



Mammen Minor Use Permit C-DRC2021-00026 (ED23-122)

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

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Forestry Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology & Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems
<input type="checkbox"/> Energy	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Wildfire
<input type="checkbox"/> Geology & Soils	<input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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.

Brandi Cummings, SWCA
 Environmental Consultants

Prepared by (Print) _____ Signature _____ Date _____

Nicole Ellis, Senior Planner

for Eric Hughes, Principal
 Environmental Specialist

8/31/23

Reviewed by (Print) _____ Signature _____ Date _____

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

Project Environmental Analysis

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

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

A. Project

DESCRIPTION: A request by Kurt and Renee Mammen for a Minor Use Permit/Coastal Development Permit (C-DRC2021-00026) to allow for the construction of an approximately 1,935-square-foot single-family residence with an attached 560-square-foot garage, an 806-square-foot deck, a 616-square-foot patio, and associated site improvements. The project would result in approximately 0.28 acre (12,000 square feet) of ground disturbance on a 0.35-acre vacant parcel (Assessor's Parcel Number [APN] 074-325-067) located south of Vista del Osos, west of Covey Lane in the community of Los Osos in the Residential Single-Family (RSF) land use designation in the Estero Planning Area (Coastal Zone).

The project includes the construction of a new single-story, three-bedroom 1,935-square-foot single-family residence that would include an attached 560-square-foot garage, an 806-square-foot deck, and a 616-square-foot patio (Figure 2). The proposed residence would have a maximum height of 20 feet above grade. The project also includes the construction of site improvements, including construction of a new gravel driveway off of Covey Lane and installation of an on-site septic system. The proposed gravel driveway would be 2,255 square feet in size and would extend from the existing access easement from Covey Lane to the proposed garage within the southern portion of the parcel. The proposed garage would provide two parking spaces on-site. The proposed on-site septic system would include a septic tank, two leach fields, and associated sewer lines and would be constructed to the northeast of the proposed residence. In addition, the project includes the installation of solar photovoltaic (PV) panels, consistent with the California Building Code.

The project would require the extension of existing utility infrastructure, including gas, electrical, and water lines within the project site. The project is anticipated to result in a new potable water demand of 150 gallons per day, which would be provided by Golden State Water Company (GSWC). GSWC has provided a will-serve letter for the project. The project includes the construction of a new on-site septic system and would not require connection to a community sewer system.

Construction of the proposed residence and site improvements would be developed in one phase of construction. The project would result in a total of 0.28 acre (12,000 square feet) of ground disturbance. No tree removal is required for the project.

ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER(S): 074-325-067

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

Latitude: 35° 18' 13.41" N **Longitude:** 120° 49' 31.86" W **SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT #** 2

B. Existing Setting

Plan Area: Estero **Sub:** **Comm:** Los Osos

Land Use Category: Residential Single Family

Combining Designation: Coastal Zone , Archaeologically Sensitive

Parcel Size: 0.35 acres

Topography: Nearly level

Vegetation: Non-native grasses Scattered Oaks

Existing Uses: Undeveloped

Surrounding Land Use Categories and Uses:

North: Residential Single Family;
single-family residence(s)

East: Residential Single Family;
single-family residence(s)

South: Residential Single Family;
single-family residence(s)

West: Residential Single Family;
single-family residence(s)

Baseline Conditions

The 0.35-acre parcel is located in the Residential Single Family (RSF) zone in the Estero Planning Area. The project site is currently undeveloped and there is an unpaved access easement in the southern portion of the parcel. The project site consists of nearly level topography and non-native grasses. There are five coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) trees located along the northern property line. The project site is surrounded by single-family residences in all directions. The project site would be accessed from Covey Lane via an existing access easement. There are no surface water features, rock outcroppings, or heritage trees on the project site.


Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

Figure 1. Project Location Map



Initial Study - Environmental Checklist

Figure 2. Site Plan



Source: William P. Mammen Associates, September 2021

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

C. Environmental Analysis

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

I. AESTHETICS

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

Setting

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

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

The California Scenic Highway Program was created by the State Legislature in 1963 with the intention of protecting and enhancing the natural scenic beauty of California highways and adjacent corridors. Within

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

the County Coastal Zone, there is one officially designated state scenic highway and several eligible state scenic highways. State Route (SR) 1 is an Officially Designated State Scenic Highway and All-American Road from the city of San Luis Obispo to the northern San Luis Obispo County boundary. Portions of U.S. Highway 101 (US 101), SR 46, SR 41, SR 166, and a southern portion of SR 1 are also classified as Eligible State Scenic Highways – Not Officially Designated.

The *County of San Luis Obispo Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance (CZLUO)* establishes regulations for visual resources that apply to all projects that are visible from the shoreline, public beaches, the Morro Bay estuary, and any of the roads specified in the applicable planning area standards for Critical Viewsheds, Scenic Corridors or Sensitive Resource Areas (SRAs) intended to protect visual resources (CZLUO 23.04.210). Structures that are not visible from these locations or agricultural structures that are 600 sf or less in area or other minor agriculturally related development are exempt from these standards. The County CZLUO also includes a section detailing standards for all outdoor night-lighting sources, with the exception of streetlights located within public rights-of-way and all uses established in the Agriculture land use category (CZLUO 23.04.320).

The *County of San Luis Obispo General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE)* provides guidelines for the appropriate placement of development so that the natural landscape continues to be the dominant view in rural parts of the county and to ensure the visual character contributes to a robust sense of place in urban areas. COSE provides a number of goals and policies to protect the visual character and identify of the county while protecting private property rights, such as the identification and protection of community separators (rural-appearing land located between separate, identifiable communities and towns), designation of scenic corridors along public roads and highways, retaining existing access to scenic vista points, and ensuring that new development in Urban and Village areas are consistent with the local character, identity, and sense of place. Policies in the County COSE supplement CZLUO policies, except when the County COSE policies conflict with CZLUO policies, for which the County CZLUO policies would control (COSE 9.2).

The 0.35-acre parcel is located in an urban residential area in the RSF zone in the Estero Planning Area, within the community of Los Osos. The project site is currently undeveloped and consists of nearly level topography and non-native grasses. There are five coast live oak trees located along the northern property line. The project site is surrounded by single-family residences in all directions. There are no surface water features, rock outcroppings, or heritage trees on the project site. There are no officially designated or eligible scenic highways located within close proximity to the project site. The nearest scenic highway is SR 1, located approximately 4 miles north of the project site (Caltrans 2018).

Discussion

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

A scenic vista is generally defined as a high-quality view displaying good aesthetic and compositional values that can be seen from public viewpoints and may be officially or informally designated by public agencies or other organizations. Vistas are inherently expansive views, usually from an open area or an elevated point. A substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista would occur if the project would significantly degrade the scenic landscape as viewed from public roads or other public areas. The project site is not located within a designated scenic vista, a visually sensitive area, or an area with high scenic quality. The nearest suggested scenic corridor included in the County's COSE is Pecho Valley Road, which is located approximately 1.85 miles west of the project site. Due to distance, the project site is not visible from Pecho Valley Road. The project would not degrade views

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

within a designated scenic vista, a visually sensitive area, or an area with high scenic quality; therefore, *no impacts* would occur.

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

The nearest designated state scenic highway is SR 1, located approximately 4 miles north of the project site (Caltrans 2018). Due to distance, intervening topography, and existing development and vegetation, the project would not be visible from SR 1; therefore, implementation of the project would not result in damage to scenic resources within the viewshed of a state scenic highway, and *no impacts* would occur.

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

The project is located in an urban residential area within the RSF land use and zoning designation. The project includes the construction of an approximately 1,935-square-foot single-family residence with an attached 560-square-foot garage, an 806-square-foot deck, a 616-square-foot patio, and associated site improvements. The proposed single-story residence would have a maximum height of 20 feet above grade, which is consistent with the allowable height of the RSF land use designation for this neighborhood within the Estero Area Plan. The project would also be consistent with the minimum floor area, allowable density, and other development standards of the RSF land use designation. The proposed residence would be consistent with the design and scale of surrounding single-family residences and would not introduce new architectural features or substantial densities that could alter the existing visual character of the project area. As described in Impact I(a), the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista, which is consistent with the County's COSE and other applicable County planning documents. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with applicable zoning standards or other regulations governing scenic quality and impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

Existing sources of nighttime lighting within the project area include residential lighting from neighboring single-family residences and intermittent vehicle headlights along Vista del Osos and Covey Lane. The project does not include the use or installation of highly reflective materials that would create a substantial source of glare. New sources of outdoor lighting associated with the project would be consistent with the level and scale of lighting from existing development in the project vicinity. In addition, the project would be required to comply with CZLUO Section 23.04.320 for outdoor lighting requirements. Based on consistency with the surrounding area and required compliance with CZLUO Section 23.04.320, the project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Conclusion

The project would not result in a substantial change to a scenic vista, scenic corridor, or other scenic resources in the area. The project would be consistent with existing policies and standards in the County's

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

CZLUO and COSE related to the protection of scenic resources. Potential impacts to aesthetic resources would be less than significant and mitigation measures are not necessary.

Mitigation

None necessary.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES

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

Setting

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

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

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

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

The California Department of Conservation (CDOC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) produces maps and statistical data used for analyzing impacts on California's agricultural resources. Agricultural land is rated according to soil quality and current land use. For environmental review purposes under CEQA, the FMMP categories of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, and Grazing Land are considered 'agricultural land'. Other non-agricultural designations include Urban and Built-up Land, Other Land, and Water. Based on the FMMP, soils at the project site are designated as Urban and Built-Up Land (CDOC 2022).

According to the Soil Survey for San Luis Obispo County and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey (USDA 2021), the project site is underlain by Baywood Fine Sand, 2 to 9 percent slopes. This sandy soil is somewhat excessively well drained, has a very low runoff, and a depth to water table of more than 80 inches. This soil is not considered prime farmland (NRCS 2023).

The Land Conservation Act of 1965, commonly referred to as the Williamson Act, enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agriculture or related open space use. In return, landowners receive property tax assessments which are much lower than normal because they are based upon farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value. The project site does not include land within the Agriculture land use designation and is not within or adjacent to land subject to an active Williamson Act contract.

According to Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), forest land is defined as land that can support 10-percent native tree cover of any species, including hardwoods, under natural conditions, and that allows for management of one or more forest resources, including timber, aesthetics, fish and wildlife, biodiversity, water quality, recreation, and other public benefits. Timberland is defined as land, other than land owned by the federal government and land designated by the State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection as experimental forest land, which is available for, and capable of, growing a crop of trees of a commercial species used to produce lumber and other forest products, including Christmas trees. The project site does not contain any forest land or timberland.

Discussion

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

The project site is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land and does not contain land classified as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance as designated by the FMMP (CDOC 2022). Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of Farmland pursuant to the FMMP to a non-agricultural use, and *no impact* would occur.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

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

The project site does not include land within the Agriculture land use designation or land subject to a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract, and *no impact* would occur.

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

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

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

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

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

The project site is not located in close proximity to Farmland or forest land and the project would not conflict with existing agricultural uses. The project would not increase demand on agricultural water supplies or facilities and would not affect proximate agricultural support facilities. Therefore, the project would not result in changes in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural uses or forest land to non-forest uses; therefore, *no impacts* would occur.

Conclusion

The project would not directly or indirectly result in the conversion of Farmland, forest land, or timber land to non-agricultural uses or non-forest uses and would not conflict with agricultural zoning or otherwise adversely affect agricultural resources or uses. No potentially significant impacts to agriculture, forest land, or timberland would occur, and mitigation is not necessary.

Mitigation

None necessary.

III. AIR QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

(a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting

Regulatory Agencies and Standards

San Luis Obispo County is part of the South Central Coast Air Basin, (SCCAB) which also includes Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties. Air quality within the SCCAB is regulated by several jurisdictions including the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), California Air Resources Board (ARB), and the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD). Each of these jurisdictions develops rules, regulations, and policies to attain the goals or directives imposed upon them through legislation. The California ARB is the agency responsible for coordination and oversight of state and local air pollution control programs in California and for implementing the California Clean Air Act (CCAA) of 1988. The State Department of Public Health established California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) in 1962 to define the maximum amount of a pollutant (averaged over a specified period of time) that can be present without any harmful effects on people or the environment. The California ARB adopted the CAAQS developed by the Department of Public Health in 1969, which had established CAAQS for 10 criteria pollutants: particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), ozone (O₃), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), sulfate, carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), visibility reducing particles, lead (Pb), hydrogen sulfide (H₂S), and vinyl chloride.

The Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA) later required the U.S. EPA to establish National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for pollutants considered harmful to public health and the environment, and also set deadlines for their attainment. The U.S. EPA has established NAAQS for six criteria pollutants (all of which are also regulated by CAAQS): CO, lead, NO₂, ozone, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}, and SO₂.

California law continues to mandate compliance with CAAQS, which are often more stringent than national standards. However, California law does not require that CAAQS be met by specified dates as is the case with NAAQS. Rather, it requires incremental progress toward attainment. The SLOAPCD is the agency primarily responsible for ensuring that NAAQS and CAAQS are not exceeded and that air quality conditions within the county are maintained.

SLOAPCD Thresholds

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

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

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

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

Table 1. SLOAPCD Thresholds of Significance for Construction Activities

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

1. Daily and quarterly emission thresholds are based on the California Health and Safety Code and the CARB Carl Moyer Guidelines.
2. Any project with a grading area greater than 4.0 acres of worked area can exceed the 2.5-ton PM₁₀ quarterly threshold.

The SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook also provides preliminary screening construction emission rates based on the proposed volume of soil to be moved and the anticipated area of disturbance. Table 2 lists the SLOAPCD's screening emission rates that would be generated based on the amount of material to be moved. The SLOAPCD's CEQA Handbook also clarifies that any project that would require grading of 4.0 acres or more can exceed the 2.5-ton PM₁₀ quarterly threshold listed above.

Table 2. Screening Emission Rates for Construction Activities

Pollutant	Grams/Cubic Yard of Material Moved	Lbs/Cubic Yard of Material Moved
Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM)	2.2	0.0049

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	9.2	0.0203
Oxides of Nitrogen (NO _x)	42.4	0.0935
Fugitive Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	0.75 tons/acre/month of construction activity (assuming 22 days of construction per month)	

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

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

Air Quality Monitoring

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

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

San Luis Obispo County Clean Air Plan

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

Naturally Occurring Asbestos

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) is identified as a toxic air contaminant by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). Serpentine and other ultramafic rocks are fairly common throughout the county and may contain NOA. If these areas are disturbed during construction, NOA-containing particles can be released into the air and have an adverse impact on local air quality and human health. The project site is not located in an area with potential for NOA (SLOAPCD 2023).

Sensitive Receptors

Sensitive receptors are people that have an increased sensitivity to air pollution or environmental contaminants, such as the elderly, children, people with asthma or other respiratory illnesses, and others who are at a heightened risk of negative health outcomes due to exposure to air pollution. Some land uses are considered more sensitive to changes in air quality than others, due to the population that occupies the uses and the activities involved. Sensitive receptor locations include schools, parks and playgrounds, day care centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residences. There are existing mobile home units within the project site. The nearest off-site sensitive receptor is a single-family residence located adjacent to the eastern property line of the project site. In addition, there are several off-site residences located within 1,000 feet in all directions of the project site.

