to support development of new affordable housing. However, the Board of Supervisors’ current policy to mitigate or provide adequate measures for affordable housing needs is to require fees from residential subdivisions only.

Being in a rural area, the subject property is not within walking distance of any rental housing, retail commercial development, or transit facilities.

The expansion area does not include any existing residences.

**Impact.** The project will result in a need for new housing to accommodate up to 41 additional employees. Should this project be approved, the jobs/housing balance would worsen in the Central County sub-region. The project will not displace existing housing.

The project will use a fair amount of fuel for excavation of cover material. There may be a substantial use of fuel/energy from daily operational needs. The project will have secondary indirect impacts from the expansion where approval will result in additional vehicle trips using the facility to fill up the expansion area and the fuel it takes to go to and from the landfill.

**Mitigation/Conclusion.** Based on the above discussion and any other existing information, determine if the additional jobs is considered potentially significant. If determined significant, additional analysis shall be completed to determine the feasibility of any mitigation measures, and if the proposed measures would reduce impacts to less than significant levels. Also, evaluate the use of fuel/energy to determine significance. If found significant, determine what if any mitigation measures can be applied to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

10. PUBLIC SERVICES/UTILITIES - <i>Will the project have an effect upon, or result in the need for new or altered public services in any of the following areas:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Fire protection?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Police protection (e.g., Sheriff, CHP)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Schools?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Roads?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Solid Wastes?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) <i>Other public facilities?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Setting** - Existing Regulations. T

The County-adopted Public Facilities Fee Ordinance (Title 18) provides for the collection of a fair-share fee from new development to help mitigate for cumulative impacts on public facilities. This fee currently being collected helps fund capital improvement projects in the following areas: libraries, fire, general government, parks and recreation, and sheriff’s patrol.

Fire Protection

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection/San Luis Obispo County Fire Department (CDF), provides fire protection, emergency medical, and rescue services to the proposed project.

Based on the County’s fire severity map the project is within the “High” risk area, which identifies the susceptibility to wildland and brush fires. Fire hazard severity is determined by a number of factors including but not limited to: remoteness of the area, denseness of vegetation, the areas circulation network, proximity to fire fighting facilities, habitat type, and the degree of urbanization. These factors among others contribute to an area’s overall response time. CDF’s Response Time map shows it would take approximately 10 minutes to reach the project once a call is received from the closest CDF station. The closest CDF station is approximately 4.5 miles to the north.

Appropriate response times for fire protection services vary with the degree of urbanization. Appropriate response times for urban areas are up to six minutes, for suburban areas up to seven minutes, and rural areas up to twelve minutes. Response times exceeding 15 minutes for structure fires provide little possibility of saving the structure, and 60 minutes or more could mean fires approaching disaster levels in steep, chaparral covered, remote areas such as the Santa Lucia Range. For structure fires, CDF has mutual aid agreements with all fire protection agencies in the County. An air tanker squadron at Paso Robles Airport is available if needed (CDF 2003).

Police Protection and Emergency Services

The County Sheriff’s Department provides police and patrol services in the unincorporated areas of the County. The County is divided into three areas; North, Coast, and South. The Sheriff’s Department is headquartered from the operational facility at Camp San Luis Obispo. Each area has its own substation, which is supervised by a sergeant and staffed with approximately 23 deputies and two legal clerks. According to the Sheriff’s Office, the ratio of deputies to population has not kept pace with population growth for many years. The current ratio is one deputy for every 1,140 people. Based on information provided by the Sheriff’s Office, an adequate level of service is approximately

one deputy for every 750 people.

The Coast Station is located at 2099 10th Street in Los Osos, serving an area of 900 square miles. The Coast Station personnel provide service to San Simeon/Hearst Castle area, Cambria, Harmony, Cayucos, Los Osos/Baywood Park, rural San Luis Obispo, and Avila Beach/Port San Luis. Planning areas served by the Coast Station include: Nacimiento, Adelaida, North Coast, Estero, San Luis Bay Inland, San Luis Obispo, Los Padres, and Las Pilitas. Current average response times generally range from 5 to 30 minutes with longer response times to the more rural outlying areas of the service jurisdiction.

The California Highway Patrol (CHP) services San Luis Obispo County's highways, with stations located in San Luis Obispo and Templeton. They are available to respond in emergency situations, but generally do not respond to residential calls.

