



**COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO
INITIAL STUDY SUMMARY - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
(ver 2.1)**

Project Title & No. Fox Parcel Map; SUB 2005-00079/CO 04-0247; ED 05-289

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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

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

Stephanie Fuhs		
Prepared by (Print)	Signature	Date
	Ellen Carroll, Environmental Coordinator	
Reviewed by (Print)	Signature (for)	Date

Project Environmental Analysis

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

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

A. PROJECT

DESCRIPTION: Request by Dave and Carla Fox for a parcel map using the Transfer of Development Credits program to subdivide an approximately 11 acre parcel into two parcels of 5.8 and 5.1 acres each for the sale and/or development of each proposed parcel. The project is within the Residential Rural land use category and is located on the north side of Quiet Oaks Drive, approximately .25 miles south of the Pomeroy/Los Berros Road intersection, approximately three miles north of the community of Nipomo, in the South County (Inland) planning area.

ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER(S): 091-011-057

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT # 4

B. EXISTING SETTING

PLANNING AREA: South County (Inland), Rural

LAND USE CATEGORY: Residential Rural

COMBINING DESIGNATION(S): None

EXISTING USES: Residence

TOPOGRAPHY: Gently sloping to moderately sloping

VEGETATION: Grasses , coastal scrub , oak woodland

PARCEL SIZE: approximately 11 acres

SURROUNDING LAND USE CATEGORIES AND USES:

<i>North:</i> Residential Rural; residential	<i>East:</i> Residential Rural; residential
<i>South:</i> Residential Rural; residential	<i>West:</i> Residential Rural; residential

C. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

During the Initial Study process, several issues were identified as having potentially significant environmental effects (see following Initial Study). Those potentially significant items associated with the proposed uses can be minimized to less than significant levels.

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

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

Setting. The project is located in an area characterized by large residential rural parcels supporting residential and accessory uses. The project will not be visible from any major public roadway or silhouetting against any ridgelines as viewed from public roadways. The project is considered compatible with the surrounding uses.

Impact. No significant visual impacts are expected to occur.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No mitigation measures are necessary.

2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES - <i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Convert prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Impair agricultural use of other property or result in conversion to other uses?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Conflict with existing zoning or Williamson Act program?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

2. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES
- Will the project:

Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

d) *Other:* _____

Setting. The soil types are as follows:

Oceano sand, (9 - 30 % slope) . This gently to steeply sloping soil is considered well drained. The soil has low erodibility and low shrink-swell characteristics, as well as having potential septic system constraints due to: poor filtering capabilities, steep slopes. The soil is considered Class VI without irrigation and is not rated when irrigated.

Xerorthents, Escarpment. This moderately steep to steep sloping soil has unrated drainage characteristics. The soil has unrated erodibility and unrated shrink-swell characteristics, as well as having unrated septic system constraints. The soil is considered Class VII without irrigation and is not rated when irrigated.

Impact. The project is located in a predominantly non-agricultural area with no agricultural activities occurring on the property or immediate vicinity. No significant impacts to agricultural resources are anticipated.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No mitigation measures are necessary.

3. AIR QUALITY - Will the project:

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

a) *Violate any state or federal ambient air quality standard, or exceed air quality emission thresholds as established by County Air Pollution Control District?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

b) *Expose any sensitive receptor to substantial air pollutant concentrations?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

c) *Create or subject individuals to objectionable odors?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

d) *Be inconsistent with the District's Clean Air Plan?*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

e) *Other:* _____

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Setting. The Air Pollution Control District (APCD) has developed the 2003 CEQA Air Quality Handbook to evaluate project specific impacts and help determine if air quality mitigation measures are needed, or if potentially significant impacts could result. To evaluate long-term emissions, cumulative effects, and establish countywide programs to reach acceptable air quality levels, a Clean Air Plan has been adopted (prepared by APCD). No comments were received from the APCD for this project, but in general, it is determined that subdivisions proposed outside of an urban reserve line with proposed parcel sizes less than 20 acres are inconsistent with the Clean Air Plan.