Discussion

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

In order to be considered consistent with the 2001 San Luis Obispo County CAP, a project must be consistent with the land use planning and transportation control measures and strategies outlined in the CAP (SLOAPCD 2012). Adopted land use planning strategies include, but are not limited to, planning compact communities with higher densities, providing for mixed land uses, and balancing jobs and housing. The project includes infill development of a new single-family residence within the RSF zone in the Los Osos Urban Reserve Line (URL). Based on the Estero Area Plan, the average household size in the community of Los Osos is 2.44 persons per occupied dwelling unit; therefore, development of one new single-family residence would result in a population increase of approximately 3 residents (County of San Luis Obispo 2009). Additionally, the project does not include the development of new land uses that would generate employment opportunities within the area. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial increase in population or employment and would not generate a significant increase in vehicle trips due to the low-density nature of the proposed project. Operation of the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the SLOAPCD CAP or other applicable regional and local planning documents. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

The county of San Luis Obispo is currently designated as non-attainment for ozone and PM₁₀ under state ambient air quality standards (CARB 2022).

Construction Emissions

Construction activities associated with the construction of the proposed project would result in the generation of criteria air pollutants including ozone precursors (reactive organic gases [ROG] and nitrogen oxides [NO_x]) and fugitive dust. Fugitive dust emissions would result from grading operations and ROG and NO_x emissions would result from the use of large diesel-fueled equipment including scrapers, loaders, bulldozers, haul trucks, compressors, and generators. The SLOAPCD

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

CEQA Air Quality Handbook provides thresholds of significance for construction-related emissions. The SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook also provides preliminary screening construction emission rates based on the proposed volume of soil to be moved and the anticipated area of disturbance. The SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook clarifies that any project that would require grading of 4.0 acres or more has the potential to exceed the 2.5-ton PM₁₀ quarterly threshold listed above. The project would result in a total of 0.28 acre (12,000 square feet) of ground disturbance and would involve less than 4 acres of site disturbance and 1,200 cy of earthwork per day, which would not result in exceedances of the SLOAPCD thresholds based on the SLOAPCD screening emission rates for construction activities. Based on the limited proposed construction activities, construction-related emissions would be *less than significant*.

Operational Emissions

The project includes infill development of a new single-family residence within the RSF zone. Based on the Estero Area Plan, the average household size in the community of Los Osos is 2.44 persons per occupied dwelling unit; therefore, development of one new single-family residence would result in a population increase of approximately 3 residents (County of San Luis Obispo 2009). Based on the limited scale of proposed development, implementation of the project would not result in a substantial increase in population or employment and would not generate a significant increase in vehicle trips. The proposed driveway would be constructed with gravel and would not generate long-term dust emissions. Installation of any wood burning devices (i.e., wood stoves, fireplaces) would be required to be certified by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency “Step 2” New Source Performance Standard and comply with APCD Rule 504 to be eligible for installation in new dwelling units. Based on the limited size and scope of the proposed project, the project would not include components that could result in substantial long-term pollutant concentrations in a manner that would exceed SLOAPCD thresholds. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in identified criteria pollutants, and operational impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

According to the SLOAPCD *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*, projects that occur within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors have the potential to result in adverse impacts involving construction emissions (SLOAPCD 2012). The nearest off-site sensitive receptor is a single-family residence located adjacent to the eastern property line of the project site. In addition, there are several off-site residences located within 1,000 feet in all directions of the project site. As evaluated above, the project would not result in construction-related or operational criteria air pollutant emissions above established SLOAPCD thresholds; however, due to the close proximity of sensitive receptor locations, Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 have been identified to ensure compliance with SLOAPCD diesel idling restrictions and fugitive dust reduction measures intended to reduce exposure of DPM and fugitive dust to sensitive receptor locations. With implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

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

Typically, construction activities have the potential to emit odors from diesel equipment, paints, solvents, fugitive dust, and adhesives. Any odors generated by construction activities would be intermittent and temporary, and generally would not extend beyond the construction area.

Future residential uses would not include any components or operational activities that would generate substantial long-term adverse odors. Therefore, odors generated by the project would be short-term, intermittent, and primarily undetectable.

According to the SLOAPCD Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) Map, the project site is not located in an area with known NOA (SLOAPCD 2023). The project does not require demolition that could inadvertently release asbestos containing material (ACM), lead paint, or other hazardous materials and contaminants. Further, the project does not require the import of fill materials that could introduce other potential contaminants to the project site. The project is not anticipated to result in other adverse emissions or odors; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Conclusion

The proposed project would result in limited short-term construction emissions. The project site is not located in an area that has known NOA and would not result in the demolition of buildings that could inadvertently release ACM. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 would reduce impacts of construction emissions near sensitive receptors. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2, impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation

AQ-1 Diesel Idling Restrictions for Construction Phases. The APCD recognizes the public health risk reductions that can be realized by idle limitations for both on- and off-road equipment. The following idle restricting measures are required for the construction phase of projects. **Upon application for construction and/or encroachment permits,** all required measures shall be shown on applicable grading or construction plans and made applicable during grading and construction activities, as described below.

1. Idling Restrictions Near Sensitive Receptors for Both On- and Off-Road Equipment.
 - a. Staging and queuing areas shall be located at the greatest distance feasible from sensitive receptor locations;
 - b. Diesel idling when equipment is not in use shall not be permitted;
 - c. Use of alternative fueled equipment shall be used whenever possible; and
 - d. Signs that specify the no-idling requirements shall be posted and enforced at the construction site.
2. California Diesel Idling Regulations. On-road diesel vehicles shall comply with 13 CCR 2485. This regulation limits idling from diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles with gross vehicular weight ratings of more than 10,000 pounds and licensed for operation on highways. It applies to California and non-California based vehicles. In general, the regulation specifies that drivers of said vehicles:
 - a. Shall not idle the vehicle's primary diesel engine when vehicle is not in use, except as noted in Subsection (d) of the regulation; and

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

- b. Shall not operate a diesel-fueled auxiliary power system (APS) to power a heater, air conditioner, or any ancillary equipment on that vehicle during sleeping or resting in a sleeper berth for greater than 5.0 minutes at any location when within 100 feet of a restricted area, except as noted in Subsection (d) of the regulation.

Signs must be posted in the designated queuing areas and job sites to remind drivers of the no-idling requirement. The specific requirements and exceptions in the regulation can be reviewed at the following website:

https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/classic/msprog/truck-idling/13ccr2485_09022016.pdf.

AQ-2

Fugitive Dust. At the time of application for grading and construction permits for initial site improvements and future residential development, the following measures shall be provided on project grading and construction plans and shall be implemented throughout the duration of project grading and construction activities to manage fugitive dust emissions such that they do not exceed the APCD 20% opacity limit (APCD Rule 401) and minimize nuisance (APCD Rule 402) impacts:

1. The amount of the disturbed area shall be reduced where possible;
2. Water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site and from exceeding the SLOAPCD's limit of 20% opacity for greater than 3 minutes in any 60-minute period. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed (non-potable) water shall be used whenever possible. When drought conditions exist and water use is a concern, the contractor or builder shall consider use of a dust suppressant that is effective for the specific site conditions to reduce the amount of water used for dust control. Please refer to the following link from the San Joaquin Valley Air District for a list of potential dust suppressants: <http://www.valleyair.org/busind/comply/PM10/Products%20Available%20for%20Controlling%20PM10%20Emissions.htm>;
3. All dirt stockpile areas shall be sprayed daily and covered with tarps or other dust barriers as needed;
4. All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible, and building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding, soil binders, or other dust controls are used;
5. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) or otherwise comply with California Vehicle Code Section 23114;
6. "Track-Out" is defined as sand or soil that adheres to and/or agglomerates on the exterior surfaces of motor vehicles and/or equipment (including tires) that may then fall onto any highway or street as described in California Vehicle Code Section 23113 and California Water Code 13304. To prevent track out, access points shall be designated, and all employees, subcontractors, and others shall be required to use them. A "track-out prevention device" shall be installed and operated where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved streets. The track-out prevention device can be any device or combination of devices that are effective at preventing track

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

out, located at the point of intersection of an unpaved area and a paved road. Rumble strips or steel plate devices need periodic cleaning to be effective. If paved roadways accumulate tracked out soils, the track-out prevention device may need to be modified;

7. All fugitive dust mitigation measures shall be shown on grading and building plans;
8. The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons whose responsibility is to ensure any fugitive dust emissions do not result in a nuisance and to enhance the implementation of the mitigation measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints and reduce visible emissions below the SLOAPCD's limit of 20% opacity for greater than 3 minutes in any 60-minute period. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress (for example, wind-blown dust could be generated on an open dirt lot). The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SLOAPCD Compliance Division prior to the start of any grading, earthwork or demolition (Contact the Compliance Division at 805-781-5912).
9. Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans shall be implemented as soon as possible, following completion of any soil-disturbing activities;
10. Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than 1 month after initial grading shall be sown with a fast-germinating, non-invasive grass seed and watered until vegetation is established;
11. All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the SLOAPCD;
12. Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 miles per hour on any unpaved surface at the construction site;
13. Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers shall be used with reclaimed water where feasible. Roads shall be pre-wetted prior to sweeping when feasible; and
14. Additional measures shall be taken as needed to ensure dust from the project site is not impacting areas outside the project boundary.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

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

Setting

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

The following setting information and evaluation is based, in part, on the *Mammen Single-Family Residence Biological Resources Assessment* (BRA) prepared by SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA) in June 2015 (SWCA 2015).

Federal and State Endangered Species Acts

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

Migratory Bird Treaty Act

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

Clean Water Act and State Porter Cologne Water Quality Control Act

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) regulates discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. These waters include wetland and non-wetland water bodies that meet specific criteria. USACE jurisdiction regulates almost all work in, over, and under waters listed as “navigable waters of the U.S.” that results in a discharge of dredged or fill material within USACE regulatory jurisdiction, pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). Under Section 404, USACE regulates traditional navigable waters, wetlands adjacent to traditional navigable waters, relatively permanent non-navigable tributaries that have a continuous flow at least seasonally (typically 3 months), and wetlands that directly abut relatively permanent tributaries.

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) regulate discharges of fill and dredged material in California, under Section 401 of the CWA and the State Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, through the State Water Quality Certification Program. State Water Quality Certification is necessary for all projects that require a USACE permit, or fall under other federal jurisdiction, and have the potential to impact waters of the State. Based on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory, the project site does not support wetlands, riparian, or deep-water habitats (USFWS 2023).

Conservation and Open Space Element

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

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

identifies features of particular importance to wildlife for movement corridors such as riparian corridors, shorelines of the coast and bay, and ridgelines.

Sensitive Resource Area and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area Designations

The County CZLUO SRA combining designation identifies areas of San Luis Obispo County with special environmental qualities, or areas containing unique, sensitive, or endangered vegetation or habitat resources. The County CZLUO establishes specific standards for all uses requiring a land use permit that are located within an SRA combining designation. These standards include requirements for initial submittal of the land use permit application, application content, environmental determination, final permit requirements and processing, required findings, and minimum site design and development standards (23.07.162, 164, 166). These design and development standards include the prohibition of surface mining onsite, setback distances on ocean, lake, and streambank shoreline development, prevention of degradation of lakes, ponds, wetlands, or perennial watercourses, setback distances from geological features visible from offsite, and prevention of disturbance of specific vegetation when the SRA designation is applied because of its presence.

The County CZLUO also includes special provisions for any development proposed within or adjacent to an Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA). The California Coastal Act defines an ESHA as any area in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments (CZLUO 23.07170).

Project Site

The project site is located outside of the boundaries of critical habitat units for Morro shoulderband snail (MSS) designated on February 7, 2001. The project site is currently undeveloped but there is an unpaved driveway near the southern property boundary. The project site consists of nearly level topography and supports non-native grassland that is dominated by veldt grass (*Ehrharta calycina*) and seven small, planted coast live oak trees, a pepper tree (*Schinus* sp.), one hop-bush (*Dodonaea* sp.), and a bottlebrush (*Callistemon* sp.) along the northern property boundary. The adjoining parcel supports a remnant patch of maritime chaparral that does provide adequate shelter for MSS (SWCA 2015).

Protocol surveys for MSS were conducted during protocol conditions on February 20, 2010; February 24, 2010; and January 27, 2015. During the first two surveys that were conducted on February 20 and 24, 2010, one live MSS and six empty shells were observed on the parcel. As a result, the applicant delayed the survey efforts and the project. Based on guidance from USFWS, a third protocol survey was conducted on January 27, 2015 to update the survey record (SWCA 2015).

Special-Status Species

The BRA includes the results of desktop-level background review and multiple field surveys. Background review conducted for the project included a query of the CDFW California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB), the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) Electronic Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California, and other applicable databases. A total of four field surveys for the project were conducted between February 2010 and May 2015.

Based on a 6-quadrangle search of the CNDDDB and conditions observed at the project site, the following 10 special-status plant and 6 special-status wildlife species have the potential to occur at the project site:

Special-Status Plants

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

- Hoover's bent grass (*Agrostis hooveri*)
- Morro Manzanita (*Arctostaphylos morroensis*)
- surf thistle (*Cirsium rhothophilum*)
- popcorn lichen (*Cladonia firma*)
- mesa horkelia (*Horkelia cuneata ssp. puberula*)
- coastal goosefoot (*Chenopodium littoreum*)
- compact cobwebby thistle (*Cirsium occidentale var. compactum*)
- Blochman's leafy daisy (*Erigeron blochmaniae*)
- southern curly-leaved monardella (*Monardella sinuata ssp. sinuata*)
- sand almond (*Prunus fasciculata*)

During the botanical conducted in May 2015, no special-status plant species were observed at the project site (SWCA 2015).

Special-Status Wildlife

- silvery legless lizard (*Anniella pulchra pulchra*)
- black legless lizard (*Anniella pulchra nigra*)
- Morro shoulderband snail (*Helminthoglypta walkeriana*)
- loggerheaded shrike (*Lanius ludovicianua*)
- California horned lark (*Eremophila alpestris actia*)
- Class Aves Other migratory bird species (nesting)

Other than the identified presence of MSS in 2010, no other special-status wildlife species were documented at the project site during field surveys (SWCA 2015).

Project Site Setting

The project site is currently undeveloped but there is an unpaved driveway located in the southern portion of the parcel. The project site consists of nearly level topography and supports non-native grassland that is dominated by veldt grass and seven small, planted coast live oak trees, a pepper tree, one hop-bush, and a bottlebrush along the northern property boundary. There are no surface water features or drainages located within the project area. In addition, there are no sensitive natural communities on-site (SWCA 2015).