Emergency services generally include ambulance and hospital service. Private companies based throughout the County provide ambulance service. Response times are generally good with the exception of the more rural portions of the County where the large area being served and the distances involved lend to poorer levels of service. Hospital services are provided by Twin Cities Hospital in Templeton, Arroyo Grande Community Hospital in the City of Arroyo Grande, and by French and Sierra-Vista in the City of San Luis Obispo. In addition, the western portion of the Adelaida area and the North Coast Planning Area are included in the Cambria Community Hospital District, which operates a clinic and provides ambulance service.

### Schools

The project is located in the San Luis Coastal Unified School District. The Resource Management System Annual Resource Summary Report identified the school district's "level of severity" on student capacity ranges from "I" to "III" depending on the instructional level. III, the highest severity, means the current "enrollment equals or exceeds school capacity".

School districts within the County provide enrollment and capacity information relative to individual schools within their jurisdiction. Capacity is defined as design or maximum. Enrollment at 28 out of 58 (48.3 percent) of the County's schools exceeds their design capacities (SLO County 2003). Design capacity is exceeded by the addition of relocatable temporary classrooms to a school site, but there is a practical limit to the number of temporary facilities that can be added before core facilities become so burdened that the educational environment suffers. The maximum capacity is usually about 25 percent higher than design capacity. The County's Department of Planning and Building reports that 18 out of 23 communities in the County have severe school resources capacity problem, where the enrollment is higher than the school's design capacity.

Countywide, several districts have been experiencing significant enrollment declines over the last several years, particularly in elementary schools. The decline is generally attributed to high housing costs in some parts of the county, which deter families with young children from locating there (SLO County 2003). Table 1 summarizes the capacity of County school districts and ranks them by level of severity.

Revenue for facilities construction comes from both State and local sources, including developer fees. A statutory fee that also contributes to funding facilities is the Stirling fee. This fee is based on the amount of building construction proposed and is adjusted annually. The State Building Program is the primary source of funding for school facility projects. Most County school districts participate in school construction programs, whereby new development contributes a portion of the cost of new facilities, while the remainder is supplied by State and local resident taxes. Local funding alternatives include community approval of a general obligation bond for school construction. The General Obligation (GEO) Bond election process requires two-thirds voter approval. From 1986 to June 2000, only 55% of the school districts that held GEO Bond elections successfully earned the two-thirds voter approval for school facility funding. However, Proposition 39, which allows for approval of school construction bonds at a 55% threshold, was approved in the year 2000.

**TABLE 1  
San Luis Obispo County Schools 2003-04**

District	Planning Area Served	School	Capacity	Enrollment	Enrollment Capacity	RLOS <sup>1</sup>
Cayucos Elementary	Estero	Cayucos Elementary	240	210	0.88	I
Shandon Unified	Shandon-Carrizo	Shandon Elementary	145	187	1.29	III
		Shandon Jr/Sr H.S.	187	132	0.71	OK
Coast Unified	Adelaida, Estero, Nacimiento, North Coast	Cambria Elementary	191	331	1.73	III
		Santa Lucia Middle	103	194	1.88	III
		Coast Union H.S.	506	350	0.69	OK
San Miguel Joint Union	Nacimiento, Salinas River	Lillian Larson K-8	290	434	1.50	III
Paso Robles	Adelaida, El-Pomar/Estrella, Nacimiento, Salinas River	Paso Robles Elem. (6)	3,453	2,758	0.8	OK
		Paso Robles Middle (2)	1,170	1,525	1.30	III
		Paso Robles H.S.	1,836	2,152	1.17	III
Templeton Unified	Adelaida, El-Pomar/Estrella, Salinas River	Templeton Elem. (2)	955	862	0.90	II
		Templeton Middle	545	553	1.01	III
		Templeton H.S.	720	789	1.10	III
Atascadero Unified	El-Pomar/Estrella, Los Padres, Las Pilitas, Salinas River	Atascadero Elem. (4)	1,708	2,009	1.18	III
		Atascadero Jr. High	1,150	760	0.66	OK
		Atascadero H.S.	1,824	1,676	0.92	II
		Carrisa Plains K-8	53	43	0.81	OK
		Creston Elementary	40	103	2.58	III
		Santa Margarita Elem.	358	296	0.83	OK
San Luis Coastal Unified	Adelaida, Estero, Los Padres, San Luis Bay, San Luis Obispo	Los Osos Elem. (2)	1,300	768	0.59	OK
		Los Osos Middle	725	542	0.68	OK
		Morro Bay H.S.	1,000	962	0.87	I
		Morro Bay Elem.	650	421	0.65	OK
		SLO Area Elem. (6)	3,570	2,362	0.62	OK
		Laguna Middle	850	792	0.93	II
		San Luis H.S.	1,564	1,561	0.92	II
Bellevue-Santa Fe	San Luis Obispo	K-8 (Charter)	170	146	0.86	II
Lucia Mar	Huasna-Lopez, Los Padres, San Luis Bay, San Luis Obispo	Five Cities Elem. (8)	3,541	3,886	1.10	III
		Five Cities Middle (2)	1,150	1,211	1.05	III
		Arroyo Grande H.S.	1,500	2,176	1.45	III
		Nipomo Elem. (2)	1,050	1,407	1.34	III
		Nipomo Middle	660	803	1.22	III
		Nipomo H.S.	655	1,228	1.20	III

