



## INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

For EID-0345-2020

**1. Project Title:**

Bullock Ranch Residential Development Project

**2. Lead Agency Name and Address:**

Rachel Cohen  
City of San Luis Obispo  
Community Development Department  
919 Palm Street  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-3218

**3. Contact Person and Phone Number:**

Rachel Cohen, Associate Planner  
805.781.7574

**4. Project Location:**

The project is located on two parcels totaling 10.93 acres (Assessor Parcel Numbers [APNs] 004-705-009, 053-061-053), located at 3580 3580, 3584, and 3590 Bullock Lane within the city of San Luis Obispo, California.

**5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

Barry Ephraim and John Young  
Bullock Ranch, LLC  
125 S Bowling Green Way, Los Angeles, CA 90049

**6. General Plan Designations:**

Medium-High Density Residential

**7. Specific Plan Designations:**

R-3 Medium-High Density Residential and Mixed-Use/Neighborhood Commercial

**8. Zoning:**

R-3-SP (Medium-High Density Residential, Specific Plan Overlay) and C-C-MU (Community Commercial, Mixed-Use Overlay)

**9. Description of the Project:**

The proposed project includes a Vesting Tentative Tract Map (VTTM, TR 3136) and the development of 192 residential units, including eight live-work units with commercial/office space (mixed-use), 433 on-site parking

spaces, and other residential community amenities on a 10.93-acre site located within the Orcutt Area Specific Plan (OASP) area (Figures 1 and 2).

In December 2009, the City of San Luis Obispo (City) certified the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Orcutt Area Specific Plan (OASP Final EIR). The OASP Final EIR evaluated potential environmental impacts that would result from the annexation and development of the 231-acre OASP area. Within the plan area, the OASP designated 113 acres for residential uses, 0.25 acre for neighborhood commercial uses, 81 acres of open space, 21 acres of parkland, and 5 acres for a school site. Under the approved OASP, the project site is designated for Medium-High Density Residential (R-3) uses and Mixed-Use/Neighborhood Commercial uses.

Existing development on the project site includes two vacant single-family residences, a barn, several accessory structures, and searain containers. Vegetation on the property consists of nonnative grassland, heavily disturbed roadside areas, and residential landscaping. The project site currently supports two coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) trees, one eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus* spp.) trees, and several clusters of other common native and nonnative trees.

The residential development would consist of three housing product types: 8 live work townhouses in the southeast corner of the project site along Ranch House Road, 88 bungalows/carriages on the east side of the project site, and 96 townhouses on the west side of the project site along Bullock Lane. All residential development would be on airspace condominium lots. The bungalows/carriages and the conventional townhouses would be in San Luis Obispo Mission and Adobe Ranch architectural styles and the live/work townhouses in the Farmhouse architectural style (Figures 3 through 5). The proposed bungalows/carriages would be semi-detached housing organized in clusters of two bungalows and one carriage house. Each of the bungalows would be two levels and would include small back yards and a detached two-car garage. Each of the carriage houses would be a single-level unit on top of its two-car garage and the garages for the two bungalows in the cluster.

The eight live-work townhouse apartments would be located within the Mixed Use/Neighborhood Commercial zoned area. Each townhouse would have three levels, three bedrooms, would range in size between 2,050 and 2,265 square feet, and would have a direct access two car garage in its rear. The ground floor of each live-work townhouses would be limited to a commercial or office use. The bungalows would each have 4 bedrooms and range in size between 1,600 square feet and 1,901 square feet. The carriage houses with one bedroom would be 749 square feet and those with three bedrooms 1,446 square feet. The traditional townhouse apartments would range in size between 733 square feet for one-bedroom units up to 1,839 square feet for three-bedroom units. These townhouses would be in three level buildings of either 6 units or 12 units. Each townhouse would have a direct access garage.

The project also includes construction of several residential community amenities, including a 1,766-square foot community center that would include a fitness center and lease office, a 766 square-foot pool building that would include bathrooms, showers, resident mailboxes, a bicycle maintenance room, and an outdoor pool area. Several landscaped seating areas would be provided throughout the residential community areas, including an open area with a fire pit and a 16-square-foot shade structure with an outdoor kitchen for neighborhood gatherings.

The project would improve Bullock Lane between the project site's north property line and south property line. Additionally the project would include the extension of an existing regional bike path along the west side of Bullock Lane from the project's south property line to the southwest corner of the intersection of Orcutt Road and Bullock Lane.

The project would require establishment of new connections to City water and wastewater systems. The project would include establishing a new connection to existing City sewer infrastructure located along Bullock Lane. New domestic water and fire water line connections would be to existing City water lines along Ranch House Road, which would be constructed or are in the process of being constructed.

The proposed development would be implemented in two phases. Phase 1 would include the development of 88 bungalows/carriages and 8 live-work townhouses. Phase 2 would include 96 townhouses and the community center. The project would result in the disturbance of the entire project site, and would include additional disturbance offsite for improvements, for a total site disturbance of approximately 11.24 acres, including 3.5 acres of area to be paved as well as some nearby offsite improvements. The project would result in the removal of all trees currently on site, as well as demolition and removal of both single-family residences and the existing barn located on site. The project construction period to complete both phases would be approximately 2 years and 9 months.

**10. Project Entitlements:**

- Vesting Tentative Tract Map
- Architectural Review

**11. Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:**

Surrounding uses include vacant land, two single-family residences, and a mobile home park to the north; residential development under construction to the east; a single-family residential neighborhood currently under construction to the south; and industrial and commercial uses and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) to the west.

The project site is characterized by nearly flat to gently rolling grassland. Righetti Hill is located 0.6 mile to the southeast. Vegetation on the property consists of nonnative grassland, heavily disturbed roadside areas, and residential landscaping. The project site currently supports four coast live oak trees, three eucalyptus trees, and several clusters of other common native and nonnative trees. A small rock outcropping is located near the north of the project site. There are no drainage, wetland, or water features on-site.

**12. 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.?**

The City contacted local California Native American tribes and received a consultation request from one tribe. Consultation has been completed and no changes to the project are proposed.

**13. Other public agencies whose approval is required:**

San Luis Obispo Air Quality Control District (construction permits, if necessary)



Figure 1. Project Vicinity Map



Figure 2. Project Location Map





Source: ktgy Architecture + Planning, 2020.

**Figure 4. Bungalow Conceptual Rendering**



Figure 5. Live-Work Townhouse Conceptual Rendering



### 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Recreation
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology and Water Quality	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Energy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wildfire
<input checked="" 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 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)).
-------------------------------------	--

**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"/>

*Shawna Scott*

November 24, 2020

Signature

Date

Shawna Scott

Printed Name

For: Michael Codron,

Community Development Director

## 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 EID-0345-2020	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, 2	<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, 3	<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, 4, 5, 6	<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, 5	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 Righetti 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 *City of San Luis Obispo General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE)* identifies specific goals and policies intended to protect and enhance the city’s visual quality and character. Policies in the COSE include, but are not limited to, promoting the creation of “streetscapes” and linear scenic parkways during construction or modification of major roadways, designing new development to be consistent with the surrounding architectural context, and preserving natural and agricultural landscapes. Based on the COSE map of scenic roadways and vistas, the project site is not located along a roadway considered to be of moderate or high scenic value or within the cone of view of a scenic roadway (source reference 2). However, the project site would be visible from portions of Orcutt Road that are designated as having high or moderate scenic value outside the city limit.

The City’s Architectural Review Commission (ARC) reviews and approves the designs of proposed development projects. Architectural review is a process whereby the ARC examines a proposed project’s layout, building design, relationship to the neighborhood in which it would be located, landscaping, parking, signage, lighting, and other features affecting the project’s appearance. The ARC is charged with administering architectural review in a way that is consistent with the General Plan and that creates a pleasant environment, maintains property values, preserves the city’s natural beauty and visual character, and ensures orderly and harmonious development. The ARC uses the City’s Community Design Guidelines (November 2002) as a basis for evaluating the suitability and appropriateness of individual project design and to help achieve attractive and environmentally sensitive development (source reference 4).

The project site is located in the southeast portion of the city, on the western side of the OASP area. As described in the OASP Final EIR, the OASP area is located at the base of the Santa Lucia Mountains and provides views of scenic resources including Righetti Hill, Islay Hill, and the Santa Lucia foothills (see Figure 6). Vegetation on the property consists of nonnative grassland, heavily disturbed roadside areas, and residential landscaping. The project site currently supports four coast live oak trees, three eucalyptus trees, and several clusters of other common native and nonnative trees, and one rock outcrop is located on the eastern side of the northern project parcel (see Figure 7; APN 004-705-009). Surrounding uses include vacant land, two single-family residences, and a mobile home park to the north; residential developments under construction to the east; a single-family residential neighborhood currently under construction to the south; and industrial and commercial uses and the UPRR to the west.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------



**Figure 6. Photograph from project site to Santa Lucia foothills, facing east (June 30, 2020)**



**Figure 7. Photograph of existing rock outcrop located on project site, facing east (June 30, 2020)**

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

The OASP Final EIR previously analyzed specific plan areawide impacts to aesthetic and visual resources, including those associated with development of the project site. The OASP Final EIR identified significant impacts to the scenic character of the area and viewsheds from Orcutt Road and Tank Farm Road. The Final EIR identifies policies of the OASP intended to address these potential impacts; however, impacts were determined to remain significant and unavoidable. The OASP Final EIR also identified that potentially significant impacts related to light and glare, but with the incorporation of mitigation, this impact was reduced to a less than significant level.

**Project-Specific Review**

- 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 is located in an urbanized area with views of the Santa Lucia foothills, Righetti Hill, and Islay Hill. Based on the 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. However, the project site would be visible from portions of Orcutt Road that are designated as having moderate scenic value and high or moderate scenic value outside the city limit. Based on the location of the project site, the project would not result in blocking views of the Santa Lucia foothills, Righetti Hill, or Islay Hill for viewers traveling along Orcutt Road. 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 0.34-mile northeast of State Route (SR) 227. Based on the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) California Scenic Highways online mapping tool, this section of SR 227 is not designated a state scenic highway or listed as eligible. The project site would not be visible to viewers traveling along SR 227 due to existing development, vegetation, and topography. 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 residential development would consist of three housing product types: live work townhouses in the southeast corner in Farmhouse style, bungalows/carriages on the east side of the project site in San Luis Obispo Mission and Adobe Ranch architectural styles (see Figure 4), and townhouses along the west side of the project site in a San Luis Obispo Mission architectural style and Ranch architectural style (see Figure 5). The project has been designed to be consistent with development standards identified in the City Municipal Code Chapter 17.20 Medium-High Density Residential Zone (R-3) Development Standards, which identify minimum property line setback distances, building height and floor area ratio, and lot coverage.

The proposed residential development would also be subject to the City’s Community Design Guidelines, which are intended to provide guidelines for residential and infill projects of high architectural quality that are compatible with existing development. No particular architectural style or design theme is required in the City nor can San Luis Obispo be defined by any particular architectural style. Based on a preliminary review of the proposed design plans, the project is generally consistent with standards set forth in the City Design Guidelines associated with proportional building elements, design consistency, and neighborhood compatibility.

The OASP Final EIR identified significant and unavoidable impacts to the viewsheds along Orcutt Road. Mitigation provided in the Final EIR was specific to parcels adjacent to Orcutt and Tank Farm Roads, which do not include the proposed project site. The OASP includes policies and programs to help maintain the scenic value of the OASP area, but generally these requirements mirror the Final EIR mitigation and again only apply to parcels adjacent to Orcutt and Tank Farm Roads. Additional design standards and guidelines are included in Chapter 4.1 of the OASP that are intended to ensure well designed and internally compatible development that enhances the city’s unique sense of place. The project would be subject to review by the ARC prior to approval of building permits to ensure compliance with these and other design standards.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Impacts related to scenic quality are consistent with those analyzed in the OASP Final EIR and potential impacts associated with a conflict with zoning regulations or other standards governing scenic quality would be *less than significant*.

- d) The project is located in an urbanized area with light sources from neighboring commercial and residential uses, as well as light from vehicular circulation along surrounding roadways. The OASP Policies 4.4.1 through 4.4.4 require that lighting in the OASP area be compatible with the architectural and landscape design, not be a nuisance for neighbors, and adhere to the standards contained in the San Luis Obispo Community Design Guidelines and the City’s night-sky ordinance. The City’s Night Sky Preservation Ordinance (17.70.100) includes requirements for new outdoor light sources to be shielded and directed away from adjacent properties and public rights-of-way, maximum light intensity limits, and limits on hours of operation. OASP Program 4.4.3a identifies additional lighting standards for streets, public spaces, and private grounds of the specific plan area that all projects being developed under the OASP shall comply with. The project would be subject to review and approval by the City Architecture Review Committee to ensure compliance with these standards prior to final approval. OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure AES-3(a), which includes the language of OASP Program 4.4.3a, is included as mitigation. Therefore, impacts from new sources of light or glare would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

**Mitigation Measures**

**OASP Final EIR AES-3(a). Minimize Lighting on Public Areas.** Lighting shall be shielded as shown in the Specific Plan and directed downward. Lighting shall not be mounted more than 16 feet high. Streetlights, where they are included, shall be primarily for pedestrian safety, and shall not provide widespread illumination unless necessary to comply with safety requirements, as determined by the Public Works Director. Street lighting should focus on intersections and should be placed between intersections only when it is necessary to comply with safety requirements, as determined by the Public Works Director. Trail lighting shall be at a scale appropriate for pedestrians, utilizing bollards, although overhead lighting may be used where vandalism of bollard lights is a concern. Prior to development of individual lots, proposed lighting shall be indicated on site plans and shall demonstrate that spill-over of lighting would not affect nearby residential areas.

