



INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

For EID # 0800-2019

1. Project Title:

1137 Peach Street Residential Subdivision

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

City of San Luis Obispo
919 Palm Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Kyle Van Leeuwen, Assistant Planner
(805) 781-7091

4. Project Location:

1137 Peach Street (APN 002-316-005), San Luis Obispo, CA

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Levi Seligman
1405 Garden Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

6. General Plan Designations:

Medium Density Residential (12 dwelling units/acre)

7. Zoning:

Medium-Density Residential with Historical Preservation Area Overlay Zone (R-2-H)

8. Description of the Project:

The project includes a common-interest subdivision of a 0.86-acre medium-density residential parcel (Assessor's Parcel Number [APN] 002-316-005) to create 10 parcels and construct five new single-family homes and a 20-foot-wide common driveway that would provide access to new and existing residences within the site. There are five existing single-family residences within the project site; as part of the proposed subdivision, each existing residence would be located on a new parcel (Lots 1, 2, 3, 4 and 10), and five additional parcels would be created to accommodate construction of five new single-family residences on the remaining parcels (Lots 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9). All parcels have a medium-density residential zoning designation (R-2), which allows for single-family homes with a density of 12 dwelling units per acre. The new common driveway would provide access from Toro Street and would provide primary access to Lots 6, 7, 8, and 9 and rear access to Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, and 10 are developed with existing 2-bedroom, single-family dwellings, including attached garages. The proposed project would provide additional rear access and parking, permeable paving patios, utility improvements, and

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

landscaping improvements at these existing residences, but does not propose demolition, reconstruction, or replacement of the existing residences.

Lots 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 would each be developed with a 2-bedroom single-family dwelling and 2-car garage. The project would also include removal of up to five trees, and installation of new water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure to service the proposed residences.

The subject parcel is located at the intersection of Peach Street and Toro Street, approximately 0.15 miles northeast of downtown San Luis Obispo in the City-designated Mill Street Historic District. Topography of the site is essentially level with an elevation of approximately 270 feet above mean sea level. Buildout of the new common driveway and residences would result in removal of five trees. The project is subject to development standards identified in the City of San Luis Obispo (City) Municipal Code Chapter 17.18 Medium-Density Residential (R-2) Development Standards, which identify minimum property line setback distances, building height and floor area ratio, and lot coverage standards. The project is requesting variable side yard setbacks for the new subdivision per Section 17.70.170.D.2.c. Proposed development characteristics and setbacks are shown in Table 1. The project would also be subject to the City Municipal Code Chapter 17.56 Historic Preservation Overlay Standards, which are intended to provide for residential and infill projects of high architectural quality that are compatible with existing development.

Table 1. Lot and Proposed Residential Development Characteristics

Lot Number	Height (feet)	Front Setback (feet)	Interior Side Setbacks (feet) (height=side setback)	Corner Lot-Side Setback (feet)	Rear Setbacks (feet) (height=rear setback)	Minimum Lot Size (square feet)
Standard	35'	20'	20-22 = 9 23-24 = 10 25-26 = 11	10'	20-22 = 9 23-24 = 10 25-26 = 11	5,000
Lot 1	(E)	19' (E)	10' = 5' 10' = 10'	N/A	12' = 11'	3,621
Lot 2	(E)	19' (E)	10' = 10' 10' = 5'	N/A	12' = 11'	3,718
Lot 3	(E)	19' (E)	18' = 7' (8' req) 18' = 6' (8' req)	N/A	12' = 14'	3,704
Lot 4	(E)	18' (E)	16' = 5' (7' req) 16' = 8"	N/A	12' = 15'	3,855
Lot 5	22'	20'	20' = 7' (9' req)	10'	23' = 9' (10' req)	3,739
Lot 6	(E)	20' (E)	12' = 8' 12' = 20'	N/A	12' = 5'	4,370
Lot 7	25'	N/A	19' = 7' (8' req) 19' = 8'	N/A	22' = 11'	3,617
Lot 8	25'	N/A	25' = 8' (11' req) 19' = 8'	N/A	25' = 11'	3,617
Lot 9	25'	N/A	19' = 9' 19' = 9'	N/A	22' = 11'	3,622
Lot 10	25'	N/A	25' = 11' 19' = 8'	N/A	25' = 11'	3,624

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

9. Project Entitlements:

Architectural Review
Subdivision

10. Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:

The property is surrounded by medium-density single-family residential development, as well as office buildings within the same block to the southwest.

11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?

Native American Tribes were notified about the project consistent with City and State regulations including, but not limited to, Assembly Bill 52. The AB 52 notification period closed on April 3, 2020, and formal consultation was not requested.

12. Other public agencies whose approval is required:

N/A

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

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

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

FISH AND WILDLIFE FEES

<input type="checkbox"/>	The California Department of Fish and Wildlife has reviewed the CEQA document and written no effect determination request and has determined that the project will not have a potential effect on fish, wildlife, or habitat (see attached determination).
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	The project has potential to impact fish and wildlife resources and shall be subject to the payment of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Code. This initial study has been circulated to the California Department of Fish and Wildlife for review and comment.

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	This environmental document must be submitted to the State Clearinghouse for review by one or more State agencies (e.g. Cal Trans, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Housing and Community Development). The public review period shall not be less than 30 days (CEQA Guidelines 15073(a)).
-------------------------------------	--

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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.	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant” impact(s) or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact(s) 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	<input type="checkbox"/>
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>

Signature

Date

Printed Name

For: Michael Codron,
Community Development Director

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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, including 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 Section 19, "Earlier Analysis," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analysis 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 addressed 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

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

1. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	1, 4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, open space, and historic buildings within a local or state scenic highway?	1, 5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	1, 3, 6, 7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	1, 7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation

The topography of the city of San Luis Obispo is generally defined by several low hills and ridges, such as Islay Hill, Bishop Peak, and Cerro San Luis—three of the nine peaks known as the Morros—which provide scenic focal points for much of the city. The project vicinity exhibits intermittent views of nearby natural landmarks, including Cerro San Luis.

The project is located within an urbanized residential neighborhood in the Mill Street Historic District of the city of San Luis Obispo (city) and is generally surrounded by residential uses and office buildings. The project site currently consists of five one-story single-family homes with no attached or detached garages. The visual character of the project vicinity is comprised of older residences with wood and stucco exteriors, constructed between 1906 and 1925, street trees, and sidewalks. Public views of Cerro San Luis from viewers travelling along Peach Street at this location are heavily screened by existing buildings and vegetation. Distant views of Islay Hill are available for viewers travelling along Toro Street at this location.

- a) A scenic vista is generally defined as a high-quality view displaying good aesthetic and compositional values that can be seen from public viewpoints. Some scenic vistas are officially or informally designated by public agencies or other organizations. A substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista would occur if the proposed project would significantly degrade the scenic landscape as viewed from public roads or other public areas. The project site is located in an urbanized area with intermittent views of Cerro San Luis. Public views of Cerro San Luis from viewers travelling along Peach Street at this location are heavily screened by existing buildings and vegetation. Based on the City's Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE) map of scenic roadways and vistas, the project site is not located along roadways considered to be of moderate or high scenic value or within the cone of view of a scenic roadway. Santa Rosa and Johnson Avenue in the project vicinity are identified as having moderate scenic value; however, the project site would not be highly visible from these roadways. Therefore, the project is not located within a scenic vista and potential impacts would be *less than significant*.
- b) The project site is located approximately 0.15 miles southeast of U.S. Highway 101 (U.S. 101). Based on the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) California Scenic Highways online mapping tool, the section of the U.S. 101 closest to the project site is eligible for state scenic highway designation but is not officially designated (reference source 5). The project site would not be visible to viewers travelling along U.S. 101 due to existing development, vegetation, and topography. Based on the City's COSE map of scenic roadways and vistas, the project site is not located along and would not be highly visible from roadways considered to be of moderate or high scenic value or within the cone of view of a scenic roadway. The project would not demolish historic buildings (the existing residences, which are identified as contributing resources to the Mill Street Historic District, would be retained onsite) and the project does not propose development that is substantially inconsistent with surrounding uses because it proposes residential uses within an

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

existing residential area. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial damage to scenic resources within a state or local scenic highway and impacts would be *less than significant*.

- c) The proposed subdivision and construction would occur within an urbanized residential area and is considered an infill development project. Proposed tree removals would be consistent with the City’s Tree Ordinance, which establishes protection and compensatory planting requirements. The proposed residential development would be consistent with existing zoning and land use designations for the site and consistent with surrounding uses. The project requires an exception to standard setbacks, but those exceptions would not result in a substantial change in the visual character of the project site due to the compact nature of surrounding residential uses.

The project is subject to the *City of San Luis Obispo Historic Preservation Guidelines*. The intent of the Guidelines is that new structures “shall be designed to be architecturally compatible” with the prevailing historic character. A Historic Preservation Report was prepared by SWCA for the project and concluded that none of the project’s proposed design features, either individually or collectively, would constitute an effect that would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource – in this instance defined as any or all of the adjacent contributing properties to the Mill Street Historic District or the Mill Street Historic District as a whole. Similarly, none of the project’s proposed design features, either individually or collectively, would cause substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource (as defined above) such that that the significance of the historical resource would be materially impaired (14 CCR § 15064.5[b][1]). Therefore, the Historic Preservation Report concluded that the proposed development would not cause the project to have a significant effect on the environment as defined under CEQA (14 CCR § 15064.5[b]).

The project would also be reviewed by the Architectural Review Commission (ARC) to ensure consistency with the City’s Community Design Guidelines (CDG). Consistency with the CDG and Historic Preservation Guidelines would ensure any potential aesthetic impacts related to conflicts with regulations governing scenic quality would be *less than significant*.

- d) The project is in an urbanized area with existing light sources from neighboring residential and office uses as well as light from vehicular circulation along neighboring streets. The proposed development of five single-family residences would add additional sources of exterior and interior light in the area. The proposed lighting would not be inconsistent with existing surrounding nighttime lighting and the project would be subject to Lighting and Night Sky Preservation standards set forth in the City Municipal Code (17.70.100), which require residential development to minimize glare and obtrusive light by limiting outdoor lighting that is misdirected, excessive, or unnecessary. Therefore, potential impacts associated with development of the project site related to light and glare would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

None necessary.

Conclusion

The project is not located within a scenic vista or within the viewshed of a designated scenic highway. The project would be subject to applicable standards set forth in the City’s CDG and Municipal Code, as well as the City’s Historic Preservation Guidelines. The project would be subject to review by the City Architectural Review Commission to ensure consistency with applicable guidelines prior to finalizing and approving design plans. Therefore, no potentially significant impacts to aesthetic resources would occur, and no mitigation is necessary.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY 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. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	2, 8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	2, 9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	2, 8, 9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation

The California Department of Conservation (DOC) classifies and maps agricultural lands in the state in the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). The FMMP identifies five farmland categories: Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, and Farmland of Local Potential. The project site is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land by the FMMP and therefore, is not considered farmland.

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

- a) The project site is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land by the FMMP. The project site is not in agricultural use and is not located on lands designated Farmland by the FMMP. Due to existing onsite and surrounding urbanized uses, the potential for the site to support agricultural uses in the future is very low. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use and *no impacts* would occur.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

<p>b) The project site does not include land use designations or zoning for agricultural uses and is not located within or adjacent to land under an active Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract and <i>no impacts</i> would occur.</p> <p>c-d) The project site does not include forest land or timberland and does not include land use designations or zoning for forest land or timberland. Therefore, the project would not conflict with zoning for, result in the loss of, or result in the conversion of forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production and <i>no impacts</i> would occur.</p> <p>e) The project includes the subdivision of a residentially zoned infill parcel in an established residential neighborhood near downtown San Luis Obispo. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial changes in the environment that could result in conversion of nearby agricultural land or forest land to non-agricultural or non-forest use and <i>no impacts</i> would occur.</p> <p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p> <p>None necessary.</p> <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>The project site is located in an urbanized area and is not within or adjacent to Prime Farmland, land zoned for agricultural or forest land use, or land under a Williamson Act contract. No potentially significant impacts to agriculture, forest land, or timberland would occur, and no mitigation is necessary.</p>
--

3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	4, 10, 11, 12, 15	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	10, 11, 12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	1, 11, 13	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	1, 13	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p><u>Evaluation</u></p> <p>The city is located within the South Central Coast Air Basin (SCCAB), which also includes Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties. Air quality within the SCCAB is regulated by several jurisdictions, including the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), California Air Resources Board (CARB), and the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD).</p> <p>San Luis Obispo County is currently designated as “nonattainment” for the state standards for ozone, partial nonattainment (in eastern San Luis Obispo County, outside of the project area) for federal ambient standards for ozone, and nonattainment for the state standards for particulate matter 10 micrometers or less in diameter (PM₁₀). The COSE identifies goals and policies to achieve and maintain air quality that supports health and enjoyment for those who live, work, and visit the city. These goals and</p>

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

policies include meeting state and federal air quality standards, reducing dependency on gasoline- or diesel-powered motor vehicles, and encouraging walking, biking, and public transit use.

The SLOAPCD has developed a CEQA Air Quality Handbook (most recently updated with a November 2017 Clarification Memorandum) to evaluate project-specific impacts and determine if potentially significant impacts could result from a project. To evaluate long-term emissions, cumulative effects, and establish countywide programs to reach acceptable air quality levels, the SLOAPCD adopted a Clean Air Plan (CAP) in 2001.

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to changes in air quality than others, depending on the population groups and the activities involved. CARB has identified the following groups who are most likely to be affected by air pollution (i.e., sensitive receptors): children under 14, the elderly over 65 years of age, athletes, and people with cardiovascular and chronic respiratory diseases. Sensitive receptor locations include schools, parks and playgrounds, day care centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residential dwelling units. The project site is located within close proximity to multiple sensitive receptors, including residential dwelling units within 50 feet of the parcel boundaries and surrounding residential neighborhoods.

Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) has been identified as a toxic air contaminant by the CARB. Any ground disturbance proposed in an area identified as having the potential to contain NOA must comply with the CARB Airborne Toxics Control Measure (ATCM) for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations (17 California Code of Regulations [CCR] Section 93105). The SLOAPCD Naturally Occurring Asbestos Map indicates that the project site is located within an area identified as having a potential for NOA to occur.