*Notes:*

<sup>1</sup> RLOS=Relative Level of Service:

I – When enrollment projections reach school capacity within seven years

II – When enrollment projections reach school capacity within five years

III – When enrollment equals or exceeds capacity

Source: Annual Resources Summary Report 2004

**Impact.** Overall, it is not expected that the project-specific impacts to utilities or public services will be significant and can be mitigated through existing programs. This project, along with others in the area, will have a cumulative effect on police and fire protection, and schools. The project's direct and cumulative impacts are within the general assumptions of allowed use for the subject property that was used to estimate the fees in place.

**Mitigation/ Action Required.** While impacts are not considered significant to public services, or considered mitigable when established fees are applied, the following should be included in the analysis:

1. Consultation with the California Department of Forestry/County Fire Department, the San Luis Obispo County Sheriff's Department, and the San Luis Coastal Unified School District.
2. Evaluation and discussion of the past and present status of police, fire, and school services in the project area.
3. Identification and discussion of impacts to public services, or resulting from inadequate public services, that could result from the development of the project.
4. Identification and discussion of feasible mitigation measures, if any, which could be included in the project to minimize potential impacts related to public services.

<b>11. RECREATION - <i>Will the project:</i></b>	<b>Potentially Significant</b>	<b>Impact can &amp; will be mitigated</b>	<b>Insignificant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>a) <i>Increase the use or demand for parks or other recreation opportunities?</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>b) <i>Affect the access to trails, parks or other recreation opportunities?</i></b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>c) <i>Other</i> _____</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Setting.** The County Trails Plan does not show that a potential trail goes through the proposed project. The project is not proposed in a location that will affect any trail, park or other recreational resource.

**Impact.** The proposed project will not create a significant need for additional park or recreational resources.

**Mitigation/Action Required.** While no significant recreation impacts are anticipated, the following analysis is needed to be performed by a qualified individual with expertise in recreation, and shall include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following:

1. Consultation with the County Department of General Services – Parks and Recreation Division.
2. Identification of the existing recreational demands and deficiencies in the region.
3. Identification and evaluation of the project's demand on recreational facilities.
4. Discussion of the adequacy of existing fees, and as appropriate, identification and discussion of feasible mitigation measures which could be included in the project to minimize potential impacts related to recreation.

12. TRANSPORTATION/ CIRCULATION - <i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Increase vehicle trips to local or areawide circulation system?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Reduce existing "Levels of Service" on public roadway(s)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Create unsafe conditions on public roadways (e.g., limited access, design features, sight distance, slow vehicles)?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Provide for adequate emergency access?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Result in inadequate parking capacity?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) <i>Result in inadequate internal traffic circulation?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) <i>Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., pedestrian access, bus turnouts, bicycle racks, etc.)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) <i>Result in a change in air traffic patterns that may result in substantial safety risks?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) <i>Other: _____</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Setting.** The county has established the acceptable Level of Service (LOS) on roads for this rural area as "C" or better. The existing road network in the area (primarily Highway 227) is generally operating at acceptable levels. Based on existing road speeds (55 mph) and configuration (vertical and horizontal road curves), combined with slow moving vehicles making left turns, sight distance will need to be evaluated.

The County's Circulation Element (Framework for Planning) includes 11 goals and objectives intended for new development to help maintain acceptable levels of service and traffic safety, as well as help maintain a high quality environment.

While the project is not within the Airport Review area, it is below the flight pattern used at the San Luis Obispo airport. In an effort to reduce the scavenging bird (primarily seagulls) population (potential disease vector), a falconry program was established within the last two years. Based on discussions with the operator's representative, this program has proven highly effective. Anecdotal information from neighbors confirms the bird population reduction, but also suggests that the remaining scavenging birds may be pushed higher to avoid the falcons, and potentially into the flight pattern or potential interference with aircraft.