**Conclusion**

The project is not located within a scenic vista or within the viewshed of a designated scenic highway. The project has been designed to comply with all applicable standards set forth in the OASP and the City’s Community Design Guidelines and would be subject to review and approval by the ARC and Planning Commission for finalization of design plans. Mitigation Measure AES-3(a) from the OASP, which includes the language of OASP Program 4.4.3a, is required.

**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, 7	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	2, 8	<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, 9	<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?	10	<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, 10	<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 and Farmland of Local Potential by the FMMP (source reference 7).

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 support any forest land or timberland.

### **Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

The OASP Final EIR previously analyzed specific plan areawide impacts to agricultural resources, including those associated with development of the project site. The OASP Final applied the Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) model to the OASP area to determine if there would be significant impacts on agricultural land due to development of the OASP area. The LESA Model determined that the value of the OASP's agricultural land is not significant. To support this evaluation, the Final EIR determined that although the City's COSE mapped potentially prime agricultural soils in the Orcutt Area, which coincide with the boundaries of the Cropley clay (127 and 128) shown on the USDA Soil Survey map, Cropley clay was not considered to be prime soil because they had not been irrigated recently, nor did they have the potential to be easily irrigated because of the topography, pattern of property ownership, and existing development on the site. The Final EIR also identified potential impacts related to conflicts between residential and agricultural operations. Mitigation for this impact, outside of specific plan goals and policies, is specific to the land around the Righetti family ranch, which is not in proximity to this project.

### **Project-Specific Review**

- a) The project site is designated as Urban and Built-Up Land and Farmland of Local Potential by the FMMP. The proposed project site is not in agricultural use and is not located on lands designated Farmland by the FMMP. Therefore, the project would not result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use, and *no impacts would occur*.
- b) The project site does not include land use designations or zoning for agricultural uses and is not located within land under an active Williamson Act Contract. The nearest property under Williamson Act contract is located approximately



Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

0.85 mile east of the project site. Therefore, the project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract and *no impacts would occur*.

c) Under the approved OASP, the project site is designated for Medium-High Density Residential (R-3) uses and Mixed-Use/Neighborhood Commercial uses. The project site does not include zoning for forest land or timberland and therefore would not conflict with forest land or timberland zoning, and *no impacts would occur*.

d) The project property currently supports two coast live oak trees, one eucalyptus trees, and several clusters of other common native and nonnative trees. While these trees provide an aesthetic benefit to the site, they do not constitute more than 10% of native tree cover of the site and therefore do not qualify as forest land. Therefore, *no impacts would occur*.

e) The project includes the development of a residentially zoned parcel with no existing agricultural uses or resources and therefore would not result in substantial changes in the environment that could otherwise result in conversion of agricultural land. The project would be required to comply with OASP Policy 3.2.24 and Program 3.2.24a and 3.2.24b, which requires compliance with the County’s Right to Farm Ordinance and also requires the eventual phase-out of agricultural activities within the OASP area. Therefore, *no impacts would occur*.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Conclusion**

The project site is located in a developed 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. The project would comply with OASP Policy 3.2.24 and Program 3.2.24a and 3.2.24b. No potentially significant impacts to agriculture or forest land would occur, and no mitigation is necessary.

### 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?	14, 15, 65	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?	11, 14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	1, 14	<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, 14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Evaluation**

The setting and analysis of this section are primarily based on the Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Impact Assessment prepared for the project by AMBIENT Air and Noise Consulting (source reference 14).

The City of San Luis Obispo 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

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Protection Agency (EPA), California Air Resources Board (CARB), and San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD).

San Luis Obispo County is currently designated as partial non-attainment for federal ambient standards for ground-level ozone, non-attainment for the state standards for ground-level ozone, and non-attainment for the state standards for particulate matter 10 micrometers or less in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>) (source reference 11). 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 policies include meeting federal and state 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 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Air Quality Handbook (most recently updated with a November 2017 Clarification Memorandum [source references 13 and 18]) 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 (source reference 15).

In 2003, the California Legislature enacted Senate Bill (SB) 656 to reduce public exposure to particulate matter (PM<sub>10</sub> and particulate matter 10 micrometers or less in diameter [PM<sub>2.5</sub>], collectively referred to as PM). SB 656 required the CARB in consultation with local air pollution control districts, to develop and adopt a list of PM reduction strategies. In July 2005, SLOAPCD adopted the Particulate Matter Report (PM Report). The PM Report identifies various measures and strategies to reduce public exposure to PM emitted from a wide variety of sources, including emissions from permitted stationary sources and fugitive sources, such as construction activities.

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to changes in air quality than others, depending on the population groups and the activities involved. The 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. The project site is located within 1,000 feet of multiple sensitive receptors, including an existing single-family residence located approximately 25 feet to the northwest, a mobile home park located approximately 300 feet to the northwest, a daycare center located approximately 500 feet to the north, existing residential development located approximately 580 feet to the east, and an approved residential development currently in construction to the southeast.

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] 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 (source reference 12).

**Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

The OASP Final EIR previously analyzed specific plan areawide impacts related to air quality, including those associated with development of the project site. The EIR identified impacts associated with long-term emissions related to traffic and energy use and short-term emissions related to construction equipment and grading. These impacts were determined to be less than significant with mitigation. The OASP analyzed in the OASP Final EIR was determined to be inconsistent with the City’s Clean Air Plan, because the rate of increase in vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled associated with buildout of the OASP area may exceed population growth rates for the area. This was determined to be a significant and unavoidable impact.

**Project-Specific Review**

- a) The SLOAPCD’s 2001 CAP addresses the attainment and maintenance of federal and state ambient air quality standards. In order to be considered consistent with the 2001 CAP, a project must be consistent with the land use planning and transportation control measures and strategies outlined in the CAP. The CAP includes multiple transportation and land use control measures intended to reduce emissions through reductions in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and the promotion of alternative forms of transportation. The control measures applicable to the proposed project

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

are summarized in Table 1. As noted, the proposed project would be considered consistent with the SLOAPCD's regional air quality planning efforts.

**Table 1. Project Consistency with SLOAPCD's CAP Transportation and Land Use Control Measures**

Control Measures	Project Consistency
<b>Land Use Planning Strategies</b>	
<p><b>L-1 Planning Compact Communities.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cities and unincorporated communities should be developed at densities that reduce trips and travel distances and encourage the use of alternative forms of transportation.</li> <li>Urban growth should occur within the urban reserve lines of cities and unincorporated communities.</li> <li>Local planning agencies should encourage walking and transit use by planning neighborhoods and commercial centers at densities to allow for convenient access to and use of local and regional transit systems.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The proposed project is located within the City's urban reserve lines and would result in the development of approximately 192 housing units, which is anticipated to promote overall increases in density that would help to reduce vehicle trip distances. Increases in housing units would help to offset projected imbalances between jobs and housing units, as noted in the 2019 Regional Housing Needs Assessment prepared by the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG). Improvements in a jobs-to-housing imbalance would be anticipated to help support and promote local and regional improvements related to increased transportation mobility and potential reductions in VMT. The proposed project would be consistent with this measure.</p>
<p><b>L-2 Providing for Mixed Land Use.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The mixing of compatible commercial and residential land uses should be encouraged when it will reduce dependence on the automobile or improve the balance between jobs and housing without creating incompatible land use relationships.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>L-3 Balancing Jobs and Housing.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Within cities and unincorporated communities, the gap between the availability of jobs and housing should be narrowed and should not be allowed to expand.</li> </ul>	
<b>Transportation Control Measures</b>	
<p><b>T-2B Regional Public Transit Improvements.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The goal of this measure is to improve transit service and facilities that will promote increased public transit use instead of a private automobile.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Consistent with Mitigation Incorporated.</b> Refer to Control Measure L-1, above.</p>
<p><b>T-3 Bicycling and Bikeway Enhancements.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The goal of this measure is to encourage a modal shift to bicycles through implementation of infrastructure improvements and administrative actions that provide inexpensive commute options and increased safety and convenience for commuters.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>T-6 Traffic-Flow Improvements.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This measure focuses on implementation of measures that would promote traffic calming and decreased vehicle congestion.</li> </ul>	

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Control Measures	Project Consistency
<b>Transportation Control Measures</b>	
<b>T-8 Teleworking, Teleconferencing, and Telelearning.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The objective of this measure is to reduce the number of trips and miles traveled by employees and students by promoting teleworking, tele-conferencing and telelearning.</li> </ul>	<b>Consistent.</b> The proposed project does not include commercial or industrial land uses that would result in increases in employment from outside the OASP area. The project includes eight live-work units, which would allow employees of the commercial spaces to live on-site. In addition, Mitigation Measure AQ-1(d) of the OASP Final EIR requires all new homes within the Specific Plan area to be constructed with internal wiring/cabling that allows telecommuting, teleconferencing, and telelearning to occur simultaneously in at least three locations in each home.

Based on the number of residential units proposed, the project is expected to result in an increase of approximately 440 residents. According to the U.S. Census, the City's 2019 population was approximately 47,459 (source reference 14). Under the medium growth scenario evaluated in the *2050 Regional Growth Forecast for San Luis Obispo County* (source reference 17) the City's population is estimated to total approximately 48,601 residents in 2025 and 51,672 in 2050. In comparison to the existing estimated population, this equates to an increase of approximately 1,142 residents by year 2025 and 4,213 residents by year 2050. The proposed project would result in near-term increases in population of approximately 440 residents, which would not exceed projected year 2025 or year 2050 population projections. The project would be consistent with the projected increases in residents within the OASP area identified in the City Land Use Element Program EIR, which concluded that the Land Use Circulation Element Update, which included the OASP, Airport Area Specific Plan, and Margarita Specific Plan, would not result in residential development or other associated population growth that would exceed an adopted average annual growth rate threshold. Lastly, the project would be consistent with the level of development evaluated in the OASP Final EIR, which concluded that the OASP was consistent with population assumptions of the General Plan and San Luis Obispo 2020 CAP. Since adoption of the OASP, several other specific plans and residential subdivision projects have been adopted within the City, including the San Luis Ranch Specific Plan and Froom Ranch Specific Plan. The adopted OASP and associated projected population growth were included in the cumulative impact evaluation for each of these subsequent specific plans.

According to the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA), the City has about 61% more jobs than housing units, indicative of a "jobs-rich" community. Based on the San Luis Obispo Council of Government (SLOCOG) 2019 Regional Transportation Plan, the City's jobs-to-housing ratio is estimated to increase from a year 2015 ratio of 1.61 jobs/housing to a ratio of 1.82 jobs/housing by year 2030 (source reference 65). The proposed project would add approximately 192 housing units, which would help to offset this projected increase in jobs-to-housing imbalance. Improvements in a jobs-to-housing imbalance would be anticipated to help support and promote regional and local improvements related to increased transportation mobility and potential reductions in VMT.

The PM Report identifies various measures and strategies to reduce public exposure to PM emitted from a wide variety of sources, including emissions from permitted stationary sources and fugitive sources, such as construction activities. As discussed in Threshold b, below, uncontrolled fugitive dust generated during construction may result in localized pollutant concentrations that may result in increased nuisance concerns to nearby land uses. Therefore, construction-generated emissions of PM would be considered to have the potential to result in a conflict with the SLOAPCD PM Report. Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-3 have been identified to reduce construction-generated emissions and upon implementation of these measures, the project would not conflict with the SLOAPCD PM Report.

The OASP Final EIR concluded that the OASP was consistent with population assumptions of the General Plan and SLOAPCD CAP, however, the specific plan would propose low density residential development outside of the current Urban Reserve Line (URL) and therefore would be inconsistent with the CAP policy encouraging growth within the

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

URL. Since the OASP Final EIR was certified, the URL boundaries of the City have been revised and now include the OASP area in its entirety. Therefore, the OASP Final EIR mitigation measure identified to address this potential conflict is no longer applicable. Therefore, potential impacts associated with a conflict or obstruction of implementation of the applicable air quality plan would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

- b) San Luis Obispo County is currently designated as non-attainment for ozone and PM<sub>10</sub> under state ambient air quality standards. Construction of the project would result in emissions of ozone precursors including reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrous oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), and fugitive dust emissions (PM<sub>10</sub>). During operation, the project would result in emissions of ozone precursors associated with mobile source emissions and other stationary sources.

**Construction Emissions**

Emissions associated with the construction of the proposed project were calculated using the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod), version 2016.3.2, computer program. Project construction is anticipated to occur over an approximately 33-month period. Construction generated emissions were compared to SLOAPCD’s recommended significant thresholds (Daily, Quarterly Tier 1, and Quarterly Tier 2).

As depicted in Table 2, maximum daily emissions associated with the construction of the proposed project would total approximately 36.4 pounds per day (lbs/day) of ROG+NO<sub>x</sub> and 1.25 lbs/day of exhaust PM<sub>10</sub> and the maximum quarterly construction-generated emissions would total approximately 1.21 tons per quarter (tons/qtr) of ROG+NO<sub>x</sub>, 0.16 tons/qtr of fugitive PM<sub>10</sub>, and 0.03 tons/qtr of exhaust PM<sub>10</sub>.

