



Negative Declaration & Notice Of Determination

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

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION NO. ED18-167

DATE: May 17, 2019

PROJECT/ENTITLEMENT: PMT2013-00095 Stoller As-Built Major Grading Permit

APPLICANT NAME: Craig Stoller

Email: Francisco@kirk-consulting.net

ADDRESS: PO Box 391, Paso Robles, CA, 93447

CONTACT PERSON: Francisco Vargas / Kirk Consulting

Telephone: 805-461-5765

PROPOSED USES/INTENT: Request by Craig Stoller for a major grading permit for an existing high-density polyethylene (HDPE) lined agricultural reservoir on a 112-acre parcel within the existing 90-acre RBZ Vineyard to provide frost protection and irrigation. The 3.95 acre-foot agricultural reservoir was constructed in 2013 from approximately 7,361 cubic yards of earthen material within approximately a 0.90 acre (39,205 square feet) area. The maximum depth of the reservoir is approximately 15 feet and is currently supplied by an existing irrigation well located near the reservoir on the subject property. No additional site disturbance is being proposed.

LOCATION: The existing (As-Built) reservoir is within the Agriculture land use category located northwest of the intersection of Almond Drive and South El Pomar Road in Templeton, CA. The site is in the El Pomar-Estrella Sub Area of the North County planning area.

LEAD AGENCY: County of San Luis Obispo Dept of Planning & Building
976 Osos Street, Rm. 200
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040
Online: <http://www.slocounty.ca.gov/EnvDocs.aspx>

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE REVIEW: YES NO

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

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

Notice of Determination State Clearinghouse No. _____

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

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

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

Holly Phipps (hphipps@co.slo.ca.us)

County of San Luis Obispo

Signature	Project Manager Name	Date	Public Agency



Initial Study Summary – Environmental Checklist

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

(ver 5.10) [Using Form](#)

Project Title & No. Craig Stoller Major Grading Permit PMT2013-00095 / ED18-167

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 type="checkbox"/> Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/> Agricultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation
<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Wastewater
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing	<input type="checkbox"/> Water /Hydrology
<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input 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.

Prepared by (Print) _____ Signature _____ Date _____

Reviewed by (Print) _____ Signature _____ Date _____

Project Environmental Analysis

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

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

A. PROJECT

DESCRIPTION: Request by Craig Stoller for a major grading permit for an existing high-density polyethylene (HDPE) lined agricultural reservoir on a 112-acre parcel within the existing 90-acre RBZ Vineyard to provide frost protection and irrigation. The 3.95 acre-foot agricultural reservoir was constructed in 2013 from approximately 7,361 cubic yards of earthen material within approximately a 0.90 acre (39,205 square feet) area. The maximum depth of the reservoir is approximately 15 feet and is currently supplied by an existing irrigation well located near the reservoir on the subject property. No additional site disturbance is being proposed and active code enforcement actions are currently being pursued by the County of San Luis Obispo (County) for previously unpermitted activities.

Because construction of the reservoir occurred in 2013 and County code enforcement actions are currently underway to address the unpermitted construction of the reservoir, this CEQA determination (i.e., Negative Declaration) is required to be prepared evaluating the proposed action (i.e., no further physical disturbance or other operational actions) against existing current conditions on the project site (i.e., the conditions in 2019). Conditions at this time, for the purposes of this CEQA determination, are therefore considered the CEQA "baseline conditions". The question of how to characterize the baseline where the existing conditions (either on-site physical conditions or operations) are the result of previous illegal activity, including activity inconsistent with existing permits was addressed in *Fat v. County of Sacramento* (2002), 97 Cal.App.4th 1270, where the court (citing *Riverwatch v. County of San Diego* (1999) 76 Cal.App.4th 1428) noted that the preparation of a CEQA document is not a forum for determining the nature and consequences of the prior conduct of a project applicant and upheld the County's selection of the NOP issuance date as the baseline date for the IS/MND, despite the fact that the Conditional Use Permit for the airport in question had expired many years earlier. Lead agencies such as the County of San Luis Obispo must evaluate impacts against actual conditions existing at the time of CEQA review and are not required to "turn back the clock" and evaluate impacts compared to a baseline condition that predates the illegal activity.