- a) In order to be considered consistent with the 2001 San Luis Obispo County CAP, a project must be consistent with the land use planning and transportation control measures and strategies outlined in the CAP. The proposed project would be consistent with the general level of development anticipated and projected in the CAP. The project would also be consistent with the CAP's land use and circulation management strategies because it consists of an infill project within an urbanized area proximate to public transit stops and bicycle routes. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.
- b) San Luis Obispo County is currently designated as non-attainment for ozone and PM10 under state ambient air quality standards. Construction of the project would disturb approximately 37,900 sf of land and result in emissions of ozone precursors, including reactive organic gasses (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NOx), and fugitive dust emissions (PM10). During operation, the project would result in emissions of ozone precursors associated with mobile source emissions and other uses.

Construction Emissions

The project would result in approximately 37,900 sf of ground disturbance during construction, including approximately 850 cubic yards of cut and 850 cubic yards of fill. This would result in the generation of construction dust as well as short-term construction vehicle emissions, including diesel particulate matter (DPM), ROGs, NOx, and particulate matter (PM). As shown in Table 2 below, the project's construction emissions would not exceed the APCD's applicable screening thresholds for ROG, NOx, DPM, or PM10. Therefore, potential construction-related emissions of these pollutants would be *less than significant* and would not be cumulatively considerable.

Table 2. Project Construction Emissions

Criteria Pollutant	Total Project Emissions (assuming 1 month/22 day construction period)	APCD Screening Threshold	Exceeds Threshold?
Reactive Organic Gases (ROG) + Nitrogen Oxide (NOx)	193.46 total lbs 8.79 lbs/day	137 lbs/day	No

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM)	8.33 total lbs 0.38 lbs/day	7 lbs/day	No
Fugitive Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	.6525 total tons	2.5 tons/quarter	No

Operational Impacts

Implementation of the proposed project would result in a marginal increase in vehicle trips, electricity use, and architectural coating off-gassing that would generate criteria pollutant emissions. Based on Table 1-1 of the SLOAPCD’s CEQA Handbook, the size of a single-family residential project expected to exceed SLOAPCD’s operational greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions Brightline Threshold would be a project proposing a minimum of 76 dwelling units. The size of a single-family residential project expected to exceed the SLOAPCD operational threshold for ozone precursors would consist of a minimum of 128 dwelling units. The project would construct 5 new single-family dwelling units; therefore, the project would not exceed any of the thresholds established by the SLOAPCD for operational emissions. Therefore, potential impacts associated with project-related or a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment would be *less than significant*.

- c) The project site is located within 1,000 feet of multiple sensitive receptors, including single-family residential units to the north, east, and south of the project site. The development of five new single-family residences on-site would result in temporary construction vehicle emissions and fugitive dust that may affect surrounding sensitive receptors. SLOAPCD’s CEQA Air Quality Handbook recognizes special conditions, such as proximity to sensitive receptors, that require implementation of standard construction mitigation measures to reduce diesel idling (DPM) and fugitive dust. Due to the project’s proximity to surrounding residential areas (less than 1,000 feet), standard measures for reducing DPM and fugitive dust are required. Mitigation Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 have been identified to reduce exposure of sensitive receptors to adverse fugitive dust and construction vehicle emissions; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

The SLOAPCD Naturally Occurring Asbestos Map indicates that the project site is located within an area identified as having a potential for NOA to occur. The project includes excavation for foundation installation and road construction, and trenching and installation of new water, wastewater and stormwater service pipelines to the proposed new residences. Pursuant to SLOAPCD requirements and the CARB ATCM for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations (17 CCR 93105), the applicant is required to provide geologic evaluation prior to any ground-disturbing activities and comply with existing regulations regarding NOA, if present. Mitigation Measures AQ-3 and AQ-4 have been identified to require the applicant to complete a geologic evaluation and follow all applicable protocols and procedures if NOA is determined to be present on-site. Based on compliance with identified mitigation and existing regulations, this potential impact would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

Some or all of the existing infrastructure (pipes, fencing, paving, yard improvements) located on-site were constructed before 1926 and may have the potential to include asbestos containing materials (ACM) and/or lead-based paint. Demolition of these structures may have the potential to result in harmful asbestos or lead emissions. Mitigation Measure AQ-5 has been identified to require full compliance with applicable regulatory requirements for removal and disposal of these toxic contaminants if present on-site, including notification of the SLOAPCD prior to demolition of existing utilities/improvements. Based on compliance with identified mitigation and existing regulations, potential impacts associated with other emissions would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

- d) Project development activities, such as building construction, utility trenching, and installation, would generate odors associated with equipment exhaust and fumes. The proposed activities would not differ significantly from those resulting from any other type of construction project. Any effects would be short term in nature and limited to the construction phase of the proposed project. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

AQ-1 During all construction activities and use of diesel vehicles, the applicant shall implement the following idling control techniques:

1. Idling Restrictions Near Sensitive Receptors for Both On- and Off-Road Equipment.
 - a. Staging and queuing areas shall not be located within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors if feasible;
 - b. Diesel idling within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors shall not be permitted;
 - c. Use of alternative fueled equipment shall be used whenever possible; and,
 - d. Signs that specify the no idling requirements shall be posted and enforced at the construction site.
2. California Diesel Idling Regulations. On-road diesel vehicles shall comply with Section 2485 of Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations. This regulation limits idling from diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles with gross vehicular weight ratings of more than 10,000 pounds and licensed for operation on highways. It applies to California and non-California based vehicles. In general, the regulation specifies that drivers of said vehicles:
 - a. Shall not idle the vehicle’s primary diesel engine for greater than 5 minutes at any location, except as noted in Subsection (d) of the regulation; and,
 - b. Shall not operate a diesel-fueled auxiliary power system (APS) to power a heater, air conditioner, or any ancillary equipment on that vehicle during sleeping or resting in a sleeper berth for greater than 5.0 minutes at any location when within 1,000 feet of a restricted area, except as noted in Subsection (d) of the regulation.

Signs must be posted in the designated queuing areas and job sites to remind drivers of the 5-minute idling limit. The specific requirements and exceptions in the regulation can be reviewed at the following website: www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/truck-idling/2485.pdf.

AQ-2 During all construction and ground-disturbing activities, the applicant shall implement the following particulate matter control measures and detail each measure on the project grading and building plans. In addition, 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, reduce visible emissions below the APCD’s limit of 20% opacity for no greater than 3 minutes in any 60 minute period. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the City Community Development Department prior to commencement of construction. 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.

- a. Reduce the amount of 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 SLOAPCD’s limit of 20% opacity for greater than 3 minutes in any 60-minute period. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed (non-potable) water should be used whenever possible.
- c. All dirt stockpile areas (if any) shall 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 shall be implemented as soon as possible, following completion of any soil-disturbing activities.
- e. Exposed grounds that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than 1 month after initial grading shall be sown with a fast germinating, non-invasive, grass seed and watered until vegetation is established.
- f. All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation shall be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the SLOAPCD.
- g. All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

<p>h. Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 miles per hour on any unpaved surface at the construction site.</p> <p>i. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials, are to be covered or shall maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with California Vehicle Code Section 23114.</p> <p>j. “Track Out” is defined as sand or soil that adheres to and/or agglomerates on the exterior surfaces of motor vehicles and/or equipment (including tires) that may then fall onto any highway or street as described in California Vehicle Code Section 23113 and California Water Code Section 13304. To prevent track out, designate access points and require all employees, subcontractors, and others to use them. Install and operate a “track-out prevention device” where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved streets. The track-out prevention device can be any device or combination of devices that are effective at preventing track out, located at the point of intersection of an unpaved area and a paved road. Rumble strips or steel plate devices need periodic cleaning to be effective. If paved roadways accumulate tracked out soils, the track-out prevention device may need to be modified;</p> <p>k. Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers shall be used with reclaimed water where feasible. Roads shall be pre-wetted prior to sweeping when feasible.</p> <p>l. All PM₁₀ mitigation measures required should be shown on grading and building plans.</p> <p>m. The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons whose responsibility is to ensure any fugitive dust emissions do not result in a nuisance and to enhance the implementation of the mitigation measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints and reduce visible emissions below the SLOAPCD’s limit of 20% opacity for greater than 3 minutes in any 60-minute period. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress (for example, wind-blown dust could be generated on an open dirt lot). The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SLOAPCD Compliance Division prior to the start of any grading, earthwork, or demolition (Contact Tim Fuhs at 805-781-5912).</p> <p>AQ-3 Prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities, the applicant shall retain a registered geologist to conduct a geologic evaluation of the property, including sampling and testing for NOA in full compliance with SLOAPCD requirements and the CARB ATCM for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations (17 CCR 93105). This geologic evaluation shall be submitted to the City Community Development Department upon completion. If the geologic evaluation determines that the project would not have the potential to disturb NOA, the applicant must file an Asbestos ATCM exemption request with the SLOAPCD.</p> <p>AQ-4 If NOA are determined to be present on-site, proposed earthwork, demolition, and construction activities shall be conducted in full compliance with the various regulatory jurisdictions regarding NOA, including the CARB ATCM for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations (17 CCR 93105) and requirements stipulated in the National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP; 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Section 61, Subpart M – Asbestos). These requirements include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Written notification, within at least 10 business days of activities commencing, to the SLOAPCD; b. Preparation of an asbestos survey conducted by a Certified Asbestos Consultant; and c. Implementation of applicable removal and disposal protocol and requirements for identified NOA. <p>AQ-5 Prior to initiation of demolition activities, the applicant shall implement the following measures to reduce the risk associated with disturbance of ACM and lead-coated materials that may be present within the existing structures onsite:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Demolition of the on-site structures shall comply with the procedures required by the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (40 CFR 61, Subpart M – Asbestos) for the control of asbestos emissions during demolition activities. SLOAPCD is the delegated authority by the U.S. EPA to implement the Federal Asbestos NESHAP. Prior to demolition of on-site structures, SLOAPCD shall be notified, per 					
---	--	--	--	--	--

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

NESHAP requirements. The project applicant shall submit proof that SLOAPCD has been notified prior to demolition activities to the City Community Development Department.

- b. If during the demolition of the existing structures, paint is separated from the construction materials (e.g., chemically or physically), the paint waste shall be evaluated independently from the building material by a qualified hazardous materials inspector to determine its proper management. All hazardous materials shall be handled and disposed of in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations. According to the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), if the paint is not removed from the building material during demolition (and is not chipping or peeling), the material can be disposed of as non-hazardous construction debris. The landfill operator shall be contacted prior to disposal of lead-based paint materials. If required, all lead work plans shall be submitted to SLOAPCD at least 10 days prior to the start of demolition. The applicant shall submit proof that paint waste has been evaluated by a qualified hazardous waste materials inspector and handled according to their recommendation to the City Community Development Department.

Conclusion

With implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-5, residual impacts associated with air quality would be less than significant.

4. 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?	1, 4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	1, 4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	1, 4, 17	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	1, 4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	1, 7, 16	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	1, 18	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The project site is located in an urbanized area within downtown San Luis Obispo and is surrounded by residential and office uses. The project site currently consists of five single-family residences with several street trees located along the frontage of Peach Street and Toro Street, and several trees scattered throughout the parcel. The nearest water feature to the project site is San Luis Obispo Creek, located approximately 0.3 mile to the southeast.

The city of San Luis Obispo is generally surrounded by open rangeland used for grazing and other agricultural uses and open space areas that support a variety of natural habitats and plant communities. The city's many creeks provide sheltered corridors that allow local wildlife to move between habitats and open space areas. The City COSE identifies various goals and policies to maintain, enhance, and protect natural communities within the City planning area. These policies include, but are not limited to, protection of listed species and species of special concern, preservation of existing wildlife corridors, protection of significant trees, and maintenance of development setbacks from creeks.

The City's Tree Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 12.24) was adopted in 2010 and recently updated in 2019 with the purpose of establishing a comprehensive program for installing, maintaining, and preserving trees within the city. This ordinance includes policies that encourage preservation of trees whenever possible and feasible, detail the procedure and requirements for acquisition of a permit for tree removal within the city, and identify application requirements for tree removals associated with development permits. The City has also established a Heritage Tree Program which protects Heritage trees throughout the city designated by the Tree Committee and City Council. Based on the City's GIS Division Heritage Trees map, no heritage trees are located within the project site.

- a) The project would allow for the development of five new single-family residences within the project site, consistent with adjacent areas. The project is located in downtown San Luis Obispo and surrounded by moderately dense residential and office uses. Due to the level of existing development, frequent human activity, regular vehicle noise, lighting, and developed nature of the area, the project site does not contain suitable habitat for sensitive plant or wildlife species. Therefore, impacts to special-status plants and wildlife would be *less than significant*.
- b) There are no mapped blue line creeks and no riparian vegetation or other sensitive natural communities within or immediately adjacent to the proposed area of disturbance. The project is located approximately 0.3 mile from the nearest creek and associated riparian habitat and would not result in any direct or indirect impacts to this habitat. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities and *no impact* would occur.
- c) Based on the National Wetlands Inventory Map, the project site does not support state or federal wetlands or other potentially jurisdictional water features. Therefore, the project would not result in an adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands and *no impacts* would occur.
- d) The project is not located within an area designated as a wildlife corridor within the COSE. The project site does not contain habitat features conducive to migratory wildlife species such as riparian corridors or ridgelines. Project development would result in the removal of mature trees, several of which are larger than 12 inches in diameter at standard height (DSH). Bird species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) may have the potential to pass through the area and nest in trees on the project site. While in an urban environment, mature trees have the potential to support nesting habitat for birds. If project construction activities are conducted between February and September, they could result in direct and indirect impacts to nesting birds, if present. The removal of trees and construction activity proximate to nests may result in abandonment of eggs and potential avian harm or mortality, resulting in a potentially significant impact. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is included to minimize potential impacts to nesting migratory birds during construction. With implementation of BIO-1, the project would not interfere with the movement of resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or wildlife nursery sites and impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.
- e) The project site does not contain any heritage trees or native vegetation. The proposed subdivision and subsequent development of five single-family residences would result in the removal of up to five mature trees. The project would add six new street trees (four dwarf southern magnolias and two mayten trees) to be located along the Peach Street and Toro Street property frontages, which would compensate for the tree removals. The project would not adversely affect sensitive habitats or resources identified in the COSE or impact any heritage trees designated by the Heritage Tree Program. The proposed area of disturbance does not support sensitive resources that are protected by local policies and

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

plans. Therefore, the project would not result in a conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources and impacts would be *less than significant*.

