Negative Declaration & Notice Of Determination

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

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION NO. ED14-162 **DATE:** April 16, 2015

PROJECT/ENTITLEMENT: Charnley Grading Permit; PMT2014-01622

APPLICANT NAME: Ian Charnley
ADDRESS: 5310 N. River Rd., Paso Robles, CA, 93446
CONTACT PERSON: Ian Charnley **Telephone:** 805-305-3210

PROPOSED USES/INTENT: Major Grading permit to allow grading for a single-family residence, detached garage, and related site improvements and removal of an existing mobile home which will result in the disturbance of 10,200 square feet (0.23 acres), including 3,690 cubic yards of cut and 2,890 cubic yards of fill on a 11.52 acre parcel.

LOCATION: The project is located in the Agriculture land use category, on the east side of the North River Road, approximately 1.13 miles south of Wellsona Road, approximately 2 miles north of the City of Paso Robles.

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

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW: YES ☒ **NO** ☐

OTHER POTENTIAL PERMITTING AGENCIES: California Department of Fish and Wildlife
Environmental Health California Department of Fish and Wildlife

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

COUNTY "REQUEST FOR REVIEW" PERIOD ENDS AT ..... 4:30 p.m. (2 wks from above DATE)

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

Notice of Determination

State Clearinghouse No. _____

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

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

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

	Holly Phipps		County of San Luis Obispo
Signature	**Project Manager Name**	**Date**	**Public Agency**

Initial Study Summary – Environmental Checklist

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

(ver 5.6) Using Form

Project Title & No. Charnley Major Grading Permit (ED14-162) / PMT2014-01622

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.

☒ Aesthetics	☒ Geology and Soils	☐ Recreation
☐ Agricultural Resources	☐ Hazards/Hazardous Materials	☐ Transportation/Circulation
☐ Air Quality	☐ Noise	☐ Wastewater
☒ Biological Resources	☐ Population/Housing	☒ Water /Hydrology
☐ Cultural Resources	☒ Public Services/Utilities	☐ Land Use

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Holly Phipps — Signature — April 3, 2015
Prepared by (Print) — Date

Steven McMasters — Signature — Ellen Carroll, Environmental Coordinator (for) — 4/3/15
Reviewed by (Print) — Date

Project Environmental Analysis

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

Persons, agencies or organizations interested in obtaining more information regarding the environmental review process for a project should contact the County of San Luis Obispo Planning Department, 976 Osos Street, Rm. 200, San Luis Obispo, CA, 93408-2040 or call (805) 781-5600.

A. PROJECT

DESCRIPTION: Request by Ian Charnley for a Major Grading permit to allow grading for a single-family residence, detached garage, and related site improvements and removal of an existing mobile home which will result in the disturbance of 10,200 square feet (0.23 acres), including 3,690 cubic yards of cut and 2,890 cubic yards of fill on a 11.52 acre parcel. The project is located in the Agriculture land use category, on the east side of the North River Road, approximately 1.13 miles south of Wellsona Road, approximately 2 miles north of the City of Paso Robles. The site is located in the Salinas River sub area of the North County planning area,.

ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER(S): 026-431-015

Latitude: 35 degrees 40'43.8" N Longitude: -120 degrees 41'04.9" W **SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT #** 1

B. EXISTING SETTING

PLAN AREA: North County **SUB**: Salinas River **COMM:** Rural

LAND USE CATEGORY: Agriculture

COMB. DESIGNATION: None

PARCEL SIZE: 11.52 acres

TOPOGRAPHY: Gently sloping to moderately sloping

VEGETATION: Ornamental landscaping majority of project site, scattered oak trees

EXISTING USES: Single-family residence(s), landscaping business

SURROUNDING LAND USE CATEGORIES AND USES:

North: Agriculture; agricultural uses	*East:* Agriculture; single-family residence(s)
South: Agriculture; single-family residence(s)	*West:* Agriculture; single-family residence(s)

C. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

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

COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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

Setting. The area's topography consists of rolling hillsides. The proposed project site is gently sloping to moderately sloping. The existing vegetation on the project site consists of non-native ornamental landscaping and scattered oak trees. The area is characterized by intermittent small scale agricultural use and single-family residential development on parcels between 1 and 5 acres in size. The project is considered compatible with these surrounding uses.

Impact. Future development of a single family residence would be visible from Settlers Place a private road. The proposed single family residence would not significantly change the visual character of the area, however, exterior lighting may create lighting and glare when viewed from Settlers Place. The applicant has agreed to shield exterior lighting to minimize glare.

Mitigation/Conclusion. The applicant shall submit an exterior lighting plan showing the location, height, and intensity of proposed exterior lighting. Lighting shall be shielded and downward facing to reduce the glare. Based on implementation of these measures, potential visual impacts would be less than significant.