The existing reservoir is within the Agriculture land use category located northwest of the intersection of Almond Drive and South El Pomar Road in Templeton, CA. The site is in the El Pomar-Estrella Sub Area of the North County planning area. Access to the site is provided by existing farm roads and no new driveways or roads would be constructed. The reservoir is located in the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin and evaporative water loss offset requirements have been previously obtained through the removal of existing vineyards.

ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER(S): 033-291-034

Latitude: 35° 32' 26.7" N Longitude: 120° 36' 49.04" W

SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT # 5

B. EXISTING SETTING

PLAN AREA: North County

SUB: El Pomar/Estrella

COMM: Rural

LAND USE CATEGORY: Agriculture

COMB. DESIGNATION:

PARCEL SIZE: 112 acres

TOPOGRAPHY: Nearly level

VEGETATION: Vineyards

EXISTING USES: Agricultural uses

SURROUNDING LAND USE CATEGORIES AND USES:

<i>North:</i> Agriculture; vineyards	<i>East:</i> Agriculture; vineyards
<i>South:</i> Agriculture; vineyards	<i>West:</i> Agriculture; vineyards

C. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

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



COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

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

Aesthetics

Setting. The existing reservoir is located in rural Templeton within a predominantly agricultural area surrounded by existing vineyards. The visual setting along Almond Drive and East Pomar Road is predominately characterized as agriculture with mostly open pastoral views of vineyards, orchards, and scattered rural residence. The low-profile reservoir is characteristic of similar agricultural and vineyard operations in the area and is not easily visible from the adjacent road or nearby residences. The existing reservoir is not within the County’s visually sensitive combining designation and there are no scenic highways or roads in the vicinity that have been designated or considered eligible by the County or the California Department of Transportation’s (Caltrans) California Scenic Highway Mapping System.

Impact. The existing agricultural reservoir is setback from the adjacent roadways and nearby residences and is surrounded by existing vineyards. No additional activities are being proposed that would create an aesthetically incompatible site open to public view or introduce a new use within a scenic view open to the public. The existing reservoir is compatible with adjacent uses and the surrounding visual character. The site does not include unique geological or physical features and no new lighting is proposed. Therefore, no impacts to visual resources would occur.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No impacts related to aesthetics or visual resources would occur and no mitigation is required.



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, per NRCS soil classification, to non-agricultural use?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Impair agricultural use of other property or result in conversion to other uses?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or Williamson Act program?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Agricultural Resources

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

Land Use Category: Agriculture
State Classification: Unique Farmland

Historic/Existing Commercial Crops: Vineyards
In Agricultural Preserve? No
Under Williamson Act contract? Yes

Based on the California Department of Conservation, the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP), and San Luis Obispo County Important Farmland Map (FMMP 2016), the project site contains Unique Farmland. The soil type(s) and characteristics on the subject property include:

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

152-Linne-Calodo complex (9 to 30% slopes). This complex consists of moderately steep soils on hills. Elevation is 600 to 1,500 feet with a mean annual precipitation of 12 to 20 inches. This complex is about 30 percent Linne shaly clay loam and 25 percent Calodo clay loam. This soil is well drained with moderately low erosion and very high runoff. The soil is considered Class 4e with and without irrigation. Per NRCS classifications, this soil is not prime farmland.

Impact. The reservoir is located on land designated as “not prime farmland” per NRCS soil classifications and is considered an agricultural use that supports the production of existing vineyards. No new activities are proposed that would result in the conversion of agricultural or prime farmland to non-agricultural uses, or conflict with the existing Williamson Act contract that the property is currently enrolled in. Additionally, no new activities associated with the operation of the reservoir are proposed that would adversely affect the existing vineyards onsite or proximate agricultural uses.

A hydrogeologic analysis determined that the annual net evaporative loss of the reservoir is approximately 1.55 acre-feet, and nearby off-site wells are only temporarily affected during the initial filling of the reservoir. The project applicant has previously obtained a 1:1 net evaporative water loss offset through the County by removing existing vineyards. An expansion in reservoir capacity or an increase in water consumption is not proposed, and no additional water offsets would be required.



Mitigation/Conclusion. The reservoir is considered a beneficial effect on agricultural resources and does not substantially deplete groundwater supplies in proximate wells to an extent that would adversely affect adjacent uses. No new activities are proposed that would increase the reservoir’s capacity or water consumption that would warrant additional water offset requirements. Therefore, no impacts to agricultural resources would occur and no mitigation is required.