**Table 2. Summary of Project Construction Emissions.**

Criteria	Project Emissions	SLOAPCD Significance Threshold		Exceeds Significance Threshold?	
		Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 1	Tier 2
Maximum Daily Emissions of ROG+NO <sub>x</sub>	36.4 lbs/day	137 lbs/day		No	
Maximum Daily Emissions of Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM)	1.25 lbs/day	7 lbs/day		No	
Maximum Quarterly Emissions of ROG+NO <sub>x</sub>	1.26 tons/qtr	2.5 tons/qtr	6.3 tons/qtr	No	No
Maximum Quarterly Emissions of DPM	0.03 tons/qtr	0.13 tons/qtr	0.32 tons/qtr	No	No
Maximum Quarterly Emissions of Fugitive PM	0.16 tons/qtr	2.5 tons/qtr	None	No	No

Maximum daily and quarterly construction emissions of ROG+NO<sub>x</sub> would not exceed SLOAPCD’s Daily, Quarterly Tier 1, or Quarterly Tier 2 significance thresholds. Emissions would be largely a result of mobile-source emissions associated with construction vehicle and equipment operations anticipated to occur during the building construction phase. Estimated emissions of fugitive PM and Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) would not exceed SLOAPCD’s significance thresholds.

While the project individually would not exceed SLOAPCD’s thresholds for construction emissions, the OASP Final EIR concluded that development under the proposed Specific Plan would have the potential to generate construction-related emissions that would contribute to the County’s non-attainment status for PM<sub>10</sub>. The OASP Final EIR identified mitigation measures to require Construction Best Available Control Technology (CBACT), dust control, covering of stockpiled soils, and dust control monitoring on projects with an area of disturbance greater than 1 acre. For the purposes of this project, OASP mitigation measures AQ-3(a) through AQ-3(d) would be replaced by mitigation measure AQ-2, which includes all of the same requirements but has been updated to reflect current APCD requirements and standard language.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**Operational Emissions**

Project operational emissions associated with the proposed project are summarized in Table 3, below. As depicted, maximum daily operational emissions would total approximately 18.1 lbs/day of ROG+NO<sub>x</sub>, 42.9 lbs/day of carbon monoxide (CO), and 9.3 lbs/day of fugitive PM<sub>10</sub>. Daily emissions of ROG+NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, and fugitive PM<sub>10</sub> would not exceed SLOAPCD’s corresponding significance thresholds.

**Table 3. Summary of Project Operational Emissions.**

Operational Period/Source	Emissions <sup>1</sup>						
	ROG	NO <sub>x</sub>	ROG+NO <sub>x</sub>	CO	PM <sub>10</sub>		
					Fugitive	Exhaust <sup>2</sup>	Total
<b>Daily Emissions (lbs/day)</b>							
Area Source	5.3	0.2	5.5	15.8	0	<0.1	<0.1
Energy Use	0.1	1.0	1.1	0.4	0	0.1	0.1
Mobile <sup>3</sup>	2.3	9.2	11.5	26.7	9.3	0.1	9.4
Total Project Emissions	7.7	10.4	18.1	42.9	9.3	0.2	9.5
SLOAPCD Significance Thresholds	--	--	25	550	25	1.25 <sup>4</sup>	--
Exceeds SLOAPCD Thresholds?	--	--	No	No	No	No <sup>3</sup>	--
<b>Annual Emissions (tons/year)</b>							
Total Project Emissions	1.4	1.8	3.1	7.1	1.5	<0.1	1.6
SLOAPCD Significance Thresholds	--	--	25	--	25	--	--
Exceeds SLOAPCD Thresholds?	--	--	No	--	No	--	--

<sup>1</sup> Daily emissions are based on the highest emissions for summer or winter operational conditions for buildout year 2024 conditions. Totals may not sum due to rounding. Refer to Appendix C for modeling output files and assumptions.

<sup>2</sup> Includes PM exhaust emissions for diesel- and gasoline-fueled vehicles. Based on the CalEEMod default fleet mix, diesel-fueled vehicles would represent less than 10 percent of the overall vehicle fleet mix/VMT and total exhaust PM<sub>10</sub> emissions for the project. Estimated total diesel-exhaust PM<sub>10</sub>, including on-site and off-site vehicular emissions, would be less than approximately 0.2 lbs/day. The proposed project is not anticipated to include the installation of on-site stationary or mobile sources of DPM emissions that would be anticipated to exceed the SLOAPCD’s on-site significance threshold of 1.25 lbs/day.

<sup>3</sup> Includes EMFAC off-model adjustment factors to account for the SAFE Vehicle Rule, Part One.

<sup>4</sup> The SLOAPCD-recommended DPM significance threshold applies to on-site emission sources.

The OASP Final EIR concluded that the operational vehicle emissions associated with the buildout within the Specific Plan area would result in emissions of air pollutants in exceedance of recommended significance thresholds and identified mitigation measures to require an increase of building energy efficiency, transit improvements, installation of shade trees, improvements to allow for telecommuting, accessible pathways, and pedestrian signalization. Upon implementation of these measures, the OASP Final EIR concluded that potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant. Therefore, potential impacts associated with a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

- c) The project site is located within 1,000 feet of multiple sensitive receptors, including an existing single-family residence located approximately 25 feet to the northwest, a mobile home park located approximately 300 feet to the northwest, a daycare center located approximately 500 feet to the north, existing residential development located approximately 580 feet to the east, and an approved residential development currently in construction to the southeast.

Construction activities such as excavation, grading, vegetation removal, staging, and building construction would result in temporary construction vehicle emissions and fugitive dust that may affect surrounding sensitive receptors. Based on the scale of activities proposed and proximity to sensitive receptors, the project would have the potential to expose nearby sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-3 have been

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

identified to reduce construction-generated emissions and upon implementation of these measures, the project would not result in the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial ozone precursor or fugitive dust emissions.

Localized concentrations of CO are of primary concern in areas located near congested roadway intersections. Of particular concern are signalized intersections that are projected to operate at unacceptable levels of service (LOS) E or F. Based on transportation impact analysis summarized in Section 17, Transportation, the project would contribute to the future reduction of LOS at the Orcutt Road/Bullock Lane/Laurel Lane intersection to LOS F during both peak hours under the cumulative development scenario. Mitigation Measure TR-1 has been identified to require the project owner(s) to coordinate with City staff to determine the fair-share payment to the fund to construct an additional westbound through lane at this intersection, as described in the *City of San Luis Obispo General Plan Circulation Element*. With the addition of a westbound through lane, the LOS at this intersection would be reduced to LOS D or better during peak hours and localized concentrations of CO would be reduced to no longer pose a significant health risk to nearby sensitive receptors. The OASP Final EIR also concluded that the traffic generation of the Specific Plan would not result in CO “hotspots” and that potential impacts associated with CO hotspots would be less than significant.

NOA has been identified as a toxic air contaminant by the CARB. In accordance with CARB ATCM, prior to any grading activities, a geologic evaluation must be conducted to determine if NOA is present within the area that will be disturbed. If NOA is not present, an exemption request form, along with a copy of the geologic report, must be filed with the SLOAPCD. If NOA is found at the site, the applicant must comply with all requirements outlined in the Asbestos ATCM.

Based on a review of the SLOAPCD’s map depicting potential areas of NOA, the project site is located in or near an area that has been identified as having a potential for NOA and there is a potential for NOA to potentially be discovered during the grading process.

The proposed project would include the demolition of approximately 2,000 square feet of existing on-site structures. Demolition activities can have potential adverse air quality impacts, including issues surrounding the proper handling, demolition, and disposal of asbestos-containing material (ACM), as well as the release of lead-containing particles if demolished structures are coated with lead-based paint. Mitigation Measure AQ-4 has been identified to adequately reduce potential impacts to sensitive receptors associated with the disturbance of asbestos and lead during demolition and grading activities through implementation of applicable national, state, and local standards for the identification, treatment, and disposal of NOA, ATCM, and lead-containing materials.

Upon implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-4 and TR-1, potential impacts associated with exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

- d) The proposed project would not result in the installation of any equipment or processes that would be considered major odor emission sources. However, construction of the proposed project would involve the use of a variety of gasoline or diesel-powered equipment that would emit exhaust fumes. Exhaust fumes, particularly diesel exhaust, have the potential to generate odors considered objectionable. In addition, pavement coatings and architectural coatings used during project construction would also emit temporary odors. However, construction-generated emissions would occur intermittently throughout the workday and would dissipate rapidly with increasing distance from the source. The project would be required to adhere to standard APCD diesel idling restrictions and does not propose a land use identified as a nuisance odor source in SLOAPCD’s CEQA Air Quality Handbook. As a result, neither short-term construction activities nor project operation would expose a substantial number of people to frequent odorous emissions, and potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

**Mitigation Measures**

*Note: OASP Mitigation Measure AQ-3(a-d) have been replaced by AQ-1 through AQ-3. These measures implement the same requirements of the original mitigation measures but have been updated to conform to current SLOAPCD requirements/standards.*

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

*Note: OASP Mitigation Measure AQ-1(a) requires that building energy efficiency rating be 10% above what is required by Title 24. The California Green Building Standards Code, known as Title 24, was adopted in 2008 and went into effect in 2009, and was the code in effect at the time of adoption of the OASP Final EIR. The California Energy Commission estimates that the current (2019) Title 24 energy requirements will reduce residential building energy use by over 50 percent and nonresidential energy use by 30 percent; this reduction is greater than a 10% reduction from the 2008 code requirements and therefore this measure has been satisfied through legislative statute and is not included in this document.*

**AQ-1** The following SLOAPCD-recommended *Standard Mitigation Measures* shall be implemented to reduce construction-generated NO<sub>x</sub>, ROG, and DPM:

- a. Maintain all construction equipment in proper tune according to manufacturer’s specifications;
- b. Fuel all off-road and portable diesel-powered equipment with CARB-certified motor vehicle diesel fuel (non-taxed version suitable for use off-road);
- c. Diesel-fueled construction equipment shall meet, at a minimum, CARB’s Tier 2-certified engines or cleaner off-road heavy-duty diesel engines, and comply with the State Off-Road Regulation;
- d. Use on-road heavy-duty trucks that meet the CARB’s 2007 or cleaner certification standard for on-road heavy-duty diesel engines, and comply with the State On-Road Regulation;
- e. Construction or trucking companies with fleets that do not have engines in their fleet that meet the engine standards identified in the above two measures (e.g. captive or NO<sub>x</sub> exempt area fleets) may be eligible by proving alternative compliance;
- f. All on- and off-road diesel equipment shall not idle for more than 5 minutes. Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas and or job sites to remind drivers and operators of the 5-minute idling limit;
- g. Diesel idling within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors is not permitted;
- h. Staging and queuing areas shall not be located within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors, if feasible;
- i. Electrify equipment, when feasible;
- j. Substitute gasoline-powered in place of diesel-powered equipment, where feasible; and
- k. Use alternative-fueled construction equipment on-site where feasible, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane, or biodiesel.

**AQ-2** The following SLOAPCD-recommended mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce construction generated fugitive dust. These measures shall be shown on grading and building plans.

- a. Reduce the amount of disturbed area where possible.
- b. Use water trucks, SLOAPCD-approved dust suppressants (see Section 4.3 in the CEQA Air Quality Handbook), 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 (mph). Reclaimed (non-potable) water should be used whenever possible. Please note that since water use is a concern due to drought conditions, the contractor or builder shall consider the use of a SLOAPCD-approved dust suppressant where feasible to reduce the amount of water used for dust control. For a list of suppressants, see Section 4.3 of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook.
- c. All dirt stockpile areas should be sprayed and covered daily, as needed.
- d. Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans should be implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil-disturbing activities;
- e. Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than 1 month after initial grading should be sown with a fast-germinating, non-invasive grass seed and watered until vegetation is established.



Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- f. All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the SLOAPCD.
- g. All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- h. Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site.
- i. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between the top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114.
- j. Install wheel washers at the construction site entrance/exit, wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site, or implement other SLOAPCD-approved track-out prevention devices sufficient to minimize the track-out of soil onto paved roadways.
- k. Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water should be used where feasible.
- l. The burning of vegetative material shall be prohibited. Effective February 25, 2000, the SLOAPCD prohibited developmental burning of vegetative material within San Luis Obispo County. If you have any questions regarding these requirements, contact the SLOAPCD Engineering & Compliance Division at (805) 781-5912.
- m. The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the fugitive dust emissions and enhance the implementation of the measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints, reduce visible emissions below 20% opacity, and to prevent the transport of dust off-site. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SLOAPCD Compliance Division prior to the start of any grading, earthwork, or demolition.
- n. When applicable, portable equipment, 50 horsepower (hp) or greater, used during construction activities shall be registered with the California statewide portable equipment registration program (issued by the CARB) or be permitted by the SLOAPCD. Such equipment may include power screens, conveyors, internal combustion engines, crushers, portable generators, tub grinders, trammel screens, and portable plants (e.g., aggregate plant, asphalt plant, concrete plant). For more information, contact the SLOAPCD Engineering & Compliance Division at (805) 781-5912.
- o. Construction of the proposed project shall use low volatile organic compound (VOC)-content paints not exceeding 50 grams per liter.
- p. To the extent locally available, use prefinished building materials or materials that do not require the application of architectural coatings.