2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES *Will the project:*	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) Convert prime agricultural land, per NRCS soil classification, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Impair agricultural use of other property or result in conversion to other uses?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or Williamson Act program?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Other: _____	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

Land Use Category: Agriculture

State Classification: Prime farmland if irrigated

Historic/Existing Commercial Crops: None

In Agricultural Preserve? No

Under Williamson Act contract? No

The 73 acre property to the north and east are planted in wine grapes. The property to the west and south/southeast range in size from 6 to 12 acres, have single-family homes located on site and are void of agriculture. The proposed single family residence would be located greater than 400 feet from the agriculture to the north.

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

Arbuckle-San Ysidro complex (2 - 9% slope).

Arbuckle. This gently sloping coarse loamy soil is considered moderately 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 IV without irrigation and Class II when irrigated.

San Ysidro. This gently sloping coarse loamy soil is considered moderately to well drained. The soil has high erodibility and low shrink-swell characteristics, as well as having potential septic system constraints due to: slow percolation. The soil is considered Class IV without irrigation and Class II when irrigated.

Hanford and Greenfield fine sandy loams (2 - 9% slope).

Hanford. This gently sloping, coarse loamy bottom soil is considered moderately drained. The soil has moderate erodibility and low shrink-swell characteristics, as well as having potential septic system constraints due to: no severe limitations identified. The soil is considered Class IV without irrigation and Class II when irrigated.

Greenfield. This gently sloping, coarse loamy bottom soil is considered moderately drained. The soil has moderate erodibility and low shrink-swell characteristics, as well as having potential

septic system constraints due to: no severe limitations identified. The soil is considered Class IV without irrigation and Class II when irrigated.

Hanford and Greenfield gravelly sandy loams (0 - 2% slope).

Hanford. This nearly level, coarse loamy bottom 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: no severe limitations identified. The soil is considered Class IV without irrigation and Class II when irrigated.

Greenfield. This nearly level, coarse loamy bottom 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: no severe limitations identified. The soil is considered Class IV without irrigation and Class II when irrigated.

Pico fine sandy loam (0 - 2% slope). This nearly level soil is considered moderately drained. The soil has moderate erodibility and low shrink-swell characteristics, as well as having potential septic system constraints due to: no severe limitations identified. The soil is considered Class IV without irrigation and Class I when irrigated.

Impact. The project will result in the permanent disturbance of 4,830 sf to allow construction of a single-family residence, detached garage, and related site improvements and demo of an existing single-family residence (mobile home). The proposed single family residence would be located 407 feet from the vineyards to the north. No significant impacts to agricultural resources are anticipated.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No mitigation measures are necessary.

3. AIR QUALITY *Will the project:*	**Potentially Significant**	**Impact can & will be mitigated**	**Insignificant Impact**	**Not Applicable**
a) Violate any state or federal ambient air quality standard, or exceed air quality emission thresholds as established by County Air Pollution Control District?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Expose any sensitive receptor to substantial air pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Create or subject individuals to objectionable odors?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be inconsistent with the District's Clean Air Plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant either considered in non-attainment under applicable state or federal ambient air quality standards that are due to increased energy use or traffic generation, or intensified land use change?	☐	☐	☒	☐

3. AIR QUALITY *Will the project:*	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
GREENHOUSE GASES				
f) ***Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?***	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) ***Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?***	☐	☐	☒	☐
h) ***Other:*** _____	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Impact. As proposed, the project will result in the disturbance of approximately 10,200 square feet. This will result in the creation of construction dust, as well as short- and long-term vehicle emissions. The project will be moving less than 1,200 cubic yards/day of material and will disturb less than four acres of area, and therefore will be below the general thresholds triggering construction-related mitigation. The project is also not in close proximity to sensitive receptors that might otherwise result in nuisance complaints and be subject to limited dust and/or emission control measures during construction.

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

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

Mitigation/Conclusion. No mitigation measures are necessary.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES *Will the project:*	**Potentially Significant**	**Impact can & will be mitigated**	**Insignificant Impact**	**Not Applicable**
a) Result in a loss of unique or special status species* or their habitats?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Reduce the extent, diversity or quality of native or other important vegetation?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Impact wetland or riparian habitat?	☐	☐	☒	☐

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES *Will the project:*	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
d) Interfere with the movement of resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or factors, which could hinder the normal activities of wildlife?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Conflict with any regional plans or policies to protect sensitive species, or regulations of the California Department of Fish & Wildlife or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Other: _____	☐	☐	☐	☒

*** Species – as defined in Section15380 of the CEQA Guidelines, which includes all plant and wildlife species that fall under the category of rare, threatened or endangered, as described in this section.**

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

On-site Vegetation: Grassland with scattered hardwoods

Name and distance from blue line creek(s): Salinas River is greater than 400 ft west, Huerhuero Creek is 1,000ft south.

