City of Paso Robles
Planning Commission Agenda Report

From: Darcy Delgado, Associate Planner
Subject: Planned Development 18-09, Conditional Use Permit CUP 18-06
Applicant – REC Solar / Firestone Walker Brewery
Request to construct a 2.1-megawatt (MW) solar ground-mounted single axis tracker system and a 277 kilowatt (kW) solar carport system for Firestone.

Date: February 12, 2019

Facts
1. The proposed solar project would consist of construction of a 2.1-megawatt (MW) solar ground-mounted single-axis tracker system and a 277-kilowatt (kW) solar carport system, within the overall Firestone Campus at the northern end of Ramada Drive, east of US Highway 101. The larger ground mount system is located on approximately 9.7-acres of an overall 39-acre open field located east of Firestone’s main building operations, near the water treatment ponds. The 277 kilowatt (kW) carport system is proposed within an existing parking lot and will cover approximately 14,000 square feet of the overall 2.77-acre parcel (See Attachment 1, Vicinity Map).

2. The General Plan land use designations include Business Park (BP) and Parks & Open Space (POS) and the zoning includes Industrial, Planned Industrial, and Parks & Open Space (M, PM, and POS).

3. Zoning Code Section 21.23B, Development Review, requires that all projects subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) for which either a Mitigated Negative Declaration or an environmental impact report is required receive Development Plan (PD) approval. Additionally, the project also requires the processing of a PD since the project scope is greater than 10,000 square feet in size.

4. Table 21.16.200 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City of El Paso de Robles also requires a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for public utilities facility substations, which would include renewable energy systems, in the PM and M zones. The discretion authorized with approval of a CUP gives the Planning Commission the ability to require specific conditions of approval to ensure that a particular use is compatible with the surrounding uses.

5. The DRC reviewed this project at their meeting on January 28, 2019. Overall, the DRC members were in support of the project and indicated interest in additional photo simulations of the solar array system from US Highway 101 for the Planning Commission meeting.

6. Pursuant to the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the City’s Procedures for Implementing CEQA, an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was prepared and circulated for public review and comment. Based on the information and analysis contained in the Initial Study (and comments and responses thereto), a determination has been made that the project may be approved with a Mitigated Negative Declaration.
Options
1. Approve the project as follows:
   a. Approve Draft Resolution A (Attachment 3); certifying the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project; and
   b. Approve Draft Resolution B (Attachment 4); approving Planned Development 18-09 and Conditional Use Permit 18-06, subject to site specific conditions of approval; and
2. Amend the above listed action;
3. Refer back to staff/DRC for additional analysis;

Analysis and Conclusions

Project Summary:
For the Planning Commission to consider a Development Plan and Conditional Use Permit for the installation of two solar systems for Firestone as follows:

- 2.1-megawatt (MW) ground-mounted single axis tracker system located on approximately 9.78-acres of an overall 39-acre open field located east of Firestone’s main building operations, near the water treatment ponds.
- 277-kilowatt (kW) carport system located within an existing parking lot currently used by Firestone employees encompassing approximately 14,000 square feet of the overall 2.77-acre parcel.

General Plan & Zoning Compatibility:
The site where the ground mount system will be installed has Business Park and Parks & Open Space (BP & POS) land use designations and is zoned Planned Industrial as well as Parks & Open Space (PM and POS).

The site where the carport canopies would be installed has a Business Park (BP) land use designation and is zoned Industrial (M). The Zoning Ordinance permits utility facilities, including renewable energy systems, in the POS zone, and allows them in the M and PM zones subject to a Conditional Use Permit. The discretion authorized with approval of a CUP gives the Planning Commission the ability to require specific conditions of approval to ensure that a particular use is compatible with the surrounding uses.
Neighborhood Compatibility
The height, bulk, pattern, scale and character of the ground-mounted array system would not conflict with the visual character of surrounding area, considering it will be located in proximity to an existing wastewater treatment pond. Additionally, although there is some visibility from US Hwy 101 Southbound lanes, the vantage points are approximately 0.50 miles away from the site and views of the solar arrays would not be fixed for the driver. The nearest commercial/industrial development is over 750-feet away, and none of the businesses are directly facing the direction of the arrays. The carport canopies are visible from Ramada Drive, however, the design of the canopies is typical for parking lots, and will be painted a neutral galvanized steel color.

River Trail Access
The 2018 Paso Robles Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan proposes a future Class 1 bicycle facility that goes through the Firestone Walker property to provide a river trail near the property’s edge. The Class 1 facility would support both recreational and commuting opportunities, and is also consistent with the regional Salinas River Trail Master Plan, which plans to connect an approximately 35-mile section of the Salinas River corridor between the communities of Santa Margarita and San Miguel in northern San Luis Obispo County.

For consistency with the City’s Master Plan, a condition of approval has been added to the project which will require a 30-foot wide access easement to be dedicated for the future Class 1 facility. The access easement location will need to be consistent with the location of the proposed Class 1 bicycle facility as outlined in the Master Plan. The timeline for when the facility would be installed will depend on future funding for trails in this area of the City.
Biological Resources
San Joaquin Kit Fox
A Biological Report was prepared by Althouse and Meade, Inc., dated June 2018, to analyze impacts from the solar array system, which is located within an area that is considered an important migration area for the San Joaquin Kit Fox (SJFK). Because the area is within the 2 to 1 standard mitigation ratio area for SJFK in San Luis Obispo County, the applicant would typically be required to purchase credits in a California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) approved conservation bank to offset impacts to San Joaquin kit fox by loss of habitat. However, the Biological Report indicated that SJFK was not detected in the study area, which has been used for cropland for several years, and would have a low probability of utilizing habitat in this location. A SJFK habitat evaluation form was later prepared (dated 7-18-2018) for the project with the determination that the land is no longer suitable for SJFK habitat, concluding that no compensatory mitigation would be required per the CDFW, which was confirmed by a CDFW field representative. These changes are reflected with strikethroughs to Measure B-3 in both the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Exhibit B to Draft Resolution A) as well as the Site Specific Conditions of Approval (Exhibit A to Draft Resolution B).

Potential impacts to nesting birds and American badger from ground disturbing activities are also noted in the report. The report provides recommended mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts to these biological resources to a less than significant level. These mitigation measures have been incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Cultural Resources
A Cultural Resource Study was prepared by Applied EarthWorks, Inc., dated August 2018, which determined that the location of the solar arrays is considered culturally significant. No cultural resources were observed during the survey, however, since the excavation of the water treatment ponds to the west of the solar project previously uncovered prehistoric human remains, there is heightened potential for previously undocumented subsurface human burials and cultural materials within the project area. The study indicates that typically a testing program would be recommended as the next step for cultural studies, due to the proximity of burials. However, due to the depth of previously located burials, a testing effort which only extends 1-meter deep would not benefit the project. During project construction, there is still the potential of encountering unmarked human burials within the project area. For this reason, the study recommends that a qualified archaeological monitor and a Native American observer be present for all ground-disturbing work for the proposed project. Additional mitigation measures that when implemented will reduce the impacts of this project on resources to less than significant are listed in the MMRP.

Options
Option 1. Approval of the Firestone Solar project is consistent with the City’s climate action plan, a long-range plan to help reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, lower energy costs, reduce air pollution, and improve public health and quality of life.

Option 2. Option 2 takes into account the potential for the Planning Commission to make changes to the conditions of approval for compatibility with surrounding uses. However, the solar facility has been designed so that the height, bulk, pattern, scale and character of the project features would not conflict with the visual character of surrounding commercial/industrial uses.
**Fiscal Impact**
None identified at this time.

**Recommendation**
Option 1 - Approval of the project by the following actions:
   a. Approve Draft Resolution A; certifying the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the project; and
   b. Approve Draft Resolution B; approving Planned Development 18-09 and Conditional Use Permit 18-06, subject to site specific conditions of approval.

**Attachments**
1. Vicinity Map
2. Site Plan
3. Draft Resolution – A: MND
4. Draft Resolution – B: PD 18-09, CUP 18-06
5. Mail Affidavit
6. News Affidavit
7. CEQA – Initial Study
Agenda Item 1

Attachment 1

Vicinity Map

PROJECT AREA
Ground Mount Arrays

PROJECT AREA
Carport Canopies
RESOLUTION NO. PC 19-XXX
A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
FOR THE FIRESTONE SOLAR PROJECT
(PLANNED DEVELOPMENT 18-09, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 18-06)
APNs: 009-631-018, 009-631-019, and 009-631-006

APPLICANT – REC SOLAR

WHEREAS, an application for Planned Development (PD18-09) and Conditional Use Permit (CUP18-06), has been filed by REC Solar, representative for the Firestone Solar Project; and

WHEREAS, the project would consist of construction of a 2.1-megawatt (MW) solar ground-mounted single-axis tracker system and a 277-kilowatt (kW) solar carport system, within the overall Firestone Campus at the northern end of Ramada Drive, east of US Highway 101; and

WHEREAS, the project is consistent with the applicable policy and regulatory documents of the City, including the following:

• General Plan Business Park and Open Space land use designations – The project would provide development of two renewable energy utility sites which is consistent with the Business Park (BP) and Parks & Open Space (POS) land use designations; and

• Zoning Districts of Industrial, Planned Industrial, and Parks & Open Space (M, PM, and POS) – The project is a “conditionally permitted” use in the M and PM districts, and a “permitted” use in the POS district; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq., and the City’s Procedures for Implementing CEQA, an Initial Study and a Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was prepared and circulated for a 30-day public review period beginning on January 14, 2019 through February 12, 2019. No public comments were received on the MND prior to the Planning Commission meeting. A copy of the Draft MND/Initial Study is included in Exhibit A (Attachment 7 of the project staff report) of this Resolution, and it is on file at the Paso Robles Community Development Department; and

WHEREAS, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the MND and will be imposed on the project through the City’s adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) in compliance with CEQA Guideline 15074(d). These mitigation measures are imposed on the project to address potential environmental effects from: Biological and Cultural resources. With the implementation of this mitigation, all potential environmental effects will be reduced to a less than significant level. These mitigation measures are provided in Exhibit B, “Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program” attached to this Resolution; and

WHEREAS, mitigation measures set forth in the MMRP are specific and enforceable. The MMRP adequately describes implementation procedures, monitoring responsibility, reporting actions, compliance schedule, and
verification of compliance in order to ensure that the Project complies with the adopted mitigation measures; and

WHEREAS, the mitigation measures contained in the MMRP will also be imposed as enforceable conditions of approval; and

WHEREAS, public notice of the proposed Draft MND was posted as required by Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on February 12, 2019 to consider the Initial Study and the Draft MND prepared for the proposed project, and to accept public testimony on the Planned Development, Conditional Use Permit, and environmental determination. At the close of this public hearing, the Planning Commission adopted the MND approving the proposed project; and

WHEREAS, based on the information and analysis contained in the Initial Study prepared for this project and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the Planning Commission finds that there is no substantial evidence supporting a fair argument that there would be a significant impact on the environment with mitigation measures imposed on the project; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to CEQA the Planning Commission has independently reviewed the Initial Study, the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and all comments received regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and based on the whole record before it finds that the Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, that there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment with the incorporation of mitigation, and the Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Planning Commission.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles, based on its independent judgment and analysis, has adopted the Mitigated Negative Declaration (Exhibit A) for the Firestone Solar project and adopted a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Exhibit B), and imposes each mitigation measure as a condition of approval, in accordance with the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the City’s Procedures for Implementing CEQA.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 12th day of February 2019, by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

DOUG BARTH, CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST:

WARREN FRACE, SECRETARY OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
Exhibits:

A. Exhibit A – Mitigated Negative Declaration / Initial Study (refer to Attachment 7 of the Planning Commission staff report)
B. Exhibit B – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
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 indicated above to lessen the level of environmental impact of the project to a level of non-significance. A completed and signed checklist for each mitigation measure indicates that it has been completed.

**Explanation of Headings:**

- **Type:** Project, ongoing, cumulative
- **Monitoring Department or Agency:** Department or Agency responsible for monitoring a particular mitigation measure
- **Shown on Plans:** When a mitigation measure is shown on the plans, this column will be initialed and dated.
- **Verified Implementation:** When a mitigation measure has been implemented, this column will be initialed and dated.
- **Remarks:** Area for describing status of ongoing mitigation measure, or for other information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitoring Department or Agency</th>
<th>Shown on Plans</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
<th>Timing/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD18-09, CUP18-06</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Certified Arborist CDD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Notes shown on construction documents.</td>
<td>Prior to issuing grading permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Firestone Solar Project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BR-1. Within one week of ground disturbance activities, if work occurs between March 15 and August 15, nesting bird surveys shall be conducted. To avoid impacts to nesting birds, grading and construction activities that affect trees and grasslands shall not be conducted during the breeding season from March 1 to August 15. If construction activities must be conducted during this period, nesting bird surveys shall take place within one week of habitat disturbance. If surveys do not locate nesting birds, construction activities may be conducted. If nesting birds are located, no construction activities shall occur within a distance specified by a qualified biologist, until chicks are fledged or nest fails. This includes nests of all common bird species (under the MBTA), as well as special status birds and raptor nests. Construction activities shall observe the delineated buffer, determined by a qualified biologist, where buffer radius will be specified according to special status rank, intensity of construction activity or impact (i.e. high decibel levels or heavy ground disturbance) and where local, state, and federal
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitoring Department or Agency</th>
<th>Shown on Plans</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
<th>Timing/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD18-09, CUP18-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Notes shown on construction documents</td>
<td>Prior to issuing Grading Permit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

regulations apply. A preconstruction survey report shall be submitted to the lead agency immediately upon completion of the survey. The report shall detail appropriate fencing or flagging of the buffer zone and make recommendations on additional monitoring requirements. A map of the Project site and nest locations shall be included with the report. The Project biologist conducting the nesting survey shall have the authority to reduce or increase the recommended buffer depending upon site conditions.

**BR-2.** A pre-construction survey shall be conducted within thirty days of beginning work on the site to identify if badgers are using the site. If the pre-construction survey finds potential badger dens, they shall be inspected to determine whether they are occupied. The survey shall cover the entire property and shall examine both old and new dens. If potential badger dens are too long to completely inspect from the entrance, a fiber optic scope shall be used to examine the den to the end. Inactive dens may be excavated by hand with a shovel to prevent re-use of dens during construction. If badgers are found in dens on the property between February and July, nursing young may be present. To avoid disturbance and the possibility of direct take of adults and nursing young, and to prevent badgers from becoming trapped in burrows during construction activity, no grading shall occur within 100 feet of active badger dens between February and July. Between July 1st and February 1st all potential badger dens shall be inspected to determine if badgers are present. During the winter badgers do not truly hibernate, but are inactive and asleep in their dens for several days at a time. Because they can be torpid during the winter, they are vulnerable to disturbances that may collapse their dens before they rouse and emerge. Therefore, surveys shall be conducted for badger dens throughout the year. If badger dens are found on the property during the pre-construction survey, the CDFW wildlife biologist for the area shall be contacted to review current allowable management practices.
Mitigation Measure  
PD18-09, CUP18-06  
(Firestone Solar Project)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitoring Department or Agency</th>
<th>Shown on Plans</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
<th>Timing/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR-3. Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits, the applicant shall submit evidence to the City of Paso Robles, Community Development Department (Planning Division) that states that one or a combination of the following three San Joaquin kit fox mitigation measures has been implemented:</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td>Notes shown on construction documents</td>
<td>Prior to issuing Grading Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Provide for the protection in perpetuity, through acquisition of fee or a conservation easement of [Total number of mitigation acres required] acres of suitable habitat in the kit fox corridor area (e.g. within the San Luis Obispo County kit fox habitat area, in the City of Paso Robles), either on-site or off-site, and provide for a non-wasting endowment to provide for management and monitoring of the property in perpetuity. Lands to be conserved shall be subject to the review and approval of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) and the City.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Deposit funds into an approved in-lieu fee program, which would provide for the protection in perpetuity of suitable habitat in the kit fox corridor area within San Luis Obispo County, and provide for a non-wasting endowment for management and monitoring of the property in perpetuity. Mitigation alternative (b) above can be completed by providing funds to The Nature Conservancy (TNC) pursuant to the Voluntary Fee-Based Compensatory Mitigation Program (Program). The Program was established in agreement between the CDFW and TNC to preserve San Joaquin kit fox habitat, and to provide a voluntary mitigation alternative to project proponents who must mitigate the impacts of projects in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The fee, payable to “The Nature Conservancy,” would total $[Amount of fee based on $2500 per acre]. This fee is calculated based on the current cost per unit of $2500 per acre of mitigation, which is scheduled to be adjusted to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure PD18-09, CUP18-06 (Firestone Solar Project)</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Monitoring Department or Agency</td>
<td>Shown on Plans</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
<td>Timing/Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address the increasing cost of property in San Luis Obispo County; your actual cost may increase depending on the timing of payment. This fee must be paid after the CDFW provides written notification about your mitigation options but prior to City permit issuance and initiation of any ground disturbing activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Purchase [Total number of mitigation acres required] credits in a CDFW-approved conservation bank, which would provide for the protection in perpetuity of suitable habitat within the kit fox corridor area and provide for a non-wasting endowment for management and monitoring of the property in perpetuity. Mitigation alternative (c) above can be completed by purchasing credits from the Palo Prieto Conservation Bank (see contact information below). The Palo Prieto Conservation Bank was established to preserve San Joaquin kit fox habitat, and to provide a voluntary mitigation alternative to project proponents who must mitigate the impacts of projects in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The cost for purchasing credits is payable to the owners of The Palo Prieto Conservation Bank, and would total $[Amount of mitigation acres required (i.e. credits), currently priced at $2500 per credit]. This fee is calculated based on the current cost per credit of $2,500 per acre of mitigation. The fee is established by the conservation bank owner and may change at any time. Your actual cost may increase depending on the timing of payment. Purchase of credits must be completed prior to City permit issuance and initiation of any ground disturbing activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* A SJF habitat evaluation form was prepared (dated 7-18-2018) for the project with the determination that the land is no longer suitable for SJF habitat, concluding that no compensatory mitigation would be required per the CDFW, which was confirmed by a CDFW field representative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-4. Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits, the applicant shall provide evidence that they have retained a qualified biologist acceptable to the City. The retained biologist shall perform the following monitoring activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>i.</strong> Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits and within 30 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction, the biologist shall conduct a pre-activity (i.e. preconstruction) survey for known or potential kit fox dens and submit a letter to the City reporting the date the survey was conducted, the survey protocol, survey results, and what measures were necessary (and completed), as applicable, to address any kit fox activity within the project limits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ii.</strong> The qualified biologist shall conduct weekly site visits during site-disturbance activities (i.e. grading, diskng, excavation, stock piling of dirt or gravel, etc.) that proceed longer than 14 days, for the purpose of monitoring compliance with required Mitigation Measures. Site disturbance activities lasting up to 14 days do not require weekly monitoring by the biologist unless observations of kit fox or their dens are made on-site or the qualified biologist recommends monitoring for some other reason. When weekly monitoring is required, the biologist shall submit weekly monitoring reports to the City.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>iii.</strong> Prior to or during project activities, if any observations are made of San Joaquin Kit fox, or any known or potential San Joaquin kit fox dens are discovered within the project limits, the qualified biologist shall re-assess the probability of incidental take (e.g. harm or death) to kit fox. At the time a den is discovered, the qualified biologist shall contact USFWS and the CDFW for guidance on possible additional kit fox protection measures to implement and whether or not a Federal and/or State incidental take permit is needed. If a potential den is encountered during construction, work shall stop until such time the USFWS determines it is appropriate to resume work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitoring Department or Agency</th>
<th>Shown on Plans</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
<th>Timing/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD18-09, CUP18-06 (Firestone Solar Project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BR-5.** Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits, the applicant shall clearly delineate the following as a note on the project plans: “Speed signs of 25 mph (or lower) shall be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitoring Department or Agency</th>
<th>Shown on Plans</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
<th>Timing/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD18-09, CUP18-06 (Firestone Solar Project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>posted for all construction traffic to minimize the probability of road mortality of the San Joaquin kit fox*. Speed limit signs shall be installed on the project site within 30 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BR-6.</strong> During the site disturbance and/or construction phase, grading and construction activities after dusk shall be prohibited unless coordinated through the City, during which additional kit fox mitigation measures may be required.</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td>Shown on construction documents</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BR-7.</strong> Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permit and within 30 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction, all personnel associated with the project shall attend a worker education training program, conducted by a qualified biologist, to avoid or reduce impacts on sensitive biological resources (i.e. San Joaquin kit fox). At a minimum, as the program relates to the kit fox, the training shall include the kit fox’s life history, all mitigation measures specified by the City, as well as any related biological report(s) prepared for the project. The applicant shall notify the City shortly prior to this meeting. A kit fox fact sheet shall also be developed prior to the training program, and distributed at the training program to all contractors, employers and other personnel involved with the construction of the project.</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td>Shown on construction documents</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BR-8.</strong> During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, to prevent entrapment of the San Joaquin kit fox, all excavations, steep-walled holes and trenches in excess of two feet in depth shall be covered at the close of each working day by plywood or similar materials, or provided with one or more escape ramps constructed of earth fill or wooden planks. Trenches shall also be inspected for entrapped kit fox each morning prior to onset of field activities and immediately prior to covering with plywood at the end of each working day. Before such holes or trenches are</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Biologist</td>
<td>Shown on construction documents</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Monitoring Department or Agency</td>
<td>Shown on Plans</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
<td>Timing/Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD18-09, CUP18-06 (Firestone Solar Project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filled, they shall be thoroughly inspected for entrapped kit fox. Any kit fox so discovered shall be allowed to escape before field activities resume, or removed from the trench or hole by a qualified biologist and allowed to escape unimpeded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BR-9.</strong> During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, any pipes, culverts, or similar structures with a diameter of four inches or greater, stored overnight at the project site shall be thoroughly inspected for trapped San Joaquin kit foxes before the subject pipe is subsequently buried, capped, or otherwise used or moved in any way. If during the construction phase a kit fox is discovered inside a pipe, that section of pipe will not be moved. If necessary, the pipe may be moved only once to remove it from the path of activity, until the kit fox has escaped.</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BR-10.</strong> During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, all food-related trash items such as wrappers, cans, bottles, and food scraps shall be disposed of only in closed containers. These containers shall be regularly removed from the site. Food items may attract San Joaquin kit foxes onto the project site, consequently exposing such animals to increased risk of injury or mortality. No deliberate feeding of wildlife shall be allowed.</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to issuance of Grading Permit/On-going with project construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BR-11.</strong> Prior to, during and after the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, use of pesticides or herbicides shall be in compliance with all local, State and Federal regulations. This is necessary to minimize the probability of primary or secondary poisoning of endangered species utilizing adjacent habitats, and the depletion of prey upon which San Joaquin kit foxes depend.</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BR-12.</strong> During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, any contractor or employee that inadvertently kills or injures a San Joaquin kit fox or who finds any such animal either dead, injured, or entrapped shall be required to report the incident</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td></td>
<td>On Going during construction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Monitoring Department or Agency</td>
<td>Shown on Plans</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
<td>Timing/Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD18-09, CUP18-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Firestone Solar Project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

immediately to the applicant and City. In the event that any observations are made of injured or dead kit fox, the applicant shall immediately notify the USFWS and CDFW by telephone. In addition, formal notification shall be provided in writing within three working days of the finding of any such animal(s). Notification shall include the date, time, location and circumstances of the incident. Any threatened or endangered species found dead or injured shall be turned over immediately to CDFW for care, analysis, or disposition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BR-13</th>
<th>On-going</th>
<th>CDD</th>
<th>Prior to issuance of a grading permit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BR-13. Prior to final inspection, or occupancy, whichever comes first, should any long internal or perimeter fencing be proposed or installed, the applicant shall do the following to provide for kit fox passage:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. If a wire strand/pole design is used, the lowest strand shall be no closer to the ground than 12 inches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. If a more solid wire mesh fence is used, 8 by 12 inch openings near the ground shall be provided every 100 yards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Upon fence installation, the applicant shall notify the City to verify proper installation. Any fencing constructed after issuance of a final permit shall follow the above guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CR-1</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>CDD</th>
<th>Grading Plans &amp; Building Plans</th>
<th>Prior to issuance of a grading permit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR-1: A qualified archaeological monitor and a Native American observer shall be present for all ground-disturbing work for the proposed Project. A worker-education training meeting to discuss the requirements for archaeological monitoring shall be held prior to the start of construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric materials may include chert flaked stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (midden) containing fire-altered rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones). Historic-period materials might include stone, concrete, wood or adobe building foundations, corals, and walls; filled wells or privies; mining features; and deposits of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Monitoring Department or Agency</td>
<td>Shown on Plans</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD18-09, CUP18-06 (Firestone Solar Project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. If any of these materials are found during the course of construction, the Project archaeologist should halt construction and determine if materials are isolated finds or part of a larger archaeological deposit. If an archaeological site is identified, then the resource should be evaluated for significance under CEQA and further treatment measures may be required.

- If human remains are discovered during Project construction, work must stop at the discovery location and any nearby area suspected to contain human remains (PRC 7050.5). The San Luis Obispo Coroner must be contacted to determine whether the cause of death should be investigated. If the coroner determines that the remains are of Native American origin, it is necessary to comply with state laws relating to the disposition of Native American burials, which fall within the jurisdiction of the NAHC (PRC 5097). The coroner will contact the NAHC. The NAHC will contact the most likely descendant(s) who will be afforded the opportunity to recommend means for treatment of the human remains following protocols in PRC 5097.98.

(add additional measures as necessary)

**Explanation of Headings:**

- **Type:** ............................................................... Project, ongoing, cumulative
- **Monitoring Department or Agency:** ........ Department or Agency responsible for monitoring a particular mitigation measure
- **Shown on Plans:** ............................................... When a mitigation measure is shown on the plans, this column will be initialed and dated.
- **Verified Implementation:** ................................. When a mitigation measure has been implemented, this column will be initialed and dated.
- **Remarks:** ........................................................... Area for describing status of ongoing mitigation measure, or for other information.
DRAFT RESOLUTION NO. PC 19-XXX

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
TO APPROVE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT 18-09 & CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 18-06
2125 ARDMORE ROAD, APN: 025-362-007

APPLICANT – REC SOLAR

WHEREAS, an application for Planned Development (PD18-09) and Conditional Use Permit (CUP18-06), has been filed by REC Solar, representative for the Firestone Solar Project; and

WHEREAS, the project would consist of construction of a 2.1-megawatt (MW) solar ground-mounted single-axis tracker system and a 277-kilowatt (kW) solar carport system, within the overall Firestone Campus at the northern end of Ramada Drive, east of US Highway 101; and

WHEREAS, the General Plan land use designations include Business Park (BP) and Parks & Open Space (POS) and the zoning includes Industrial, Planned Industrial, and Parks & Open Space (M, PM, and POS). The project is a “conditionally permitted” use in the M and PM districts, and a “permitted” use in the POS district; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the City’s Procedures for Implementing CEQA, an Initial Study was prepared for the project; and

WHEREAS, based on the information and analysis contained in the Initial Study, staff determined that the proposed project as designed, and with appropriate mitigation measures added as conditions of approval, will not result in significant environmental impacts, and a Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for public review and comment in full compliance with CEQA; and

WHEREAS, a duly noticed public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on February 12, 2019 to consider the facts as presented in the staff report prepared for this project, and to accept public testimony regarding this Planned Development and Conditional Use Permit request; and

NOW, THEREFORE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. All of the above recitals are true and correct and incorporated herein by reference.

Section 2 –Findings: In accordance with Zoning Ordinance Section 21.23B.050, Findings for Approval of Development Plans, and findings for approval of a Conditional Use Permit, and based upon the facts and analysis presented in the staff report, public testimony received and subject to the conditions listed below, the Planning Commission makes the following findings:

1. The project is consistent with the goals and policies established by the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, since the project would provide for renewable energy utility sites which is consistent with the Business Park (BP) and Parks & Open Space (POS) land use designations and the Industrial, Planned Industrial, and Parks & Open Space (M, PM, and POS) zoning designations. The project will also require dedication of an access easement for future trail connections, consistent with the 2018 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan; and
2. The proposed development plan will not be detrimental to the health, safety, morals, comfort, convenience and general welfare of the residents and or businesses in the surrounding area, or be injurious or detrimental to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City, since the property is not located in close proximity to other residents or neighborhoods, and it would not result in significant noise, traffic, light, glare, or other potential effects; and

3. The proposed development plan accommodates the aesthetic quality of the City as a whole, since the solar field will be located behind Firestone’s water treatment ponds which is not highly visible, and the solar carports will blend in with the commercial/industrial buildings along Ramada Drive; and

4. The proposed development plan is compatible with, and is not detrimental to, surrounding land uses and improvements, provides an appropriate visual appearance, and contributes to the mitigation of any environmental and social impacts, since it is proposed to be a low-intensity development; and

5. The proposed development plan is compatible with existing scenic and environmental resources, as noted in #3 and #4 above; and

6. The proposed development plan contributes to the orderly development of the city as a whole by providing a well-designed project that is suitable for the location where it is proposed and surrounding land uses including commercial, industrial, and the existing rural residential in the vicinity; and

**Section 3 - Environmental Determination:** Pursuant to the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the City’s Procedures for Implementing CEQA, an Initial Study was prepared for the project. Based on the information and analysis contained in the Initial Study, staff determined that the proposed project as designed, and with appropriate mitigation measures added as conditions of approval, will not result in significant environmental impacts, and a Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for public review and comment in full compliance with CEQA.

**Section 4 - Approval:** Planned Development 18-09 & CUP 18-06 is approved subject to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXHIBIT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Site Specific Conditions of Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Standard Conditions of Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Development Plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 12th day of February 2019 by the following roll call vote:

AYES: _______

NOES: _______

ABSENT: _______

ABSTAIN: _______

________________________
DOUG BARTH, CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST: 
________________________
WARREN FRACE, PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY
Exhibit A

Site Specific Conditions of Approval – PD18-09 & CUP18-06

Planning Division Conditions:

NOTE: In the event of conflict or duplication between standard and site-specific conditions, the site-specific condition shall supersede the standard condition.

1. The project shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the Conditions of Approval established by this Resolution and it shall be constructed in substantial conformance with the following Exhibits:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXHIBIT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Standard Conditions of Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Development Plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Planned Development 18-09, Conditional Use Permit 18-06 allows for the installation of two solar systems for Firestone as follows:
   a. 2.1-megawatt (MW) ground-mounted single axis tracker system located on approximately 9.78-acres of an overall 39-acre open field located east of Firestone’s main building operations, near the water treatment ponds.
   b. 277 kilowatt (kW) carport system located within an existing parking lot currently used by Firestone employees encompassing approximately 14,000 square feet of the overall 2.77-acre parcel.

3. Approval of this project is valid for a period of two (2) years from date of approval. Unless construction permits have been issued and site work has begun, the approval of Planned Development 18-09 and Conditional Use Permit 18-06 shall expire on February 12, 2021. The Planning Commission may extend this expiration date if a Time Extension application has been filed with the City along with the fees before the expiration date.

4. Prior to issuance of a grading permit, the applicant shall provide evidence that a 1602 permit from the CDFW Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement program has been satisfied, as necessary.

5. All lighting shall be downward directed and shielded to prevent offsite glare in conformance with Section 21.21.040 of the City’s Zoning Ordinance.

6. Prior to issuance of the building permit, the applicant shall submit neutral color samples, for approval by the Community Development Department, for the steel component of the canopy structure.

7. Upon completion of the construction of the project, the property and any improvements thereon shall be restored to a good and safe condition.

8. Any condition imposed by the Planning Commission in approving this Development Plan may be modified or eliminated, or new conditions may be added, provided that the Planning Commission shall first conduct a public hearing in the same manner as required for the granting of the original permit. No such modification shall be made unless the Commission finds that such modification is necessary.
to protect the public interest and/or neighboring properties, or, in the case of deletion of an existing condition, that such action is necessary to permit reasonable operation and use under the Development Plan

**Engineering Division Conditions:**

9. Prior to building permit issuance, the applicant shall dedicate a 30-foot wide access easement for future trail access to the City Engineer’s satisfaction. The access easement shall be consistent with the location of the proposed Class 1 bicycle facility as outlined in the City’s 2018 Paso Robles Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

**Building Division Conditions:**

10. Prior to the start of construction, applicant shall submit plans prepared by a registered design professional, showing compliance with all applicable building and fire codes and obtain the required permits.

**Emergency Services Conditions:**

*Ground-mount system:*

11. The roadway providing access from Road to the proposed project site must provide a minimum 12-foot edge-to-edge all-weather driving surface capable of supporting a 20-ton load capacity.

12. Any part of the Road grade that exceed 12% shall be nonskid asphalt or concrete surface.

13. An approved 20-foot minimum road is required around the perimeter of the entire project for emergency vehicles.

14. All internal roads shall be a minimum of 20 feet wide.

15. Vertical clearance of 13’-6” is required the entire length of the roadway.

16. Roadways shall also provide for a 10-foot fuel modification zone on both sides.

17. A fuel reduction zone (vegetation Clearance) is required around the project site. A minimum of 100-feet of “defensible space” shall be required.

18. Annual fuel modification must be maintained in accordance with the Public Resources Code, Title 19 and California Fire Code.