**AQ-3** The following measures shall be implemented to reduce construction emissions from on- and off-road construction equipment (NO<sub>x</sub>, ROG, and DPM). These measures shall be shown on grading and building plans:

- a. Idling Restrictions Near Sensitive Receptors for Both On- and Off-Road Equipment.
  - 1. Staging and queuing areas shall not be located within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors;
  - 2. Diesel idling within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors is not permitted;
  - 3. Use of alternative-fueled equipment is recommended whenever possible; and
  - 4. Signs that specify the no-idling requirements must be posted and enforced at the construction site.
- b. Idling Restrictions for On-Road Vehicles. Section 2485 of 13 CCR limits diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles that operate in the state of California with gross vehicular weight ratings of greater 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:

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

1. 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
2. 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 minutes at any location when within 100 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 web site: [www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/truck-idling/2485.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/truck-idling/2485.pdf).

- c. Idling Restrictions for Off-Road Equipment. Off-road diesel equipment shall comply with the 5-minute idling restriction identified in Section 2449(d)(3) of the CARB’s In-Use Off-Road Diesel regulation: [www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2007/ordiesl07/frooal.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2007/ordiesl07/frooal.pdf).

Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas and job sites to remind off-road equipment operators of the 5-minute idling limit.

**AQ-4** The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce the disturbance of asbestos and lead. Strategies include but are not limited to the following:

- a. Demolition of on-site structures shall comply with the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Emissions (NESHAP) requirements (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Part 61, Subpart M) for the demolition of existing structures. The SLOAPCD is delegated authority by the EPA to implement the federal Asbestos NESHAP. Prior to demolition of on-site structures, the SLOAPCD shall be notified, per NESHAP requirements. The SLOAPCD notification form and reporting requirements are included in Appendix A. Additional information may be obtained at the following website: <http://slocleanair.org/business/asbestos.php>.
- b. If during the demolition of existing structures paint is separated from the construction materials (e.g., chemically or physically), the paint waste will 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 federal, state, and local regulations. According to the California 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 construction debris (a non-hazardous waste). The landfill operator will be contacted prior to disposal of building material debris to determine any specific requirements the landfill may have regarding the disposal of lead-based paint materials. The disposal of demolition debris shall comply with any such requirements. Contact the SLOAPCD Enforcement Division at (805) 781-5912 for more information. Approval of a lead work plan and permit may be required. Lead work plans, if required, will need to be submitted to SLOAPCD 10 days prior to the start of demolition.
- c. Prior to any grading activities, a geologic evaluation shall be conducted to determine if NOA is present within the area that will be disturbed unless the applicant agrees to comply with the Asbestos ATCM without an evaluation. If NOA is not present, an exemption request must be filed with the SLOAPCD. If NOA is found at the site, the applicant must comply with all requirements outlined in the Asbestos ATCM. These requirements may include but are not limited to:
  1. Development of an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan, which must be approved by the SLOAPCD before operations begin; and
  2. Development and approval of an Asbestos Health and Safety Program (required for some projects).

**OASP Final EIR AQ-1(c). Shade Trees.** All parking lots shall include shade trees within the parking area. There shall be at least one shade tree for every six vehicle parking spaces.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**OASP Final EIR AQ-1(d). Telecommuting.** All new homes within the Specific Plan area shall be constructed with internal wiring/cabling that allows telecommuting, teleconferencing, and telelearning to occur simultaneously in at least three locations in each home.

**OASP Final EIR AQ-1(e). Pathways.** Where feasible, all cul-de-sacs and dead-end streets shall be links by pathways to encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel.

**Conclusion**

The project would result in air pollutant emissions during construction that would have the potential to adversely affect nearby sensitive receptors and result in a conflict with the SLOAPCD’s significance thresholds and PM Report. With implementation of the mitigation measures identified above, potential impacts associated with air quality would be reduced to 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?	21, 22, 23, 24	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?	23, 25	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?	23, 25	<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?	23, 25	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	5, 10	<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?	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Evaluation**

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 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.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The *City of San Luis Obispo Tree Ordinance* was adopted in 2010 and amended in 2019 (Ordinance 1664) with the purpose of establishing a comprehensive program for installing, maintaining, and preserving trees within the city (source reference 5). This ordinance includes policies that require preservation of trees whenever possible and feasible, acquisition of a permit for any tree removal within the city, and application requirements for tree removals associated with development permits. The City has also established a Heritage Tree Program, which identifies landmark trees throughout the city that are typically large specimens and/or of unusual species and are identified and approved by the Tree Committee and City Council. Based on the City's Geographic Information System (GIS) Division Heritage Trees map, no heritage trees are located within the project site (source reference 20).

The project site is characterized by nearly flat to gently rolling nonnative grassland, heavily disturbed ruderal areas, and residential landscaping. Existing development on the project site includes two vacant single-family residences, a barn, several accessory structures, and searain containers. The project site currently supports four coast live oak trees, three eucalyptus trees, and several clusters of other common native and nonnative trees. A small rock outcropping is located near the north of the project site (see Figure 7). There are no drainage, wetland, or water features on-site.

**Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

The OASP Final EIR previously analyzed biological resources, generally in the OASP area. The project site was not surveyed for the OASP Final EIR. The Final EIR analysis found that development within the OASP area would result in impacts to special-status plant species and plant communities. Mitigation related to this impact requires that individual projects being developed under the OASP prepare seasonally-time botanical surveys and identify buffers and a mitigation plan should special-status species or communities be identified. Mitigation also requires pre-construction surveys related to wildlife species. The Final EIR also identified impacts to riparian woodland and wetland habitat, but neither of these communities were found to occur on the project site. Additionally, OASP Policy 2.2.7 and 2.2.8, which require protection of special status plant species and habitats, primarily through encouragement of native plantings, removal of non-native species, and adherence to the Final EIR mitigation measures. The project's tree removals and replanting/landscape plan were reviewed by the City's Tree Committee on October 26, 2020 and was recommended for approval.

**Project-Specific Review**

a) *Special-Status Plants*

To satisfy OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measures B-2(a) and B-2(e), botanical surveys of the project site were conducted on April 23 and May 31, 2019, to determine the presence or absence of rare plant species, sensitive habitats, and native bunchgrass habitat on the property. The surveys were timed to coincide with the blooming period of special-status plant species with potential to occur to ensure an accurate presence/absence determination. A records search of the California Diversity Database (CNDDDB) was conducted, and based on the results of the records search and a preliminary assessment of the on-site location and conditions, it was determined that Congdon's tarplant (*Centromadia parryi* ssp. *congdonii*), a California Native Plant Society (CNPS) California Rare Plant Rank (CRPR) 1B.1 plant, had the potential to occur on-site. On May 30, 2019, prior to conducting the second survey, a reference population of Congdon's tarplant located off Tank Farm Road was observed to be flowering. No Congdon's tarplant, native bunchgrasses, native bunchgrass habitat, or sensitive habitats or species were observed during either survey of the project site.

One CRPR 4.2 (limited distribution) species, Cambria morning glory (*Calystegia subacaulis* ssp. *episcopalis*), was observed growing sporadically throughout the undeveloped areas of both parcels. It is important to note that although Cambria morning glory was listed as a CRPR 1B plant at the time the OASP EIR was drafted (December 2009), this species is presently no longer a CRPR 1B plant according to the most recent CNPS ranking system. This species was placed on the CNPS Rank 4 list in approximately 2011 after the Final EIR was drafted and certified. Therefore, impacts to this species are considered less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. Based on the CNDDDB records search and botanical surveys conducted on-site, the project site does not support any special-status plant species or sensitive vegetation communities. Therefore, potential impacts to special-status plant species or sensitive vegetation communities would be *less than significant*.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

*Special-Status Wildlife*

The project site is characterized by three habitat types: nonnative grassland, heavily disturbed ruderal areas, and residential landscaping. The project site currently supports four coast live oak trees, three eucalyptus trees, and several clusters of other common native and non-native trees. The project would result in the removal of all trees on-site and disturbance of the entire site. Based on the certified Final EIR, no riparian woodland, wetland, coastal scrub, or other sensitive native communities have been mapped within the project site. Based on the analysis provided in the certified Final EIR, trees on-site could provide habitat, including nesting, roosting, and/or basking sites for special-status raptors, including the Cooper’s hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), golden eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*), prairie falcon (*Falco mexicanus*), and sharp-shinned hawk (*Accipiter striatus*), as well as nesting birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA).

If project construction activities are conducted between February 1 and September 15, they could result in direct and indirect impacts to nesting birds, if present. Potential direct impacts to nesting birds include injury, mortality, or destruction of nests and/or eggs from the use and movement of construction equipment and from tree and vegetation removal. Potential indirect impacts to nesting birds include the generation of noise and dust from construction activities and the alteration of suitable nesting habitat. OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure B-5(a) has been identified to minimize potential impacts to nesting migratory birds during construction of future residential uses through avoiding work during nesting season or conducting a preconstruction survey for active nests prior to vegetation removal activities and implementation of appropriate buffers if active nests are identified on-site. With implementation of OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure B-5(a), potential impacts to special-status bird species and nesting birds protected under the MBTA would be *less than significant*.

In addition, the eucalyptus trees located onsite could have potential to provide an autumnal/winter aggregation site for the monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*). Potential impacts to the monarch butterfly could occur if present during tree removal and construction activities. OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure B-5(c) has been identified to require a preconstruction survey for active monarch butterfly roost sites if site disturbance activities are scheduled between October and March and implementation of appropriate no-work buffers if active roosts are found. Upon implementation of BIO-2, potential impacts to the monarch butterfly would be *less than significant*.

On-site trees and structures also have the potential to support roosting bats, including Townsend’s big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii townsendii*). Potential impacts to roosting bats could occur if present during tree removal and construction activities. Mitigation Measure BIO-3 has been identified to require a preconstruction survey for active bat roosts if site disturbance activities are scheduled during roosting season and implementation of appropriate no-work buffers if active roosts are found. Upon implementation of BIO-3, potential impacts to roosting bats, including Townsend’s big-eared bat, would be *less than significant*.

Non-native grasslands on-site have the potential to provide foraging and burrowing habitat for burrowing owls (*Athene cunicularia*). To satisfy OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure B-5(b), a total of six field surveys were conducted on-site to determine the potential for the site to support wintering and breeding burrowing owls in accordance with the 1993 California Burrowing Owl Consortium Guidelines and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) 2012 staff report on burrowing owl mitigation. No winter or breeding burrowing owls were observed using the site during any of the field surveys. In addition, there was no evidence of burrowing owl use around any of the observed ground squirrel burrows located on-site (source reference 24). Given the minimal ground squirrel activity, mostly level site, and surrounding development, burrowing owls would not occur on-site, and potential impacts to burrowing owl would be *less than significant*.

It should be noted that the project site is located within an area identified in the certified Final EIR as potential compensatory mitigation area for future impacts to vernal pool fairy shrimp (VPFS) (*Branchinecta lynchi*) that may result from development located within the OASP. The certified Final EIR identified potentially significant impacts to VPFS associated with future development of areas with existing wetland features if present within the OASP area and if complete avoidance is not economically or technically feasible. To mitigate this potentially significant impact, the Final EIR identified Mitigation Measure B-5(d) and B-5(e) requiring compensatory mitigation by enhancing existing

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

wetland or creating wetland habitat at a ratio to be determined by the applicable regulatory agencies. These mitigation measures noted that this type of mitigation is difficult to ensure success and identified an alternative measure that would include collection and storage of fairy shrimp cysts during the dry season. To date, no development of areas within the OASP that have existing wetland features with potential for supporting VPFS have been approved. Development of the project site would result in the loss of potential area that could be used for compensatory VPFS mitigation. In addition, two other areas within the OASP designated as potential compensatory mitigation areas for VPFS have been approved for development and are under construction. However, the project, in conjunction with the other approved development areas, would result in a loss of less than 50% of the total compensatory mitigation area, and alternative mitigation measures are available to reduce impacts to less than significant that do not require enhancement or creation of VPFS habitat.

Additionally, the OASP Final EIR identified that development could introduce or maintain non-native animals (pets) and non-native landscaping to the OASP area. The introduction and presence of these species could directly impact wildlife resources through habitat alteration, predation, and reduction of food/competition for food. OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measures B-6(c) and B-6(d) [incorrectly numbered B-6(c) in the Final EIR] would require landscaping plan review that prohibits certain exotic and invasive plant species, and would require homeowner education regarding pet impacts to wildlife.