3. AIR QUALITY

Will the project:

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Violate any state or federal ambient air quality standard, or exceed air quality emission thresholds as established by County Air Pollution Control District?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Expose any sensitive receptor to substantial air pollutant concentrations?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Create or subject individuals to objectionable odors?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Be inconsistent with the District’s Clean Air Plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant either considered in non-attainment under applicable state or federal ambient air quality standards that are due to increased energy use or traffic generation, or intensified land use change?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
GREENHOUSE GASES				
f) <i>Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) <i>Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Air Quality

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Impact. Table 2-2 of the APCD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook outlines thresholds for construction-related emissions which include Reactive Organic Gas (ROG), Nitrogen oxide (NO_x) and fugitive particulate matter (PM₁₀). There are no new ground disturbing activities being proposed that would result in the generation of construction-related emissions; therefore, the APCD's emissions thresholds would not be exceeded and no construction-related air quality impacts would occur. Operationally, the existing reservoir requires minimal routine maintenance and there are no new activities being proposed



that would increase existing operational emissions. Therefore, operational emissions would not exceed the APCD's thresholds and no impacts to air quality would occur.

The existing reservoir would not require the use of additional energy other than what is currently being used and would not result in the unnecessary consumption of energy resources or conflict with a renewable or energy efficiency plan. Therefore, no impacts related to energy sources would occur and no mitigation is required.

Using the GHG threshold information described in the Setting discussion, there are no new activities being proposed that would exceed the Bright-Line Threshold of 1,150 metric tons of GHG emissions due. Therefore, no direct or cumulative GHG emissions would occur. Section 15064(h)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines provide guidance on how to evaluate cumulative impacts. If it is shown that an incremental contribution to a cumulative impact, such as global climate change, is not "cumulatively considerable," no mitigation is required. Because no new emissions are being generated, no mitigation is required.

Mitigation/Conclusion. There are no new activities associated with the reservoir that would result in construction or operation-related emissions; therefore, no impacts to Air Quality and GHG emissions would occur and no mitigation is required.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Result in a loss of unique or special status species* or their habitats?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Reduce the extent, diversity or quality of native or other important vegetation?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Impact wetland or riparian habitat?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Interfere with the movement of resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or factors, which could hinder the normal activities of wildlife?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Conflict with any regional plans or policies to protect sensitive species, or regulations of the California Department of Fish & Wildlife or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service?</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>

* Species – as defined in Section 15380 of the CEQA Guidelines, which includes all plant and wildlife species that fall under the category of rare, threatened or endangered, as described in this section.

Biological Resources

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

On-site Vegetation: Barren soils, ruderal vegetation

Name and distance from blue line creek(s): Unnamed intermittent stream located approximately 0.25 mile north.

Habitat(s): Disturbed

The existing reservoir is located within a 90-acre vineyard that has historically been cultivated since the 1990s and more recently used as an agricultural staging area prior to the installation of the reservoir. The site is generally flat, with gently sloping vineyards abutting the outer earthen berm. Other than agriculture, dominant habitat types within a 10-mile radius of the project site primarily consist of annual grassland interspersed with coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*) and blue oak (*Quercus douglasii*). The reservoir is not located within San Joaquin kit fox habitat area.

Impact. The existing 3.95 acre-foot reservoir is lined with high-density polyethylene (HDPE), and when full, has a maximum depth of 15 feet with approximately 3 feet of freeboard. The reservoir is encompassed by an earthen berm that varies in width from 18 to 30 feet and also serves as the reservoir’s access road. No new physical disturbance is being proposed, and other than the initial filling of the reservoir and routine maintenance, operational impacts are minimal and consistent with other agricultural activities on the property. There are no unique habitats or special-status species that surround the reservoir nor is the reservoir located within a migratory corridor or in a San Joaquin kit fox habitat mitigation area. There are no other aquatic features onsite aside from the reservoir itself. No new activities are being proposed that would potentially conflict with existing regional plans and policies for sensitive species. Therefore, no impacts to biological resources would occur.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No new physical disturbance or activities are being proposed aside from minimal routine operational maintenance. Therefore, no impacts to biological resources would occur and no mitigation is required

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

<i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Disturb archaeological resources?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Disturb historical resources?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Disturb paleontological resources?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Cause a substantial adverse change to a Tribal Cultural Resource?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Cultural Resources

Setting. The reservoir is located in an area historically occupied by the Obispeno Chumash and Salinan. These Native Americans established a sophisticated system of horticulture, using seed scattering, harrowing, selective harvesting, coppicing and spot burning to produce crops of acorns, grass, wildflower seeds. They also hunted wildlife and foraged for juncus, willow, redbud, and elderberry for basket making. The founding of Mission Asistencia at Santa Margarita in the 1780s and Mission San Miguel in 1797 led to the gradual depopulation of native communities in this area. The Highway 41/46 corridor has historically served as a traveling route between the coastal areas and the Central Valley. These same routes were previously used by Native Americans for the movement of people and goods as well.