Discussion

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

Special-Status Plants

The project includes ground-disturbance activities for development of residential uses, which would have the potential to result in direct removal of special-status plant species if present within the project site during construction. As described above, no special-status plant species were observed

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

at the project site during the botanical survey conducted in May 2015 (SWCA 2015). Further, annual mowing occurs at the project site, which further reduces the potential for special-status plant species to occur. Based on the absence of special-status plants at the project site, implementation of the proposed project would not result in adverse effects to any special-status plant species, and *no impacts* would occur.

Special-Status Wildlife

Proposed construction activities have the potential to result in direct (i.e., take) or indirect (i.e., noise, dust, light pollution) disturbance to special-status wildlife species if present within the project area during construction activities. As identified above, there is potential for MSS, black legless lizard, silvery legless lizard, loggerhead shrike, California horned lark, and migratory birds to occur within the project area. During field surveys conducted at the project site, only MSS was observed on-site (SWCA 2015).

The following special-status wildlife species were identified by CNDDDB as having the potential to occur in the region:

Morro Shoulderband Snail

Based on three MSS surveys conducted at the project site, the presence of live MSS was confirmed on the parcel (SWCA 2015). Due to annual mowing that occurs at the project site, very few MSS were found on the parcel. The annual mowing does not allow the veldt grass and other vegetation on the site to generate significant duff or woody debris that is necessary for MSS shelter (SWCA 2015). Based on the presence of MSS on the project site, the Applicant prepared a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and obtained an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) to cover the proposed activities at the project site. The ITP is valid for a period of 10 years and was issued on January 19, 2017 (USFWS 2017). The HCP includes avoidance and minimization measures to be implemented during project activities to avoid adverse impacts to MSS. Mitigation measure BIO-1 requires compliance with the avoidance and minimization measures outlined in the HCP prepared for the project site. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1 would reduce impacts to MSS; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

Special-Status Reptiles

Although no special-status reptiles were observed on-site during reconnaissance-level field surveys, the project site supports suitable habitat for black legless lizard and silvery legless lizard and there are known occurrences of these species within the project region (SWCA 2015). If special-status reptile species are present within the project area, proposed ground-disturbing activities may result in direct disturbance to these species. Therefore, Mitigation Measure BIO-2 has been identified to avoid impacts to black legless lizard and silvery legless lizard through preconstruction surveys. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-2, the project would not result in adverse impacts to special-status reptile species; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

Special-Status and Migratory Birds

There are seven small, planted coast live oak trees, a pepper tree, one hop-bush, and a bottlebrush along the northern property boundary that could provide suitable habitat for nesting migratory birds. The project does not include the removal of any trees that could result in direct disturbance to special-status or migratory birds. However, short-term construction-related noise and dust may result in indirect disturbance to nesting migratory bird species if present at the project site during

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

construction activities. Mitigation Measure BIO-3 has been included to require nesting bird surveys prior to the start of construction activities if construction activities occur during the recognized breeding season (February 1 to August 15). If nesting birds are identified during preconstruction surveys, Mitigation Measure BIO-3 also includes appropriate avoidance measures. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

Based on the analysis provided above, potential impacts associated with substantial adverse effects on special-status species or their habitats would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

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

The project site supports non-native grassland that is dominated by veldt grass (SWCA 2015). The project site does not support riparian vegetation or other sensitive natural communities; therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural community and *no impacts* would occur.

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

According to the USFWS National Wetland Inventory (NWI) Mapper, there are no mapped blue line creeks or wetland features within or adjacent to the project site (USFWS 2023). Therefore, implementation of the project would not result in direct disturbance to potential wetland areas. Based on the absence of wetlands within the project site, the project would not result in disturbance to any state or federally protected wetlands, and *no impact* would occur.

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

The project includes infill development of a single-family residence and is surrounded by single-family residences in all directions. The project site is not located within or adjacent to wildlife corridors or aquatic resources that could facilitate the movement of migratory fish or wildlife through the project site. In addition, the project does not include the development of fencing or other features that may restrict wildlife movement. The project would retain existing trees and shrubs at the project site, which would provide long-term habitat for nesting migratory birds at the project site. Therefore, the project would not impede the movement of migratory species through the project site, and impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

The project does not require any tree removal; therefore, the project would not conflict with local policies or ordinances pertaining to oak tree removal. The proposed area of disturbance does not support other sensitive natural resources (i.e., wetlands, streams, etc.) that are protected by local policies and plans. Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-3 have been identified to avoid and/or minimize potential impacts to special-status wildlife species, which is consistent with local plans and policies to protect wildlife and their habitats. With implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

through BIO-3, the project would not result in a conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

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

Based on three MSS surveys conducted at the project site, the presence of live MSS was confirmed on the parcel (SWCA 2015). The Applicant prepared a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and obtained an Incidental Take Permit (ITP) to cover the proposed activities at the project site. The ITP is valid for a period of 10 years and was issued on January 19, 2017 (USFWS 2017). The HCP includes avoidance and minimization measures to be implemented during project activities to avoid adverse impacts to MSS. Mitigation measure BIO-1 requires compliance with the avoidance and minimization measures outlined in the HCP prepared for the project site. With implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, the project would not conflict with an existing HCP; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

Conclusion

Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-3 would avoid or minimize potential impacts to biological resources within the project area and ensure with local plans and policies protecting biological resources. Therefore, with implementation of the identified mitigation, potential impacts to biological resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation

- BIO-1** **Morro Shoulderband Snail Habitat Conservation Plan. At the time of building and grading permit issuance,** the Applicant shall demonstrate compliance with all avoidance, minimization, mitigation and reporting measures identified in the *Habitat Conservation Plan Morro Shoulderband Snail (Helminthoglypta walkeriana) Mammen Parcel (APN 074-325-067) Los Osos, San Luis Obispo County, California* (HCP) prepared for the property.
- BIO-2** **Northern Legless Lizard and Coast Horned Lizard Impact Avoidance. No more than three (3) days prior to initiation of ground disturbing activities,** a County-approved biologist shall conduct surveys for silvery legless lizards and other reptiles. The biologist shall utilize hand search or cover board methods in areas of disturbance where legless lizards are expected to be found (e.g., under shrubs, other vegetation, or debris). If cover board methods are used, they shall commence at least 30 days prior to the start of construction. Hand search surveys shall be completed immediately prior to and during grading activities. During grading activities, the biologist shall walk behind the grading equipment to capture silvery legless lizards that are unearthed by the equipment. The biologist shall capture and relocate any legless lizards or other reptiles observed during the survey effort. The captured individuals shall be relocated from the construction area and placed in suitable habitat on the parcel but at least 50 feet outside of the work area. Following the survey and monitoring efforts, the biologist shall submit to the County a project completion report that documents the number of silvery legless lizards captured and relocated, and the number of legless lizards taken during grading activities.
- BIO-3** **Nesting Bird Impact Avoidance and Protection.** To the maximum extent possible, site preparation, ground disturbing, and construction activities shall be conducted outside of the migratory bird breeding season (February 1 to August 15). If such activities are required during this period, the applicant shall retain a County-approved biologist to conduct a

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

nesting bird survey and verify that migratory birds are not occupying the site **within 14 days prior to vegetation removal or construction**. If nesting activity is detected, the following measures shall be implemented:

- a. If feasible, vegetation removal activities should be scheduled to occur outside the February 1 to September 15 nesting. No surveys for nesting birds shall be required for project activities occurring between September 16 and January 31.
- b. For project-related activities that occur during the nesting season (February 1 to September 15) a nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist at least 14 days prior to vegetation removal for each phase of the project. The surveys shall be conducted within all accessible areas within 500 feet of the work area.
- c. The project shall be modified or delayed as necessary to avoid direct take of identified nests, eggs, and/or young protected under the MBTA;
- d. If nests are located during any survey, all project-related activities shall be avoided within the following buffer zones: 50 feet for non-raptor species and 500 feet for all active raptor nests. The County-approved biologist shall contact the USFWS and CDFW to determine an appropriate biological buffer zone around active nest sites. Construction activities within the established buffer zone will be prohibited until the young have fledged the nest and achieved independence; and,
- e. The County-approved biologist shall document all active nests and submit a letter report to the County, USFWS, and CDFW, documenting project compliance with the MBTA and applicable project mitigation measures.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

Setting

San Luis Obispo County possesses a rich and diverse cultural heritage and has an abundance of historic and prehistoric cultural resources dating as far back as 9,000 B.C. The County protects and manages cultural resources in accordance with the provisions detailed by CEQA and local ordinances. PRC Section 5024.1

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

requires that any properties that can be expected to be directly or indirectly affected by a proposed project be evaluated for California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) eligibility. The purpose of the CRHR is to maintain listings of the state's historical resources and to indicate what properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from material impairment and substantial adverse change.

As defined by CEQA, a historical resource includes:

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

The COSE identifies and maps anticipated culturally sensitive areas and historic resources within the county and establishes goals, policies, and implementation strategies to identify and protect areas, sites, and buildings having architectural, historical, Native American, or cultural significance. According to the County's Land Use View, the project site is not located in an Archaeologically Sensitive Area.

In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 require that no further disturbances shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

A Phase I Archaeological Surface Survey was prepared by Heritage Discoveries, Inc. (Heritage Discoveries) for the proposed project to determine the presence and the likelihood of presence of cultural resources within the project area (Heritage Discoveries 2015). The Phase I Archaeological Surface Survey includes the results and findings of background review and a Phase 1 surface survey of the project area. A records search was conducted at the Central Coast Information Center (CCIC) located at the University of California, Santa Barbara to identify any previously recorded cultural resources within the project area. The records search was negative for previously recorded resources. A pedestrian field survey was conducted within the project area on August 15, 2015, and no cultural resources or evidence of cultural resources were observed (Heritage Discoveries 2015).

Discussion

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

The project site is currently undeveloped and does not contain any historic artifacts (Heritage Discoveries 2015). In addition, the project would not require the removal or modification of any buildings or structures adjacent to the project site. Therefore, the project would not result in an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource and *no impacts* would occur.

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

According to the County's Land Use View, the project site is located in an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. The project would result in a total of 0.28 acre (12,000 square feet) of ground disturbance on an undeveloped parcel. A records search of the site files from the Regional Archaeological Information Center in Santa Barbara was conducted in order to determine whether any previously

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

recorded cultural resources have been recorded on or near the project area. The records search did not identify any known previously recorded archaeological resources within the project area. A surface survey of the project site was conducted, and no visible surface archaeological resources were found. Based on the results of the Phase I Archaeological Surface Survey Report prepared for the project, there are no known cultural archaeological resources within the project area and the site has low potential for subsurface resources (Heritage Discoveries 2015).

Because there are no known archaeological resources within the project area, implementation of the project would not be anticipated to result in adverse change to known archaeological resources. However, there is still some potential for inadvertent discovery of unknown cultural resources if present within the proposed work area. In the unlikely event that unknown cultural resources are encountered during construction activities, the project would be required to comply with CZULO Section 23.05.140 (Archaeological Resources Discovery), which requires work be stopped, the County be notified, and the discovery evaluated by an archaeologist. Based on required compliance with CZULO Section 23.05.140, the project would not result in an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

Based on existing site conditions, project activities are not expected to uncover or disturb any known or unknown human remains. In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and CZLUO Section 23.05.140 (Archaeological Resources Discovery) require that no further disturbances shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. Based on adherence to California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and CZLUO Section 23.05.140, the project would not disturb human remains; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Conclusion

The project site is currently undeveloped and does not contain any historic artifacts. Based on the low archaeological sensitivity of the project site and required compliance with CZULO Section 23.05.140 and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, the project would not result in an adverse change in the significance of archaeological or human resources. Therefore, impacts related to cultural resources would be less than significant, and mitigation would not be required.

Mitigation

None necessary.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

VI. ENERGY

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

Setting

Local Utilities

Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) is the primary electricity provider for urban and rural communities within the County of San Luis Obispo. PG&E utilizes clean energy sources, including 50% renewable energy sources and 43% greenhouse gas (GHG) free energy sources (PG&E 2021).

PG&E offers two programs through which consumers may purchase electricity from renewable sources: the Solar Choice program and the Regional Renewable Choice program. Under the Solar Choice program, a customer remains on their existing electric rate plan and pays a modest additional fee on a per kilowatt-hour (kWh) basis for clean solar power. The fee depends on the type of service, rate plan, and enrollment level. Customers may choose to have 50% or 100% of their monthly electricity usage to be generated via solar projects. The Regional Renewable Choice program enables customers to subscribe to renewable energy from a specific community-based project within PG&E's service territory. The Regional Renewable Choice program allows a customer to purchase between 25% and 100% of their annual usage from renewable sources.

The Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) is the primary provider of natural gas for urban and rural communities within San Luis Obispo County. SoCalGas has committed to replacing 20% of its traditional natural gas supply with renewable natural gas by 2030 (Sempra 2021).

Local Energy Plans and Policies

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

State Building Code Requirements

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

The California Building Code (CBC) contains standards that regulate the method of use, properties, performance, or types of materials used in the construction, alteration, improvement, repair, or rehabilitation of a building or other improvement to real property. The CBC includes mandatory green building standards for residential and nonresidential structures, the most recent version of which are referred to as the *2023 Building Energy Efficiency Standards*. These standards focus on four key areas: smart residential photovoltaic systems, updated thermal envelope standards (preventing heat transfer from the interior to the exterior and vice versa), residential and nonresidential ventilation requirements, and non-residential lighting requirements. While the CBC has strict energy and green-building standards, U-occupancy structures (such as greenhouses used for cultivation activities) are typically not regulated by these standards.

Vehicle Fuel Economy Standards

In October 2012, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), on behalf of the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), issued final rules to further reduce GHG emissions and improve corporate average fuel economy (CAFE) standards for light-duty vehicles for model years 2017 and beyond. NHTSA's CAFE standards have been enacted under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act since 1978. This national program requires automobile manufacturers to build a single light-duty national fleet that meets all requirements under both federal programs and the standards of California and other states. This program would increase fuel economy to the equivalent of 54.5 miles per gallon (mpg) limiting vehicle emissions to 163 grams of carbon dioxide (CO₂) per mile for the fleet of cars and light-duty trucks by the model year 2025.

In January 2017, USEPA Administrator Gina McCarthy signed a Final Determination to maintain the current GHG emissions standards for the model year 2022–2025 vehicles. However, on March 15, 2017, USEPA Administrator Scott Pruitt and USDOT Secretary Elaine Chao announced that the USEPA intends to reconsider the Final Determination. On April 2, 2018, USEPA Administrator Pruitt officially withdrew the January 2017 Final Determination, citing information that suggests that these current standards may be too stringent due to changes in key assumptions since the January 2017 Determination. According to the USEPA, these key assumptions include gasoline prices and overly optimistic consumer acceptance of advanced technology vehicles. The April 2nd notice is not USEPA's final agency action, and the USEPA intends to initiate rulemaking to adopt new standards. Until that rulemaking has been completed, the current standards remain in effect.

As part California's overall approach to reducing pollution from all vehicles, the CARB has established standards for clean gasoline and diesel fuels and fuel economies of new vehicles. CARB has also put in place innovative programs to drive the development of low-carbon, renewable, and alternative fuels, such as their Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) Program pursuant to California Assembly Bill (AB) 32 and the Governor's Executive Order S-01-07.