Based on the analysis provided above, the project would have the potential to result in impacts to special-status bird species, nesting birds protected under the MBTA, monarch butterflies, and roosting bats. Upon implementation of OASP Mitigation Measures B-5(a) and B-5(c) and B-6(c) and B-6(d) identified below, potential impacts to special-status species and their habitats would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

- 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 600 feet from the nearest creek and associated riparian habitat and would not result in any direct impacts to this habitat area. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities, and impacts would be *less than significant*.
- c) Based on the certified Final EIR and a review of the National Wetlands Inventory Mapping tool, the project site does not support federal or state wetlands or other potentially jurisdictional water features (source reference 25). Therefore, the project would not result in an adverse effect on federally or state-protected wetlands, and *no impacts would occur*.
- d) In the project vicinity, the foothills of the Santa Lucia Mountains to the north and east and their associated canyons provide an important regional wildlife movement corridor for many species. Wildlife movement within the OASP area is expected to occur primarily along the riparian habitats and associated drainage channels located outside of the project site. The project site does not contain any riparian habitats, drainages, or other features that would characterize a wildlife movement corridor. Based on existing structures and disturbed areas on-site and lack of habitats characteristic of movement corridors, the project would not interfere substantially with the movement of migratory fish or wildlife, and potential impacts would be *less than significant*.
- e) The project site does not contain any heritage trees or significant native vegetation. The project includes the removal of two coast live oak trees, one eucalyptus trees, and several small clusters of other common native and nonnative trees. Proposed tree removal would be conducted in compliance with the City's Tree Ordinance standards for tree removal with a development permit, which requires submittal of site plans showing location and species of trees to be removed, information to support the reason for removal, and other required pertinent information. This application would be subject to review and approval by the City Tree Committee. In addition, tree removals authorized by the project development permit/tract map would be subject to the compensatory tree planting requirements set forth in the City Municipal Code (12.24.090). The project would not result in a conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources; therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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**

**OASP Final EIR B-5(a). Bird Pre-Construction Survey.** To avoid impacts to nesting special-status bird species and raptors including the ground nesting burrowing owl, all initial ground-disturbing activities and tree removal shall be limited to the time period between September 15 and February 1. If initial site disturbance, grading, and tree removal cannot be conducted during this time period, a pre-construction survey for active nests within the limits of grading shall be conducted by a qualified biologist at the site no more than 30 days prior to the start of any construction activities (for ground-nesting burrowing owl survey see below). If active nests are located, all construction work must be conducted outside a buffer zone of 250 feet to 500 feet from the nests as determined in consultation with the CDFG. No direct disturbance to nests shall occur until the adults and young are no longer reliant on the nest site. A qualified biologist shall confirm that breeding/nesting is completed and young have fledged the nest prior to the start of construction.

**OASP Final EIR B-5(c). Monarch Pre-Construction Survey.** If initial ground-breaking is to occur between the months of October and March a preconstruction survey for active monarch roost sites within the limits of grading shall be conducted by a qualified biologist at the site two weeks prior to any construction activities. If active roost sites are located no ground-disturbing activities shall occur within 50 feet of the perimeter of the habitat. Construction shall not resume within the setback until a qualified biologist has determined that the monarch butterfly has vacated the site.

**OASP Final EIR B-6(c). Educational Pet Brochure.** Any development pursuant to the Specific Plan shall prepare a brochure that informs prospective homebuyers and Home Owners Association (HOA) members about the impacts associated with non-native animals, especially cats and dogs, to the project site; similarly, the brochure must inform potential homebuyers and all HOA members of the potential for coyotes to prey on domestic animals.

**OASP Final EIR B-6(d). Landscaping Plan Review.** To ensure that project landscaping does not introduce invasive non-native plant and tree species to the region of the site, the final landscaping plan shall be reviewed and approved by a qualified biologist. The California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC) maintains several lists of the most important invasive plants to avoid. The lists shall be used when creating a plant palette for landscaping to ensure that plants on the lists are not used. The following plants shall not allowed as part of potential landscaping plans pursuant to development under the Specific Plan:

- African sumac (*Rhus lancea*)
- Australian saltbush (*Atriplex semibaccata*)
- Black locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia*)
- California pepper (*Schinus molle*) and Brazilian pepper (*S. terebinthifolius*)
- Cape weed (*Arctotheca calendula*)
- Cotoneaster (*Cotoneaster pannosus*), (*C. lacteus*)
- Edible fig (*Ficus carica*)
- Fountain grass (*Pennisetum setaceum*)
- French broom (*Genista monspessulana*)
- Ice plant, sea fig (*Carpobrotus edulis*)
- Leafy spurge (*Euphorbia esula*)
- Myoporum (*Myoporum* spp.)
- Olive (*Olea europaea*)
- Pampas grass (*Cortaderia seloana*), and Andean pampas grass (*C. jubata*)
- Russian olive (*Elaeagnus angusticifolia*)
- Scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*) and striated broom (*C. striatus*)
- Spanish broom (*Spartium junceum*)
- Tamarix, salt cedar (*Tamarix chinensis*), (*T. gallica*), (*T. parviflora*), (*T. ramosissima*)

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- Blue gum (Eucalyptus globulus)
- Athel tamarisk (Tamarix aphylla)

With the exception of poison oak, only those species listed in the Specific Plan’s Suggested Plant List (Appendix E) shall not be planted anywhere on-site because they are invasive non-native plant species. Poison oak is a native plant species and could be used to deter human entrance to an area such as a mitigation/enhancement area.

**Conclusion**

The project site does not support any blue line creeks, riparian vegetation, federal or state wetlands or other potentially jurisdictional water features. The project would not interfere substantially with the movement of migratory fish or wildlife or result in a conflict with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources. Based on the analysis provided above, the project would have the potential to result in impacts to special-status bird species, nesting birds protected under the MBTA, monarch butterflies, roosting bats, and native wildlife species. With implementation of the mitigation measures identified above, potential impacts to biological resources would be reduced to 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?	26, 27	<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?	27	<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?	27	<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 not located within a Burial Sensitivity Area as identified in Figure 1 of the COSE.

**Historic Setting**

The COSE identifies Historic Districts and historic listed properties within the city and establishes various policies to balance cultural and historical resource preservation with other community goals. The project is not located within a Historic District or Historic Perseveration Overlay Zone.

**Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

The OASP Final EIR previously analyzed specific plan areawide impacts to cultural resources, including the potential for significant but mitigatable impacts to previously unidentified archaeological deposits and/or human remains. OASP Policies 2.51 and 2.7.1a and Program 2.7.1a call for the protection of known and unknown archaeological resources through the implementation of the OASP Final EIR mitigation measures. OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measures CR-1(a) through CR-1(d) require surveys for previously un-surveyed parcels, monitoring during vegetation removal (limited to certain areas) and construction, and CR-2(a) and CR-2(b) require additional testing and monitoring should avoidance of known sites be impossible.



Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**Project-Specific Review**

a) A records search was conducted through the Central Coast Information Center (CCIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), located at the University of California, Santa Barbara. The CCIC data includes the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) Listed Properties, California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), California Inventory of Historical Resources, California State Historical Landmarks, California Points of Historical Interest, and California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) Historic Property Directory and Determinations of Eligibility. Based on the results of this records search, the project site does not currently contain, nor is it located near, any known historic resources identified in the NRHP or CRHR.

An architectural evaluation was completed for both parcels, in compliance with OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure CR-4(a) to determine whether any existing built environment resources located on-site were eligible for listing in the CRHR. None of the historic-period built environment resources present within the project area limits meet the eligibility criteria for listing in the CRHR or otherwise constitute historical resources for the purposes of CEQA (source reference 26).

During the field survey in April 2019, abundant trash associated with the residence and workshops on the property were observed throughout the project area. While some of the debris was of historic age, none warranted official documentation, nor did it contribute to an archaeological resource. The project site is not identified on the City’s Historical Properties map or located within a Historic District; therefore, the project would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of, or any other adverse impact to, a historical resource, and *no impact would occur*.

b) The archaeological survey conducted in support of the OASP EIR by Conejo Archaeological Consultants in 2004 only evaluated the southern parcel of the project site. In compliance with OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure CR-1(a), an archaeological survey for the northern parcel was conducted in 2019 by SWCA Environmental Consultants. A records search was conducted through the CCIC, located at the University of California, Santa Barbara. The CCIC records search revealed that one previously identified archaeological resources is located within 0.25 mile of the project area. Although no resources were identified within the project area, the Phase I Archaeological Survey Report prepared for the project (source reference 27) concluded that the project area has moderate sensitivity for the presence of unidentified archaeological resources. In the event that archaeological resources are exposed during project implementation, potentially significant impacts to those resources could occur. OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure CR-1(d) would apply to reduce potential impacts to archaeological resources if discovered during proposed site disturbance activities; therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

c) The project site not located within a Burial Sensitivity Area associated with San Luis Obispo Creek identified in Figure 1 of the COSE. No human remains are known to exist within the project site; however, the discovery of unknown human remains is always a possibility during ground-disturbing activities. Protocol for properly responding to the inadvertent discovery of human remains is identified in California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and is detailed in OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure CR-1(d). Potential impacts related to disturbance of human remains would be less than significant with incorporation of Mitigation Measure CR-1(d). Therefore, impacts related to disturbance of human remains would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

**Mitigation Measures**

**OASP Final EIR CR-1(d). Archaeological Resource Construction Monitoring.** At the commencement of project construction, an orientation meeting shall be conducted by an archaeologist for construction workers associated with earth disturbing procedures. The orientation meeting shall describe the possibility of exposing unexpected archaeological resources and directions as to what steps are to be taken if such a find is encountered.

An archaeologist shall monitor construction grading within 50 meters (164 feet) of the two isolated finds. In the event that prehistoric or historic archaeological resources are exposed during project construction, all earth disturbing work within 50 meters (164 feet) of the find must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated (e.g., curation,

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

preservation in place, etc.), work in the area may resume. The City should consider retaining a Chumash representative to monitor any field work associated with Native American cultural material.

If human remains are exposed, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

*Note: Isolated finds were not identified on the proposed project site and the requirement for monitoring during construction within 50 meters of the two isolated finds does not apply to this project.*

**Conclusion**

The project has the potential to result in impacts to previously undiscovered cultural resources during proposed grading activities. With implementation of the mitigation measures identified above, residual impacts associated with cultural resources would be reduced to 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?	28, 33, 75	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	28, 29, 33, 75	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Evaluation**

The setting and analysis of this section are primarily based on the Energy Use Assessment prepared for the project by AMBIENT Air and Noise Consulting (source reference 75).

The City’s current electricity provider is Central Coast Community Energy (CCCE; formerly known as Monterey Bay Community Power) which provides 100% carbon-free electricity to City government facilities, as well as residences and private businesses within the city.

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* (source reference 33). 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 CBC to encourage all-electric new buildings. When paired with CCCE’s carbon-free electricity supply, all electric new buildings are carbon free and avoid health and safety issues associated with fossil fuels and greenhouse gases (GHGs). At a meeting on Tuesday, September 3, 2019, the City Council adopted the resolution to establish a Clean Energy Choice Program by amending the City Building Code to require higher energy performance for newly constructed structures. On June 16, 2020, such an ordinance was passed, which involved ordinance amendments that took effect September 1, 2020. The Clean Energy Choice Program applies to all new buildings within the city and encourages clean, efficient, and cost-effective all-electric buildings through incentives and local amendments to the California Energy Code. 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

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

more efficient and higher performing buildings or 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-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 (2020) 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.

**Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

The OASP Final EIR did not discuss energy consumption as a stand-alone issue area and instead included discussion relevant to the document’s Air Quality and Global Climate Change analysis. The OASP Final EIR included mitigation measures requiring site design and energy efficient measures be incorporated into the project.

**Project-Specific Review**

- a) The project includes the construction of a total of 192 residential units, including 96 townhouses, 88 bungalows, and eight live-work townhouses, and approximately 433 on-site parking spaces. During construction, fossil fuels, electricity, and natural gas would be used by construction vehicles and equipment. Based on fuel usage and consumption rates derived from CalEEMod, the total fuel use associated with project construction would total approximately 15,027 million British thermal units (MMBTUs). Assuming construction were to occur over an estimate 33-month period, based on the CalEEMod emissions modeling conducted for the proposed project, annual construction-related energy use would average approximately 5,464 MMBTUs/year. The energy consumed during construction would be temporary in nature and would be typical of other similar construction activities in the city. Federal and state 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*.

**Table 4. Project Energy Use Summary**

<b>Construction Energy Use<sup>1</sup></b>		
<b>Source</b>	<b>Gallons</b>	<b>Annual MMBTU</b>
Off-Road Equipment Fuel (Diesel)	66,683	9,161
On-Road Vehicle Fuel (Gasoline)	44,120	5,309
On-Road Vehicle Fuel (Diesel)	4,051	557
<b>Total:</b>		15,027
<b>Operational Fuel Use - Year 2024<sup>2</sup></b>		
<b>Source</b>	<b>Gallons</b>	<b>Annual MMBTU</b>
Mobile Fuel (Diesel)	10,210	1,403
Mobile Fuel (Gasoline)	57,024	6,862
<b>Total:</b>		8,264
<b>Operational Fuel Use - Year 2030<sup>2</sup></b>		
<b>Source</b>	<b>Gallons</b>	<b>Annual MMBTU</b>
Mobile Fuel (Diesel)	8,777	1,206
Mobile Fuel (Gasoline)	48,399	5,824
<b>Total:</b>		7,030

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Operational Electricity & Natural Gas Use <sup>3</sup>		
Source	Annual Energy	Annual MMBTU
Electricity (kWh/yr, MMBTU)	1,195,369	4,002
Water Use, Treatment & Conveyance (kWh/Yr, MMBTU)	72144	246
Natural Gas (kBTU/yr, MMBTU)	3,756,924	967
<b>Total:</b>		<b>5,215</b>

MMBTU = one million British Thermal Units (BTU); kBTU=one thousand BTU; kWh=kilowatt hours

1. Construction energy use was calculated based on off-road and on-road fuel usage, including worker trips, vendor trips, and haul truck trips. Fuel usage was converted to BTUs for comparison purposes.
2. Operational mobile fuel use is based on year 2024 and year 2030 operational conditions. Fuel use is anticipated to decrease in future years due to improvements in fuel-efficiency standards. Energy usage was converted to BTUs for comparison purposes.
3. Does not include participation in Monterey Bay Community Power. With participation in Monterey Bay Community Power, the project would not result in the consumption of electricity from non-renewable sources. Does not include mitigation measures that prohibit the installation of natural-gas fired appliances. Energy usage was converted to BTUs for comparison purposes.

