

RESOLUTION NO: 14-012

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
APPROVING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT 13-005
(WILCOX RANCH, LP)

WHEREAS, PD 13-005 has been submitted by Aaron Johnson, on behalf of Wilcox Ranch, LP to establish an equestrian facility and horse keeping on the 7.7 acre site located at the northeast corner of Sherwood Road and Fontana Road (1448 Fontana Road); and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared for this project (attached as Exhibit A) which concludes that a Mitigated Negative Declaration may be approved; and

WHEREAS, Public Notice of the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration was distributed as required by Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code and no written comments have been submitted; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on April 22, 2014, to consider facts as presented in the staff report prepared for this project, and to accept public testimony regarding this proposed Development Plan, and associated Mitigated Negative Declaration; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has entered into a signed Mitigation Agreement (Exhibit B) with the City of Paso Robles (prior to Planning Commission action on the Mitigated Negative Declaration) that establishes obligation on the part of the property owner to mitigate potential future impacts as identified in the environmental document; and

WHEREAS, the Mitigation Monitoring Program, attached as Exhibit C to this resolution, has been reviewed by the Planning Commission in conjunction with its review of this project and shall be carried out by the responsible parties by the identified deadlines; and

WHEREAS, based on the information contained in the Initial Study prepared for this project and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the Planning Commission finds no substantial evidence that there would be a significant impact on the environment based on the attached Mitigation Agreement and mitigation measures described in the Initial Study and contained in the resolution approving Planned Development 13-003 (Section 3) as site specific conditions summarized below.

Topic of Mitigation	Condition #
Air Quality	AQ 1- AQ 4

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles, based on its independent judgment, approves a Mitigated Negative Declaration for CUP 13-005, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles, based on its independent judgment, approves a Mitigated Negative Declaration for CUP 13-005, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Planning Commission of the City of Paso Robles this 22nd day of April, 2014 by the following vote:

AYES: Gregory, Garcia, Rollins, Donaldson, Vanderlip, Barth

NOES: Cooper

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None



DOUG BARTH, CHARIMAN

ATTEST:



ED GALLAGHER, PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM
CITY OF PASO ROBLES

- 1. PROJECT TITLE:** Conditional Use Permit 13-005
- Concurrent Entitlements:**
- 2. LEAD AGENCY:** City of Paso Robles
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446
- Contact:** Darren Nash
Phone: (805) 237-3970
- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:** 1448 Fontana Road, Paso Robles, CA (APN: 025-381-008)
- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** Wilcox Ranch, LP
- Contact Person:** Aaron P. Johnson - Johnson, Moncrief & Hart
- Phone:** (831) 759-0900
Email: Aaron@JohnsonMoncrief.com
- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** RA (Residential Agriculture)
- 6. ZONING:** RS (Residential Suburban)
- 7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Request for the approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to establish an equestrian facility and horse keeping. The applicant would board up to forty (40) horses on site, some of which are used for the trainers' personal use and most of which are used for training youth on western horseback riding (the main reason for the CUP). Equestrian activities will be conducted outdoors in an arena area located at the southeastern portion of the property. No other events are requested as part of the CUP.
- 8. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:** The 7.7 acre site is located at the northeast corner of Sherwood Road and Fontana Road. The structures on the property include the original house and barn for the Chandler Ranch. Some of the original corrals and water troughs still remain from the historic cattle ranch activities on the Chandler Ranch.
- The property is relatively flat, and besides the areas where the house, barn and driveways are located, the property consists of the native dirt (soils).
- The site is located adjacent to the western boundary of the Quail Run Mobile Home Park. The impacts of the activities from the proposed equestrian facility, mainly dust, odor, and flies resulting from the horses, is the main discussion within this environmental review.
- 9. OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED):** Air Pollution Control District.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that 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.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that 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.
- I find that 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.

Signature: _____

Date _____

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved. Answers should address off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. “Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

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

I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The site is relatively flat and is located at a similar elevation as the neighboring properties. The site is not considered a scenic vista; therefore there will not be an impact.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There is no development or removal of structures related to this project, there are no significant trees or rock outcroppings and the site is not located in the proximity of a scenic highway, therefore there will not be an impact to scenic resources.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion in sections a & b above.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?
(Sources: 1, 2, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: All exterior lighting includes wall mounted light fixtures mounted to the barn. A standard condition of approval requires that exterior light fixtures be shielded so that they do not produce off-site glare. The condition requires that the City review the fixtures prior to installation.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest, land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 5114(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-e): This project consists of a Conditional Use Permit to allow horse riding lessons and horse keeping on the 7.7 -acre site that has historically been used for cattle grazing and ranching activities. There is no construction or grading activities associated with this CUP request.