Impact. As proposed, the project will not result in additional site disturbance because there are currently two residences on the property, one on each proposed parcel. Future site disturbance would result if subsequent secondary residences or accessory buildings are constructed. This potential future development will result in the creation of construction dust, as well as short- and long-term vehicle emissions. Based on Table 1-1 of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the project will result in less than 10 lbs./day of pollutants, which is below thresholds warranting any mitigation.

In 1994, the South County Area Plan was adopted and associated EIR certified. As a part of that analysis, a cumulative assessment of the buildout impacts of the planning area was completed, which included the ultimate breakdown of the subject property as is currently proposed. While cumulative impacts to air quality was identified in the EIR as potentially significant and unavoidable, the findings recognized that the existing cumulative air quality mitigation program, combined with a slight improvement over the previous Area Plan buildout would offset some of these impacts. The project is consistent with the general level of development anticipated and projected in the Clean Air Plan.

Mitigation/Conclusion. Each new residence(s) will be subject to the South County Air Quality Mitigation fee, which is intended to partially mitigate the cumulative effects of new residential development within the South County planning area. This program funds several strategies within the South County to improve air quality and reduce single-occupant vehicles, by: attracting transit ridership through regional bus stop improvements; encouraging carpooling through park-and-ride lot improvements and ridesharing advertising; promoting the use of bicycles through bike lane installation; reducing dust through limited road paving of several unpaved roads; and by providing electronic information/services locally to reduce vehicle trip lengths.

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

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

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

Plants- Dune larkspur (*Delphinium parryi* ssp. *blochmaniae*) List 1B
 Pismo clarkia (*Clarkia speciosa* ssp. *immaculate*) FE, SR, List 1B app. 0.6 miles southwest of the property
 Sand Mesa manzanita (*Arctostaphylos rudis*) List 1B app. 0.3 miles southeast, and 0.8 miles southwest of the property

Habitat- Vernal Pools

The proposed project is within the Santa Barbara vernal pool region, which is a generalized regional area with vernal pools known to exist within its boundaries. A vernal pool habitat will consist of seasonal wetland (i.e., an area with ponding water during the wet season and then drying up during the summer months). This habitat sometimes support sensitive aquatic plant and wildlife species, such as the federally-threatened vernal pool fairy shrimp, the spadefoot toad, the California Tiger salamander, and several sensitive aquatic plant species. During a field inspection on November 29, 2006, the project area's topography was inspected for the potential to support vernal pools (e.g., low-lying areas, natural or man-made ponding areas, etc.). No such topography was identified.

KEY: FE-Federally Endangered; PFE-Proposed Listing-Federally Endangered; FT-Federally Threatened; PFT-Proposed listing-Federally Threatened; FC-Federal Candidate; FSC-Federal Species of Concern (no longer used); FD - Federally delisted SE-State Endangered; SCE-State Endangered Candidate for listing; ST-State Threatened; SCT-State Threatened Candidate for listing; SR-State Rare; CSC- CA Special Concern Species; FP-CDFG Fully Protected; List 1A-CNPS Presumed extinct in CA; List 1B-CNPS Rare or Endangered in CA & elsewhere; List 2-CNPS Rare or Endangered in CA, but common elsewhere; List 3-CNPS Plants needing more info (Review List); List 4-CNPS Plants of limited distribution (Watch List).

Impact. Disturbed annual grassland, coast live oak woodland, coastal scrub, riparian woodland and blue gum windrow occurs on the project site. A comprehensive floristic botanical survey was conducted for the proposed project (David J. Keil, Ph.D., July, 2005). The botanical survey found evidence of three special status plants on the project site: sand mesa manzanita (*Arctostaphylos rudis*), California spineflower (*Mucronea californica*), and black flowered figwort (*Scrophularia atrata*). The site currently has one residence on each parcel. Future development could include secondary dwellings as well as residential accessory structures (barns, workshop/garages).