Under opening year 2024 conditions, annual operational fuel use associated with project operations would total approximately 8,264 MMBTUs/year, unmitigated energy use, including electricity and natural gas consumption, would total approximately 5,215 MMBTUs/year (see Table 6). Under year 2030 operational conditions, fuel use associated with project operations would total approximately 7,030 MMBTUs/year. In comparison to year 2024 operational conditions, fuel use in future years is projected to decrease due to improvements in vehicle fuel efficiency. Energy use associated with electricity and natural gas consumption is not projected to decrease substantially in future years.

Based on the City’s adopted Clean Energy Choice Program, the project residential units would either be all electric or would include natural gas and would be built with higher efficiency standards or subject to an offset fee to retrofit existing buildings. Project electricity use would be supplied by CCCE and would be 100% renewable-energy sourced.

The City’s Travel Demand Model (TDM) was run under base year (2016) conditions to determine regional VMT both with and without the project. With development of the project, regional VMT would be reduced from 8,486,113 to 8,482,745 (reduction of approximately 3.97%).

At the time the OASP Final EIR was prepared, energy use was not a stand-alone issue area required to be evaluated within the State CEQA Guidelines. However, the OASP Final EIR identified several energy efficiency mitigation measures to address potentially significant impacts associated with the future development of the OASP area. These mitigation measures included increased building energy efficiency ratings, transit improvements, shade trees, improvements to allow for telecommuting, implementation of bicycle and pedestrian pathways, and pedestrian signalization.

Based on required participation in the City Clean Energy Choice Program, carbon-free electricity sourcing, overall reduced VMT, current fuel economy standards, and applicable OASP Final EIR mitigation measures, the project would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources and potential impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

- b) The project would be subject to the City Clean Energy Choice Program and would be designed in compliance with applicable CBC and California Energy Code requirements. Based on required participation in the City Clean Energy Choice Program, carbon-free electricity sourcing, overall reduced VMT, current fuel economy standards, and applicable OASP Final EIR mitigation measures, the project would also be consistent with the City COSE and potential impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**Mitigation Measures**

Implement OASP Final EIR AQ-1(c) through AQ-1(e). These mitigation measures require shade trees in the parking areas, facilities to promote telecommuting, and pathways that encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel. Full text to these mitigation measures can be found in Section 3, Air Quality.

**Conclusion**

The project would be subject to the City Clean Energy Choice Program, would be supplied with 100% carbon-free electricity, and would reduce overall regional VMT. With implementation of measures AQ-1(c) through AQ-1(e) of the OASP Final EIR, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant. Additionally, the project is required to comply with OASP Policies 4.7.1, 4.7.2, and 4.7.3 and Programs 4.7.2a through 4.7.2d and 4.7.3a and 4.7.3b which require energy efficient project design including solar exposure, passive cooling, and Energy Start appliances.

**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:					
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.	32, 34	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	32, 33, 34, 35	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	32, 33, 34, 35	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	32, 33, 35	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	1, 32, 33, 35	<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?	30, 32, 33, 35	<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?	31, 32, 33, 35	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?	36, 37	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Evaluation**

The *City of San Luis Obispo 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

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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 from 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 are typically in valleys (source reference 35).

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 located approximately 2,000 feet from a potentially active fault line (source references 34 and 35).

**Seismic-Related Ground Failure**

Settlement is defined as the condition in which a portion of the ground supporting part of a structure or facility lowers more than the rest or becomes softer, usually because ground shaking reduces the voids between soil particles, often with groundwater rising in the process. Liquefaction is the sudden loss of the soil’s supporting strength due to groundwater filling and lubricating the spaces between soil particles as a result of ground shaking. Soils with high risk for liquefaction are typically sandy and in creek floodplains or close to lakes. In extreme cases of liquefaction, structures can tilt, break apart, or sink into the ground. The likelihood of liquefaction increases with the strength and duration of an earthquake. Based on the Ground Shaking and Landslide Hazards Map in the Safety Element, the project site is located within an area with high liquefaction potential.

**Slope instability and Landslides**

Slope instability can occur as a gradual spreading of soil, a relatively sudden slippage, a rockfall, or in other forms. Causes include steep slopes, inherently weak soils, saturated soils, and earthquakes. Improper grading and manmade drainage can be contributing factors. Much of the development in San Luis Obispo is in valleys, where there is low potential for slope instability. Based on the Ground Shaking and Landslide Hazards Map in the Safety Element, the project site is located within an area with low landslide potential.

**Subsidence**

Land subsidence is a gradual settling or sudden sinking of the Earth’s surface due to subsurface movement of earth materials. Primary causes are ground-water withdrawal, in which water is removed from pore space as the water table drops, causing the ground surface to settle; tectonic subsidence, where the ground surface is warped or dropped lower due to geologic factors such as faulting or folding; and earthquake-induced shaking that causes sediment liquefaction, which in turn can lead to ground-surface subsidence. Based on the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Areas of Land Subsidence in California Map, the project site is not located in an area of known subsidence (source reference 30).

**Soils**

The project is underlain by three different soil units (source reference 31):

120. Conception loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes. This very deep, moderately well-drained, gently sloping soil has very slow permeability and surface runoff is slow. The hazard of water erosion is slight. Building sites and most other engineering practices often require special design considerations due to the high shrink-swell potential, low strength, and hardness to pack of the subsoil. Foundations and footings need to be designed to compensate for these soil characteristics. Septic tank absorption fields do not function properly due to very slow permeability.

127. Cropley clay, 0 to 2 percent slopes. This very deep, moderately well-drained, nearly level soil has slow permeability and slow surface runoff. The hazard of water erosion is slight, and the shrink swell potential of this soil is high. This soil is well suited to vegetable crops, dryland farming, and pasture. If used for urban development, foundations and

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

footings should be designed to compensate for the high shrink swell potential and low strength. Septic tank absorption fields do not function properly because of slow permeability.

128. Cropley clay, 2 to 9 percent slopes. This very deep, moderately well drained, gently sloping and moderately sloping soil has slow permeability and surface runoff is slow or medium. The hazard of water erosion is slight or moderate and the shrink swell potential is high. If used for urban development, foundation and footing designs need to compensate for the high shrink-swell and low strength of this soil. Septic tank absorption fields do not function properly because of the slow permeability.

**Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

The OASP Final EIR previously analyzed specific plan areawide impacts to geological resources, including those of the project site. The Final EIR determined that although the OASP area is within a seismically active regional of California, there are no active or potentially active faults within the OASP area. The Final EIR analysis also determined that soils in the OASP area have the potential for high liquification, moderate to high expansion potential, and the potential for damage associated with groundshaking. Theses impacts were considered less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures, including the requirement for a site-specific geotechnical study.

**Project-Specific Review**

- a.i) Based on the Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared for the project (source reference 32), the nearest fault line to the project site is the Los Osos Fault, located approximately 3.7 kilometers (km) from the 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 *less than significant*.
- a.ii) Based on the Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared for the project pursuant to OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure G-2(a), the fault lines nearest to the project site include the Los Osos Fault, located approximately 3.7 km southwest of the site, the San Luis Range Fault, located approximately 8.4 km northeast of the site, the Rinconada Fault, located 11.8 km northeast of the site, the Hosgri Fault, located approximately 24.6 km northeast of the site, and the San Andreas Fault Zone, located 58.3 km east of the project site. 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. Proposed residential development on-site 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; therefore, impacts associated with strong seismic groundshaking would be *less than significant*.
- a.iii) Based on the Ground Shaking and Landslide Hazards Map in the Safety Element, the project site is located within an area with high liquefaction potential. However, based on the quality and conditions of the in-place soils and the absence of groundwater in boring explorations, the potential for liquefaction and/or lateral spreading at this site is low.

Development of the project within this area may have the potential to result in adverse effects due to seismic-related ground failure. 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 response to liquefaction potential, in accordance with the CBC Chapter 18, any issues identified in the report will be addressed through standard site construction techniques, as required by the CBC. In addition, the proposed development 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. Therefore, based on compliance with existing regulations, impacts related to causing substantial adverse effects due to seismic-related ground failure would be *less than significant*.

- a.iv) Based on the Ground Shaking and Landslide Hazards Map in the Safety Element, the project site is located within an area with low landslide potential. Based on the Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared for the project, the project site topography and exposed soils indicate that the potential for landslides is minimal, and no evidence of previous

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

landslide activity was observed on-site. Therefore, the project would not result in significant adverse effects associated with landslides, and *no impacts would occur*.

- b) The project is located on a flat site and does not include substantial vegetation removal. The *City of San Luis Obispo Municipal Code* requires proposed development projects to implement erosion control measures and best management practices (BMPs) through the building permit process, such as scheduling ground disturbance to avoid rain events (if feasible); using hydroseeding, planting, and mulch to stabilize soils; using dust control to stabilize stockpiles, unpaved roads, and graded areas; protecting storm drain inlets; using sediment traps; constructing a stabilized page of aggregate and filter fabric at the construction access entrance; conducting street sweeping; and using silt fencing, sand/gravel bags, and fiber rolls. Therefore, based on the flat topography of the project site and compliance with local erosion control regulations, impacts related to soil erosion and loss of topsoil would be *less than significant*.
  
- c) Landslides typically occur in areas with steep slopes or in areas containing escarpments. Based on the Ground Shaking and Landslide Hazards Map in the Safety Element, the project site is located within an area with low landslide potential. Based on the *City of San Luis Obispo Safety Element* and USGS data, the project is not located in an area of historical or current land subsidence.  
  
Based on the Ground Shaking and Landslide Hazards Map in the Safety Element, the project site is located within an area with high liquefaction potential. 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 response to liquefaction potential, in accordance with the CBC Chapter 18, any issues identified in the report will be addressed through standard site construction techniques, as required by the CBC. In addition, the proposed development 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. Therefore, potential impacts associated with being located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project would be *less than significant*.
  
- d) Based on the Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County and Web Soil Survey, the project site is located in an area underlain by soils with high shrink-swell potential (source reference 31). Mitigation Measures GEO-1 and OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure G-4(a) have been identified to require the preparation of a revised soils engineering report to evaluate the proposed development activities and implement specific measures to adequately protect proposed development from potential hazards caused by expansive soils. Typical design measures used to address soil expansion 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. Upon implementation of these measures, potential impacts associated with expansive soils would be *less than significant with mitigation*.
  
- e) The project would include a new connection to the city sewer system. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater treatment systems are proposed on-site. Therefore, *no impacts would occur*.
  
- f) The project site is primarily underlain by quaternary older alluvium (Qoa) and quaternary alluvium (Qa), composed of gravel, sand, and clay (source reference 36). Quaternary older alluvium is classified as having high paleontological sensitivity and alluvium gravel, sand, and clay is classified as having low paleontological sensitivity (source reference 37). The project would result in considerable earthwork associated with construction of building foundations, installation of new utility lines, and construction of the pool. Based on the sensitivity of underlying geologic formations, Mitigation Measure GEO-2 has been recommended, identifying the inadvertent discovery protocol in order to reduce potential impacts to paleontological resources to less than significant; therefore, potential impacts are *less than significant with mitigation*.

**Mitigation Measures**

**GEO-1** Prior to application for construction permits of any development at the project site, the applicant shall retain a qualified soil engineer to prepare a revised Soils Engineering Report to evaluate on-site soil stability risks, including expansive soils. This report shall include specific design recommendations to properly safeguard against risks identified. The



Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

applicant shall incorporate all recommendations identified in the geotechnical report into the final design and construction plans for the project.

**OASP Final EIR G-4(a). Expansive Soils Grading.** If the project area is identified as having expansive soils (through the Soils Engineering Report required in [OASP Final EIR] Mitigation Measure G-2(a)), the foundations and transportation infrastructure shall be designed by a structural engineer to withstand the existing conditions, or the site shall be graded in such a manner to address the condition. Suitable measures to reduce impacts from expansive soils could include, but need not be limited to:

- a. Excavation of existing soils and importation of non-expansive soils; and/or
- b. Foundation design to accommodate certain amounts of differential expansion such as post-tensional slab and/or ribbed foundations designed in accordance with Chapter 18, Division III of the Uniform Building Code (UBC).

**GEO-2** Should any vertebrate fossils or potentially significant finds (e.g., numerous well-preserved invertebrate or plant fossils) be encountered during work on the site, all activities in the immediate vicinity of the find shall cease until a qualified paleontologist evaluates the find for its scientific value. If deemed significant, the paleontological resource(s) shall be salvaged and deposited in an accredited and permanent scientific institution where they will be properly curated and preserved.

**Conclusion**

Potential future development at 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 and ground stability. The project has the potential to result in substantial erosion on- and off-site and would have the potential to impact previously undiscovered paleontological resources during project grading activities. With implementation of the mitigation measures identified above, potential impacts associated with geology and soils would be less than significant with mitigation.

**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?	14, 28	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?	14, 16, 29	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Evaluation**

Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHGs) are any gases that absorb infrared radiation in the atmosphere, and are different from the criteria pollutants discussed in Section III, Air Quality, above. The primary GHGs that are emitted into the atmosphere as a result of human activities are carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), methane (CH<sub>4</sub>), nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O), 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. In addition, the City is currently developing a plan for achieving carbon neutrality by 2035. The City of San Luis Obispo 2005 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% came from waste (source reference 23).