The project is zoned residential agricultural and while there has been grazing and ranching activities on this site in the past, it has not been used for farming of row crops. The site is also not considered forest land. There will be no impact from the project on this environmental factor.

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

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?
(Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?
(Source: 11 & Attachment 2 & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion (a-d): This project consists of a Conditional Use Permit to allow horse riding lessons and horse keeping on a 7.7- acre site that has historically been used for cattle grazing and ranching activities. There is no construction or grading activities associated with this CUP request.

The main topic of concern with this proposed CUP is the fugitive dust (dust leaving the site onto adjacent properties) that is created as a result of the equestrian business. The Quail Run mobile home park is located adjacent to the property and has experienced dust impacts from the existing horse activities on the site. It has been determined that the dust is not necessarily from the riding lessons, but mostly from the cars coming and going from the site and horses in the pen areas. As a result of current drought years, there has not been much vegetation on the ground so the land within the pen areas is very dry and minimal animal or vehicle activity creates dust.

The concern of Valley Fever has been raised by residents in Quail Run mobile home park. Since the Valley Fever virus is transported by airborne dust, it is more evident that dust control needs to be addressed and mitigated. The City contacted both the SLO County Health Department and the SLO County AG Commissioners office to determine if there are specific criteria that could be implemented with this project to prevent Valley Fever. Both indicated that dust control is the best

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

way to control valley fever.

The applicants have taken measures to help prevent dust on site such as: having a paved driveway from Fontana Road extending approximately 500-feet into the site; installing compacted base material in the parking and internal drive areas; and placing sand in the arena and horse stalls. Even with the measures listed above, it is anticipated that the equestrian facility will generate dust, mainly from horses moving about the pens and vehicles entering and leaving the site.

City staff consulted with San Luis Obispo County APCD staff to develop the following mitigation measures to reduce dust impacts to a level of insignificance:

AQ-1 Section 3.6.3 Fugitive Dust, of the 2012 APCD CEQA Handbook and more specifically describes that a potential source of fugitive dust can come from equestrian facilities, which may be a nuisance to local residents. To minimize nuisance impacts and to reduce fugitive dust emissions from equestrian facilities the following mitigation measures should be incorporated into the project:

- a. Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible;
- b. Use water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency whenever wind speeds exceed 15 mph. Reclaimed (non-potable) water shall be used whenever possible;
- c. Permanent dust control measures shall be implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities;
- d. All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation shall be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the Air District;
- e. All access roads and parking areas associated with the facility should be paved to reduce fugitive dust. As an alternative, an all-weather surface such as decomposed granite can be used, subject to the conditions outlined within mitigation measure AQ-2; and,
- f. A person or persons shall be designated to monitor for dust and implement additional control measures as necessary to prevent transport of dust offsite. The monitor's duties shall include holidays and weekend. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the Air District prior to operation of the arena.

AQ-2 An alternative to paving the parking and internal driveway areas is to utilize an all-weather surface such as decomposed granite, along with the addition of a soil binding agent, the installation of rumble strips, and the use of water to reduce dust.

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

AQ-3 Prior to the issuance of a business license, a dust control plan shall be provided for Planning Staff review and approval that incorporates the dust control measures listed above and indicates the program in which they will be implemented.

e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Source: 11)

Discussion: The manure associated with the keeping of horses on this site is the main source of the odors leaving the site. The nearest pen where horses are located is an existing pen that is over 80 feet away from the western property boundary. The new pens would be located over 100-feet from the boundary.

That being said, it will be important that manure is picked up and disposed of on a regular basis. The applicant has indicated that the manure is picked up from the horse stalls on a daily basis, and from the horse pen areas on a weekly basis.

AQ-4 All animal enclosures, including but not limited to pens, stalls and feed areas shall be maintained free from litter, garbage and the accumulation of manure, so as to discourage the proliferation of flies, other disease vectors and offensive odors. Site shall be maintained in a neat and sanitary manner.



IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

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

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-f): This project consists of a Conditional Use Permit to allow horse riding lessons and horse keeping on a 7.7-acre site that has historically been used for cattle grazing and ranching activities. There is no construction or grading activities associated with this CUP request.

This site has perimeter fencing that has been in place for many years that will remain in place in its current location. Internal fencing will change to create the horse pens and riding arena areas. All fencing and corals would contain large animals (horses and cattle) but allow for smaller animals to pass through.

This CUP application is to study impacts related to the operation of the equestrian facility and horse keeping activities with no significant ground disturbing activities or relocation of perimeter fencing when compared to the historic cattle operations therefore, the addition of this land use to the existing property will not be an impact to biological resources.

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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion (a-d): This project consists of a Conditional Use Permit to allow horse riding lessons on a 7.7 acre site that has historically been used for cattle grazing and ranching activities. There is no construction or grading activities associated with this CUP request, therefore there is no impact from the project on this environmental factor.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. (Sources: 1, 2, & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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

Discussion: There are no structures be constructed for this proposed CUP, so there is no impact.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?
(Sources: 1, 2, & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The General Plan EIR identified impacts resulting from ground shaking as less than significant and provided mitigation measures that will be incorporated into the design of this project including adequate structural design and not constructing over active or potentially active faults. Therefore, impacts that may result from seismic ground shaking are considered less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iii. Seismic-related ground failure,
including liquefaction? (Sources: 1,
2 & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR, the project site is located in an area with soil conditions that have a low potential for liquefaction or other type of ground failure due to seismic events and soil conditions. To implement the EIR’s mitigation measures to reduce this potential impact, the City has a standard condition to require submittal of soils and geotechnical reports, which include site-specific analysis of liquefaction potential for all building permits for new construction, and incorporation of the recommendations of said reports into the design of the project.

- | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iv. Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Per the General Plan Safety Element, the project site is in an area that is designated a low-risk area for landslides. Therefore, potential impacts due to landslides is less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the
loss of topsoil? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: there is no grading necessary as part of this CUP, so there will not be an impact.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that
is unstable, or that would become
unstable as a result of the project, and
potentially result in on- or off-site
landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence,
liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

Discussion: See response to item a.iii, above.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See response to item a.iii, above.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion (a-d): There is no development included in this CUP request, therefore there will be no impact to existing septic systems related to this property.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion (a-b): This project consists of a Conditional Use Permit to allow horse riding lessons and horse keeping on a 7.7 acre site that has historically been used for cattle grazing and ranching activities. There is no construction or grading activities associated with this CUP request.

The addition of the horse riding lessons and horse keeping activities will increase daily vehicle trips coming and going from the site, however the greenhouse gas emissions resulting from 8 to 12 trips from the equestrian lessons and horse keeping activities would not be considered a significant impact.

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

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-h): This project consists of a Conditional Use Permit to allow horse riding lessons on a 7.7 acre site that has historically been used for cattle grazing and ranching activities. There is no construction or grading activities associated with this CUP request, therefore there is no impact from the project on this environmental factor.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., Would the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? Would decreased rainfall infiltration or groundwater recharge reduce stream baseflow? (Source: 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (Source: 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
on- or off-site? (Source: 10)				
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Source: 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
j. Inundation by mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
k. Conflict with any Best Management Practices found within the City's Storm Water Management Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
l. Substantially decrease or degrade watershed storage of runoff, wetlands, riparian areas, aquatic habitat, or associated buffer zones?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion (a-1): This project consists of a Conditional Use Permit to allow horse riding lessons on a 7.7 acre site that has historically been used for cattle grazing and ranching activities. There is no construction or grading activities associated with this CUP request, therefore there is no impact from the project on this environmental factor.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

- a. Physically divide an established community?

Discussion: This project consists of a Conditional Use Permit to allow horse riding lessons on a 7.7 acre site that has historically been used for cattle grazing and ranching activities. There is no construction or grading activities associated with this CUP request, therefore there is no impact from the project on this environmental factor.

- b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

Discussion: The project site has a zoning designation of Residential Agriculture (RA). Equestrian facilities are allowed in the RA zone with the approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). The reason for the CUP is to determine if the proposed land use is compatible with the neighboring land uses. Conditions of approval can be added to make a project more compatible.