Impact. The existing reservoir is located approximately 0.25 mile from the nearest blue line stream and is in an area that has been historically cultivated and disked since the 1990s. When the reservoir was constructed in 2013, no archaeological or culturally sensitive resources were uncovered. There are no



historical resources within the vicinity of the reservoir. No new physical disturbance is being proposed that would potentially disturb archaeological, historical, or paleontological resources or would cause an adverse change to tribal cultural resources. Therefore, no impacts to cultural resources would occur.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No new physical disturbance or activities are being proposed; therefore, no impacts to cultural resources would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Will the project:

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Result in exposure to or production of unstable earth conditions, such as landslides, earthquakes, liquefaction, ground failure, land subsidence or other similar hazards?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Be within a California Geological Survey "Alquist-Priolo" Earthquake Fault Zone", or other known fault zones*?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Result in soil erosion, topographic changes, loss of topsoil or unstable soil conditions from project-related improvements, such as vegetation removal, grading, excavation, or fill?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Include structures located on expansive soils?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) <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"/>
f) <i>Preclude the future extraction of valuable mineral resources?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

* Per Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication #42

Geology and Soils

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

Topography: Nearly level to gently sloping

Within County's Geologic Study Area?: No

Landslide Risk Potential: Moderate

Liquefaction Potential: Low

Nearby potentially active faults?: Yes Distance? Approximately 2 miles

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



Shrink/Swell potential of soil: Low to moderate

Other notable geologic features? None

Impact. The 3.95 acre-foot agricultural reservoir was constructed in 2013 from approximately 7,361 cubic yards of earthen material within approximately a 0.90 acre (39,205 square feet) area on a hill surrounded by vineyards. The earthen berms encompassing the reservoir range from 18 to 30 feet and also serve as an access road for routine maintenance. In 2018, a site inspection performed by Hallin Geotechnical, LLC. evaluated the suitability of the reservoir. Based on the report findings, the reservoir was determined to be set entirely into firm weathered shale bedrock with no fill. No signs of seepage or slope failure within the exterior slopes were observed. The reservoir and associated appurtenance have been in operation for approximately 5 years and continue to function as originally designed. The report concluded that the existing reservoir remains suitable for the intended use with no further recommendations. No new physical ground disturbance or activities are being proposed that would result in unstable earth conditions or result in topographic changes that would cause erosion or topsoil loss. In addition, there are no activities proposed that would be inconsistent with the County's Safety Element or preclude future extractions of mineral resources. As a result, no impacts to geology or soils would occur.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No new physical disturbance or activities are being proposed and no further recommendations were made per the geotechnical memo. Therefore, no impacts to geology and soils would occur and no mitigation is required.

7. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Will the project:

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) <i>Create a hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Create a hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within ¼-mile of an existing or proposed school?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Be located on, or adjacent to, a site which is included on a list of hazardous material/waste sites compiled pursuant to Gov't Code 65962.5 ("Cortese List"), and result in an adverse public health condition?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



7. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Will the project:

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
e) <i>Impair implementation or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) <i>If within the Airport Review designation, or near a private airstrip, result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) <i>Increase fire hazard risk or expose people or structures to high wildland fire hazard conditions?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) <i>Be within a 'very high' fire hazard severity zone?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) <i>Be within an area classified as a 'state responsibility' area as defined by CalFire?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Setting. The reservoir is not located in an area of known hazardous material contamination and is not on a site listed on the “Cortese List” (which is a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5) (SWRCB 2018; DTSC 2018). The reservoir is located within a high fire hazard severity zone and based on the County’s response time map, it will take approximately 5 to 10 minutes to respond to a call regarding fire or life safety. The reservoir is not located within an Airport Review Area and there are no active private landing strips within the vicinity.