Habitat(s):

Developed Open Space/Cultivated Cropland

Southern Coastal Scrub

Valley and Southern Coastal Grasslands

Valley and Foothill Riparian

Site's tree canopy coverage: Approximately 5%.

Salinas River is approximately (400) feet (west) of the proposed project.

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

Wildlife

Least Bell's vireo *(Vireo bellii pusillus)* FE, SE

Least Bell's vireo *(Vireo bellii pusillus)* has been found about 0.75 mile to the southwest. This listed species is considered endangered at the federal and state levels. During the breeding season (mid-March through late September), this bird prefers structurally diverse woodlands (e.g., cottonwood-willow forests, oak woodlands, mule fat scrub) associated with riparian corridors. Extensive breeding habitat loss/degradation (human activities) and brood parasitism by the brown-headed cowbird have been the primary reasons for the species decline.

Western pond turtle *(Emys (or Clemmys) marmorata pallida)*, CSC, FSC

Western pond turtle *(Emys (or Clemmys) marmorata pallida)* has been found about 1 mile to the north. Western pond turtle is a federal and California Species of Special Concern. This is

an aquatic turtle that uses upland habitat seasonally. They occur in ponds, streams, lakes, ditches, and marshes. The species prefers slow-water aquatic habitat with available basking sites nearby. Hatchlings require shallow water habitat with relatively dense submergent vegetation for foraging.

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

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

The project site occurs within the Carrizo Vernal Pool Region, as designated by the California Department of Fish and Game Vernal pool habitat consists of seasonal wetlands (i.e. areas that pond water during the wet season and dry up during the summer months) that may provide habitat for sensitive aquatic plant and animal species.

Impact. The project site does not support any sensitive native vegetation, significant wildlife habitats, or special status species.

Western pond turtles. The proposed project will not affect pond turtles or pond turtle nesting habitat due to the absence of aquatic habitats on the site(greater than 400 feet from the Salinas River).

Least Bell's vireo. The proposed project would be very unlikely to affect Least Bell's vireo due to the lack of riparian and associated woodland habitat. The site consists mainly of ornamental landscaping.. Riparian habitat is located greater than 400 feet from the project site.

Impact. The project will impact 0.11 acres of San Joaquin kit fox habitat. Based on the results of previous Kit Fox Habitat Evaluations that have been conducted for the El Pomar/Estrella area, Bob Stafford from the Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) has determined that the standard mitigation ratio for projects on parcels less than 40 acres in size as **3**:1. This means that all impacts be mitigated at a ratio of **3** acres conserved for each acre impacted. Total compensatory mitigation required for the proposed project is **0.33** based on **3** times **0.11** acres impacted.

A site visit of the project site was made by Staff (January 2015) to inspect the project site's topography for the potential to support vernal pool habitat (e.g., low-elevation areas, depressions, natural or man-made ponded areas, etc.). At this time, no evidence of vernal pools or potential areas for ponded water was observed. The topography on the project site is such that water would not pool in a manner consistent with the characteristics of vernal pools or seasonal wetlands. Therefore, there was no indication of habitat suitable for supporting fairy shrimp, or sensitive aquatic animal or plant species associated with vernal pools.

Mitigation/Conclusion. With regards to the San Joaquin Kit Fox, the applicant will be required to mitigate the loss of **0.33** acres of kit fox habitat by one of the following ways:

- ✓ Deposit of funds to an approved in-lieu fee program;

- ✓ Provide for the protection of kit foxes in perpetuity through acquisition of fee or conservation easement of suitable habitat in the kit fox corridor area; or
- ✓ Purchase credits in an approved conservation bank.

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

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES *Will the project:*	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) Disturb archaeological resources?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Disturb historical resources?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Disturb paleontological resources?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Other: _____	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

No previous cultural surveys were found for the subject property. Two previous cultural surveys with negative findings were found in the vicintity of 1/4 miles.

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

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

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS *Will the project:*	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) Result in exposure to or production of unstable earth conditions, such as landslides, earthquakes, liquefaction, ground failure, land subsidence or other similar hazards?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Be within a California Geological Survey "Alquist-Priolo" Earthquake Fault Zone", or other known fault zones?*	☐	☐	☐	☒

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS *Will the project:*	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
c) *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?*	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) *Include structures located on expansive soils?*	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) *Be inconsistent with the goals and policies of the County's Safety Element relating to Geologic and Seismic Hazards?*	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) *Preclude the future extraction of valuable mineral resources?*	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) *Other:* _____	☐	☐	☐	☒

* **Per Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication #42**

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

Topography: Gently sloping to moderately sloping

Within County's Geologic Study Area?: No

Landslide Risk Potential: Low

Liquefaction Potential: Low

Nearby potentially active faults?: No Distance? Not applicable

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

Shrink/Swell potential of soil: Negligible

Other notable geologic features? None

The project is not within the Geologic Study area designation or within a high liquefaction area, and is not subject to the preparation of a geological report per the County's Land Use Ordinance LUO section 22.14.070 (c) to evaluate the area's geological stability.