- f) The project is not located within an area under an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted plan and *no impacts* would occur.

Mitigation Measures

BIO-1 If feasible, tree removal shall be scheduled to occur from September 16 to January 31, outside of the typical nesting bird season, to avoid potential impacts to nesting birds. If tree removal or other construction activities are proposed during the nesting season (February 1 through September 15), prior to any ground disturbing activity, surveys for active nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within one week prior to the start of activities. If nesting birds are located on or near the proposed project site, they shall be avoided until they have successfully fledged or the nest is no longer deemed active. A non-disturbance buffer of 50 feet will be placed around non-listed, passerine species, and a 250-foot buffer will be implemented for raptor species. All activity will remain outside of that buffer until a qualified biologist has determined that the young have fledged or that proposed construction activities would not cause adverse impacts to the nest, adults, eggs, or young. If special-status avian species are identified, no work shall be conducted until an appropriate buffer is determined in consultation with the City and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and/or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Conclusion

Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is included to minimize potential impacts to nesting migratory birds during construction. No other potentially significant impacts were identified. Therefore, with implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1, project impacts to biological resources would be less than significant.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource pursuant to §15064.5?	3, 19, 20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	4, 61	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	4, 61	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation

Pre-Historic Setting

Archaeological evidence demonstrates that Native American groups (including the Chumash) have occupied the Central Coast for at least 10,000 years. San Luis Obispo is located within an area historically occupied by the Obispeño Chumash, the northernmost of the Chumash people of California. The earliest evidence of human occupation in the region comes from archaeological sites along the coast. The project site is located within a Burial Sensitivity Area as identified in Figure 1 of the COSE.

Historic Setting

The City COSE establishes various goals and policies to balance cultural and historical resource preservation with other community goals. These policies include, but are not limited to the following:

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- Identification, preservation, and rehabilitation of significant historic and architectural resources;
- Prevention of demolition of historically or architecturally significant buildings unless doing so is necessary to remove a threat to health and safety;
- Consistency in the design of new buildings in historical districts to reflect the form, spacing and materials of nearby historic structures; and
- Identification and protection of neighborhoods or districts having historical character due to the collective effect of Contributing or Master List historic properties.

The City Historic Preservation Ordinance (SLOMOC14.01) was adopted in 2010 for the purpose of promoting the public health, safety and welfare through the identification, protection, enhancement and preservation of those properties, structures, sites, artifacts and other cultural resources that represent distinctive elements of San Luis Obispo’s cultural, educational, social, economic, political and architectural history. This ordinance includes the responsibilities of the Cultural Heritage Committee (CHC), which is responsible for reviewing and providing recommendations to City Council regarding certain projects associated with historic districts and/or resources. The ordinance establishes the City’s historical designations “Master List”, “Contributing List Resources or Properties”, and “Non-contributing Properties”, and references the use of the Secretary of Interior Standards, Historic Preservation Program Guidelines, and Archaeological Resource Preservation Program Guidelines for projects that involve new development in Historic Districts and the modification, demolition or relocation of structures included on the Inventory of Historic Resources.

The project site is located within the Mill Street Historic District Preservation Overlay Zone (C-D-H). The Mill Street Historic District is one of five historic districts in the city which also include Old Town, Chinatown, Downtown, and the Railroad Historic District. The Mill Street Historic District was developed at the turn of the 20th century, with the majority of the existing buildings dating from the 1900s to 1920s, the district’s primary period of historical and architectural significance. Architectural styles in the Mill Street district include examples of Neo-classic Row House, Victorian (with elements of Gothic Revival, Queen Anne, Stick and Eastern Shingle), Tudor Revival, Mission Revival, and Craftsman Bungalow, with many homes borrowing architectural details from more than one style.

The parcel is currently occupied by five single-family residences constructed between 1906 and 1925. All five of the existing residences on-site are listed as contributing resources to the Mill Street Historic District. The proposed project would construct five new two-story, single-family residences (each with a double garage below the main living area) on the project site. The City’s Historic Preservation Program Guidelines provide guidance for construction within historic districts and on properties with historic resources, alterations to historic resources, and reconstruction of historic resources.

Characteristics of houses defining the Mill Street Historic District include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Houses set back from the street;
- Either no garage or later-built garages, generally small, detached, and set behind or beside the house;
- Either no driveway or Hollywood driveways of two parallel concrete strips;
- Raised foundation, requiring several steps leading from street to the front door; and
- Recessed and sheltered usable front porches that are a focal point in design.

The project would not demolish, relocate, or alter the existing one-story residences, but would provide additional rear access and parking, permeable paving patios, utility improvements, and landscaping improvements at these existing residences.

- a) The project is subject to the City of San Luis Obispo Historic Preservation Guidelines. The intent of the Guidelines is to ensure that new structures “shall be designed to be architecturally compatible” with the prevailing historic character. A Historic Preservation Report was prepared by SWCA for the project and concluded that none of the project’s proposed design features, either individually or collectively, would constitute an effect that would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource – in this instance defined as any or all of the adjacent contributing properties to the Mill Street Historic District or the Mill Street Historic District as a whole. Similarly, none of the

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

project’s proposed design features, either individually or collectively, would cause substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource (as defined above) such that that the significance of the historical resource would be materially impaired (14 CCR § 15064.5[b][1]). Therefore, the Historic Preservation Report concluded that the proposed development would not cause the project to have a significant effect on the environment as defined under CEQA (14 CCR § 15064.5[b]). Potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

- b) The project site is located in a Burial Sensitivity Area per the City’s COSE. A Cultural Resources Survey of the Peach and Toro Project was prepared for the project in March 2020, which included review of archival records and archaeological site records, a records search at the Central Coast Information Center (CCIC), and an intensive survey of the project site. The records search identified no cultural resources recorded within the project site. The field investigation and survey identified no prehistoric materials or resources within the project site. The Cultural Resources Survey concluded that the potential for intact archaeological resources to exist on the project site is low. In the unlikely event that buried cultural materials are encountered during construction, all ground disturbances will cease until a qualified archaeologist is contacted to evaluate the nature, integrity, and significance of the deposit (refer to mitigation measures CR-1 through CR-3, below).

Therefore, impacts related to a substantial adverse change in the significance of archaeological resources would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

- c) No human remains are known to exist within the project site; however, the discovery of unknown human remains is a possibility during ground-disturbing activities. Protocol for properly responding to the inadvertent discovery of human remains is identified in the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and is detailed in Mitigation Measure CR-3. Potential impacts related to disturbance of human remains would be less than significant with incorporation of Mitigation Measure CR-3. Therefore, impacts related to disturbance of human remains would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

Mitigation Measures

CR-1 Cultural Resource Awareness Training. Prior to construction activities, a qualified archaeologist shall conduct a cultural resource awareness training for all construction personnel including the following:

- a. Review the types of archaeological artifacts that may be uncovered;
- b. Provide examples of common archaeological artifacts to examine;
- c. Review what makes an archaeological resource significant to archaeologists and local native Americans;
- d. Describe procedures for notifying involved or interested parties in case of a new discovery;
- e. Describe reporting requirements and responsibilities of construction personnel;
- f. Review procedures that shall be used to record, evaluate, and mitigate new discoveries; and
- g. Describe procedures that would be followed in the case of discovery of disturbed as well as intact human burials and burial-associated artifacts.

CR-2 If cultural resources are encountered during subsurface earthwork activities, all ground disturbing activities within a 25-foot radius of the find shall cease and the City shall be notified immediately. Work shall not continue until a City-qualified archaeologist assesses the find and determines the need for further study. If the find includes Native American affiliated materials, a local Native American tribal representative will be contacted to work in conjunction with the City-approved archaeologist to determine the need for further study. A standard inadvertent discovery clause shall be included in every grading and construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously unidentified resources found during construction shall be recorded on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria by a qualified archaeologist.

If the resource is determined significant under CEQA, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan, in conjunction with locally affiliated Native American representative(s)

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

as necessary, that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant. The archaeologist shall also perform appropriate technical analysis, prepare a comprehensive report, and file it with the Central Coast Information Center (CCIC), located at the University of California, Santa Barbara, and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered materials.

CR-3 In the event that human remains are exposed during earth disturbing activities associated with the project, an immediate halt work order shall be issued and the Community Development Director and locally affiliated Native American representative(s) (as necessary) shall be notified. State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. These requirements shall be printed on all building and grading plans.

Conclusion

With implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1 through CR-3, residual impacts associated with cultural resources would be less than significant.

6. ENERGY

Would the project:					
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	21, 23, 24	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	21, 22, 23, 24	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation

Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) has historically been the primary electricity provider for the City. In October 2018, the City Council committed to joining the Monterey Bay Community Power (MBCP) and beginning in January 2020, MBCP is the City’s primary electricity provider. MBCP provides 100% carbon-free electricity.

The California Building Code (CBC) contains standards that regulate the method of use, properties, performance, or types of materials used in the construction, alteration, improvement, repair, or rehabilitation of a building or other improvement to real property. The CBC includes mandatory green building standards for residential and nonresidential structures, the most recent version of which are referred to as the *2019 Building Energy Efficiency Standards*. These standards focus on four key areas: smart residential photovoltaic systems, updated thermal envelope standards (preventing heat transfer from the interior to the exterior and vice versa), residential and nonresidential ventilation requirements, and nonresidential lighting requirements.

The City is currently developing local amendments to the 2019 California Building Code (CBC) to encourage all-electric new buildings. When paired with Monterey Bay Community Power's carbon free electricity supply, all electric new buildings are carbon free and avoid health and safety issues associated with fossil fuels and GHGs. At its meeting on Tuesday, September 3, 2019, the City Council introduced the Clean Energy Choice Program; the City Council has yet to adopt the ordinance. Unlike some cities that are banning natural gas entirely, the proposed Clean Energy Choice Program will provide options to people who want to develop new buildings with natural gas. New projects wishing to use natural gas will be required to build more efficient and higher performing buildings and offset natural gas use by performing retrofits on existing buildings or by paying an in-lieu fee that will be used for the same purpose.

The City COSE establishes goals and policies to achieve energy conservation and increase use of cleaner, renewable, and locally controlled energy sources. These goals include increasing the use of sustainable energy sources and reducing reliance on non-

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

sustainable energy sources to the extent possible and encouraging the provision for and protection of solar access. Policies identified to achieve these goals include, but are not limited to, use of best available practices in energy conservation, procurement, use and production; energy-efficiency improvements; pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly facility design; fostering alternative transportation modes; compact, high-density housing; and solar access standards.

The City Climate Action Plan also identifies strategies and policies to increase use of cleaner and renewable energy resources in order to achieve the City’s GHG emissions reduction target. These strategies include promoting a wide range of renewable energy financing options, incentivizing renewable energy generation in new and existing developments, and increasing community awareness of renewable energy programs. The City’s CAP is currently being updated.

a) During construction, fossil fuels, electricity, and natural gas would be used by construction vehicles and equipment. The energy consumed during construction would be temporary in nature and would be typical of other similar construction activities in the city. State and federal regulations in place require fuel-efficient equipment and vehicles and prohibit wasteful activities, such as diesel idling; therefore, potential impacts associated with construction energy use would be *less than significant*.

The project would result in an overall increase in consumption of energy resources associated with vehicle trips and electricity and natural gas usage by project occupants. The project would be designed in full compliance with the CBC, including applicable green building standards, ensuring a high standard for energy efficiency in building design, materials, light fixtures, and appliances. The project would rely on the local electricity service provider, MBCP, to supply project electricity needs. MBCP provides 100 percent carbon-free electricity. Compliance with existing building codes would ensure the project would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. Through use of 100% greenhouse gas (GHG) free electricity resources, project energy use would not result in a significant environmental impact; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

b) The project would be designed in full compliance with the CBC, including applicable green building standards. The project would be consistent with energy goals and policies in the COSE associated with use of best available practices in energy conservation. The project would be consistent with other goals and policies set forth in the City’s Climate Action Plan associated with renewable energy or energy efficiency, including the provision of compact, high-density housing. Therefore, the project would not result in a conflict with, or obstruction of, a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, and impacts would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

None necessary.

Conclusion

The project has been located and designed in full compliance with applicable energy efficiency standards, and would not conflict with state or local plans for renewable energy or energy efficiency. No potentially significant impacts related to energy would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Would the project:	
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:	

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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.	14, 25, 26	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	14,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	1, 26, 28	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	14, 29	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2013), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	14, 29	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	1, 29, 30	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation

The City's General Plan Safety Element identifies active, potentially active, and inactive mapped and inferred faults with the potential to affect the city in the event of rupture. The Los Osos Fault, adjacent to San Luis Obispo, is identified under the State of California Alquist-Priolo Fault Hazards Act and is classified as active. The West Huasna, Oceanic, and Edna faults are considered potentially active and present a moderate fault rupture hazard to developments near them. The San Andreas Fault and the offshore Hosgri Fault, which present the most likely source of ground shaking for San Luis Obispo, have a high probability of producing a major earthquake within an average lifespan. The highest risk of ground shaking is found on deep soils that were deposited by water, are geologically recent, and have many pore spaces among the soil grains. These soils are typically in valleys.

Faults capable of producing strong ground-shaking motion in San Luis Obispo include the Los Osos, Point San Luis, Black Mountain, Rinconada, Wilmar, Pecho, Hosgri, La Panza, and San Andreas faults. Engineering standards and building codes set minimum design and construction methods for structures to resist seismic shaking. Based on the DOC Fault Activity Map and the Safety Element Earthquake Faults – Local Area map, the project site is not located within or in the immediate vicinity of an active fault zone.