Impact. The agricultural reservoir was constructed in 2013 per industry standards and applicable codes, and later inspected in 2018 to ensure it was still suitable for the intended purpose of storing water. No new activities or construction of buildings for human habitation are proposed nor would the use of hazardous materials or the generation of hazardous wastes occur. No activities associated with the reservoir presents a significant fire safety risk nor are there proposed activities that would conflict with any regional emergency response or evacuation plan.

Mitigation/Conclusion. There are no new activities associated with the existing reservoir that would involve the use of hazardous waste or increase hazards. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

8. NOISE

Will the project:

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

8. NOISE

<i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
b) <i>Generate permanent increases in the ambient noise levels in the project vicinity?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Cause a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise in the project vicinity?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Expose people to severe noise or vibration?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>If located within the Airport Review designation or adjacent to a private airstrip, expose people residing or working in the project area to severe noise levels?</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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Noise

Setting. The reservoir is located in an agricultural area and is not considered a “noise sensitive land use” nor is it within close proximity of loud noise sources. The nearest sensitive receptors are approximately 800 feet away. The reservoir is not located within an Airport Review Area and there are no active private landing strips within the vicinity.

Impact. There are no loud noises associated with the operation of the existing reservoir and no new noise-generating activities are being proposed. Therefore, operation and maintenance of the pond would not expose people to existing or increased noise levels.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No noise impacts would occur, 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 (e.g., construct new homes or businesses) or indirectly (e.g., extension of major infrastructure)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Displace existing housing or people, requiring construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Create the need for substantial new housing in the area?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Other:</i> _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Population/Housing

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

Impact. The existing agricultural reservoir is used for water storage to support existing agricultural uses and does not include any residential uses or structures for human habitation. There are no activities or proposed uses associated with the reservoir that would result in a need for new housing or displace existing housing.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No population and housing impacts would occur. No mitigation measures are necessary.

10. PUBLIC SERVICES/UTILITIES

Will the project have an effect upon, or result in the need for new or altered public services in any of the following areas:

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a) Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police protection (e.g., Sheriff, CHP)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Roads?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Solid Wastes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Other: _____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Public Services

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

Police: County Sheriff

Location: Templeton (Approximately 8 miles to the west)

Fire: Cal Fire (formerly CDF)

Hazard Severity: High

Response Time: 10-15

Location: Templeton Fire Department (Approximately 7.5 miles to the west)

School District: Templeton Unified School District.

Impact. The existing agricultural reservoir supports the existing vineyard and does not propose a new use or activity that would generate substantial long-term increases in demand for fire protection, police protection, emergency services, schools, roads, solid waste, or other public services or utilities. The reservoir is accessed by existing local and farm roads and there are no new activities that are proposed that would generate substantial long-term operational trips. Therefore, no impacts to public services would occur.



Mitigation/Conclusion. No significant impacts to public services or utilities would occur. No mitigation measures are necessary.

11. RECREATION

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

Recreation

Setting. The existing reservoir is located within privately-owned operational agricultural parcels that primarily support existing vineyards.

Impact. There are no new activities associated with the existing reservoir that would not have any adverse effects on existing or planned recreational opportunities in the County. Operation of the existing reservoir would not result in the need for an additional park, Natural Area, and/or recreational resources.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No impacts to recreational resources would occur, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

12. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
<i>Will the project:</i>				
a) <i>Increase vehicle trips to local or areawide circulation system?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) <i>Reduce existing "Level 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Provide for adequate emergency access?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Conflict with an established measure of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system considering all modes of transportation (e.g. LOS, mass transit, etc.)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) <i>Conflict with an applicable congestion management program?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

12. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

<i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
<i>g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>h) 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Transportation

Setting. The County has established the acceptable Level of Service on roads for this rural area as “C” or better. The existing road network in the area, including Almond Drive and East El Pomar Road, are operating at acceptable levels. Based on existing road speeds and configuration (vertical and horizontal road curves), sight distance is considered acceptable.