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

Impact. As proposed, the project will result in the disturbance of approximately 10,200 square feet.

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

7. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - *Will the project:*	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable

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

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

With regards to potential fire hazards, the subject project is within an unknown Fire Hazard Severity Zone(s). Based on the County's fire response time map, it will take approximately 5 to 10 minutes to respond to a call regarding fire or life safety. Refer to the Public Services section for further discussion on Fire Safety impacts.

Due to local jurisdiction, fire hazard severity data is unavailable.

The project is within the Salinas dam inundation area, and is approximately 9 miles below the dam. The boundary of the dam inundation area is intended to show the maximum water limit line should there be a catastrophic release/failure of the upstream dam.

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

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

8. NOISE *Will the project:*	**Potentially Significant**	**Impact can & will be mitigated**	**Insignificant Impact**	**Not Applicable**
a) Expose people to noise levels that exceed the County Noise Element thresholds?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Generate permanent increases in the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Cause a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise in the project vicinity?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Expose people to severe noise or vibration?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) If located within the Airport Review designation or adjacent to a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to severe noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Other: _____	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

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

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

9. POPULATION/HOUSING *Will the project:*	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly (e.g., construct new homes or businesses) or indirectly (e.g., extension of major infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Displace existing housing or people, requiring construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Create the need for substantial new housing in the area?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Other: _____	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

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

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

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

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

Police: City of Paso Robles Location: (Approximately 3 1/2 miles to the closet station

Fire: Cal Fire (formerly CDF) Hazard Severity: Not Applicable Response Time: 5-10 minutes

Location: (Approximately 3 1/2 miles to the closet station

School District: Paso Robles Joint Unified School District.

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

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

11. RECREATION *Will the project:*	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) Increase the use or demand for parks or other recreation opportunities?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Affect the access to trails, parks or other recreation opportunities?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Other _____	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

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

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

12. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION *Will the project:*	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) Increase vehicle trips to local or areawide circulation system?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Reduce existing "Level of Service" on public roadway(s)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Create unsafe conditions on public roadways (e.g., limited access, design features, sight distance, slow vehicles)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Provide for adequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐

12. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION *Will the project:*	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
e) Conflict with an established measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system considering all modes of transportation (e.g. LOS, mass transit, etc.)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐
h) Result in a change in air traffic patterns that may result in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i) Other: _____	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting. Future development will access onto the following public road(s): North River Road. The identified roadways are operating at acceptable levels. No significant traffic-related concerns were identified.

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

Mitigation/Conclusion. No significant traffic impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

13. WASTEWATER *Will the project:*	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) Violate waste discharge requirements or Central Coast Basin Plan criteria for wastewater systems?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Change the quality of surface or ground water (e.g., nitrogen-loading, day-lighting)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Adversely affect community wastewater service provider?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Other: _____	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting. Regulations and guidelines on proper wastewater system design and criteria are found within

the County's Plumbing Code (hereafter CPC; see Chapter 7 of the Building and Construction Ordinance [Title 19]), the "Water Quality Control Plan, Central Coast Basin" (Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB] hereafter referred to as the "Basin Plan"), and the California Plumbing Code. These regulations include specific requirements for both on-site and community wastewater systems. These regulations are applied to all new wastewater systems.

For on-site septic systems, there are several key factors to consider for a system to operate successfully, including the following:

- ✓ Sufficient land area (refer to County's Land Use Ordinance or Plumbing Code) – depending on water source, parcel size minimums will range from one acre to 2.5 acres;
- ✓ The soil's ability to percolate or "filter" effluent before reaching groundwater supplies (30 to 120 minutes per inch is ideal);
- ✓ The soil's depth (there needs to be adequate separation from bottom of leach line to bedrock [at least 10 feet] or high groundwater [5 feet to 50 feet depending on percolation rates]);
- ✓ The soil's slope on which the system is placed (surface areas too steep creates potential for daylighting of effluent);
- ✓ Potential for surface flooding (e.g., within 100-year flood hazard area);
- ✓ Distance from existing or proposed wells (between 100 and 250 feet depending on circumstances); and
- ✓ Distance from creeks and water bodies (100-foot minimum).