The project site is underlain by one soil unit, as described below, based on the San Luis Obispo County Soil Survey:

162. Los Osos-Diablo Complex, 5-9% slopes. This complex is about 35% Los Osos soil and 30% Diablo soil. The Los Osos soil is moderately deep and well-drained. Permeability is slow and the available water capacity is low to medium. Surface runoff is medium and the hazard of water erosion is moderate. The Diablo soil is deep and well drained. Permeability is slow and the available water capacity is moderate to very high. Surface runoff is medium and the hazard of water erosion is slight. This soil has high shrink-swell potential. The main limitations for these soils for urban development are high shrink-swell potential, low strength and slow permeability. These soils are hard to pack. These limitations can require special design considerations for urban development and most other engineering practices.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

<p>A geotechnical investigation report was prepared by Pacific Coast Testing, Inc. to evaluate the subsurface conditions at the project site. The geotechnical investigation identified sandy clays with medium to high expansivity to a depth of 4 to 5 feet with Franciscan bedrock below.</p> <p>a.i) Based on Figure 3 (Earthquake Faults – Local Area) of the Safety Element and the DOC Fault Activity Map of California, no known fault lines are mapped on or within 0.5 mile of the project site. Therefore, the project would not have the potential to result in substantial adverse effects involving rupture of a known earthquake fault and impacts would be <i>less than significant</i>.</p> <p>a.ii) Due to the highly seismic nature of the region, potential future development on the project site would very likely be subject to strong seismic ground shaking at some point(s) during the life of the project. The geotechnical investigation identified a peak ground acceleration for the project site of 0.461 gravity (2% probability in 50 years) which would produce severe perceived ground shaking with moderate to heavy potential damage. Development of the five additional single-family residences onsite would be required to be designed in full compliance with seismic design criteria established in the CBC to adequately withstand and minimize the risk associated with the level of seismic ground shaking expected to occur in the project region. The geotechnical investigation included recommendations to minimize seismic risks. Development would be designed in full compliance with seismic design criteria established in the CBC and would adhere to the recommendations in the geotechnical report; therefore, impacts associated with strong seismic groundshaking would be <i>less than significant</i>.</p> <p>a.iii) The geotechnical report included an evaluation of on-site soils and potential soil limitations, including expansive soils and liquefaction. Due to the soil density, the presence of clayey soils, and the shallow depth to bedrock, the potential for liquefaction at the site is low.</p> <p>In accordance with CBC Chapter 18, any geologic issues identified in the report would be addressed through standard site construction techniques, as required by the CBC. Potential future development on the project site would be required to be designed in compliance with standard seismic design criteria established in the CBC to reduce risk associated with seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. In addition, the project would be designed in accordance with all recommendations of the geotechnical report. Therefore, impacts related to substantial adverse effects due to seismic-related ground failure would be <i>less than significant</i>.</p> <p>a.iv) The project site is essentially flat. Based on the Ground Shaking and Landslide Hazards Map in the City Safety Element, the project site is located within an area with low landslide potential. Therefore, the project would not result in significant adverse effects associated with landslides and <i>no impacts</i> would occur.</p> <p>b) The project is located within a developed infill site and does not include substantial vegetation removal. No substantial permanent changes in existing topography or total area of exposed soil would occur. The project would require surface grading and deeper cuts for foundation and utility installation. Grading permits are required for projects, excavations, or fills exceeding 50 cubic yards in volume and require implementation of standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure substantial erosion, siltation, and/or sedimentation are avoided. Therefore, compliance with existing regulation and BMPs would reduce potential impacts related to soil erosion and loss of topsoil to <i>less than significant</i>.</p> <p>c) The Geotechnical Report prepared for the project site identified expansivity of the on-site soils as the primary soils engineering concern. The report identified little or no potential for landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse. Project construction would follow the recommendations of the Geotechnical Report and would be required to be designed in compliance with standard seismic design criteria established in the CBC to reduce risk associated with seismic-related ground failure. Construction would also be required to comply with CBC seismic requirements to address potential seismic-related ground failure. Therefore, potential impacts would be <i>less than significant</i>.</p> <p>d) Based on the Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, the project site is located in an area underlain by soils with moderate-to-high shrink-swell potential. Based on the 2019 Geotechnical Report, soil expansivity is a primary concern at the project site. Soil borings conducted in 2019 indicated that the upper sandy clay onsite met the criteria to be classified in the “high” expansion category, per CBC Table 18-I-B. The volume changes that soils undergo in this</p>

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

cyclical pattern can stress and damage slabs and foundations. Review of a soils report prepared by a qualified engineer is required upon review of the building permit to address the nature of the subsurface soils in accordance with CBC Chapter 18. Any issues identified in the report will be addressed through standard site construction techniques, as required by the Code, and/or through compliance with the recommendations of the project's Geotechnical Report. Typical precautionary measures would likely include premoistening the underlying soil in conjunction with placement of non-expansive material beneath slabs, and a deepened and more heavily reinforced foundation. In addition, the project would be required to be designed in compliance with standard seismic design criteria established in the CBC to reduce risk associated with ground failure, including from expansive soils. Therefore, based on compliance with existing regulations, impacts related to expansive soils would be *less than significant*.

- e) The project would include a new connection to the City sewer system. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater treatment systems are proposed onsite. Therefore, *no impacts* would occur.
- f) The project site is underlain by Franciscan Assemblage composed of a mélange of claystone, graywacke, and blocks of other Franciscan rocks of the Mesozoic era. The Franciscan Assemblage consists of various types of rocks that formed along the Pacific Oceanic and North American Plates; these rocks were subsequently deformed and metamorphosed during subduction of the Pacific Oceanic Plate. Various authors have reported the presence of marine invertebrates in the Franciscan Assemblage throughout California (e.g., Bailey et al. 1964); however, marine invertebrate fossil specimens are generally common, well developed, and well documented. They would generally not be considered a unique paleontological resource. Because of the nature of this rock assemblage (e.g., vertebrate fossils in the original parent material generally would have been destroyed during the subduction and metamorphosis process) and the general lack of previously recorded vertebrate fossil localities, this formation is considered to have a low paleontological sensitivity.

There are no known paleontological resources on the project site and there are no unique geologic features on the property. Grading and excavation is proposed for residential foundations to remove expansive soils. Based on the low sensitivity of the underlying geologic unit and the lack of proposed activities that would result in significant cuts into bedrock, the project would not have the potential to result in impacts to a unique paleontological resource or unique geologic feature; therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

None necessary.

Conclusion

Based on the location of the project site and underlying geologic and soil properties, and compliance with existing regulations and recommendations of the required Geotechnical Investigation prepared for the project, potential impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Would the project:					
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	1, 11	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	10, 12, 23	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Evaluation</u>					

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

GHGs are any gases that absorb infrared radiation in the atmosphere and are different from the criteria pollutants discussed in Section 3, Air Quality, above. The primary GHGs that are emitted into the atmosphere as a result of human activities are carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), and fluorinated gases. In 2012, the City established a Climate Action Plan that identified measures and implementation strategies in order to achieve the City’s GHG reduction target of 1990 emission levels by 2020. The City’s Climate Action Plan is currently being updated. In addition, the City is currently developing a plan for achieving carbon neutrality by 2035. The City’s 2016 Community Wide GHG Emissions Inventory showed that 50% of the city’s GHG emissions came from transportation, 22% came from commercial and industrial uses, 21% came from residential uses, and 7% from waste.

Statewide legislation, rules, and regulations have been adopted to reduce GHG emissions from significant sources. Senate Bill (SB) 32 and Executive Order (EO) S-3-05 extended the state’s GHG reduction goals and required the CARB to regulate sources of GHGs to meet a state goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, 40% below 1990 levels by 2030, and 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. Other statewide policies adopted to reduce GHG emissions include Assembly Bill (AB) 32, SB 375, SB 97, Clean Car Standards, Low Carbon Fuel Standard, Renewable Portfolio Standard, CBC, and the California Solar Initiative.

Plans, policies, and guidelines have also been established at the regional and local levels to address GHG emissions and climate change effects within the city. In March 2012, the SLOAPCD approved thresholds for GHG emission impacts, and these thresholds have been incorporated into the CEQA Air Quality Handbook and updated in 2017 with a clarification memorandum. The Bright-Line Threshold of 1,150 Metric Tons of CO₂/year (MTCO₂e/yr) is the most applicable GHG threshold for most projects. Table 1-1 in the SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook (updated November 2017) provides a list of general land uses and the estimated sizes or capacities of those uses expected to exceed the GHG Bright Line Threshold of 1,150 MTCO₂/yr. Projects that exceed the criteria or are within 10% of exceeding the criteria presented in Table 1-1 are required to conduct a more detailed analysis of air quality impacts. It is important to note the Bright-Line Threshold of 1,150 MT CO₂/year was developed to meet the state goal of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020; however, construction and operation of the project would occur well beyond 2020. Therefore, the project would be subject to the SB 32-based targets for 2030, which are 40% below the AB 32-based 2020 targets. The SLOAPCD’s GHG thresholds have not been updated to comply with SB 32 and the more recent, more stringent GHG reduction goals; therefore, the Bright Line Threshold and SLOAPCD screening thresholds are included for informational purposes only.

a) Construction-related activities that would generate GHG emissions include worker trips and hauling trips to and from the project site, and off-road construction equipment (i.e. dozers, loaders, excavators). As discussed in Section 3. Air Quality, project emissions during construction activities would not exceed SLOAPCD’s construction emissions thresholds. In addition, impacts related to GHG emissions occur on a global scale and are, therefore, cumulative in nature. Short-term construction-related emissions rarely result in a considerable contribution to GHG emissions. The project would be well below the thresholds established in Table 1-1 of the SLOAPCD’s CEQA Handbook for operational GHG emissions. Therefore, the project would not exceed the operational thresholds established by the SLOAPCD for GHG emissions. The project would rely on the local electricity service provider, MBCP, to supply project electricity needs, which supplies energy from 100% GHG-free sources.

The proposed development proposes infill development and is located in close proximity to local public transit facilities and bicycle infrastructure, increasing the ability for future occupants to replace vehicle trips with alternative modes of transportation, further reducing its overall GHG emissions. The project is also consistent with CARB’S 2017 Scoping Plan, which describes local planning efforts that can further reduce GHG reduction goals, including through developing land use plans with more efficient development patterns that bring people and destinations closer together in more mixed-use, compact communities that facilitate walking, biking, and use of transit. Therefore, the project would not generate substantial GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that would have a significant impact on the environment, and potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

b) As discussed in threshold a) above, the project would not exceed any of the operational thresholds established by the SLOAPCD for GHG emissions. The project would be consistent with the land use policies identified in the SLOAPCD CAP that encourage cities to develop at higher densities and encourage growth within their respective urban reserve lines to reduce overall vehicle trips and travel distances. The project would be consistent with policies established in CARB’s 2017 Scoping Plan and the City’s CAP promoting infill development. The project would not conflict with or

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

obstruct implementation of a plan or policy adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

None necessary.

Conclusion

The project would be located and designed to minimize GHG emissions and would not result in a conflict with an applicable plan or policy adopted for reducing GHG emissions. No potentially significant impacts associated with GHG emissions have been identified and no mitigation measures are necessary.

9. 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?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	1, 13	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	32, 33	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	35	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Site (Cortese) List is a resource used by the state, local agencies, and developers to comply with CEQA requirements related to the disclosure of information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. California Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency (Cal/EPA) to develop, at least annually, an updated Cortese List. Various state and local government agencies are required to track and document

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

hazardous material release information for the Cortese List. The California Department of Toxic Substance Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database tracks DTSC cleanup, permitting, enforcement, and investigation efforts at hazardous waste facilities and sites with known contamination, such as federal superfund sites, state response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, school cleanup sites, school investigation sites, and military evaluation sites. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) GeoTracker database contains records for sites that impact, or have the potential to impact, water in California, such as Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) sites, Department of Defense sites, and Cleanup Program Sites. The remaining data regarding facilities or sites identified as meeting the “Cortese List” requirements can be located on the Cal/EPA website: <https://calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/>.

Based on a review of the SWRCB Geotracker database and the DTSC EnviroStor database, there are no active hazardous waste cleanup sites within the project site. The closest cleanup site is located immediately south of the project site; the closed cleanup site has been remediated and closed since 2002.

Based on the Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) for the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport, the project site is not located within the Airport Land Use Planning Area or noise contours.

- a) The project does not propose the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous substances. Any potentially hazardous substances used within the project site during construction or buildout conditions (e.g., cleaners, solvents, oils, paints, etc.) would be transported, stored, and used according to regulatory requirements and existing procedures for the handling of hazardous materials. Therefore, project impacts associated with the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous substances would be *less than significant*.
- b) The project does not propose the routine handling or use of hazardous materials or volatile substances that would result in a significant risk of upset or accidental release conditions. Demolition and construction activities associated with the proposed project are anticipated to require use of limited quantities of hazardous substances, including gasoline, diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid, solvents, oils, and paints.

The project includes demolition of existing infrastructure on the property that could contain asbestos and lead (e.g., through driveway modifications, utility line replacement, etc.). Asbestos, a naturally occurring fibrous material, was used as a fireproofing and insulating agent in building construction before being banned by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in the 1970s. Because it was widely used prior to discovery of its negative health effects, asbestos can be found in a variety of building materials and components including sprayed-on acoustic ceiling materials, thermal insulation, wall and ceiling texture, floor tiles, and pipe insulation. Asbestos is classified into two main categories: friable and non-friable. Friable asbestos can release asbestos fibers easily when disturbed and is considered Regulated Asbestos-Containing Material (RACM). Friable (easily crumbled) materials are particularly hazardous because inhalation of airborne fibers is the primary mode of asbestos entry into the body, which potentially causes lung cancer and asbestosis. Non-friable asbestos will release fibers less readily than RACM and is referred to as Category I or Category II, non-friable. Non-friable asbestos and encapsulated friable asbestos do not pose substantial health risks. The California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (Cal/OSHA) considers asbestos containing building materials (ACBM) to be hazardous when a sample contains more than 0.1 percent asbestos by weight; Cal/OSHA requires it to be handled by a licensed, qualified contractor.

Lead can be found in paint, water pipes, plumbing solder, and in soils around buildings and structures with lead-based paint. In 1978, the federal government required the reduction of lead in house paint to less than 0.06 percent (600 parts per million [ppm]). However, some paints manufactured after 1978 for industrial uses or marine uses legally contain more than 0.06 percent lead. Exposure to lead can result in bioaccumulation of lead in the blood, soft tissues, and bones. Children are particularly susceptible to potential lead-related health problems because lead is easily absorbed into developing systems and organs.

Prior to any building demolition, CCR Title 8 Section 5208 requires that a state-certified risk assessor conduct a risk assessment and/or paint inspection of all structures constructed prior to 1978 for the presence of asbestos. If such hazards are determined to exist onsite, the risk assessor would prepare a site-specific hazard control plan detailing ACBM removal methods and specific instructions for providing protective clothing and gear for abatement personnel. If

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

necessary, the project sponsor would be required to retain a state certified ACBM removal contractor (independent of the risk assessor) to conduct the appropriate abatement measures as required by the plan. Wastes from abatement and demolition activities would be disposed of at a landfill(s) licensed to accept such waste. Once all abatement measures have been implemented, the risk assessor would conduct a clearance examination and provide written documentation to the City that testing, and abatement have been completed in accordance with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

Several regulations and guidelines pertain to abatement of and protection from exposure to lead-based paint. These include Construction Safety Order 1532.1 from Title 8 of the CCR and lead-based paint exposure guidelines provided by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). In California, lead-based paint abatement must be performed and monitored by contractors with appropriate certification from the California Department of Health Services. Compliance with existing regulations would ensure impacts related to hazardous materials exposure would be less than significant.