The project site is adjacent to an existing mobile home park (Quail Run) along the western property line. Concerns have been raised from the Quail Run residents related to dust, odor and flies that would be generated from the proposed equestrian facility.

The 7.7 acre site has historically been used for cattle grazing and ranching activities. Mitigation measures have been identified as being necessary to reduce impacts from the project related to dust, odor and flies. Those mitigation measures have been identified in the Air Quality (Section III) of this environmental initial study.

The applicants have met with the neighbors to discuss ways to minimize and control dust, flies and odor. Regarding land use and planning, if the Planning Commission approves the CUP with the identified mitigation measures and conditions of approval, impacts to land use and planning would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion (c): There is no conservation plan associated with this property.				

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: There are no known mineral resources at this project site.

b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: There are no known mineral resources at this project site.

XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:

a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-d): This project consists of a Conditional Use Permit to allow horse riding lessons on a 7.7 acre site that has historically been used for cattle grazing and ranching activities. There is no construction or grading activities associated with this CUP request. The riding lessons would include up to 20 people including students and parents. The training area would be in the arena area that is located on the east side of the barn. While there will be increased noise from general conversation amongst the 20 people, it is not anticipated to be significant.

e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1, 4)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The project site is not located within an airport safety zone.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:

a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-c): This project consists of a Conditional Use Permit to allow horse riding lessons on a 7.7 acre site that has historically been used for cattle grazing and ranching activities. There is no construction or grading activities associated with this CUP request, therefore there is no impact from the project on this environmental factor.

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

a. Fire protection? (Sources: 1,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Police protection? (Sources: 1,10)	<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. Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Other public facilities? (Sources: 1,10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-e): This project consists of a Conditional Use Permit to allow horse riding lessons on a 7.7 acre site that has historically been used for cattle grazing and ranching activities. There is no construction or grading activities associated with this CUP request, therefore there is no impact from the project on this environmental factor.

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

XV. RECREATION

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion (a&b):

The equestrian lessons use would not encourage new housing demands and use of recreational facilities, it will not result in impacts to recreational facilities.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures or effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

(Source: Attachment 8)

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

Discussion (a,b): It is anticipated that this project would have at the most 20 people visiting the site for lessons at any one time, which would include 12 students and 8 parents. Assuming there would be 8-12 visiting vehicles, there would be no impact associated with transportation or traffic.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not located within an airport land use planning area.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There are no hazardous design features associated with, planned for or will result from this project.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e. Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not impede emergency access, and is designed in compliance with all emergency access safety features and to City emergency access standards.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See discussion in section a & b above.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-g): This project consists of a Conditional Use Permit to allow horse riding lessons on a 7.7 acre site that has historically been used for cattle grazing and ranching activities. There is no construction or grading activities associated with this CUP request, therefore there is no impact from the project on utilities and service systems.

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

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- a. Does the project 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?

Discussion: This project consists of a Conditional Use Permit to allow horse riding lessons on a 7.7 acre site that has historically been used for cattle grazing and ranching activities. There is no construction or grading activities associated with this CUP request, therefore there is no impact to fish, wildlife, of plant habitat.

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

Discussion: The project will not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

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

Discussion: As determined in this document, the project will be required to apply mitigation measures to control dust, flies and odor that results from the keeping of horses on this site. While dust, flies and odors can be an annoyance, with the mitigation measures it is anticipated that substantial adverse effects either directly or indirectly, will be less than significant.

EARLIER ANALYSIS AND BACKGROUND MATERIALS.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D).

Earlier Documents Prepared and Utilized in this Analysis and Background / Explanatory Materials

<u>Reference #</u>	<u>Document Title</u>	<u>Available for Review at:</u>
1	City of Paso Robles General Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446
2	City of Paso Robles Zoning Code	Same as above
3	City of Paso Robles Environmental Impact Report for General Plan Update	Same as above
4	2005 Airport Land Use Plan	Same as above
5	City of Paso Robles Municipal Code	Same as above
6	City of Paso Robles Water Master Plan	Same as above
7	City of Paso Robles Urban Water Management Plan 2005	Same as above
8	City of Paso Robles Sewer Master Plan	Same as above
9	City of Paso Robles Housing Element	Same as above
10	City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval for New Development	Same as above
11	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Guidelines for Impact Thresholds	APCD 3433 Roberto Court San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
12	San Luis Obispo County – Land Use Element	San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning County Government Center San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
13	USDA, Soils Conservation Service, Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, Paso Robles Area, 1983	Soil Conservation Offices Paso Robles, Ca 93446

Attachments:

- 1. Vicinity Map/Site Plan**
- 2. Mitigation Measure Summary**



Google earth

312 35°53'703.59" N 120°38'56.97" W elev 847 ft eye alt 1903 ft

UCI 17 2013

Exhibit A
Site Plan
CUP 13-005
(Wilcox Ranch, LP)

City of Paso Robles
Community Development Dept.