Statewide legislation, rules, and regulations have been adopted to reduce GHG emissions from significant sources. 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,

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Clean Car Standards, Low Carbon Fuel Standard, Renewable Portfolio Standard, California Building Codes, 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 CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent per year (MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/year) 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 capacity of those uses expected to exceed the GHG Bright Line Threshold of 1,150 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/year. 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 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/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.

The City of San Luis Obispo Climate Action Plan (2020) is a long-range plan to reduce GHG emissions from City government operations and community activities. Implementation of the Climate Action Plan also is intended to help achieve multiple community goals such as lowering energy costs, reducing air pollution, supporting local economic development. The Climate Action Plan was prepared with the goal of achieving carbon neutrality by 2035. The Climate Action Plan includes measures to reduce community-wide GHG emissions by 45 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and 66 percent below 1990 levels by 2035, which is consistent with California's goal of reducing GHG emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 (source reference 29).

**Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

The OASP Final EIR evaluated greenhouse gas emissions under the context of Global Climate Change. However, at the time of the Final EIR, determining the significance of a project's impact on global climate was speculative for several reasons including: lack of guidance indicating what level of GHG emission would be considered substantial, no adopted thresholds of significance, and global climate change models were not sensitive enough to be able to predict the effect of a single project on global temperatures. Notwithstanding these considerations, the City of San Luis Obispo's General Plan included extensive policy guidance for sustainable energy use, including solar access standards, solar power requirements and green-building, which are used as a basis for the qualitative analysis and the conclusions drawn in the Final EIR.

**Project-Specific Review**

- a) The buildout year for this project would be post year 2020. Because the SLOAPCD's-recommended GHG-efficiency threshold was based on AB 32 year 2020 GHG-reduction target, the project-level GHG-efficiency threshold was adjusted to account for the more stringent year 2030 GHG-reduction target mandated by SB 32. The GHG-efficiency threshold was calculated by dividing the GHG emissions inventory goal (allowable emissions), by the estimated service population (SP). The efficiency threshold was calculated based on CARB's GHG emissions inventory identified in the *2017 Scoping Plan Update* (source reference 16). Project-generated GHG emissions that would exceed the efficiency threshold of 4.0 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/SP/year in year 2024 or 3.3 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/SP/year in 2030 would be considered to have a potentially significant impact on the environment that could conflict with GHG-reduction planning efforts. To be conservative, amortized construction-generated GHG emissions were included in annual operational GHG emissions estimates, consistent with SLOAPCD-recommended methodologies.

The project's short-term emissions were quantified using CalEEMod, version 2016.3.2, based on estimated acreage and building square footage provided for the proposed project. Based on the modeling conducted, construction-related GHG emissions would total approximately 1,209 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e. Amortized GHG emissions, when averaged over the assumed 30-year life of the project, would total approximately 40 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/year.

Long-term operational GHG emissions were calculated using CalEEMod, version 2016.3.2. Energy use included emissions associated with natural gas use. Electricity use assumes service would be supplied by CCCE, which provides

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

renewable and carbon-free electricity, per the City’s existing commitment. Mobile-source emissions were based on vehicle trip-generation rates for proposed residential land uses derived from the *Transportation Impact Study* prepared for the project (source reference 64). Estimated long-term increases in GHG emissions associated with the proposed project for buildout year 2024 and future year 2030 are summarized in Table 4. As depicted, operational GHG emissions for the proposed project, with the inclusion of amortized construction GHGs, would total approximately 1,711.3 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/year during the initial year of full operation (year 2024) and 1,502.6 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/year for operational year 2030.

Based on the modeling conducted and assuming a total service population of 440 individuals, the calculated GHG efficiency for the proposed project, without mitigation, would be 3.9 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/SP/year in 2024 and 3.4 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/SP/year in 2030. The GHG efficiency for the proposed project would not exceed the threshold of 4.0 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/SP/year in 2024. However, the GHG efficiency for the proposed project would exceed the threshold of 3.2 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/SP/year in 2030.

**Table 5. Summary of Project Operational GHG Emissions**

Operational Year/Source	GHG Emissions (MTCO <sub>2</sub> e/Year)	
	Year 2024	Year 2030
Area Source <sup>1</sup>	4.4	4.4
Energy Use <sup>2</sup>	201.7	201.7
Motor Vehicles <sup>3</sup>	1,379.8	1,171.1
Waste Generation <sup>4</sup>	85.4	85.4
Total Operational Emissions:	1,671.3	1,462.6
Amortized Construction Emissions:	40	40
Total with Amortized Construction Emissions:	1,711.3	1,502.6
Service Population (SP) <sup>5</sup> :	440	440
MTCO <sub>2</sub> e/SP:	3.9	3.4
GHG Efficiency Significance Threshold:	4.0	3.3
Exceeds Threshold?	No	Yes

<sup>1</sup> Area source includes emissions associated primarily with the use of landscape maintenance equipment.

<sup>2</sup> Includes natural gas use. Assumes electricity service would be provided by CCCE, which provides renewable and carbon-free electricity, per the City’s existing commitment.

<sup>3</sup> Based on default fleet mix for non-residential land uses contained in CalEEMod for San Luis Obispo County. Includes CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, and CO<sub>2</sub> mobile source emissions expressed in CO<sub>2</sub>e.

<sup>4</sup> Based on an average annual waste diversion/recycling rate of 50% based on statewide averages.

<sup>5</sup> Based on the estimated number of residents served by the proposed project.

Refer to Appendix C for modeling assumptions and results.

**Table 6. Summary of Project Operational GHG Emissions with Mitigation**

Operational Year/Source	GHG Emissions (MTCO <sub>2</sub> e/Year)	
	Year 2024	Year 2030
Area Source <sup>1</sup>	4.4	4.4
Energy Use <sup>2</sup>	201.7	201.7
Motor Vehicles <sup>3</sup>	1,235.0	1,048.8
Waste Generation <sup>4</sup>	85.4	85.4
Total Operational Emissions:	1,529.1	1,339.9
Amortized Construction Emissions:	40	40

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Operational Year/Source	GHG Emissions (MTCO <sub>2</sub> e/Year)	
	Year 2024	Year 2030
Total with Amortized Construction Emissions:	1,569.1	1,379.9
Service Population (SP) <sup>5</sup> :	440	440
MTCO <sub>2</sub> e/SP:	3.6	3.1
GHG Efficiency Significance Threshold:	4.0	3.3
Exceeds Threshold?	No	No

<sup>1</sup> Area source includes emissions associated primarily with the use of landscape maintenance equipment.

<sup>2</sup> Includes natural gas use. Assumes electricity service would be provided by CCCE, which provides renewable and carbon-free electricity, per the City's existing commitment.

<sup>3</sup> Based on default fleet mix for non-residential land uses contained in CalEEMod for San Luis Obispo County. Includes CH<sub>4</sub>, N<sub>2</sub>O, and CO<sub>2</sub> mobile source emissions expressed in CO<sub>2</sub>e.

<sup>4</sup> Based on an average annual waste diversion/recycling rate of 50% based on statewide averages.

<sup>5</sup> Based on the estimated number of residents served by the proposed project.

Mitigation measures have been incorporated to increase use of alternative means of transportation, waste reduction, and the use of carbon-free energy through the discouraged installation of natural-gas fired appliance, as well as electricity service provided by CCCE. With implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1, operational GHG emissions would be reduced to 3.6 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/SP for year 2024 and 3.1 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/SP for year 2030 and would not exceed corresponding significant thresholds of 4.0 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/SP and 3.3 MTCO<sub>2</sub>e/SP, respectively (see Table 5). In addition, because the project might pursue mixed energy sources (electricity and natural gas), the project would be required to build more efficient and higher performing buildings or 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. Therefore, potential impacts associated with generation of GHG emissions that may have a significant impact on the environment would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

- b) Projects that are consistent with the demographic forecasts and land use assumptions used in the Climate Action Plan can utilize the City's CEQA GHG Emissions Analysis Compliance Checklist to demonstrate consistency with the CAP's GHG emissions reduction strategy.

The demographic forecasts and land use assumptions of the Climate Action Plan are based on the *City of San Luis Obispo General Plan Land Use and Circulation Elements*. If a plan or project is consistent with the existing 2014 General Plan land use and zoning designations of the project site, then the project would be considered consistent with the demographic forecasts and the land uses assumptions of the Climate Action Plan. The proposed project includes the construction of a total of 192 residential units, including 96 apartments, 88 bungalows, and eight live-work units, and approximately 433 on-site parking spaces. The project site is located within the OASP. The OASP and the City's 2014 General Plan show medium-high density residential on the project site, which is consistent with the proposed land use.

The City has prepared a CEQA GHG Emissions Analysis Compliance Checklist for plans and projects to ensure that they are consistent with the measures of the Climate Action Plan. Based on the analysis provided in Table 5 below, the project would be consistent with the City's GHG Emissions Analysis Checklist with implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1. Therefore, potential impacts associated with a conflict with a plan or policy adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions of would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**Table 7. Project Consistency with the City’s Climate Action Plan**

Climate Action Plan Measures	Project Consistency
<b>Clean Energy Systems</b>	
Does the Project include an operational commitment to participate in Central Coast Community Energy?	<b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> A mitigation measure has been included to require an operational commitment to participate in CCCE.
<b>Green Buildings</b>	
<p>Does the Project exclusively include “All-electric buildings”? For the purpose of this checklist, the following definitions and exemptions apply:</p> <p><i>All-electric building.</i> A new building that has no natural gas plumbing installed within the building and that uses electricity as the source of energy for all space heating, water heating, cooking appliances, and clothes drying appliances. An All-Electric Building may be plumbed for the use of natural gas as fuel for appliances in a commercial kitchen.</p> <p>Specific exemptions to the requirements for all - electric buildings include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commercial kitchens</li> <li>• The extension of natural gas infrastructure into an industrial building for the purpose of supporting manufacturing processes (i.e. not including space conditioning).</li> <li>• Accessory Dwelling Units that are attached to an existing single-family home. Essential Service Buildings including, but not limited to, public facilities, hospitals, medical centers and emergency operations centers.</li> <li>• Temporary buildings.</li> <li>• Gas line connections used exclusively for emergency generators.</li> <li>• Any buildings or building components exempt from the California Energy Code.</li> <li>• Residential subdivisions in process of permitting or constructing initial public improvements for any phase of a final map recorded prior to January 1, 2020, unless compliance is required by an existing Development Agreement.</li> </ul> <p>If the proposed project falls into an above exemption category, what measures are applicants taking to reduce on-site fossil fuel consumption to the maximum extent feasible? If not applicable (N/A), explain why this action is not relevant.</p>	<p><b>Consistent.</b> The project would include development of either all electric or mixed-fuel buildings and would be required to be in full compliance with the City’s Energy Reach code.</p>

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Climate Action Plan Measures	Project Consistency
<b>Connected Community</b>	
Does the Project comply with requirements in the City’s Municipal Code with no exceptions, including bicycle parking, bikeway design, and EV charging stations?	<b>Consistent.</b> The project has been designed to comply with the requirements in the City’s Municipal Code and would be required to demonstrate compliance with applicable City Municipal code requirements related to bicycle parking, bikeway design, and electric vehicle (EV) charging stations.
Is the estimated Project-generated Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) within the City’s adopted thresholds, as confirmed by the City’s Transportation Division?	<b>Consistent.</b> Based on the traffic analysis prepared for this project, project-generated VMT per capita would be below the City’s adopted threshold for residential developments (source reference 64).
If “No”, does the Project/Plan include VMT mitigation strategies and/or a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan approved by the City’s Transportation Division?	
Does the Project demonstrate consistency with the City’s Bicycle Transportation Plan?	<b>Consistent.</b> The project has been designed to include and would be required to incorporate features to promote alternative means of transportation, including the installation of bicycle facilities connecting to off-site existing or planned bicycle facilities.
<b>Circular Economy</b>	
Will the Project subscribe all units and/or buildings to organic waste pick up and provide the appropriate on-site enclosures consistent with the provisions of the City of San Luis Obispo Development Standards for Solid Waste Services? Please provide a letter from San Luis Garbage company verifying that the project complies with their standards and requirements for organic waste pick up.	<b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> A mitigation measure has been included to require the project to provide organic waste pick up and provide the appropriate on-site enclosures consistent with the provisions of the City of San Luis Obispo Development Standards for Solid Waste Services.
<b>Natural Solutions</b>	
Does the Project comply with Municipal Code requirements for trees?	<b>Consistent with Mitigation.</b> A mitigation measure has been included to require the on-site installation of trees consistent with the City’s municipal code requirements.

**Mitigation Measures**

**GHG-1** The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce long-term operational GHG emissions:

- a. The project shall be served by CCCE.
- b. The project shall provide on-site bicycle parking/amenities and electric vehicle (EV) charging stations in accordance with applicable building code requirements.
- c. The project shall incorporate a pedestrian and bicycle access network that connects proposed on-site land uses to adjacent existing or planned pedestrian and bicycle facilities contiguous with the project site.
- d. The project shall be designed to minimize barriers to pedestrian access and interconnectivity.
- e. The project shall be designed to provide safe and convenient access to public transit contiguous to the project site.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- f. The project shall provide organic waste pick up and shall provide the appropriate on-site enclosures consistent with the provisions of the City of San Luis Obispo Development Standards for Solid Waste Services.
- g. Trees shall be planted in accordance with the City’s municipal code requirements.