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

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

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

--***slow percolation***, where fluids will percolate 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 greater than 30 and less than 120 minutes per inch.

- ***wetness or high groundwater***, where this soil at this location tends to frequently be in a saturated condition due to several possible factors, such as high groundwater or it is in a low lying area that is being regularly fed by a water source. The on-site system needs at least five feet between the bottom of the leach line to the saturated soil (e.g. high groundwater) where the five feet of soil does not remain in a saturated condition for any length of time. Otherwise, special engineering will be required to provide this separation.

- ***seepage in bottom layer,*** where effluent seeps quickly through (rather than be absorbed by) the soil horizon(s) to a soil layer just above bedrock that is typically in a saturated condition. The on-site system needs at least five feet between the bottom of the leach line to the saturated

soil (e.g. high groundwater) with possible treatment of the soil to insure effluent movement rate through the soil meets basin plan requirements. Special engineering may be required to provide this acceptable percolation rate.

- ***cemented pan,*** where there is thin in an upper soil horizon that may interfere with or intercept effluent percolation and create saturated soil conditions above the impervious layer which may be near the soil surface. When such conditions exist, one of the following is necessary to resolve the potential problem: leach lines must either penetrate or be below the cemented pan, if leach lines above the cemented pan layer, this layer must be removed or permanently modified to allow effluent to percolate through this layer.

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

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

Based on the above discussion and information provided, the site appears to be able to design an on-site system that will meet CPC/Basin Plan requirements. Prior to building permit issuance and/or final inspection of the wastewater system, the applicant will need to show to the county compliance with the County Plumbing Code/ Central Coast Basin Plan, including any above-discussed information relating to potential constraints. Therefore, based on the project being able to comply with these regulations, potential groundwater quality impacts are considered less than significant.

14. WATER & HYDROLOGY

Will the project:

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
QUALITY				
a) Violate any water quality standards?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Discharge into surface waters or otherwise alter surface water quality (e.g., turbidity, sediment, temperature, dissolved oxygen, etc.)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Change the quality of groundwater (e.g., saltwater intrusion, nitrogen-loading, etc.)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide additional sources of polluted runoff?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Change rates of soil absorption, or amount or direction of surface runoff?	☐	☒	☐	☐

14. WATER & HYDROLOGY

Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
f) Change the drainage patterns where substantial on- or off-site sedimentation/ erosion or flooding may occur?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Involve activities within the 100-year flood zone?	☐	☐	☐	☒
QUANTITY				
h) Change the quantity or movement of available surface or ground water?	☐	☐	☒	☐
i) Adversely affect community water service provider?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j) Expose people to a risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding (e.g., dam failure,etc.), or inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒
k) Other: _____	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

The topography of the project is gently sloping to moderately sloping The Salinas River is approximately 400 feet from the proposed project. As described in the NRCS Soil Survey, the soil surface is considered to have low erodibility.

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

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

Within the 100-year Flood Hazard designation? No

Closest creek? Salinas River Distance? Approximately 400 feet

Soil drainage characteristics: Moderately drained

The subject property is within the Paso Robles Ground Water Basin. The Paso Robles Ground Water Basin (PRGWB) Resource Capacity Study (RCS) has found that the PRGWB demand is approaching its safe yield. The RCS has also found that groundwater levels are dropping throughout the basin resulting in dry wells and causing property owners to drill wells deeper into the basin. The Board of Supervisors has directed several actions in order to address the continuing groundwater problems. These actions seek to arrest the creation of additional rural parcels that will raise the demand for water in the basin; require discretionary land uses to offset new pumping from the basin; develop a special landscape irrigation ordnance for the basin area; and establish special growth rates in the basin. The Board determined that ministerial development such as construction of single family

residences will not require special attention to water use beyond what is required in the building ordinance and existing land use ordinance requirements.

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

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

Soil erodibility: Low

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

Impact – The proposed project, the construction of a new single family residence will replace the existing single family residence (mobile home).

Water Quality/Hydrology

With regards to project impacts on water quality the following conditions apply: Approximately 10,200 square feet of site disturbance is proposed and the movement of approximately 3,690 cubic yards of material;

- ✓ The project will be subject to standard County requirements for drainage, sedimentation and erosion control for construction and permanent use;
- ✓ The project is not on highly erodible soils, nor on moderate to steep slopes;
- ✓ The project is not within a 100-year Flood Hazard designation;
- ✓ The project is more than 100 feet from the closest creek or surface water body;
- ✓ All disturbed areas will be permanently stabilized with impermeable surfaces and landscaping;
- ✓ Parking area drainage inlets will be fitted with hydrocarbon filters;
- ✓ Stockpiles will be properly managed during construction to avoid material loss due to erosion;
- ✓ The project is subject to the County's Plumbing Code (Chapter 7 of the Building and Construction Ordinance [Title 19]), and/or the "Water Quality Control Plan, Central Coast Basin" for its wastewater requirements, where wastewater impacts to the groundwater basin will be less than significant;
- ✓ All hazardous materials and/or wastes will be properly stored on-site, which include secondary containment should spills or leaks occur;

Water Quantity

Based on the project description, there would be no increase in water usage because the existing residence (mobile home) will be removed and replaced with a new single family dwelling.