Mitigation/Conclusion. In order to avoid disturbance of sand mesa manzanita and black flowered figwort, the applicant has agreed to provide construction control lines that would not allow development or disturbance for the areas identified to contain these plants. Construction control lines are shown in the attached exhibit to the Negative Declaration and will become conditions of approval for the project. Due to the fact that the area containing California Spinflower is within the annual grassland area and was not well defined, any future development within the grassland area will require submittal of a supplemental spring botanical report to ensure the area proposed for development will not disturb this plant. Implementation of the construction control lines and a subsequent botanical report at the time of potential future development will reduce impacts to a level of insignificance.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES -
Will the project:

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Disturb pre-historic resources?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Disturb historic resources?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Disturb paleontological resources?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES -
Will the project:

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

d) *Other:* _____

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

Impact. A Phase I surface survey was conducted (Thor Conway, Heritage Discoveries, Inc., April 2005). No evidence of cultural materials was noted on the property. Impacts to historical or paleontological resources are not expected.

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

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -
Will the project:

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

- a) *Result in exposure to or production of unstable earth conditions, such as landslides, earthquakes, liquefaction, ground failure, land subsidence or other similar hazards?*
- b) *Be within a California Geological Survey "Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone"?*
- c) *Result in soil erosion, topographic changes, loss of topsoil or unstable soil conditions from project-related improvements, such as vegetation removal, grading, excavation, or fill?*
- d) *Change rates of soil absorption, or amount or direction of surface runoff?*
- e) *Include structures located on expansive soils?*
- f) *Change the drainage patterns where substantial on- or off-site sedimentation/ erosion or flooding may occur?*
- g) *Involve activities within the 100-year flood zone?*

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS - <i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
h) <i>Be inconsistent with the goals and policies of the County's Safety Element relating to Geologic and Seismic Hazards?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) <i>Preclude the future extraction of valuable mineral resources?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting. GEOLOGY - The topography of the project is gently sloping to moderately sloping. The area proposed for development is outside of the Geologic Study Area designation. The landslide risk potential is considered low. The liquefaction potential during a ground-shaking event is considered moderate to high. No active faulting is known to exist on or near the subject property. The project is not within a known area containing serpentine or ultramafic rock or soils.

DRAINAGE – The area proposed for development is outside the 100-year Flood Hazard designation. The closest creek (Los Berros Creek) from the proposed development is approximately 0.2 miles to the north. As described in the Natural Resource Conservation Service Soil Survey, the soil is considered well drained.

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

Impact. As proposed, the project will not result in additional site disturbance because both of the proposed parcels currently have residences on them. Future development of secondary dwellings and/or accessory structures will result in additional disturbance. This disturbance would not result in significant drainage or sedimentation or erosion issues.

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

7. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - <i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Result in a risk of explosion or release of hazardous substances (e.g. oil, pesticides, chemicals, radiation) or exposure of people to hazardous substances?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Expose people to safety risk associated with airport flight pattern?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

7. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - <i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
d) <i>Increase fire hazard risk or expose people or structures to high fire hazard conditions?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Create any other health hazard or potential hazard?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) <i>Other: _____</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

Impact. The project does not propose the use of hazardous materials. The project does not present a significant fire safety risk. The project is not expected to conflict with any regional evacuation plan.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Setting. In its efforts to provide for affordable housing, the county currently administers the Home Investment Partnerships (HOME) Program and the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, which provides limited financing to projects relating to affordable housing throughout the county. Title 18 of the County Code (Public Facilities Fees) requires that an affordable housing mitigation fee be imposed as a condition of approval of any new residential development project.

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

Mitigation/Conclusion. No significant population and housing impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are necessary. Prior to map recordation, the applicant will pay an affordable housing mitigation fee of 3.5 percent of the adopted Public Facility Fee. This fee will not apply to any county-recognized affordable housing included within the project.

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

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

Setting. The project area is served by the County Sheriff's Department and CDF/County Fire as the primary emergency responders. The closest CDF fire station (Nipomo Station 20) is approximately 4.58 miles to the nsoutheast. The closest Sheriff substation is in Oceano, which is approximately 5.78 miles northwest the proposed project. The project is located in the Lucia Mar Unified School District.

Impact. No significant project-specific impacts to utilities or public services were identified. This project, along with others in the area, will have a cumulative effect on police and fire protection, and schools. The project's direct and cumulative impacts are within the general assumptions of allowed use for the subject property that was used to estimate the fees in place. In addition, the site is within South County Road Impact fee area 2 which requires future development to pay its share of cumulative impacts to area roads.