19. Access to all associated equipment shall be controlled by means of a locked gate or fence.

20. If a proposed gate is added at the access point, Emergency Services may require a “Knox” lock to ensure access during emergencies.

21. Electrical Panels and shut offs must be identified and labeled.

22. 30 foot setback from property line required for parcels 1 acre in size or larger. **Note: All setbacks are subject to City of Paso Robles Planning Department approval.
23. Solar Photovoltaic systems must be clearly marked. Marking is needed to provide emergency responders with appropriate warning and guidance with respect to working around and isolating the solar electric system.

24. All marking signs shall be installed per the current Cal Fire Solar Photovoltaic Installation Guidelines.

25. Materials used for marking signs must be weather resistant.

Carport System:

26. All hazardous electrical transmission lines must be labeled – “CAUTION – Electrical Hazard”.

27. Warning labels shall appear on the utility interactive inverter or be applied by the installer near the ground fault indicator at a visible location stating the following:
   a. Warning Electrical Shock Hazard

28. Shut down and/or isolation procedures will be clearly displayed on the main electrical service panel exterior shunt trip device designed to terminate power to all electrical service (solar and domestic) when the main service disconnect is in the off position.

29. Main electrical service panel shall be labeled – “Solar Power Enhanced”.

Air Quality Conditions:

30. The following measures are recommended to minimize nuisance impacts associated with construction-generated fugitive dust emissions:
   a. Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible;
   b. Use of water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site and from exceeding the APCD’s limit of 20% opacity for greater than 3 minutes in any 60-minute period. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 mph. Reclaimed (non-potable) water should be used whenever possible. Please note that since water use is a concern due to drought conditions, the contractor or builder shall consider the use of an APCD-approved dust suppressant where feasible to reduce the amount of water used for dust control. For a list of suppressants, see Section 4.3 of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook;
   c. All dirt stock pile areas should be sprayed daily and covered with tarps or other dust barriers as needed;
   d. Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans should be implemented as soon as possible, following completion of any soil disturbing activities;
   e. Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading should be sown with a fast germinating, non-invasive grass seed and watered until vegetation is established;
All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the APCD;

All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used;

Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site;

All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with CVC Section 23114;

Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site;

Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers shall be used with reclaimed water used where feasible. Roads shall be pre-wetted prior to sweeping when feasible;

All PM$_{10}$ mitigation measures required should be shown on grading and building plans; and,

m. The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the fugitive dust emissions and enhance the implementation of the measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints and reduce visible emissions below the APCD’s limit of 20% opacity for greater than 3 minutes in any 60-minute period. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the APCD Compliance Division prior to the start of any grading, earthwork or demolition.

18. Demolition of onsite structures shall comply with the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Emissions (NESHAP) requirements (NESHAP, 40 CFR, Part 61, Subpart M) for the demolition of existing structures. The SLOAPCD is delegated authority by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to implement the Federal Asbestos NESHAP. Prior to demolition of onsite structures, the SLOAPCD shall be notified, per NESHAP requirements. SLOAPCD notification form and reporting requirements are included in Appendix A. Additional information may be obtained at website url: http://slocleanair.org/business/asbestos.php.

19. Maintain all construction equipment in proper tune according to manufacturer’s specifications;

20. Fuel all off-road and portable diesel powered equipment with ARB certified motor vehicle diesel fuel (non-taxed version suitable for use off-road);

21. Use diesel construction equipment meeting ARB’s Tier 2 certified engines or cleaner off-road heavy-duty diesel engines, and comply with the State Off-road Regulation;
22. Idling of all on and off-road diesel-fueled vehicles shall not be permitted when not in use. Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas and or job site to remind drivers and operators of the no idling limitation.

23. Electrify equipment when possible;

24. Substitute gasoline-powered in place of diesel-powered equipment, when available; and,

25. Use alternatively fueled construction equipment on-site when available, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane or biodiesel.

Mitigation Measures – Conditions of Approval:

BR-1. Within one week of ground disturbance activities, if work occurs between March 15 and August 15, nesting bird surveys shall be conducted. To avoid impacts to nesting birds, grading and construction activities that affect trees and grasslands shall not be conducted during the breeding season from March 1 to August 15. If construction activities must be conducted during this period, nesting bird surveys shall take place within one week of habitat disturbance. If surveys do not locate nesting birds, construction activities may be conducted. If nesting birds are located, no construction activities shall occur within a distance specified by a qualified biologist, until chicks are fledged or nest fails. This includes nests of all common bird species (under the MBTA), as well as special status birds and raptor nests. Construction activities shall observe the delineated buffer, determined by a qualified biologist, where buffer radius will be specified according to special status rank, intensity of construction activity or impact (i.e. high decibel levels or heavy ground disturbance) and where local, state, and federal regulations apply. A preconstruction survey report shall be submitted to the lead agency immediately upon completion of the survey. The report shall detail appropriate fencing or flagging of the buffer zone and make recommendations on additional monitoring requirements. A map of the Project site and nest locations shall be included with the report. The Project biologist conducting the nesting survey shall have the authority to reduce or increase the recommended buffer depending upon site conditions.

BR-2. A pre-construction survey shall be conducted within thirty days of beginning work on the site to identify if badgers are using the site. If the pre-construction survey finds potential badger dens, they shall be inspected to determine whether they are occupied. The survey shall cover the entire property and shall examine both old and new dens. If potential badger dens are too long to completely inspect from the entrance, a fiber optic scope shall be used to examine the den to the end. Inactive dens may be excavated by hand with a shovel to prevent re-use of dens during construction. If badgers are found in dens on the property between February and July, nursing young may be present. To avoid disturbance and the possibility of direct take of adults and nursing young, and to prevent badgers from becoming trapped in burrows during construction activity, no grading shall occur within 100 feet of active badger dens between February and July. Between July 1st and February 1st all potential badger dens shall be inspected to determine if badgers are present. During the winter badgers do not truly hibernate, but are inactive and asleep in their dens for several days at a time. Because they can be torpid during the winter, they are vulnerable to disturbances that may collapse their dens before they rouse and emerge. Therefore, surveys shall be conducted for badger dens throughout the year. If badger dens are found on the property during the pre-construction survey, the CDFW wildlife biologist for the area shall be contacted to review current allowable management practices.
BR-4. Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits, the applicant shall provide evidence that they have retained a qualified biologist acceptable to the City. The retained biologist shall perform the following monitoring activities:

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

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

iii. Prior to or during project activities, if any observations are made of San Joaquin Kit fox, or any known or potential San Joaquin kit fox dens are discovered within the project limits, the qualified biologist shall re-assess the probability of incidental take (e.g. harm or death) to kit fox. At the time a den is discovered, the qualified biologist shall contact USFWS and the CDFW for guidance on possible additional kit fox protection measures to implement and whether or not a Federal and/or State incidental take permit is needed. If a potential den is encountered during construction, work shall stop until such time the USFWS determines it is appropriate to resume work. If incidental take of kit fox during project activities is possible, before project activities commence, the applicant must consult with the USFWS. The results of this consultation may require the applicant to obtain a Federal and/or State permit for incidental take during project activities. The applicant should be aware that the presence of kit foxes or known or potential kit fox dens at the project site could result in further delays of project activities.

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

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

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

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

BR-5. Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits, the applicant shall clearly delineate the following as a note on the project plans: “Speed signs of 25 mph (or lower) shall be posted for all construction traffic to minimize the probability of road mortality of the San Joaquin kit fox”.

Agenda Item 1
Speed limit signs shall be installed on the project site within 30 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction.

BR-6. During the site disturbance and/or construction phase, grading and construction activities after dusk shall be prohibited unless coordinated through the City, during which additional kit fox mitigation measures may be required.

BR-7. Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permit and within 30 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction, all personnel associated with the project shall attend a worker education training program, conducted by a qualified biologist, to avoid or reduce impacts on sensitive biological resources (i.e. San Joaquin kit fox). At a minimum, as the program relates to the kit fox, the training shall include the kit fox’s life history, all mitigation measures specified by the City, as well as any related biological report(s) prepared for the project. The applicant shall notify the City shortly prior to this meeting. A kit fox fact sheet shall also be developed prior to the training program, and distributed at the training program to all contractors, employers and other personnel involved with the construction of the project.

BR-8. During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, to prevent entrapment of the San Joaquin kit fox, all excavations, steep-walled holes and trenches in excess of two feet in depth shall be covered at the close of each working day by plywood or similar materials, or provided with one or more escape ramps constructed of earth fill or wooden planks. Trenches shall also be inspected for entrapped kit fox each morning prior to onset of field activities and immediately prior to covering with plywood at the end of each working day. Before such holes or trenches are filled, they shall be thoroughly inspected for entrapped kit fox. Any kit fox so discovered shall be allowed to escape before field activities resume, or removed from the trench or hole by a qualified biologist and allowed to escape unimpeded.

BR-9. During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, any pipes, culverts, or similar structures with a diameter of four inches or greater, stored overnight at the project site shall be thoroughly inspected for trapped San Joaquin kit foxes before the subject pipe is subsequently buried, capped, or otherwise used or moved in any way. If during the construction phase a kit fox is discovered inside a pipe, that section of pipe will not be moved. If necessary, the pipe may be moved only once to remove it from the path of activity, until the kit fox has escaped.

BR-10. During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, all food-related trash items such as wrappers, cans, bottles, and food scraps shall be disposed of only in closed containers. These containers shall be regularly removed from the site. Food items may attract San Joaquin kit foxes onto the project site, consequently exposing such animals to increased risk of injury or mortality. No deliberate feeding of wildlife shall be allowed.

BR-11. Prior to, during and after the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, use of pesticides or herbicides shall be in compliance with all local, State and Federal regulations. This is necessary to minimize the probability of primary or secondary poisoning of endangered species utilizing adjacent habitats, and the depletion of prey upon which San Joaquin kit foxes depend.

BR-12. During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, any contractor or employee that inadvertently kills or injures a San Joaquin kit fox or who finds any such animal either dead, injured, or entrapped shall be required to report the incident immediately to the applicant and City. In the event that any observations are made of injured or dead kit fox, the applicant shall immediately notify the USFWS and CDFW by telephone. In addition, formal notification shall be provided in writing within three working days of the finding of any such animal(s). Notification shall include
the date, time, location and circumstances of the incident. Any threatened or endangered species found dead or injured shall be turned over immediately to CDFW for care, analysis, or disposition.

BR-13. Prior to final inspection, or occupancy, whichever comes first, should any long internal or perimeter fencing be proposed or installed, the applicant shall do the following to provide for kit fox passage:

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

ii. If a more solid wire mesh fence is used, 8 by 12 inch openings near the ground shall be provided every 100 yards.

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

CR-1: A qualified archaeological monitor and a Native American observer shall be present for all ground-disturbing work for the proposed Project. A worker-education training meeting to discuss the requirements for archaeological monitoring shall be held prior to the start of construction.

- Prehistoric materials may include chert flaked stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (midden) containing fire-altered rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones). Historic-period materials might include stone, concrete, wood or adobe building foundations, corrals, and walls; filled wells or privies; mining features; and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. If any of these materials are found during the course of construction, the Project archaeologist should halt construction and determine if materials are isolated finds or part of a larger archaeological deposit. If an archaeological site is identified, then the resource should be evaluated for significance under CEQA and further treatment measures may be required.

- If human remains are discovered during Project construction, work must stop at the discovery location and any nearby area suspected to contain human remains (PRC 7050.5). The San Luis Obispo Coroner must be contacted to determine whether the cause of death should be investigated. If the coroner determines that the remains are of Native American origin, it is necessary to comply with state laws relating to the disposition of Native American burials, which fall within the jurisdiction of the NAHC (PRC 5097). The coroner will contact the NAHC. The NAHC will contact the most likely descendant(s) who will be afforded the opportunity to recommend means for treatment of the human remains following protocols in PRC 5097.98.
Exhibit B

CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
STANDARD DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS

☒ Planned Development
☐ Conditional Use Permit
☐ Tentative Parcel Map
☐ Tentative Tract Map

Approval Body: PC
Date of Approval: February 12, 2019
Applicant: REC Solar
Location: Northern end of Ramada Drive
APNs: 009-631-006, 009-631-018, and 009-631-019

The following conditions that have been checked are standard conditions of approval for the above referenced project. The checked conditions shall be complied with in their entirety before the project can be finalized, unless otherwise specifically indicated. In addition, there may be site specific conditions of approval that apply to this project in the resolution.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT - The applicant shall contact the Community Development Department, (805) 237-3970, for compliance with the following conditions:

A. GENERAL CONDITIONS – PD/CUP:

☒ 1. This project approval shall expire on February 12, 2021 unless a time extension request is filed with the Community Development Department, or a State mandated automatic time extension is applied prior to expiration.

☒ 2. The site shall be developed and maintained in accordance with the approved plans and unless specifically provided for through the Planned Development process shall not waive compliance with any sections of the Zoning Code, all other applicable City Ordinances, and applicable Specific Plans.

☒ 3. To the extent allowable by law, Owner agrees to hold City harmless from costs and expenses, including attorney’s fees, incurred by City or held to be the liability of City in connection with City’s defense of its actions in any proceeding brought in any State or Federal court challenging the City’s actions with respect to the project. Owner understands and acknowledges that City is under no obligation to defend any legal actions challenging the City’s actions with respect to the project.
4. Any site specific condition imposed by the Planning Commission in approving this project (PD/CUP) may be modified or eliminated, or new conditions may be added, provided that the Planning Commission shall first conduct a public hearing in the same manner as required for the approval of this project. No such modification shall be made unless the Commission finds that such modification is necessary to protect the public interest and/or neighboring properties, or, in the case of deletion of an existing condition, that such action is necessary to permit reasonable operation and use for this approval.

5. The site shall be kept in a neat manner at all times and the landscaping shall be continuously maintained in a healthy and thriving condition.

6. All signs shall be subject to review and approval as required by Municipal Code Section 21.19 and shall require a separate application and approval prior to installation of any sign.

7. All walls/fences and exposed retaining walls shall be constructed of decorative materials which include but are not limited to splitface block, slumpstone, stuccoed block, brick, wood, crib walls or other similar materials as determined by the Development Review Committee, but specifically excluding precision block.

8. Prior to the issuance of a Building Permit a landscape and irrigation plan consistent with the Landscape and Irrigation Ordinance, shall be submitted for City review and approval. The plan needs to be designed in a manner that utilizes drought tolerant plants, trees and ground covers and minimizes, if not eliminates the use of turf. The irrigation plan shall utilize drip irrigation and limit the use of spray irrigation. All existing and/or new landscaping shall be installed with automatic irrigation systems.

9. A reciprocal parking and access easement and agreement for site access, parking, and maintenance of all project entrances, parking areas, landscaping, hardscape, common open space, areas and site lighting standards and fixtures, shall be recorded prior to or in conjunction with the Final Map. Said easement and agreement shall apply to all properties, and be referenced in the site Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs).

10. All outdoor storage shall be screened from public view by landscaping and walls or fences per Section 21.21.110 of the Municipal Code.

11. For commercial, industrial, office or multi-family projects, all refuse enclosures are required to provide adequate space for recycling bins. The enclosure shall be architecturally compatible with the primary building. Gates shall be view obscuring and constructed of durable materials. Check with Paso Robles Waste Disposal to determine the adequate size of enclosure based on the number and size of containers to be stored in the enclosure.

12. For commercial, industrial, office or multi-family projects, all existing and/or new ground-mounted appurtenances such as air-conditioning condensers, electrical
transformers, backflow devices etc., shall be screened from public view through the use of decorative walls and/or landscaping subject to approval by the Community Development Director or his designee. Details shall be included in the building plans.

☐ 13. All existing and/or new roof appurtenances such as air-conditioning units, grease hoods, etc. shall be screened from public view. The screening shall be architecturally integrated with the building design and constructed of compatible materials to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director or his designee. Details shall be included in the building plans.

☒ 14. All existing and/or new lighting shall be shielded so as to be directed downward in such a manner as to not create off-site glare or adversely impact adjacent properties. The style, location and height of the lighting fixtures shall be submitted with the building plans and shall be subject to approval by the Community Development Director or his designee.

☐ 15. All walls/fences and exposed retaining walls shall be constructed of decorative materials which include but are not limited to splitface block, slumpstone, stuccoed block, brick, wood, crib walls or other similar materials as determined by the Development Review Committee, but specifically excluding precision block.

☒ 16. It is the property owner's responsibility to insure that all construction of private property improvements occur on private property. It is the owner's responsibility to identify the property lines and insure compliance by the owner's agents.

☒ 17. Any existing Oak trees located on the project site shall be protected and preserved as required in City Ordinance No.835 N.S., Municipal Code No. 10.01 "Oak Tree Preservation", unless specifically approved to be removed. An Oak tree inventory shall be prepared listing the Oak trees, their disposition, and the proposed location of any replacement trees required. In the event an Oak tree is designated for removal, an approved Oak Tree Removal Permit must be obtained from the City, prior to removal.

☐ 18. No storage of trash cans or recycling bins shall be permitted within the public right-of-way.

☒ 19. Prior to recordation of the map or prior to occupancy of a project, all conditions of approval shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and Community Developer Director or his designee.

☐ 20. Two sets of the revised Planning Commission approved plans incorporating all Conditions of Approval, standard and site specific, shall be submitted to the Community Development Department prior to the issuance of building permits.

☒ 21. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Development Review Committee shall approve the following:

☐ Planning Division Staff shall approve the following:
a. A detailed site plan indicating the location of all structures, parking layout, outdoor storage areas, walls, fences, light fixtures and trash enclosures;

b. A detailed landscape plan;

c. Detailed building elevations of all structures indicating materials, colors, and architectural treatments;

d. Other: River multi-use pathway easement dedication for future pedestrian access

B. GENERAL CONDITIONS – TRACT/PARCEL MAP:

1. In accordance with Government Section 66474.9, the subdivider shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the City, or its agent, officers and employees, from any claim, action or proceeding brought within the time period provided for in Government Code section 66499.37, against the City, or its agents, officers, or employees, to attack, set aside, void, annul the City's approval of this subdivision. The City will promptly notify subdivider of any such claim or action and will cooperate fully in the defense thereof.

2. The Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (CC&Rs) and/or Articles Affecting Real Property Interests are subject to the review and approval of the Community Development Department, the Public Works Department and/or the City Attorney. They shall be recorded concurrently with the Final Map or prior to the issuance of building permits, whichever occurs first. A recorded copy shall be provided to the affected City Departments.

3. The owner shall petition to annex residential Tract (or Parcel Map)________ into the City of Paso Robles Community Facilities District No. 2005-1 for the purposes of mitigation of impacts on the City's Police and Emergency Services Departments.

4. Street names shall be submitted for review and approval by the Planning Commission, prior to approval of the final map.

5. The following areas shall be permanently maintained by the property owner, Homeowners’ Association, or other means acceptable to the City:

******************************************************************************

ENGINEERING DIVISION- The applicant shall contact the Engineering Division, (805) 237-3860, for compliance with the following conditions:

All conditions marked are applicable to the above referenced project for the phase indicated.

C. PRIOR TO ANY PLAN CHECK:

1. The applicant shall enter into an Engineering Plan Check and Inspection Services Agreement with the City.
D. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A GRADING PERMIT:

☐ 1. Prior to approval of a grading plan, the developer shall apply through the City, to FEMA and receive a Letter of Map Amendment (LOMA) issued from FEMA. The developer’s engineer shall provide the required supporting data to justify the application.

☒ 2. Any existing Oak trees located on the project site shall be protected and preserved as required in City Ordinance No. 553, Municipal Code No. 10.01 "Oak Tree Preservation", unless specifically approved to be removed. An Oak tree inventory shall be prepared listing the Oak trees, their disposition, and the proposed location of any replacement trees required. In the event an Oak tree is designated for removal, an approved Oak Tree Removal Permit must be obtained from the City, prior to its removal.

☒ 3. A complete grading and drainage plan shall be prepared for the project by a registered civil engineer and subject to approval by the City Engineer. The project shall conform to the City’s Storm Water Discharge Ordinance.

☐ 4. A Preliminary Soils and/or Geology Report providing technical specifications for grading of the site shall be prepared by a Geotechnical Engineer.

☒ 5. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan per the State General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity shall be provided for any site that disturbs greater than or equal to one acre, including projects that are less than one acre that are part of a larger plan of development or sale that would disturb more than one acre.

E. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT:

☐ 1. All off-site public improvement plans shall be prepared by a registered civil engineer and shall be submitted to the City Engineer for review and approval. The improvements shall be designed and placed to the Public Works Department Standards and Specifications.

☐ 2. The applicant shall submit a composite utility plan signed as approved by a representative of each public utility.

☐ 3. Landscape and irrigation plans for the public right-of-way shall be incorporated into the improvement plans and shall require approval by the Streets Division Supervisor and the Community Development Department.

☐ 4. In a special Flood Hazard Area as indicated on a Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) the owner shall provide an Elevation Certificate in accordance with the National Flood Insurance program. This form must be completed by a land surveyor or civil engineer licensed in the State of California.
F. PRIOR TO PROJECT FINAL BY THE BUILDING DEPARTMENT:

The Planning Commission has made a finding that the fulfillment of the construction requirements listed below are a necessary prerequisite to the orderly development of the surrounding area.

1. The applicant shall pay any current and outstanding fees for Engineering Plan Checking and Construction Inspection services.

2. All public improvements are completed and approved by the City Engineer, and accepted by the City Council for maintenance.

3. The owner shall offer to dedicate and improve the following street(s) to the standard indicated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>City Standard</th>
<th>Standard Drawing No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. If, at the time of approval of the final map, any required public improvements have not been completed and accepted by the City the owner shall be required to enter into a Subdivision Agreement with the City in accordance with the Subdivision Map Act.

Bonds required and the amount shall be as follows:
Performance Bond...............100% of improvement costs.
Labor and Materials Bond........50% of performance bond.

5. If the existing City street adjacent to the frontage of the project is inadequate for the traffic generated by the project, or will be severely damaged by the construction, the applicant shall excavate the entire structural section and replace it with a standard half-width street plus a 12' wide travel lane and 8' wide graded shoulder adequate to provide for two-way traffic.

6. If the existing pavement and structural section of the City street adjacent to the frontage of the project is adequate, the applicant shall provide a new structural section from the proposed curb to the edge of pavement and shall overlay the existing paving to centerline for a smooth transition.

7. Due to the number of utility trenches required for this project, the City Council adopted Pavement Management Program requires a pavement overlay on _________________ along the frontage of the project.

8. The applicant shall install all utilities. Street lights shall be installed at locations as required by the City Engineer. All existing overhead utilities adjacent to or within the project shall be relocated underground except for electrical lines 77 kilovolts or greater. All utilities shall be extended to the boundaries of the project.

9. The owner shall offer to dedicate to the City the following easement(s). The location
and alignment of the easement(s) shall be to the description and satisfaction of the City Engineer:

- a. Public Utilities Easement;
- b. Water Line Easement;
- c. Sewer Facilities Easement;
- d. Landscape Easement;
- e. Storm Drain Easement.

10. The developer shall annex to the City's Landscape and Lighting District for payment of the operating and maintenance costs of the following:

- a. Street lights;
- b. Parkway/open space landscaping;
- c. Wall maintenance in conjunction with landscaping;
- d. Graffiti abatement;
- e. Maintenance of open space areas.

11. For a building project within a Special Flood Hazard Area as indicated on a Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), the owner shall provide an Elevation Certificate in accordance with the National Flood Insurance Program to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. This form must be completed by a lands surveyor or civil engineer licensed in the State of California.

12. All final property corners shall be installed.

13. All areas of the project shall be protected against erosion by hydro seeding or landscaping.

14. All construction refuse shall be separated (i.e. concrete, asphalt concrete, wood gypsum board, etc.) and removed from the project in accordance with the City's Source Reduction and Recycling Element.

15. Clear blackline mylars and paper prints of record drawings, signed by the engineer of record, shall be provided to the City Engineer prior to the final inspection. An electronic autocad drawing file registered to the California State Plane – Zone 5 / NAD83 projected coordinate system, units in survey feet, shall be provided.

******************************************************************************

PASO ROBLES DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY SERVICES- The applicant shall contact the Department of Emergency Services, (805) 227-7560, for compliance with the following conditions:

G. GENERAL CONDITIONS
1. Prior to the start of construction:
   - Plans shall be reviewed, approved and permits issued by Emergency Services for underground fire lines.
   - Applicant shall provide documentation to Emergency Services that required fire
flows can be provided to meet project demands.

☐ Fire hydrants shall be installed and operative to current, adopted edition of the California Fire Code.
☒ A based access road sufficient to support the department’s fire apparatus (HS-20 truck loading) shall be constructed and maintained for the duration of the construction phase of the project.
☒ Access road shall be at least twenty (20) feet in width with at least thirteen (13) feet, six (6) inches of vertical clearance.


☐ Plans shall be reviewed, approved and permits issued by Emergency Services for the installation of fire sprinkler systems.


4. ☒ If required by the Fire Chief, provide on the address side of the building if applicable:
   ☒ Fire alarm annunciator panel in weatherproof case.
   ☒ Knox box key entry box or system.
   ☒ Fire department connection to fire sprinkler system.

5. ☐ Provide temporary turn-around to current City Engineering Standard for phased construction streets that exceed 150 feet in length.


7. ☐ Prior to the issuance of Certificate of Occupancy:
   ☒ Final inspections shall be completed on all underground fire lines, fire sprinkler systems, fire alarm systems and chemical hood fire suppression systems.
   ☐ Final inspections shall be completed on all buildings.
FIREFSTONE WALKER BREWERY
SOLAR PHOTOVOLTAIC SYSTEM

OWNER
RENEWable SOLAR BREWING COMPANY, 1630 RAMADA DRIVE, PASO ROBLES, CA 93446
Owner: RENEWable SOLAR BREWING COMPANY
Contact: Pat Brown

APPLICATION DEVELOPER
RENEWable SOLAR SYSTEMS COMPANY
Contact: Pat Brown

STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING
COTTLE BIGGS & COOLEY
Contact: Mike Cottle

ELECTRICAL ENGINEERS
Pure POWER ENGINEERING & S WIRING, HIGH PLATE, SUITE 2133 HOBOKEN, NEW JERSEY 07030
Contact: Rich Kings

RENEWable SOLAR IS PROPOSING TO DESIGN AND INSTALL A 2.75 MW SINGLE AXIS TRACKER SOLAR PV SYSTEM AND A 0.7 MW
SOLAR CARPORT FOR FIREFSTONE WALKER BREWERY. THE SOLAR PV SYSTEMS WILL OFFSET ENERG USAGE AT THE MAIN
BREWERY THROUGH PRODUCED NET ENERGY METERING AGGREGATION IS PROGRAMS. THE TRACKER PROJECT WILL
COVER A TOTAL FOOTPRINT OF 8.7 ACRES ON PARCEL APN: 089-031-108 AND 089-031-118 WHICH IS CURRENTLY MAINTAINED
THROUGH PARKING OF ROOF MOWS AND CORRAL GRAINS BY FIREFSTONE. THE SITE IS CURRENTLY OCCUPIED BY OPEN
FARM AND DIRECTLY EAST OF THE EXISTING WATER TREATMENT AND SOUTH OF RAMADA DRIVE.

THE CARPORT SYSTEM WILL COVER APPROXIMATELY 1.4 ACRES ON APN: 089-031-06 WHICH IS CURRENTLY OCCUPIED BY
A REMOTE PARKING LOT FOR FIREFSTONE WALKER EMPLOYEES. THE SYSTEMS WILL CONSIST OF PV MODULES MOUNTED TO
SINGLE AXIS TRACKERS OR A CARPORT BASE STRUCTURE. INVERTERS AND VARIOUS AC ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT. THE
SYSTEMS WILL PROVIDE INTERFERENCE TO THE ELECTRICAL UTILITY INFRASTRUCTURE VIA A LINE SIDE TIE IN, THE EXISTING
WATER TREATMENT PLANT SERVICE. THE CARPORT SYSTEMS WILL BE INTRODUCED AT THE EXISTING SERVICE
AT THE PARKING LOT.

ACCESS TO THE TRACKER SITE WILL BE RESTRICTED TO QUALIFIED PERSONNEL AND SECURED BY A TYPICAL LINK LINK
BEFORE THE SYSTEM INSTALLATION. THE CARPORT WILL HAVE A MOBILE CRAWL SPACE TO ALLOW FOR THE PROJECT TO BE
NEAR THE TOP OF EACH STRUCTURAL COLUMN. THE STRUCTURES WILL BE DEPRESSED WITHIN THE PARKING LOT STUMPING AND
NOT IMPACT ON EXISTING LINES.

THE SYSTEM WILL INCLUDE SOLAR MODULES AT:
AZABJAD: 1007 W
ITICHY:
VARIES
LOCATED ON:
GROUND / CANOPY
BACKING SYSTEM:
AT SINGLE AXIS TRACKER / CANOPY
INTERCONNECTION INFORMATION AT PCC:
SINGLE AXIS TRACKER:
VOLTAGE: 480V
CURRENT: 206A
CONVERSION: 384KVA
LOCATION:
EXISTING 200A SWITCHBOARD
AT WASTE WATER TREATMENT FACILITY
CARRYPORT:
VOLTAGE: 480V
CURRENT: 206A
CONVERSION: 384KVA
LOCATION:
UPGRADED 208A
SINGLE LINE DIAGRAM:
SINGLE AXIS TRACKER
CARRYPORT

PV INVERTERS AND EQUIPMENT CABINETS SHALL BE MOUNTED ON EQUIPMENT POSTS ADJACENT TO THE ARRAY FOR
SINGLE AXIS TRACKER AND AT CARRYPORT POST FOR CARRYPORT.

SYSTEM SIZE:
SINGLE AXIS TRACKER:
DC SYSTEM SIZE: (2.75) x (2400) = 6600KW
AC SYSTEM SIZE: 1350/1350 (1): 1700KW
CARRMET AC SYSTEM SIZE: (2): 191KW
DC/RATIO: (1.81, 1.85)

SYSTEM SPECIFICATIONS:
SINGLE AXIS TRACKER:
MODULES: (96) REC MODULES 72 PV 330W
INVERTER: (4) INVERTERS AC 190-120 (4) UNGROUND
UTILITY: 1500V
PARCEL: 18 ACRES
PV AREA: 8 ACRES

CARRYPORT:
MODULES: (96) LE-6000系列 450W
INVERTER: (4) INVERTERS AC 190-120 (4) UNGROUND
UTILITY: 1500V
PARCEL: 18 ACRES
PV AREA: 8 ACRES

PROPERTY:
SINGLE AXIS TRACKER
RAMADA DR, PASO ROBLES, CA 93446
APN: 089-031-108

PROPERTY:
CARRYPORT
RAMADA DR, PASO ROBLES, CA 93446
APN: 089-031-06
Exhibit C
Development Plans

[Images of site plans and photos of the development site.]

[Diagram showing key map with labels for different areas and features.]
AFFIDAVIT

OF MAIL NOTICES

PLANNING COMMISSION/CITY COUNCIL PROJECT NOTICING

I, Rachel McCabe, employee of the City of El Paso de Robles, California, do hereby certify that the mail notices have been processed as required for Conditional Use Permit 18-06 and Planned Development 18-09 on this 14th day of January, 2019.

City of El Paso de Robles
Community Development Department
Planning Division

Signed: Rachel McCabe
In The Superior Court of The State of California
In and for the County of San Luis Obispo

AD #4036062
CITY OF PASO ROBLES

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

County of San Luis Obispo

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen and not interested in the above entitled matter; I am now, and at all times embraced in the publication herein mentioned was, the principal clerk of the printers and publishers of THE TRIBUNE, a newspaper of general circulation, printed and published daily at the City of San Luis Obispo in the above named county and state; that notice at which the annexed clippings is a true copy, was published in the above-named newspaper and not in any supplement thereof – on the following dates to wit; JANUARY 14, 2019 that said newspaper was duly and regularly ascertained and established a newspaper of general circulation by Decree entered in the Superior Court of San Luis Obispo County, State of California, on June 9, 1952, Case #19139 under the Government Code of the State of California.

I certify (or declare) under the penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

(Signature of Principal Clerk)
DATE: JANUARY 14, 2019
AD COST: $272.25
CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM
FIRESTONE SOLAR PROJECT
Public Review Period: January 14, 2019 – February 12, 2019

1. PROJECT TITLE:
   Firestone Solar Project
   Planned Development (PD18-09) and
   Conditional Use Permit (CUP18-06)

2. LEAD AGENCY:
   City of Paso Robles
   1000 Spring Street
   Paso Robles, CA  93446
   Contact: Darcy Delgado
   Phone: (805) 237-3970
   Email: Ddelgado@prcity.com

3. PROJECT LOCATION:
   Northern end of Ramada Drive / east of

4. PROJECT PROPOONENT:
   REC Solar
   Project Representative: Thomas Cemo
   Phone: (805) 704-1245
   Email: tcemo@recsolar.com

5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:
   BP and OS (Business Park and Open Space)

6. ZONING:
   M, PM, and POS (Industrial, Planned Industrial,
   and Parks and Open Space)

7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
   REC Solar (applicant) is proposing to design and install a solar system facility for the Firestone Walker Brewery to offset energy usage at the main brewery through PG&E’s Net Energy Metering Aggregation (NEMA) program. The NEMA program is designed to allow single customers, such as Firestone Walker Brewery, that have multiple meters on adjacent or contiguous properties to allocate energy to more than one meter.