The project would be subject to the City’s Municipal Code requirements associated with Demolition and Moving of Buildings public safety standards. These standards include general requirements for building demolition activities, permitting for such activities, and includes subsections for dust and debris management, fire safety, and removal and disposal of demolition materials. Construction contractors would be required to comply with applicable federal and state environmental and workplace safety laws for the handling of hazardous materials, including the Federal OSHA Process Safety Management Standard (California Code of Regulations 29.1910.119), which includes requirements for preventing and minimizing the consequences of accidental release of hazardous materials. In addition, Mitigation Measures AQ-3, AQ-4 and AQ-5 have been identified to require full compliance with applicable regulatory requirements for removal and disposal of toxic contaminants if present on-site, including notification of the SLOAPCD prior to demolition of the existing structure. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

- c) The project site is located approximately 0.36 mile from the nearest school facility, Mission College Preparatory Catholic High School, located at 761 Broad Street. The project site is not located within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school facility. Therefore, *no impacts* would occur.
- d) Based on a search of the DTSC EnviroStar database, the SWRCB Geotracker database, and Cal/EPA’s Cortese List website, there are no hazardous waste cleanup sites within the project site. The closest cleanup site is located immediately south of the project site and has been remediated and closed since 2002. There are no active hazardous waste cleanup sites within the project site or within close proximity to the project site. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.
- e) The project site is located approximately 2.9 miles north of the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport. Based on the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport ALUP, the project is not located within the airport Land Use Planning Area or noise contours. Therefore, *no impacts* would occur.
- f) The project could result in periodic temporary lane closures along Toro Street during the construction phase. No road closures are anticipated and the project would provide alternative detour routes through the project vicinity. Due to the project site location, there are multiple detours available within 500 feet of proposed construction activities. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant temporary or permanent impact on any adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. Any construction-related detours would include proper signage and notification and would be short-term and limited in nature and duration. For further discussion on potential impacts to transportation, see Section 17. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.
- g) The project is not located within or adjacent to a wildland area. The project would be required to comply with all applicable fire safety rules and regulations including the California Fire Code and Public Resources Code prior to issuance of building permits; therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Implement Mitigation Measures AQ-3, AQ-4, and AQ-5.

Conclusion

The project does not propose the routine transport, use, handling, or disposal of hazardous substances. It is not located within proximity to any known open contaminated sites, schools, or airports. Impacts related to the potential release of asbestos or lead would be mitigated with implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-3, AQ-4 and AQ-5. Project implementation would not subject people or structures to substantial risks associated with wildland fires and would not impair implementation or interfere with any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. Implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-3, AQ-4 and AQ-5 would ensure potential impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant and no further mitigation is necessary.

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	37, 43	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	39, 40, 41	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:					
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site;	1, 37	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	1, 37	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	1, 37	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	1, 38	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	38, 42	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	37, 39, 41, 43	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation

The project site is located within the San Luis Obispo Creek watershed. The San Luis Obispo Creek watershed is an approximately 53,271-acre coastal basin in southern San Luis Obispo County. It rises to an elevation of about 2,500 feet above sea level in the Santa Lucia Range. San Luis Obispo Creek flows to the Pacific Ocean and has six major tributary basins: Stenner Creek, Prefumo Creek, Laguna Lake, East Branch San Luis Obispo Creek, Davenport Creek, and See Canyon. The creek flows through the city of San Luis Obispo and empties into the Pacific Ocean just west of Avila Beach.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The City is enrolled in the State General Permit National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program governing stormwater. As part of this enrollment, the City is required to implement the Post-Construction Stormwater Management requirements adopted by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) through the development review process. The primary objective of these post-construction requirements is to ensure that the permittee is reducing pollutant discharges to the Maximum Extent Practicable and preventing stormwater discharges from causing or contributing to a violation of receiving water quality standards in all applicable development projects that require approvals and/or permits issued.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year flood zone identifies areas that would be subject to inundation in a 100-year storm event, or a storm with a 1% chance of occurring in any given year. Based on FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) Viewer, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone.

In 2015, the state legislature approved the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). SGMA requires governments and water agencies of high- and medium-priority basins to halt overdraft and bring groundwater basins into balanced levels of pumping and recharge. Under SGMA, these basins should reach sustainability within 20 years of implementing their sustainability plans. The project is located within the San Luis Obispo Valley Groundwater Basin, which has been designated by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) as a high-priority basin. The County of San Luis Obispo (County) and the City formed Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSAs) within their respective jurisdictions to ensure full compliance with SGMA throughout the entire San Luis Obispo Valley Groundwater Basin.

- a) The project proposes infill development located within a developed site and would not include substantial vegetation removal. The project site is not located in close proximity to any mapped creeks or surface water bodies that could be adversely affected by project construction or operation. Because the project would be located within a developed area comprised of residential yards and outbuildings and would include gutters, downspouts, and chambers to capture and retain stormwater flows similar to existing conditions, implementation of the project would not substantially change the volume or velocity of runoff off-site.

The City's Public Works, Utilities, and Community Development Departments are responsible for coordinating the implementation of the City's Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP). This comprehensive program is required under the Phase II Stormwater Regulations regulated by SWRCB, San Luis Obispo Region. The primary goal of the program is to minimize urban runoff that enters the municipal storm drain system and carries bacteria and other pollutants into the local creeks, watershed, and to the ocean. As part of these requirements, the City has been mandated to establish a set of minimum designated Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Pollution Prevention Methods (PPMs). BMPs are steps taken to minimize or control the amount of pollutants and runoff. PPMs are strategies to eliminate the use of polluting materials, and/or not expose potential pollutants to rainwater or other runoff. Development is required to be undertaken in strict accordance with conditions and requirements of this program. The project site is generally flat and does not pose a substantial risk to downslope runoff, sedimentation, erosion, or runoff. With implementation of standard BMPs and PPMs, and compliance with the City of San Luis Obispo Engineering Standards related to stormwater management, the project would not substantially affect surface water or groundwater quality. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

- b) The project would be serviced by the City's water system, which has four primary water sources, including the Whale Rock Reservoir, Salinas Reservoir, Nacimiento Reservoir, and recycled water (for irrigation), with groundwater serving as a fifth supplemental source. The City no longer draws groundwater for potable purposes as of 2015. Therefore, the project would not deplete groundwater resources, and impacts would be *less than significant*.
- c.i-iii) The project site is generally flat and does not pose a substantial risk to downslope runoff, sedimentation, or erosion. The project site is currently developed with five existing single-family homes with associated driveways, yards, walks, sidewalks, and street trees. The proposed single-family homes would include rooftop gutters and downspouts to capture surface runoff. The runoff from the new residences and driveway connection would be directed to the existing landscape to the east and captured within a proposed underground chamber placed under the proposed driveway.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The project would not result in substantial permanent changes in impervious surface area onsite and would be designed to adequately capture and retain stormwater flows. The project incorporates pervious pavers in exterior spaces (e.g., through use of pervious pavers in the common driveway and patios) which would further reduce changes in onsite drainage patterns. Surface runoff and storm drains would drain into a proposed trench drain system that would connect to a proposed stormwater storage system before draining to the existing City stormwater drain beneath Peach Street. The proposed trench drain system has been designed to accommodate the volume of an 85th percentile 24-hour storm (1.2 inches of rainfall). The project site is not located in proximity to any surface stream or body of water that would be subject to risk associated with erosion or siltation as the result of project construction or operation. The project includes a stormwater storage system that would prevent substantial increases in stormwater runoff that would lead to on- or off-site flooding or exceedance of existing stormwater drainage systems. With implementation of standard BMPs and PPMs, and compliance with the City of San Luis Obispo Engineering Standards related to stormwater management, the project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site. Therefore, potential impacts associated with alteration of the existing drainage pattern of the site would be *less than significant*.

- c.iv) Based on the FEMA NFHL Viewer, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone and, therefore, would not have the potential to impede or redirect flood flows and impacts would be *less than significant*.
- d) Based on the County of San Luis Obispo Tsunami Inundation Maps, the project site is not located in an area with potential for inundation by a tsunami. The project site is not located within close proximity to a standing body of water with the potential for a seiche to occur. Therefore, the project site has no potential to release pollutants due to project inundation and *no impacts* would occur.
- e) As discussed in the analysis above, the project would not deplete groundwater supplies, or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The project includes stormwater storage facilities to facilitate onsite detention and would not conflict with the Central Coastal Basin Plan or other water quality control plans. The project would not conflict with SGMA, or other local or regional plans or policies intended to manage water quality or groundwater supplies; therefore, *no impacts* would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None necessary.

Conclusion

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone and does not proposed alterations to existing drainages or other surface waters. The project would not substantially increase impervious surfaces, would manage stormwater onsite, and does not propose alterations to existing water courses. Therefore, potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	1, 4, 44	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The project site is located in a Medium-Density Residential with Historical Preservation Area Overlay Zone (R-2-H) and is generally surrounded by office buildings to the south and southwest and residential neighborhoods on all other sides.

a) The proposed infill development would not result in a physical division between an established community. The project would be consistent with the general level of development within the project vicinity and would not create, close, or impede any existing public or private roads, or create any other barriers to movement or accessibility within the community. Therefore, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community and *no impacts* would occur.

b) The project would be consistent with the property's land use designation and the guidelines and policies for development within the applicable zoning designation, Land Use Element, and COSE. The project would be consistent with existing surrounding land uses and designations and is not located within a site containing sensitive environmental resources; therefore, the project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects and potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

None necessary.

Conclusion

No potentially significant impacts associated with land use would result from the proposed project; therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary.

12. 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?	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation

Based on the COSE, mineral extraction is prohibited within city limits.

a-b) No known mineral resources are present within the project site and future extraction of mineral resources is very unlikely due to the urbanized nature of the area. Therefore, *no impacts* would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None necessary.

Conclusion

No impacts to mineral resources were identified; therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

13. NOISE

Would the project result in:					
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	7, 45, 46	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	47, 48	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	35	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation

The City's General Plan Noise Element establishes standards for maximum acceptable noise levels associated with stationary and transportation sources. Noise created by new transportation noise sources are required to be mitigated to not exceed the maximum acceptable noise levels below (Table 3).

Table 3. Maximum Noise Exposure for Noise-Sensitive Uses due to Transportation Noise Sources

Noise-Sensitive Use	Outdoor Activity Areas ¹	Indoor Spaces		
	L _{dn} or CNEL in dB	L _{dn} or CNEL in dB	L _{eq} in dB ²	L _{max} in dB ³
Residences, hotels, motels, hospitals, nursing homes	60	45	--	60
Theaters, auditoriums, music halls	--	--	35	60
Churches, meeting halls, office building, mortuaries	60	--	45	--
Schools, libraries, museums	--	--	45	60
Neighborhood parks	65	--	--	--
Playgrounds	70	--	--	--

Note: L_{dn} = day-night average sound level, CNEL = community noise equivalent level, dB = decibels, L_{eq} = equivalent continuous sound level, L_{max} = maximum sound level.

¹ If the location of outdoor activity areas is not shown, the outdoor noise standard shall apply at the property line of the receiving land use.

² As determined for a typical worst-case hour during periods of use.

³ L_{max} indoor standard applies only to railroad noise at locations south of Orcutt Road.

The Noise Element also identifies Policy 1.4, regarding noise created by new transportation sources, including road, railroad, and airport expansion projects, which states noise from these sources shall be mitigated to not exceed the levels specified in Table 3 for outdoor activity areas and indoor spaces of noise-sensitive land uses.

In addition, per City Municipal Code Chapter 9.12 Noise Control, operating tools or equipment used in construction between weekday hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. or any time on Sundays or holidays is strictly prohibited, except for emergency works of public service utilities or by exception issued by the City's Community Development Department. The Municipal Code also

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

states that construction activities shall be conducted in such a manner, where technically and economically feasible, that the maximum noise levels at affected properties will not exceed 75 A-weighted decibels (dBA) at single-family residences. Based on the City’s Municipal Code, operating any device that creates vibration that is above the vibration perception threshold of an individual at or beyond 150 feet from the source if on a public space or right-of-way is prohibited (9.12.050.B.7).

- a) The project includes construction of five single-family homes and a new driveway and related appurtenances. During construction of the project, noise from construction activities may intermittently dominate the noise environment in the immediate area. Typical noise levels produced by equipment commonly used on demolition and construction projects are shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Construction Equipment Noise Emission Levels

Equipment Type	Typical Noise Level (dBA) 50 ft From Source
Backhoe	80
Compactor	80
Concrete Mixer	85
Concrete Pump	82
Dozer	85
Excavator	85
Heavy Truck	84
Paver	85
Scraper	85

The project site is located approximately 10 feet from the nearest residential units, which generally surround the project site. Noise produced by construction equipment would be short-term, intermittent, and would be required to comply with City Municipal Code construction timeframe constraints prohibiting construction equipment use between weekday hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. or any time on Sundays or holidays.

Based on the construction equipment anticipated to be used and proximity to surrounding single-family residences, construction activities associated with future development of the site have the potential to exceed the construction noise limit of 75 dBA at single-family residences established in the City Municipal Code. Mitigation Measure N-1 has been identified to require that all construction equipment shall have the manufacturers’ recommended noise abatement methods installed, such as mufflers, engine enclosures, and engine vibration insulators, intact and operational. In addition, all construction activities would be limited to daytime hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and would be prohibited on Sundays and federal and state holidays, in accordance with the City Municipal Code Noise Control standards.

Therefore, implementation of Mitigation Measures N-1 through N-5 would ensure potential impacts associated with generation of a substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

Upon completion of construction activities, vehicle noise and other on-site residential noise generated from the new single-family residences would be consistent with the surrounding noise levels and would not result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels. Therefore, impacts associated with generation of a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance would be *less than significant*.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- b) Use of heavy equipment would generate groundborne noise and vibration; however, the project does not propose pile driving or other high impact activities that would generate substantial groundborne noise or groundborne vibration during construction.