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

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

Setting. The County Trails Plan does not show that a potential trail goes through the proposed project. The project is not proposed in a location that will affect any trail, park or other recreational resource. Prior to map recordation, county ordinance requires the payment of a fee (Quimby) for the improvement or development of neighborhood or community parks.

Impact. The proposed project will not create a project specific significant need for additional park or recreational resources. However, this project, along with others in the area, will have a cumulative demand on parks and recreational resources.

Mitigation/Conclusion. The "Quimby" fee will adequately mitigate the project's impact on recreational facilities. No significant recreation impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

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

Setting. Future development will access onto Quiet Oaks Drive, a local road, and Pomeroy Road, an arterial road. The identified roadways are operating at acceptable levels of service. Referrals were sent to the Public Works Department. No significant traffic-related concerns were identified.

Impact. The proposed project is estimated to generate about 19 trips per day, based on the Institute of Traffic Engineer's manual of 9.57 trips/unit. This small amount of additional traffic will not result in a project specific significant change to the existing road service or traffic safety levels, but will contribute to a cumulative areawide impact to roadways.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No project specific significant traffic impacts were identified, but the project is located within the South County Circulation Study Area and will be subject to its fair share of circulation fees consistent with that study. The fees are used for areawide improvements to impacted roadways and intersections.

13. WASTEWATER - <i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
---	-------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------	----------------

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

Setting. As described in the NRCS Soil Survey (see Agriculture section for soil types and descriptions), the main limitations for on-site wastewater systems relates to: poor filtering characteristics, steep slopes. These limitations are summarized as follows:

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

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

Impact. The project proposes to use an on-site system as its means to dispose of wastewater. Based on the proposed project, adequate area is available for an on-site system and both existing residences are being served by on-site systems.

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

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

14. WATER - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
c) <i>Change the quality of groundwater (e.g., saltwater intrusion, nitrogen-loading, etc.)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Change the quantity or movement of available surface or ground water?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Adversely affect community water service provider?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting. The project proposes to use a community system (Los Berros Water Co.) as its water source. The Environmental Health Division has reviewed the project for water availability and has determined that there is preliminary evidence that there will be sufficient water available to serve the proposed project. Based on available information, there is some concern regarding the long-term availability of water resources to serve existing and future development on the Nipomo Mesa.

The topography of the project is gently sloping to moderately sloping. The closest creek (Los Berros Creek) from the proposed development is approximately 0.2 miles away. As described in the NRCS Soil Survey, the soil surface is considered to have low erodibility.

Impact. On water use, based on the project description, as shown below, a reasonable “worst case” indoor water usage would likely be about 2.36 acre feet/year (AFY)

$$2 \text{ residential lots (w/primary (0.85 afy) \& secondary (0.33 afy) X 2 lots) = 2.36 afy}$$

Source: “City of Santa Barbara Water Demand Factor & Conservation Study “User Guide” (Aug., 1989) [SBWaterUsage.pdf](#)

Regarding surface water quality, as proposed, the project will not result in additional site disturbance unless secondary dwellings or accessory structures are developed in the future. The project is not within close proximity to surface water sources.

Mitigation/Conclusion. Due to continued uncertainty regarding water availability within the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin, water conservation measures for future residential development and landscaping are proposed. Standard drainage and erosion control measures will be required for the proposed project and will provide sufficient measures to adequately protect surface water quality.

15. LAND USE - Will the project:	Inconsistent	Potentially Inconsistent	Consistent	Not Applicable
a) <i>Be potentially inconsistent with land use, policy/regulation (e.g., general plan [county land use element and ordinance], local coastal plan, specific plan, Clean Air Plan, etc.) adopted to avoid or mitigate for environmental effects?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

15. LAND USE - <i>Will the project:</i>	Inconsistent	Potentially Inconsistent	Consistent	Not Applicable
b) <i>Be potentially inconsistent with any habitat or community conservation plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Be potentially inconsistent with adopted agency environmental plans or policies with jurisdiction over the project?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Be potentially incompatible with surrounding land uses?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Setting/Impact. Surrounding uses are identified on Page 2 of the Initial Study. The proposed project was reviewed for consistency with policy and/or regulatory documents relating to the environment and appropriate land use (e.g., County Land Use Ordinance, Local Coastal Plan, etc.). Referrals were sent to outside agencies to review for policy consistencies (e.g., CDF for Fire Code, APCD for Clean Air Plan, etc.). No referral response was received from the APCD, however, generally subdivisions outside urban reserve lines less than 20 acres have been found to be inconsistent with the Clean Air Plan. Please see the discussion under the "Air Quality" section of this document for further clarification.