   The project consists of two separate solar systems installed at two locations within the overall Firestone campus (see Attachment 2, Vicinity Map). The larger of the two systems includes a 2.1-megawatt (MW) ground-mounted single axis tracker system on approximately 9.78-acres of an overall 39-acre open field located east of Firestone’s main building operations, near the water treatment ponds. An additional 277 kilowatt (kW) carport system is proposed within an existing parking lot currently used by Firestone employees and will cover approximately
14,000 square feet of the overall 2.77-acre parcel. Overall, the system will consist of PV modules mounted to single axis trackers or a carport canopy structure, inverters, and various AC electrical equipment. The tracker system will be interconnected to the electric utility infrastructure via a line side tap at an existing service located between the water treatment ponds and the railroad tracks. The carport system will be interconnected at an existing service located within the rear portion of the parking lot.

Once the project is completed, the single axis tracker facility and the carport structure will be unoccupied and will require minimal maintenance during operations. Access to the tracker site will be restricted to qualified personnel and secured by a 7-foot chain link perimeter fence. Typical maintenance activities include 1-2 visits per year for module washing, vegetation management, and any pertinent service calls. Grading for the tracker facility is minimal as no excavation, cut or fill will be required for installation of the solar arrays. The foundations for the single axis trackers will be driven I beam piles. Access roads throughout the site will require areas to be compacted and improved with an all-weather surface material. The disturbed area to install the access roads will be approximately 2.1-acres.

The project requires a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to operate a renewable energy generation facility. A Development Plan (PD) is also required since the project scope is greater than 10,000 square feet in size.

It should be noted that although the project description includes both the tracker system and the carport system, this environmental document analyzes project impacts for the 2.1-MW tracker system only. Since the carport system is proposed within an existing parking lot, the carport system qualifies as Categorically Exempt from environmental review under the State’s Guidelines to Implement the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per Section 21080.35 of the Public Resources Code.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The Firestone campus is accessed from Ramada Drive, a frontage road to US Hwy 101. The site where the ground mount system will be installed has Business Park and Open Space (BP & OS) land use designations and is zoned Planned Industrial as well as Parks and Open Space (PM and POS). The site where the carport canopies would be installed has a Business Park (BP) land use designation and is zoned Industrial (M).

The approximately 9.78-acre project area for the tracker facility is located within an open 39-acre field primarily used for farming activities and for two existing wastewater treatment ponds for Firestone Walker Brewery. There is an existing access road currently used for the treatment ponds that will also be used for the solar system, with additional perimeter access roads to be installed throughout the 9.78-acre project area. The 39-acre field is surrounded by additional farmland to the north, the Salinas River to the east, the Union Pacific Railroad and commercial and industrial development to the west, and City property used for water reclamation to the south. The carport system is located within an existing parking lot surrounded by commercial development to the north and south, the Union Pacific Railroad to the east, and Ramada Drive and US Hwy 101 corridor to the west.

The primary feature of the 39-acre field is the recently plowed agricultural field where the solar arrays are proposed. The area is generally flat, and unvegetated. Although there is riparian habitat along the bank of the Salinas River to the east of the site, the project area will be substantially setback from this habitat. Additionally, there is no evidence of ponded water
within the project area. Several large Valley oak trees surround the project area, with one tree near the project area that will be preserved and protected during construction activities. A portion of the solar system will be within the 100-year flood zone with all electrical equipment a minimum of 2-feet above the base flood elevation.

9. **OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED):** A portion of the project is within the 100-year flood zone, and may require a 1602 permit from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement program.
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.

☐ Aesthetics  ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources  ☐ Air Quality
☒ Biological Resources  ☒ Cultural Resources  ☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions  ☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials  ☐ Hydrology/Water Quality
☐ Land Use/Planning  ☐ Mineral Resources  ☐ Noise
☐ Population/Housing  ☐ Public Services  ☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation/Traffic  ☐ Utilities/Service Systems  ☐ 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: [Signature]
Date: 11/11/19
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
I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:

a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

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

   [ ] [ ] [x] [ ]

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

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

   [ ] [ ] [x] [ ]

Discussion (a-b): The project area is relatively flat, and when viewed from the US Hwy 101 Southbound lanes or the nearest commercial development fronting Ramada Drive, the project area is at similar elevations and is not considered a scenic vista. The project area does not include scenic resources such as trees, rocks or any historic buildings and it is not located in proximity to a state scenic highway. This project will not have impacts related to scenic vistas or scenic or historic resources.

c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

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

   [ ] [ ] [x] [ ]

Discussion (c): The height, bulk, pattern, scale and character of the project features would not conflict with the visual character of surrounding area, considering it will be located in proximity to an existing wastewater treatment pond. Additionally, although there is some visibility from US Hwy 101 Southbound lanes, the vantage points are approximately 0.50 miles away from the site and views of the solar arrays would not be fixed for the driver. The nearest commercial/industrial development is over 750-feet away, and none of the businesses are directly facing the direction of the solar facility. Therefore, the project is not expected to substantially contrast with surrounding lands, thereby limiting the impact on views.

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)

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

   [ ] [ ] [x] [ ]

Discussion (d): The photovoltaic technology proposed uses non-reflective panels to convert solar energy into electricity. The panels have microscopically irregular surfaces and are designed to trap the rays of sunlight and absorb as much light as possible, further reducing reflection and glare. They reflect much less of the sun’s energy than normal glass because the panels are not reflective. Therefore, the project would not be a substantial source of glare. There will be no lighting as part of the project, therefore nighttime views in the area will not be impacted.

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

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

   [ ] [ ] [x] [ ]
Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

Discussion (a): The project site is zoned Planned Industrial and Parks and Open space. Although a portion of the site has been used in the past for farming activities associated with the Brewery, it is not designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

Discussion (b): The project would not conflict with zoning for agricultural use. The Project Site is not zoned for agriculture and is not under a Williamson Act Contract.

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))?

Discussion (c): The project area is currently vacant land and has never been designated as forest land or timberland.

d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Discussion (d): See response to II.c.

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?

Discussion (e): The project area is within an open field currently used for farming and for Firestone’s wastewater treatment ponds, however, a majority of the property is zoned for industrial/commercial development. Use of the site for future development would not have a significant impact to agricultural or forestry resources.

### 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)

Discussion (a): The project is located in the San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD). According to the SLOAPCD’s CEQA Air Quality Handbook (2012), a consistency analysis with the Clean Air Plan (CAP) is required for a program-level environmental review, and may be necessary for a larger project-level environmental review, depending on the project being considered. Project-Level environmental reviews which may require a consistency analysis with the CAP include: large residential developments and large commercial/industrial developments. For such projects, evaluation of consistency is based on a comparison of the proposed project with the land use and transportation control measures and strategies outlined in the CAP.
If the project is consistent with these measures, the project is considered consistent with the CAP. Additionally, projects that exceed SLOAPCD’s recommended significance thresholds would also be considered to potentially conflict with regional air quality planning efforts, including the control measures and strategies identified in the CAP. The proposed project is not considered a large development project that would have the potential to result in a substantial increase in population, or employment. In addition, the proposed project is also consistent with existing zoning and land use designations and would not result in the installation of any major stationary sources of emissions. Lastly, the project will not exceed SLOAPCD’s recommended significance thresholds for construction and would not generate substantial operational emissions; therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct continued implementation of the CAP.

The disturbed area of grading activity is approximately 2.1-acres which is solely for the project’s access roads. This falls under the 4-acre threshold described in footnote 2 of Table 2-1 of the APCD CEQA Handbook (April 2012), indicating that the pollutants produced as a result of construction activities is less than the 2.5 ton PM 10 quarterly threshold. Therefore, impacts to air quality as a result of grading for this project are considered less than significant and no mitigation is required. Standard conditions related to dust control will be required with the issuance of a grading permit for this project.

b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 11)

Discussion (b): see Section III.a

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)

Discussion (c): Construction-generated emissions are of temporary duration, lasting only as long as construction activities occur, but have the potential to represent a significant air quality impact. The construction of the proposed project would result in the temporary generation of emissions associated with site grading and motor vehicle exhaust associated with construction equipment and worker trips, as well as the movement of construction equipment on unpaved surfaces. Short-term construction emissions would result in increased emissions of ozone-precursor pollutants (i.e., ROG and NOX) and emissions of particulate matter (PM). Emissions of ozone-precursors would result from the operation of on- and off-road motorized vehicles and equipment. Emissions of airborne PM are largely dependent on the amount of ground disturbance associated with site preparation activities and can result in increased concentrations of PM that can adversely affect nearby sensitive land uses. The project proposes minimal grading activities, resulting in the project’s construction-generated emissions not exceeding SLOAPCD’s construction-related significance thresholds. Post-construction, the project would not generate substantial operational emissions and will not exceed SLOAPCD’s operational-related thresholds. Although the project will not exceed these thresholds, SLOAPCD has standard conditions that will be incorporated into the project to further reduce operational emissions associated with energy use and motor vehicle use resulting in impacts that are less than significant. These will be incorporated into the project conditions of approval.

d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Source: 11)

Discussion (d): There are no hospitals, schools, convalescent homes or other sensitive receptors located proximal to the site. The project is a solar photovoltaic generating facility that would convert solar energy to...
electric energy without pollutant emissions. During construction, emissions would be controlled to a level that is less than significant as described in Response III.a above, and construction emissions would be short term. Considering these factors, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

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

Discussion (e): The project would not be a source of odors. The project is a solar photovoltaic generating facility that would convert solar energy to electric energy without odor emissions.

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?

Discussion (a): The Biological Report prepared by Athouse and Meade, Inc., dated June 2018 (Attachment 5) indicates that construction of the proposed solar photovoltaic generating facility could affect nesting birds, American badger, and San Joaquin kit fox. The survey area included the proposed development within an overall 25.3-acre study area. The overall proposed project is planned to impact about 9-acres of the 25.3-acre Study Area. Other areas of the Study Area outside of the Project footprint will not be disturbed.

Wetlands and jurisdictional waters occur outside of the proposed project area and within the Salinas River corridor. Areas of potential wetlands within the proposed project footprint were not found. There was no evidence in the Study Area of ponded water, including cracked crusts or wetland vegetation. Thorough surveys of the site were conducted in June, 48 days after the last rainfall of the season in Paso Robles. Examination of historical aerial photographs of the site showed no evidence of ponding water in the proposed project site.

Special status plant and animal species were not detected on the property, however, several could occur: American badger, San Joaquin kit fox, and nesting bird. Potential impacts are outlined in the Biological Study (See Attachment 5, and mitigation measure are recommended in Section 5).

There is potential for ground nesting birds to occur within the proposed project area. Nesting raptors in oaks within 500 feet of the project and ground nesting birds within the project site area of ground disturbance could be affected by construction of the solar plant. However, impacts to nesting birds would be mitigated by BR-1 (refer to Section 5.3 of the Biological Study, Attachment 5) which recommends preconstruction surveys be conducted prior to activities that affect trees and shrubs during the nesting season, March 15 to August 15.

American badger has moderate potential to occur in the Study Area. Project activities including grading and other excavation work could result in take of American badger adults or young, or disturbance of natal dens and abandonment by adult badgers. To reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level, mitigation BR-2 (refer to Section 5.4 of the Biological Study, Attachment 5) recommends preconstruction surveys be conducted.

San Joaquin kit fox was not detected in the Study Area, however the proposed project is within the 2 to 1 standard mitigation ratio area for San Joaquin kit fox in San Luis Obispo County. Total kit fox habitat disturbed would be a maximum of 8.85 acres, and the Study Area and property containing the Project is 39 acres.
A SJKF habitat evaluation form was prepared (dated 7-18-2018) for the project that produced a score of 45. This means that the mitigation ratio for the site is in the range for two to one (2:1) mitigation acres to acres removed from use by kit fox. Therefore, the mitigation requirement would be to take the 8.85 acres multiply it by 2, which would result in 160.5 acres that would need to be mitigated. The applicant proposes to mitigate the 17.7 acres by purchasing credits in a CDFW approved conservation bank. The credits are $2,500 per acre, which would result in the requirement to pay of $44,250 to the conservation bank.

The Biological report has provided mitigation measures that when implemented will reduce the impacts of this project on biological resources to less than significant. See list of mitigation measures BR-1 – BR 13 in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Table, Attachment 1.

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?

Discussion (b): Although there is riparian habitat along the bank of the Salinas River to the east of the site, the project area will be substantially setback from this habitat and would not result in any impacts to riparian habitat.

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?

Discussion (c): Wetlands or waters do not occur within the project area, therefore no mitigations are necessary for project impacts. A portion of the project is within the 100-year flood zone, and may require a 1602 permit from the CDFW Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement program. A condition of approval will be added to the project requiring evidence that the 1602 permit has been satisfied, as necessary, prior to issuance of a construction permit.

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?

Discussion (d): The project site is located within an area that is considered an important corridor area for the San Joaquin kit fox. The area is within an established 2:1 mitigation area recognized by the County and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. The Biological Study indicates that the approximately 8.85-acre area will be disturbed for the development of the solar facility. The disturbed area will permanently remove kit fox habitat area and is required to be mitigated at a 2:1 mitigation ratio.

The mitigation measures are listed in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Table, Attachment 1 to this
Initial Study. With the incorporation of the mitigation measures this project’s impacts on Kit Fox habitat, will be less than significant.

e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? □ □ ☒ □ 

Discussion (e): One mature oak tree is located immediately adjacent to the project area. However, preliminary construction drawings indicate the project has been designed to avoid impacts to the individual oak tree, therefore, impacts to oaks are less than significant.

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? □ □ ☒ ☒ ☒ 

Discussion (f): There are no Habitat Conservation Plans or other related plans applicable in the City of Paso Robles.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? □ ☒ □ □ 

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? □ ☒ □ □ 

c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? □ ☒ □ □ 

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? □ ☒ □ □ 

Discussion (a-d): The project is located in an area that is considered culturally significant. The Cultural Resource Study prepared by Applied EarthWorks, Inc., dated August 2018 (Attachment 7) indicates that one previously recorded cultural resource is within the project area, and three additional archaeological sites are within a 0.25-mile radius of the project area. No cultural resources were observed within the Project parcel during the survey, however, since the site contains prehistoric human remains that were previously found during the excavation of water treatment ponds, there is heightened potential for previously undocumented subsurface human burials and cultural materials within the project area. The study indicates that typically a testing program would be recommended as the next step for cultural studies, due to the proximity of burials. However, due to the depth of previously located burials, a testing effort which only extends 1-meter deep would not benefit the project. During project construction, there is still the potential of encountering unmarked human burials within the project area.
the project area. For this reason, the study recommends that a qualified archaeological monitor and a Native American observer be present for all ground-disturbing work for the proposed project. Additional resources that could be found during construction, such as stone tools or toolmaking debris, would require evaluation as an isolated find or part of a larger archaeological deposit. The study has provided mitigation measures that when implemented will reduce the impacts of this project on resources to less than significant. See list of all required mitigation measures (CR-1) in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Table, Attachment 1.

AB 52 – The Initial Study will be circulated to the 6 tribes that have requested consultation.

### 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)

   Discussion (a-i): The potential for and mitigation of impacts that may result from fault rupture in the project area are identified and addressed in the General Plan EIR, pg. 4.5-8. There are two known fault zones on either side of the Salinas River Valley. The Rinconada Fault system runs on the west side of the valley, and grazes the City on its western boundary. The San Andreas Fault is on the east side of the valley and is situated about 30 miles east of Paso Robles. The City of Paso Robles recognizes these geologic influences in the application of the California Building Code (CBC) to all new development within the City. However, since the project is limited to solar panels and ancillary electrical equipment and is an unoccupied facility, the likelihood of on-site ground rupture resulting in risk to people or structures is considered low. Nonetheless, the design of any structures on-site would incorporate measures to accommodate projected seismic loading, pursuant to existing CBC and local building regulations. There are no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones within City limits.

   ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

   Discussion (a-ii): Future structures within this project will be constructed to current CBC codes. 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)

   Discussion (a.iii): Per the General Plan EIR, the project site is located in an area with soil conditions that
have a high 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. Since the project is limited to solar panels and ancillary electrical equipment and is an unoccupied facility, the likelihood of seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction resulting in risk to people or structures is considered low. Nonetheless, the design of any structures on-site would incorporate measures to incorporate design measures into the project.

**b. Landslides?**

Discussion (b): 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.

**c. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)**

Discussion (c): Per the General Plan EIR the soil condition is not erosive or otherwise unstable. As such, no significant impacts are anticipated. A geotechnical/soils analysis will be required prior to issuance of building permits that will evaluate the site specific soil stability and suitability of the grading proposed. This study will determine the necessary grading techniques that will ensure that potential impacts due to soil stability will not occur.

**d. 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?**

Discussion (d): See response to item VI.a.iii, above.

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

Discussion (e): See response to item VI.a.iii, above.

**f. 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?**

Discussion (f): The project does not propose to use septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems; therefore, no impacts would occur. No further analysis is warranted.

**VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:** Would the project:

a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

Discussion (a): The project is a 2.1-megawatt solar photovoltaic (PV) generating facility that would convert solar energy into electric energy with the primary source of greenhouse gas emissions (GhG) being vehicle and equipment emissions for construction and maintenance activities. Once constructed, the electric energy produced by the project would reduce the dependency on fossil fuel-produced electric energy thereby providing a long-term GhG benefit. Considering that the project would operate as an unmanned facility and would require relatively minimal maintenance vehicle trips, and considering that limiting climate change is the focus of California’s goals for implementing solar PV and other renewable energy technologies, project GhG emissions would be less than significant both individually and cumulatively.

b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses? (Source 15)

Discussion (b): The City of Paso Robles Climate Action Plan (CAP) was adopted by the City Council in November, 2013. The CAP is a long-range plan to reduce greenhouse gas (GhG) emissions from City government operations and community activities within Paso Robles and prepare for the anticipated effects of climate change. The CAP will also help achieve multiple community goals such as lowering energy costs, reducing air pollution, supporting local economic development, and improving public health and quality of life (City of Paso Robles, 2013). Since the project consists of the installation of solar PV systems that would reduce GhG emissions from the commercial/industrial energy use sector, the project would be consistent with the CAP. No further analysis is warranted.

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?

Discussion (a): The proposed project is not expected to result in impacts from hazards and hazardous materials with respect to creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, nor is it expected to result in impacts from accidental release of materials into the environment. During construction, the proposed project would involve the transport of general construction materials as well as the materials necessary to construct the proposed PV arrays. Construction activities would involve the use of fuels and greases for the construction equipment, however, the use, storage, transport and disposal of these materials will be carried out in accordance with federal, state, and local laws, ordinances and regulations. Once installed, the solar panels would produce no waste during operation and would need to be cleaned approximately twice per year via water trucks with spray nozzles, with no chemical products being used.

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?

Discussion (b): See response to VIII.a above.
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? □ □ □ ✗

Discussion (c): There are no existing or proposed schools located within ¼ mile of the project. Furthermore, the project is a solar photovoltaic generating facility that would convert solar energy into electric energy without hazardous emissions.

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? □ □ □ ✗

Discussion (d): The project site is not included on a hazardous materials site list.

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? □ □ □ ✗

Discussion (e-f): The project site is not located within an airport safety zone.

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? □ □ □ ✗

Discussion (e-f): The project site is not located within an airport safety zone.

g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? □ □ □ ✗

Discussion (g): The City does not have any adopted emergency response plans. As proposed, the development would not interfere with emergency response.

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? □ □ □ ✗

Discussion (h): The site is not located in an area that is considered wildland, therefore, the project will not be impacted by wildland fires.
IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:

Would the project:

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Discussion (a): Water use during construction would be limited to dust control measures for grading activities. The project will not result in releasing water or waste water discharge from the site. Therefore, considering these factors, impacts as result of the development of this project on storm water will be less than significant.

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)

Discussion (b): The project would not deplete groundwater supplies since the project will use minimal water, as discussed in response IX.a above. Additionally, the project requires minimal grading only for the access roads and overall the project site will be designed to maintain similar drainage conditions as the existing condition. Once complete, the solar panels have gaps between them that will allow stormwater to infiltrate the surface, therefore groundwater recharge would not be impacted by the project.

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)

Discussion (c): The project grading and drainage plan is designed to maintain similar drainage conditions as the existing condition. Additionally, in compliance with State and local regulations, during construction erosion and/or stormwater control measures will be implemented during site disturbance; therefore the project is not expected to result in substantial erosion or siltation.

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 on- or off-site? (Source: 10)

Discussion (d): Under existing conditions, there is no stormwater runoff from the site. The proposed project requires minimal grading for access roads, and overall the project site will be designed to maintain similar drainage conditions as the existing condition. Once complete, the solar panels have gaps between them that will allow stormwater to infiltrate the surface. Since the project will have a negligible affect to the existing terrain and drainage patterns, there will not be substantially additional sources of runoff that could contribute to flooding.
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)

Discussion (e): There are no drainage systems proposed as part of this project. As noted in IX.d. above, the proposed project requires minimal grading for access roads only. Once complete, the solar panels have gaps between them that will allow stormwater to infiltrate the surface. Since the project will have a negligible affect to the existing terrain and drainage patterns, there will not be substantially additional sources of runoff.

f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Discussion (f): The project’s potential to degrade water quality is addressed in IX.a. above. The project does not have reasonably foreseeable potential to substantially degrade water quality.

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?

Discussion (g): The project does not involve placement of housing, therefore there is no impact.

h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

Discussion (h): A portion of the project is within the 100-year flood zone, and may require a 1602 permit from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement program. In compliance with the City’s flood zone building requirements, the arrays within the flood zone will be required to be constructed 2-feet above base flood elevation; therefore impacts would be less than significant.

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?

Discussion (i): The project will have a negligible affect to the existing drainage patterns, and the site will be an unoccupied facility. Additionally, there are no levees or dams in the City.

j. Inundation by mudflow?

Discussion (j): In accordance with the Paso Robles General Plan, there is no mudflow hazards located on or near the project site. Therefore, the project could not result in mudflow inundation impacts.

k. Conflict with any Best Management Practices found within the City’s Storm Water Management Plan?

Discussion (k): The project will implement the City’s Storm Water Management Plan - Best Management Practices, and would therefore not conflict with these measures.
X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

a. Physically divide an established community?

Discussion: The project would not physically divide an established community since it is located between the Firestone Brewery wastewater treatment ponds to the west and the Salinas River to the east.

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 site has Business Park and Open Space (BP and OS) land use designations and is zoned Planned Industrial and Parks and Open Space (PM and POS). The zoning requires a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to permit operation of a renewable energy generation facility. A Development Plan (PD) is also required since the project scope is greater than 10,000 square feet in size. With the approval of the project, the solar facility would be consistent with land use and zoning designations, and therefore not be in conflict with the City’s General Plan and Zoning Ordinance or other applicable regulations.

c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Discussion: There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans established in this area of the City. Therefore, there would be no conflicts.

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)

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

Discussion (a-b): 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)

Discussion (a): Construction would generate noise on the project site consistent with typical construction activities. Most construction activity would occur within an approximately four-month period encompassing the site preparation and PV assembly/installation. In general, the grading phase of project construction tends to create the highest noise levels because of the operation of heavy equipment. Short-term construction noise would only occur during daytime hours. Ongoing operations would generate minimal noise, primarily from fans used to cool electrical equipment and transformers. Additionally, since the project area is located centrally within the open field currently used for farming and for the water treatment ponds, there are no sensitive receptors nearby. Therefore, this project's impact related to the noise levels in the vicinity will be less than significant.

b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Discussion (b): The levels of ground-born noise and vibration generated by project construction would be low, and noise would only occur during daytime hours of construction and would cease upon completion of the project. Additionally, the project area is located centrally within the open field currently used for farming and for the water treatment ponds, and the nearest commercial development to the west is not sensitive to groundborne vibration.

c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Discussion (c): Construction noise impacts would be short term and, therefore, would not result in a permanent increase of ambient noise. Operation of the facility would generate low noise levels during the daytime. These daytime noise levels would not be substantial due to the low-level noise sources and surrounding environment characteristics described in the response to response XII.a, above. Considering these factors, the project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Discussion (d): Construction would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels as described in response XII.a above. However, these activities would not be significant since the construction site is generally within the interior of the site and setback substantially from commercial/industrial uses to the west. Construction would only occur during daytime hours. The applicant would need to comply with noise standards in the zoning ordinance, and not create nuisance noise between 7:00 pm and 7:00 am.

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)

Discussion (e): The project is not located within the geographic boundaries of the Airport Land Use Plan, therefore there is no impact.

**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)

Discussion (a): The project is not expected to generate population growth. The project does not propose any housing or commercial development, nor extension of roads or expansion of infrastructure. Construction jobs would be short term and are expected to be filled by the existing workforce without relocation.

b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Discussion (b): The project would not displace any housing. No housing occurs on the project site.

c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Discussion (c): The project would not displace people or housing. No housing occurs on the project site.

**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)

Discussion (a): The project would be designed and constructed in accordance with Paso Robles Department of Emergency Services (EMS) requirements for access, fire water supply, and vegetation management. With adherence to these requirements, the project poses a low fire hazard and is not expected to impact capacity or service levels. No new or modified government facilities are needed to provide fire protection for the project.

b. Police protection? (Sources: 1,10)
Discussion (b): The project site is located in the City of Paso Robles, which provides police protection and public safety within the City limits. Construction and operation of the project would not generate a material demand on police services. Specifically, the project would be enclosed with a six-foot-tall chain link fence topped by one-foot of barbed wire to control trespassing. As such, the project is not expected to result in an adverse impact on City of Paso Robles Police Department response times, service ratios, or other performance objectives, nor would the project result in the need for new or modified police facilities to serve the site. No new or modified government facilities are needed to provide police protection for the project.

Discussion (c): As described in Response XIII.a, above, the project is not expected to generate population growth. Therefore, no new demands on school facilities are expected.

Discussion (d): As described in Response XIII.a, above, the project is not expected to generate population growth. Therefore, no new demands on park facilities are expected.

Discussion (e): As described in Response XIII.a, above, the project is not expected to generate population growth, extend roads or other public infrastructure. The project would not require new or physically altered public facilities. Therefore, there would be no impact on these services.

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?  

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?  

Discussion (a-b): The project will 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?

Discussion (a): Project-related vehicles typically would access the site by utilizing US Hwy 101 and Ramada Drive, and using the railroad crossing at the northern terminus of Ramada Drive which is where the current access point is for the water treatment ponds. Construction fieldwork for the project would occur over an approximately 2-month period during which the average number of construction workers is expected to be approximately 24 persons. Project construction worker and delivery traffic would incrementally add to existing traffic congestion on both US Hwy 101 and Ramada Drive, but would be less than significant because of the relatively small number of trips generated and the short term of construction. Additionally, project operations would typically be unattended, with routine monitoring and maintenance on an as-needed basis. When needed, such site visits would typically require no more than one to two vehicle trips per day, which would add negligible traffic. Overall, the project would be developed in conformance with all applicable plans, policies, programs, and ordinances related to transportation and is expected to have a less than significant impact in regard to the circulation system.

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?

Discussion (b): As described in Response XVI.a above, the proposed project would have minimal impact on traffic circulation during construction and operation. Minimal traffic would occur during project operation as a result of routine monitoring and maintenance. This long-term level of traffic from the project is less than significant and would not conflict with regional and local traffic management planning.

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?

Discussion (c): The project is not located within the geographic boundaries of the Airport Land Use Plan, therefore there is no impact.

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

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

e. Result in inadequate emergency access?

Discussion (e): The project has been reviewed by the City’s Emergency Services Department. 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?

Discussion (f): There are no public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities near the project vicinity and the project is not anticipated to have any impact on pedestrian traffic in the area due to the location, therefore there is no impact.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

Discussion (a): The project would not discharge wastewater. No wastewater treatment requirements are applicable to the project. Therefore, the project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements for the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

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?

Discussion (b): During construction, water would be provided through a nearby water service located at the water treatment ponds. Water needed for panel washing during the operating life of the facility would be obtained from a commercial water truck with spray nozzle, and would be performed approximately twice per year. No new water or wastewater facilities will need to be constructed or expanded for this project, therefore there are no impacts.

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?

Discussion (c): Existing drainage patterns would not be substantially altered by the project since the proposed grading is minimal. The final grading and drainage plan would be subject to approval by the City Engineering Department.

d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Discussion (d): During construction, water would be provided through a nearby water service located at the water treatment ponds. Water needed for panel washing during the operating life of the facility would be obtained from a commercial water truck with spray nozzle, and would be performed approximately twice per year. Since the project’s water needs are minimal for both construction and ongoing maintenance, the project’s water use is considered less than significant.

e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may

Discussion (e):
serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

Discussion (e): See response to XVII.a. above.

f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

Discussion (f): The project is a solar photovoltaic generation facility that would convert solar energy into electric energy without substantial waste generation during operations. During construction, most debris would consist of recyclable materials such as wood pallets, plastic and paper packaging and scrap metal that can be taken to the nearby waste recycling center and all other non-recyclable construction debris being taken to the nearby landfill. The City landfill has adequate capacity to accommodate solid waste that will result during construction.

g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Discussion (g): The project will comply with all federal, state, and local solid waste regulations.

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 (a): As noted within this environmental document, and with the mitigation measures outlined in the document, the projects future development impacts related to habitat for wildlife species (e.g. San Joaquin Kit Fox) will be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. The project would not result in impacts to fish habitat or impacts to fish and wildlife populations. The site is vacant and shows evidence of being previously disturbed through regular farming practices for several years. Additionally, vegetative and underground cover is generally lacking on the site. Considering the disturbed nature of the site, impacts to fish, wildlife, or plant habitat are expected to be less than significant.

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 (b): Due to the location of the project area being east of the Union Pacific Railroad, which cuts the site off from the rest of Firestone’s operations and allows minimal access, there is not the potential for
significant additional development in this area of the City. Considering these factors, the project’s impacts on this environmental factor would be less than significant.

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

Discussion (c): As noted within this environmental document, and with the mitigation measures outlined in the document, the project’s potential to cause what may be considered substantial, adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly is less than significant. Therefore, the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.
**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference #</th>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Available for Review at:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>City of Paso Robles General Plan</td>
<td>City of Paso Robles Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000 Spring Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paso Robles, CA 93446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>City of Paso Robles Zoning Code</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>City of Paso Robles Environmental Impact Report for General Plan Update</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2007 Airport Land Use Plan</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>City of Paso Robles Municipal Code</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>City of Paso Robles Water Master Plan</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>City of Paso Robles Urban Water Management Plan 2005</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>City of Paso Robles Sewer Master Plan</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>City of Paso Robles Housing Element</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval for New Development</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan</td>
<td>Same as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Guidelines for Impact Thresholds</td>
<td>APCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3433 Roberto Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Luis Obispo, CA 93401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo County – Land Use Element</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>County Government Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Luis Obispo, CA 93408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>USDA, Soils Conservation Service, Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, Paso Robles Area, 1983</td>
<td>Soil Conservation Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paso Robles, Ca 93446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>City of Paso Robles Climate Action Plan 2013</td>
<td>City of Paso Robles Community Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000 Spring Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paso Robles, CA 93446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan

Project File No./Name: Firestone Solar Project
Approving Resolution No.: by: Planning Commission City Council

Date: February 12, 2019

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 indicated above to lessen the level of environmental impact of the project to a level of non-significance. A completed and signed checklist for each mitigation measure indicates that it has been completed.