In January 2012, the CARB approved the Advanced Clean Cars Program, which combines the control of GHG emissions and criteria air pollutants, as well as requirements for greater numbers of zero-emission vehicles, into a single package of standards for vehicle model years 2017 through 2025. The new rules strengthen the GHG standard for 2017 models and beyond. This will be achieved through existing technologies, the use of stronger and lighter materials, and more efficient drivetrains and engines. The program's zero-emission vehicle regulation requires a battery, fuel cell, and/or plug-in hybrid electric vehicles to account for up to 15% of California's new vehicle sales by 2025. The program also includes a clean fuels outlet regulation designed to support the commercialization of zero-emission hydrogen fuel cell vehicles planned by vehicle manufacturers by 2015 by requiring increased numbers of hydrogen fueling stations throughout the state.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

The number of stations will grow as vehicle manufacturers sell more fuel cell vehicles. By 2025, when the rules will be fully implemented, the statewide fleet of new cars and light trucks will emit 34% fewer global warming gases and 75% fewer smog-forming emissions than the statewide fleet in 2016 (CARB 2016).

All self-propelled off-road diesel vehicles 25 horsepower (hp) or greater used in California and most two-engine vehicles (except on-road two-engine sweepers) are subject to the CARB's Regulation for In-Use Off-Road Diesel Fueled Fleets (Off-Road regulation). This includes vehicles that are rented or leased (rental or leased fleets). The overall purpose of the Off-Road regulation is to reduce emissions of NO_x and particulate matter from off-road diesel vehicles operating within California through the implementation of standards including, but not limited to, limits on idling, reporting and labeling of off-road vehicles, limitations on use of old engines, and performance requirements.

Discussion

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

Construction activities for the proposed project would require the use of energy in the form of electricity, diesel fuel, and gasoline for worker and construction vehicles and equipment. The project would require limited construction activities and would be subject to state and local diesel idling restrictions and other equipment standards. Therefore, construction is not anticipated to result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Further, Mitigation Measure AQ-1 has been included in Section III, *Air Quality*, to reduce diesel idling near sensitive receptors, which would further reduce the potential for wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.

Implementation of the proposed project would result in a new approximately 21,935-square-foot single-family residence with an attached 560-square-foot garage, an 806-square-foot deck, and a 616-square-foot patio that would be subject to green building and California Building Code (CBC) standards. The project would be provided electricity from PG&E, which sources 50% of electricity from renewable resources and 43% of electricity from GHG-free resources (PG&E 2021). Based on required compliance with green building standards and use of electricity from GHG-free resources, operation of the project is not anticipated to result in environmental impacts due to wasteful or otherwise inefficient use of energy during project construction or operation; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

In order to comply with the County's COSE and EWP, the project would be required to reduce GHG emissions where feasible in energy consumption. The project would be provided electricity from PG&E, which sources 50% of electricity from renewable resources and 43% of electricity from GHG-free resources (PG&E 2021). By utilizing PG&E for electricity, 93% of the project's electricity demand would be sourced from GHG-free energy sources. In addition, the project includes the installation of solar PV panels, which would further promote the use of renewable energy resources. The project would also comply with CBC 2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards and the 2019 Green Building Code and is not anticipated to result in wasteful use of energy. Therefore, the project would comply with applicable energy efficiency plans and impacts would be *less than significant*.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

Conclusion

The project would not result in a wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources during short-term construction or long-term operation and would not conflict with state or local renewable energy or energy efficiency plans. Therefore, potential impacts related to energy would be less than significant and mitigation measures are not necessary.

Mitigation

None necessary.

VII. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

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

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting

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

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

The community of Los Osos is underlain by the Los Osos Fault zone. In addition, the Cambria fault zone is located approximately 4.5 miles northeast, the Edna fault zone is located approximately 5 miles south, and the San Miguelito fault zone is located approximately 6.8 miles south of the project site (CDOC 2015).

The County CZLUO identifies a Geologic Study Area (GSA) combining designation for areas where geologic and soil conditions could present new developments and their users with potential hazards to life and property. All land use permit applications for projects located within a GSA shall include a report prepared by a certified engineering geologist and/or registered civil/soils engineer, as appropriate. This report shall then be evaluated by a geologist retained by the county who is registered in the state of California. In

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

addition, all uses within a GSA are subject to special standards regarding grading, distance from an active fault trace within an Earthquake Fault Zone, and erosion and geologic stability (CZLUO Section 23.07.080). The project site is not within the GSA combining designation.

Groundshaking refers to the motion that occurs in response to local and regional earthquakes. Groundshaking can endanger life and safety due to damage or collapse of structures or lifeline facilities. The CBC currently requires structures to be designed to resist a minimum seismic force resulting from ground motion.

Liquefaction is the sudden loss of soil strength due to a rapid increase in soil pore water pressures resulting from groundshaking during an earthquake. Liquefaction potential increases with earthquake magnitude and groundshaking duration. Low-lying areas adjacent to creeks, rivers, beaches, and estuaries underlain by unconsolidated alluvial soil are most likely to be vulnerable to liquefaction. The CBC requires the assessment of liquefaction in the design of all structures. Based on the County Safety Element Maps, the project site is in an area with low potential for liquefaction.

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

The classification of expansive soils relates to the extent to which the soil shrinks as it dries out or swells when it gets wet. Extent of shrinking and swelling is influenced by the amount and kind of clay in the soil. Shrinking and swelling of soils can cause damage to building foundations, roads and other structures. A high shrink/swell potential indicates a hazard to maintenance of structures built in, on, or with material having this rating. Moderate and low ratings lessen the hazard accordingly. The project site is underlain by Baywood Fine Sand, 2 to 9 percent slopes, which is comprised of sand (NRCS 2023). As such, soils at the project site have negligible potential for expansion.

The County COSE identifies a policy for the protection of paleontological resources from the effects of development by avoiding disturbance where feasible. Paleontological sensitivity is defined as the potential for a geologic unit to produce scientifically significant fossils. According to the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), the project site is underlain by old eolian deposits (Qoe) from the late to middle Pleistocene (USGS 2021).

Discussion

- (a) *Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:*
- (a-i) *Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.*

The community of Los Osos, including the project site, is underlain by the Los Osos Fault zone, which is a seismically active fault (CDOC 2015). The project would be required to comply with the most

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

recent California Building Code (CBC) and other engineering practices and standards to adequately withstand and minimize the risk associated with the level of seismic ground shaking expected to occur in the project region. Although there is potential for fault rupture and ground shaking at the project site, based on required compliance with existing building standards, implementation of the project is not anticipated to result in the risk of loss, injury, or death; therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

The Central Coast is a seismically active region and there is always potential for seismic groundshaking. In addition to the Los Osos Fault zone, there are several other potentially active and inactive fault zones located in the project region, including the Cambria fault zone located approximately 4.5 miles northeast, the Edna fault zone located approximately 5 miles south, and the San Miguelito fault zone located approximately 6.8 miles south of the project site (CDOC 2015). The project would be required to comply with the most recent California Building Code (CBC) and other engineering practices and standards to adequately withstand and minimize the risk associated with the level of seismic ground shaking expected to occur in the project region. Based on required compliance with the CBC and other engineering practices, implementation of the project is not anticipated to result in the risk of loss, injury, or death related to seismic groundshaking; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

Based on the County Safety Element Liquefaction Hazards Map, the project site is located in an area with low potential for liquefaction. Further, the project would be required to comply with the most recent CBC seismic requirements to address the potential for seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction at the project site. Based on required compliance with the CBC, implementation of the project is not anticipated to result in the risk of loss, injury, or death related to liquefaction; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

(a-iv) *Landslides?*

Based on the County Safety Element Landslide Hazards Map, the project site is located in an area with low potential for landslide risk. The project would be required to comply with applicable sections of the most recent CBC and other engineering practices to minimize the risk associated with landslide at the project site. Based on required compliance with the CBC, implementation of the project is not anticipated to result in the risk of loss, injury, or death related to landslides; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

The project would result in a total of 0.28 acre (12,000 square feet) of ground disturbance on an undeveloped parcel. The project would be required to comply with CZLUO Section 23.05.036, which requires preparation and approval of an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan to minimize potential impacts related to erosion, sedimentation, and siltation. The plan would be prepared by a civil engineer to address both temporary and long-term sedimentation and erosion impacts. In addition, the project site is located in the County's Municipal Stormwater Management Area (MS4) coverage area and must adhere to the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) Post Construction Requirements (PCRs). As part of the MS4 process, construction BMPs would be applied to all work areas to reduce potential erosive runoff from construction activities. Based on

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

required compliance with CZLUO Section 23.05.036 and RWQCB requirements, the project would not result in substantial erosion and loss of topsoil; therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

As described above, the project site is located in an area with low risk for liquefaction and low risk for landslides. According to the USGS Areas of Land Subsidence in California Map, the project site is not located in an area of recorded land subsidence (USGS 2023). The project would be required to comply with all applicable CBC and other engineering standards to reduce potential risk associated with development on unstable soils. Therefore, impacts related to unstable soils would be *less than significant*.

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

Typically, expansive soils contain clay and clay materials. The project site is underlain by Baywood fine sand, 2 to 9 percent slopes, which has a soil profile that is comprised of sand (NRCS 2023). As such, soils at the project site have negligible potential for expansion, and future development would not be located on expansive soil; therefore, *no impact* would occur.

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

The proposed on-site septic system would include a septic tank, two leach fields, and associated sewer lines and would be constructed to the northeast of the proposed residence. The proposed septic system would be required to be designed in accordance with conditions observed during percolation testing and the County's LAMP, which develops minimum standards for the treatment and disposal of sewage through onsite wastewater treatment systems. The final design of the proposed septic system would be subject to County approval. Therefore, proposed septic leach fields and stormwater control measures would be designed in a manner that is consistent with conditions at the site, and impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

According to the USGS, the project site is underlain by Qoe from the late to middle Pleistocene (USGS 2021). This formation consists of fine-to-coarse sand and fine gravel and is often capped with well-developed soil. Previous fossil encounters in the area have been identified in alluvial deposits; eolian sediments are typically accumulated in depositional environments that are not generally favorable for fossil preservation. In addition, the project would not require substantial earthwork that may disturb paleontological resources. Therefore, impacts to paleontological resources would be *less than significant*.

Conclusion

The project site is not within the GSA combining designation or an area of high risk of landslide, liquefaction, subsidence, or other unstable geologic conditions. The project would be required to comply with CBC and standard CZLUO requirements which have been developed to properly safeguard against seismic and geologic hazards. The proposed on-site septic system would be required to be designed in accordance with

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

conditions observed during percolation testing and final design of the septic leach fields would be subject to County approval. Therefore, potential impacts related to geology and soils would be less than significant and mitigation measures are not necessary.

Mitigation

None necessary.

VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

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

Setting

Greenhouse gasses (GHGs) are any gases that absorb infrared radiation in the atmosphere. The primary GHGs that are emitted into the atmosphere as a result of human activities are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and fluorinated gases. These are most commonly emitted through the burning of fossil fuels (oil, natural gas, and coal), agricultural practices, decay of organic waste in landfills, and a variety of other chemical reactions and industrial processes (e.g., the manufacturing of cement). Carbon dioxide (CO₂) is the most abundant GHG and is estimated to represent approximately 80–90% of the principal GHGs that are currently affecting the earth’s climate. According to the California Air Resources Board (CARB), transportation (vehicle exhaust) and electricity generation are the main sources of GHGs in the state.

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

Senate Bill (SB) 32 and Executive Order (EO) S-3-05 extended the state’s GHG reduction goals and require CARB to regulate sources of GHGs to meet the following goals:

- Reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020;

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

- Reduce GHG emissions to 40% below 1990 levels by 2030;
- Reduce GHG emissions to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050.

The initial Scoping Plan was first approved by CARB on December 11, 2008, and is updated every 5 years. The first update of the Scoping Plan was approved by the CARB on May 22, 2014, which looked past 2020 to set mid-term goals (2030–2035) toward reaching the 2050 goals. The most recent update released by CARB is the 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan, which was released in November 2017. The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan incorporates strategies for achieving the 2030 GHG-reduction target established in SB 32 and EO S-3-05.

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

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

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

Since SB 32 requires the state to reduce GHG levels by 40 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2030, the application of an interim “bright line” SB32-based working threshold that is 40 percent below the 1,150 MTCO₂e Bright Line threshold ($1,150 \times 0.6 = 690$ MTCO₂e) would be expected to produce comparable GHG reductions “in the spirit of” the targets established by SB32. Therefore, for the purpose of evaluating the significance of GHG emissions for a project after 2020, emissions estimated to be less than 690 MTCO₂e per year GHG are considered *de minimus* (too trivial or minor to merit consideration), and will have a less than significant impact that is less than cumulatively considerable and consistent with state and local GHG reduction goals.

Discussion

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

Construction activities for the proposed project would require the use of electricity, diesel fuel, and gasoline for worker and construction vehicles and equipment. The project would require limited construction activities and would be subject to state and local diesel idling restrictions and other equipment standards. Therefore, construction is not anticipated to generate substantial GHG emissions. Further, Mitigation Measure AQ-1 has been included in Section III, *Air Quality*, to reduce diesel idling near sensitive receptors, which would further reduce the potential to generate substantial GHG emissions. Based on required compliance with state and local diesel idling restrictions, the project would not generate substantial GHG emissions during construction activities; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Operational emissions would come primarily from vehicle trips to and from the project site and residential energy use. One new single-family residence would result in a limited increase in vehicle trips to and from the project site. The project would be provided electricity from PG&E, which sources 50% of electricity from renewable resources and 43% of electricity from GHG-free resources (PG&E 2021). In addition, the project includes the installation of solar PV panels, which would further reduce GHG emissions from energy consumption. Operational energy use is not anticipated to generate a significant amount of GHGs because it is sourced primarily from GHG-free resources. Based on the limited number of vehicle trips generated by the project and the use of electricity from GHG-free sources, the project would not generate a substantial amount of GHG emissions during operation of the project; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

The project would result in one new single-family residence within the RSF zone. Energy inefficiency contributes to higher GHG emissions which has the potential to conflict with state and local plans for energy efficiency. As discussed above, the EWP, adopted in 2011, serves as the County's GHG reduction strategy. The GHG-reducing policy provisions contained in the EWP were prepared for the purpose of complying with the requirements of AB 32 and achieving the goals of the AB 32 Scoping Plan, which have a horizon year of 2020. The policy provisions consist of community-wide measures and measures aimed at reducing GHG emissions associated with County operations. The GHG reduction measures contained in the EWP are generally programmatic and intended to be implemented at the community level. Measure No. 7 encourages energy efficient new development and provides incentives for new development to exceed CALGreen energy efficiency standards. The

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

following is a summary of project consistency with the relevant supporting actions identified in Measure No. 7 for promoting energy efficiency in new development (Table 2).

Table 2. EnergyWise Plan Measure 7 Consistency Analysis.