**Impact.** The proposed project will generate about 41 additional employees, and expand its services to attract more users of the facility. This is considered a relatively small amount of additional traffic that is likely to be mostly generated during off-peak periods. It is not expected to result in a significant change to the existing road service levels. However, as previously mentioned, while the proposed entrance would be considered an improvement over the existing entrance, traffic safety will need further analysis to determine potential impacts and appropriate mitigation measures.

Undesirable bird attraction will remain a part of the proposed expansion. The bird control aspect will need to be further evaluated, including but not necessarily limited to: effectiveness of the falconry program and if there are any secondary effects (e.g., are scavenging birds being pushed into the flight path of incoming or outgoing aircraft. Additional analysis may consider other feasible alternatives that would be effective for bird control (e.g., tenting active disposal area, etc.).

**Mitigation/Action Required.** Due to the potential for significant traffic and air safety impacts, additional analysis is needed to be performed by a registered Engineer with expertise in traffic, and shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Consultation with the California Department of Transportation and the County Public Works Department.
2. Identification of the existing traffic capacity and load of the following roads:
  - a. Highway 227
3. Identification and evaluation of existing traffic safety issues, with special attention to the following locations:
  - a. Proposed new entrance @ Highway 227.
  - b. Any other access points onto Highway 227.
4. Identification and discussion of feasible mitigation measures, if any, which could be included in the project to minimize potential impacts related to traffic capacity or traffic safety.
5. Identification and effectiveness of all litter and disease vectors, and any significant adverse secondary effects from the use of such controls as they relate to air safety.

<b>13. WASTEWATER - Will the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant</b>	<b>Impact can &amp; will be mitigated</b>	<b>Insignificant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>a) Violate waste discharge requirements or Central Coast Basin Plan criteria for wastewater systems?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>b) Change the quality of surface or ground water (e.g., nitrogen-loading, daylighting)?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>c) Adversely affect community wastewater service provider?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>d) Other: _____</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Setting.** As described in the NRCS Soil Survey (see Agriculture section for soil types and

descriptions), the main limitations for on-site wastewater systems relates to: poor filtering characteristics, slow percolation, steep slopes, shallow depth to bedrock. These limitations are summarized as follows:

**Poor Filtering Characteristics** – due to the very permeable soil; without special engineering, larger separations will be required between the leach lines and the groundwater basin to provide adequate filtering of the effluent; to achieve compliance with the Central Coast Basin Plan, depth to groundwater information will need to be provided at the building permit stage.

**Shallow Depth to Bedrock** – indicates that there may not be sufficient soil depth to provide adequate soil filtering of effluent before reaching bedrock. Once effluent reaches bedrock, chances increase for the effluent to infiltrate cracks that could lead directly to groundwater sources or near wells without adequate filtering, or allow effluent to daylight where bedrock is exposed to the earth’s surface. To comply with the Central Coast Basin Plan, additional information is needed prior to issuance of a building permit, such as borings at leach line locations, to show that there will be adequate separation between leach line and bedrock.

**Steep Slopes** – where portions of the soil unit contain slopes steep enough to result in potential daylighting of wastewater effluent (no system is allowed on greater than 30% slopes). To comply with the Central Coast Basin Plan, additional information is needed prior to issuance of a building permit, such as slope comparison with leach line depths, to show that there is no potential of effluent “daylighting” to the ground surface.

**Slow Percolation** – is where fluid percolates too slowly through the soil for the natural processes to effectively break down the effluent into harmless components. The Basin Plan identifies the percolation rate should be less than 120 minutes per inch. To achieve compliance with the Central Coast Basin Plan, additional information will be needed prior to issuance of a building permit that shows the leach area can adequately percolate to achieve this threshold.

**Impact.** The project proposes to use an on-site system as its means to dispose of wastewater. Based on the proposed project, adequate area appears available for an on-site system. See Water Section for landfill’s potential impact to groundwater and surface water quality.

**Mitigation/Conclusion.** Future leach lines shall be located at least 100 feet from any private well and at least 200 from any community/public well. Prior to building permit issuance, the septic system will be evaluated in greater detail to insure compliance with the Central Coast Basin Plan for any constraints listed above, and will not be approved if Basin Plan criteria cannot be met.