Explanation of Headings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitoring Department or Agency</th>
<th>Shown on Plans</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
<th>Timing/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project, ongoing, cumulative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation Measure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD18-09, CUP18-06 (Firestone Solar Project)</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitoring Department or Agency</th>
<th>Shown on Plans</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
<th>Timing/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BR-1.</strong> Within one week of ground disturbance activities, if work occurs between March 15 and August 15, nesting bird surveys shall be conducted. To avoid impacts to nesting birds, grading and construction activities that affect trees and grasslands shall not be conducted during the breeding season from March 1 to August 15. If construction activities must be conducted during this period, nesting bird surveys shall take place within one week of habitat disturbance. If surveys do not locate nesting birds, construction activities may be conducted. If nesting birds are located, no construction activities shall occur within a distance specified by a qualified biologist, until chicks are fledged or nest fails. This includes nests of all common bird species (under the MBTA), as well as special status birds and raptor nests. Construction activities shall observe the delineated buffer, determined by a qualified biologist, where buffer radius will be specified according to special status rank, intensity of construction activity or impact (i.e. high decibel levels or heavy ground disturbance) and where local, state, and federal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR-1.</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>Certified Arborist CDD</td>
<td>Notes shown on construction documents.</td>
<td>Prior to issuing grading permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure PD18-09, CUP18-06 (Firestone Solar Project)</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Monitoring Department or Agency</td>
<td>Shown on Plans</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
<td>Timing/Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulations apply. A preconstruction survey report shall be submitted to the lead agency immediately upon completion of the survey. The report shall detail appropriate fencing or flagging of the buffer zone and make recommendations on additional monitoring requirements. A map of the Project site and nest locations shall be included with the report. The Project biologist conducting the nesting survey shall have the authority to reduce or increase the recommended buffer depending upon site conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BR-2.</strong> A pre-construction survey shall be conducted within thirty days of beginning work on the site to identify if badgers are using the site. If the pre-construction survey finds potential badger dens, they shall be inspected to determine whether they are occupied. The survey shall cover the entire property and shall examine both old and new dens. If potential badger dens are too long to completely inspect from the entrance, a fiber optic scope shall be used to examine the den to the end. Inactive dens may be excavated by hand with a shovel to prevent re-use of dens during construction. If badgers are found in dens on the property between February and July, nursing young may be present. To avoid disturbance and the possibility of direct take of adults and nursing young, and to prevent badgers from becoming trapped in burrows during construction activity, no grading shall occur within 100 feet of active badger dens between February and July. Between July 1st and February 1st all potential badger dens shall be inspected to determine if badgers are present. During the winter badgers do not truly hibernate, but are inactive and asleep in their dens for several days at a time. Because they can be torpid during the winter, they are vulnerable to disturbances that may collapse their dens before they rouse and emerge. Therefore, surveys shall be conducted for badger dens throughout the year. If badger dens are found on the property during the pre-construction survey, the CDFW wildlife biologist for the area shall be contacted to review current allowable management practices.</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td>Notes shown on construction documents.</td>
<td>Prior to issuing Grading Permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Monitoring Department or Agency</td>
<td>Shown on Plans</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
<td>Timing/Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD18-09, CUP18-06 (Firestone Solar Project)</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td>Notes shown on construction documents</td>
<td>Prior to issuing Grading Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BR-3. Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits, the applicant shall submit evidence to the City of Paso Robles, Community Development Department (Planning Division) that states that one or a combination of the following three San Joaquin kit fox mitigation measures has been implemented:

a. Provide for the protection in perpetuity, through acquisition of fee or a conservation easement of \[\text{Total number of mitigation acres required}\] acres of suitable habitat in the kit fox corridor area (e.g. within the San Luis Obispo County kit fox habitat area, in the City of Paso Robles), either on-site or off-site, and provide for a nonwasting endowment to provide for management and monitoring of the property in perpetuity. Lands to be conserved shall be subject to the review and approval of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (Department) and the City.

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

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

Mitigation alternative (b) above can be completed by providing funds to The Nature Conservancy (TNC) pursuant to the Voluntary Fee-Based Compensatory Mitigation Program (Program). The Program was established in agreement between the CDFW and TNC to preserve San Joaquin kit fox habitat, and to provide a voluntary mitigation alternative to project proponents who must mitigate the impacts of projects in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The fee, payable to “The Nature Conservancy,” would total $\[\text{Amount of fee based on } $2500\text{ per acre}\]. This fee is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitoring Department or Agency</th>
<th>Shown on Plans</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
<th>Timing/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD18-09, CUP18-06 (Firestone Solar Project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- calculated based on the current cost-per-unit of $2500 per acre of mitigation, which is scheduled to be adjusted to address the increasing cost of property in San Luis Obispo County; your actual cost may increase depending on the timing of payment. This fee must be paid after the CDFW provides written notification about your mitigation options but prior to City permit issuance and initiation of any ground disturbing activities.

  - **c.** Purchase [Total number of mitigation acres required] credits in a CDFW-approved conservation bank, which would provide for the protection in perpetuity of suitable habitat within the kit fox corridor area and provide for a non-wasting endowment for management and monitoring of the property in perpetuity. Mitigation alternative (c) above can be completed by purchasing credits from the Palo Prieto Conservation Bank (see contact information below). The Palo Prieto Conservation Bank was established to preserve San Joaquin kit fox habitat, and to provide a voluntary mitigation alternative to project proponents who must mitigate the impacts of projects in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The cost for purchasing credits is payable to the owners of The Palo Prieto Conservation Bank, and would total $[Amount of mitigation acres required (i.e. credits), currently priced at $2500 per credit]. This fee is calculated based on the current cost-per-credit of $2,500 per acre of mitigation. The fee is established by the conservation bank owner and may change at any time. Your actual cost may increase depending on the timing of payment. Purchase of credits must be completed prior to City permit issuance and initiation of any ground disturbing activities.

**BR-4.** Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits, the applicant shall provide evidence that they have retained a qualified biologist acceptable to the City. The retained biologist shall perform the following monitoring activities:

  - **i.** Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitoring Department or Agency</th>
<th>Shown on Plans</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
<th>Timing/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PD18-09, CUP18-06 (Firestone Solar Project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

If incidental take of kit fox during project activities is possible, before project activities commence, the applicant must consult with the USFWS. The results of this consultation may require the applicant to obtain a Federal and/or State permit for incidental take during project activities. The applicant should be aware that the presence of kit foxes or known or potential kit fox dens at the project site could result in further delays of project activities.
iv. In addition, the qualified biologist shall implement the following measures:

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

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

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

BR-5. Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits, the applicant shall clearly delineate the following as a note on the project plans: “Speed signs of 25 mph (or lower) shall be posted for all construction traffic to minimize the probability of road mortality of the San Joaquin kit fox”. Speed limit signs shall be installed on the project site within 30 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Measure</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitoring Department or Agency</th>
<th>Shown on Plans</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
<th>Timing/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BR-6.</strong> During the site disturbance and/or construction phase, grading and construction activities after dusk shall be prohibited unless coordinated through the City, during which additional kit fox mitigation measures may be required.</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td>Shown on construction documents</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BR-7.</strong> Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permit and within 30 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction, all personnel associated with the project shall attend a worker education training program, conducted by a qualified biologist, to avoid or reduce impacts on sensitive biological resources (i.e. San Joaquin kit fox). At a minimum, as the program relates to the kit fox, the training shall include the kit fox’s life history, all mitigation measures specified by the City, as well as any related biological report(s) prepared for the project. The applicant shall notify the City shortly prior to this meeting. A kit fox fact sheet shall also be developed prior to the training program, and distributed at the training program to all contractors, employers and other personnel involved with the construction of the project.</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td>Shown on construction documents</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BR-8.</strong> During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, to prevent entrapment of the San Joaquin kit fox, all excavations, steep-walled holes and trenches in excess of two feet in depth shall be covered at the close of each working day by plywood or similar materials, or provided with one or more escape ramps constructed of earth fill or wooden planks. Trenches shall also be inspected for entrapped kit fox each morning prior to onset of field activities and immediately prior to covering with plywood at the end of each working day. Before such holes or trenches are filled, they shall be thoroughly inspected for entrapped kit fox. Any kit fox so discovered shall be allowed to escape before field activities resume, or removed from the trench or hole by a qualified biologist and allowed to escape unimpeded.</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Project Biologist</td>
<td>Shown on construction documents</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure PD18-09, CUP18-06 (Firestone Solar Project)</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Monitoring Department or Agency</td>
<td>Shown on Plans</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
<td>Timing/Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BR-9.</strong> During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, any pipes, culverts, or similar structures with a diameter of four inches or greater, stored overnight at the project site shall be thoroughly inspected for trapped San Joaquin kit foxes before the subject pipe is subsequently buried, capped, or otherwise used or moved in any way. If during the construction phase a kit fox is discovered inside a pipe, that section of pipe will not be moved. If necessary, the pipe may be moved only once to remove it from the path of activity, until the kit fox has escaped.</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to issuance of grading permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BR-10.</strong> During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, all food-related trash items such as wrappers, cans, bottles, and food scraps shall be disposed of only in closed containers. These containers shall be regularly removed from the site. Food items may attract San Joaquin kit foxes onto the project site, consequently exposing such animals to increased risk of injury or mortality. No deliberate feeding of wildlife shall be allowed.</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to issuance of Grading Permit/On-going with project construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BR-11.</strong> Prior to, during and after the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, use of pesticides or herbicides shall be in compliance with all local, State and Federal regulations. This is necessary to minimize the probability of primary or secondary poisoning of endangered species utilizing adjacent habitats, and the depletion of prey upon which San Joaquin kit foxes depend.</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a grading permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BR-12.</strong> During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, any contractor or employee that inadvertently kills or injures a San Joaquin kit fox or who finds any such animal either dead, injured, or entrapped shall be required to report the incident immediately to the applicant and City. In the event that any observations are made of injured or dead kit fox, the applicant shall immediately notify the USFWS and CDFW by telephone. In addition, formal notification shall be provided in writing within three working days of the finding of any such</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On Going during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Measure PD18-09, CUP18-06 (Firestone Solar Project)</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Monitoring Department or Agency</td>
<td>Shown on Plans</td>
<td>Verified Implementation</td>
<td>Timing/Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animal(s). Notification shall include the date, time, location and circumstances of the incident. Any threatened or endangered species found dead or injured shall be turned over immediately to CDFW for care, analysis, or disposition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BR-13.</strong> Prior to final inspection, or occupancy, whichever comes first, should any long internal or perimeter fencing be proposed or installed, the applicant shall do the following to provide for kit fox passage:</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. If a wire strand/pole design is used, the lowest strand shall be no closer to the ground than 12 inches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. If a more solid wire mesh fence is used, 8 by 12 inch openings near the ground shall be provided every 100 yards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Upon fence installation, the applicant shall notify the City to verify proper installation. Any fencing constructed after issuance of a final permit shall follow the above guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CR-1:</strong> A qualified archaeological monitor and a Native American observer shall be present for all ground-disturbing work for the proposed Project. A worker-education training meeting to discuss the requirements for archaeological monitoring shall be held prior to the start of construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prehistoric materials may include chert flaked stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (midden) containing fire-altered rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones). Historic-period materials might include stone, concrete, wood or adobe building foundations, corals, and walls; filled wells or privies; mining features; and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. If any of these materials are found during the course of construction, the Project archaeologist should halt construction and determine if materials are isolated finds or part of a larger archaeological deposit. If an archaeological site is</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>CDD</td>
<td>Grading Plans &amp; Building Plans</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a grading permit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mitigation Measure  
PD18-09, CUP18-06  
(Firestone Solar Project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Monitoring Department or Agency</th>
<th>Shown on Plans</th>
<th>Verified Implementation</th>
<th>Timing/Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Identified, then the resource should be evaluated for significance under CEQA and further treatment measures may be required.
- If human remains are discovered during Project construction, work must stop at the discovery location and any nearby area suspected to contain human remains (PRC 7050.5). The San Luis Obispo Coroner must be contacted to determine whether the cause of death should be investigated. If the coroner determines that the remains are of Native American origin, it is necessary to comply with state laws relating to the disposition of Native American burials, which fall within the jurisdiction of the NAHC (PRC 5097). The coroner will contact the NAHC. The NAHC will contact the most likely descendant(s) who will be afforded the opportunity to recommend means for treatment of the human remains following protocols in PRC 5097.98.

(add additional measures as necessary)

Explanation of Headings:

**Type**: ............................................................... Project, ongoing, cumulative  
**Monitoring Department or Agency**: ........ Department or Agency responsible for monitoring a particular mitigation measure  
**Shown on Plans**: ........................................... When a mitigation measure is shown on the plans, this column will be initialed and dated.  
**Verified Implementation**: ............................ When a mitigation measure has been implemented, this column will be initialed and dated.  
**Remarks**: ........................................................ Area for describing status of ongoing mitigation measure, or for other information.
October 8, 2018

City of Paso Robles
Community Development Department
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446
(805) 237-3970

RE: Firestone Walker Brewery Solar PV Conditional Use Permit

Dear Mr. Nash,

The updated conditional use planset is attached for your review. Please find the following attached:

(4) Complete Plansets
(9) Site plans

The below narrative is the respective project descriptions for the application and environmental form.

**Development Application - Project Description**

REC solar is proposing to design and install a 2.1mw single axis tracker solar pv system and a 277kw solar carport for Firestone Walker Brewery. The solar pv systems will offset energy usage at the main brewery through pg&e’s net energy metering aggregation (nema) program. The project single axis tracker will cover a total footprint of 9.78 acres on parcel apn 009-631-018 and 009-631-019, which is currently maintained through farming of row crops and cereal grains by firestone. The site is currently occupied by open farmland directly east of the existing waste water treatment ponds and south of ramada drive.

The carport system will cover approximately 14,000sq ft on apn 009-631-006, which is currently occupied by a remote parking lot for firestone walker employees.

The system will consist of pv modules mounted to single axis trackers or a carport shade structure, inverters, and various ac electrical equipment. The tracker system will interconnected to the electric utility infrastructure via a line side tap at the existing 2000a service and coordinated with pg&e. The carport system will be interconnected at the existing service at the parking lot.

Access to the tracker site will be restricted to qualified personnel and secured by a 7ft chain link fence around the perimeter. The carport will have a minimum clear height of 10ft with all equipment mounted near the top of each structural column. The structures will reside within the parking lot striping and not impede on existing fire lanes.

**Environmental Form**

35b. b.If industrial, state the type, hours of operation, number of shifts, estimated employment per shift, applicable shipping and delivery requirements, and provisions for loading facilities.

Once completed, the sites will not be staffed and no regular vehicle traffic will be present. Typical maintenance activities include 1-2 visits per year for module washing, vegetation management, and any pertinent service calls.

**Soil Stability, vegetation, and animals on and around site**

The site is currently dry farmed with cereal crops and is stable. The solar security fence will maintain a minimum 90ft open space barrier to the small riparian area to the East. There is a low potential for several native bird and mammal species on the parcels. Mitigations and biologist surveys will be conducted per the biological survey by Althouse and Meade.

**Topography of the site and any unusual landform features**

The topography of the site is mostly flat with a slight grade NE of 1.1% over the whole site. The foundations for
the single axis trackers will be driven I beam piles. A portion of the solar array will be in the 100 year flood zone with all electrical equipment a minimum of 2 feet above the base flood elevation. No excavation, cut or fill will be required on this site. The carport site is a paved asphalt lot. Foundations will be drilled reinforced concrete caissons.

Structures on the site and their uses
Firestone Walker Brewery operates a Waste Water Treatment Facility on the same parcels that the single axis tracker project will be located on. The solar carport project will be located on a remote parking lot for Firestone employees.

Cultural, historical, and scenic aspects of the site.
The sites have been surveyed for archaeological significance and minimal findings were reported from Applied Earthworks. Coordination with Native American tribes will be implemented during construction.
The tracker project is located behind existing brewery facilities and is partially viewable from the Southbound lane of the 101 on top of the hill. Renderings can be found on PV108.
The carport site is adjacent to highway 101 on Ramada Dr and can be viewed from the north and southbound lanes. The Renderings of this shade structure can be viewed on PV110.

Surrounding Land Use
The site is mainly bordered by industrial businesses including Firestone Walker’s main brewery facility. Along with the brewery, there are several industrial buildings where Storage 101, Quinn Rentals, and Matheson conduct business. The Eastern parcel boundary is parks and open space along the Salinas River. The closest single family residential homes are approximately 1000 feet North East of the site across the Salinas river.

Existing Utilities
Bordering the site to the West is the Firestone Waste Water Treatment Facility. The solar site will interconnect to electric infrastructure at the service supplying the treatment plant. There are several utilities and easements that are approximately 700ft away from the solar project along the western border of the parcels including the following:
- Union Pacific Railroad
- City of Paso Robles Water and Sewer Easements
- City of Paso Robles Temporary Construction Easement
- City of Paso Robles water line
- City of Paso Robles sewer line

Oak Trees
Please see sheet PV106 of the submitted site plans for oak tree and existing tree locations and sizes. There is one oak tree near the project area that will be preserved and protected during construction per the mitigations in the biological survey performed by Althouse and Meade.

Please don't hesitate to contact me directly if you have questions or need assistance.

Sincerely,

Thomas Cemo
Project Engineer

REC Solar
3450 Broad Street, Suite 105
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
Direct: (805) 704-1245
Toll Free: (844) REC-Solar (732-7652)

tcemo@recsolar.com
www.RECSolar.com
Preliminary Biological Report

for

Firestone Solar Plant
City of Paso Robles CUP 18-06

Paso Robles, San Luis Obispo County

Prepared for

REC Solar
3450 Broad Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

by

ALTHOUSE AND MEADE, INC.
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1602 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446
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SYNOPSIS

- This preliminary biological report examines a 28.4-acre Study Area located in the City of Paso Robles, San Luis Obispo County, California. The Study Area includes portions of (APN 009-631-019 and –018). Approximately 9 acres would be directly impacted by the proposed project.

- The proposed project is construction of a 2.1 megawatt photovoltaic solar plant for the Firestone Brewery (CUP 18-06).

- Habitat types identified in the Study Area consist of agricultural and riparian habitats. The proposed project would only impact agricultural habitat.

- Botanical surveys conducted in May and June 2018 identified 40 species, subspecies, and varieties of vascular plants in the Study Area. There is no potential for special status plants to occur in the Study Area. Special status plants were not observed in the Study Area.

- Wildlife species detected in the Study Area include 2 reptiles, 22 birds, and 4 mammals. There is low potential for 2 special status animals to occur in the Study Area. No state or federally listed animals have been detected in the Study Area.

- Mitigation recommendations are provided to reduce potential impacts to nesting birds, American badger, and San Joaquin kit fox.
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose
This report provides information regarding biological resources associated with an approximately 28.4-acre site (Study Area) in the City of Paso Robles, San Luis Obispo County, California. Results are reported for botanical and wildlife surveys of the Study Area conducted from May to June 2018. A habitat inventory and results of database and literature searches of special status species reports within a nine 7.5-minute quadrangle search area of the Study Area are also included. Special status species that could occur in the Study Area or be affected by the proposed project are discussed and lists of plant and animal species that were identified or are expected in the Study Area are provided. An evaluation of the effect of the proposed project on biological resources is included, and mitigation recommendations are outlined.

1.2 Location
The proposed solar plant would be built on an approximately 9-acre site located 850 feet east of Vendels Circle adjacent to existing water treatment ponds, on assessor’s parcel numbers 009-631-018 and -019, (Figures 1 and 2). Approximate coordinates for the center of the Study Area are 120.689° W, 35.596° N (WGS84) in the United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangle Templeton. Elevation is approximately 715 feet above mean sea level. The Study Area is located in the City of Paso Robles in San Luis Obispo County. Our Study Area includes a larger area than the proposed project area to account for any sensitive biological resources that could be affected by the project but were not in the project footprint. In this document we refer to both a Study Area and a proposed project area to distinguish locations of biological resources and potential project impacts.

1.3 Project Description
The proposed project is a 2.1 megawatt photovoltaic power plant on approximately 9-acres for Firestone Brewery located at the northern terminus of Ramada Drive, east of the Union Pacific railroad line. The major components of the project consist of a security fence enclosing the 9-acre site, rows of photovoltaic solar modules mounted on single axis trackers, a distribution switchboard unit, and power interconnection line.

1.4 Regulatory Framework

1.4.1 Federal Law and Regulations
Endangered Species Act. The federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) provides the legal framework for the listing and protection of species (and their habitats) identified as being endangered or threatened with extinction. Actions that jeopardize endangered or threatened species and the habitats upon which they rely are considered a ‘take’ under the Endangered Species Act. Take of a federally listed threatened or endangered species is prohibited without a special permit. The Endangered Species Act allows for take of a threatened or endangered species incidental to development activities once a habitat conservation plan has been prepared to the satisfaction of the USFWS and an incidental take permit has been issued. The Endangered Species Act also allows
for the take of threatened or endangered species after consultation has deemed that development activities will not jeopardize the continued existence of the species. The federal Endangered Species Act also provides for a Section 7 Consultation when a federal permit is required, such as a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit.

“Critical Habitat” is a term within the federal Endangered Species Act designed to guide actions by federal agencies (as opposed to state, local, or other agency actions) and defined as “an area occupied by a species listed as threatened or endangered within which are found physical or geographical features essential to the conservation of the species, or an area not currently occupied by the species which is itself essential to the conservation of the species.”

**Section 404 Clean Water Act Regulations.** The Clean Water Act provides wetland regulation at the federal level and is administered by the USACE. The purpose of the Clean Water Act is to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of all waters of the U.S. Permitting is required for filling waters of the U.S. (including wetlands). Permits may be issued on an individual basis or may be covered under approved nationwide permits.

**Migratory Bird Treaty Act.** All migratory bird species that are native to the U.S. or its territories are protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as amended under the Migratory Bird Treaty Reform Act of 2004. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act is generally protective of migratory birds.

### 1.4.2 State Law and Regulations

**California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).** CEQA requires that biological resources be considered when assessing the environmental impacts that are the result of proposed actions. The lead agencies determine the scope of what is considered an impact and what constitutes an “adverse effect” on a biological resource.

**California Fish and Game Code.** The California Fish and Game Code regulates the taking or possession of birds, mammals, fish, amphibians, and reptiles, as well as natural resources such as wetlands and waters of the state. It includes but is not limited to the California Endangered Species Act, Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreements, and the California Native Plant Protection Act.

**Nesting Birds.** Fish and Game Code, Section 3503, states that it is “unlawful to take, possess, or needlessly destroy the nest or eggs of any bird, except as otherwise provided by this code or any regulation made pursuant thereto,” and “unlawful to take, possess, or destroy any birds of prey or to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any such bird” unless authorized.

**California Endangered Species Act.** The California Endangered Species Act (CESA), similar to the federal Endangered Species Act, contains a process for listing of species and regulating potential impacts to listed species. State threatened and endangered species include both plants and wildlife, but do not include invertebrates. The designation “rare species” applies only to California native plants. State threatened and endangered plant species are regulated largely under the Native Plant Preservation Act in conjunction with the California Endangered Species Act. State threatened and endangered animal species are legally protected against “take.” The CESA authorizes CDFW to enter into a memorandum of agreement for take of listed species to issue an incidental take permit for a state-listed threatened and endangered species only if specific criteria...
are met. Section 2080 of the CESA prohibits the take of species listed as threatened or endangered pursuant to the Act. Section 2081 allows CDFW to authorize take prohibited under Section 2080 provided that: 1) the taking is incidental to an otherwise lawful activity; 2) the taking will be minimized and fully mitigated; 3) the applicant ensures adequate funding for minimization and mitigation; and 4) the authorization will not jeopardize the continued existence of the listed species.

**Lake and Streambed Alteration.** Section 1602 of the Fish & Game Code requires any person, state, or local governmental agency to provide advance written notification to CDFW prior to initiating any activity that would: 1) divert or obstruct the natural flow of, or substantially change or remove material from the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake; or 2) result in the disposal or deposition of debris, waste, or other material into any river, stream, or lake. The state definition of “lakes, rivers, and streams” includes all rivers or streams that flow at least periodically or permanently through a well-defined bed or channel with banks that support fish or other aquatic life, and watercourses with surface or subsurface flows that support or have supported riparian vegetation.

**California Native Plant Protection Act.** Section 1900-1913 of the California Fish and Game Code contains the regulations of the Native Plant Protection Act of 1977. The intent of this act is to help conserve and protect rare and endangered plants in the state.

**Regional Water Quality Control Board.** The RWQCB not only regulates impacts to water quality in federal waters of the U.S. under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act, but they also regulate any isolated waters that are impacted under the state Porter Cologne Act utilizing a Waste Discharge Requirement. Discharge of fill material into waters of the State not subject to the jurisdiction of the USACE pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act may require authorization pursuant to the Porter Cologne Act through application for waste discharge requirements or through waiver of waste discharge requirements.
2 METHODS

2.1 Literature Review

Relevant literature, including relevant plans, policies, and biological information, was reviewed to determine what biological resources may occur near or in the project area. Research included:

- Review of agency plans pertaining to sensitive and special-status species;
- Queries of special-status species occurrence records;
- Review of literature on sensitive species and biological resources in the project area and region;

We conducted a search of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB June 2018 data) and the California Native Plant Society (CNPS) On-line Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California for special status species known to occur in the 9 USGS 7.5-minute quadrangles surrounding the Study Area: Templeton, Adelaida, Paso Robles, Estrella, York Mtn, Creston, Morro Bay North, Atascadero, Santa Margarita.

Additional special status species research consisted of reviewing previous biological reports for the area and searching online museum and herbarium specimen records for locality data within San Luis Obispo County. We reviewed online databases of specimen records maintained by the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology at the University of California, Berkeley, the California Academy of Sciences, and the Consortium of California Herbaria. Additional special status species with potential to occur on or near the Study Area were added to our special status species list (refer to Appendix A and Appendix B.

Special status species lists produced by database and literature searches were cross-referenced with the described habitat types in the Study Area to identify all potential special status species that could occur on or near the Study Area. Each special status species that could occur on or near the Study Area is individually discussed (refer to Section 4.4).

After review of the literature, the following criteria were used to determine the potential for special-status species to occur within the project area:

- **Present:** The species was observed in the project area during field surveys.
- **High Potential:** High habitat quality combined with CNDDB occurrences or other records indicate the species is likely to occur on the project site. Individuals may not have been observed in the project area during field surveys; however, the species likely occurs in the project vicinity and could move into the project site in the future.
- **Moderate Potential:** CNDDB occurrences or surveys have recorded the species within 10 miles of the project area and suitable habitat is present. The species could be present, at least seasonally or as a transient.
- **Low Potential:** Marginally suitable habitat may occur in the project area, but individuals were not observed during surveys and are not expected to be present.
- **No Potential:** Species, sign, or habitat were not observed on the site during surveys and suitable habitat is not present.
2.2 Mapping

Mapping efforts utilized Samsung Galaxy Tab 4 tablets equipped with Garmin GLO GPS Receivers and a third-party mapping application. Biological resource constraints were mapped in the field on site. Hand notation of habitats on high resolution aerials were digitized into polygon layers. Maps were created using aerial photo interpretation, field notation, and spatial data imported to Esri ArcGIS, a Geographic Information System (GIS) software program. Data were overlaid on a 2016 National Agriculture Imagery Program (NAIP) aerial of San Luis Obispo County (USDA 2016).

2.3 Surveys

The Study Area was surveyed for botanical resources on June 7, 2018 and for birds and other wildlife on June 6, 2018. Reconnaissance habitat survey was conducted on May 10, 2018. Surveys were conducted by Althouse and Meade, Inc. biologists Dan Meade, Kyle Nessen, and Will Knowlton (Table 1). Surveys were conducted on foot to compile species lists, search for special status plants and animals, map habitats, and to photograph the Study Area. The entire Study Area was surveyed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Date</th>
<th>Biologist(s)</th>
<th>Weather Observations</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 10, 2018</td>
<td>Daniel Meade</td>
<td>Clear, 60°F</td>
<td>Habitat survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 18, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clear, 80°F</td>
<td>Bio resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6, 2018</td>
<td>Will Knowlton</td>
<td>Clouds, 70°F</td>
<td>Wildlife &amp; nesting bird survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7, 2018</td>
<td>Kyle Nessen</td>
<td>Clear, 65°F</td>
<td>Habitat assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Botanical survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.1 Botanical

Each habitat type occurring in the Study Area was inspected, described, and catalogued (Section 3). All plant species observed in the Study Area were identified and recorded (Section 3.9 and Table 4). Reconnaissance transects were meandering with an emphasis on locating habitat appropriate for special status plants. Transects were utilized to map boundaries of different vegetation types, describe general conditions and dominant species, compile species lists, and evaluate potential habitat for special status species. Identification of botanical resources included field observations and laboratory analysis of collected material. Botanical surveys were conducted in date according to agency guidelines (USFWS 2000, CDFG [CDFW] 2009, and CNPS 2001). Botanical surveys were appropriately timed to identify all special status plant species known from the region (refer to Appendix A and Section 3.6) that have potential to occur in the Study Area. Although an early season botanical survey was not conducted, there are no special status plants expected to occur in the proposed project area that would be added by an early spring survey. Botanical nomenclature used in this document follows the Jepson Manual, Second Edition.
We also provide Jepson Manual First Edition names in brackets where nomenclature has recently changed.

2.3.2 Wildlife

Wildlife documentation included observations of animal presence and wildlife sign such as nests, tracks, and scat. Observations of wildlife were recorded during field surveys in all areas of the Study Area (Section 3.10 and Table 5). Birds were identified by sight, using 10-power binoculars, or by vocalizations. Reptiles and amphibians were identified by sight, often using binoculars, and by hand-captures; traps were not used. Mammals recorded in the Study Area were identified by sight and tracks.

2.4 Soils

The soil map unit in the proposed project area is Mocho clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes. Mocho clay loam (173) occurs on alluvial fans and alluvial flats on sedimentary rock as the parent material. The surface horizon is 19 inches with a claypan at 8 inches. Soil horizons quickly transition to undeveloped clay loam and loam to 44 inches, then gravelly loam and silt loam to a depth of 64 inches. The depth to restrictive feature is more than 80 inches. This map unit is well drained with no flooding or ponding. This characterization is confirmed on the project site by no evidence of ponding. It has a hydric soil rating of “No”. The land capability classification for irrigated crops is 1. Class I (1) soils have slight limitations that restrict their use. Mocho clay loam is prime farmland.

Three other soil map units occur in the Study Area but not in the project area. These soils are Metz-Tujunga complex, occasionally flooded, 0 to 5 percent slopes, that is confined to the bank of the terrace at the Salinas River flood channel; Lockwood shaly loam (158) that occurs west of the proposed project site along the railroad, and Corducci-Typic Xerofluvents that occurs in the Salinas River channel. These soil types do not occur within the proposed project area.

A custom soil report for the Study Area can be found as Appendix C.
3 RESULTS

3.1 Regional Context
The Study Area is located in San Luis Obispo County, within in the city of Paso Robles. The Study Area borders the Salinas River and commercial developments. The surrounding area to the east is sparsely populated or undeveloped. Industrial and commercial development occurs to the east along the U.S. Highway 101 corridor.

3.2 Existing Conditions
A large, recently plowed agricultural field is the primary feature of the Study Area, which is predominately unvegetated except for a few scattered stands of perennial weeds such as field bindweed (*Convolvulus arvensis*) and Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*). Several mature valley oaks (*Quercus lobata*) are scattered within the agricultural field. Areas that have not been plowed, such as the borders of the field and service roads, are highly disturbed and heavily invaded with ruderal weeds. In the center of the agricultural field is a water treatment facility associated with Firestone Walker Brewery. A narrow riparian zone separates the Study Area from the sand and gravel wash habitat in the Salinas River.

3.3 Habitat Types
Two habitat types are described and mapped within the 28.4 acre Study Area (Table 2 and see Figure 6 in Section 7). Most of the Study Area, approximately 25.3 acres, is agricultural farmland. The remaining area consists of approximately 3.1 acres of riparian habitat along a bank of the Salinas River. The proposed project would be on approximately 10.0 acres defined by a chain link security fence that would enclose the solar plant within the agricultural habitat type. The actual area of solar panels would be less than the project area, and some habitat value would remain within the solar arrays depending on management practices.

**TABLE 2. HABITAT TYPES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Approximate Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Center of the Study Area</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian</td>
<td>Southern and eastern borders of the Study Area</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.1 Agricultural
The agricultural field is predominately unvegetated except for two large stands of the agrastal perennial weeds, Russian thistle (*Salsola tragus*) and field bindweed (*Convolvulus arvensis*). Other less common forbs can be found as individuals or in small numbers, such as lamb’s quarters (*Chenopodium album*), jimsonweed (*Datura wrightii*), and wild mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*).
Large valley oaks (*Quercus lobata*) can be found within the field, are farmed around, and likely predate any farming activity in the Study Area.

### 3.3.2 Ruderal

Ruderal habitats are dominated by nonnative invasive plants such as wild mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*), red brome (*Bromus madritensis ssp. rubens*), and ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*) and occur where human disturbance is common. Native forbs often associated with disturbance can be found in this habitat as well, such as jimsonweed (*Datura wrightii*), coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*), and common fiddleneck (*Amsinckia intermedia*). This habitat type is on the edges of the Study Area along sides of roads, fences, and other human created boundaries, and would not be part of the proposed project area.

### 3.3.3 Riparian

Plants that associate with mesic conditions such as Fremont cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*), box elder (*Acer negundo*), and red willow (*Salix laevigata*) define riparian habitats. The understory can be heavily invaded with nonnative grasses and forbs such as Italian rye grass (*Festuca pernnis*), and milk thistle (*Silybum marianum*), making it difficult to differentiate from ruderal habitats.

### 3.4 Potential Wetlands and Jurisdictional Waters

Wetlands and jurisdictional waters occur outside of the proposed project area and within the Salinas River corridor. Areas of potential wetlands within the proposed project footprint were not found. There was no evidence in the Study Area of ponded water, including cracked crusts or wetland vegetation. Thorough surveys of the site were conducted in June, 48 days after the last rainfall of the season in Paso Robles. Examination of historical aerial photographs of the site showed no evidence of ponding water in the proposed project site. This soil map unit is well drained with no flooding or ponding (Section 2.4). The project is not expected to affect wetlands or waters.

### 3.5 Habitat Connectivity and Wildlife Movement

The proposed project is adjacent to the Salinas River corridor in an agricultural field. It would not affect aquatic species in the Salinas River during periods of water flow. The project would be fenced for safety reasons and would exclude large mammals such as deer. Mid-size mammals such as bobcat and coyote are adept and either jumping or climbing over (bobcat, racoon) or digging under fences (coyote, red fox, badger). East of the project site the Salina River corridor is open sandy flats and grassland with sparse cottonwoods and willows. Distance between the proposed project fence and the nearest fenced land to the east is approximately 1,000 feet. Wildlife movement would occur through the Salinas River corridor, but is restricted on the east by residential properties and on the west by commercial development and US Highway 101.