Supporting Action	Project Consistency
Require the use of energy-efficient equipment in all new development, including but not limited to Energy Star appliances, high-energy efficiency equipment, heat recovery equipment, and building energy management systems.	The project would be consistent with all 2019 CBC Energy Efficiency Standards and the 2019 Green Building Code standards to ensure new development is energy efficient. In addition, the project includes the installation of solar PV panels to promote renewable energy use.
Encourage new projects to provide ample daylight within the structure through the use of lighting shelves, exterior fins, skylights, atriums, courtyards, or other features to enhance natural light penetration.	The proposed project, including roof design and natural light features, would be consistent with all 2019 CBC Energy Efficiency Standards and the 2019 Green Building Code standards to ensure new development is energy efficient.
Minimize the use of dark materials on roofs by requiring roofs to achieve a minimum solar reflectivity index (SRI) of 10 for high-slope roofs and 64 for low-slope roofs (CALGreen 5.1 Planning and Design).	
Minimize heat gain from surface parking lots.	The project does not include the construction of a new parking lot.
Use light-colored aggregate in new road construction and repaving projects adjacent to existing cities and in some of the communities north of the Cuesta Grade.	The project site is not located north of the Cuesta Grade.

The 2023 RTP, which was adopted by the SLOCOG Board in June 2023, includes the region's Sustainable Communities' Strategy and outlines how the region will meet or exceed its GHG reduction targets by creating more compact, walkable, bike-friendly, transit-oriented communities, preserving important habitat and agricultural areas, and promoting a variety of transportation demand management and system management tools and techniques to maximize the efficiency of the transportation network. The RTP and SCS provide guidance for the development and management of transportation systems county-wide to help achieve, among other objectives, GHG

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

reduction goals. The RTP/SCS recommend strategies for community planning such as encouraging mixed-use, infill development that facilitate the use of modes of travel other than motor vehicles.

The project consists of the development of a new single-family residence within the RSF land use designation within the Los Osos URL. The project does not include development of retail, business, or commercial uses that would be open to the public; therefore, land use planning strategies, such as mixed-use development and planning compact communities, are generally not applicable. The project would result in the establishment of activities that are residential in nature and would not result in employment opportunities or a substantial population increase in the project area.

Pursuant to AB 32, the California Air Resources Board (CARB or Board) prepared and adopted the initial Scoping Plan to *"identify and make recommendations on direct emissions reductions measures, alternative compliance mechanisms, market-based compliance mechanisms, and potential monetary and non-monetary incentives"* in order to achieve the 2020 goal, and to achieve *"the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective GHG emissions reductions"* by 2020 and maintain and continue reductions beyond 2020. AB 32 requires CARB to update the Scoping Plan at least every five years.

The 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan recommends strategies for achieving the 2030 GHG-reduction target established in SB 32 and EO S-3-05. These strategies include the following:

- Implement SB 350 which is aimed at Reduce GHG emissions in the electricity sector;
- 2030 Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) -- Transition to cleaner/less-polluting fuels that have a lower carbon footprint.
- 2030 Mobile Source Strategy (Cleaner Technology and Fuels [CTF] Scenario) -- Reduce GHGs and other pollutants from the transportation sector through transition to zero-emission and low-emission vehicles, cleaner transit systems and reduction of vehicle miles traveled.
- Implement SB 1383 which is aimed at reducing Short-Lived Climate Pollutants to reduce highly potent GHGs.
- Implement the 2030 California Sustainable Freight Action Plan aimed at improving freight efficiency, transition to zero emission technologies, and increase competitiveness of California's freight system.
- Implement the 2030 Post-2020 Cap-and-Trade Program which is aimed at reducing GHGs across the largest GHG emissions sources.

The strategies described in the 2017 Scoping Plan are programmatic and intended to be implemented state-wide and industry-wide. They are, therefore, not applicable at the level of an individual project. However, as discussed in Section XVII, *Transportation*, the project is not expected to exceed existing VMT thresholds during construction-related or operational traffic trips or VMT which is consistent with Scoping Plan strategies for reducing VMT and transportation-related GHG emissions. Overall, the project is consistent with adopted plans and policies aimed at reducing GHG emissions and impacts would be *less than significant*.

Conclusion

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

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

with plans adopted to reduce GHG emissions. Therefore, potential impacts related to GHG emissions would be less than significant and mitigation measures are not necessary.

Mitigation

None necessary.

IX. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Site (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies, and developers to comply with CEQA requirements related to the disclosure of information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. Government Code section 65962.5 requires the California EPA to develop at least annually an updated Cortese List. Various state and local government agencies are required to track and document hazardous material release information for the Cortese List. The California Department of Toxic Substance Control’s (DTSC’s) EnviroStor database tracks DTSC cleanup, permitting, enforcement, and investigation efforts at hazardous waste facilities and sites with known contamination, such as federal superfund sites, state response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, school cleanup sites, school investigation sites, and military evaluation sites. The State Water Resources Control Board’s (SWRCB’s) GeoTracker database contains records for sites that impact, or have the potential to impact, water in California, such as Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) sites, Department of Defense sites, and Cleanup Program Sites. The remaining data regarding facilities or sites identified as meeting the “Cortese List” requirements can be located on the CalEPA website: <https://calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/>.

The California Health and Safety Code provides regulations pertaining to the abatement of fire related hazards and requires that local jurisdictions enforce the California Building Code, which provides standards for fire resistive building and roofing materials, and other fire-related construction methods. The County Safety Element provides a Fire Hazard Zones Map that indicates unincorporated areas in the County within moderate, high, and very high fire hazard severity zones (FHSZs). According to the CAL FIRE FHSZ Viewer, the project site is located in a very high FHSZ (CAL FIRE 2023).

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

Based on a query of the DTSC EnviroStor database and the SWRCB GeoTracker database, there are no previously recorded hazardous materials sites located within or adjacent to the project site (DTSC 2023; SWRCB 2023). The nearest recorded hazardous materials sites are three closed LUST sites located approximately 0.75 mile northwest of the project site and an active State Response site associated with the Baywood Park Training Area (J09CA0031), located approximately 2.45 miles west of the project site (SWRCB 2023; DTSC 2023). The nearest airport is San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport, located approximately 10.7 miles southeast of the project site. The nearest school is Stepping Stone University Preschool located approximately 0.75 mile northwest of the project site.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

Discussion

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

Project construction would require the use of limited quantities of hazardous substances, including but not limited to, gasoline, diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid, solvents, oils, and paints. Commonly used materials would be transported, stored, and used according to regulatory requirements and existing procedures for the handling of hazardous materials, including those specified in CZLUO Section 23.06.120 (Toxic and Hazardous Materials). Therefore, proposed construction activities are not anticipated to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

Operation of the project would be limited to residential uses and would not require the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials that could lead to significant upset in the event of an accidental spill. Household waste would be stored and hauled in accordance with County regulations; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

The project does not propose the handling or use of hazardous materials or volatile substances that would result in a significant risk of upset or accidental release conditions. As previously evaluated, construction of the proposed project is anticipated to require use of limited quantities of hazardous substances, and construction contractors would be required to comply with applicable state and local regulations, such as CCR Title 22 Division 4.5 and CZLUO Section 23.06.120, to reduce the potential for accidental hazardous material release during construction. Operation of the project would not require the handling or use of hazardous materials or volatile substances that would result in a significant risk of upset or accidental release conditions.

The project site is not located in an area with potential for NOA to occur and does not require demolition of any buildings, roadways, or other structures that could release ACM. The project does not require soil disturbance within or adjacent to existing major roadways (i.e., US 101) that could release aerially deposited lead (ADL) if present within the soil. In addition, the project does not require the import of any fill materials that could introduce other potential contaminants to the project site. Therefore, based on compliance with existing regulations during proposed construction activities, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

The project site is located approximately 0.75 mile southeast of Stepping Stone University Preschool. The project site is not located within 0.25 mile of a proposed or existing school; therefore, the project does not have the potential to emit or handle hazardous materials within 0.25 mile of a school and *no impact* would occur.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

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

Based on a search of the DTSC EnviroStor database, the SWRCB GeoTracker database, and CalEPA Cortese List website, there are no hazardous waste cleanup sites within or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, *no impacts* would occur.

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

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

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

The project includes the construction of a new single-family residence on an existing parcel. Construction activities would not require traffic controls or road closures and emergency access to the project site and surrounding areas would be maintained throughout the construction period. There is an existing unpaved access easement in the southern portion of the project site from Covey Lane. The project site would be accessed via a new unpaved driveway from the existing access easement. The proposed driveway would be constructed in accordance with County Public Works and CAL FIRE requirements to ensure adequate emergency access to the site. The new single-family residence would generate a negligible increase in vehicle trips to and from the site; therefore, implementation of the project would not increase vehicle congestion in a manner that could interfere with emergency response or evacuation efforts within the project area. Therefore, impacts related to emergency response and evacuation would be *less than significant*.

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

According to the CAL FIRE FHSZ Viewer, the project site is located in a very high FHSZ (CAL FIRE 2023). Implementation of the project would result in development of a new single-family residence, which would be constructed in accordance with California Fire Code (CFC) and CBC requirements to reduce risk associated with fire ignition and exposure of project occupants to wildfire risk. Based on required compliance with existing state and local regulations, the project is not anticipated to result in the risk of loss, injury, or death as a result of wildfire; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

Conclusion

The project does not propose the routine transport, use, handling, or disposal of hazardous substances. It is not located in close proximity to any known contaminated sites. Project implementation would not subject people or structures to substantial risks associated with wildland fires and would not impair implementation of or interfere with any adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. Therefore, potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant and mitigation measures are not necessary.

Mitigation

None necessary.

X. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
(i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting

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

The RWQCB Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coast Basin (Basin Plan; RWQCB 2019) describes how the quality of surface water and groundwater in the Central Coast Region should be managed to provide the highest water quality reasonably possible. The Basin Plan outlines the beneficial uses of streams, lakes, and other water bodies for humans and other life. There are 24 categories of beneficial uses, including, but not limited to, municipal water supply, water contact recreation, non-water contact recreation, and cold freshwater habitat. Water quality objectives are then established to protect the beneficial uses of those water resources. The RWQCB implements the Basin Plan by issuing and enforcing waste discharge requirements to individuals, communities, or businesses whose discharges can affect water quality.

The County CZLUO dictates which projects are required to prepare a drainage plan, including projects that would, for example, involve a land disturbance of more than 40,000 square feet, would result in an impervious surface of more than 20,000 square feet, or involves development on slopes steeper than 10 percent. The County CZLUO also dictates that an erosion and sedimentation control plan is required year-round for all construction and grading permit projects and any site disturbance activities of 0.5 acre or more in geologically unstable areas, on slopes of steeper than 30 percent, on highly erodible soils, or within 100 feet of any watercourse.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

Per the County's Stormwater Program, the Public Works Department is responsible for ensuring that new construction sites implement best management practices during construction, and that site plans incorporate appropriate post-construction stormwater runoff controls. Construction sites that disturb 1.0 acre or more must obtain coverage under the SWRCB's Construction General Permit. The Construction General Permit requires the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to minimize on-site sedimentation and erosion. There are several types of projects that are exempt from preparing a SWPPP, including routine maintenance to existing developments, emergency construction activities, and projects exempted by the SWRCB or RWQCB. Projects that disturb less than 1 acre must implement all required elements within the site's erosion and sediment control plan as required by the San Luis Obispo County CZLUO.

For planning purposes, the flood event most often used to delineate areas subject to flooding is the 100-year flood. The Safety Element of the County of San Luis Obispo General Plan establishes policies to reduce flood hazards and reduce flood damage, including, but not limited to, prohibition of development in areas of high flood hazard potential, discouragement of single-road access into remote areas that could be closed during floods, and review of plans for construction in low-lying areas. According to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) 06079C1040H (effective date 5/16/2017), the project site is located within Zone X, an area with minimal flood hazard (FEMA 2023). In addition, the project site is not located in the County's Flood Hazard combining designation.

Discussion

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

The project would result in a total of 0.28 acre (12,000 square feet) of ground disturbance on an undeveloped parcel. Proposed construction activities have the potential to temporarily increase erosion and pollution at the site. CZLUO Section 23.05.036 requires preparation and implementation of an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan for all construction and grading projects to minimize potential impacts related to erosion, sedimentation, and siltation. The plan is required to be prepared by a civil engineer to address both temporary and long-term sedimentation and erosion impacts. Equipment used during project construction has the potential to increase pollutant runoff from the project site. The project site is located within the MS4 coverage area and must adhere to the Central Coast RWQCB PCRs. As part of the MS4 process, construction BMPs would be applied to all work areas to reduce potential erosive runoff from construction activities. Based on required compliance with RWQCB and County requirements, implementation of the proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

The project includes the construction of an approximately 1,935-square-foot single-family residence with an attached 560-square-foot garage, an 806-square-foot deck, a 616-square-foot patio, and associated site improvements, which would result in 3,650 square feet of new impervious surface on the 22,651-square-foot project site. The majority of the project site would remain undeveloped to retain groundwater infiltration at the project site. Therefore, the project would not interfere with groundwater recharge at the project site.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

The County estimates the potable water demand for new single-family dwellings in Los Osos to be 150 gallons per day, which would be provided by GSWC. GSWC has provided a will-serve letter for the project. The project site is located within the Los Osos Area Subbasin of the Los Osos Valley Groundwater Basin, which is a low-priority subbasin under SGMA (Basin No. 3-08.01). According to the County, the SGMA does not apply to the Los Osos Area subbasin because requirements have been met by the Los Osos Basin Management Committee (County of San Luis Obispo 2023a).

On April 22, 2008, the Board of Supervisors approved two plumbing retrofit ordinances for the Los Osos area. The ordinances address sea water intrusion into the lower aquifer zone of the Los Osos Groundwater Basin. To manage this serious problem, the ordinances require both new and existing development to help address this problem by retrofitting older, non-conserving fixtures with those that are water efficient. These Title 19 retrofit requirements require 2:1 off-set of new water demand for covered development. The required Title 19 offset for a single-family dwelling is 300 gallons per day (2:1 offset). The applicant has agreed to retrofit at a 2:1 ratio. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

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

The project would require approximately 0.28 acre (12,000 square feet) of ground disturbance on an unimproved parcel. The project would be required to comply with CZLUO Section 23.05.036, which requires preparation and approval of an Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan to minimize potential impacts related to erosion, sedimentation, and siltation. The plan would be prepared by a civil engineer to address both temporary and long-term sedimentation and erosion impacts. In addition, the project site is located in the County's MS4 coverage area and must adhere to the Central Coast RWQCB PCRs. As part of the MS4 process, construction BMPs would be applied to all work areas to reduce potential erosive runoff from construction activities. Based on required compliance with CZLUO Section 23.05.036 and RWQCB requirements, the project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation; therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

The project would not substantially increase the amount of impervious surface area or the rate or volume of surface runoff in a manner that could result in flooding on- or off-site. The project applicant would be required to comply with CZLUO and RWQCB requirements regarding drainage, sedimentation, and erosion control. An Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan would be required and would need to show that increased surface runoff would not result in more impacts than those caused by historic flows. Based on required compliance with RWQCB and County requirements, the project would not substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

The project includes the construction of an approximately 1,935-square-foot single-family residence with an attached 560-square-foot garage, an 806-square-foot deck, a 616-square-foot patio, and associated site improvements, which would result in 3,650 square feet of new impervious surface on

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

the 22,651-square-foot project site. The majority of the project site would remain undeveloped to retain pervious surfaces at the project site. In addition, the project site is located in the County's MS4 coverage area and must adhere to the Central Coast RWQCB PCRs to address long-term stormwater control at the project site. Therefore, the project would not substantially increase the amount of impervious surface area or the rate or volume of surface runoff in a manner that could exceed the capacity of existing stormwater or drainage systems. Based on the nature and size of the project, changes in surface hydrology would be negligible. Therefore, potential impacts related to increased surface runoff exceeding stormwater capacity would be *less than significant*.