The project proposes to use the County Transfer of Development Credits program to allow this subdivision. This program allows higher densities than otherwise would be allowed in certain areas of the County. Without use of this program, the subject property would not be subdivided as proposed under the current Land Use Ordinance provisions.

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

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

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

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

c) **Have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

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

Exhibit A - Initial Study References and Agency Contacts

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

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

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

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project File for the Subject Application | <input type="checkbox"/> Area Plan and Update EIR |
| <u>County documents</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> Circulation Study |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Airport Land Use Plans | <u>Other documents</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual Resource Summary Report | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Archaeological Resources Map |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Building and Construction Ordinance | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Area of Critical Concerns Map |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Policies | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Areas of Special Biological Importance Map |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Framework for Planning (Coastal & Inland) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Natural Species Diversity Database |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan (Inland & Coastal), including all maps & elements; more pertinent elements considered include: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clean Air Plan |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Agriculture & Open Space Element | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fire Hazard Severity Map |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Energy Element | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Flood Hazard Maps |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environment Plan (Conservation, Historic and Esthetic Elements) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for SLO County |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Housing Element | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regional Transportation Plan |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise Element | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Uniform Fire Code |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parks & Recreation Element | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Quality Control Plan (Central Coast Basin – Region 3) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safety Element | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GIS mapping layers (e.g., habitat, streams, contours, etc.) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use Ordinance | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Real Property Division Ordinance | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trails Plan | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Solid Waste Management Plan | |

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

Phase I Archaeological Surface Survey, Thor Conway (Heritage Discoveries), April 2005

Botanical Survey, David J. Keil, Ph.D., July 25, 2005

Exhibit B - Mitigation Summary Table

Biological Resources

1. **At the time of application for construction permits for Parcel 2**, the applicant shall clearly delineate the building control line on the project plans, as shown on the attached exhibit "C". All new development (e.g. residences, detached garages, guest houses, sheds , access roads and driveways) shall be located outside the building control line.
2. **Prior to issuance of construction permits within the area of grassland on parcels 1 and 2**, the applicant shall submit a spring botanical survey that evaluates the site for presence of California Spineflower on the site.
 - a. If spineflower is found within the area proposed for development, the proposed structure shall be moved to an area where the plant does not exist.
 - b. If the proposed structure cannot be located outside the area containing California Spineflower, the development shall be adjusted to minimize the short and long term effects on the identified population. In no case shall greater than 20 % of the population on the site be disturbed by short or long term activities related to the development. If any of the population is disturbed as a result of development, a mitigation plan shall be prepared by a qualified botanist for the review and approval of the Environmental Coordinator. The mitigation plan shall provide for seed collection and dispersment or other propagation method to assure revegetation of the plant population. The mitigation plan shall include details on methodology, performance and success criteria, monitoring and remedial measures.

Water

3. **Prior to final inspection or occupancy (whichever occurs first)**, the following measures shall be applied to the proposed turf areas:
 - a. To maximize drought-tolerance and minimize water usage, warm season grasses, such as bermuda or buffalograss, shall be used;
 - b. To minimize establishment of shallow roots, the following shall be avoided on turf areas, and provided in all applicable documents (e.g., educational brochure, CC&Rs, landscape plans): close mowing, overwatering, excessive fertilization, soil compaction and accumulation of thatch;
 - c. Watering times shall be programmed for longer and less frequently rather than for short periods and more frequently.
4. All water fixtures installed (including showers, faucets, etc.) that are not specified in the Uniform Plumbing Code shall be of an ultra low flow design, where applicable. Water using appliances (e.g., dishwashers, clothes washers, etc.) shall be of high water efficiency design. These shall be shown on all applicable plans **prior to permit issuance**.