### 3.6 Special Status Plant Species

Research on special status plant occurrences conducted within the designated search area (see Methods) determined 62 special status plant species are known to occur in the region (refer to
Appendix A). Appropriate habitat and soil conditions are present in the Study Area for none of the special status plants in the region. Figures 3 and 5 in Section 7 depict the current GIS data for special status plant species and critical habitat mapped near the Study Area by the CNDDB and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

3.6.1 Introduction to California Rare Plant Ranks

Plant species are considered rare when their distribution is confined to localized areas, when there is a threat to their habitat, when they are declining in abundance, or are threatened in a portion of their range. The California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) categories range from species with a low threat (CRPR 4) to species that are presumed extinct (CRPR 1A). The plants of CRPR 1B are rare throughout their range. All but a few species are endemic to California. All of them are judged to be vulnerable under present circumstances, or to have a high potential for becoming vulnerable.

3.6.2 Introduction to CNDDB Definitions

“Special Plants” is a broad term used to refer to all the plant taxa inventoried by the CNDDB, regardless of their legal or protection status (CDFW April 2018). Special plants include vascular plants, high priority bryophytes (mosses, liverworts, and hornworts), and lichens. The CNDDB uses a ranking methodology that includes a Global rank (G rank) that describes a taxon over its entire distribution and a State rank (S rank) that describes the rank for the taxon over its California distribution. Subspecies and varieties are ranked with a “T” rank for their Global status. Global and State ranks are represented by a letter-number score that reflects a combination of rarity, threat and trend factors, with weighting being heavier of rarity. A Global rank of G1 or a State rank of S1 indicates a taxon that is critically imperiled, while a G5 or S5 rating indicates the taxon is common and widespread.

3.6.3 Potential Special Status Plant List

A comprehensive list of special status plant species reviewed is included as Appendix A. Federal and California State status, global and State rank, and CNPS rank status for each species are given. Also included are typical blooming periods, habitat preference, potential to occur on site, whether the species was detected in the Study Area, and effect of proposed activity.

3.6.4 Discussion

Based on an analysis of known ecological requirements for the special status plant species reported from the region (Appendix A), and the habitat conditions that were observed in the Study Area, it was determined that no special status plant species have a potential to occur in the Study Area.

3.7 Special Status Animal Species

Research on special status animal occurrences conducted within the designated search area (see Methods) determined 37 special status animal species are known to occur in the region (refer to Appendix B). Appropriate habitat conditions are present in the proposed project area for two special status animals (Table 3). Figures 4 and 5 in Section 7 depict the current GIS data for special status species and critical habitat mapped in the vicinity of the Property by the CNDDB and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).
3.7.1 Introduction to CNDDB Definitions

“Special Animals” is a general term that refers to all of the animal taxa inventoried by the CNDDB, regardless of their legal or protection status (CDFW October 2017). The Special Animals list is also referred to by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) as the list of “species at risk” or “special status species.” These taxa may be listed or proposed for listing under the California and/or Federal Endangered Species Acts, but they may also be species deemed biologically rare, restricted in range, declining in abundance, or otherwise vulnerable.

Animals listed as California Species of Special Concern (SSC) may or may not be listed under California or Federal Endangered Species Acts. They are considered rare or declining in abundance in California. The Special Concern designation is intended to provide the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, biologists, land planners and managers with lists of species that require special consideration during the planning process to avert continued population declines and potential costly listing under federal and state endangered species laws. For many species of birds, the primary emphasis is on the breeding population in California. For some species that do not breed in California but winter here, emphasis is on wintering range. The SSC designation thus may include a comment regarding the specific protection provided such as nesting or wintering.

Animals listed as Fully Protected are those species considered by CDFW as rare or faced with possible extinction. Most, but not all, have subsequently been listed under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) or the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA). Fully Protected species may not be taken or possessed at any time and no provision of the California Fish and Game code authorizes the issuance of permits or licenses to take any Fully Protected species.

3.7.2 Potential Special Status Animals List

Two special status animal species reported from the region have potential to occur on the proposed project site (Table 3). Federal and California State status, global and State rank, and CDFW listing status for each species are given. Typical breeding period, habitat preference, potential habitat on site, whether the species was detected in the Study Area, and effect of proposed activity are also provided. A comprehensive list of the 37 special status animal species reviewed is included as Appendix B.
### TABLE 3. SPECIAL STATUS ANIMAL LIST

List of species with potential to occur within the proposed project area. A complete list of species reviewed is included as Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Fed/State Status Global/State Rank CDFW Rank</th>
<th>Nesting-Breeding Period</th>
<th>Habitat Preference</th>
<th>Potential to Occur</th>
<th>Detected Within Study Area?</th>
<th>Effect of Proposed Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. American Badger</td>
<td><em>Taxidea taxus</em></td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>February – May</td>
<td>Needs friable soils in open ground with abundant food source such as California ground squirrels.</td>
<td>Low. Friable soils and open ground present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect with mitigation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Habitat characteristics are from the Jepson Manual and the CDNNB.
   *not listed in the CNDDB or CNPS for the search area, but possibly for the location.

**Abbreviations:**
- FE: Federally Endangered
- FT: Federally Threatened
- PE: Proposed Federally Endangered
- PT: Proposed Federally Threatened
- CE: California Endangered
- CT: California Threatened
- Cand. CE: Candidate for California Endangered
- Cand. CT: Candidate for California Threatened
- SSC: CDFW Species of Special Concern
- FP: CDFW Fully-Protected

---
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3.7.3 Discussion

Based on an analysis of known ecological requirements for the 37 special-status wildlife species reported or known from the region, and the habitat conditions that were observed in the Study Area and the proposed project site, it was determined that two species have a low potential to occur (American badger, San Joaquin kit fox). We discuss these two species below and describe habitat, range restrictions, known occurrences, and survey results for the Study Area.

A. American Badger (*Taxidea taxus*) is a California Species of Special Concern known from open grassland habitats throughout San Luis Obispo County and elsewhere in California. Badgers are highly mobile and hunt ground squirrels and other small and medium-sized prey. They are generally uncommon in the Paso Robles area, and although suitable open habitat is found in the Study Area, proximity to the urban edge of the City and the sandy wash habitat in the adjacent Salinas River corridor reduces the likelihood of badger presence. Badgers typically inhabit grasslands but do occasionally forage in cropland where California ground squirrels are abundant. Ground squirrels are found in the Study Area. No badgers or badger sign were observed in the Study Area during our surveys in 2018.

B. San Joaquin Kit Fox (*Vulpes macrotis mutica*) is a federally listed endangered species and a state listed threatened species. The CNDDB reports two occurrences approximately four miles northeast of the Study Area on Chandler Ranch from 1990 and 1991 (CNDDB 945 and 941). The cropland in the Study Area provides poor quality habitat for San Joaquin kit fox due to regular disturbance, low prey availability, lack of connection to appropriate foraging territory, barriers to extant populations, and agricultural management. San Joaquin kit fox was not observed in the Study Area during the spring 2018 wildlife surveys. The proposed project is within the CDFW designated two to one mitigation area for San Joaquin kit fox (San Luis Obispo County 2018). A San Joaquin Kit Fox Habitat Evaluation Form will be completed specific to this property and project once site design is complete.

The remaining 35 special status animal species that were evaluated were determined to have no potential to occur in the proposed project area due to lack of suitable habitat. However, four of these species either are listed or are candidates for listing as threatened or endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) and/or California Endangered Species Act (CESA). Therefore, although they are not expected to be affected by the proposed project, these species warrant further discussion:

A. Tricolored Blackbird (*Agelaius tricolor*) is a Candidate federal endangered and State listed endangered species. It requires open water and protected nesting substrate such as tules or cattails and foraging area with insect prey near to its colonial nesting site. This type of habitat is not present on the project site, in the Study Area, or nearby in the Salinas River corridor.

B. Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp (*Branchinecta lynchi*) is a federally listed Threatened species. It is found in ephemeral and seasonal clear water sandstone depression pools, earth slump or basalt flow depression pools, and locally in grass swales and vernal pools. This habitat type is not found in the Study Area and does not appear in the aerial photographic record of the site. Soils in the Study Area are well-drained and do not pond. Site surveys found no evidence of standing water such as dried crusts or wetland vegetation indicators in the project area. A
protocol level survey was not conducted for the site due to timing constraints, however the potential for this species to occur in the Study Area is extremely low.

C. **California Red-legged Frog** (*Rana draytonii*) is a federally listed Threatened species that occurs in lowlands and foothills in or near sources of deep water with dense, shrubby, or emergent riparian vegetation. The closest report of CRLF to the Study Area is from Graves Creek near the confluence with the Salinas River approximately 4.6 miles south of the Study Area. There are no reports of CRLF from the Salinas River in Paso Robles, probably due to the seasonal extremes in flow patterns that include high rapid flows and summer time drying of the channel. Protected breeding pools are not found in the Salinas River channel in the vicinity of the Study Area, and habitat on the project site would not support CRLF. This species seeks refuge in areas of perennial water, or in dense protective vegetative cover during dry periods. This type of aquatic or protective habitat does not occur on the proposed project site.

D. **Least Bell’s Vireo** (*Vireo bellii pusillus*) is a federally and state listed Endangered species that utilizes riparian habitat near water or dry streambeds. It nests in extensive willow, mesquite, Arundo, or mule fat thickets. The nearest report of this species to the project site is from 1924 when birds were found nesting in wild rose bushes 50 feet from running water in the “Salinas River bottom, Paso Robles”. Another report was made in 2005 of a breeding pair observed in the Salinas River about 4.8 miles north of the Study Area in willow, cottonwood, mule fat riparian habitat. Flowing water was present in a 10 to 20-foot wide channel and beaver dams created pools. Habitat in the Salinas River near the Study Area is rather sparse, with no dense riparian cover suitable for nesting Least Bell’s vireo. The proposed project site has no vegetation that would support nesting Least Bell’s vireos-
3.9 Botanical Survey Results

Botanical surveys conducted in June 7, 2018 identified 40 species or subspecies of vascular plant taxa in the Study Area (Table 4). The Study Area included locations outside of the proposed project area, such as the riparian edge. The list includes 12 species native to California and 28 introduced (naturalized or planted) species. Native plant species account for approximately 43 percent of the Study Area flora; introduced species account for approximately 57 percent. Special status plants were not identified in the Study Area.

**Table 4. Vascular Plant List.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Special Status</th>
<th>Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trees – 6 Species</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box elder</td>
<td>Acer negundo</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California coffee berry</td>
<td>Frangula californica</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont cottonwood</td>
<td>Populus fremontii</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast live oak</td>
<td>Quercus agrifolia</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley oak</td>
<td>Quercus lobata</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red willow</td>
<td>Salix laevigata</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shrubs – 3 Species</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote brush</td>
<td>Baccharis pilularis</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue elderberry</td>
<td>Sambucus nigra spp. Caerulea</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western poison oak</td>
<td>Toxicodendron diversilobum</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Forbs – 24 Species</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumbleweed</td>
<td>Amaranthus albus</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common fiddleneck</td>
<td>Amsinckia intermedia</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayweed</td>
<td>Anthemis cotula</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrow-leaf milkweed</td>
<td>Asclepias fascicularis</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black mustard</td>
<td>Brassica nigra</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tocalote</td>
<td>Centaurea melitensis</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamb’s quarters</td>
<td>Chenopodium album</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poison hemlock</td>
<td>Conium maculatum</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bindweed</td>
<td>Convolvulus arvensis</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimsonweed</td>
<td>Datura wrightii</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flax-leaved horseweed</td>
<td>Erigeron bonariensis</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redstem filaree</td>
<td>Erodium cicutarium</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Introduced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.10 Wildlife Survey Results

At least 92 animal species could occur in the Study Area (Table 5). These include at least 2 amphibians, 9 reptiles, 65 birds, and 16 mammals. Small mammal trapping studies were beyond the scope of this report, although several additional common rodent species are likely to occur. We provide this list as a guide to the wildlife observed in the Study Area and to the species that could potentially be present at least seasonally. Other species could occur as transients, particularly avian fauna.

Wildlife species detected in the Study Area include, 2 reptiles, 22 birds, and 4 mammals.

**TABLE 5. WILDLIFE LIST.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Special Status</th>
<th>Found On-site</th>
<th>Habitat Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amphibians – 2 Species</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California (Western) Toad</td>
<td>Anaxyrus [=Bufo] boreas halophilus</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grassland, woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierran Treefrog [=Pacific Chorus Frog]</td>
<td>Pseudacris sierra [formerly P. regilla]</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Many habitats near water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reptiles – 9 Species</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western pond turtle</td>
<td>Actinemys pallida</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ponds, lakes, rivers, streams, creeks, marshes, prefers pools with basking places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern California [=Silvery] Legless Lizard</td>
<td>Anniella pulchra</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy soils in dunes, woodlands, coastal scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Pacific Rattlesnake</td>
<td>Crotalus oreganus oreganus</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dry, rocky habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Alligator Lizard</td>
<td>Elgaria multicarinata multicarinata</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open grassland, woodland, chaparral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California kingsnake</td>
<td>Lampropeltis califoniae</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Many habitats from sea level to 7,100 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Gopher Snake</td>
<td>Pituophis catenifer catenifer</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodland, grassland, rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Red-tailed [=Gilbert’s] Skink</td>
<td>Plestiodon [=Eumeces]</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodland, grassland, chaparral; inland areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilton’s [=Western] Skink</td>
<td>Plestiodon [=Eumeces]</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodland, grassland, chaparral, inland and coastal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Range [=Western] Fence Lizard</td>
<td>Sceloporus occidentalis bocourtii</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Wide range; variety of habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birds – 65 Species</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-throated Swift</td>
<td>Aeronautes saxatalis</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-winged Blackbird</td>
<td>Agelaius phoeniceus</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marshes, fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallard</td>
<td>Anas platyrhynchos</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Marshes, grain fields, ponds, rivers, lakes, parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Scrub Jay</td>
<td>Aphelocoma californica</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Oak, riparian woodlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Titmouse</td>
<td>Baeolophus inornatus</td>
<td>SA (Nesting)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oak woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Horned Owl</td>
<td>Bubo virginianus</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodland, grassland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-tailed Hawk</td>
<td>Buteo jamaicensis</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open, semi-open country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Common Name | Scientific Name | Special Status | Found On-site | Habitat Type
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
California Quail | Callipepla californica | None | | Coastal sagebrush, chaparral, foothills, high desert
Anna’s Hummingbird | Calypte anna | None | | Many habitats
Wilson’s Warbler | Cardellina pusilla | None | | Scrub, forest edges, forest openings
Lawrence’s Goldfinch | Carduelis lawrencei | SA (Nesting) | | Oak woodlands, savanna
Lesser Goldfinch | Carduelis psaltria | None | | Riparian, oak woodlands
American Goldfinch | Carduelis tristis | None | | Weedy fields, woodlands
House Finch | Carpodacus mexicanus | None ✓ | | Riparian, grasslands, chaparral, and woodlands
Turkey Vulture | Cathartes aura | None ✓ | | Open country
Hermit Thrush | Catharus guttatus | None | | Woodland and brush
Killdeer | Charadrius vociferus | None ✓ | | Fields, pastures, plowed fields
Lark Sparrow | Chondestes grammacus | SA (Nesting) | | Woodland edges
Northern Flicker | Colaptes auratus | None | | Woodlands
American Crow | Corvus brachyrhynchos | None | | Many habitats, esp. urban
Yellow-rumped Warbler | Dendroica coronata | None | | Woodlands, brush, open country
Brewer’s Blackbird | Euphagus cyanocephalus | None | | Open habitats
American Kestrel | Falco sparverius | None | | Open, semi-open country
Bullock’s Oriole | Icterus bullockii | None ✓ | | Oak, riparian woodlands
Hooded Oriole | Icterus cucullatus | None | | Urban, mixed woodland
Dark-eyed Junco | Junco hyemalis | None | | Oak woodland
Acorn Woodpecker | Melanerpes formicivorus | None | | Oak woodland
Song Sparrow | Melospiza melodia | None | | Oak, riparian woodland
California Towhee | Melozone crissalis | None ✓ | | Brushy areas, chaparral, coastal scrub, gardens
Northern Mockingbird | Mimus polyglottos | None ✓ | | Riparian, chaparral and woodlands, urban
Ash-throated Flycatcher | Myiarchus cinerascens | None ✓ | | Deserts, brush, open woods
House Sparrow | Passer domesticus | None | | Rural and developed areas, agricultural, urban areas
Savannah Sparrow | Passerculus sandwichensis | None | | Open habitats, marshes, grasslands
Band-tailed pigeon | Patagioenas fasciata | None ✓ | | Oak canyons, foothills, chaparral, mountain forests
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Special Status</th>
<th>Found On-site</th>
<th>Habitat Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cliff Swallow</td>
<td>Petrochelidon pyrrhonota</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Near and over water, nest on vertical faces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phainopepla</td>
<td>Phainopepla nitens</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Desert scrub, mesquites, oak foothills, mistletoe clumps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-billed Magpie</td>
<td>Pica nuttalli</td>
<td>SA (Nesting)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oak savanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuttall’s Woodpecker</td>
<td>Picoides nuttallii</td>
<td>SA (Nesting)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oak, riparian woodlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downy Woodpecker</td>
<td>Picoides pubescens</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oak, riparian woodlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hairy Woodpecker</td>
<td>Picoides villosus</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oak, riparian woodlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Tanager</td>
<td>Piranga ludoviciana</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open coniferous and mixed coniferous-deciduous woodlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushtit</td>
<td>Psaltriparus minimus</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Woodlands, chaparral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great-tailed Grackle</td>
<td>Quiscalus mexicanus</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rural and developed areas, agricultural, urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Phoebe</td>
<td>Sayornis nigricans</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Near water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say’s Phoebe</td>
<td>Sayornis saya</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open country, grassland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow Warbler</td>
<td>Setophaga petechia</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open woodlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Bluebird</td>
<td>Sialia mexicana</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Woodland near open areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-breasted Nuthatch</td>
<td>Sitta carolinensis</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Oak savannah, woodland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence’s Goldfinch</td>
<td>Spinus lawrencei</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Open woodlands chaparral, weedy fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser goldfinch</td>
<td>Spinus psaltria</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Thickets, weedy fields, woodlands, clearings, scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Rough-winged Swallow</td>
<td>Stelgidopteryx serripennis</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open areas, often near water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurasian Collared-Dove</td>
<td>Streptopelia decaocto</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Urban, agricultural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Meadowlark</td>
<td>Sturnella neglecta</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open habitats, grasslands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Starling</td>
<td>Sturnus vulgaris</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Agricultural, livestock areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Swallow*</td>
<td>Tachycineta bicolor</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Forage over water, open areas,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet-green Swallow</td>
<td>Tachycineta thalassina</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oak, riparian woodlands, open areas near water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bewick’s Wren</td>
<td>Thryomanes bewickii</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Riparian woodland, scrub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House Wren</td>
<td>Troglydytes aedon</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Open forests, savanna, backyards,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Robin</td>
<td>Turdus migratorius</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open woodlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Agenda Item 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Special Status</th>
<th>Found On-site</th>
<th>Habitat Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Kingbird</td>
<td>Tyrannus verticalis</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grasslands, savanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassin’s Kingbird</td>
<td>Tyrannus vociferans</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open and semi-open areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warbling Vireo</td>
<td>Vireo gilvus</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mature deciduous woodlands, especially near water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mourning Dove</td>
<td>Zenaida macroura</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Open and semi-open habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-crowned Sparrow</td>
<td>Zonotrichia leucophrys</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oak, riparian woodlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Thrasher</td>
<td>Toxostoma redivivum</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lowland and coastal chaparral, riparian woodland thicket, urban parks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mammals – 16 Species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Special Status</th>
<th>Found On-site</th>
<th>Habitat Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coyote</td>
<td>Canis latrans</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Open woodlands, brushy areas, wide ranging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Pocket Mouse</td>
<td>Chaetodipus californicus</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chaparral, brush habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Opossum</td>
<td>Didelphis virginiana</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodlands, forests, urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Cat</td>
<td>Felis catus</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoary Bat</td>
<td>Lasiurus cinereus</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Variety of habitats, roosts in foliage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-tailed Weasel</td>
<td>Mustela frenata</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grasslands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Myotis</td>
<td>Myotis californicus</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tunnels, hollow trees, buildings, bridges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mule Deer</td>
<td>Odocoileus hemionus</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Many habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raccoon</td>
<td>Procyon lotor</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed forests, ponds, rivers, urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Ground Squirrel</td>
<td>Spermophilus beecheyi</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Grasslands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Boar</td>
<td>Sus scrofa</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desert Cottontail</td>
<td>Sylvilagus auduboni</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Brushy habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brush Rabbit</td>
<td>Sylvilagus bachmani</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Brushy habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Pocket Gopher</td>
<td>Thomomys bottae</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Variety of habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gray Fox</td>
<td>Urocyon cinereoargentus</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chaparral, dry woodlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Fox</td>
<td>Vulpes vulpes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Forest and open country</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 POTENTIAL IMPACTS

4.1 Habitats
The project would be built on agricultural land that has a history of dry-land farming for at least the past twenty-five years. Crops grown on the site are dry farmed grains and safflower. The project footprint is 9 acres that would be within a security fence on agricultural habitat type. Access to the project area would be by existing disturbed farm roads adjacent to the water treatment facility. After project completion, areas within the solar plant could still provide some habitat value for birds and small mammals depending on management practices. The project would not affect riparian habitat along the Salinas River.

4.1.1 Agricultural habitat
Agricultural habitat is the only habitat type that will be impacted by the proposed project through removal of approximately 10.0 acres of dry-farmed cropland. This habitat type can be utilized by foraging raptors, and mammals, and poses risk for other animals that may not be mobile enough to survive agricultural activities such as harvest and plowing. The loss of agricultural habitat is considered in the City of Paso Robles Zoning Code where the subject property is zoned as Planned Industrial (Map A4, 05.03.2011, City of El Paso de Robles, Zoning Designations).

4.2 Potential Wetlands and Jurisdictional Waters
Wetlands and jurisdictional waters occur outside of the proposed project area and within the Salinas River corridor. The project is not expected to affect wetlands or waters.

4.3 Nesting Birds
Red-tailed hawks have nested in a valley oak tree at the southern end of the Study Area within 500 feet of the proposed solar plant. There is potential for ground nesting birds to occur within the proposed project area. Nesting raptors in oaks within 500 feet of the project and ground nesting birds within the project site area of ground disturbance could be affected by construction of the solar plant.

4.4 Special Status Species

4.4.1 Plants
Special status plants were not found in the Study Area, and due to the long history of agricultural use, and the site soil, aspect, and ecological context, there are no special status plant species expect to occur in the proposed project area.

4.4.2 Amphibians and Reptiles
Special status amphibians or reptiles were not found within the Study Area and are not expected to occur within the proposed project site.
### 4.4.3 Mammals

Two special status mammals, American Badger and San Joaquin kit fox have a low probability of utilizing habitat in the proposed project site. American badger was found in 2003 as roadkill within two miles of the Study Area. Since habitat in the proposed project area could be utilized by American badger protective measures to mitigate impacts to this species are provided (see Section 5.4.4).

San Joaquin kit fox was last observed in the Paso Robles area in 1991 at what is now Barney Schwartz Park approximately four miles northwest of the Study Area. Although San Joaquin kit fox has not been observed in the vicinity for many years, the historic and potential habitat suitable for kit fox as defined by CDFW and the County of San Luis Obispo (2018) could be utilized by the species if range recovery of the species extends into the Paso Robles area. Therefore, mitigation is required for San Joaquin kit fox (see Section 5.4.5).

### 4.5 Habitat Connectivity and Wildlife Movement

The proposed project will reduce open ground accessible for north and south movement of wildlife along the Salinas River corridor by approximately 500 feet. This will leave approximately 1,000 feet between the solar plant fence and the nearest fence to the east, which is across the Salinas River channel at the property line of a parcel on Santa Ysabel Road. The eastern fence is barbed wire, which allows movement of terrestrial wildlife through an additional 500-foot wide area of rural residence open space. Aquatic species, such as steelhead would not be affected. Habitat remaining in the Salinas River movement corridor would consist of a portion of agricultural field, a narrow riparian edge, sandy wash and shrubs, the low flow channel, another riparian bank edge, and annual grassland on the eastern bank of the river. Wildlife will continue to move through the remaining corridor. North of the Study Area the Salinas River corridor is constrained to approximately 800 feet between the railroad track and residential urban development. Although this project is not likely to significantly restrict wildlife movement along the Salinas River corridor, cumulative reduction in the width of the corridor removes habitat and could eventually affect the ability of terrestrial wildlife to move safely along the Salinas River corridor.
5 MITIGATION RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Habitats

5.1.1 Agricultural Habitat

Biological resources in the agricultural habitat area consist of weeds and disturbance following plants, common wildlife, and possibly nesting birds. Impacts to nesting birds would be mitigated by BR-1 (Section 5.3). Dry-farmed grain crop, fallow ground, or other dry-farmed croplands can be utilized by San Joaquin kit fox. Mitigation for impacts to San Joaquin kit fox habitat can be accomplished by implementation of the standard mitigation program (see Section 5.4.5).

5.1.2 Riparian Habitat

The project area does not include riparian habitat. The project would not result in any impacts to riparian habitat.

5.2 Potential Wetlands and Jurisdictional Waters

Wetlands or waters do not occur within the project area, therefore no mitigations are necessary for project impacts. A portion of the project is within the 100-year flood zone, and will require a 1602 permit from the CDFW Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement program. That permit may require additional measures for impacts to the flood zone as specified by CDFW in the agreement.

5.3 Nesting Birds

Migratory non-game native bird species are protected by international treaty under the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 (50 C.F.R. Section 10.13). Sections 3503, 3503.5 and 3513 of the California Fish and Game Code prohibit take (as defined therein) of all native birds and their active nests, including raptors and other migratory non-game birds (as listed under the Federal MBTA). Ground nesting birds could occur in the project area.

BR-1. Within one week of ground disturbance or tree removal/trimming activities, if work occurs between March 15 and August 15, nesting bird surveys shall be conducted. To avoid impacts to nesting birds, grading and construction activities that affect trees and grasslands shall not be conducted during the breeding season from March 1 to August 15. If construction activities must be conducted during this period, nesting bird surveys shall take place within one week of habitat disturbance. If surveys do not locate nesting birds, construction activities may be conducted. If nesting birds are located, no construction activities shall occur within a distance specified by a qualified biologist, until chicks are fledged or nest fails. This includes nests of all common bird species (under the MBTA), as well as special status birds and raptor nests. Construction activities shall observe the delineated buffer, determined by a qualified biologist, where buffer radius will be specified according to special status rank, intensity of construction activity or impact (i.e. high decibel levels or heavy ground disturbance) and where local, state, and federal regulations apply. A preconstruction survey report shall be submitted to the lead agency immediately upon completion of the survey. The report shall detail appropriate fencing.
or flagging of the buffer zone and make recommendations on additional monitoring requirements. A map of the Project site and nest locations shall be included with the report. The qualified biologist conducting the nesting survey shall have the authority to reduce or increase the recommended buffer depending upon site conditions.

5.4 Special Status Species

5.4.1 Plants
Special status plant species were not found in the Study Area, and are not expected on the project site. No impacts to special status plants would occur from the proposed project.

5.4.2 Invertebrates
No special status invertebrates are expected to be impacted by the project.

5.4.3 Amphibians and Reptiles
The proposed project is not expected to impact special status amphibians or reptiles.

5.4.4 American badger
American badger has moderate potential to occur in the Study Area. Project activities including grading and other excavation work could result in take of American badger adults or young, or disturbance of natal dens and abandonment by adult badgers. To reduce this potential impact to a less than significant level the following measure is recommended.

BR-2. A pre-construction survey shall be conducted within thirty days of beginning work on the site to identify if badgers are using the site. The results of the survey shall be sent to the project manager and the County of San Luis Obispo. If the pre-construction survey finds potential badger dens, they shall be inspected to determine whether they are occupied. The survey shall cover the entire property and shall examine both old and new dens. If potential badger dens are too long to completely inspect from the entrance, a fiber optic scope shall be used to examine the den to the end. Inactive dens may be excavated by hand with a shovel to prevent re-use of dens during construction. If badgers are found in dens on the property between February and July, nursing young may be present. To avoid disturbance and the possibility of direct take of adults and nursing young, and to prevent badgers from becoming trapped in burrows during construction activity, no grading shall occur within 100 feet of active badger dens between February and July. Between July 1\textsuperscript{st} and February 1\textsuperscript{st} all potential badger dens shall be inspected to determine if badgers are present. During the winter badgers do not truly hibernate but are inactive and asleep in their dens for several days at a time. Because they can be torpid during the winter, they are vulnerable to disturbances that may collapse their dens before they rouse and emerge. Therefore, surveys shall be conducted for badger dens throughout the year. If badger dens are found on the property during the pre-construction survey, the CDFG wildlife biologist for the area shall be contacted to review current allowable management practices.
5.4.5 San Joaquin kit fox

The cropland found throughout most of the Study Area is considered potential habitat for San Joaquin kit fox. The California Department of Fish and Wildlife has designated the project area as within the two to one mitigation area for San Joaquin kit fox. A San Joaquin Habitat Evaluation Form will be completed when the actual acreage of the project footprint is determined and provided by the project Engineer. Impacts to San Joaquin kit fox by loss of habitat would be offset by implementation of BR-3, and mitigation of construction activities would be accomplished by applying BR-4 through BR-13.

**BR-3.** Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits, the applicant shall submit evidence to the City of Paso Robles, Department of Community Development, Planning Division that states that one or a combination of the following three San Joaquin kit fox mitigation measures has been implemented:

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

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

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

Mitigation alternative (b) above, can be completed by providing funds to The Nature Conservancy (TNC) pursuant to the Voluntary Fee-Based Compensatory Mitigation Program (Program). The Program was established in agreement between the Department and TNC to preserve San Joaquin kit fox habitat, and to provide a voluntary mitigation alternative to project proponents who must mitigate the impacts of projects in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The fee, payable to “The Nature Conservancy”, would total $[Amount of fee based on $2500 per acre]. This fee is calculated based on the current cost-per-unit of $2500 per acre of mitigation, which is scheduled to be adjusted to address the increasing cost of property in San Luis Obispo County; your actual cost may increase depending on the timing of payment. This fee must be paid after the Department provides written notification about your mitigation options but prior to City permit issuance and initiation of any ground disturbing activities.

c. Purchase [Total number of mitigation acres required] credits in a Department-approved conservation bank, which would provide for the protection in perpetuity of suitable habitat within the kit fox corridor area and provide for a non-wasting endowment for management and monitoring of the property in perpetuity.
Mitigation alternative (c) above, can be completed by purchasing credits from the Palo Prieto Conservation Bank (see contact information below). The Palo Prieto Conservation Bank was established to preserve San Joaquin kit fox habitat, and to provide a voluntary mitigation alternative to project proponents who must mitigate the impacts of projects in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The cost for purchasing credits is payable to the owners of The Palo Prieto Conservation Bank and would total $[Amount of mitigation acres required (i.e. credits), currently priced at $2500 per credit]. This fee is calculated based on the current cost-per-credit of $2500 per acre of mitigation. The fee is established by the conservation bank owner and may change at any time. Your actual cost may increase depending on the timing of payment. Purchase of credits must be completed prior to City permit issuance and initiation of any ground disturbing activities.

BR-4. Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits, the applicant shall provide evidence that they have retained a qualified biologist acceptable to the City. The retained biologist shall perform the following monitoring activities:

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

ii. **The qualified biologist shall conduct weekly site visits during site-disturbance activities** (i.e. grading, diskmg, excavation, stock piling of dirt or gravel, etc.) that proceed longer than 14 days, for the purpose of monitoring compliance with required Mitigation Measures BR-18 through BR-28. Site disturbance activities lasting up to 14 days do not require weekly monitoring by the biologist unless observations of kit fox or their dens are made on-site or the qualified biologist recommends monitoring for some other reason (see BR-19iii). When weekly monitoring is required, the biologist shall submit weekly monitoring reports to the City.

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

If incidental take of kit fox during project activities is possible, **before project activities commence,** the applicant must consult with the USFWS. The results of this consultation may require the applicant to obtain a Federal and/or State permit for incidental take during project activities. The applicant should be aware that the presence of kit foxes or known or potential kit fox dens at the project site could result in further delays of project activities.
iv. In addition, the qualified biologist shall implement the following measures:

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

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

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

BR-5. Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permits, the applicant shall clearly delineate the following as a note on the project plans: “Speed signs of 25 mph (or lower) shall be posted for all construction traffic to minimize the probability of road mortality of the San Joaquin kit fox”. Speed limit signs shall be installed on the project site within 30 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction.

BR-6. During the site disturbance and/or construction phase, grading and construction activities after dusk shall be prohibited unless coordinated through the City, during which additional kit fox mitigation measures may be required.