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

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone; therefore, flood flows are not expected to occur at the project site. In addition, the project site is located in the County's MS4 coverage area and must adhere to the Central Coast RWQCB PCRs to address long-term stormwater control at the project site. Based on Required compliance with RWQCB requirements, the project would not impede or redirect flood flows; therefore, *no impacts* would occur.

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

According to FEMA FIRM 06079C1040H (effective date 5/16/2017), the project site is located within Zone X, an area with minimal flood hazard (FEMA 2023). In addition, the project site is not located in the County's Flood Hazard combining designation. According to the CDOC San Luis Obispo County Tsunami Hazard Areas map, the project site is not located in an area at risk for tsunami. The project site is not located within or adjacent to a standing body of water with the potential for a seiche to occur. Therefore, the project site has no potential to release pollutants due to project inundation and *no impacts* would occur.

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

The project is not located within a groundwater basin designated as Level of Severity III per the County's Resource Management System or in severe decline by SGMA. As identified above, based on required compliance with the County's CZLUO and the Central Coast RWCQB construction stormwater permit requirements and PCRs, the project would not substantially increase water demand, deplete groundwater supplies, or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the Central Coastal Basin Plan, SGMA, or other local or regional plans or policies intended to manage water quality or groundwater supplies; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Conclusion

The project site is not within the 100-year flood zone and does not include existing drainages or other surface waters. The project would not substantially increase impervious surfaces and does not propose alterations to existing water courses or other significant alterations to existing on-site drainage patterns. Therefore, potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant and mitigation measures are not necessary.

Mitigation

None necessary.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING

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

Setting

The California Coastal Commission is the ultimate permit authority in the Coastal Zone of San Luis Obispo County and dictates how the County's Local Coastal Program (Title 23) is interpreted. The purpose of Title 23, also known as the County CZLUO, is to guide and manage the future growth in accordance with the County General Plan and Local Coastal Program; to regulate land use in a manner that will encourage and support orderly development and beneficial use of lands; to minimize adverse effects on the public resulting from inappropriate creation, location, use or design of buildings or land uses; and to protect and enhance significant natural, historic, archeological and scenic resources within the county.

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

Discussion

(a) *Physically divide an established community?*

The project includes construction of a new single-family residence on an existing parcel within the RSF zone. The project does not propose components that would physically divide the site from surrounding areas and uses. The project would be consistent with the general level of existing residential development in the project vicinity and would not create, close, or impede any existing public or private roads, or create any other barriers to movement or accessibility within the community. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community and *no impacts* would occur.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

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

The project would be consistent with the existing land use designation and the guidelines and policies for development within the applicable area plan, Coastal Zone Framework for Planning, and the COSE. The project was found to be consistent with standards and policies set forth in the County of San Luis Obispo General Plan, the Estero Area Plan, the SLOAPCD CAP, and other land use policies for this area.

The Los Osos Community Plan (LOCP) was adopted by the County in December 2020 and is awaiting review and certification by the California Coastal Commission. Key components of the LOCP include incorporating conditions of approval of the Coastal Development Permit from the California Coastal Commission for the Los Osos Wastewater Project. Specifically, Special Condition 6 prohibits wastewater service to undeveloped properties within the service area, until the County's Local Coastal Plan (via the LOCP) is amended to identify appropriate and sustainable buildout limits. The project site is an undeveloped property. However, the project does not include connection to a wastewater service provider and would not be in conflict with Special Condition 6, or other conditions of the Los Osos Wastewater Project.

The project would be required to implement measures to mitigate potential impacts associated with air quality and biological resources; therefore, the project would not conflict with policies or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects and impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

Conclusion

The project would not divide an established community. The project would be required to implement measures to mitigate potential impacts associated with air quality and biological resources. Therefore, the project would not conflict with policies or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects and impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation

Implement Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 and BIO-1 through BIO-3.

XII. MINERAL RESOURCES

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally- important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Setting

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

The three MRZs used in the SMARA classification-designation process in the San Luis Obispo-Santa Barbara Production-Consumption Region are defined below (California Geological Survey [CGS] 2015):

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

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

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

The purpose of this combining designation is to protect significant resource extraction and energy production areas identified by the County LUE from encroachment by incompatible land uses that could hinder resource extraction or energy production operations, or land uses that would be adversely affected by extraction or energy production.

Discussion

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

The project site is not located within or adjacent to an Extractive Resource Area or Energy/Extractive Area. The project includes minimal ground disturbance activity for the construction of the proposed

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

project; therefore, work within previously disturbed areas and is not anticipated to uncover mineral resources in the area and no impacts would occur.

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

Chapter 6 of the COSE identifies goals and policies regarding mineral resources in the county. Policies within this chapter protect mineral resources within identified extractive areas identified in the *County of San Luis Obispo General Plan Land Use Element*. The project site is not located within or adjacent to an Extractive Resource Area or Energy/Extractive Area. The project includes minimal grading activity and work within previously disturbed areas. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to uncover mineral resources in the area; therefore, *no impacts* would occur.

Conclusion

The project site is not located with an Extractive Resource Area or Energy/Extractive Area and impacts to mineral resources are not anticipated to occur; therefore, mitigation measures are not necessary.

Mitigation

None necessary.

XIII. NOISE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project result in:</i>				
(a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Setting

The San Luis Obispo County Noise Element of the General Plan provides a policy framework for addressing potential noise impacts in the planning process. The purpose of the Noise Element is to minimize future noise conflicts. The Noise Element identifies the major noise sources in the county (highways and freeways,

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

primary arterial roadways and major local streets, railroad operations, aircraft and airport operations, local industrial facilities, and other stationary sources) and includes goals, policies, and implementation programs to reduce future noise impacts. Among the most significant policies of the Noise Element are numerical noise standards that limit noise exposure within noise-sensitive land uses, and performance standards for new commercial and industrial uses that might adversely impact noise-sensitive land uses.

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

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

All sound levels referred to in the Noise Element are expressed in A-weighted decibels (dB). A-weighting de-emphasizes the very low and very high frequencies of sound in a manner similar to the human ear.

The County CZLUO Section 23.06.042 (Exceptions to Noise Standards) are not applicable to a range of exceptions, including noise sources associated with construction, provided such activities do not take place before 7:00 a.m. or after 9:00 p.m. on weekdays, or before 8:00 a.m. or after 5:00 p.m. on Saturday or Sunday.

The nearest off-site sensitive receptor is a single-family residence located adjacent to the eastern property line of the project site.

Discussion

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

During construction of the project, noise generated from construction activities may intermittently dominate the noise environment in the immediate area. Table 3 details the typical noise levels for construction equipment likely to be used in implementation of the project.

Table 3. Construction Equipment Noise Emission Levels

Equipment Type	Typical Noise Level (dBA) 50 ft From Source
Concrete Mixer, Dozer, Excavator, Jackhammer, Man Lift, Paver, Scraper	85

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

Heavy Truck	84
Crane, Mobile	83
Concrete Pump	82
Backhoe, Compactor	80

Source: FHWA 2018

The nearest off-site sensitive noise receptor is a single-family residence located adjacent to the eastern property line of the project site. Construction-related noise would be short-term, intermittent and would not result in a permanent increase in ambient noise within the project area. According to CZLUO Section 23.06.042.d, construction noise is exempt from the County's noise standards between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. on weekdays and 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. on weekends. Proposed construction activities would be limited to the hours specified in the LUO; therefore, construction-related noise would be exempt from the County's noise standards, and impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

The project does not propose substantial grading/earthmoving activities, pile driving, or other high impact activities that would generate substantial groundborne noise or groundborne vibration during construction. Construction equipment has the potential to generate minor groundborne noise and/or vibration, but these activities would be limited in duration and are not likely to be perceptible from adjacent areas. The project does not propose a use that would generate long-term operational groundborne noise or vibration. Therefore, impacts related to exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels would be *less than significant*.

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

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

Conclusion

The project would not generate a substantial increase in temporary or permanent ambient noise levels and would not generate groundborne noise in a manner that would result in disturbance. No long-term operational noise or ground vibration would occur as a result of the project. Therefore, potential impacts related to noise would be less than significant.

Mitigation

None necessary.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

XIV. POPULATION AND HOUSING

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

Setting

The County's current Housing Element (2020-2028) is intended to facilitate the provision of needed housing in the context of the General Plan Land Use Element and related ordinance. It is also intended to meet the requirements of State law. It contains a number of relevant goals, objectives, policies, and implementation programs to ensure the County meets its goals of meeting the housing needs while remaining consistent with State law.

Requirements for inclusionary housing for residential dwelling units are based upon the base density of a project. Base density is the maximum number of residential units that may be allowed, not including any density bonuses. Commercial and industrial development of 5,000 square feet or more of floor area for commercial or industrial use also requires the payment of a housing impact fee or construction of inclusionary housing units.

Discussion

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

The project includes infill development of a new single-family residence in the RSF land use designation. Based on the Estero Area Plan, the average household size in the community of Los Osos is 2.44 persons per occupied dwelling unit; therefore, development of one new single-family residence would result in a negligible population increase of approximately 3 residents (County of San Luis Obispo 2009). The project does not include any new uses that would increase employment in the area. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial unplanned population growth and impacts would be *less than significant*.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

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

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

Conclusion

No significant impacts related to population and housing would occur; therefore, mitigation measures are not necessary.

Mitigation

None necessary.

XV. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

Setting

Fire protection services in unincorporated San Luis Obispo County are provided by the CAL FIRE, which has been under contract with the County of San Luis Obispo to provide full-service fire protection since 1930. Approximately 180 full-time state employees operate the County Fire Department, supplemented by as many as 100 state seasonal fire fighters, 300 County paid-call and reserve fire fighters, and 120 state inmate fire fighters. CAL FIRE responds to emergencies and other requests for assistance, plans for and takes action

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

to prevent emergencies and to reduce their impact, coordinates regional emergency response efforts, and provides public education and training in local communities. CAL FIRE has 24 fire stations located throughout the county. The project would be served by CAL FIRE/South Bay Station 15, located approximately 0.6 mile northwest of the project site at 2315 Bayview Heights Dr, Los Osos. Emergency response to the project site is less than 0-5 minutes.

Police protection and emergency services in the unincorporated portions of the county are provided by the San Luis Obispo County Sheriff's Office. The Sheriff's Office Patrol Division responds to calls for service, conducts proactive law enforcement activities, and performs initial investigations of crimes. Patrol personnel are deployed from three stations throughout the county, the Coast Station in Los Osos, the North Station in Templeton, and the South Station in Oceano. The project would be served by the Coast Station located approximately 0.7 mile northwest of the project site.

San Luis Obispo County has a total of 12 school districts that currently enroll approximately 34,000 students in over 75 schools. The project site is located within the San Luis Coastal Unified School District (SLCUSD). Based on the County's 2016-2018 Resource Summary Report, schools within the San Luis Coastal Unified School District are currently operating at acceptable capacities and levels (County of San Luis Obispo 2018).

Within the County's unincorporated areas, there are currently 23 parks, three golf courses, four trails/staging areas, and eight Special Areas that include natural areas, coastal access, and historic facilities currently operated and maintained by the County.

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

Discussion

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

Fire protection?

The project would result in the development of one new single-family residence that would result in a negligible population increase of approximately 3 people. Based on the limited scale of proposed development and associated population growth, the project would result in a limited increase in demand on fire protection services. The project would be subject to standard Public Facilities Fees to offset the project's demand on existing fire protection services. Based on the limited population increase and payment of Public Facilities Fees, the project would not require or otherwise facilitate the need for additional or expanded fire protection services and impacts would be *less than significant*.

Police protection?

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the development of one new single-family residence that would result in a negligible population increase of approximately 3 people. Due to the

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

limited scale of the proposed development and associated growth, the project would result in a limited increase in demand on police protection services. The project would be subject to standard Public Facilities Fees to offset the project’s demand on existing police protection services. Based on the limited population increase and payment of Public Facilities Fees, the project would not require or otherwise facilitate the need for additional or expanded police protection services; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Schools?

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

Parks?

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

Other public facilities?

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

Conclusion

The project does not propose development that would substantially increase demands on public services and would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth that would increase demands on public services. The project would be subject to payment of Public Facilities Fees to offset the project’s negligible contribution to increased demands on public services and facilities. Therefore, potential impacts related to public services would be less than significant and mitigation measures are not necessary.

Mitigation

None necessary.

XVI. RECREATION

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Setting

The County of San Luis Obispo Parks and Recreation Element (Recreation Element) establishes goals, policies, and implementation measures for the management, renovation, and expansion of existing, and the development of new, parks and recreation facilities in order to meet existing and projected needs and to assure an equitable distribution of parks throughout the county.

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

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

Discussion

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

As discussed in Section XIV, *Population and Housing*, the project would result in the development of one new single-family residence that would result in a negligible population increase of approximately 3 people. Based on the limited scale of proposed development and associated population growth, the project would not substantially increase demand on any proximate existing neighborhood, regional park, or other recreational facilities. Further, the project would be required to pay park impact fees (QUIMBY fees) and Public Facility Fees for maintenance of public recreation facilities. Based on the limited population increase and payment of applicable fees, the project would not increase the use of existing recreational facilities in a manner that could lead to substantial physical deterioration; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

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

The project does not include the development of new or expanded recreational facilities; therefore, *no impacts* related to adverse physical effects on the environment as a result of construction or expansion of recreational facilities would occur.

Conclusion

The project would not increase the use of existing recreational facilities in a manner that would result in physical deterioration and does not include the construction of new or expanded recreational facilities that could result in adverse environmental impacts. Therefore, potential impacts related to recreation would be less than significant, and mitigation would not be necessary.

Mitigation

None necessary.

XVII. TRANSPORTATION

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

Setting

The San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG) holds several key roles in transportation planning within the county. As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), SLOCOG is responsible for conducting a comprehensive, coordinated transportation program; preparing a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); programming state funds for transportation projects; and administering and allocating transportation development act funds required by state statutes. The 2023 RTP, adopted June 7, 2023, is the San Luis Obispo region’s long-term blueprint for a transportation system that enhances quality of life and

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

meets the mobility needs of the region’s residents and visitors, now and in the future. This blueprint offers the region’s communities a mix of mobility options for people and goods—and makes a strong commitment to creating a more sustainable transportation system that maximizes choice, holistically addresses transportation issues, and is both visionary and attainable.