<b>14. WATER - Will the project:</b>	<b>Potentially Significant</b>	<b>Impact can &amp; will be mitigated</b>	<b>Insignificant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<b>a) <i>Violate any water quality standards?</i></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>b) <i>Discharge into surface waters or otherwise alter surface water quality (e.g., turbidity, temperature, dissolved oxygen, etc.)?</i></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>c) <i>Change the quality of groundwater (e.g., saltwater intrusion, nitrogen-loading, etc.)?</i></b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**14. WATER - Will the project:**

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
d) <i>Change the quantity or movement of available surface or ground water?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Adversely affect community water service provider?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Setting.** The Cold Canyon Landfill is located on the Pismo and Monterey geologic formations, on the northeastern flank of the Pismo Syncline. The Indian Knob Fault runs through the property. The project is approximately ½ mile from the Upper Pismo groundwater basin. Groundwater monitoring and production wells previously installed show that water-bearing formations exist below the project site. The shallow groundwater surface area is found between 185 and 275 feet above mean sea level (or depth to water is between approximately 20 and 180 feet below the surface), that generally follow under the original land contours. The Landfill Expansion EIR (1991) evaluated ground and surface water quality and identified several constituents exceeding “maximum containment levels” for groundwater, which were also found for wells surveyed up to a mile from the subject property. Water quality testing has been conducted on a regular basis and monitored by the Regional Water Quality Control Board through their permit process. Trace levels of volatile organic compounds are present in the groundwater tested from the monitoring wells. The EIR completed a 20-year drawdown analysis for the currently approved landfill (evaluated at 10,000 gpd usage), and determined the following drawdown effects to surrounding wells could occur: at 0.25 miles – 23.07 feet; at 1.0 mile – 7.74 feet; at 1.5 miles – 5.46 feet. The applicant has stated current usage ranges from a few hundred gallons a day (winter) to 60,000 gpd (summer).

A leachate collection and removal system (high density polyethylene geomembrane liner and drain pipes to collection sumps) has been installed for the previously approved expansion area. The original landfill did not include such a system. Currently, there are 11 monitoring wells. Stormwater is sampled at four locations. Results from these monitoring efforts are submitted to RWQCB.

The topography of the project is nearly level to steeply sloping. The closest creek (an unnamed stream) from the proposed development is approximately 0.05 miles away. As described in the NRCS Soil Survey, the soil surface is considered to have low erodibility.

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

**Impact.** The project proposes to use two on-site wells as its water source. The applicant has stated that up to 60,000 gpd of water are used for the existing operation during hot periods during the summer months.

The proposed operation changes and increases could result in contamination of the groundwater aquifers below the subject development, as well as surface water quality from potential runoff.

Regarding surface water quality, as proposed, the project will result in the disturbance of approximately \_\_\_ square feet. The project is not within close proximity to surface water sources.

**Mitigation/ Action Required - Water Quality.** Due to potentially significant water quality impacts associated with the expansion, analysis is necessary by a certified hydrogeologist and shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Consultation with the Regional Water Quality Control Board, Environmental Health Division, County Agricultural Commissioner's Office, California Department of Fish & Game, and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (if steelhead stream is identified, should include National Marine Fisheries Service).
2. Evaluation and discussion of past and present potable water quality in the area of the project site. "Area" will need to be defined as a "study area" by the consultant, and should include groundwater basins supplying adjacent properties as well as municipal water users.
3. Identification and discussion of the potential for potable water contamination (in addition to items 5 through 14 below) to occur as a result of:
  - a. Surface water runoff – need to evaluate surface water quality/runoff into surrounding waterways as it might significantly affect native vegetation (including sensitive vegetation such as riparian and wetland habitats), freshwater and terrestrial wildlife, off-site groundwater recharge and downstream surface water bodies. The analysis should evaluate all surface water monitoring data collected to determine potential for potential adverse impacts or trends;
  - b. Over drafting of aquifer(s);
  - c. Intensification of agricultural uses;
  - d. Topographical alteration;
  - e. Development.
4. Identification and discussion of feasible mitigation measures, if any, which could be included in the project to minimize potential impacts related to water quality.

In addition, based on the landfill's location and proximity of domestic water use within the same groundwater basin, the following items need to be addressed relating to water quality:

5. Will the landfill expansion design (cap, liner, leachate collection-removal system, etc.) prevent leachate from being formed in the landfill, and prevent leachate's leaving the landfill through the liner system for as long as the wastes in the landfill represent a threat to groundwater quality?
6. How much leachate will be generated annually in the landfill over the period during which the wastes represent a threat to groundwater quality?
7. How will desiccation-cracks and differential-settling cracks in the cap of the landfill be detected and remediated?
8. What will be the costs, and how and by whom will the costs be paid, for cap maintenance for as long as the wastes represent a potential threat to groundwater quality?
9. What will be the rate of leachate transport (gallons/acre/year) through the landfill liner and out of the leachate collection and removal system at the time of construction? How will the leakage rates change over the time that the wastes in the landfill represent a threat to groundwater quality? What is the potential impact of such leakage on groundwater quality in the vicinity of the landfill?
10. If the landfill proposes incorporation of a composite liner, what will be the potential impact of desiccation-cracking of the soil-clay layer of the composite on the rate of leachate transport? What is the anticipated area of the liner in which contact between the flexible membrane liners (FML) and the soil-clay layer will not be achieved? What will be the impact on the rate of leachate transport of not achieving contact between the FML and the soil-clay layer over that area?
11. What is the expected composition of the leachate? What is the potential for each of the