BR-7. Prior to issuance of grading and/or construction permit and within 30 days prior to initiation of site disturbance and/or construction, all personnel associated with the project shall attend a worker education training program, conducted by a qualified biologist, to avoid or reduce impacts on sensitive biological resources (i.e. San Joaquin kit fox). At a minimum, as the program relates to the kit fox, the training shall include the kit fox’s life history, all mitigation measures specified by the City, as well as any related biological report(s) prepared for the project. The applicant shall notify the City shortly prior to this meeting. A kit fox fact sheet shall also be developed prior to the training program, and distributed at the training program to all contractors, employers and other personnel involved with the construction of the project.

BR-8. During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, to prevent entrapment of the San Joaquin kit fox, all excavations, steep-walled holes and trenches in excess of two feet in depth shall be covered at the close of each working day by plywood or similar materials, or provided with one or more escape ramps constructed of earth fill or wooden planks. Trenches shall also be inspected for entrapped kit fox each morning prior to onset of field activities and immediately prior to covering with plywood at the end of each working day. Before such holes or trenches are filled, they shall be thoroughly inspected for entrapped kit fox. Any kit fox so discovered shall be allowed to escape before field
activities resume, or removed from the trench or hole by a qualified biologist and allowed to escape unimpeded.

**BR-9.** During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, any pipes, culverts, or similar structures with a diameter of four inches or greater, stored overnight at the project site shall be thoroughly inspected for trapped San Joaquin kit foxes before the subject pipe is subsequently buried, capped, or otherwise used or moved in any way. If during the construction phase a kit fox is discovered inside a pipe, that section of pipe will not be moved. If necessary, the pipe may be moved only once to remove it from the path of activity, until the kit fox has escaped.

**BR-10.** During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, all food-related trash items such as wrappers, cans, bottles, and food scraps shall be disposed of only in closed containers. These containers shall be regularly removed from the site. Food items may attract San Joaquin kit foxes onto the project site, consequently exposing such animals to increased risk of injury or mortality. No deliberate feeding of wildlife shall be allowed.

**BR-11.** Prior to, during and after the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, use of pesticides or herbicides shall be in compliance with all local, State and Federal regulations. This is necessary to minimize the probability of primary or secondary poisoning of endangered species utilizing adjacent habitats, and the depletion of prey upon which San Joaquin kit foxes depend.

**BR-12.** During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, any contractor or employee that inadvertently kills or injures a San Joaquin kit fox or who finds any such animal either dead, injured, or entrapped shall be required to report the incident immediately to the applicant and City. In the event that any observations are made of injured or dead kit fox, the applicant shall immediately notify the USFWS and CDFW by telephone. In addition, formal notification shall be provided in writing within three working days of the finding of any such animal(s). Notification shall include the date, time, location and circumstances of the incident. Any threatened or endangered species found dead or injured shall be turned over immediately to CDFW for care, analysis, or disposition.

**BR-13.** Prior to final inspection, or occupancy, whichever comes first, should any long internal or perimeter fencing be proposed or installed, the applicant shall do the following to provide for kit fox passage:

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

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

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


6 PHOTOGRAFPHS

Photo 1. Study Area overview from the northeast corner looking southwest. Plowed agricultural habitat is in the background with ruderal habitat dominated by wild mustard in the foreground. June 7, 2018.

Photo 2. Agricultural habitat within the proposed project site looking from the southwest toward the northeast. The green vegetation is bindweed, a non-native plant. June 7, 2018.
Photo 3. Agricultural habitat within the proposed project site looking from the east toward the west. The solar plant would be adjacent to the Firestone water treatment facility fence on the left in the background. June 7, 2018.
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Figure 1. United States Geological Survey Topographic Map
Figure 2. Aerial Photograph
Figure 3. California Natural Diversity Database Plant Records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lemmon's jewelflower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mesa horkelia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Santa Lucia dwarf rush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shining navarretia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Woodland woollythreads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- **Project Location**: Red star
- **5-Mile Radius**: Dashed line

**REC Solar**
Map Center: 120.68961°W 35.59602°N
Paso Robles, San Luis Obispo County
CNDDB GIS Data Last Updated: June 2018
Figure 4. California Natural Diversity Database Animal Records

Legend
- **Project Location**
- **5-Mile Radius**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>American badger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Atascadero June beetle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>California red-legged frog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lompoc grasshopper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>San Joaquin kit fox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Golden eagle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Least Bell's vireo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Northern California legless lizard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tricolored blackbird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Vernal pool fairy shrimp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Western pond turtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Western spadefoot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Map Center:** 120.68844°W 35.59821°N
Paso Robles, San Luis Obispo County

**CNDDB GIS Data Last Updated:** June 2018

**Map Updated:**
June 19, 2018 02:30 PM by JBB
Figure 5. United States Fish and Wildlife Service Critical Habitat

Legend

- Project Location
- 5-Mile Radius
- Critical Habitat
  - Vernal pool fairy shrimp
  - Steelhead

Map Center: 120.69031°W 35.59919°N
Paso Robles, San Luis Obispo County

Critical Habitat GIS Data Last Updated: June 2018
Figure 6. Biological Resources

Legend

- Study Area
- Project Area Fence Line

Habitat Type

- Agricultural (32.8 acres)
- Riparian (3.1 acres)

REC Solar
Map Center: 120.68987°W 35.59616°N
Paso Robles, San Luis Obispo County

Biological Survey Date: 06/06/2018
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**APPENDIX A. SPECIAL STATUS PLANTS REPORTED FROM THE REGION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Fed/State Status Global/State Rank Rare Plant Rank</th>
<th>Blooming Period</th>
<th>Habitat Preference</th>
<th>Potential to Occur</th>
<th>Detected within Study Area?</th>
<th>Effect of Proposed Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bristlecone Fir</td>
<td>Abies bracteata</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.3</td>
<td>May - June</td>
<td>Lower montane coniferous forest. Rocky sites in Monterey and SLO Counties. 210-1600 m.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Red Sand-Verbena</td>
<td>Abronia maritima</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>April - July</td>
<td>Sandy soil in oak woodland habitat; &lt;600 m. Endemic to SLO &amp; SB Counties.</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hoover's Bent Grass</td>
<td>Agrostis hooveri</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>March - May</td>
<td>Unstable shaly sedimentary slopes; (100) 150–1600 m. SCoR, w WTR</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Douglas's Fiddleneck</td>
<td>Amsinckia douglasiana</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>April - July</td>
<td>Rocky, gen serpentine soils, chaparral, open close-cone forest near coast; 60-950 m; SCoRO</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Oval-Leaved Snapdragon</td>
<td>Antirrhinum ovatum</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>April - July</td>
<td>Rocky, gen serpentine soils, chaparral, open close-cone forest near coast; 60-950 m; SCoRO</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Santa Lucia Manzanita</td>
<td>Arctostaphylos luciana</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>December - March</td>
<td>Shale outcrops, slopes, chaparral, 500-700 m. Cuesta Pass, SLO County.</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bishop Manzanita</td>
<td>Arctostaphylos obispoensis</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>February - June</td>
<td>Rocky, gen serpentine soils, chaparral, open close-cone forest near coast; 60-950 m; SCoRO</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Margarita Manzanita</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctostaphylos pilosula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fed/State Status</td>
<td>Global/State Rank</td>
<td>Rare Plant Rank</td>
<td>Blooming Period</td>
<td>Habitat Preference</td>
<td>Potential to Occur</td>
<td>Detected within Study Area?</td>
<td>Effect of Proposed Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>December - May</td>
<td>Shale outcrops, slopes, chaparral; 300-1100 m. SCoRO</td>
<td>Endemic to SLO County</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles' Milk-Vetch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astragalus didymocarpus var. milesianus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>G5T2/S2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>March - June</td>
<td>Clay or serpentine soils in coastal scrub, grassy areas near coast. 0-90 m. Endemic to SLO County</td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas Milk-Vetch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astragalus macrodon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>April - July</td>
<td>Eroded pale shales or sandstone, or serpentine alluvium; 300-950 m. SCoR</td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Luis Mariposa-lily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calochortus obispoensis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>May - July</td>
<td>Chaparral, coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland, often on serpentine but also sandstone; 100-500 m. SCoRO</td>
<td>Endemic to SLO County</td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Panza Mariposa-lily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calochortus simulans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>April - June</td>
<td>Grassland, oak woodland &amp; pine forest, on sand, granite, or serpentine; &lt;1100 m. Endemic to SLO County</td>
<td>Endemic to SLO County</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwarf Calycadenia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calycadenia villosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>May - October</td>
<td>Dry, rocky hills, ridges, in chaparral, woodland, meadows and seeps; &lt;1100 m. c&amp;s SCoRO</td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambria Morning-Glory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calystegia subacaulis ssp. episcopalis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>(March) April – June (July)</td>
<td>Dry, open scrub, woodland, or grassland; &lt;500 m. c SCoRO</td>
<td>Endemic to SLO County</td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Fed/State Status</td>
<td>Global/State Rank</td>
<td>Rare Plant Rank</td>
<td>Blooming Period</td>
<td>Habitat Preference</td>
<td>Potential to Occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Hardham’s Evening-primrose</td>
<td><em>Camissoniopsis hardhamiae</em></td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>March - May</td>
<td>Decomposed carbonate soils, in chaparral, cismontane woodland. Monterey, SLO Counties</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. San Luis Obispo Sedge</td>
<td><em>Carex obispoensis</em></td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>April - June</td>
<td>Serpentine springs, stream sides; &lt;600 m. Endemic to SLO County</td>
<td>No. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. San Luis Obispo Owl’s-clover</td>
<td><em>Castilleja densiflora</em> var.</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>March - May</td>
<td>Coastal grassland, &lt;100 m. Endemic to SLO County.</td>
<td>No. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Lemmon’s Jewelflower</td>
<td><em>Caulanthus lemmonii</em></td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>February - May</td>
<td>Dry, exposed slopes, grassland, chaparral, scrub; 80-1100 m. sw San Joaquin Valley, se SnFrb, e SCoRO, SCoRI</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Lompoc Ceanothus</td>
<td><em>Ceanothus cuneatus</em> var.</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>G5T4/S4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>February - April</td>
<td>Chaparral on coastal sandy mesas; &lt;400 m. s Cco</td>
<td>No. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Brewer’s Spineflower</td>
<td><em>Chorizanthe breweri</em></td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>April - August</td>
<td>Chaparral, foothill woodland on serpentine; &lt;800 m. Endemic to SLO County</td>
<td>No. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Douglas’ Spineflower</td>
<td><em>Chorizanthe douglasii</em></td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>April - July</td>
<td>Foothill woodland, pine forest, chaparral, sandy or gravelly soils; 200-1600 m.</td>
<td>No. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Palmer’s Spineflower</td>
<td><em>Chorizanthe palmeri</em></td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>April - August</td>
<td>Serpentine; 60-700m. SCoRO (w Monterey, w San Luis Obispo cos.)</td>
<td>No. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Fed/State Status</td>
<td>Global/State Rank</td>
<td>Rare Plant Rank</td>
<td>Blooming Period</td>
<td>Habitat Preference</td>
<td>Potential to Occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Straight-awned Spineflower</td>
<td>Chorizanthe rectispina</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>G2/S2</td>
<td>1B.3</td>
<td>April - July</td>
<td>Chaparral, dry woodland in sandy soil; 200-600 m. SCoRO</td>
<td>No. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. San Luis Obispo Fountain Thistle</td>
<td>Cirsium fontinale var. obispoense</td>
<td>FE/CE</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>February – July (August - September)</td>
<td>Serpentine seeps and streams; &lt;300 m. Endemic to SLO County</td>
<td>No. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Cuesta Ridge Thistle</td>
<td>Cirsium occidentale var. lucianum</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>April - June</td>
<td>Chaparral, woodland or forest openings, often on serpentine; 500-750m. s SCoRO (s Santa Lucia Range, San Luis Obispo, CA)</td>
<td>No. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Slender Clarkia</td>
<td>Clarkia exilis</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>April - May</td>
<td>Woodland; &lt;1000 m.; s SNF, The.</td>
<td>No. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Small-flowered Morning-glory</td>
<td>Convolvulus simulans</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>March - July</td>
<td>Clay substrates, occ serpentine, ann grassland, coastal-sage scrub, chaparral; 30-875 m.; s SNF, SnFrB, s SCoRO, Sco, ChI, WTR, PR; AZ, Baja CA.</td>
<td>No. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Paniculate Tarplant</td>
<td>Deinandra paniculata</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>G4/S4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>(March) April - November</td>
<td>Foothill woodland; 300-500 m. SCoRI (Monterey, SLO counties).</td>
<td>No. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Fed/State Status</td>
<td>Global/State Rank</td>
<td>Rare Plant Rank</td>
<td>Blooming Period</td>
<td>Habitat Preference</td>
<td>Potential to Occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Dune Larkspur</td>
<td>Delphinium parryi ssp. blochmaniae</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>G4/T2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>April - June</td>
<td>Coastal chaparral, sand. 0-200 m. s CCo</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Eastwood’s Larkspur</td>
<td>Delphinium parryi ssp. eastwoodiae</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>(February)</td>
<td>March - March</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal chaparral, grassland, on serpentine; 100-500m sCco, SCoRO (San Luis Obispo County)</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Umbrella Larkspur</td>
<td>Delphinium umbraculorum</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>G3/S3</td>
<td>1B.3</td>
<td>April - June</td>
<td>Moist oak forest; 400-1600 m. SCoRO, WTR.</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Betty's Dudleya</td>
<td>Dudleya abramsii ssp. bettinae</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>May - July</td>
<td>Rocky outcrops in serpentine grassland; &lt;50-180 m. Endemic to SLO County</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Mouse-Gray Dudleya</td>
<td>Dudleya abramsii ssp. murina</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>May - June</td>
<td>Serpentine outcrops; 120-300 m. Endemic to SLO County</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Blochman’s Dudleya</td>
<td>Dudleya blochmaniae ssp. blochmaniae</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>April - June</td>
<td>Open, rocky slopes, often serpentine or clay soils; &lt;450 m. s CCo, SCo</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Small Spikerush</td>
<td>Eleocharis parvula</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td></td>
<td>(April) June – August (September)</td>
<td>Brackish, wet soil, coastal; &lt;50 m. NCo, SnFrB, SCo; to BC; KS to NL, FL, LA; Mex, C.Am, Eurasia</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Yellow-flowered</td>
<td>Eriastrum</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>May - June</td>
<td>Bare sandy decomposed granite slopes in cismontane woodland, chaparral, forest; 360-1000 m. SCoR, Monterey, SLO Counties</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Fed/State Status</td>
<td>Global/State Rank</td>
<td>Rare Plant Rank</td>
<td>Blooming Period</td>
<td>Habitat Preference</td>
<td>Potential to Occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Blochman’s Leafy Daisy</td>
<td>Erigeron blochmaniae</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>G2/S2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>June - August</td>
<td>Sand dunes and hills; &lt;30 m. s CCo</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. San Joaquin Spearscale</td>
<td>Etriplex joaquinana</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>April - October</td>
<td>Alkaline soils; &lt; 350(840) m. NCoRI, San Joaquin Valley, CCo, SnFrB, SCoRI</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Ojai Fritillary</td>
<td>Fritillaria ojaiensis</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>G2?/S2?</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>February - May</td>
<td>Rocky slopes, river basins; 300-500 m. SCoRO, WTR</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. San Benito Fritillary</td>
<td>Fritillaria viridea</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>March - May</td>
<td>Serpentine slopes; 200-1500 m. SCoR (San Benito, SLO Counties)</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Hogwallow Starfish</td>
<td>Hesperevax caulescens</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>March - June</td>
<td>Clay soils, mesic sites in valley and foothill grassland; 0-505 m.</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Mesa Horkelia</td>
<td>Horkelia cuneata var. puberula</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>G4T1/S1</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>February – July</td>
<td>Dry, sandy coastal chaparral; gen 70-700 m. SCoRO, SCo.</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Kellogg’s Horkelia</td>
<td>Horkelia cuneata var. sericea</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>G4T1?/S1?</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>April - September</td>
<td>Old dunes, coastal sand hills; &lt;200 m. CCo</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Santa Lucia Dwarf Rush</td>
<td>Juncus luciensis</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>April - July</td>
<td>Vernal pools, ephemeral drainages, wet meadow habitats, and streams; 300-1900 m. CaRH, n SNH, SCoRO, TR, PR, MP.</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Fed/State Status</th>
<th>Global/State Rank</th>
<th>Rare Plant Rank</th>
<th>Blooming Period</th>
<th>Habitat Preference</th>
<th>Potential to Occur</th>
<th>Detected within Study Area?</th>
<th>Effect of Proposed Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46. <strong>Jones’s Layia</strong></td>
<td><em>Layia jonesii</em></td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>March - May</td>
<td>Open serpentine or clay slopes; &lt;400 m. Endemic to SLO County</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. <strong>Jared’s Pepper-grass</strong></td>
<td><em>Lepidium jaredii</em> ssp. jaredii*</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>March - May</td>
<td>Alkali bottoms, slopes, washes, &lt;500 m. SCoRI, San Joaquin Valley</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. <strong>Jones’ Bush Mallow</strong></td>
<td><em>Malacothamnus jonesii</em></td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>(March) April - October</td>
<td>Open chaparral in foothill woodland; 250-830 m. SCoRO (Monterey, SLO Counties).</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. <strong>Carmel Valley Bush-mallow</strong></td>
<td><em>Malacothamnus palmeri</em> var. involucratus</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>April - October</td>
<td>Chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub; 30-1100 m. s CCo, SCoRO</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. <strong>Santa Lucia Bush-mallow</strong></td>
<td><em>Malacothamnus palmeri</em> var. palmeri</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>May - July</td>
<td>Chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub; 30-1100 m. s CCo, SCoRO</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. <strong>Oregon meconella</strong></td>
<td><em>Meconella oregana</em></td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>G2G3/S2</td>
<td>1B.1</td>
<td>Mar- May</td>
<td>Shaded canyons; &lt;1000m; CCo, SnFrB</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. <strong>Palmer's Monardella</strong></td>
<td><em>Monardella palmeri</em></td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>June - August</td>
<td>Serpentine soils in chaparral, forest; 200-800 m. SCoRO</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. <strong>Woodland Woollythreads</strong></td>
<td><em>Monolopia gracilens</em></td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>(February) March - July</td>
<td>Chaparral, serpentine grassland, cismontane woodland, sandy to rocky soils; SnFrB, SCoR</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Fed/State Status</td>
<td>Blooming Period</td>
<td>Habitat Preference</td>
<td>Potential to Occur</td>
<td>Detected within Study Area?</td>
<td>Effect of Proposed Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Spreading Navarretia</td>
<td>Navarretia fossalis</td>
<td>FT/None/1B.1</td>
<td>April - June</td>
<td>Chenopod scrub, marshes and swamps, playas, and vernal pools; 30-1300m. SCoRO, SCo, to Baja Cal.</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Shining Navarretia</td>
<td>Navarretia nigelliformis</td>
<td>None/None 1B.2</td>
<td>(March) April - July</td>
<td>Vernal pools, clay depressions, dry grasslands; 150-1000 m. SCoR</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Large-Flowered Nemacladus</td>
<td>Nemacladus secundiflorus var.</td>
<td>None/None 4.3</td>
<td>April - June</td>
<td>Dry, gravelly slopes; 200-2000m. s SNH, SCoR</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Hooked Popcorn Flower</td>
<td>Plagiobothrys uncinatus</td>
<td>None/None 1B.2</td>
<td>April - May</td>
<td>Canyon sides, chaparral; on sandstone 300-600 m. SCoR (Gabilan Range, Santa Lucia Mountains)</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Chaparral Ragwort</td>
<td>Senecio aphanactis</td>
<td>None/None G3/S2</td>
<td>January - April</td>
<td>Drying alkaline flats, chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub; &lt;400 m. CW, SCo, ChI</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. San Gabriel Ragwort</td>
<td>Senecio astephanus</td>
<td>None/None 4.3</td>
<td>May - July</td>
<td>Drying alkaline flats, chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub; &lt;400 m. CW, SCo, ChI</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Cuesta Pass Checkerbloom</td>
<td>Sidalcea hickmanii ssp. anomal</td>
<td>None/CR 1B.2</td>
<td>May - June</td>
<td>Closed-cone-conifer forest, gen serpentine; 600-800 m. Endemic to SLO County</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Fed/State Status</td>
<td>Blooming Period</td>
<td>Habitat Preference</td>
<td>Potential to Occur</td>
<td>Detected within Study Area?</td>
<td>Effect of Proposed Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Most Beautiful Jewel-</td>
<td>Streptanthus albidus ssp.</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>(March) April</td>
<td>Open, grassy or barren slopes, often serpentine; ±150-800 m. c SCoRO</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flower</td>
<td>peramoenuis</td>
<td>1B.2</td>
<td>– September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. California Seablite</td>
<td>Suaeda californica</td>
<td>FE/None</td>
<td>July - October</td>
<td>Margins of coastal salt marshes; &lt;5 m. CCo</td>
<td>No. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

California Geographic Subregion Abbreviations:
- CCo: Central Coast
- Sco: South Coast
- SCoR: South Coast Ranges
- SCoRO: Outer South Coast Ranges
- SCoRI: Inner South Coast Ranges
- SnFrB: San Francisco Bay
- TR: Transverse Ranges
- WTR: Western Transverse Ranges
- SnJt: San Jacinto Mtns
- SnBr: San Bernardino
- SCoR: Sacramento Valley
- SLO: San Luis Obispo
- SN: Sierra Nevada
- C: California
- CW: Central West
- SW: South West
- DMoj: Mojave Desert
- PR: Peninsular Range

State/Rank Abbreviations:
- FE: Federally Endangered
- PT: Proposed Federally Threatened
- FT: Federally Threatened
- CE: California Endangered
- PE: Proposed Federally Endangered
- CR: California Rare
- CT: California Threatened
- Cand. CE: Candidate for California Endangered
- Cand. CT: Candidate for California Threatened

California Rare Plant Ranks:
- CRPR 1A: Plants presumed extirpated in California and either rare or extinct elsewhere
- CRPR 1B: Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere
- CRPR 2A: Plants presumed extirpated in California, but common elsewhere
- CRPR 2B: Plants rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere
- CRPR 4: Plants of limited distribution - a watch list

CRPR Threat Ranks:
- 0.1 - Seriously threatened in California (over 80% of occurrences threatened / high degree and immediacy of threat)
- 0.2 - Moderately threatened in California (20-80% occurrences threatened / moderate degree and immediacy of threat)
- 0.3 - Not very threatened in California (less than 20% of occurrences threatened / low degree and immediacy of threat or no current threats known)
## APPENDIX B. SPECIAL STATUS ANIMALS REPORTED FROM THE REGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Fed/State Status Global/State Rank CDFW Rank</th>
<th>Nesting-Breeding Period</th>
<th>Habitat Preference</th>
<th>Potential to Occur</th>
<th>Detected Within Study Area?</th>
<th>Effect of Proposed Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tricolored Blackbird</td>
<td>Agelaius tricolor</td>
<td>None/Candidate Endangered G2G3/S1S2 SSC (Nesting)</td>
<td>March 15 through August 15</td>
<td>Requires open water, protected nesting substrate, &amp; foraging area with insect prey near nesting colony.</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grasshopper Sparrow</td>
<td>Ammodramus savannarum</td>
<td>None/None G5/S3 SSC (Nesting)</td>
<td>March 15 through August 15</td>
<td>Nests in grassland habitats on mountain slopes, foothills, and valleys. May nest colonially.</td>
<td>None. No suitable nesting habitat occurs within Study Area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Northern California Legless Lizard</td>
<td>Anniella pulchra</td>
<td>None/None G3/S3 SSC</td>
<td>Breeds early spring and July; live young born September through November.</td>
<td>Warm moist loose soil with plant cover. Sandy washes, stream terraces with sycamores, cottonwoods, or oaks. Leaf litter under trees and bushes.</td>
<td>Low. Suitable habitat is present within the Study Area around oaks, not in the highly disturbed soils in the project area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pallid Bat</td>
<td>Antrozous pallidus</td>
<td>None/None G5/S3 SSC</td>
<td>Spring - Summer</td>
<td>Rock crevices, caves, tree hollows, mines, old buildings, and bridges.</td>
<td>Low. Tree hollows and cavities are present within Study Area, not within project area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Golden Eagle*</td>
<td>Aquila chrysaetos</td>
<td>None/None G5/S3 WL/Fully Protected</td>
<td>March 15 through August 15</td>
<td>Nests in large, prominent trees in valley and foothill woodland. Requires adjacent food source.</td>
<td>None. No suitable stick nests found within Study Area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Preliminary Biological Report for Firestone Solar Plant, City of Paso Robles, San Luis Obispo County

### Agenda Item 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Fed/State Status</th>
<th>Nesting-Breeding Period</th>
<th>Habitat Preference</th>
<th>Potential to Occur</th>
<th>Detected Within Study Area?</th>
<th>Effect of Proposed Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Great Blue Heron</strong></td>
<td><em>Ardea herodias</em></td>
<td>Special Animal (Rookery only)</td>
<td>March 15 through August 15</td>
<td>Rookeries located in tall trees near foraging areas.</td>
<td>None. No rookeries are present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Lesser Slender Salamander</strong></td>
<td><em>Batrachoseps minor</em></td>
<td>None/None G1/S1 SSC</td>
<td>Unknown.</td>
<td>Moist locations in mixed oak, tanbark oak, sycamore and laurel forests.</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Obscure Bumble Bee</strong></td>
<td><em>Bombus caliginosus</em></td>
<td>None/None G4?/S1S2 Special Animal</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Open coastal grasslands and meadows.</td>
<td>None. No suitable habitat present within the project area. Last record from area in 1959.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Crotch Bumble Bee</strong></td>
<td><em>Bombus crotchii</em></td>
<td>None/None G3G4/S1S2 Special Animal</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Open grasslands and scrub</td>
<td>Low. No suitable habitat present in the project area. Most recent record is in 1968.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp</strong></td>
<td><em>Branchinecta lynchi</em></td>
<td>Threatened/None Special Animal</td>
<td>Rainy Season</td>
<td>Clear water sandstone depression pools, grassed swale, earth slump, or basalt flow depression pools.</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Ferruginous Hawk</strong></td>
<td><em>Buteo regalis</em></td>
<td>None/None G4/S3S4 WL (Wintering)</td>
<td>October - April (Wintering)</td>
<td>Winters locally in open grassland or savannah habitats. More common in interior SLO County than coast.</td>
<td>Low. Low quality foraging habitat exists within Study Area. Will not nest in Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Fed/State Status</td>
<td>Global/State Rank</td>
<td>Nesting-Breeding Period</td>
<td>Habitat Preference</td>
<td>Potential to Occur</td>
<td>Detected Within Study Area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sandy Beach Tiger Beetle</td>
<td>Cicindela hirticollis gravida</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>G5T2/S2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Adjacent to non-brackish water near the coast from San Francisco to N. Mexico. Clean, dry, light-colored sand in the upper zone.</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Globose Dune Beetle</td>
<td>Coelus globosus</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>G1G2/S1S2 SSC</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Coastal sand dune habitat. Inhabits foredunes and sand hummocks.</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Townsend’s Big-eared Bat</td>
<td>Corynorhinus townsendii</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>G3G4/S2 SSC</td>
<td>Spring - Summer</td>
<td>Caves, buildings, and mine tunnels. Cave like attics as day roosts. On coast roosts are normally within 100 m. of creeks.</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Fed/State Status</td>
<td>Nesting-Breeding Period</td>
<td>Habitat Preference</td>
<td>Potential to Occur</td>
<td>Detected Within Study Area?</td>
<td>Effect of Proposed Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-tailed Kite</td>
<td><em>Elanus leucurus</em></td>
<td>None/None G5/S3S4</td>
<td>March 15 through August 15</td>
<td>Nests in dense tree canopy near open foraging areas</td>
<td>Low. No suitable nesting sites within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Pond Turtle</td>
<td><em>Emys marmorata</em></td>
<td>None/None G3G4/S3</td>
<td>April through August</td>
<td>Lakes, rivers, ponds, streams, creeks,</td>
<td>No. Wastewater treatment ponds chain-link fenced. Nearest known occurrence 1.7 miles north.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidewater Goby</td>
<td><em>Eucyclogobius newberryi</em></td>
<td>Endangered/None G3/S3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Found in shallow lagoons and lower stream reaches, need fairly still but not stagnant water and high oxygen levels.</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area..</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morro Shoulderband Snail</td>
<td><em>Helminthoglypta walkeriana</em></td>
<td>Endangered/None Special Animal</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Restricted to the coastal strand and sage scrub habitats in immediate vicinity of Morro Bay.</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area..</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Linderiella</td>
<td><em>Linderiella occidentalis</em></td>
<td>None/None Special Animal</td>
<td>Rainy season</td>
<td>Seasonal pools in unplowed grasslands with alluvial soils.</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area..</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Dusky-footed Woodrat</td>
<td><em>Neotoma macrotis luciana</em></td>
<td>None/None SSC</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Variety of habitats with moderate to dense understory vegetation</td>
<td>None. No woodrat middens were found within, or adjacent to Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steelhead - South/Central California Coast DPS</td>
<td>Threatened/None SCC</td>
<td>February - April</td>
<td>Fed listing refers to runs in coastal basins from Pajaro River</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area..</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Fed/State Status Global/State Rank CDFW Rank</td>
<td>Nesting-Breeding Period</td>
<td>Habitat Preference</td>
<td>Potential to Occur</td>
<td>Detected Within Study Area?</td>
<td>Effect of Proposed Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>south to, but not including, the Santa Maria River.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Salinas Pocket Mouse</td>
<td>Perognathus inornatus psammophilus</td>
<td>None/None SSC</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Annual grassland and desert shrub in Salinas Valley, with friable soils</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Coast Horned Lizard</td>
<td>Phrynosoma blainvillii</td>
<td>None/None G3G4/S3S4 SSC</td>
<td>May - September</td>
<td>Frequent a wide variety of habitats, most common in lowlands along sandy washes with scattered low bushes.</td>
<td>No. Sandy washes and scattered low bushes occur adjacent to Study Area, not in the project areas.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Morro Bay Blue Butterfly</td>
<td>Plebejus icarioides moroensis</td>
<td>None/None Special Animal</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Inhabits stabilized dunes and surrounding areas in coastal SLO County (Morro Bay) and nw SB County.</td>
<td>No. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Atascadero June Beetle</td>
<td>Polyphylla nubila</td>
<td>None/None Special Animal</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Known only from sand dunes in Atascadero and San Luis Obispo, San Luis Obispo County.</td>
<td>No. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Purple Martin</td>
<td>Progne subis</td>
<td>None/None G5/S3 SSC (Nesting)</td>
<td>March 15 through August 15</td>
<td>In San Luis Obispo County prefers nesting in Sycamore trees along riparian corridors.</td>
<td>Low. Sycamores with cavities are located adjacent to Study Area.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Fed/State Status</td>
<td>Nesting-Breeding Period</td>
<td>Habitat Preference</td>
<td>Potential to Occur</td>
<td>Detected Within Study Area?</td>
<td>Effect of Proposed Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. San Luis Obispo Pyrg</td>
<td>Pyrgulopsis taylori</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Freshwater habitats in San Luis Obispo County.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Foothill Yellow-legged Frog</td>
<td>Rana boylii</td>
<td>None/Candidate Threatened</td>
<td>March - September</td>
<td>Partly shaded, shallow streams and riffles with rocky substrate. Min. 15 weeks for larval development.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Western Spadefoot Toad</td>
<td>Spea hammondii</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>January – August</td>
<td>Vernal pools in grassland and woodland habitats</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Coast Range Newt</td>
<td>Taricha torosa</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>December - May</td>
<td>Slow moving streams, ponds, and lakes with surrounding evergreen/oak forests along coast.</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. American Badger</td>
<td>Taxidea taxus</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>February – May</td>
<td>Needs friable soils in open ground with abundant food source</td>
<td>Low. Friable soils and open ground present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No Effect.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
<td>Fed/State Status</td>
<td>Nesting-Breeding Period</td>
<td>Habitat Preference</td>
<td>Potential to Occur</td>
<td>Detected Within Study Area?</td>
<td>Effect of Proposed Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Lompoc Grasshopper</td>
<td>Trimerotropis occulens</td>
<td>None/None</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>such as California ground squirrels.</td>
<td>Low. Suitable habitat not present within</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Special Animal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Study Area.</td>
<td>Study Area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last report 1909.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Least Bell's Vireo</td>
<td>Vireo bellii pusillus</td>
<td>Endangered/Endangered</td>
<td>March 15 through August 15</td>
<td>Riparian habitat, near water or dry streambed, &lt;2000 ft. Nests in willows, mesquite, Baccharis.</td>
<td>None. Suitable habitat not present within Study Area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Habitat characteristics are from the Jepson Manual and the CDNNB.
*not listed in the CNDDB or CNPS for the search area, but possibly for the location.