In 2013 SB 743 was signed into law with the intent to “more appropriately balance the needs of congestion management with statewide goals related to infill development, promotion of public health through active transportation, and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions” and required the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to identify new metrics for identifying and mitigating transportation impacts within CEQA. As a result, in December 2018, the California Natural Resources Agency certified and adopted updates to the State CEQA Guidelines. The revisions included new requirements related to the implementation of SB 743 and identified VMT per capita, VMT per employee, and net VMT as new metrics for transportation analysis under CEQA (as detailed in Section 15064.3[b]). The County of San Luis Obispo has developed a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Program (Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines; Rincon, October 2020 & VMT Thresholds Study; GHD, March 2021). The program provides interim operating thresholds and includes a screening tool for evaluating VMT impacts.

The County’s Framework for Planning (Coastal) includes the Land Use and Circulation Elements of the County of San Luis Obispo General Plan. The framework establishes goals and strategies to meet pedestrian circulation needs by providing usable and attractive sidewalks, pathways, and trails to establish maximum access and connectivity between land use designations.

The County Department of Public Works maintains updated traffic count data for all County-maintained roadways. In addition, Traffic Circulation Studies have been conducted within several community areas using traffic models to reasonably simulate current traffic flow patterns and forecast future travel demands and traffic flow patterns. These community Traffic Circulation Studies include the South County Circulation Study, Los Osos Circulation Study, Templeton Circulation Study, San Miguel Circulation Study, Avila Circulation Study, and North Coast Circulation Study. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) maintains annual traffic data on state highways and interchanges within the county.

Discussion

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

The County’s LUCE and SLOCOG’s 2023 RTP includes goals, policies, and ordinances to facilitate consistency between transportation and land use planning and encourages the use of alternative methods of transportation to reduce vehicle trips throughout the region. The proposed project includes infill development of a new single-family residence in the RSF land use designation within the Los Osos URL. Based on the limited scale of proposed development and associated population growth, the project is not anticipated to generate a substantial number of additional vehicle trips. Additionally, the project would be subject to road improvement fees for maintenance of nearby county roads and transportation facilities. The project would be consistent with the County’s LUCE and the 2023 RTP; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

The County of San Luis Obispo has developed a VMT Program (Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines; Rincon, October 2020 & VMT Thresholds Study; GHD, March 2021). The VMT Program provides interim operating thresholds and includes a screening tool for evaluating VMT impacts. The

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

project would be limited to the construction of one new single-family residence and would generate less than 110 trips per day, which is the suggested screening threshold identified in the State guidance (Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA; Office of Planning & Research, December 2018). Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

The project site would be accessed via a new unpaved driveway from the existing access easement located off of Covey Lane in the southern portion of the project site. The proposed driveway would be constructed in accordance with County Public Works and CAL FIRE requirements to ensure adequate emergency access to the site. The project does not include components that would facilitate incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) along proposed or nearby roads that could increase hazards. Based on required compliance with County Public Works and CAL FIRE requirements, the project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses and impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

The project includes the construction of a new single-family residence on an existing parcel. Construction activities would not require traffic controls or road closures and emergency access to the project site and surrounding areas would be maintained throughout the construction period. The project site would be accessed via a new unpaved driveway from the existing access easement located off of Covey Lane in the southern portion of the project site. The proposed driveway would be constructed in accordance with County Public Works and CAL FIRE requirements to ensure adequate emergency access to the site. Therefore, impacts related to emergency response and evacuation would be *less than significant*.

Conclusion

The project would not alter existing transportation facilities or result in a substantial number of additional vehicle trips or VMT. The project would not interfere with short- or long-term emergency access or create hazards through road or other project component design. Payment of standard development fees and compliance with existing regulations would ensure potential impacts are reduced to less than significant. Therefore, potential impacts related to transportation would be less than significant and mitigation measures are not necessary.

Mitigation

None necessary.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

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

Setting

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

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

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

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

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

Discussion

- (a) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:*
- (a-i) *Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code section 5020.1(k)?*
- (a-ii) *A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.*

Pursuant to AB 52, the County provided notice to local California native tribes with geographic and/or cultural ties to the project region. Referral letters were sent to tribal representatives on August 4, 2023. No tribes requested consultation or provided information regarding significant tribal cultural resources to date.

According to the County's Land Use View, the project site is located in an Archaeologically Sensitive Area. The project would result in a total of 0.28 acre (12,000 square feet) of ground disturbance on an undeveloped parcel. A records search of the site files from the Regional Archaeological Information Center in Santa Barbara was conducted in order to determine whether any previously recorded cultural resources have been recorded on or near the project area. The records search did not identify any known previously recorded archaeological resources within the project area. A surface survey of the project site was conducted, and no visible surface archaeological resources were found. Based on the results of the Phase I Archaeological Surface Survey Report prepared for the project, there are no known cultural archaeological resources within the project area and the site has low potential for subsurface resources (Heritage Discoveries 2015).

Because there are no known archaeological resources within the project area, implementation of the project would not be anticipated to result in adverse change to known archaeological resources. However, there is still some potential for inadvertent discovery of unknown cultural resources if present within the proposed work area. In the unlikely event that unknown cultural resources are

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

encountered during construction activities, the project would be required to comply with CZULO Section 23.05.140 (Archaeological Resources Discovery), which requires work be stopped, the County be notified, and the discovery evaluated by an archaeologist. Based on required compliance with CZULO Section 23.05.140, the project would not result in an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Conclusion

Based on the low archaeological sensitivity of the project site and required compliance with CZULO Section 23.05.140 and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, the project would not adversely affect tribal cultural resources, and mitigation measures are necessary.

Mitigation

None necessary.

XIX. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

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

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

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

Setting

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

Per the County’s Stormwater Program, the Public Works Department is responsible for ensuring that new construction sites implement best management practices during construction, and that site plans incorporate appropriate post-construction stormwater runoff controls. Construction sites that disturb 1 acre or more must obtain coverage under the SWRCB’s Construction General Permit.

PG&E is the primary electricity provider and both PG&E and Southern California Gas Company provide natural gas services for urban and rural communities within the county of San Luis Obispo.

There are three landfills in San Luis Obispo County: Cold Canyon Landfill, located near the City of San Luis Obispo, Chicago Grade Landfill, located near the community of Templeton, and Paso Robles Landfill, located east of the City of Paso Robles. The project would be served by Mission Country Disposal and Cold Canyon Landfill.

Discussion

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

The project includes the construction of a new on-site septic system and the extension of existing utility infrastructure, including gas, electrical, and water lines within the footprint of the proposed project. As evaluated throughout this IS/MND, implementation of the proposed project has the potential to result in environmental impacts. Mitigation has been included in individual resource sections to ensure potential environmental impacts associated with development of the project are mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 and BIO-1 through BIO-3 have been included to reduce potential environmental impacts associated with the expansion and installation of utility infrastructure to serve the project. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

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

The County estimates the potable water demand for new single-family dwellings in Los Osos to be 150 gallons per day, which would be provided by GSWC. GSWC has provided a will-serve letter for the project. The project site is located within the Los Osos Area Subbasin of the Los Osos Valley Groundwater Basin, which is a low priority subbasin under SGMA (Basin No. 3-08.01). According to the County, the SGMA does not apply to the Los Osos Area subbasin because requirements have been met by the Los Osos Basin Management Committee (County of San Luis Obispo 2023a).

On April 22, 2008, the Board of Supervisors approved two plumbing retrofit ordinances for the Los Osos area. The ordinances address sea water intrusion into the lower aquifer zone of the Los Osos Groundwater Basin. To manage this serious problem, the ordinances require both new and existing development to help address this problem by retrofitting older, non-conserving fixtures with those that are water efficient. These Title 19 retrofit requirements require 2:1 off-set of new water demand for covered development. The required Title 19 offset for a single-family dwelling is 300 gallons per day (2:1 offset). The applicant has agreed to retrofit at a 2:1 ratio. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

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

The project does not include connection to a wastewater treatment provider; therefore, *no impacts* would occur.

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

Solid waste, recycling, and green waste services would be provided by Mission Country Disposal and waste materials would be disposed of at the Cold Canyon Landfill. According to the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), Cold Canyon Landfill has a maximum permitted capacity of 23,900,000 cubic yards and maximum capacity of 1,650 tons of solid waste per day. The estimated closure date of Cold Canyon Landfill is December 2040 (CalRecycle 2020).

During construction, the project would result in a short-term increase in construction-related solid waste. According to the County's Integrated Waste Management Authority (IWMA), construction waste would be subject to California's Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) Sections 4.408 and 5.408, which requires diversion of at least 75 percent of construction waste (IWMA 2022). Based on required compliance with CALGreen regulations, construction of the project would not generate solid waste in excess of local infrastructure capacity.

The project would facilitate the infill development of a new single-family residence. According to the CalRecycle Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates, operation of a new single-family residence would result in a limited increase in long-term solid waste of approximately 12.23 pounds per day (CalRecycle 2019). In addition, the project would be required to comply with County-implemented recycling and organic waste disposal programs during operation, which would reduce the amount of solid waste taken to Cold Canyon Landfill. Cold Canyon Landfill would have adequate available capacity to support the increase of solid waste; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

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

The project would be serviced by Mission Country Disposal and Cold Canyon Landfill, which are fully compliant with existing local and state regulations related to disposal of solid waste. As evaluated above, construction and operation of the project is not expected to generate solid waste in excess of state or county regulations for solid waste. In addition, the project would be required to comply with CALGreen regulations during construction and County-implemented recycling and organic waste disposal programs during operation, which would be consistent with federal, state, and local solid waste reduction goals; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Conclusion

Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 and BIO-1 through BIO-3 would be required to avoid or reduce potential impacts related to installation of expanded utility infrastructure. The project would not result in significant increased demands on water, wastewater, or stormwater infrastructure and facilities. The project would not result in a substantial increase in solid waste generation. Therefore, potential impacts related to utilities and service systems would be less than significant.

Mitigation

Implement Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 and BIO-1 through BIO-3.

XX. WILDFIRE

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</i>				
(a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting

In central California, the fire season usually extends roughly from May through October, however, recent events indicate that wildfire behavior, frequency, and duration of the fire season are changing in California. Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ) are defined by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFIRE) based on the presence of fire-prone vegetation, climate, topography, assets at risk (e.g., high population centers), and a fire protection agency’s ability to provide service to the area (CAL FIRE 2007). FHSZs throughout the County have been designated as “Very High,” “High,” or “Moderate.” In San Luis Obispo County, most of the area that has been designated as a “Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone” is located in the Santa Lucia Mountains, which extend parallel to the coast along the entire length of San Luis Obispo County. The Moderate Hazard designation does not mean the area cannot experience a damaging fire; rather, it indicates that the probability is reduced, generally because the number of days a year that the area has “fire weather” is less than in high or very high fire severity zones. According to the CAL FIRE FHSZ Viewer, the project site is located in a very high FHSZ (CAL FIRE 2023).

County Emergency Operations Plan

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

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

County Safety Element

The County of San Luis Obispo Safety Element establishes goals, policies, and programs to reduce the threat to life, structures, and the environment caused by fire. Policy S-13 identifies that new development should be carefully located, with special attention given to fuel management in higher fire risk areas, and that new development in fire hazard areas should be configured to minimize the potential for added danger.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

Implementation strategies for this policy include identifying high risk areas, the development and implementation of mitigation efforts to reduce the threat of fire, requiring fire resistant material to be used for building construction in fire hazard areas, and encouraging applicants applying for subdivisions in fire hazard areas to cluster development to allow for a wildfire protection zone.

California Fire Code

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

Discussion

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

The project site is located in a very high FHSZ (CAL FIRE 2023). The project would result in the construction of a new single-family residence and associated site improvements. Construction activities would not require traffic controls or road closures and emergency access to the site and surrounding areas would be maintained throughout construction. The project site would be accessed via a new unpaved driveway from the existing access easement located off of Covey Lane in the southern portion of the project site. The proposed driveway would be constructed in accordance with County Public Works and CAL FIRE requirements to ensure adequate emergency access to the site. Based on required compliance with County Public Works and CAL FIRE requirements, impacts related to emergency response and evacuation would be *less than significant*.

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

The project site is located within a very high FHSZ and is currently undeveloped and consists of gently to moderately sloping topography and non-native grasses and shrubs. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the construction of a new single-family residence on the 0.35-acre parcel. The project would be constructed in accordance with CAL FIRE, California Fire Code (CFC), CBC, and Public Resources Code (PRC) requirements to reduce risk associated with fire ignition and exposure of project occupants to wildfire risk and to ensure adequate emergency access to the site. Based required compliance with CAL FIRE, CFC, CBC, and PRC requirements, the project would not significantly exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

(c) *Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?*

The project would result in the construction of a new single-family residence and associated site improvements, including construction of an on-site septic system and extension of utility infrastructure, including a natural gas, water, and electricity line. Proposed utility infrastructure would be constructed below ground, which would reduce the potential for fire ignition at the project site. In addition, proposed development would be required to comply with applicable County, CBC, CFC, and PRC standards and regulations to reduce risk associated with fire ignition at the project site; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

- (d) *Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?*

Based on the County Safety Element Landslide and Liquefaction Hazards Maps, the project site is located in an area with low risk for landslide and liquefaction. In addition, the project site is not located within an area at risk for flooding (FEMA 2023). The project would be required to comply with all applicable CBC and other engineering standards to reduce potential risk associated with development on unstable soils within a very high FHSZ. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Conclusion

The project would not expose people or structures to new or exacerbated wildfire risks and would not require the development of new or expanded infrastructure or maintenance to reduce wildfire risks. Therefore, potential impacts associated with wildfire would be less than significant and mitigation measures are not necessary.

Mitigation

None necessary.

XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion

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

Based on the analysis provided in individual resource sections above, the project has the potential to disturb sensitive biological resources and unknown cultural and/or tribal cultural resources. Mitigation Measures BIO-1 through BIO-3 have been identified and would reduce potential impacts related to sensitive biological resources to less than significant. Additionally, adherence to CZULO Section 23.05.140 and California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 would reduce impacts to unknown cultural and/or tribal cultural resources if present within the project area. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

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

Based on the nature of proposed development and the analysis provided in resource sections above, the project would have the potential to result in environmental impacts associated with air quality and biological resources that could have a cumulative effect with other development projects in the project region. Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 and BIO-1 through BIO-3 have been identified to reduce potential environmental impacts associated with the project to a less-than-significant level. Other past and future development projects requiring a discretionary permit in the project region would also be subject to applicable mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts associated with these impact issue areas. Therefore, based on the implementation of project-level mitigation measures and discretionary review and CEQA review of other projects within the project area, potential impacts would be *less than cumulatively considerable with mitigation*.