Impact. There are no new construction-related activities or trips associated with the existing agricultural reservoir. Long-term maintenance and operational trips are consistent with existing onsite vineyard operations. As a result, there are no new activities being proposed that would have a long-term impact on existing road service or traffic safety levels. There are no activities being proposed that would conflict with adopted policies, plans and programs related to transportation, and would not affect air traffic patterns or policies related to public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No traffic impacts would occur, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

13. WASTEWATER

<i>Will the project:</i>	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
<i>a) 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"/>
<i>b) Change the quality of surface or ground water (e.g., nitrogen-loading, day-lighting)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>c) Adversely affect community wastewater service provider?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<i>d) Other: _____</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Wastewater

Setting/Impacts. There are no new activities associated with the existing reservoir that would generate wastewater or require wastewater disposal.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No impacts related to wastewater would occur, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

14. WATER & HYDROLOGY

Will the project:

QUALITY

- a) *Violate any water quality standards?*
- b) *Discharge into surface waters or otherwise alter surface water quality (e.g., turbidity, sediment, temperature, dissolved oxygen, etc.)?*
- c) *Change the quality of groundwater (e.g., saltwater intrusion, nitrogen-loading, etc.)?*
- d) *Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide additional sources of polluted runoff?*
- e) *Change rates of soil absorption, or amount or direction of surface runoff?*
- f) *Change the drainage patterns where substantial on- or off-site sedimentation/ erosion or flooding may occur?*
- g) *Involve activities within the 100-year flood zone?*

QUANTITY

- h) *Change the quantity or movement of available surface or ground water?*
- i) *Adversely affect community water service provider?*
- j) *Expose people to a risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding (e.g., dam failure, etc.), or inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?*
- k) *Other: _____*

	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, sediment, temperature, dissolved oxygen, etc.)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) <i>Change the quality of groundwater (e.g., saltwater intrusion, nitrogen-loading, etc.)?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) <i>Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide additional sources of polluted runoff?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) <i>Change rates of soil absorption, or amount or direction of surface runoff?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) <i>Change the drainage patterns where substantial on- or off-site sedimentation/ erosion or flooding may occur?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) <i>Involve activities within the 100-year flood zone?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) <i>Change the quantity or movement of available surface or ground water?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) <i>Adversely affect community water service provider?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j) <i>Expose people to a risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding (e.g., dam failure, etc.), or inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
k) <i>Other: _____</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Water

Setting. The existing reservoir is served by an existing well within the RBZ Vineyard to fill the reservoir. The project site is within the El Pomar-Estrella Sub Area of the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin (the



basin). Encompassing an area of approximately 505,000 acres (760 square miles), the basin extends from the Garden Farms area south of Atascadero to San Ardo in Monterey County, and from the Highway 101 corridor to east of Shandon. It is the primary, and in many places the only, source of water available to property owners throughout the North County.

In 2015, the State legislature approved a new groundwater management law known as the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). SGMA requires that high and medium priority basins comply with the new law. DWR designated the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin as a high priority basin and designated the basin to be in a "condition of critical overdraft."

In January 2007 the Board of Supervisors directed the preparation of a Resource Capacity Study (RCS) for the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin in accordance with the County's Resource Management System (RMS). The RMS describes a resource in terms of its "level of severity" (LOS) based on the rate of depletion and an estimate of the remaining capacity, if any.

Table 2. Water Resource Levels of Severity

Level of Severity	Description
LOS I	Level I is reached for a water resource when increasing water demand projected over 9 years equals or exceeds the estimated dependable supply.
LOS II	Level II for a water resource occurs when water demand projected over 7 years (or other lead time determined by a resource capacity study) equals or exceeds the estimated dependable supply.
LOS III	A Level of Severity III exists when water demand equals the available resource; the amount of consumption has reached the dependable supply of the resource.

The RCS established an LOS III for the main basin and a separate LOS I for the Atascadero sub-basin, which is hydrogeologically distinct from the main basin.

The Countywide Water Conservation Program and Water-Related General Plan and County Code Amendments

On October 27, 2015 the Board of Supervisors adopted the Countywide Water Conservation Program to address ongoing water scarcity concerns. The objectives of the Countywide Water Conservation Program are to halt increase in groundwater extraction in areas that have been certified LOS III; provide a mechanism to allow new development and new or altered irrigated agriculture to proceed in certified LOS III areas, subject to the requirements of the County General Plan and County Code, in a manner that fully offsets projected water use; and to reduce the wasteful use of water in the county. The amendments were effective on November 26, 2015 and affect the following areas:

- Paso Robles Groundwater Basin:
 - New buildings and new irrigated agriculture must offset new water use. (Building and Construction Ordinance and The County Land Use Ordinance)
 - New construction and new irrigated agriculture in the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin must be water neutral.
- Countywide:
 - Water waste prevention measures apply to all unincorporated areas where a similar program is not already operated by a water purveyor. (Health and Sanitation Ordinance)
 - Agricultural best management practices are encouraged in all unincorporated areas (The County Land Use Ordinance)

The adopted Countywide Water Conservation Program and ordinances included amendments to the County Health and Sanitation Ordinance, Building and Construction Ordinance, County Land Use Ordinance, and County Fee Schedule.