**Abbreviations:**
- FE: Federally Endangered
- FT: Federally Threatened
- PE: Proposed Federally Endangered
- PT: Proposed Federally Threatened
- CE: California Endangered
- CT: California Threatened
- Cand. CE: Candidate for California Endangered
- Cand. CT: Candidate for California Threatened
- SSC: CDFW Species of Special Concern
- FP: CDFW Fully-Protected
APPENDIX C – SOILS REPORT
Custom Soil Resource Report for San Luis Obispo County, California, Paso Robles Area

REC Solar - Firestone Brewing
Preface

Soil surveys contain information that affects land use planning in survey areas. They highlight soil limitations that affect various land uses and provide information about the properties of the soils in the survey areas. Soil surveys are designed for many different users, including farmers, ranchers, foresters, agronomists, urban planners, community officials, engineers, developers, builders, and home buyers. Also, conservationists, teachers, students, and specialists in recreation, waste disposal, and pollution control can use the surveys to help them understand, protect, or enhance the environment.

Various land use regulations of Federal, State, and local governments may impose special restrictions on land use or land treatment. Soil surveys identify soil properties that are used in making various land use or land treatment decisions. The information is intended to help the land users identify and reduce the effects of soil limitations on various land uses. The landowner or user is responsible for identifying and complying with existing laws and regulations.

Although soil survey information can be used for general farm, local, and wider area planning, onsite investigation is needed to supplement this information in some cases. Examples include soil quality assessments (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/soils/health/) and certain conservation and engineering applications. For more detailed information, contact your local USDA Service Center (https://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app?agency=nrcs) or your NRCS State Soil Scientist (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/contactus/?cid=nrcs142p2_053951).

Great differences in soil properties can occur within short distances. Some soils are seasonally wet or subject to flooding. Some are too unstable to be used as a foundation for buildings or roads. Clayey or wet soils are poorly suited to use as septic tank absorption fields. A high water table makes a soil poorly suited to basements or underground installations.

The National Cooperative Soil Survey is a joint effort of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, State agencies including the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and local agencies. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has leadership for the Federal part of the National Cooperative Soil Survey.

Information about soils is updated periodically. Updated information is available through the NRCS Web Soil Survey, the site for official soil survey information.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require
alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.
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Soil Map

The soil map section includes the soil map for the defined area of interest, a list of soil map units on the map and extent of each map unit, and cartographic symbols displayed on the map. Also presented are various metadata about data used to produce the map, and a description of each soil map unit.
Soil Map

Map Scale: 1:3,140 if printed on A portrait (8.5" x 11") sheet.

Map projection: Web Mercator
Corner coordinates: WGS84
Edge tics: UTM Zone 10N WGS84

Soil Map may not be valid at this scale.
### MAP LEGEND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Interest (AOI)</th>
<th>Spoil Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soils</td>
<td>Stony Spot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Map Unit Polygons</td>
<td>Very Stony Spot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Map Unit Lines</td>
<td>Wet Spot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Map Unit Points</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Point Features</td>
<td>Special Line Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blowout</td>
<td>Streams and Canals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrow Pit</td>
<td>Water Features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay Spot</td>
<td>Rails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed Depression</td>
<td>Interstate Highways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel Pit</td>
<td>US Routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravelly Spot</td>
<td>Major Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td>Local Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lava Flow</td>
<td>Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh or swamp</td>
<td>Aerial Photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine or Quarry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perennial Water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Outcrop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline Spot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Spot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severely Eroded Spot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinkhole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide or Slip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodic Spot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAP INFORMATION

The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:24,000.

Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale.

Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of soil line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more detailed scale.

Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements.

Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service
Web Soil Survey URL: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)
Coordinate System: Web Mercator

Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required.

This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below.

Soil Survey Area: San Luis Obispo County, California, Paso Robles Area
Survey Area Data: Version 11, Sep 13, 2017

Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger.

Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Mar 16, 2016—Feb 23, 2017

The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAP LEGEND</th>
<th>MAP INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor \n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map Unit Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Unit Symbol</th>
<th>Map Unit Name</th>
<th>Acres in AOI</th>
<th>Percent of AOI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Lockwood shaly loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Metz-Tujunga complex, occasionally flooded, 0 to 5 percent slopes</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Mocho clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, MLRA 14</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Corducci-Typic Xerofluvents, 0 to 5 percent slopes, occasionally flooded, MLRA 14</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Totals for Area of Interest</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map Unit Descriptions

The map units delineated on the detailed soil maps in a soil survey represent the soils or miscellaneous areas in the survey area. The map unit descriptions, along with the maps, can be used to determine the composition and properties of a unit.

A map unit delineation on a soil map represents an area dominated by one or more major kinds of soil or miscellaneous areas. A map unit is identified and named according to the taxonomic classification of the dominant soils. Within a taxonomic class there are precisely defined limits for the properties of the soils. On the landscape, however, the soils are natural phenomena, and they have the characteristic variability of all natural phenomena. Thus, the range of some observed properties may extend beyond the limits defined for a taxonomic class. Areas of soils of a single taxonomic class rarely, if ever, can be mapped without including areas of other taxonomic classes. Consequently, every map unit is made up of the soils or miscellaneous areas for which it is named and some minor components that belong to taxonomic classes other than those of the major soils.

Most minor soils have properties similar to those of the dominant soil or soils in the map unit, and thus they do not affect use and management. These are called noncontrasting, or similar, components. They may or may not be mentioned in a particular map unit description. Other minor components, however, have properties and behavioral characteristics divergent enough to affect use or to require different management. These are called contrasting, or dissimilar, components. They generally are in small areas and could not be mapped separately because of the scale used. Some small areas of strongly contrasting soils or miscellaneous areas are identified by a special symbol on the maps. If included in the database for a given area, the contrasting minor components are identified in the map unit descriptions along with some characteristics of each. A few areas of minor components may not have been observed, and consequently they are not mentioned in the descriptions, especially where the pattern was so complex that it
was impractical to make enough observations to identify all the soils and miscellaneous areas on the landscape.

The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The objective of mapping is not to delineate pure taxonomic classes but rather to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. The delineation of such segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, however, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

An identifying symbol precedes the map unit name in the map unit descriptions. Each description includes general facts about the unit and gives important soil properties and qualities.

Soils that have profiles that are almost alike make up a soil series. Except for differences in texture of the surface layer, all the soils of a series have major horizons that are similar in composition, thickness, and arrangement.

Soils of one series can differ in texture of the surface layer, slope, stoniness, salinity, degree of erosion, and other characteristics that affect their use. On the basis of such differences, a soil series is divided into soil phases. Most of the areas shown on the detailed soil maps are phases of soil series. The name of a soil phase commonly indicates a feature that affects use or management. For example, Alpha silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is a phase of the Alpha series.

Some map units are made up of two or more major soils or miscellaneous areas. These map units are complexes, associations, or undifferentiated groups.

A complex consists of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas in such an intricate pattern or in such small areas that they cannot be shown separately on the maps. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar in all areas. Alpha-Beta complex, 0 to 6 percent slopes, is an example.

An association is made up of two or more geographically associated soils or miscellaneous areas that are shown as one unit on the maps. Because of present or anticipated uses of the map units in the survey area, it was not considered practical or necessary to map the soils or miscellaneous areas separately. The pattern and relative proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar. Alpha-Beta association, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

An undifferentiated group is made up of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas that could be mapped individually but are mapped as one unit because similar interpretations can be made for use and management. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas in a mapped area are not uniform. An area can be made up of only one of the major soils or miscellaneous areas, or it can be made up of all of them. Alpha and Beta soils, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

Some surveys include miscellaneous areas. Such areas have little or no soil material and support little or no vegetation. Rock outcrop is an example.
San Luis Obispo County, California, Paso Robles Area

158—Lockwood shaly loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting
National map unit symbol: hbtc
Elevation: 600 to 1,500 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 12 to 20 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 60 degrees F
Frost-free period: 200 days
Farmland classification: Farmland of statewide importance

Map Unit Composition
Lockwood and similar soils: 85 percent
Minor components: 15 percent
Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Lockwood

Setting
Landform: Terraces
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Alluvium derived from sedimentary rock

Typical profile
H1 - 0 to 26 inches: channery loam
H2 - 26 to 62 inches: channery clay loam

Properties and qualities
Slope: 2 to 9 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Natural drainage class: Well drained
Runoff class: Medium
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high (0.20 to 0.57 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Salinity, maximum in profile: Nonsaline to very slightly saline (0.0 to 2.0 mmhos/cm)
Available water storage in profile: Moderate (about 8.5 inches)

Interpretive groups
Land capability classification (irrigated): 2e
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 4e
Hydrologic Soil Group: C
Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components
Unnamed, similar to lockwood soil
Percent of map unit: 10 percent
Hydric soil rating: No
Elder, loam
Percent of map unit: 2 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Still, gravelly loam
Percent of map unit: 1 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Unnamed, areas with cobbles on the surface
Percent of map unit: 1 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Unnamed
Percent of map unit: 1 percent
Landform: Drainageways
Hydric soil rating: Yes

167—Metz-Tujunga complex, occasionally flooded, 0 to 5 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting
National map unit symbol: hbtn
Elevation: 600 to 1,500 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 12 to 20 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 60 degrees F
Frost-free period: 200 days
Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

Map Unit Composition
Metz and similar soils: 35 percent
Tujunga and similar soils: 30 percent
Minor components: 25 percent
Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Metz
Setting
Landform: Flood plains
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Alluvium derived from mixed rock sources

Typical profile
H1 - 0 to 9 inches: loamy sand
H2 - 9 to 60 inches: stratified sand to very fine sandy loam

Properties and qualities
Slope: 0 to 5 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Natural drainage class: Somewhat excessively drained
Runoff class: Very low
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): High (1.98 to 5.95 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: Occasional
Frequency of ponding: None
Calcium carbonate, maximum in profile: 1 percent
Salinity, maximum in profile: Nonsaline to very slightly saline (0.0 to 2.0 mmhos/cm)
Available water storage in profile: Low (about 5.3 inches)

Interpretive groups
Land capability classification (irrigated): 3w
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 4w
Hydrologic Soil Group: A
Ecological site: SANDY BOTTOM (R014XE033CA)
Hydric soil rating: No

Description of Tujunga

Setting
Landform: Flood plains
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Alluvium derived from mixed rocks

Typical profile
H1 - 0 to 20 inches: fine sand
H2 - 20 to 60 inches: sand

Properties and qualities
Slope: 0 to 5 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Natural drainage class: Somewhat excessively drained
Runoff class: Negligible
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): High to very high (5.95 to 19.98 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: Occasional
Frequency of ponding: None
Salinity, maximum in profile: Nonsaline to very slightly saline (0.0 to 2.0 mmhos/cm)
Available water storage in profile: Low (about 4.2 inches)

Interpretive groups
Land capability classification (irrigated): 2w
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 4w
Hydrologic Soil Group: A
Ecological site: SANDY WASH (R014XE034CA)
Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components
Xerofluvents
Percent of map unit: 20 percent
**Landform:** Drainageways  
**Hydric soil rating:** Yes

**Elder, loam**  
*Percent of map unit:* 2 percent  
*Hydric soil rating:* No

**Pico, fine sandy loam**  
*Percent of map unit:* 1 percent  
*Hydric soil rating:* No

**San emigdio, fine sandy loam**  
*Percent of map unit:* 1 percent  
*Hydric soil rating:* No

**Unnamed, slopes of 5 to 9 percent**  
*Percent of map unit:* 1 percent  
*Hydric soil rating:* No

---

**173—Mocho clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, MLRA 14**

**Map Unit Setting**  
*National map unit symbol:* 2tyyy  
*Elevation:* 660 to 1,830 feet  
*Mean annual precipitation:* 12 to 25 inches  
*Mean annual air temperature:* 59 to 61 degrees F  
*Frost-free period:* 270 to 330 days  
*Farmland classification:* Prime farmland if irrigated

**Map Unit Composition**  
*Mocho and similar soils:* 75 percent  
*Minor components:* 25 percent  
*Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the map unit.*

**Description of Mocho**

**Setting**  
*Landform:* Alluvial fans, alluvial flats  
*Landform position (two-dimensional):* Toeslope  
*Landform position (three-dimensional):* Tread  
*Down-slope shape:* Linear  
*Across-slope shape:* Linear  
*Parent material:* Alluvium derived from sedimentary rock

**Typical profile**  
*Ap - 0 to 8 inches:* clay loam  
*A - 8 to 19 inches:* clay loam  
*C1 - 19 to 30 inches:* clay loam  
*C2 - 30 to 44 inches:* loam  
*2C - 44 to 58 inches:* gravelly loam  
*3C - 58 to 64 inches:* silt loam
Properties and qualities

Slope: 0 to 2 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Natural drainage class: Well drained
Runoff class: Medium
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high (0.20 to 0.60 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Calcium carbonate, maximum in profile: 5 percent
Salinity, maximum in profile: Nonsaline to very slightly saline (0.0 to 2.0 mmhos/cm)
Available water storage in profile: High (about 10.7 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): 1
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 4c
Hydrologic Soil Group: C
Ecological site: FINE LOAMY BOTTOM (R014XE025CA)
Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components

Still
Percent of map unit: 10 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Xerorthents
Percent of map unit: 5 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Haploxerolls, gravelly overwash
Percent of map unit: 5 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Sorrento
Percent of map unit: 3 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

Tujunga
Percent of map unit: 2 percent
Hydric soil rating: No

300—Corducci-Typic Xerofluvents, 0 to 5 percent slopes, occasionally flooded, MLRA 14

Map Unit Setting
National map unit symbol: 2xm5w
Elevation: 70 to 2,480 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 9 to 24 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 58 to 61 degrees F
Frost-free period: 219 to 346 days

Map Unit Composition
Corducci and similar soils: 50 percent
Typic xerofluvents and similar soils: 30 percent
Minor components: 20 percent
Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Corducci

Setting
Landform: Alluvial fans, flood plains, stream terraces
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread, talf
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Mixed alluvium derived from igneous and sedimentary rock

Typical profile
A - 0 to 5 inches: fine sand
C1 - 5 to 35 inches: fine sand
C2 - 35 to 45 inches: sand
C3 - 45 to 59 inches: coarse sand

Properties and qualities
Slope: 0 to 5 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Natural drainage class: Somewhat excessively drained
Runoff class: Very low
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): High to very high (5.99 to 19.99 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: Occasional
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water storage in profile: Low (about 3.2 inches)

Interpretive groups
Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 6e
Hydrologic Soil Group: A
Hydric soil rating: No

Description of Typic Xerofluvents

Setting
Landform: Flood plains, stream terraces
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread, talf
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Mixed alluvium derived from igneous and sedimentary rock

Typical profile
A - 0 to 4 inches: sand
C1 - 4 to 31 inches: sand
C2 - 31 to 35 inches: fine sandy loam
C3 - 35 to 59 inches: sand

Properties and qualities
- **Slope:** 0 to 5 percent
- **Depth to restrictive feature:** More than 80 inches
- **Natural drainage class:** Somewhat excessively drained
- **Runoff class:** Very low
- **Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat):** High (2.00 to 5.99 in/hr)
- **Depth to water table:** More than 80 inches
- **Frequency of flooding:** Occasional
- **Frequency of ponding:** None
- **Available water storage in profile:** Low (about 3.9 inches)

Interpretive groups
- **Land capability classification (irrigated):** None specified
- **Land capability classification (nonirrigated):** 6e
- **Hydrologic Soil Group:** A
- **Hydric soil rating:** No

Minor Components

**Metz, very rarely flooded**
- **Percent of map unit:** 5 percent
- **Landform:** Stream terraces, flood plains
- **Landform position (two-dimensional):** Toeslope
- **Landform position (three-dimensional):** Tread, talf
- **Down-slope shape:** Linear
- **Across-slope shape:** Linear
- **Hydric soil rating:** No

**Tujunga, very rarely flooded**
- **Percent of map unit:** 5 percent
- **Landform:** Flood plains, stream terraces
- **Landform position (two-dimensional):** Toeslope
- **Landform position (three-dimensional):** Tread, talf
- **Down-slope shape:** Linear
- **Across-slope shape:** Linear
- **Hydric soil rating:** No

**Xeropsamments, frequently flooded**
- **Percent of map unit:** 5 percent
- **Landform:** Drainageways
- **Landform position (two-dimensional):** Toeslope
- **Landform position (three-dimensional):** Talf
- **Microfeatures of landform position:** Channels
- **Down-slope shape:** Linear
- **Across-slope shape:** Concave
- **Hydric soil rating:** Yes

**Xerofluvents, frequently flooded**
- **Percent of map unit:** 5 percent
- **Landform:** Drainageways
- **Landform position (two-dimensional):** Toeslope
- **Landform position (three-dimensional):** Talf
- **Microfeatures of landform position:** Channels
- **Down-slope shape:** Linear
Across-slope shape: Concave
Hydric soil rating: Yes
References


Kit Fox Habitat Evaluation Form
Cover Sheet

**Project Name:** Firestone Solar Plant  
**Date:** 7-18-2018

**APN:** 072-311-014 and 072-311-018

**Project Location:** East of Vendels Circle, Paso Robles

Include project vicinity map and project boundary on copy of U.S.G.S. 7.5. minute map (size may be reduced)

**U.S.G.S. Quad Map Name:** Templeton

**Lat/Long or UTM coordinates (if available):** 120.689° W, 35.596° N

**Project Description:** Construction of a photovoltaic solar plant

**Project Size:** 8.85 acres  
**Amount of Kit Fox Habitat Affected:** 8.85 acres

Quantity of WHR Habitat Types Impacted (i.e. – 2 acres annual grassland, 3 acres blue oak woodland)

WHR type: Agricultural field 8.85 acres

**Comments:** The answer to question 1 is given as “E” because the project location is at the outer western boundary of kit fox range, south of the City of Paso Robles, and is not in or between core populations, satellite populations, or a subpopulation.

The answer to question 6 is that the project would result in a temporary impact with ongoing maintenance. Although this answer typically applies to a pipeline or other temporary ground disturbance, it is suggested here because the site fence will be kit fox friendly, allowing the possibility of kit fox to utilize the site in the future. From current information kit fox are known to utilize solar farms as habitat, and the structure of this solar plants allows virtually all the area to be available as habitat. Therefore, loss of habitat is not necessarily permanent.

**Form Completed by:** [Signature]
San Joaquin Kit Fox Habitat Evaluation Form

Is the project within 10 miles from a recorded San Joaquin kit fox observation or within contiguous suitable habitat as defined in Question 2(A-E)?

YES – Continue with evaluation form
NO – Evaluation form/surveys are not necessary

1. Importance of the project area relative to Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California (Williams et al, 1998).
   A. Project would block or degrade an existing corridor linking core populations or isolate a subpopulation (20).
   B. Project is within a core population (15)
   C. Project area is identified within satellite population (12)
   D. Project area is within a corridor linking satellite populations (10)
   E. Project area is not within any of the previously described areas but is within known kit fox range (5)

2. Habitat characteristics of the project area.
   A. Annual grassland or saltbush scrub present >50% of site (15)
   B. Grassland or saltbush scrub present but comprises <50% of project area (10)
   C. Oak savannah present on >50% of site (8)
   D. Fallow ag fields or grain/alfalfa crops (7)
   E. Orchards/vineyards (5)
   F. Intensively maintained row crops or suitable vegetation absent (0)

3. Isolation of project area
   A. Project area surrounded by contiguous kit fox habitat as described in Question 2a-e (15)
   B. Project area adjacent to at least 40 acres of contiguous habitat or part of an existing corridor (10)
   C. Project area adjacent to <40 acres of habitat but linked by existing corridor (i.e.- river, canal, aqueduct) (7)
   D. Project area surrounded by ag but less than 200 yards from habitat (5)
   E. Project area completely isolated by row crops or development and is greater than 200 yards from potential habitat (0)

4. Potential for increased mortality as a result of the project implementation. Mortality may come from direct (e.g. – construction related) or indirect (e.g. –vehicle strikes due to increases in post development traffic) sources.
   A. Increase in mortality likely (10)
   B. Unknown mortality effects (5)
   C. No long term effect on mortality (0)
5. Amount of potential kit fox habitat affected

   A. > 320 acres (10)
   B. 160-319 acres (7)
   C. 80-159 acres (5)
   D. 40-79 acres (3)
   E. <40 acres (1)

6. Results of project implementation

   A. Project site will be permanently converted and will no longer support foxes (10)
   B. **Project area will be temporarily impacted but will require periodic disturbance for ongoing maintenance** (7)
   C. Project area will be temporarily impacted and no maintenance necessary (5)
   D. Project will result in changes to agricultural crops (2)
   E. No habitat impacts (0)

7. Project shape

   A. **Large block** (10)
   B. Linear with >40 foot right-of-way (5)
   C. Linear with <40 foot right-of-way (3)

8. Have San Joaquin kit foxes been observed within 3 miles of the project area within the last 10 years?

   A. Yes (10)
   B. No (0)

**Scoring**

1. Recovery importance 5
2. Habitat condition 7
3. Isolation 10
4. Mortality 5
5. Quantity of habitat impacted 1
6. Project results 7
7. Project shape 10
8. Recent observations 0

**Total** 45
USGS 7.5' topo, quadrangle
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MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

At the request of Thomas Cemo of REC Solar, Applied EarthWorks, Inc. (Æ) completed a Phase 1 cultural resource study in support of the proposed Firestone Walker Brewery Solar Project (Project) near Paso Robles, California. The Project requires discretionary approval from the City of Paso Robles and thus is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, CEQA Guidelines 15064.5, and PRC Section 5024.1.

As part of the study, Æ conducted background research and a records search at the Central Coast Information Center (CCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS). Results of background research identified one cultural resource (CA-SLO-2790) within the Project area, and three additional archaeological sites, CA-SLO-1894, -1895, and -1896, within a 0.25-mile radius. Æ also contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission and local tribal representatives to solicit input on potential tribal resources.

Æ conducted a pedestrian survey of the 38,850-square-meter (9.6 acre) Project area on July 6, 2018. The majority of the Project area has been recently plowed, and surface visibility in these areas was 100 percent.

No cultural resources were observed within the Project parcel during the current survey. However, the parcel does include a portion of CA-SLO-2790, which contains prehistoric human remains that were found during the excavation of a holding pond for the Firestone Water Treatment Facility (Conway 2014a). Depth of remains were reported as 3 meters deep within a 10 by 10 meter area. There are also three prehistoric habitation sites near the Project area. As such, there is a heightened potential for previously undocumented subsurface human burials and cultural materials within the Project area. Typically a testing program would be recommended as the next step for cultural studies due to the proximity of burials. However, due to the depth of previously located human burials, a testing effort which only extends 1 meter deep would not benefit the project. For this reason, Æ recommends that a qualified archaeological monitor and a Native American observer be present for all ground-disturbing work for the proposed Project. Additionally, Æ recommends that a comprehensive archaeological monitoring and data recovery plan following City standards is prepared prior to the start of construction. The plan should outline measures for archaeological and Native American monitoring as well as procedures for handling finds during construction.

Field notes, maps, and photographs from this study are on file at Æ’s office in San Luis Obispo, California. A copy of the final version of this report will be submitted to the CCIC of the CHRIS System housed at the University of California, Santa Barbara.
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1 INTRODUCTION

At the request of Thomas Cemo of REC Solar, Applied EarthWorks, Inc. (Æ) completed a Phase 1 cultural resource study in support of the proposed Firestone Brewery Solar Project (Project) in Paso Robles, California. Project plans are to design and install a solar system for Firestone Walker Brewery. This includes the installation of solar panels with a trench leading to switchgear on the west side. The Project parcel is within an unsectioned portion of Township 27 South, Range 12 East on the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Templeton 7.5-minute topographical quadrangle (Figures 1-1 and 1-2). The Project area includes approximately 9.6 acres (330 meters north/south by 160 meters east/west) on the east side of Highway 101, east of Vendels Circle within APN’s 009-631-018 and 009-631-019 (Figure 1-3).

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE INVESTIGATION

Development of this property requires discretionary permits from the City of Paso Robles, which requires compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). CEQA mandates that government agencies consider the effects of permitted actions on important archaeological and historical resources (Public Resource Code [PRC] 5020 and 21000 et seq. and California Code of Regulations 15000 et seq.). Therefore, applicants must assess the potential impacts of the proposed Project on archaeological and historical resources. The purpose of Æ’s investigation is to identify any cultural resources that could be impacted by the Project and provide recommendations for any further cultural resource work, if necessary. The investigation results will assist development planning for the property concerning cultural resources under CEQA.

1.2 PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS

Æ Staff Archaeologist Joshua Patterson (M.A.) conducted the archaeological field survey, communicated with Native American representatives, and prepared this report. Æ Associate Archaeologist Simone M. Schinsing (M.A., RPA 28577763) served as project archaeologist who managed project tasks, oversaw background research, and assisted with report production. Æ Senior Archaeologist Erin Enright (M.A., RPA 16575) served as principal investigator and project manager, whose responsibility was to oversee project tasks and provide quality control and technical review of this document.

1.3 REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report is prepared in accordance with Archaeological Resource Management Reports: Recommended Contents and Format published by the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP 1990). This document consists of six chapters. Following this introduction, Chapter 2 describes the natural and cultural setting of the Project area. Chapter 3 presents Æ’s methods for the study, including background research and field investigations. Chapter 4 discusses the results of the research and archaeological investigations, and Chapter 5 contains a summary and
recommendations. A complete listing of references cited is provided in Chapter 6. Appendix A presents the results of the records search and Appendix B contains documentation of communication with the Native American Heritage Commission and local tribal representatives.
Figure 1-1  Project area vicinity in San Luis Obispo County, California.
Figure 1-2  Project area on the USGS Templeton 7.5-minute quadrangle.
Figure 1-3  Aerial view of the Project area east of Highway 101 in Paso Robles, California.
2 NATURAL AND CULTURAL CONTEXT

2.1 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

The Project lies in inland San Luis Obispo County in the southern extent of the Coast Ranges geologic province. The Coast Ranges were formed by pressure between the North American and Pacific plates, which folded the North American Plate into a series of northwest-southeast trending ridges and valleys and raised the coastline (Pletka and Pletka 2004). Geology of the area includes Quaternary alluvium, lake, playa, and terrace deposits (California Geological Survey 2015). Sediments within the Project area consist of dark silty loam (Natural Resources Conservation Service 2018).

The Project is south of the city of Paso Robles, within agricultural fields along the western bank of the Salinas River. The local Mediterranean climate is typically warm and dry in the summer, and cool and wet in the winter. Most of the area’s rivers, creeks, and streams remain dry during the summer months. Average inland temperatures range from 37 to 89 degrees Fahrenheit; July and August are the warmest months and December is the coldest. Precipitation occurs primarily as winter rain between November and March; February is usually the wettest month. Mean annual precipitation near the Project area is 12.9 inches (World Spark 2018).

2.2 PREHISTORY

Early attempts at regional cultural chronology by Rogers (1929) and Olson (1930) divided prehistory into three periods. However, extensive archaeological studies since then and development of more precise dating methods have allowed many refinements to the San Luis Obispo cultural sequences. Currently, the most common chronological system—based on work by Erlandson and Colten (1991), Jones and Ferneau (2002), Jones et al. (2007), King (1990), and Jones et al. 2015—divides Central Coast prehistory into six periods (Table 2-1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Years B.C./A.D.</th>
<th>Cal Years B.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paleo-Indian</td>
<td>pre-8000 B.C.</td>
<td>pre-10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Archaic</td>
<td>8000–3500 B.C.</td>
<td>10,000–5500 B.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>3500–600 B.C.</td>
<td>5500–2600 B.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>600 B.C.–A.D. 1000</td>
<td>2600–950 B.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-Late Transition</td>
<td>A.D. 1000–1250</td>
<td>950–700 B.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>A.D. 1250–1769</td>
<td>700 B.P.–Historic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.1 Paleo-Indian Period (Pre-10,000 cal. B.P.)

The Paleo-Indian Period represents the earliest human occupations in the region, which began prior to 10,000 years ago. Paleo-Indian sites throughout North America are known by the representative fluted projectile points, crescents, large bifaces used as tools as well as flake cores, and a distinctive assemblage of small flake tools. Only three fluted points have been reported
from Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo counties, and all are isolated occurrences unassociated with larger assemblages of tools or debris (Erlandson et al. 1987; Gibson 1996; Mills et al. 2005). However, more evidence of Paleo-Indian sites on the mainland is slowly being uncovered. Recent work on Vandenberg Air Force Base (AFB) uncovered a late Paleo-Indian site (CA-SBA-1547) with a robust artifact assemblage (Lebow et al. 2016). Data recovery work at this location has documented a dense single-component shell midden dating to approximately 10,725 calibrated years before present (cal B.P). Data from this site, also known as the Sudden Flats Site, points to an early culture that utilized a unique tool assemblage that exhibit traits derived from Alaska/Beringia (Lebow et al. 2016).

Interestingly, early sites on San Miguel and Santa Rosa islands have yielded numerous radiocarbon dates of older Paleo-Indian age than the Sudden Flats Site. Additionally, these sites do not contain fluted points or other notable artifacts typically associated with Paleo-Indian adaptations (Agenbroad et al. 2005; Erlandson et al. 1996). Nonetheless, both offshore and mainland sites provide clear evidence of watercraft use by California’s earliest colonizers, and also offer tantalizing evidence of pre-Clovis occupations. Overall, inhabitants of the Central Coast during the Paleo-Indian Period are thought to have lived in small groups with a relatively egalitarian social organization and a forager-type land-use strategy (Erlandson 1994; Glassow 1996; Greenwood 1972; Moratto 1984).

2.2.2 Early Archaic Period (10,000–5500 cal B.P.)

Additional evidence of human occupation has been found at sites dating to the Early Archaic. A growing number of Early Archaic components have been identified, most located in coastal or pericoastal settings. Two such components, at CA-SLO-2 (Diablo Canyon) and CA-SLO-1797 (the Cross Creek Site), are radiocarbon dated between 10,300 and 8500 cal B.P. providing the earliest evidence for the widespread California Milling Stone adaptive pattern (Greenwood 1972; Jones et al. 2008). The most common artifacts in these assemblages are the eponymous milling slabs and handstones used to grind hard seeds and process other foodstuffs. Choppers, core tools, and large bifaces also are common, while side-notched dart points, pitted stones, simple bone awls, bipointed bone gorges, and possible eccentric crescents occur in lesser frequencies. Population density likely remained low, although settlements may have been semipermanent. Subsistence activities appeared to be aimed broadly at a diverse spectrum of terrestrial and marine resources.

During this time, people appear to have subsisted largely on plants, shellfish, and some vertebrate species using a seemingly simple and limited tool technology. Sites of this age are notable for the prevalence of handstones and milling slabs and less abundant flaked tools and projectile points (Jones et al. 2007:135). Archaeological components from central California show substantial regional variability. Differences in site location, artifact assemblages, and faunal remains suggest that populations were beginning to establish settlements tethered to the unique characteristics of the local environment and adopt subsistence practices responsive to local conditions. Obsidian from several of these components originated on the east side of the Sierra Nevada, suggesting that long-distance trade networks were also established during this era. Glassow (1990, 1996) infers that occupants of sites in the Vandenberg area during this time were sedentary and had begun using a collector-type (i.e., logistically mobile) land-use strategy. However, others have argued for a broader and less permanent subsistence base as over-
exploitation of costal resources pushed human residents towards the interior (Jones and Richman 1995).

2.2.3 Early Period (5500–2600 cal B.P.)

An important adaptive transition occurred along the Central Coast around 5500 cal B.P. (Jones et al. 2007; Price et al. 2012). Technological changes marking the transition into the Early Period include an abundance of contracting-stemmed, Rossi square-stemmed, large side-notched, and other large projectile points (Jones et al. 2007:138). Mortars and pestles were introduced and gradually replaced manos and milling slabs as the primary plant processing tools, indicating expansion of the subsistence base to include acorns (Glassow and Wilcoxon 1988). Shell beads and obsidian materials indicate that trade between regions expanded (Jones et al. 1994). Site occupants appear more settled with more limited mobility, and they increasingly used sites for resource procurement activities such as hunting, fishing, and plant material processing (Jones et al. 1994:62; Jones and Waugh 1995:132). Farquhar et al. (2011:14) argue that cultural changes during this period are the result of population circumscription and economic intensification. Echoing Rogers (1929), Price et al. (2012:36–37) suggest such constraints might have been prompted by the arrival of new populations or adoption of new social norms in the region.

2.2.4 Middle Period (2600–950 cal B.P.)

The Middle Period is defined by continued specialization in resource exploitation and increased technological complexity. Contracting-stemmed points still existed, while square-stemmed and large side-notched variants disappeared (Rogers 1929). The use of mortars and pestles also increased. Additionally, expansion of trade is evident in the increased quantity of obsidian, beads, and sea otter bones (Farquhar et al. 2011:15). Circular shell fishhooks, which facilitated an increase in exploitation of fishes, appeared for the first time (Glassow and Wilcoxon 1988). The appearance of small leaf-shaped projectile points toward the end of the period is evidence for the arrival of bow and arrow technology (Jones et al. 2007:139).

2.2.5 Middle-Late Transition Period (950–700 cal B.P.)

The Middle-Late Transitional Period represents a rapid change in artifact assemblages as large numbers of arrow points appeared and most stemmed points disappeared (Jones et al. 2007:139). Hopper mortars also made their first entry in the archaeological record (Farquhar et al. 2011:16). At the same time, some evidence points to population decline and interregional trade collapse. Obsidian is not found in sites dating to this period (Jones et al. 1994). Settlement shifted away from the coast and people relocated to more interior settings (Jones 1995:215). Marine resources appear to have been largely dropped from the diet and instead people relied more on terrestrial resources such as small mammals and acorns (Farquhar et al. 2011:16). These changes may have been caused by an environmental shift that increased sea and air temperatures, resulting in decreased precipitation and overexploitation of resources (Arnold 1992; Graumlich 1993; Kennett et al. 1997; Pisias 1978; Stine 1990).