Mitigation/Conclusion. The project will not result in an increase water demand. The proposed construction of a new single family residence will replace the existing residence. As specified above for water quality, existing regulations and/or required plans will adequately address surface water quality impacts during construction.

Standard drainage and erosion control measures will be required for the proposed project and will provide sufficient measures to adequately protect surface water quality.

Based on the proposed amount of water to be use, the water source, and proposed use of drought tolerant landscaping, no significant impacts from water use are anticipated

15. LAND USE *Will the project:*	**Inconsistent**	**Potentially Inconsistent**	**Consistent**	**Not Applicable**
a) 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Be potentially inconsistent with any habitat or community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Be potentially inconsistent with adopted agency environmental plans or policies with jurisdiction over the project?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be potentially incompatible with surrounding land uses?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Other: _____	☐	☐	☐	☒

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

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

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

1) Chapter 22.94 North County Planning Area
2) Chapter 22.94.080 Salinas River Sub-area

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

16. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Will the project:

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) ***Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or pre-history?***	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) ***Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)***	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) ***Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?***	☐	☐	☐	☒

For further information on CEQA or the County's environmental review process, please visit the County's web site at "www.sloplanning.org" under "Environmental Information", or the California Environmental Resources Evaluation System at: http://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 Department has contacted various agencies for their comments on the proposed project. With respect to the subject application, the following have been contacted (marked with an ☒) and when a response was made, it is either attached or in the application file:

Contacted	Agency	Response
☐	County Public Works Department	**Not Applicable**
☐	County Environmental Health Services	**Not Applicable**
☐	County Agricultural Commissioner's Office	**Not Applicable**
☐	County Airport Manager	**Not Applicable**
☐	Airport Land Use Commission	**Not Applicable**
☐	Air Pollution Control District	**Not Applicable**
☐	County Sheriff's Department	**Not Applicable**
☐	Regional Water Quality Control Board	**Not Applicable**
☐	CA Coastal Commission	**Not Applicable**
☐	CA Department of Fish and Wildlife	**Not Applicable**
☐	CA Department of Forestry (Cal Fire)	**Not Applicable**
☐	CA Department of Transportation	**Not Applicable**
☐	Community Services District	**Not Applicable**
☐	Other _____	**Not Applicable**
☐	Other _____	**Not Applicable**

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

The following checked ("☒") reference materials have been used in the environmental review for the proposed project and are hereby incorporated by reference into the Initial Study. The following information is available at the County Planning and Building Department.

☒ Project File for the Subject Application

County documents

☐ Coastal Plan Policies
☒ Framework for Planning (Coastal/Inland)
☒ General Plan (Inland/Coastal), includes all maps/elements; more pertinent elements:
  ☒ Agriculture Element
  ☒ Conservation & Open Space Element
  ☐ Economic Element
  ☒ Housing Element
  ☒ Noise Element
  ☐ Parks & Recreation Element/Project List
  ☒ Safety Element
☒ Land Use Ordinance (Inland/Coastal)
☐ Building and Construction Ordinance
☒ Public Facilities Fee Ordinance
☐ Real Property Division Ordinance
☒ Affordable Housing Fund
☐ Airport Land Use Plan
☐ Energy Wise Plan
☒ North County Area Plan/Salinas River SA and Update EIR
☐ Design Plan
☐ Specific Plan
☒ Annual Resource Summary Report
☐ Circulation Study

Other documents

☒ Clean Air Plan/APCD Handbook
☒ Regional Transportation Plan
☒ Uniform Fire Code
☒ Water Quality Control Plan (Central Coast Basin – Region 3)
☒ Archaeological Resources Map
☒ Area of Critical Concerns Map
☒ Special Biological Importance Map
☒ CA Natural Species Diversity Database
☒ Fire Hazard Severity Map
☒ Flood Hazard Maps
☒ Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for SLO County
☒ GIS mapping layers (e.g., habitat, streams, contours, etc.)
☐ Other

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

None

Exhibit B - Mitigation Summary Table

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

Aesthetics

AS-1 **At the time of application for construction permit(s),** the applicant shall provide an exterior lighting plan. The plan shall include the height, location, and intensity of all exterior lighting. All lighting fixtures shall be shielded so that neither the lamp nor the related reflector interior surface is visible from North River Road. All lighting poles, fixtures, and hoods shall be dark colored. This plan shall be implemented prior to final inspection or occupancy, whichever occurs first.