Drainage Characteristics

The topography of the project is nearly level to gently sloping to. The closest intermittent creek is approximately 0.25 miles away. As described in the NRCS Soil Survey, the soil surface is considered to have moderate erodibility.

Projects involving more than one acre of disturbance are typically required to prepare a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to minimize on-site sedimentation and erosion; however, SWPPP requirements do not apply to agricultural reservoirs. When work is done in the rainy season, the County's Land Use Ordinance requires that temporary erosion and sedimentation measures to be installed.

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

Within the 100-year Flood Hazard designation? No

Closest creek? Unnamed intermittent drainage Distance? Approximately 0.25 miles

Soil drainage characteristics: Well drained

For areas where drainage is identified as a potential issue, the Land Use Ordinance (LUO Sec. 22.52.110 or CZLUO Sec. 23.05.042) includes a provision to prepare a drainage plan to minimize potential drainage impacts. When required, this plan would need to address measures such as: constructing on-site retention or detention basins, or installing surface water flow dissipaters. This plan would also need to show that the increased surface runoff would have no more impacts than that caused by historic flows.

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

Soil erodibility: Moderate

A sedimentation and erosion control plan is required for all construction and grading projects (LUO Sec. 22.52.120, CZLUO Sec. 23.05.036) to minimize these impacts. When required, the plan is prepared by a civil engineer to address both temporary and long-term sedimentation and erosion impacts.

Impact

Water Quality

The reservoir was previously constructed on nearly flat topography and is not within a 100-year Flood Hazard designation. The reservoir is located approximately 0.25 miles from unnamed intermittent drainage. Underlying soils have moderate erodibility.

With regards to project impacts on water quality the following conditions apply:

- No site disturbance is proposed;
- The project will be subject to standard County requirements for drainage, sedimentation and erosion control for construction and permanent use;
- The project is not on highly erodible soils, nor on moderate to steep slopes;
- The project is more than 100 feet from the closest creek or surface water body;



- Stockpiles will be properly managed during construction to avoid material loss due to erosion; and
- All hazardous materials and/or wastes will be properly stored on-site, which include secondary containment should spills or leaks occur.

To provide protection from downward migration of stored water within the reservoir, the earthen irrigation reservoir is lined with 40-mil high density polyethylene (HDPE) plastic. This HDPE liner provides protection from leakage into the subsurface and there are no modifications proposed to the reservoir that would result in water quality related impacts to groundwater. In addition, there are no new activities or modifications to the reservoir that would potentially result in adverse impacts to the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin.

Water Quantity

The reservoir is filled using an existing nearby well. The existing reservoir increases water-use efficiency during the peak frost period by reducing the cumulative amount of water simultaneously pumped from the basin during frost events. However, some loss through evaporation from the water surface to the atmosphere occurs requiring increased pumping from the basin to compensate for reservoir evaporation. To reduce evaporative water losses, filling of the reservoir for frost protection purposes occur during the typical peak frost period (March through May).

Evaporative Loss

A hydrogeologic analysis performed by Monsoon Consultants (2019) determined that the annual net evaporative loss of the reservoir is approximately 1.55 acre-feet, and nearby off-site wells are only temporarily affected during the initial filling of the reservoir. The project applicant has previously obtained a 1:1 net evaporative water loss offset through the County by removing existing vineyards. An expansion in reservoir capacity or an increase in water consumption is not proposed, and no additional water offsets would be required.

Well Interference

Potential impacts to neighboring wells was analyzed for the existing reservoir in the hydrogeologic analysis. A well interference and draw-down analysis was conducted to evaluate how increased pumping during the initial filling of the reservoir affects eight neighboring wells. The report analyzed the 10-day period that is required to fill the reservoir and concluded drawdown impacts to neighboring wells ranges from 1.98 to 5.23 feet, which is temporary and insignificant. No new pumping or filling techniques are being proposed that would increase drawdown impacts to the neighboring wells, and no impacts would occur.