At the same time it appears that social complexity became more noticeable during the transition between the Middle and Late periods. It is during this time that craft specialization and social ranking developed (Arnold 1992). The tomol (plank canoe), which was utilized by the Chumash
south of Point Conception where ocean conditions were more favorable, allowed for a greater reliance on marine resources, particularly fish, for food. However, these changes are again more noticeable south of Point Conception, and may have been due, in part, to environmental changes occurring at that time.

2.2.6 Late Period (700 cal B.P.–Historic)

Populations on the Central Coast expanded in the Late Period (Farquhar et al. 2011:17; Glassow 1996). More sites were occupied during this period than ever before (Jones et al. 2007:143). It appears that the inhabitants of the Central Coast used a range of subsistence strategies depending on the available local ecology. Some studies have found that Late Period residents did not increase maritime subsistence activities but instead continued to demonstrate a terrestrial focus with occasional forays to the coastal zone to procure marine products (Farquhar et al. 2011:17; Jones et al. 2007:140; Price 2005; Price et al. 1997:4.13–4.14). However, archaeological investigations at Late Period coastal sites along the Central Coast show evidence of intensification of marine resource use and overall expansion of the subsistence base (Codding et al. 2013; Joslin 2010; Moratto et al. 2009). Analysis of assemblages from two Late Period sites on the San Simeon Reef (Joslin 2010) and excavations at Tom’s Pond (CA-SLO-1366/H) on the Pecho Coast (Codding et al. 2013) demonstrate that some human populations responded to climate shifts and associated impacts to terrestrial faunal communities with an increased use of the marine subsistence base. This same trend is visible to the south, along the Vandenberg AFB coast where analysis of faunal assemblages from CA-SBA-694 and -695 found that Late Period inhabitants used coastal sites as camps for exploitation of marine resources, especially shellfish and fish (Moratto et al. 2009).

Artifact assemblages from the Late Period within San Luis Obispo County contain an abundance of arrow points, small bead drills, bedrock mortars, hopper mortars, and a variety of bead types (Price 2005). More shell and stone beads appeared in the Late Period and became a more standardized and common form of exchange (Jones et al. 2007:140, 145). The use of handstones and milling slabs continued during this period, but pestles and mortars occurred in greater proportions (Jones and Waugh 1995:121). There are few records of Spanish encounters with the Chumash north of Point Conception (Glassow 1990). However, in San Luis Obispo County it appears that the absence of the tomol and a lower population density contributed to a different social and political organization than their neighbors to the south. Moreover, the absence of imported obsidian after 900 cal B.P. suggests a change in trade relationships that is likely associated with the shift in settlement patterns (Jones et al. 1994).

2.3 ETHNOGRAPHIC SETTING

The Project area is within the traditional territorial ranges of both the Salinan and Chumash people (Hester 1978; Jones et al. 2007). A hunting and gathering people, the Salinans were separated into northern and southern groups. Northern Salinans, or Antoniaños, were associated with the populations around Mission San Antonio de Padua. The southern group, or Migueleños, were associated with the populations around Mission San Miguel Archángel. The territories of both Salinan groups extended east into the interior of the Coast Range, where they met Chumash and Yokuts territory. The Salinan language is a classificatory isolate of the Hokan linguistic group (Golla 2011:114).
The Northern Chumash occupied land along the Pacific coast from the Santa Maria River north to approximately Point Estero and east to the edge of the San Joaquin Valley. The Chumash people lived in large villages along the Santa Barbara Channel coast, with less dense populations in the interior regions, on the Channel Islands, and in coastal areas north of Point Conception. Both Salinan and Northern Chumash subsistence was focused on fishing, hunting, and gathering native plants, particularly acorns, although many animals and dozens of plants were used for food (Hester 1978:501). Marine shellfish was an important source of nourishment, and both men and women shared in the task of gathering (Greengo 1952). Fishing also had a division of labor along gender lines: Men would weave the fishing nets and catch the fish, while women would process the catch. A variety of mammals were hunted, including bear, rabbit, and deer. The meat was roasted, baked, boiled, or dried. Cooking baskets and earth ovens were used in food preparation.

Vegetal foods, especially acorns, provided the bulk of the diet. Acorns were stored in large willow-twig granaries until needed, then ground with a stone mortar and pestle. The tannic acid in the acorn meal was leached out with water, and the result was cooked into a gruel. Other important plant foods included wild grass and sage seeds, berries, mescal, and wild fruits and berries. Animals and birds were captured with snares, traps, spears, and the bow and arrow.

Stone, bone, wood, and shell provided materials for the production of tools (Hester 1978:501). Stone tools were manufactured from locally available chert as well as imported obsidian, and debris from their manufacture and maintenance are most likely to be seen in an archaeological context. Pecked and ground stone objects include bowl mortars, pestles, metates, basket mortars, stone bowls, notched pebble net sinkers, and steatite arrow shaft straighteners. Ornaments are made of steatite and serpentine. Bone and shell tools were also manufactured, especially bone awls and C-shaped fishhooks. Shell beads of olive snail, mussel, abalone, and other species were the basis of the native “currency,” with value being assigned based on the color of the shell and other factors (Hester 1978:502).

It is clear that the Salinan and Chumash people were on good terms with the Yokuts to the east, especially those residing on the shore of Tulare Lake. They would regularly travel inland to fish and hunt fowl, and the Yokuts, in kind, would venture westward to obtain littoral resources. Trade was extensive; the Yokuts received shell beads, unworked shells, and other marine resources, while the Chumash and Salinans received saltgrass salt, obsidian, seeds, lake fish, and tanned antelope and deer skins (Baldwin 1971). There was less trade between the Chumash and Salinans due to relations that were often hostile (Hester 1978:500). The Salinans obtained univalve shell ornaments, wooden dishes, and steatite vessels from the Chumash (Hester 1978:500).

2.4 HISTORY

One of the first documented European incursions into San Luis Obispo County occurred in 1587, when Pedro de Unamuno, landed near the mouth of Chorro Creek, near the present site of Morro Bay. Unamuno led an expedition approximately 12 miles up either the Los Osos or Chorro Valley, but fled after several skirmishes with the native inhabitants (Krieger 1988). In 1602, Sebastian Vizcaino sailed up the California coast from Mexico looking for a good harbor along the “Manila Galleon” sea route, and anchored at San Luis Bay. Over 150 years passed before the
next major European expedition reached San Luis Obispo County. In 1769, Gaspar de Portola and Fray Crespi departed the newly established San Diego settlement and marched northward toward Monterey, passing through present-day San Luis Obispo County that same year (Krieger 1988). Father Serra founded the Mission San Luis Obispo de Tolosa three years later in 1772. Mission San Miguel Archángel was founded in northern San Luis Obispo County in 1797.

Spanish rule in Alta California came to an end in 1821 with Mexican Independence. The mission lands were secularized in the 1830s. During Mexican rule, missions declined in influence and large cattle ranches (called ranchos) came into dominance in the Paso Robles area. The planning area falls within the historic boundaries of Rancho Santa Ysabel, granted in 1844 to Francisco C. Arce, which was originally part of Mission San Miguel Archángel’s land holdings (Krieger 1988). The Mexican Period ended with the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848, which transferred control of California, New Mexico, Texas, and other western properties to the United States.

Paso Robles was a popular tourist location as early as the 1860s because of the reported healing properties of its hot springs and mud baths. The community that developed around Paso Robles remained small through the early American Period with ranching and agriculture dominating the area’s early economy. Following the construction of the Southern Pacific Railroad in 1886, a town site was laid out with the hot springs resort as the nucleus. At the end of one year, the town included 523 residents and 100 structures (Paso Robles Daily News 2013). The City of El Paso de Robles incorporated in 1889. Since the 1950s the city has grown in size through the annexation of various sections of land located east of the Salinas River. Today, Paso Robles population is approximately 29,500.
3 METHODS

3.1 RECORDS SEARCH

On June 25, 2018, a records search for the Project was conducted at the Central Coast Information Center (CCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), housed at the University of California, Santa Barbara. Through examination of maps, site records, and archaeological reports, the records search identified previous archaeological surveys, previously recorded cultural resources, and data recovery projects within 0.25-mile of the Project. Additionally, the State Historic Property Data Files, National Register of Historic Places, National Register of Determined Eligible Properties, California Points of Historic Interest, California Office of Historic Preservation Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility, and A’s in-house files were reviewed.

3.2 NATIVE AMERICAN COMMUNICATION

A contacted the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) to determine whether any sites recorded in the Commission’s Sacred Lands File occurred in or near the Project area. On August 6, 2018, the NAHC supplied a list of local Native American individuals and/or groups with interests and knowledge about the area (Appendix B). Those included on the list were contacted by letter and telephone to request comments or information about the Project area (see Section 4.3).

3.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES INSPECTION

A Staff Archaeologist, Joshua Patterson completed a pedestrian survey of the Project area on July 6, 2018. Patterson examined the ground surface by walking linear transects spaced no more than 20 meter intervals throughout the entire property. Modern disturbances and landscape features were documented in the field using a hand-held GPS device, and digital photographs were taken with a Fujifilm XP Camera.
4

FINDINGS

4.1 PREVIOUS STUDIES

The CCIC records search identified 20 previous cultural resource investigations within the 0.25-mile search radius (Appendix A). Of these, six previous cultural resource investigations have occurred within portions of the Project area (Table 4-1). The records search also identified four archaeological sites within a 0.25 mile radius, with a portion of CA-SLO-2790 within the Project area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL-03515</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Getchell, Barbie S. and John E. Atwood</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Inventory of Riverside Farm Lots 10 and 14, and Adjacent parcels 3 and 4 per Assessor’s Map 9-63 (200+ Acres) in the City of Paso Robles, San Luis Obispo County, California.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL-06916</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Conway, Thor</td>
<td>Archaeological Monitoring for the Firestone Water Treatment Facility Project, 1400 Ramada Drive, Paso Robles, California.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robert Gibson (1975) surveyed the proposed route for a sewer line, northwest of the Project. Getchell and Atwood’s survey in 1998 included the entire Project area, and recorded CA-SLO-1894, -1895, and -1896 (Getchell and Atwood 1998). Nelson et al. (2000) and Sikes et al. (2006) performed cultural resources surveys for proposed fiber optic alignments, northwest of the Project area. Getchell and Atwood returned in 2003 for a Phase II excavation of CA-SLO-1894, -1895, and -1896 that would be impacted by the construction of a new waterline (Getchell and Atwood 2003). In 2014, Heritage Discoveries, Inc. monitored the construction of the water treatment facility for the Firestone Walker Brewery, which overlaps with the proposed switchgear location and trench along the west side of the current Project area (Conway 2014a). During the excavation for one of the holding ponds, human remains were uncovered at CA-SLO-2790 (Conway2014b).
4.2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

The CCIC records search revealed four previously recorded cultural resources; CA-SLO-2790 is within the Project area, and CA-SLO-1894, -1895, and -1896 are within the 0.25 mile buffer (Table 4-2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Primary No</th>
<th>Date Recorded</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA-SLO-1894</td>
<td>P-40-001894</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Includes eight artifact concentrations with projectile points, flake tools, ground stone fragments, cores, and lithic debitage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SLO-1895</td>
<td>P-40-001895</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Includes two artifact concentrations with flake tools, ground stone fragments, cores, fire affected rock, lithic debitage, and marine shell fragments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SLO-1896</td>
<td>P-40-001896</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>A large prehistoric habitation site with projectile points, flake tools, cores, ground stone artifacts, fire affected rock, and lithic debitage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA-SLO-2790</td>
<td>P-40-002790</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Human remains that were uncovered during the excavation of holding ponds. No associated artifacts were found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CA-SLO-2790 contains human remains with no associated artifacts. There were several groupings of burials that were deeply buried within a 10 by 10 meter area. This resource is along the western edge of the field of solar panels, just north of the switchgear. The burials had evidence of being redeposited by alluvial activities. Conway (2014a) speculated that the burials may have been washed into the area from a nearby unrecorded prehistoric cemetery. The burials were uncovered during the excavation of a holding pond that is part of the Firestone Walker Brewery water treatment facility.

CA-SLO-1894, -1895, and -1896 were recorded in 1998 by Pacific Archaeological Sciences Team, and may each be a portion of a large prehistoric village site along the banks of the Salinas River (Getchell and Atwood 1998). CA-SLO-1894 consists of eight artifact concentrations with projectile points, flake tools, cores, ground stone fragments, debitage, and marine shell. CA-SLO-1895 includes two artifact concentrations with flake tools, cores, debitage, fire-altered rock, a pestle, ground stone fragments, and marine shell. CA-SLO-1896 is a large lithic scatter with projectile points, flake tools, cores, fire-altered rock, ground stone fragments, burnt faunal fragments, and marine shell.

4.3 NATIVE AMERICAN COMMUNICATION

The NAHC responded to Æ’s information request on August 6, 2018 noting that its search of the Sacred Lands File failed to indicate the presence of any Native American cultural resources within the Project area. The NAHC provided a contact list of local individuals and groups and suggested Æ request more information from these contacts. Æ sent a notification letter on August 7, 2018, to individuals on the NAHC list informing them of the nature and intent of the Project and soliciting comments or concerns. Follow-up phones calls were initiated on August 15, 2018. On August 20, 2018 Fred Collins of the Northern Chumash Tribal Council emailed to request the results of the survey. On August 27, 2018 a follow up email was sent to Mr. Collins describing
the survey conditions and findings. Table 4-3 identifies each individual or group on the list that was contacted and provides the responses to the request for information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Tribe/Group</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Kahn</td>
<td>Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians</td>
<td>Notification letter sent on 8/7/2018 Called on 8/15/2018; left message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred Collins</td>
<td>Northern Chumash Tribal Council</td>
<td>Notification letter sent on 8/7/2018 Emailed on 8/20/2018 requesting survey results. A follow up email was sent on 8/27/2018 describing survey conditions and findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredrick Segobia</td>
<td>Salinan Tribe of Monterey, San Luis Obispo Counties</td>
<td>Notification letter sent on 8/7/2018 Called on 8/15/2018; left message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mona Olivas Tucker</td>
<td>Northern Chumash Tribe</td>
<td>Notification letter sent on 8/7/2018 Called on 8/15/2018; left message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Haro</td>
<td>Xolon-Salinan Tribe</td>
<td>Notification letter sent on 8/7/2018 Called on 8/15/2018; left message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Lynn</td>
<td>Barbarenio/Venturenio Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Notification letter sent on 8/7/2018 Called on 8/15/2018; left message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia Lopez</td>
<td>Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation</td>
<td>Notification letter sent on 8/7/2018 Called on 8/15/2018; unable to leave a voice message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen White</td>
<td>Xolon-Salinan Tribe</td>
<td>Notification letter sent on 8/7/2018 Called on 8/15/2018; left message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raudel Banuelos</td>
<td>Barbarenio/Venturenio Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Notification letter sent on 8/7/2018 Called on 8/15/2018; left message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Burch</td>
<td>Salinan Tribe of Monterey, San Luis Obispo Counties</td>
<td>Notification letter sent on 8/7/2018 Called on 8/15/2018; left message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet Cavanaugh</td>
<td>Northern Chumash Tribal Council</td>
<td>Notification letter sent on 8/7/2018 Called on 8/15/2018; left message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleanor Arrelianes</td>
<td>Barbarenio/Venturenio Band of Mission Indians</td>
<td>Notification letter sent on 8/7/2018 Called on 8/15/2018; left message.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSPECTION

On July 6, 2018, Æ Staff Archaeologist Joshua Patterson conducted a pedestrian survey of the 9.6-acre Project area. The solar panel field, switchgear pad, and connection trench were completely surveyed. The solar panel field had been recently plowed, and had a surface visibility of 100 percent (Figure 4-1). There were also several animal burrows whose side walls and spoils piles were inspected.

Within this portion of the Project area was a moderate amount of modern debris including concrete pipe fragments, aluminum cans, plastic fragments, and small metal fragments. The switchgear pad and nearby trench along the southern extent of existing retention ponds are within the fenced portion of the water treatment facility and have been graded with gravels laid on top. Observed sediments consisted of loosely (where it was plowed) to moderately compacted (where
it has been graded) medium brown silty loam. No cultural materials were observed within the Project area during the survey. The portion of CA-SLO-2790 within the Project area was surveyed more intensely at 5-meter transects, and despite there being excellent visibility (Figure 4-2) no human remains or artifacts were identified.

Figure 4-1 Overview of solar panel field within the Project area, facing northeast.

Figure 4-2 Portion of CA-SLO-2790 within the Project area, facing southwest.
Æ completed a Phase 1 cultural resource study in support of the proposed Firestone Brewery Solar Project near Paso Robles, California. Project plans include the installation of solar panels with associated switchgear and underground wiring. The study included a record search, surface survey, and outreach to local Native Americans. Record search results found that one previously recorded cultural resource, CA-SLO-2790, is within the Project area, and three additional archaeological sites, CA-SLO-1894, -1895, and -1896, are within a 0.25 mile radius of the Project area.

No cultural resources were observed within the Project parcel during the current survey. However, the parcel does include a portion of CA-SLO-2790, which contains prehistoric human remains that were found during the excavation of a holding pond for the Firestone Water Treatment Facility (Conway 2014a). Depth of remains were reported as 3 meters deep within a 10 by 10 meter area. There are also three prehistoric habitation sites near the Project area. As such, there is a heightened potential for previously undocumented subsurface human burials and cultural materials within the Project area. Typically a testing program would be recommended as the next step for cultural studies due to the proximity of burials. However, due to the depth of previously located human burials, a testing effort which only extends 1 meter deep would not benefit the project. For this reason, Æ recommends that a qualified archaeological monitor and a Native American observer be present for all ground-disturbing work for the proposed Project. Additionally, Æ recommends that a comprehensive archaeological monitoring and data recovery plan following City standards is prepared prior to the start of construction. The plan should outline measures for archaeological and Native American monitoring as well as procedures for handling finds during construction.

Prehistoric materials may include chert flaked stone tools (e.g., projectile points, knives, scrapers) or toolmaking debris; culturally darkened soil (midden) containing fire-altered rocks, artifacts, or shellfish remains; and stone milling equipment (e.g., mortars, pestles, handstones). Historic-period materials might include stone, concrete, wood or adobe building foundations, corrals, and walls; filled wells or privies; mining features; and deposits of metal, glass, and/or ceramic refuse. If any of these materials are found during the course of construction, the Project archaeologist should halt construction and determine if materials are isolated finds or part of a larger archaeological deposit. If an archaeological site is identified, then the resource should be evaluated for significance under CEQA and further treatment measures may be required.

If human remains are discovered during Project construction, work must stop at the discovery location and any nearby area suspected to contain human remains (PRC 7050.5). The San Luis Obispo Coroner must be contacted to determine whether the cause of death should be investigated. If the coroner determines that the remains are of Native American origin, it is necessary to comply with state laws relating to the disposition of Native American burials, which fall within the jurisdiction of the NAHC (PRC 5097). The coroner will contact the NAHC. The NAHC will contact the most likely descendant(s) who will be afforded the opportunity to recommend means for treatment of the human remains following protocols in PRC 5097.98.
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APPENDIX A

Records Search Results
The Central Coast Information Center received your record search request for the project area referenced above, located on the Templeton USGS 7.5’ quad(s). The following reflects the results of the records search for the project area and a 0.25 mile radius:

As indicated on the data request form, the locations of reports and resources are provided in the following format: ■ custom GIS maps ■ shapefiles ■ hand-drawn maps ■ none

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources within project area:</th>
<th>SLO-2790</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources within 0.25 mi. radius:</td>
<td>SLO-1894, SLO-1895, SLO-1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports within project area:</td>
<td>7 reports; see map and list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports within 0.25 radius:</td>
<td>7 additional reports; see map and list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Reports within records search radius:</td>
<td>SL-04809, SR-01082, SR-01442. These reports are classified as Other Reports; reports with little or no field work or missing maps. The electronic maps do not depict study areas for these reports, however a list of these reports has been provided. In addition, you have not been charged any fees associated with these studies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resource Database Printout (list): ✔ enclosed  □ not requested  □ nothing listed
Resource Database Printout (details): ✔ enclosed  □ not requested  □ nothing listed
Resource Digital Database Records:  □ enclosed  ✔ not requested  □ nothing listed
Report Database Printout (list): ✔ enclosed  □ not requested  □ nothing listed
Report Database Printout (details): ✔ enclosed  □ not requested  □ nothing listed
Report Digital Database Records:  □ enclosed  ✔ not requested  □ nothing listed
Resource Record Copies:  ✔ enclosed  □ not requested  □ nothing listed
Report Copies:  ✔ enclosed  □ not requested  □ nothing listed
OHP Historic Properties Directory:  □ enclosed  □ not requested  ✔ nothing listed
Archaeological Determinations of Eligibility:  ✔ enclosed  □ not requested  ✔ nothing listed

6/25/2018
Josh Patterson
Applied EarthWorks, Inc.
811 El Capitan Way, Suite 100
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Re: Firestone Brewery Phase I (Job #3892)
The following sources of information are available at [http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=28065](http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=28065). Some of these resources used to be available through the CHRIS but because they are now online, they can be accessed directly. The Office of Historic Preservation makes no guarantees about the availability, completeness, or accuracy of the information provided through the sources listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>California State Lands Commission Shipwreck Database</th>
<th>Caltrans Historic Bridge Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Geological Survey Historic Topographic Maps</td>
<td>Rancho Plat Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Service National Register of Historic Places Nominations</td>
<td>Natural Resource Conservation Service Soil Survey Maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Bureau of Land Management General Land Office Records</td>
<td>California Historical Landmarks Listing (by county)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please forward a copy of any resulting reports from this project to the office as soon as possible. Due to the sensitive nature of archaeological site location data, we ask that you do not include resource location maps and resource location descriptions in your report if the report is for public distribution. If you have any questions regarding the results presented herein, please contact the office at the phone number listed above.

The provision of California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) data via this records search response does not in any way constitute public disclosure of records otherwise exempt from disclosure under the California Public Records Act or any other law, including, but not limited to, records related to archeological site information maintained by or on behalf of, or in the possession of, the State of California, Department of Parks and Recreation, State Historic Preservation Officer, Office of Historic Preservation, or the State Historical Resources Commission.

Due to processing delays and other factors, not all of the historical resource reports and resource records that have been submitted to the Office of Historic Preservation are available via this records search. Additional information may be available through the federal, state, and local agencies that produced or paid for historical resource management work in the search area. Additionally, Native American tribes have historical resource information not in the CHRIS Inventory, and you should contact the California Native American Heritage Commission for information on local/regional tribal contacts.

Should you require any additional information for the above referenced project, reference the record search number listed above when making inquiries. Requests made after initial invoicing will result in the preparation of a separate invoice.

Thank you for using the CHRIS.

Sincerely,

Hugh Radde, M.A.
Assistant Coordinator
## Resource List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary No.</th>
<th>Trinomial</th>
<th>Other IDs</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Attribute codes</th>
<th>Recorded by</th>
<th>Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P-40-001894</td>
<td>CA-SLO-001894</td>
<td>Other - Riverside #3; Other - Riverside Farm Properties #3</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>AP02; AP15</td>
<td>1998 (John Atwood, Barbie Getchell, Pacific Archaeological Sciences Team)</td>
<td>SL-03515, SL-05230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-40-001895</td>
<td>CA-SLO-001895</td>
<td>Other - Riverside #2; Other - Riverside Farm Properties #2</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>AP15</td>
<td>1998 (John Atwood, Barbie Getchell, Pacific Archaeological Sciences Team)</td>
<td>SL-03515, SL-05230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-40-001896</td>
<td>CA-SLO-001896</td>
<td>Other - Riverside #1; Other - Riverside Farm Properties #1</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>AP15</td>
<td>1998 (John Atwood, Barbie Getchell, Pacific Archaeological Sciences Team)</td>
<td>SL-03515, SL-06082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-40-002790</td>
<td>CA-SLO-002790</td>
<td>Other - Salinas River Burial Site; Other - Prehistoric burial site</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Prehistoric</td>
<td>AP09</td>
<td>2014 (Thor Conway, Heritage Discoveries)</td>
<td>SL-06916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Central Coast Information Center
Department of Anthropology
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106-3210
(805) 893-2474
(805) 893-8707 FAX
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report No.</th>
<th>Other IDs</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SL-00025</td>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Gibson, R.</td>
<td>Archaeological Element of Environmental Impact Report for Paso Robles/Templeton Interceptor Sewer, San Luis Obispo County, California</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL-00170</td>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Spanne, L.</td>
<td>An Archaeological Evaluation of a Curve Correction Project Near Paso Robles, SLO County 05-SLO-101-54.5 259201</td>
<td>archaeological consultant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL-03515</td>
<td></td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Barbier Stevenson, Getchell and John E. Atwood</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Inventory of Riverside Farm Lots 10 and 14, and Adjacent Parcels 3 and 4 Per Assessor's Map 9-63 (200 + Acres) in the City of Paso Robles, San Luis Obispo County, California</td>
<td>Pacific Archaeological Sciences Team</td>
<td>40-001894, 40-001895, 40-001896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL-04057A</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Appendix A: Project Maps and Site Locations</td>
<td>Far Western Anthropological Research Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL-04101</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Gibson, Robert</td>
<td>Results of archival records check and phase one surface survey for the Paso Robles Auto Mall Project, Paso Robles, San Luis Obispo County, CA</td>
<td>Gibson's Archaeological Consulting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL-04181</td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Gibson, Robert O.</td>
<td>Results of Archival Records Check and phase One Surface Survey for the 55 acre Tatum Parcel #20, Paso Robles, San Luis Obispo County, CA</td>
<td>Gibson's Archaeological Consulting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report No.</td>
<td>Other IDs</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL-04822</td>
<td></td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Stevenson, Barbie and John Atwood</td>
<td>Cultural Resources Survey For The Proposed Thunderbird Wells 16-Inch Waterline Project In The City Of El Paso De Robles, San Luis Obispo County, California.</td>
<td>Pacific Archaeological Sciences Team (PAST)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL-04925</td>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Farrell, Nancy</td>
<td>Historical Documentation of the Santa Ysabel Ranch Water Management System</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Management Services</td>
<td>40-041087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL-05611a</td>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Nathan Stevens</td>
<td>Research Plan for Data Recovery Excavations at Prehistoric Site CA-SLO-2084, Santa Ysabel Ranch, San Luis Obispo County, California</td>
<td>Cultural Resource Management Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL-06082A</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>none given</td>
<td>Appendix A: Qwest Fiber Optic Cultural Resources Protocols; Appendix B: Native American Contact Table and Sample Consultation Letter</td>
<td>SWCA Environmental Consultants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL-06916</td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Thor Conway</td>
<td>Archaeological Monitoring for the Firestone Water Treatment Facility Project, 1400 Ramada Drive, Paso Robles, California</td>
<td>Heritage Discoveries, Inc.</td>
<td>40-002790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report No.</td>
<td>Other IDs</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report No.</td>
<td>Other IDs</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report No.</td>
<td>Other IDs</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Native American Communication
June 19, 2018

Native American Heritage Commission  
1550 Harbor Blvd, Suite 100  
West Sacramento, CA 95691

Re: Cultural Resource Study for the Firestone Walker Brewery Solar Project, Paso Robles, California

To Whom it May Concern:

Applied EarthWorks, Inc. is conducting a cultural resource study for the proposed Firestone Brewery Solar Project, in Paso Robles, California. Project plans are to design and install a solar system for Firestone Walker Brewery. The project area is depicted on the attached copy of the Templeton CA 7.5’ Quadrangle Map and is located within an unsectioned portion of Township 27S, Range 12E.

This letter is being submitted to formally request your agency to conduct a search of its Sacred Lands Inventory File. Your information will aid us in determining if any other cultural properties are present within the general vicinity of the proposed project, thereby assisting us in our environmental analysis. In addition, we are requesting the names, addresses, and phone numbers of officially recognized tribal representatives in the project area.

Please fax the results to (805) 594-1577 and do not hesitate to call me at (805) 594-1590 if you have any questions or require additional information. Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Joshua Patterson, Staff Archaeologist  
Applied EarthWorks, Inc.
Project location map for *Firestone Brewery Phase I - AE#3892.*
August 2, 2018

Joshua Patterson
Applied EarthWorks

Sent by Email: 805-594-1577

Re: Firestone Walker Brewery Solar Project, San Luis Obispo County

Dear Mr. Paterson,

A record search of the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) Sacred Lands File (SLF) was completed for the information you have submitted for the above referenced project. The results were negative. However, the absence of specific site information in the SLF does not preclude the presence of cultural resources in any project area. Other sources for cultural resources should also be contacted for information regarding known and/or recorded sites.

Enclosed is a list of Native Americans tribes who may have knowledge of cultural resources in the project area. I suggest you contact all of those indicated, if they cannot supply information, they might recommend others with specific knowledge. By contacting all those listed, your organization will be better able to respond to claims of failure to consult with the appropriate tribe. If a response has not been received within two weeks of notification, the Commission requests that you follow-up with a telephone call to ensure that the project information has been received.

If you receive notification of change of addresses and phone numbers from any of these tribes, please notify me. With your assistance we are able to assure that our lists contain current information. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact me at 916-573-1033 or frank.lienert@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

Frank Lienert
Associate Governmental Program Analyst
Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Indians
Kenneth Kahn. Chairperson
P.O. Box 517
Santa Ynez, CA 93460
kkahn@santaynezchumash.org
(805) 688-7997

(805) 686-9578 Fax

Barbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians
Julie Lynn Tumamait-Stenslie. Chair
365 North Poli Ave
Ojai, CA 93023
itumamait@hotmail.com
(805) 646-6214

Salinan Tribe of Monterey. San Luis Obispo Counties
John Burch. Traditional Lead
7070 Morro Road. Suite A
Atascadero, CA 93422
info@salinantribe.com
(805) 858-8199

(805) 423-5195 Cell

Xolon-Salinan Tribe
Karen White. Council Chairperson
P.O. Box 7045
Spreckels, CA 93962
xolon.salinan.heritage@gmail.com
831-238-1488

Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation
Mia Lopez
24 S. Voluntario Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
mialopez2424@gmail.com
(805) 324-0135

vak titvu titvu - Northern Chumash Tribe
Mona Olivas Tucker. Chairwoman
660 Camino Del Rey
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
olivas.mona@gmail.com
(805) 489-1052 Home

(805) 748-2121 Cell

Northern Chumash Tribal Council
Fred Collins. Chairman
P.O. Box 6533
Los Osos, CA 93412
fcollins@northernchumash.org
(805) 801-0347 (Cell)

Barbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians
Eleanor Arrellanes
P.O. Box 5687
Ventura, CA 93005
(805) 701-3246

Barbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians
Raudel Joe Banuelos. Jr.
331 Mira Flores Court
Camarillo, CA 93012
(805) 427-0015

Salinan Tribe of Monterey. San Luis Obispo Counties
Fredrick Secobia
7070 Morro Road. Suite A
Atascadero, CA 93422
info@salinantribe.com
831-385-1490

This list is current only as of the date of this document and is based on the information available to the Commission on the date it was produced.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native American Tribes with regard to cultural resources assessments for the proposed Firestone Walker Brewery Solar Project, San Luis Obispo County
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Native American Heritage Commission
Native American Contacts
August 2, 2018

Xolon-Salinan Tribe
Donna Haro, Tribal Headwoman
P.O. Box 7045
Spreckels, CA 93962
dhxolonaakletse@gmail.com
(925) 470-5019

Northern Chumash Tribal Council
Violet Cavanaugh
P.O. Box 6533
Los Osos, CA 93412
760-549-3532

This list is current only as of the date of this document and is based on the information available to the Commission on the date it was produced.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resource Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native American Tribes with regard to cultural resources assessments for the proposed Firestone Walker Brewery Solar Project, San Luis Obispo County.
August 7, 2018

Eleanor Arrellanes  
Barbareno/Ventureno Band of Mission Indians  
P.O. Box 5687  
Ventura, CA 93005

Re: Cultural Resource Study for the Firestone Walker Brewery Solar Project, Paso Robles, California

Dear Ms. Arrellanes:

Applied EarthWorks, Inc. is conducting a cultural resource study for the proposed Firestone Brewery Solar Project, in Paso Robles, California. Project plans are to design and install a solar system at the Firestone Walker Brewery. The project area is depicted on the attached copy of the Templeton CA 7.5’ Quadrangle Map and is located within an unsectioned portion of Township 27S, Range 12E.

Your name and address were provided to us by the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC), which lists you as an individual with knowledge of Native American resources in San Luis Obispo County, California. This letter is being submitted to formally request any information you may have regarding Native American cultural resources within or adjacent to the project site. If you have information regarding the study area or have interest in the project, please call or send a letter to my attention. Your comments will be included in our cultural resources study report.

Please call me at (805) 594-1590 or email me at jpatterson@appliedearthworks.com if you have any questions or require additional information.

Sincerely,

Joshua Patterson, Staff Archaeologist  
Applied EarthWorks, Inc.