The vibration threshold at which there is a risk to historic and historic-age buildings is 0.5 inches per second particle velocity (in/sec ppv) for transient sources and 0.25 in/sec ppv for continuous/frequent intermittent sources. With regard to human perception, vibration levels would begin to be perceptible at levels of 0.04 in/sec ppv for continuous events and 0.25 in/sec ppv for transient events. Groundborne vibration levels associated with representative construction equipment are summarized in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Representative Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment

Equipment	Peak Particle Velocity at 25 feet (in/sec)
Large bulldozer	0.089
Caisson drilling	0.089
Loaded trucks	0.076
Jackhammer	0.035
Small Bulldozers	0.0003

While some construction activities may result in perceptible vibration, the project-generated vibration levels would be well below the thresholds identified as having the potential to adversely affect surrounding historic buildings and the substantial majority of construction activities and resulting vibration would not be at levels perceptible to humans. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

- c) The project site is located approximately 2.9 miles north of the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport. Based on the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport ALUP, the project is not located within the Airport Land Use Planning Area or noise contours. Therefore, *no impacts* would occur.

Mitigation Measures

N-1 For the entire duration of the construction phase of the project, the following Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be adhered to:

1. Stationary construction equipment that generates noise that exceeds 60 dBA at the project boundaries shall be shielded with the most modern noise control devices (i.e. mufflers, lagging, and/or motor enclosures).
2. Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, rock drills, etc.) used for project construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed-air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools.
3. Where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed-air exhaust shall be used.
4. All construction equipment shall have the manufacturers’ recommended noise abatement methods installed, such as mufflers, engine enclosures, and engine vibration insulators, intact and operational.
5. All construction equipment shall undergo inspection at periodic intervals to ensure proper maintenance and presence of noise control devices (e.g., mufflers, shrouding, etc.).

N-2 Construction plans shall note construction hours, truck routes, and all construction noise Best Management Practices (BMPs) on project plans, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City Community Development Department prior

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

to issuance of grading/building permits. The City shall provide and post signs stating these restrictions at construction entry sites prior to commencement of construction and maintained throughout the construction phase of the project. All construction workers shall be briefed at a pre-construction meeting on construction hour limitations and how, why, and where BMP measures are to be implemented.

N-3 Construction activities shall be conducted so that the maximum noise levels at affected properties will not exceed 75 dBA for single-family residences where feasible.

N-4 For all construction activity at the project site, additional noise attenuation techniques shall be employed as needed to ensure that noise levels are maintained within levels allowed by the City of San Luis Obispo Municipal Code, Title 9, Chapter 9.12 (Noise Control). Such techniques shall include, but are not limited to:

- Sound blankets shall be used on noise-generating equipment.
- Stationary construction equipment that generates noise levels above 65 dBA at the project boundaries shall be shielded with a barrier that meets a sound transmission class (a rating of how well noise barriers attenuate sound) of 25.
- All diesel equipment shall be operated with closed engine doors and shall be equipped with factory-recommended mufflers.
- The movement of construction-related vehicles, with the exception of passenger vehicles, along roadways adjacent to sensitive receptors shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 A.M. and 7:00 P.M., Monday through Saturday. No movement of heavy equipment shall occur on Sundays or official holidays (e.g., Thanksgiving, Labor Day).
- Temporary sound barriers shall be constructed between construction sites and affected uses.

N-5 The project contractor shall inform residents and business operators at properties within 300 feet of the project of proposed construction timelines and noise complaint procedures to minimize potential annoyance related to construction noise. Signs shall be in place prior to and throughout grading and construction activities informing the public that noise-related complaints shall be directed to the construction manager prior to the City’s Community Development Department.

Conclusion

The project has the potential to periodically exceed City Municipal Code construction and operational noise standards for single-family residential uses. Implementation of Mitigation Measures N-1 through N-5 would ensure potential impacts associated with temporary exceedances of local established standards would be less than significant. No other potentially significant impacts associated with noise were identified and no additional mitigation measures are necessary.

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

Would the project:					
a) Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	49, 50	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation

San Luis Obispo is the largest city in terms of population in San Luis Obispo County and has grown from 45,119 in 2010 to approximately 46,548 in 2018 according to the City’s General Plan 2018 Annual Report. According to the City’s Housing Element, between 2005 and 2019, the City’s population grew by 2,140 persons, a total increase of 4.8 percent, or annual increase of 0.3 percent. Based on the City’s 2018 General Plan Annual Report, the city’s total buildout population would be 57,200

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

people. The City’s housing tenure is approximately 39% owner-occupied and 61% renter-occupied, which is strongly influenced by California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (Cal Poly) and Cuesta College enrollment. A large portion of the city’s population has difficulty finding affordable housing within the city due to economic, physical, or sociological circumstances. The city contains the largest concentration of jobs in the county and the city’s population increases to an estimated 70,000 persons during workdays.

The City’s General Plan Housing Element identifies various goals, policies, and programs based on an assessment of the housing needs, opportunities, and constraints. The City’s overarching goals for housing include ensuring safety and affordability, conserving existing housing, accommodating for mixed-income neighborhoods, providing housing variety and tenure, planning for new housing, maintaining neighborhood quality, providing special needs housing, encouraging sustainable housing and neighborhood design, maximizing affordable housing opportunities for those who live or work in the city, and developing housing on suitable sites.

- a) The project would develop five new single-family homes, which would result in approximately 12 new residents (assuming 2.32 people per household). The project has been designed to be consistent with goals and policies established in the City’s Housing Element associated with the provision of new housing, sustainable housing design, and the provision of affordable housing opportunities. The project would be consistent with the projected population growth for the city and the City’s Housing Element goals and policies. The project would not result in substantial unplanned population growth; therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.
- b) The project would not result in the displacement of any existing or proposed housing; therefore, *no impacts* would occur.

Mitigation Measures

None necessary.

Conclusion

The project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth or displace existing housing or people. The project would not result in potentially significant impacts to population or housing; therefore, no mitigation is necessary.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:					
Fire protection?	50, 51	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	50, 51	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	50, 51	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	50, 51	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	50, 51	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The project site is located within the service area of the City’s Fire Department and would be served by City Fire Station 1. The newest fire station in the City, Fire Station 1 provides primary response to the downtown area of San Luis Obispo. This station is staffed by a Battalion Chief and a 4-person paramedic truck company.

The City’s Police Department (SLOPD), which consists of 85.5 employees, 59 of which are sworn police officers, provides public safety services for the city. The SLOPD operates out of one main police station located at 1042 Walnut Street at the intersection of Santa Rosa (Highway 1) and U.S. 101. The project site is located within the San Luis Coastal Unified School District (SLCUSD), and public parks and recreational trails within the city are managed and maintained by the City’s Parks and Recreation Department.

All new residential and non-residential development within the city is subject to payment of development impact fees, which are administered by and paid through the Community Development Department. Development impact fees provide funding for maintaining City emergency services, infrastructure, and facilities. For example, fire protection impact fees provide funding for projects such as the renovation of the City’s fire stations and the replacement of fire service vehicles and equipment.

a) **Fire protection:** The project proposes infill development and would not result in a substantial increase in demand on fire protection services. The project would result in a negligible increase in residents within the city and would be consistent with the projected population growth for San Luis Obispo. The project would not result in a substantial increase in the number of units or population in the city and would not result in the need for construction of new or expanded fire protection facilities. In addition, the project would be subject to development fees for fire protection, which would offset the project’s contribution to increased demand on fire protection services. Therefore, impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities would be *less than significant*.

Police protection: The project proposes infill development and would not result in a substantial increase in demand on police protection services. The project would result in a negligible increase in residents within the city and would be consistent with the projected population growth for the city. The project would not result in a substantial increase in the number of units or population in the city and would not result in the need for construction of new or expanded police protection facilities. In addition, the project would be subject to development impact fees for police protection, which would offset the project’s contribution to increased demand on police protection services. Therefore, impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities would be *less than significant*.

Schools: The project site would be located within the SLCUSD and potential future development of residential uses at the project site would be subject to payment of development impact fees to offset the potential marginal increase in student attendance in the SLCUSC’s schools as a result of the project. These fees would be used to maintain sufficient service levels, which include incremental increases in school capacities. Through participation in this fee program, potential project impacts on schools would be *less than significant*.

Parks: Development of five new single-family homes would result in a negligible increase in residents that could result in an incremental increase in local park usership. The project would not result in the need for construction of new or expanded public parks or other public recreation facilities. The project would be subject to park development impact fees, which would offset the project’s contribution to increased demand on park and recreational facilities. Through participation in this fee program, potential project impacts on parks would be *less than significant*.

Other public facilities: The project would result in a negligible increase in use of other City public facilities, such as roadways and public libraries. The project would be subject to transportation development impact fees, which would offset the project’s contribution to increased use of City roadways. Through participation in this fee program and standard development impact fees, potential project impacts on other public facilities would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

None necessary.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Conclusion
 The project would not result in significant impacts to public services; therefore, no mitigation measures are necessary.

16. 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?	50, 51, 52	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	51	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation

Existing City recreational facilities consist of 28 parks and recreational facilities, in addition to 10 designated natural resources and open space areas and two bike trails. The City of San Luis Obispo General Plan Recreation Element identifies goals, policies, and programs to help plan, develop, and maintain community parks and recreation facilities. The City’s statement of overall department goals is for the City Parks and Recreation facilities and programs to enable all citizens to participate in fun, healthy, or enriching activities that enhance the quality of life in the community. As demand for recreational facilities and activities grow and change, the City intends to focus its efforts in the following areas: continuing development of athletic fields and support facilities; providing parks in underserved neighborhoods; providing a multi-use community center and therapy pool; expanding paths and trails for recreational use; linking recreation facilities; and meeting the special needs of disabled persons, at-risk youth, and senior citizens.

Parks and Recreation Element Policy 3.13.1 establishes the City’s goal to develop and maintain a park system at the rate of 10 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, of which, 5 acres shall be dedicated as neighborhood parks.

a, b) The project would result in a marginal increase in the demand on public parkland and neighborhood parks from an increased residential population. While the project would result in a slight increase in residents within the city, the project would be consistent with the projected population growth for the city of San Luis Obispo. The project would be subject to City park in-lieu fees, which would offset the project’s contribution to increased demand on park and recreational facilities and contribute to helping the City achieve its goal service ratio of 10 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. These fees would be used in the future to contribute funding for the establishment of new park/recreational facilities or expansion of existing facilities; however, these actions would not be directly triggered by, or required as a result of, implementation of the project. Through participation in this fee program, potential project impacts associated with accelerated deterioration of existing facilities or construction of new park facilities would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

None necessary.

Conclusion

The project would be subject to payment of City park land in-lieu fees for parks and recreation facilities, which would offset potential project impacts associated with the incremental increase of demand on these facilities. No potentially significant impacts to parks or recreation facilities would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

17. TRANSPORTATION

Would the project:					
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	1, 15, 22, 53	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	1, 22	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	1, 15	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	1, 15, 49	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation

The City of San Luis Obispo General Plan Circulation Element identifies current traffic levels and delays of public roadways and transportation goals and policies to guide development and express the community's preferences for current and future conditions. Goals included in the plan include, but are not limited to, maintaining accessibility and protecting the environment throughout San Luis Obispo while reducing dependence on single-occupant use of motor vehicles, reducing use of cars by supporting and promoting alternative transportation, such as walking, riding buses and bicycles, and carpooling; promoting the safe operation of all modes of transportation; and widening and extending streets only when there is a demonstrated need and when the widening would cause no significant, long-term environmental problems.

Level of Service (LOS) is a term used to describe the operating conditions of an intersection or roadway based on factors such as speed, travel time, queuing time, and safety. LOS designations range between A and F, with A representing the best operating conditions and F, the worst. The Circulation Element establishes the minimum acceptable LOS standard for vehicles in the downtown area of the city as LOS E and states any degradation of the LOS below this standard shall be determined significant under CEQA.

The City's 2013 Bicycle Transportation Plan outlines the City's official policies for the design and development of bikeways within the city and in adjoining territory under County jurisdiction but within the City's Urban Reserve and includes specific objectives for reducing vehicle use and promoting other modes. The project site is located in the City's Central District. In the project area, Mill Street has Class III bicycle lanes and Toro Street is a planned bicycle boulevard, as identified in the City of San Luis Obispo Bicycle Transportation Plan. Bicycle boulevards are low-volume, low-speed streets that have been optimized for bicycle travel through treatments such as traffic calming and traffic reduction, signage and pavement markings, and intersection crossing treatments. The Toro Street Bicycle Boulevard is planned between Islay Street and Highway 101 but does not have an established timeline for development.

In 2013, SB 743 was signed into law with the intent to "more appropriately balance the needs of congestion management with statewide goals related to infill development, promotion of public health through active transportation, and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions" and required the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to identify new metrics for identifying and mitigating transportation impacts within CEQA. As a result, in December 2018, the California Natural Resources Agency certified and adopted updates to the State CEQA Guidelines. The revisions included new requirements related to the implementation of SB 743 and identified vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita, VMT per employee, and net VMT as new metrics for transportation analysis under CEQA (as detailed in Section 15064.3 [b]). Beginning July 1, 2020, the newly adopted VMT criteria for determining significance of transportation impacts must be implemented statewide.