©2013 Google

Mitigation Measures Summary

Air Quality:

- AQ-1 Section 3.6.3 Fugitive Dust, of the 2012 APCD CEQA Handbook and more specifically describes that a potential source of fugitive dust can come from equestrian facilities, which may be a nuisance to local residents. To minimize nuisance impacts and to reduce fugitive dust emissions from equestrian facilities the following mitigation measures should be incorporated into the project:
- a. Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible;
 - b. Use water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency whenever wind speeds exceed 15 mph. Reclaimed (non-potable) water shall be used whenever possible;
 - c. Permanent dust control measures shall be implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities;
 - d. All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation shall be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the Air District;
 - e. All access roads and parking areas associated with the facility should be paved to reduce fugitive dust. As an alternative, an all-weather surface such as decomposed granite can be used, subject to the conditions outlined within mitigation measure AQ-2; and,
 - f. A person or persons shall be designated to monitor for dust and implement additional control measures as necessary to prevent transport of dust offsite. The monitor's duties shall include holidays and weekend. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the Air District prior to operation of the arena.
- AQ-2 An alternative to paving the parking and internal driveway areas is to utilize an all-weather surface such as decomposed granite, along with the addition of a soil binding agent, the installation of rumble strips, and the use of water to reduce dust.
- AQ-3 Prior to the issuance of a business license, a dust control plan shall be provided for Planning Staff review and approval that incorporates the dust control measures listed above and indicates the program in which they will be implemented.
- AQ-4 All animal enclosures, including but not limited to pens, stalls and feed areas shall be maintained free from litter, garbage and the accumulation of manure, so as to discourage the proliferation of flies, other disease vectors and offensive odors. Site shall be maintained in a neat and sanitary manner.



CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES

"The Pass of the Oaks"

CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
MITIGATION AND REIMBURSEMENT AGREEMENT FOR PROPOSED
NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Lead Agency: City of El Paso de Robles ("City")
Director of Community Development
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446

City Contact Person: Darren Nash Phone: (805) 237-3970
Project Title: Associate Planner
Discretionary Application(s) File No.(s): CUP 13-005
Project Applicant: Wilcox Ranch, LP – Aaron Johnson (representative)
Owner: Wilcox Ranch, LP
Project Description/Location: Equestrian facility with riding lessons and horse keeping.

MITIGATION AGREEMENT:

As the Applicant/Owner:

- A) I/we hereby agree to incorporate all mitigation measures into future development plans, to the satisfaction of the City, as identified in the related Project Initial Study and Project development conditions (collectively "mitigation measures").
- B) I/we hereby agree to comply with the Project Mitigation Monitoring Program adopted or approved by the City.
- C) I/we also understand that additional mitigation measures may be required following the review of the Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration by the public and by the applicable advisory and final decision-making bodies. I/we hereby agree to incorporate all additional mitigation measures into future development plans, to the satisfaction of the City.
- D) I/we acknowledge and agree that, notwithstanding the Applicant's mitigation obligations under this Agreement, the City is not obligated to approve any or all of the proposed uses or permits for the Property, to approve a Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Project, or General Plan or Municipal Code amendments or other entitlements which may be required for any of the uses contemplated for the Project/Property.

FUTURE INDEPENDENT CEQA REVIEW:

As the Applicant/Owner, I/we understand and hereby agree that in addition to the mitigation measures, the City reserves the right to monitor compliance with the Mitigation Measures and may utilize Environmental Consultants to assist in monitoring Project construction to ensure compliance. City costs for monitoring compliance shall be reimbursed by Applicant prior to City issuing a Certificate of Occupancy.