Drainage and Flood Hazard

As noted above, the existing reservoir site is nearly level surrounded by sloping vineyards. The reservoir is designed to withstand storm and flood events and is not located in an area that would substantially impede floodwaters or otherwise create a public health and safety issue. No new ground disturbance or activities are proposed that would alter drainage patterns or increase flood hazards; therefore, no impacts would occur.

Mitigation/Conclusion. The reservoir was designed in compliance with existing regulations and/or required plans to adequately address the potential for surface water quality impacts. There are no new activities being proposed that would result in a change to groundwater quality; therefore, no impacts to water quality would occur and no mitigation is required.

The project applicant has previously obtained a 1:1 net evaporative water loss offset through the County by removing existing vineyards. An expansion in reservoir capacity or an increase in water consumption is not proposed, and no additional water offsets would be required.

No new pumping activities are being proposed that would result in additional water level drawdown at neighboring properties; therefore, no impacts to neighboring wells would occur and no mitigation is required.

15. LAND USE

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

Land Use

Setting/Impact. Surrounding uses are identified on Page 2 of the Initial Study. There are no new activities associated with the existing reservoirs that would conflict with existing policy and/or regulatory documents relating to the environment and appropriate land use (e.g., County Land Use Ordinance, etc.). Consistent with County plans and ordinances aimed at addressing water shortages within the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin, all required offsets have been obtained.

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

Mitigation/Conclusion. No land use or planning related policy inconsistencies were identified. No impacts would occur and no mitigation is necessary.

16. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

Will the project:

<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</i>				



important examples of the major periods of California history or pre-history?

There are no new activities associated with the existing reservoir that are being proposed that would result in the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or pre-history. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation is required.

- 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)**

There are no new activities associated with the existing reservoir that are individually limited but would result in cumulatively considerable impacts. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation is required.

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

There are no new activities associated with the existing reservoir that would have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Therefore, no impacts would occur and no mitigation is required.

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

Exhibit A - Initial Study References and Agency Contacts

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

<u>Contacted</u>	<u>Agency</u>	<u>Response</u>
<input type="checkbox"/>	County Public Works Department	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	County Environmental Health Services	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	County Agricultural Commissioner's Office	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 Wildlife	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	CA Department of Forestry (Cal Fire)	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	CA Department of Transportation	Not Applicable
<input type="checkbox"/>	Community Services District	Not Applicable
<input 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"/> Design Plan
<u>County documents</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Specific Plan
<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal Plan Policies	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Regional Transportation Plan
<input type="checkbox"/> Economic Element	<input type="checkbox"/> Uniform Fire Code
<input type="checkbox"/> Housing Element	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Quality Control Plan (Central Coast Basin – Region 3)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise Element	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Archaeological Resources Map
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parks & Recreation Element/Project List	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Area of Critical Concerns Map
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Safety Element	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Special Biological Importance Map
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use Ordinance (Inland/Coastal)	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Other
<input type="checkbox"/> Energy Wise Plan	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> North County Area Plan/Shandon-Carrizo SA and Update EIR	

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

1. California Department of Conservation. 2016. Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. <<http://maps.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/ciftimeseries/>> Accessed on: March 22, 2019.
2. California Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC). 2018. Envirostor. <<https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/>> Accessed on: March 22, 2019..
3. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 2018. California Scenic Highway Mapping System. <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/16_livability/scenic_highways/>. Accessed on: March 22, 2019..
4. California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). 2018. Cortese List Data Resources. <<https://calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/>> Accessed on: March 22, 2019..
5. California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). 2018. GeoTracker. <<https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/>> Accessed on: March 22, 2019..
6. County of San Luis Obispo (County). 2018. Land Use View: Agricultural-Williamson Act <<https://gis.slocounty.ca.gov/sites/luvview.htm>> Accessed on: March 22, 2019..
7. County of San Luis Obispo (County). 2015. General Plan: Framework for Planning (Inland).
8. Hallin Geotechnical, LLC. 2019. *Results of Site Inspection and Statement of Suitability*. January 2019.
9. Monsoon Consultants. 2019. *Hydrogeologic Analysis for the Agricultural Irrigation Storage Reservoir To be Constructed at RBZ Vineyard*.
10. Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS). 2018. Web Soil Survey. <<https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>> Accessed on: April 1, 2018
11. San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution District (APCD). 2012. *CEQA Air Quality Handbook*.
12. San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution District (APCD). 2017. *Clarification Memorandum for the CEQA Air Quality Handbook*.

Vicinity Map



Aerial Map