components to pollute groundwater in the vicinity of the landfill, rendering it unusable or impaired for use as a domestic water supply?

12. What is the potential for trichloroethylene (TCE) and other chlorinated solvents in the proposed landfill to pollute groundwater with known human carcinogens?
13. What is the ability of the groundwater monitoring system proposed to detect leakage from the landfill liner before widespread groundwater contamination occurs?
14. Should the municipal solid waste leachate contaminate the aquifer, can it be "cleaned up" to the point at which the groundwater and the aquifer could be used again for domestic water supply purposes? What would be the estimated range of the total cost of the groundwater aquifer clean-up should such an effort be needed? Who would pay those costs and by what means?

**Water availability.** Due to potentially significant impacts on water resources, a complete hydro-geologic analysis shall be prepared by a certified engineering geologist and shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Consultation with the County Public Works Department and/or appropriate County Environmental Health Division, and/or appropriate nearby mutual, private, or public water companies.
2. Current and future projections of water demand for the project based on the various uses making up the proposed project's water demands.
3. Is there a hydraulic connection between the landfill or aquifer potentially affected by the landfill and groundwaters beneath adjacent properties that could, at any time in the future, be used for domestic water supply purposes?
4. Evaluation and discussion of on-site water availability, including:
  - a. Feasibility of individual on site wells for the lifespan of the project
  - b. Sustained pumping capacities of existing on site wells.
  - c. Investigation of draw down (if any) of other wells on site and wells on neighboring properties.
5. Evaluation and discussion of the long-term capability of the ground water basin(s) to provide adequate quantities of water, and the potential for subsidence.
6. Analysis of potential water quality impacts as a result of increased pumping.
7. Evaluation and discussion of potential impacts on neighboring wells as a result of on site water requirements. This analysis should take into account the cumulative impacts associated with water availability impacts.
8. Discussion of the potential water availability impacts that could occur as a result of increased water use by neighboring properties.
9. Identification and discussion of feasible mitigation measures, if any, which could be included in the project to minimize potential impacts related to groundwater availability.

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

Link to: [Things to consider](#) [Alt.-Sample Language](#)

**Setting/Impact.** As described in other sections of this Initial Study, this project is subject to numerous local, state and federal regulations to minimize conflict with surrounding land uses. As far as it is known by the County, the applicant has made all efforts to comply with the required permits and regulations. A Notice of Preparation will also be sent to all applicable agencies to verify compliance, as well as solicit any additional requirements applicable to the proposed expansion.

The project is not within or adjacent to a Habitat Conservation Plan area.

**Mitigation/Action Required.** While no land use inconsistencies have been identified to date, an analysis should be accomplished by a qualified land use planner and include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. Consultation with the County Planning and Building Department.
2. Evaluation and discussion of the proposed project as it relates to all applicable elements of the County General Plan including, but not limited to:
  - a. Framework for Planning
  - b. Land Use Ordinance
  - c. San Luis Obispo Area Plan
  - d. Other pertinent local, state and federal regulations and policies relating to land use that are not discussed in other sections of the Initial Study.

<b>16. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE - <i>Will the project:</i></b>	<b>Potentially Significant</b>	<b>Impact can &amp; will be mitigated</b>	<b>Insignificant Impact</b>	<b>Not Applicable</b>
a) <i>Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>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)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

For further information on CEQA or the county’s environmental review process, please visit the County’s web site at “[www.sloplanning.org](http://www.sloplanning.org)” under “Environmental”, or the California Environmental Resources Evaluation System at: “[http://www.ceres.ca.gov/topic/env\\_law/ceqa/guidelines/](http://www.ceres.ca.gov/topic/env_law/ceqa/guidelines/)” for information about the California Environmental Quality Act.