Biological Mitigation

Your project will impact **0.33** acres of San Joaquin kit fox habitat. Based on the results of previous Kit Fox Habitat Evaluations that have been conducted for the El Pomar/Estrella area, Bob Stafford from the Department of Fish and Game (Department) has determined that the standard mitigation ratio for projects on parcels less than 40 acres in size has been established as **3:1**. This means that all impacts be mitigated at a ratio of **3** acres conserved for each acre impacted. Total compensatory mitigation required for your project is **0.33** based on **3** times **0.11** acres impacted. The mitigation options identified in BR-1 through BR-11 apply to the proposed project only; should your project change, your mitigation obligation may also change, and a reevaluation of your mitigation measures would be required.

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

a. Provide for the protection in perpetuity, through acquisition of fee or a conservation easement of **0.33** acres of suitable habitat in the kit fox corridor area (e.g. within the San Luis Obispo County kit fox habitat area), either on-site or off-site, and provide for a non-wasting endowment to provide for management and monitoring of the property in perpetuity. Lands to be conserved shall be subject to the review and approval of the California Department of Fish and Game (Department) and the County.

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

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

Mitigation alternative (b) above, can be completed by providing funds to The Nature Conservancy (TNC) pursuant to the Voluntary Fee-Based Compensatory Mitigation Program (Program). The Program was established in agreement between the Department and TNC to preserve San Joaquin kit fox habitat, and to provide a voluntary mitigation alternative to project proponents who must mitigate the impacts of projects in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The fee, payable to "The Nature Conservancy," would total **$825.00**. This fee must be paid after the Department provides written notification identifying your mitigation options but prior to County permit issuance and initiation of any ground disturbing activities.

c. Purchase **0.33** credits in a Department-approved conservation bank, which would provide for the protection in perpetuity of suitable habitat within the kit fox corridor area and provide for a non-wasting endowment for management and monitoring of the property in perpetuity.

Mitigation alternative (c) above, can be completed by purchasing credits from the Palo Prieto Conservation Bank (see contact information below). The Palo Prieto Conservation Bank was established to preserve San Joaquin kit fox habitat, and to provide a voluntary mitigation alternative to project proponents who must mitigate the impacts of projects in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The cost for purchasing credits is payable to the owners of The Palo Prieto Conservation Bank, and would total **$825.00**. **(currently priced at $2500 per credit)**. This fee is calculated based on the current cost-per-credit of $2500 per acre of mitigation. The fee is established by the conservation bank owner and may change at any time. Your actual cost may increase depending on the timing of payment. Purchase of credits must be completed prior to County permit issuance and initiation of any ground disturbing activities.

d. If none of the above measures (a, b, or c) are available, the applicant may enter into a Mitigation Agreement with the Department, including depositing of funds into an escrow account (or other means of securing funds acceptable to the Department) which would ensure the protection in perpetuity of **0.33** acres of suitable habitat within the kit fox corridor area and provide for a non-wasting endowment for management and monitoring in perpetuity. The Department can provide a draft agreement to review; a signed Mitigation Agreement shall be submitted to the County prior to County permit issuance and initiation of any ground disturbing activities.

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

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

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

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

during construction, work shall stop until such time the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service/Department determine it is appropriate to resume work.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

training program, and distributed at the training program to all contractors, employers and other personnel involved with the construction of the project.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DATE: MARCH 19, 2015

DEVELOPER'S STATEMENT FOR CHARNLEY MAJOR GRADING PERMIT / PMT2014-01622

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

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

Aesthetics

AS-1 **At the time of application for construction permit(s),** the applicant shall provide an exterior lighting plan. The plan shall include the height, location, and intensity of all exterior lighting. All lighting fixtures shall be shielded so that neither the lamp nor the related reflector interior surface is visible from North River Road. All lighting poles, fixtures, and hoods shall be dark colored. This plan shall be implemented prior to final inspection or occupancy, whichever occurs first.

Monitoring: Required at the time of application for construction. Compliance will be verified by the County Department of Planning and Building.

Biological Mitigation

Your project will impact **0.33** acres of San Joaquin kit fox habitat. Based on the results of previous Kit Fox Habitat Evaluations that have been conducted for the El Pomar/Estrella area, Bob Stafford from the Department of Fish and Game (Department) has determined that the standard mitigation ratio for projects on parcels less than 40 acres in size has been established as **3**:1. This means that all impacts be mitigated at a ratio of **3** acres conserved for each acre impacted. Total compensatory mitigation required for your project is **0.33** based on **3** times **0.11** acres impacted. The mitigation options identified in BR-1 through BR-11 apply to the proposed project only; should your project change, your mitigation obligation may also change, and a reevaluation of your mitigation measures would be required.