LEGAL CHALLENGES:

Nothing herein shall be construed to require City to defend any third party claims and suits challenging any action taken by the City with regard to any procedure or substantive aspect of the City's approval of development of the Property, the environmental process, or the proposed uses of the Property. The Applicant may, however, in its sole and absolute discretion appear as real party in interest in any such third party and action or proceeding. If the City defends such action or proceeding, the Applicant shall be responsible and reimburse the City for whatever legal fees and costs, in their entirety may be incurred by the City in defense of such action or proceeding. The City shall have the absolute right to retain such legal counsel as the City deems necessary and appropriate. Applicant may, at any time, notify City in writing of its decision to terminate such reimbursement obligation and, thereafter, in the event that the City decides to continue the defense of such third party action or proceeding, Applicant shall have no further obligation to reimburse City for City's attorneys' fees and costs. Applicant shall reimburse City in the event of any award of Court Costs or attorney fees is made against City in favor of any third party challenging either the sufficiency of a negative declaration or EIR or the validity of the City's approval of the Application.

MISCELLANEOUS:

This Agreement shall be binding on the Applicant/Owner and on any assigns or successors in interest.

This Agreement is in addition to, and does not supersede other Project related Agreements between the City and the Project Applicant/Owner.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the Community Development Director or his assign, representing the City of El Paso de Robles, and the applicant/owner have executed this agreement on this _____ day of _____, 20__.

CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPT.

_____, [Title]_____

By: _____
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT/OWNER

APPLICANT

APPLICANT(S) NAME AND ADDRESS:

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT/OWNER

APPLICANT

APPLICANT(S) NAME AND ADDRESS:

OWNER

OWNER(S) NAME AND ADDRESS:

OWNER

OWNER(S) NAME AND ADDRESS:

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan

Project File No./Name: CUP 13-005 – Wilcox Ranch Equestrian Facility

Approving Resolution No.:

Date: April 22, 2014

The following environmental Mitigation Measures were either incorporated into the approved plans or were incorporated into the Conditions of Approval. Each and every Mitigation Measure listed below has been found by the approving body to lessen the level of environmental impact of the project to a less than significant level. A completed and signed checklist for each mitigation measure indicates that it has been completed.

See attached Mitigation Summary Table for Mitigation Measure Descriptions.

Mitigation Measure	Type	Monitoring Dept or Agency	Shown on Plans	Verified Implementation	Remarks
AQ-1 Section 3.6.3 Fugitive Dust, of the 2012 APCD CEQA Handbook and more specifically describes that a potential source of fugitive dust can come from equestrian facilities, which may be a nuisance to local residents. To minimize nuisance impacts and to reduce fugitive dust emissions from equestrian facilities the following mitigation measures should be incorporated into the project:	Project	Planning Division, Building Division			
a. Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible;	Project	Planning Division, Building Division			

Mitigation Measure	Type	Monitoring Dept or Agency	Shown on Plans	Verified Implementation	Remarks
<p>b. Use water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency whenever wind speeds exceed 15 mph. Reclaimed (non-potable) water shall be used whenever possible;</p>	Project	Planning Division, Building Division			
<p>c. Permanent dust control measures shall be implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities;</p>	Project	Planning Division			
<p>d. All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation shall be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the Air District;</p>	Project	Planning Division			
<p>e. All access roads and parking areas associated with the facility should be paved to reduce fugitive dust. As an alternative, an all-weather surface such as decomposed granite can be used, subject to the conditions outlined within mitigation measure AQ-2; and,</p>	Project	Planning Division			

Mitigation Measure	Type	Monitoring Dept or Agency	Shown on Plans	Verified Implementation	Remarks
<p>f. A person or persons shall be designated to monitor for dust and implement additional control measures as necessary to prevent transport of dust offsite. The monitor's duties shall include holidays and weekend. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the Air District prior to operation of the arena.</p>	Project	Planning Division, Building Division			
<p>AQ-2 An alternative to paving the parking and internal driveway areas is to utilize an all-weather surface such as decomposed granite, along with the addition of a soil binding agent, the installation of rumble strips, and the use of water to reduce dust.</p>	Project	Planning Division, Building Division			
<p>AQ-3 Prior to the issuance of a business license, a dust control plan shall be provided for Planning Staff review and approval that incorporates the dust control measures listed above and indicates the program in which they will be implemented.</p>	Project	Planning Dept.			