**Exhibit A - Initial Study References and Agency Contacts**

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

<u>Contacted</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Response</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	County Public Works Department	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	County Environmental Health Division	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	County Agricultural Commissioner's Office	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	County Airport Manager	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Airport Land Use Commission	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Air Pollution Control District	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	County Sheriff's Department	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Regional Water Quality Control Board	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	CA Coastal Commission	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	CA Department of Fish and Game	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	CA Department of Forestry	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	CA Department of Transportation	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Community Service District	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____	<b>Not Applicable</b>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other _____	<b>Not Applicable</b>

*\*\* "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><u>County documents</u></li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Airport Land Use Plans</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual Resource Summary Report</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building and Construction Ordinance</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Policies</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Framework for Planning (Coastal &amp; Inland)</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan (Inland &amp; Coastal), including all maps &amp; elements; more pertinent elements considered include:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture &amp; Open Space Element</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Energy Element</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environment Plan (Conservation, Historic and Esthetic Elements)</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</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safety Element</li> </ul> </li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use Ordinance</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Real Property Division Ordinance</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trails Plan</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Solid Waste Management Plan</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> San Luis Obispo Area Plan and Update EIR</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Circulation Study</li> <li><u>Other documents</u></li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Archaeological Resources Map</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Area of Critical Concerns Map</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Areas of Special Biological Importance Map</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Natural Species Diversity Database</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clean Air Plan</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"/> Regional Transportation Plan</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Uniform Fire Code</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Quality Control Plan (Central Coast Basin – Region 3)</li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GIS mapping layers (e.g., habitat, streams, contours, etc.)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</li> </ul> |
|---|---|

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

**See applicant's attached list of technical monitoring reports previously prepared.**

### [County References](#)

#### Aesthetics

Agriculture and Open Space Element of the General Plan  
Design Guidelines - - A Community Design Reference Document; November 1998  
[Environment Plan \(Conservation Element, Historic Element, Esthetic Element\) \(1974\)](#)

#### Agriculture

[RULES OF PROCEDURE TO IMPLEMENT THE CALIFORNIA LAND CONSERVATION ACT OF 1965](#)

[County Agriculture & Open Space Element](#)

USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service - Soil Surveys of San Luis Obispo County ([Coastal Area](#))

[Co. Guidelines on Williamson Act](#)

#### Air Quality

Clean Air Plan - San Luis Obispo County, and Appendices (2001)

[Annual Air Quality Report \(2003\)](#)

[APCD - 2004 Annual Air Quality Report](#)

[CEQA Air Quality Handbook \(2003\)](#)

[Annual Resource Summary Report 2005 - Air Quality](#)

San Luis Obispo Area Plan and Update EIR (year)

County of San Luis Obispo - Energy Element (1995)

Title 24, Part 6, 2001 Energy Efficiency Standards for Residential and Non-Residential Buildings

CARB Handout - Naturally-Occurring Asbestos

Environment Plan (Conservation Element, Historic Element, Esthetic Element) (1974)

State and Federal Air Quality standards

APCD - Air Quality & Your Health

APCD - Air quality data

APCD-Monitoring Station information (go to Sitelist by County)

APCD - Emission Inventory

#### Biological Resources

California Natural Diversity Data Base, California Department of Fish & Game (2005)

Areas of Special Biological Importance Map

California Native Plant Society's Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California; Sixth Edition, 2001

Agriculture and Open Space Element of the General Plan

Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended ("ESA")

Article 3.5 of Division 3, Chapter 1.5 of the California Fish and Game Code, the California Endangered Species Act ("CESA")

[CDFG's Website for Listed Plants](#)

[Environment Plan \(Conservation Element, Historic Element, Esthetic Element\) \(1974\)](#)

#### Cultural Resources

Archaeological Resource Maps

[County Land Use Ordinance - Inland \(Title 22\)](#)

[County Handout on Archeological Resources Environment Plan \(Conservation Element, Historic Element, Esthetic Element\) \(1974\)](#)

## Geology/Soils

Uniform Building Code (1997)  
[County of San Luis Obispo Safety Element](#) (1999)  
County Landslide Risk Map, Coastal and Inland (Envicom, 1974)  
County Liquefaction Potential Map, Coastal and Inland (Envicom, 1974)  
[Guidelines for Analyzing and Mitigating Landslide Hazards \(2002\)](#)  
[Guidelines for Analyzing and Mitigating Liquefaction Hazards in California - Special Publication 117](#)  
(California Division of Mines and Geology, 1999)  
[County Land Use Ordinance - Inland \(Title 22\)](#)  
County of San Luis Obispo Framework for Planning (Inland)  
Federal Emergency Management Agency flood insurance rate maps for San Luis Obispo County  
(incorporated and unincorporated areas)