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

Based on the nature and scale of proposed development and the analysis provided in individual resource areas sections above, the project has the potential to have environmental effects that could result in substantial adverse effects on human beings. Potential impacts associated with air quality would be reduced to less-than-significant levels with the implementation of Mitigation

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2. Therefore, potential impacts associated with environmental effects that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

Conclusion

Potential impacts would be less than significant upon implementation of mitigation measures identified in the resource sections above.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

Exhibit A - Initial Study References and Agency Contacts

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

Contacted	Agency	Response
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	County Public Works Department	In File**
<input type="checkbox"/>	County Environmental Health Services	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	County Agricultural Commissioner's Office	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	County Airport Manager	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	Airport Land Use Commission	Not Applicable
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Air Pollution Control District	None
<input type="checkbox"/>	County Sheriff's Department	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	Regional Water Quality Control Board	Not Applicable
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CA Coastal Commission	None
<input type="checkbox"/>	CA Department of Fish and Wildlife	Not Applicable
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CA Department of Forestry (Cal Fire)	None
<input type="checkbox"/>	CA Department of Transportation	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	Community Services District	Not Applicable
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other Los Osos Community Advisory Council	In File**
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other Golden State Water Company	None

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

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

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

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

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

California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2022. Maps of State and Federal Area Designations. Available at: <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/resources/documents/maps-state-and-federal-area-designations>. Accessed June 2023.

California Department of Conservation (CDOC). 2015. Fault Activity Map of California. Available at: <https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/>. Accessed June 2023.

———. 2016. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program – California Important Farmland Finder. Available at: <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/fmmp/>. Accessed June 2023.

———. 2023. San Luis Obispo County Tsunami Inundation Maps. Available at: <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps/San-Luis-Obispo>. Accessed June 2023.

California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE). 2023. FHSZ Viewer. Available at: <https://egis.fire.ca.gov/FHSZ/>. Accessed June 2023.

California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle). 2019. Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates. Available at: <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates#:~:text=Residential%20Sector%20Generation%20Rates%20%20%20Waste,%20Cor%20...%20%208%20more%20rows%20>. Accessed June 2023.

———. 2020. SWIS Facility/Site Inspection Details – Cold Canyon Landfill. Available at: <https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SolidWaste/SiteActivity/Details/1509?siteID=3171>. Accessed June 2023.

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2023. EnviroStor. Available at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>. Accessed June 2023.

California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2018. California State Scenic Highway System Map. Available at: <https://caltrans.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=2e921695c43643b1aaf7000dfc19983>. Accessed June 2023.

California Geologic Survey (CGS). 2015. *San Luis Obispo-Santa Barbara Production-Consumption Region*. 2015.

California Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR). 2018. *Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA*. Available at: http://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/20180416-743_Technical_Advisory_4.16.18.pdf. Accessed June 2023.

California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2023. Geotracker. Available at: <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>. Accessed June 2023.

County of San Luis Obispo. 2009. Estero Area Plan. Available at: <https://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Departments/Planning-Building/Forms-Documents/Plans-and-Elements/Area-Plans/Estero-Area-Plan.pdf>. Accessed June 2023.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

- , 2011. EnergyWise Plan. Available at: <https://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Departments/Planning-Building/Energy-and-Climate/Energy-Climate-Reports/EnergyWise-Plan.aspx>. Accessed June 2023.
- , 2020. *Los Osos Community Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*. Available at: [https://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Departments/Planning-Building/Forms-Documents/Plans/Community-Plans/Los-Osos-Community-Plan-Update-Files/Final-Environmental-Impact-Report-\(FEIR\)-for-the-L.aspx](https://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Departments/Planning-Building/Forms-Documents/Plans/Community-Plans/Los-Osos-Community-Plan-Update-Files/Final-Environmental-Impact-Report-(FEIR)-for-the-L.aspx). Accessed June 2023.
- , 2023a. Los Osos Valley Groundwater Basin. Available at: [https://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Departments/Public-Works/Committees-Programs/Sustainable-Groundwater-Management-Act-\(SGMA\)/Los-Osos-Valley-Groundwater-Basin.aspx](https://www.slocounty.ca.gov/Departments/Public-Works/Committees-Programs/Sustainable-Groundwater-Management-Act-(SGMA)/Los-Osos-Valley-Groundwater-Basin.aspx). Accessed June 2023.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2023. Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM), San Luis Obispo County Unincorporated Areas. Map Numbers 06079C1036H. Effective May 16, 2017.
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). 2018. Techniques for Reviewing Noise Analyses and Associated Noise Reports. June 2018. Available at: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/Environment/noise/resources/reviewing_noise_analysis/fhwahep18067.pdf. Accessed June 2023.
- Golden State Water Company (GSWC). *Preliminary Can and Will Serve Letter*. October 11, 2021.
- GHD. 2021. *VMT Thresholds Study*. March.
- Heritage Discoveries, Inc. (Heritage Discoveries). 2015. *Phase I Archaeological Surface Survey at Vista Del Osos, Los Osos, San Luis Obispo County, California*. August 31, 2015.
- Mammen, Kurt. 2015. *Habitat Conservation Plan Morro Shoulderband Snail (Helminthoglypta walkeriana) Mammen Parcel (APN 074-325-067) Los Osos, San Luis Obispo County, California*. July 9, 2015.
- Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2023. Web Soil Survey. Available at: <https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>. Accessed June 2023.
- Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E). 2021. Delivering Low-Emission Energy. Available at: https://www.pge.com/en_US/about-pge/environment/what-we-are-doing/clean-energy-solutions/clean-energy-solutions.page. Accessed June 2023.
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). 2019. *Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coastal Basin*. June Edition. Available at: https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/publications_forms/publications/basin_plan/docs/2019_basin_plan_r3_complete_webaccess.pdf. Accessed June 2023.
- Rincon Consultants. 2020. *San Luis Obispo County Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines*. October 2020.
- San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD). 2001. Clean Air Plan. Available at: <https://storage.googleapis.com/slocleanair-org/images/cms/upload/files/business/pdf/CAP.pdf>. Accessed June 2023.
- , 2012. CEQA Air Quality Handbook. Available at: <https://storage.googleapis.com/slocleanair->
-

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

[org/images/cms/upload/files/CEQA_Handbook_2012_v2%20%28Updated%20Map2019%29_LinkedwithMemo.pdf](#). Accessed June 2023.

———. 2017. CEQA Air Quality Handbook Clarification Memo. Available at: https://storage.googleapis.com/slocleanair-org/images/cms/upload/files/FINAL_Clarification%20Memorandum%2020172.pdf. Accessed June 2023.

———. 2023. SLOAPCD NOA Screening Buffers. Available at: <https://www.google.com/maps/d/viewer?mid=1YAKjBzVkw1bZ4rQ1p6b2OMyvlM&ll=35.04695385317672%2C-120.49463069929739&z=15>. Accessed June 2023.

SEMPRA. 2021. UPDATE: Renewable Natural Gas Produced by Anaergia from Diverted Landfill Waste Now Flowing through SoCalGas System. Available at: <https://www.sempra.com/update-renewable-natural-gas-produced-anaergia-diverted-landfill-waste-now-flowing-through-socalgas>. Accessed June 2023.

SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA). 2015. *Mammen Single-Family Residence Biological Resources Assessment*. June 2015.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2023. Web Soil Survey. Available at: <https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>. Accessed June 2023.

United States Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS). 2017. *Incidental Take Permit TE16901C-0 for the Mammen Single-Family Residence, Los Osos, San Luis Obispo County, California*. January 19, 2017.

———. 2023. National Wetlands Inventory Surface Waters and Wetlands. Available at: <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html>. Accessed June 2023.

United States Geologic Survey (USGS). 2023. Areas of Land Subsidence in California Map. Available at: https://ca.water.usgs.gov/land_subsidence/california-subsidence-areas.html. Accessed June 2023.

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

Exhibit B – Mitigation Summary

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

Air Quality

AQ-1 Diesel Idling Restrictions for Construction Phases. The APCD recognizes the public health risk reductions that can be realized by idle limitations for both on- and off-road equipment. The following idle restricting measures are required for the construction phase of projects. **Upon application for construction and/or encroachment permits**, all required measures shall be shown on applicable grading or construction plans and made applicable during grading and construction activities, as described below.

1. Idling Restrictions Near Sensitive Receptors for Both On- and Off-Road Equipment.
 - a. Staging and queuing areas shall be located at the greatest distance feasible from sensitive receptor locations;
 - b. Diesel idling when equipment is not in use shall not be permitted;
 - c. Use of alternative fueled equipment shall be used whenever possible; and
 - d. Signs that specify the no-idling requirements shall be posted and enforced at the construction site.
2. California Diesel Idling Regulations. On-road diesel vehicles shall comply with 13 CCR 2485. This regulation limits idling from diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles with gross vehicular weight ratings of more than 10,000 pounds and licensed for operation on highways. It applies to California and non-California based vehicles. In general, the regulation specifies that drivers of said vehicles:
 - a. Shall not idle the vehicle's primary diesel engine when vehicle is not in use, except as noted in Subsection (d) of the regulation; and
 - b. Shall not operate a diesel-fueled auxiliary power system (APS) to power a heater, air conditioner, or any ancillary equipment on that vehicle during sleeping or resting in a sleeper berth for greater than 5.0 minutes at any location when within 100 feet of a restricted area, except as noted in Subsection (d) of the regulation.

Signs must be posted in the designated queuing areas and job sites to remind drivers of the no-idling requirement. The specific requirements and exceptions in the regulation can be reviewed at the following website: www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/truck-idling/2485.pdf.

AQ-2 Fugitive Dust. At the time of application for grading and construction permits for initial site improvements and future residential development, the following measures shall be provided on project grading and construction plans and shall be implemented throughout the duration of project grading and construction activities to manage fugitive dust emissions such that they do not exceed the APCD 20% opacity limit (APCD Rule 401) and minimize nuisance (APCD Rule 402) impacts:

1. The amount of the disturbed area shall be reduced where possible;

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

2. Water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site and from exceeding the SLOAPCD's limit of 20% opacity for greater than 3 minutes in any 60-minute period. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed (non-potable) water shall be used whenever possible. When drought conditions exist and water use is a concern, the contractor or builder shall consider use of a dust suppressant that is effective for the specific site conditions to reduce the amount of water used for dust control. Please refer to the following link from the San Joaquin Valley Air District for a list of potential dust suppressants: <http://www.valleyair.org/busind/comply/PM10/Products%20Available%20for%20Controlling%20PM10%20Emissions.htm>;
3. All dirt stockpile areas shall be sprayed daily and covered with tarps or other dust barriers as needed;
4. All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible, and building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding, soil binders, or other dust controls are used;
5. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) or otherwise comply with California Vehicle Code Section 23114;
6. "Track-Out" is defined as sand or soil that adheres to and/or agglomerates on the exterior surfaces of motor vehicles and/or equipment (including tires) that may then fall onto any highway or street as described in California Vehicle Code Section 23113 and California Water Code 13304. To prevent track out, access points shall be designated, and all employees, subcontractors, and others shall be required to use them. A "track-out prevention device" shall be installed and operated where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved streets. The track-out prevention device can be any device or combination of devices that are effective at preventing track out, located at the point of intersection of an unpaved area and a paved road. Rumble strips or steel plate devices need periodic cleaning to be effective. If paved roadways accumulate tracked out soils, the track-out prevention device may need to be modified;
7. All fugitive dust mitigation measures shall be shown on grading and building plans;
8. The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons whose responsibility is to ensure any fugitive dust emissions do not result in a nuisance and to enhance the implementation of the mitigation measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints and reduce visible emissions below the SLOAPCD's limit of 20% opacity for greater than 3 minutes in any 60-minute period. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress (for example, wind-blown dust could be generated on an open dirt lot). The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SLOAPCD Compliance Division prior to the start of any grading, earthwork or demolition (Contact the Compliance Division at 805-781-5912).
9. Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans shall be implemented as soon as possible, following completion of any soil-disturbing activities;

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

10. Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than 1 month after initial grading shall be sown with a fast-germinating, non-invasive grass seed and watered until vegetation is established;
11. All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the SLOAPCD;
12. Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 miles per hour on any unpaved surface at the construction site;
13. Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers shall be used with reclaimed water where feasible. Roads shall be pre-wetted prior to sweeping when feasible; and
14. Additional measures shall be taken as needed to ensure dust from the project site is not impacting areas outside the project boundary.

Biological Resources

- BIO-1** **Morro Shoulderband Snail Habitat Conservation Plan. At the time of building and grading permit issuance,** the Applicant shall demonstrate compliance with all avoidance, minimization, and reporting measures identified in the *Habitat Conservation Plan Morro Shoulderband Snail (Helminthoglypta walkeriana) Mammen Parcel (APN 074-325-067) Los Osos, San Luis Obispo County, California* (HCP) prepared for the property.
- BIO-2** **Northern Legless Lizard and Coast Horned Lizard Impact Avoidance. No more than three (3) days prior to initiation of ground disturbing activities,** a County-approved biologist shall conduct surveys for silvery legless lizards and other reptiles. The biologist shall utilize hand search or cover board methods in areas of disturbance where legless lizards are expected to be found (e.g., under shrubs, other vegetation, or debris). If cover board methods are used, they shall commence at least 30 days prior to the start of construction. Hand search surveys shall be completed immediately prior to and during grading activities. During grading activities, the biologist shall walk behind the grading equipment to capture silvery legless lizards that are unearthed by the equipment. The biologist shall capture and relocate any legless lizards or other reptiles observed during the survey effort. The captured individuals shall be relocated from the construction area and placed in suitable habitat on the parcel but at least 50 feet outside of the work area. Following the survey and monitoring efforts, the biologist shall submit to the County a project completion report that documents the number of silvery legless lizards captured and relocated, and the number of legless lizards taken during grading activities.
- BIO-3** **Nesting Bird Impact Avoidance and Protection.** To the maximum extent possible, site preparation, ground disturbing, and construction activities shall be conducted outside of the migratory bird breeding season (February 1 to August 15). If such activities are required during this period, the applicant shall retain a County-approved biologist to conduct a nesting bird survey and verify that migratory birds are not occupying the site **within 14 days prior to vegetation removal or construction.** If nesting activity is detected, the following measures shall be implemented:

Initial Study – Environmental Checklist

- a. If feasible, vegetation removal activities should be scheduled to occur outside the February 1 to September 15 nesting. No surveys for nesting birds shall be required for project activities occurring between September 16 and January 31.
- b. For project-related activities that occur during the nesting season (February 1 to September 15) a nesting bird survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist at least 14 days prior to vegetation removal for each phase of the project. The surveys shall be conducted within all accessible areas within 500 feet of the work area.
- c. The project shall be modified or delayed as necessary to avoid direct take of identified nests, eggs, and/or young protected under the MBTA;
- d. If nests are located during any survey, all project-related activities shall be avoided within the following buffer zones: 50 feet for non-raptor species and 500 feet for all active raptor nests. The County-approved biologist shall contact the USFWS and CDFW to determine an appropriate biological buffer zone around active nest sites. Construction activities within the established buffer zone will be prohibited until the young have fledged the nest and achieved independence; and,
- e. The County-approved biologist shall document all active nests and submit a letter report to the County, USFWS, and CDFW, documenting project compliance with the MBTA and applicable project mitigation measures.