SLO Transit operates transit service within the city of San Luis Obispo and San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority (SLORTA) operates transit service throughout San Luis Obispo County and adjacent areas.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

a)	The development of five single-family residences would result in a marginal increase of temporary construction traffic and long-term vehicle trips. Neither temporary construction vehicle traffic nor operational vehicle trips from the five single-family residences would generate enough vehicle trips to substantially affect surrounding roadway and interchange LOS, and the project would not impact surrounding bicycle infrastructure or transit services. Therefore, the project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, and impacts would be <i>less than significant</i> .
b)	Based on State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), projects located within 0.5 mile of either an existing major transit stop or along an existing high-quality transit corridor should be presumed to cause a less-than-significant transportation impact. The project would be infill development and is located within 0.5 mile of the San Luis Obispo Downtown Transit Center and approximately eleven public transit stops. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the standards set forth in State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) and impacts would be <i>less than significant</i> .
c-d)	During the construction phase, the project may result in a periodic detour and/or minor lane closure on Toro and/or Peach Streets. Proposed lane closures and use and transport of construction vehicles and equipment within an area that experiences a low volume of vehicle, pedestrian, and bicycle traffic would have a low potential to result in safety hazards. If traffic control is required, it would be short term and there are numerous adequate alternative routes proximate to the project site. Therefore, potential impacts would be <i>less than significant</i> .
<p>The project also includes construction of a driveway extension from Toro Street to access the proposed residences onsite. No changes to the existing driveways would be required and residential development would not require modification of any surrounding roadways. These potential improvements would be designed and constructed in compliance with City Public Works standards to provide adequate vehicle and emergency vehicle access to all five residences. The project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses or result in inadequate emergency access; therefore, potential impacts would be <i>less than significant</i>.</p>	
<p><u>Mitigation Measures</u></p>	
<p>None necessary.</p>	
<p><u>Conclusion</u></p>	
<p>Potential future infill development of residential uses at the project site would not result in a reduction in LOS on surrounding intersections and would be consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) regarding VMT. Any future development at the project site would be required to meet City Public Works safety design standards and would maintain adequate emergency access. Therefore, no potentially significant impacts related to transportation would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.</p>	

18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

<p>Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:</p>					
<p>a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)</p>	<p>17, 18, 19</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	17, 18, 19	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Evaluation

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

1. Sites, features, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe that are either of the following:
 - a. Included or determined to be eligible for inclusion in the CRHR; or
 - b. Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC Section 5020.1(k).
2. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in PRC Section 5024.1(c). In applying these criteria for the purposes of this paragraph, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American Tribe.

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

a.i-ii.) The City has provided notice of the opportunity to consult with appropriate tribes per the requirements of AB 52. One tribal representative, Fred Collins of the Northern Chumash Tribal Council, responded requesting the records search and archaeological report prepared for the project. Upon receipt of these reports, Mr. Collins confirmed that the Northern Chumash Tribal Council would not be requesting a formal consultation and has no further comments on the project.

Mitigation measures CR-1 through CR-3 have been identified to address the potential for inadvertent discovery of cultural resources and require cultural resource awareness training and cessation of work area if a discovery is made until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find. Therefore, impacts related to a substantial adverse change in the significance of tribal cultural resource would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measures CR-1 through CR-3.

Conclusion

With implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-1 through CR-3, impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Would the project:					
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	54,	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	51	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	55, 56	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	55, 56	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation

The City Utilities Department is the sole water provider within the city, provides potable and recycled water to the community, and is responsible for water supply, treatment, distribution, and resource planning. The City Water Resource Recovery Facility (WRRF) treats all of the wastewater from the city, Cal Poly, and the County airport. The WRRF treats 4.5 million gallons of wastewater daily, 365 days a year. The most recent upgrade to the WRRF was completed to improve the quality of water discharged into San Luis Obispo Creek (located downstream of the project site). The WRRF has very stringent discharge requirements and now produces a high-quality effluent that surpasses drinking water standards for many constituents. Plans to utilize a portion of this effluent to irrigate parks, median strips, landscaping, and other appropriate uses are being implemented under the City's Water Reuse Program.

- a) The project includes the installation of new water, wastewater, stormwater, and natural gas infrastructure and connections to City infrastructure. These components have been evaluated for their potential to result in adverse environmental effects throughout this document. Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-5, CR-1 through CR-3, and N-1 through N-5 would reduce potentially significant environmental impacts that could result from installation and establishment of new utility connections associated with air quality, cultural resources, and noise to less than significant. Therefore, potential environmental impacts associated with construction or extension of existing utilities would be *less than significant with mitigation*.
- b) The project would be served by the City's water system, which has four primary water sources, including Whale Rock Reservoir, Salinas Reservoir, Nacimiento Reservoir, and recycled water (for irrigation), with groundwater serving as a fifth supplemental source. The City no longer draws groundwater for potable purposes as of 2015. As of May 2020, both the Whale Rock and Salinas Reservoirs are at above 84% storage capacity and Nacimiento Reservoir is at 50% storage capacity.

Based on the City Utilities Department website, the City's diversification of water sources in the last several decades has allowed the City to maintain sufficient water supplies even following the driest years on record. The total water available for the City in 2019 was 10,136 acre-feet per year (AFY), which included 244 AFY of recycled water. As this availability was adjusted following years of drought and updates to the City's safe annual yield model, the availability is considered a reasonable long-term safe yield value for the purposes of this analysis. The City's water demand for

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

2019 was 4,762 AF. Compared against the City’s 2019 annual availability, the City has approximately 5,374 AF of water surplus available to allocate to new beneficial uses within the City.

The project would be required to pay development impact fees to offset the project’s marginal impact on the City’s water resources. Therefore, based on the City’s current surplus of water supplies and payment of development impact fees to offset use, potential impacts associated with having sufficient water supplies during normal, dry, and multiple dry years would be *less than significant*.

- c) The project would be served by the City’s sewer system and includes the installation of new sewer infrastructure to connect the five new residential units to existing City sewer infrastructure. The project would result in an incremental increase in wastewater demand on the City’s WRRF. Impact fees are collected at the time building permits are issued to accommodate the project’s contribution to the City’s WRRF capacity. Therefore, impacts associated with the City’s capacity to serve the project’s wastewater needs would be *less than significant*.
- d) Based on the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), the project would result in the generation of approximately 5.2 pounds of solid waste per resident per day, or 62.4 pounds of solid waste generation per day. This represents an incremental increase in demand on San Luis Garbage Company, the local solid waste service provider. Waste generated from the project site would likely be disposed of at the Cold Canyon Landfill. Cold Canyon Landfill has approximately 14,500,000 cubic yards of remaining capacity and is expected to reach capacity in 2040. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.
- e) Background research for the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) shows that Californians dispose of roughly 2,500 pounds of waste per month. Over 90% of this waste goes to landfills, posing a threat to groundwater, air quality, and public health. The five single-family residences would be required to adhere to the standards set forth in the City’s Development Standards for Solid Waste Services for trash, green waste, and recycling. Therefore, the project would be in compliance with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste and impacts would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

Implement Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-5, BIO-1, CR-1 through CR-3, and N-1 through N-5.

Conclusion

With implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-5, BIO-1, CR-1 through CR-3, and N-1 through N-5, potential impacts to utilities and service systems would be less than significant.

20. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:					
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	57, 59	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	1, 57, 58, 59, 60	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	1, 7, 58, 59, 60	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	1, 57, 58, 59, 60	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation

The project site is located in an urban area within the city of San Luis Obispo. Urban fire hazards result from the materials, size, and spacing of buildings, and from the materials, equipment, and activities they contain. Additional factors include access, available water volume and pressure, and response time for fire fighters. Based on the City’s Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, the risk of wildland fires is greatest near the city limits where development meets rural areas of combustible vegetation. Most of the community is within 1 mile of a designated High or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, which indicates significant risk to wildland fire.

The Safety Element identifies four policies to address the potential hazards associated with wildfire, which include approving development only when adequate fire suppression services and facilities are available, classifying Wildland fire hazard severity zones as prescribed by CAL FIRE, prohibiting new subdivisions located within “Very High” wildland fire hazard severity zones, and continuing enhancement of fire safety and construction codes for buildings.

- a) The project proposes infill development within an existing residential neighborhood. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant temporary or permanent impact on any adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. No breaks in utility service or road closures would occur as a result of project implementation; therefore, the project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or evacuation plan and impacts would be *less than significant*.
- b) The project site is located within a developed parcel located within an urban area in the city of San Luis Obispo. The project would not substantially change the existing flat topography of the project site. Project construction would be required to comply with the California Fire Code and would not exacerbate existing fire conditions. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.
- c) The project includes construction of a dead-end driveway approximately 250 feet in length. The City’s Municipal Code requires dead-end streets in excess of 150 feet in length to include an approved emergency turnaround unless all buildings are protected with approved fire sprinkler systems, in which case the distance may be extended to 300 feet. The project includes 13-D sprinkler systems in all buildings which would meet fire code requirements. The project also includes the installation of new water, emergency water, wastewater, stormwater, and natural gas infrastructure and connections to City infrastructure. These proposed infrastructure components would be located within existing developed land and would be required to be installed in full compliance with applicable CBC and California Fire Code regulations; therefore, potential impacts associated with exacerbation of fire risk from installation of new infrastructure would be *less than significant*.
- d) The project site is generally flat and is not located near a hillslope or in an area subject to downstream flooding or landslides. The project does not include any design elements that would expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

Mitigation Measures

None necessary.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER #	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Conclusion

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

21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<p>a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The project would develop five new single-family residences within the project site, which would result in the removal of up to five trees. Mitigation Measure BIO-1 is included to minimize potential impacts to nesting migratory birds during tree removal and construction.

Mitigation Measures CR-1 through CR-3 have been included to require awareness training be conducted for all construction crew members so that cultural resources can be recognized if unearthed during site disturbance activities and to require work be halted in the event of an unanticipated discovery until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find and identify the appropriate protocol for properly responding to the inadvertent discovery. With implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, potential impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

<p>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)?</p>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

When project impacts are considered along with, or in combination with, other reasonably foreseeable impacts, the project's potential cumulative impacts may be significant. Mitigation measures have been incorporated into the project to reduce project-related impacts to a less-than-significant level. Based on implementation of identified project-specific mitigation measures and the relatively limited number and extent of potential impacts, the cumulative effects of the proposed project would not be cumulatively considerable and would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

<p>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

The project has the potential to result in significant impacts associated with air quality and noise that could result in substantial adverse effects on human beings. Mitigation measures have been identified to reduce these potential impacts to less than significant, including, but not limited to, standard idling restrictions, dust control measures, preparation of a geologic investigation for asbestos, and implementation of noise control measures. With incorporation of mitigation measures identified in this Initial Study, potential environmental effects of the project would not directly or indirectly result in any substantial adverse effects on human beings and this impact would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

22. EARLIER ANALYSES

<p>Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the 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). In this case a discussion should identify the following items:</p>
<p>a) Earlier analysis used. Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.</p>
<p>N/A</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>N/A</p>
<p>c) Mitigation measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions of the project.</p>
<p>N/A</p>

23. SOURCE REFERENCES

1.	Architectural Review Commission Package. Ten Over Studios, October 31, 2019.
2.	City of San Luis Obispo Interactive Parcel Viewer, January 2015
3.	SWCA. Historic Preservation Report for Redevelopment of APN 002-316-005 (Peach and Toro Streets). 2020
4.	City of San Luis Obispo Conservation & Open Space Element (COSE), 2006.
5.	Caltrans, California Scenic Highways, February 2017
6.	City of San Luis Obispo Community Design Guidelines, June 2010
7.	City of San Luis Obispo Municipal Code, May 2019
8.	California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, 2018
9.	California Department of Conservation Land Conservation Act of 1965: San Luis Obispo County, 2006
10.	San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District, County Attainment Status, 2019
11.	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District CEQA Air Quality Handbook, April 2012 (revised November 2017)
12.	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Clean Air Plan, December 2001
13.	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control Board Naturally Occurring Asbestos Mapping Tool, 2020
14.	Pacific Coast Testing, Geotechnical Investigation Proposed Residences 1137 Peach Street (APN 002-316-005) 2019
15.	City of San Luis Obispo Bicycle Transportation Plan, 2013
16.	San Luis Obispo Heritage Trees Map, 2019
17.	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory Map, 2019
18.	California Department of Fish and Wildlife, California Natural Community Conservation Plans Map 2019
19.	Historic Properties in San Luis Obispo, California (A SLO Story Map), accessed March 9, 2020
20.	San Luis Obispo Historic Preservation Program Guidelines 2010
21.	Pacific Gas and Electric webpage: Delivering low emission energy, accessed March 9, 2020
22.	San Luis Obispo Transit 2019-20120 User Guide, June 17, 2019
23.	City of San Luis Obispo Climate Action Plan, August 2012
24.	California Building Code, 2019
25.	California Department of Conservation Fault Activity Map of California, 2010
26.	City of San Luis Obispo Safety Element, 2014

27.	Areas of Land Subsidence in California, USGS, Accessed March 10, 2020
28.	NRCS Web Soil Survey, 2019
29.	Department of Conservation, Soil Web Survey 2020
30.	Geologic Map of the San Luis Obispo Quadrangle, San Luis Obispo County, California, 2004
31.	California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Envirostor Accessed March 10, 2020
32.	State Water Resources Control Board, Geotracker Accessed March 10, 2020
33.	California Environmental Protection Agency, Cortese List Data Resources Accessed March 10, 2020
34.	San Luis Obispo 2016 Community Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory Update 2019
35.	County of San Luis Obispo Airport Land Use Plan, May 2005
36.	SLO Watershed Project, San Luis Obispo Creek Description, 2014
37.	SLO Stormwater Website 2020
38.	Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) Viewer, accessed November 4, 2019
39.	SGMA Groundwater Management, California Department of Water Resources Webpage, 2019
40.	San Luis Obispo Valley Groundwater Basin, County of San Luis Obispo Webpage, 2019
41.	Water Sources, City of San Luis Obispo Utilities Webpage, Accessed November 2019
42.	Department of Conservation (DOC) Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning Port San Luis Quadrangle, 2009
43.	Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coast Basin, 2019
44.	City of San Luis Obispo Land Use Element 2014
45.	City of San Luis Obispo Noise Element, 1996
46.	Construction Noise Handbook: Construction Equipment Noise Levels and Ranges, Federal Highway Administration, September 2017
47.	Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Manual. United States Department of Transportation, Federal Transit Administration (FTA). September 2018. Available at: https://www.transit.dot.gov/sites/fta.dot.gov/files/docs/research-innovation/118131/transit-noise-and-vibration-impact-assessment-manual-fta-report-no-0123_0.pdf .
48.	Transportation and Construction-Induced Vibration Guidance Manual. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). September 2013. Available at: http://website.dot.ca.gov/env/noise/docs/tcvgm-sep2013.pdf .
49.	City of San Luis Obispo 2014-2019 General Plan Housing Element, January 2015
50.	City of San Luis Obispo General Plan Annual Report, 2018
51.	Community Development Department Development Impact Fees, 2018
52.	City of San Luis Obispo General Plan Parks and Recreation Element, 2001
53.	City of San Luis Obispo Circulation Element, October 2017
54.	2018 Water Resources Status Report, 2018
55.	Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates, California Department of Resources, Recycling, and Recovery (CalRecycle), accessed November 2019
56.	SWIS Facility Detail Cold Canyon Landfill, Inc., California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery, Accessed March 11, 2020
57.	San Luis Obispo Local Hazard Mitigation Plan 2006
58.	San Luis Obispo General Plan Safety Element 2014
59.	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Fire Hazard Severity Zones Maps, San Luis Obispo County, March 2009
60.	City of San Luis Obispo Municipal Code. 15.04. Construction and Fire Prevention Regulations. 2019
61.	Cultural Resources Survey of the Peach and Toro Project, City of San Luis Obispo, San Luis Obispo County, California. March 2020. Prepared by: Central Coast Archaeological Research Consultants.