## Hazards/Hazardous Material

[San Luis Obispo Airport Land Use Plan & Maps](#) (last Amended 2005)  
San Luis Obispo Airport Land Use Plan  
Uniform Fire Code  
[County of San Luis Obispo Safety Element](#) (1999)  
County Hazardous Waste Management Plan  
[Environment Plan \(Conservation Element, Historic Element, Esthetic Element\) \(1974\)](#)

## Land Use

[Public Facility Fees \(Title 18\)](#)  
[Framework for Planning - Inland](#)

### Elements

County Agriculture and Open Space Element ([AG Element-Chapter 2](#))  
County [Economic Element](#)  
Energy Element  
[Environment Plan \(Conservation Element, Historic Element, Esthetic Element\) \(1974\)](#)  
[Housing Element](#)  
[Noise Element](#)  
Parks & Recreation Element  
[County of San Luis Obispo Safety Element](#) (1999)  
Countywide Settlement Pattern Strategy  
Hazardous Waste Management Plan  
SLO Co./CDF Fire Protection Plan Master Plan  
California Department of Fish & Game Wetlands Resource Policy  
Clean Air Plan - San Luis Obispo County, and Appendices (2001) ([Transportation & Land Use Mgmt Strategies](#))  
Regional Transportation Plan  
Uniform Building Code  
Uniform Plumbing Code  
Uniform Fire Code  
Water Quality Control Plan (Central Coast Basin - Region 3)

## Noise

[Noise Element](#)  
[Environment Plan \(Conservation Element, Historic Element, Esthetic Element\) \(1974\)](#)

## [County Land Use Ordinance - Inland \(Title 22\)](#)

### Pop/Housing

[Housing Element](#) of the General Plan

### Public Services/Utilities

Uniform Fire Code

Solid Waste Management Plan

SLO Co./CDF Fire Protection Plan Master Plan

Annual Resource Summary Report (2005) [Schools](#)

### Recreation

County Trails Plan

Parks & Recreation Element

[County Recreation Plan](#) (1968)

### Transportation

Annual Resource Summary Report (2005) [Roads](#)

SLO Area Plan Circulation Element [SanLuisObispo](#)

Trip Generation, 6th Edition, (Institute of Transportation Engineers , 1997)

County Traffic Volumes (County Public Works, 2001)

[SLO County traffic counts](#)

Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report 209 (Transportation Research Board, 3rd Edition, 1994)

Regional Transportation Plan (SLO Council of Governments, 1993)

County Circulation Element (Framework for Planning) ([11 goals and objectives](#))

[County Transportation Plan \(1979\)](#)

### Wastewater

San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning & Building - Annual Resource Summary Report (2005)

[County Land Use Ordinance - Inland \(Title 22\)](#)

Annual Resource Summary Report (2005) [Sewage](#)

City of Santa Barbara Water Demand Factor & Conservation Study 'User Guide' (Aug., 1989)

Uniform Building Code (1997 edition)

Uniform Plumbing Code (1997 edition)

County of San Luis Obispo Building and Construction Ordinance (Title 19)

County Bulletin - "Private Sewage Disposal System"

Central Coast Region Water Quality Control Plan (1997 update)

SLO County Chapter 8.40/Construction, Repair, Modification and Destruction of Wells

Water Well Standards: State of California/Bulletins 74-81 & 74-90

EPA Design Manual/Onsite Wastewater Treatment and Disposal Systems

SLO Area Plan and Update EIR (year)

### Water

Annual Resource Summary Report (2005) [Water Supply](#), [Water System](#)

[County Land Use Ordinance - Inland \(Title 22\)](#)

City of Santa Barbara Water Demand Factor & Conservation Study 'User Guide' (Aug., 1989) [SB WaterUsage Table](#)

Uniform Building Code (1997 edition)

Uniform Plumbing Code (1997 edition)

[County of San Luis Obispo Building and Construction Ordinance \(Title 19\)](#)

Central Coast Region Water Quality Control Plan (1997 update)  
SLO County Chapter 8.40/Construction, Repair, Modification and Destruction of Wells  
Water Well Standards: State of California/Bulletins 74-81 & 74-90  
SLO Area Plan and Update EIR  
[Environment Plan \(Conservation Element, Historic Element, Esthetic Element\) \(1974\)](#)  
[County Master Water and Sewer Plan \(1972\)](#)  
[SLO Co. Water Quality reports](#)  
[SLO County Hydrologic Reports - Water Years 01-02 & 02-03](#)  
[SLO County Draft Integrated Regional Water Management Plan \(2006\)](#)  
[Weather/Rainfall data](#)