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

a. Provide for the protection in perpetuity, through acquisition of fee or a conservation easement of **0.33** acres of suitable habitat in the kit fox corridor area (e.g. within the San Luis Obispo County kit fox habitat area), either on-site or off-site, and provide for a non-wasting endowment to provide for management and monitoring of the property in perpetuity. Lands to be conserved shall be subject to the review and approval of the California Department of Fish and Game (Department) and the County.

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

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

Mitigation alternative (b) above, can be completed by providing funds to The Nature Conservancy (TNC) pursuant to the Voluntary Fee-Based Compensatory Mitigation Program (Program). The Program was established in agreement between the Department and TNC to preserve San Joaquin kit fox habitat, and to provide a voluntary mitigation alternative to project proponents who must mitigate the impacts of projects in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The fee, payable to "The Nature Conservancy," would total **$825.00**. This fee must be paid after the Department provides written notification identifying your mitigation options but prior to County permit issuance and initiation of any ground disturbing activities.

c. Purchase **0.33** credits in a Department-approved conservation bank, which would provide for the protection in perpetuity of suitable habitat within the kit fox corridor area and provide for a non-wasting endowment for management and monitoring of the property in perpetuity.

Mitigation alternative (c) above, can be completed by purchasing credits from the Palo Prieto Conservation Bank (see contact information below). The Palo Prieto Conservation Bank was established to preserve San Joaquin kit fox habitat, and to provide a voluntary mitigation alternative to project proponents who must mitigate the impacts of projects in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The cost for purchasing credits is payable to the owners of The Palo Prieto Conservation Bank, and would total **$825.00**. **(currently priced at $2500 per credit)**. This fee is calculated based on the current cost-per-credit of $2500 per acre of mitigation. The fee is established by the conservation bank owner and may change at any time. Your actual cost may increase depending on the timing of payment. Purchase of credits must be completed prior to County permit issuance and initiation of any ground disturbing activities.

d. If none of the above measures (a, b, or c) are available, the applicant may enter into a Mitigation Agreement with the Department, including depositing of funds into an escrow account (or other means of securing funds acceptable to the Department) which would ensure the protection in perpetuity of **0.33** acres of suitable habitat within the kit fox corridor area and provide for a non-wasting endowment for management and monitoring in perpetuity. The Department can provide a draft agreement to review; a signed Mitigation Agreement shall be submitted to the County prior to County permit issuance and initiation of any ground disturbing activities.

Monitoring: Compliance will be verified by the County Department of Planning and Building.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

with a radius of the following distance measured outward from the den or burrow entrances:

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

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

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

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

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

Monitoring (San Joaquin Kit Fox Measures BR-3 – BR-11): Compliance will be verified by the County Division of Environmental and Resource Management in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game. As applicable, each of these measures shall be included on construction plans.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Water

W-1 At the time of application for construction permits, the applicant shall submit a landscape and irrigation plan to the Department of Planning and Building for review and approval in consultation with the Environmental Coordinator. All landscaping shall be drought tolerant and use drip irrigation for watering purposes.

Monitoring: (Water Measures W-1 thru W-2) Compliance will be verified by the County Department of Planning and Building.

W-2 Prior to occupancy or final inspection whichever occurs first, the applicant shall implement the final approved landscape plan.

No longer Required. Developer's Statement Revised April 3, 2015 H. Phipps / Project manager

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

Signature of Owner(s)	Name (Print)	Date
	IAN Charnley + Tami Charnley	3-24-15



PROJECT

Charnley Major Grading Permit
PMT2014-01622

EXHIBIT

Vicinity Map

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF BUILDING AND PLANNING



PROJECT

Charnley Major Grading Permit
PMT2014-01622

EXHIBIT

Aerial

Charnley - 5310 North River Road - Grading, Drainage & Erosion Control Plan

VICINITY MAP



SITE MAP



LEGAL DESCRIPTION

BENCHMARK

OWNER

SURVEYOR

APPLICABLE CODES

PROJECT STATISTICS

ABBREVIATIONS

LEGEND

CONSTRUCTION NOTES

GENERAL NOTES

GRADING NOTES

UNDERGROUND UTILITY NOTES

DIG ALERT 811

Roberts Engineering

Timothy P. Roberts
Civil Engineer - RCE 39369

Record Drawings

Roberts Engineering, Inc.
Charnley - 5310 North River Road
Title Sheet
1

PROJECT

Charnley Major Grading Permit
PMT2014-01622

EXHIBIT

Grading Plan



PROJECT

Charnley Major Grading Permit
PMT2014-01622

EXHIBIT

Enlarged Grading Plan