Attachments

1. Project Plans
2. Historic Preservation Report for Redevelopment of APN 002-316-005 (Peach and Toro Streets). SWCA May 2020.

REQUIRED MITIGATION AND MONITORING PROGRAMS

Air Quality

AQ-1 During all construction activities and use of diesel vehicles, the applicant shall implement the following idling control techniques:

1. Idling Restrictions Near Sensitive Receptors for Both On- and Off-Road Equipment.
 - e. Staging and queuing areas shall not be located within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors if feasible;
 - f. Diesel idling within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors shall not be permitted;
 - g. Use of alternative fueled equipment shall be used whenever possible; and,
 - h. Signs that specify the no idling requirements shall be posted and enforced at the construction site.
2. California Diesel Idling Regulations. On-road diesel vehicles shall comply with Section 2485 of Title 13 of the California Code of Regulations. This regulation limits idling from diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles with gross vehicular weight ratings of more than 10,000 pounds and licensed for operation on highways. It applies to California and non-California based vehicles. In general, the regulation specifies that drivers of said vehicles:
 - a. Shall not idle the vehicle's primary diesel engine for greater than 5 minutes at any location, except as noted in Subsection (d) of the regulation; and,
 - b. Shall not operate a diesel-fueled auxiliary power system (APS) to power a heater, air conditioner, or any ancillary equipment on that vehicle during sleeping or resting in a sleeper berth for greater than 5.0 minutes at any location when within 1,000 feet of a restricted area, except as noted in Subsection (d) of the regulation.

Signs must be posted in the designated queuing areas and job sites to remind drivers of the 5-minute idling limit. The specific requirements and exceptions in the regulation can be reviewed at the following website: www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/truck-idling/2485.pdf.

AQ-2 During all construction and ground-disturbing activities, the applicant shall implement the following particulate matter control measures and detail each measure on the project grading and building plans. In addition, 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, reduce visible emissions below the APCD's limit of 20% opacity for no greater than 3 minutes in any 60 minute period. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the City Community Development Department prior to commencement of construction. 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.

- a. Reduce the amount of 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 SLOAPCD's limit of 20% opacity for greater than 3 minutes in any 60-minute period. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed (non-potable) water should be used whenever possible.
- c. All dirt stockpile areas (if any) shall 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 shall be implemented as soon as possible, following completion of any soil-disturbing activities.
- e. Exposed grounds that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than 1 month after initial grading shall be sown with a fast germinating, non-invasive, grass seed and watered until vegetation is established.

- f. All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation shall be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the SLOAPCD.
- g. All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- h. Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 miles per hour on any unpaved surface at the construction site.
- i. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials, are to be covered or shall maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with California Vehicle Code Section 23114.
- j. “Track Out” is defined as sand or soil that adheres to and/or agglomerates on the exterior surfaces of motor vehicles and/or equipment (including tires) that may then fall onto any highway or street as described in California Vehicle Code Section 23113 and California Water Code Section 13304. To prevent track out, designate access points and require all employees, subcontractors, and others to use them. Install and operate a “track-out prevention device” where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto paved streets. The track-out prevention device can be any device or combination of devices that are effective at preventing track out, located at the point of intersection of an unpaved area and a paved road. Rumble strips or steel plate devices need periodic cleaning to be effective. If paved roadways accumulate tracked out soils, the track-out prevention device may need to be modified;
- k. Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers shall be used with reclaimed water where feasible. Roads shall be pre-wetted prior to sweeping when feasible.
- l. All PM₁₀ mitigation measures required should be shown on grading and building plans.
- m. The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons whose responsibility is to ensure any fugitive dust emissions do not result in a nuisance and to enhance the implementation of the mitigation measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints and reduce visible emissions below the SLOAPCD’s limit of 20% opacity for greater than 3 minutes in any 60-minute period. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress (for example, wind-blown dust could be generated on an open dirt lot). The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SLOAPCD Compliance Division prior to the start of any grading, earthwork, or demolition (Contact Tim Fuhs at 805-781-5912).

AQ-3 Prior to initiation of ground-disturbing activities, the applicant shall retain a registered geologist to conduct a geologic evaluation of the property, including sampling and testing for NOA in full compliance with SLOAPCD requirements and the CARB ATCM for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations (17 CCR 93105). This geologic evaluation shall be submitted to the City Community Development Department upon completion. If the geologic evaluation determines that the project would not have the potential to disturb NOA, the applicant must file an Asbestos ATCM exemption request with the SLOAPCD.

AQ-4 If NOA are determined to be present on-site, proposed earthwork, demolition, and construction activities shall be conducted in full compliance with the various regulatory jurisdictions regarding NOA, including the CARB ATCM for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations (17 CCR 93105) and requirements stipulated in the National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP; 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Section 61, Subpart M – Asbestos). These requirements include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Written notification, within at least 10 business days of activities commencing, to the SLOAPCD;
- b. Preparation of an asbestos survey conducted by a Certified Asbestos Consultant; and
- c. Implementation of applicable removal and disposal protocol and requirements for identified NOA.

AQ-5 Prior to initiation of demolition activities, the applicant shall implement the following measures to reduce the risk associated with disturbance of ACM and lead-coated materials that may be present within the existing structures onsite:

- a. Demolition of the on-site structures shall comply with the procedures required by the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (40 CFR 61, Subpart M – Asbestos) for the control of asbestos emissions during demolition activities. SLOAPCD is the delegated authority by the U.S. EPA to implement the Federal Asbestos NESHAP. Prior to demolition of on-site structures, SLOAPCD shall be notified, per NESHAP requirements. The project applicant shall submit proof that SLOAPCD has been notified prior to demolition activities to the City Community Development Department.
- b. If during the demolition of the existing structures, paint is separated from the construction materials (e.g., chemically or physically), the paint waste shall be evaluated independently from the building material by a qualified hazardous materials inspector to determine its proper management. All hazardous materials shall be handled and disposed of in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations. According to the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), if the paint is not removed from the building material during demolition (and is not chipping or peeling), the material can be disposed of as non-hazardous construction debris. The landfill operator shall be contacted prior to disposal of lead-based paint materials. If required, all lead work plans shall be submitted to SLOAPCD at least 10 days prior to the start of demolition. The applicant shall submit proof that paint waste has been evaluated by a qualified hazardous waste materials inspector and handled according to their recommendation to the City Community Development Department.

Monitoring Program: Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 shall be incorporated into project grading and building plans for review and approval by the City Community Development Department. Compliance shall be verified by the City during regular inspections, in coordination with the County of San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District, as necessary. The applicant shall submit the geologic evaluation detailed in measure AQ-3 and documentation showing compliance with measures AQ-4 and AQ-5 to the City Community Development Department upon completion and prior to issuance of grading permits.

Biological Resources

BIO-1 If feasible, tree removal associated with any future residential (or accessory) development at the project site shall be scheduled to occur from September 16 to January 31, outside of the typical nesting bird season, to avoid potential impacts to nesting birds. If tree removal or other construction activities are proposed during the nesting season (February 1 through September 15), prior to any ground disturbing activity, surveys for active nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist within one week prior to the start of activities. If nesting birds are located on or near the proposed project site, they shall be avoided until they have successfully fledged or the nest is no longer deemed active. A non-disturbance buffer of 50 feet will be placed around non-listed, passerine species, and a 250-foot buffer will be implemented for raptor species. All activity will remain outside of that buffer until a qualified biologist has determined that the young have fledged or that proposed construction activities would not cause adverse impacts to the nest, adults, eggs, or young. If special-status avian species are identified, no work shall be conducted until an appropriate buffer is determined in consultation with the City and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and/or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Monitoring Program: These conditions and measures shall be noted on all grading and construction plans. The City Community Development Department and Natural Resources Manager shall verify compliance through regular inspections and review of monitoring reports, as necessary.

Cultural Resources

- CR-1** Cultural Resource Awareness Training. Prior to construction activities, a qualified archaeologist shall conduct a cultural resource awareness training for all construction personnel including the following:
- a. Review the types of archaeological artifacts that may be uncovered;
 - b. Provide examples of common archaeological artifacts to examine;
 - c. Review what makes an archaeological resource significant to archaeologists and local native Americans;
 - d. Describe procedures for notifying involved or interested parties in case of a new discovery;
 - e. Describe reporting requirements and responsibilities of construction personnel;
 - f. Review procedures that shall be used to record, evaluate, and mitigate new discoveries; and

- g. Describe procedures that would be followed in the case of discovery of disturbed as well as intact human burials and burial-associated artifacts.

CR-2 If cultural resources are encountered during subsurface earthwork activities, all ground disturbing activities within a 25-foot radius of the find shall cease and the City shall be notified immediately. Work shall not continue until a City-qualified archaeologist assesses the find and determines the need for further study. If the find includes Native American affiliated materials, a local Native American tribal representative will be contacted to work in conjunction with the City-approved archaeologist to determine the need for further study. A standard inadvertent discovery clause shall be included in every grading and construction contract to inform contractors of this requirement. Any previously unidentified resources found during construction shall be recorded on appropriate California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) forms and evaluated for significance in terms of CEQA criteria by a qualified archaeologist.

If the resource is determined significant under CEQA, the qualified archaeologist shall prepare and implement a research design and archaeological data recovery plan, in conjunction with locally affiliated Native American representative(s) as necessary, that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant. The archaeologist shall also perform appropriate technical analysis, prepare a comprehensive report, and file it with the Central Coast Information Center (CCIC), located at the University of California, Santa Barbara, and provide for the permanent curation of the recovered materials.

CR-3 In the event that human remains are exposed during earth disturbing activities associated with the project, an immediate halt work order shall be issued and the Community Development Director and locally affiliated Native American representative(s) (as necessary) shall be notified. State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner shall notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. These requirements shall be printed on all building and grading plans.

Monitoring Program: These conditions shall be noted on all grading and construction plans. The City shall review and approve the City-qualified archaeologist consistent with the Archaeological Resource Preservation Program Guidelines.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Implement Mitigation Measures AQ-3, AQ-4, and AQ-5.

Monitoring Program: Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 shall be incorporated into project grading and building plans for review and approval by the City Community Development Department. Compliance shall be verified by the City during regular inspections, in coordination with the County of San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District, as necessary. The applicant shall submit the geologic evaluation detailed in measure AQ-3 and documentation showing compliance with measures AQ-4 and AQ-5 to the City Community Development Department upon completion and prior to issuance of grading permits.

Noise

N-1 For the entire duration of the construction phase of the project, the following Best Management Practices (BMPs) shall be adhered to:

1. Stationary construction equipment that generates noise that exceeds 60 dBA at the project boundaries shall be shielded with the most modern noise control devices (i.e. mufflers, lagging, and/or motor enclosures).
2. Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, rock drills, etc.) used for project construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed-air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools.
3. Where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed-air exhaust shall be used.
4. All construction equipment shall have the manufacturers' recommended noise abatement methods installed, such as mufflers, engine enclosures, and engine vibration insulators, intact and operational.

5. All construction equipment shall undergo inspection at periodic intervals to ensure proper maintenance and presence of noise control devices (e.g., mufflers, shrouding, etc.).
- N-2** Construction plans shall note construction hours, truck routes, and all construction noise Best Management Practices (BMPs) on project plans, which shall be reviewed and approved by the City Community Development Department prior to issuance of grading/building permits. The City shall provide and post signs stating these restrictions at construction entry sites prior to commencement of construction and maintained throughout the construction phase of the project. All construction workers shall be briefed at a pre-construction meeting on construction hour limitations and how, why, and where BMP measures are to be implemented.
- N-3** Construction activities shall be conducted so that the maximum noise levels at affected properties will not exceed 75 dBA for single-family residences where feasible.
- N-4** For all construction activity at the project site, additional noise attenuation techniques shall be employed as needed to ensure that noise levels are maintained within levels allowed by the City of San Luis Obispo Municipal Code, Title 9, Chapter 9.12 (Noise Control). Such techniques shall include, but are not limited to:
- Sound blankets shall be used on noise-generating equipment.
 - Stationary construction equipment that generates noise levels above 65 dBA at the project boundaries shall be shielded with a barrier that meets a sound transmission class (a rating of how well noise barriers attenuate sound) of 25.
 - All diesel equipment shall be operated with closed engine doors and shall be equipped with factory-recommended mufflers.
 - The movement of construction-related vehicles, with the exception of passenger vehicles, along roadways adjacent to sensitive receptors shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 A.M. and 7:00 P.M., Monday through Saturday. No movement of heavy equipment shall occur on Sundays or official holidays (e.g., Thanksgiving, Labor Day).
 - Temporary sound barriers shall be constructed between construction sites and affected uses.
- N-5** The project contractor shall inform residents and business operators at properties within 300 feet of the project of proposed construction timelines and noise complaint procedures to minimize potential annoyance related to construction noise. Signs shall be in place prior to and throughout grading and construction activities informing the public that noise-related complaints shall be directed to the construction manager prior to the City's Community Development Department.

Monitoring Program: These measures shall be incorporated into project grading and building plans for review and approval by the City Community Development Department. Compliance shall be verified by the City during regular inspections.

Tribal Cultural Resources

Implement Mitigation Measures CR-1 through CR-3.

Monitoring Program: These conditions shall be noted on all grading and construction plans. The City shall review and approve the City-qualified archaeologist consistent with the Archaeological Resource Preservation Program Guidelines.

Utilities and Service Systems

Implement Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-5, BIO-1, CR-1 through CR-3, and N-1 through N-5.

Monitoring Program: Measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 shall be incorporated into project grading and building plans for review and approval by the City Community Development Department. Compliance shall be verified by the City during regular inspections, in coordination with the County of San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District, as necessary. The applicant shall submit the geologic evaluation detailed in measure AQ-3 and documentation showing compliance with measures AQ-4 and AQ-5 to the City Community Development Department upon completion and prior to issuance of grading permits. BIO-1, CR-1 through CR-3, and N1 through N-5 shall be noted on all grading and construction plans. The City Community Development Department shall verify compliance through regular inspections and review of monitoring reports, as necessary.