**Conclusion**

The project has the potential to result in the generation of GHG emissions in exceedance of the efficiency threshold calculated to demonstrate consistency with SB 32 target emission rates and result in a conflict with the City Climate Action Plan. With implementation of the mitigation measure identified above, the project’s long-term GHG emissions would be consistent with both SB 32 emission targets as well as the City’s Climate Action Plan. Therefore, potential impacts associated with GHG emissions would be less than significant with mitigation.

**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?	38, 39	<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?	38, 39	<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?	14, 38, 39, 1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?	40, 41, 42	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	43	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	44, 45	<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, 45	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Evaluation**

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Site (Cortese) List is a planning document 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 (CalEPA) to develop at least annually an updated Cortese List. Various state and local government agencies are required to track and document 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

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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 CalEPA website: <https://calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/>.

Based on a review of the DTSC EnviroStor and SWRCB Geotracker databases, there are no active hazardous waste cleanup sites within the project site. The closest cleanup site is located approximately 0.12 mile to the southwest of the project site, and this site is closed and has been remediated to the satisfaction of agency staff.

Asbestos, a naturally occurring fibrous material, was used as a fireproofing and insulating agent in building construction before being banned by the 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% 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 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% (600 parts per million). However, some paints manufactured after 1978 for industrial uses or marine uses legally contain more than 0.06% 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, 8 CCR 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 on-site, 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 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.

The *City of San Luis Obispo Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP)* was adopted in 2006 and updated in 2014 and provides a guide for San Luis Obispo to achieve greater disaster resistance and resilience in accordance with federal requirements. Potential hazards evaluated in the LHMP include earthquakes, floods, hazard materials events, landslides, wildfires, and windstorms. Mitigation actions include a range of specific action and projects that reduce the effects of each hazard, with particular emphasis on protecting new and existing buildings and infrastructure.

The County of San Luis Obispo, as well as the municipalities and special districts within its boundaries, including the City of San Luis Obispo, adopted a comprehensive update to the San Luis Obispo County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan in 2019. The plan incorporates vulnerability and risk assessments to identify mitigation actions to reduce human and financial losses from hazard events. The mitigation actions incorporated in the plan revolve around four pillars: communication, implementation, action on existing rules, regulation, policies and procedures, and monitoring of funding opportunities.

**Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

The OASP Final EIR analyzed hazards and hazardous material impacts associated with development of the OASP through other topic areas, such as Public Safety. Potentially significant impacts that were identified in the Final EIR, and for which mitigation



Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

measures are required, are related to electromagnetic fields (EMF), hazardous associated with the UPRR corridor, including the movement of hazardous materials, spills, and accidental release, and the presence of hazardous materials associated with farmhouses in the OASP area.

**Project-Specific Review**

- a) The project does not propose the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous substances. Any commonly used hazardous substances within the project site (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) A *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment* (ESA) was prepared for each of the project parcels (source references 38, 39) in order to implement OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure S-4(a). Based on a reconnaissance of the project property, one recognized environmental condition was identified on-site, which was the presence of 5-gallon buckets and 55-gallon drums of used motor oil on-site with no secondary containment. As a result of the project, the 5-gallon buckets and 55-gallon drums of used oil would be removed from the project site and disposed of in accordance with applicable state and local rules and regulations. Because no significant staining of the soil beneath the waste oil storage was noted, the presence of these items would not pose a significant environmental threat to soil or groundwater.

Other notable conditions included, but were not limited to, the presence of automotive batteries, used auto tires, stained soil and asphalt, and non-functioning automobiles and equipment. These items would be removed from the project site and disposed of in accordance with applicable state and local rules and regulations and would therefore not pose a significant environmental concern to soil or groundwater.

It was also noted that there were two leaking 55-gallon drums and an aboveground storage tank (AST) on the property located north of the northern project parcel (APN 004-705-009). Although the 55-gallon drums located to the north were observed to be leaking, and the contents appeared to be used motor oil, they were located at a distance from the project site and therefore would not pose an environmental concern to the project site. However, OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure S-4(d) requires that soil samples be analyzed prior to commencement of development. The AST did not appear to be leaking and would therefore not pose an environmental concern to the project site.

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, paints, etc.

The project includes demolition of existing structures on the property that could be over 50 years old and therefore could contain asbestos and lead. 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 U.S. 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 and OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measures would ensure impacts related to hazardous materials exposure would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

The project would be subject to the *City of San Luis Obispo 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 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 Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) Process Safety Management Standard (CCR 29.1910.119), which includes requirements for preventing and minimizing the consequences of accidental release of hazardous materials. In addition, Mitigation Measure AQ-4 has been identified to require full compliance with applicable

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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 0.6 mile from the nearest school facility, which is Sinsheimer Elementary School located at 2755 Augusta Street. The project site is not located within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school facility; therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.
- d) Based on a review of the SWRCB Geotracker and DTSC EnviroStor databases, there are no active hazardous waste cleanup sites within the project site. The closest cleanup site is located approximately 0.12 mile to the southwest of the project site, and this site is closed and has been remediated to the satisfaction of agency staff. There are no active hazardous waste cleanup sites within the project site or within close proximity to the project site. Therefore, *no impacts would occur*.
- e) The project site is located approximately 1 mile north of the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport and within the S-2 Safety Area, as designated in the Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP; source reference 43). Based on Figure 1 of the ALUP, the project site is located outside of the 50 decibel (dB) or higher airport noise contours. Per OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure S-2(a), the OASP was reviewed by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) on March 17, 2010. The ALUC found the OASP consistent with the ALUP. The OASP Table A-3 identified a maximum allowed density for the two project parcels of 17.99 and 17.79, which was consistent with the provisions of the ALUP. Therefore, the project would not result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for project residents and other occupants; therefore, *potential impacts would be less than significant*.
- f) The project would improve Bullock Lane between the project site's south and north property lines. San Luis Obispo has six main evacuation routes, with Orcutt Road and Broad Street being two of them. The project would not result in any road closures of currently operating roadways and would not result in any other potential conflict with emergency evacuation or response plans during construction. Upon completion of construction and occupancy of the proposed residential units, the project would result in additional vehicle traffic along the Broad Street and Orcutt Road evacuation routes in the event of an emergency. While increased traffic along these routes would occur, it would not result in a conflict or directly inhibit the implementation of the LHMP or Evacuation Plan. 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 PRC prior to issuance of building permits; therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

**Mitigation Measures**

Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-4. This measure requires testing during demolition to identify lead and/or asbestos contaminates present in the existing on-site structures. The measure also requires a geologic evaluation be conducted to determine if NOA is present within the project site. Full text of AQ-4 can be found in Section 3, Air Quality, and in Required Mitigation and Monitoring Programs section at the end of the document.

**OASP Final EIR S-4(d). 55-Gallon Drums.** Prior to development on the property where 55-gallon drums were identified as shown in Figure 4.9-1 [of the Final EIR for the OASP], soils samples shall be taken in the vicinity of the drums and analyzed for total extractable petroleum hydrocarbons (TEPH) by EPA method 8015, heavy metals by CCR Title 22 metals, and solvents by EPA method 8260B. If levels of contaminants are found to exist in concentrations that exceed regulatory thresholds, further sampling may be needed to determine the extent of contamination. Once the extent of contamination is delineated, an appropriate remediation method should be implemented according to the size of the area contaminated and the contaminant involved.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**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 contaminated sites or existing or proposed schools. Due to proposed demolition and removal of old structures, the project may result in hazards associated with lead-based paint and/or ACM. With implementation of the mitigation measure identified above, potential impacts associated with release of these hazardous materials would be reduced to less than significant. Therefore, impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant with mitigation.

**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?	1, 5, 23	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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?	50	<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, 5, 23	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, 23, 47, 48	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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, 5, 23	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	47, 48	<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?	47, 48, 51	<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?	5, 49, 52	<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, which 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 (source reference 46).

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 Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) adopted Post-Construction Stormwater Management Requirements 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.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The 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 the City Flood Preparedness Map and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) Viewer, the project site is within an area of minimal flood hazard and is not located within a 100-year flood zone (source reference 47).

**Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

The OASP Final EIR evaluated hydrology and water quality impacts of the development of the OASP area. The Final EIR identified that sediment during construction could be transported from the OASP area downstream and cause water quality impacts. Additionally, the addition of impervious area would increase runoff from the project site which would also have the potential to impact water quality downstream. Mitigation measures were identified that include implementation of BMPs per the NPDES/SWPPP permits and incorporation of detention/retention basins to treat stormwater runoff.

**Project-Specific Review**

a) The City Public Works, Utilities, and Community Development Departments are responsible for coordinating the implementation of the City’s storm water quality ordinance (municipal code 12.08). This comprehensive ordinance is required under the Phase II Stormwater Regulations regulated by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The primary goal of the ordinance is to protect and enhance the quality of watercourses and water bodies in a manner pursuant to and consistent with the Clean Water Act by reducing pollutants in storm water discharges to the maximum extent practicable, by prohibiting non-storm water discharges to the storm drain system, and improving storm water management. As part of these requirements, the City has been mandated to establish a set of minimum designated stormwater BMPs and Pollution Prevention Methods (PPMs). Stormwater 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 exposing potential pollutants to rainwater or other runoff. Development is required to be undertaken in strict accordance with conditions and requirements of this program.

Prior to issuance of grading permits, the project would be required to submit a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that identifies the potential sources of pollution that may be created by the project and the recommended BMPs that would be applied. The SWPPP would be reviewed for consistency with the City’s SWMP and other applicable requirements prior to approval by the City Community Development Director.

The project site is generally flat and is not located within proximity to any surface waterways. Based on the total area of proposed site disturbance and vegetation removal, the project would have potential to result in considerable erosion of soils on-site during wind or rain events during the 2-year construction period. Mitigation Measure HYD-1 has been identified to require the submittal and implementation of an erosion control plan to be reviewed and approved by the City Community Development Department prior to issuance of project grading permits. With implementation of standard BMPs and PPMs required by the City, compliance with the *City of San Luis Obispo Engineering Standards* related to stormwater management, and implementation of Mitigation Measure HYD-1, the project would not substantially affect surface water or groundwater quality. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

b) The project would be serviced by the City 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 has not used groundwater for potable purposes since 2015. Therefore, the project would not deplete groundwater resources, and impacts would be *less than significant*.

c.i) The project site is generally flat and is not located within proximity to any surface waterways. Based on the total area of proposed site disturbance and vegetation removal, the project would have potential to result in considerable erosion of soils on-site during wind or rain events during the 2-year construction period. While the *City of San Luis Obispo Water Pollution Control Plan (WPCP)* includes mandatory BMPs, there are no mandatory BMPs required associated with erosion control measures. OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure D-1(a) has been identified to require the submittal

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

and implementation of an erosion control plan to be reviewed and approved by the City Community Development Department and Public Works Department prior to issuance of project grading permits. With implementation of standard BMPs and PPMs required by the City, compliance with the *City of San Luis Obispo Engineering Standards* related to stormwater management, and implementation of mitigation measure D-1(a), the project would not result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

- c.ii-iii) Project implementation would result in ground disturbance of approximately 11.24 acres, including disturbance of the entire 10.93 acre project site, removal of all trees on-site, and 3.5 acres of area to be paved. Regulations under the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) require that a NPDES storm water permit be obtained for projects that would disturb greater than one acre during construction; therefore, the project would require an NPDES storm water permit. This permit requires preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Program (SWPPP), which includes BMPs to control the discharge of pollutants, including sediment, into the local surface water drainages. This requirement is included as OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure D-1(b).

Based on the City’s Waterway Management Plan Drainage Design Manual, all construction projects in the city require the installation, maintenance, routine inspection (i.e., weekly, before predicted rain events, after rain events and during prolonged rain events), and repair or replacement, as needed, of BMPs throughout the course of the construction project in order to protect local water quality. Most BMPs (e.g., concrete/tool washouts, street sweeping) are required year-long and others are specifically required during the rainy season (October 15 through April 15) or prior to a predicted rain event, even if that rain event is predicted during the summer months.

The project would be required to comply with City standards associated with the City Waterway Management Plan Drainage Design Manual, RWQCB Post-Construction Stormwater Management Requirements, as well as applicable engineering standards and building code requirements for erosion control and on-site management of stormwater runoff. Therefore, the project would not result in a substantial increase of the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site, or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems and potential impacts would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

- c.iv) Based on the City of San Luis Obispo Flood Preparedness Map and 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 City of San Luis Obispo Flood Preparedness Map and FEMA NFHL Viewer, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone. 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 threshold analysis above, the project would not deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge. The project includes stormwater treatment and storage facilities and would not conflict with the Central Coastal Basin Plan, or other water quality control plans. The project would not conflict with the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA), or other local or regional plans or policies intended to manage water quality or groundwater supplies; therefore, *no impacts would occur*.

**Mitigation Measures**

**OASP Final EIR D-1(a). Erosion Control Plan.** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall submit a detailed erosion control plan (ECP) to the City Community Development Department for review and approval. At a minimum, the ECP should be prepared according to the guidelines outlined in the Drainage Design Manual and should include the following:

- a. A proposed schedule of grading activities, monitoring, and infrastructure milestones in chronological format;
- b. Identification of critical areas of high erodibility potential and/or unstable slopes;

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- c. Soil stabilization techniques such as short-term biodegradable erosion control blankets and hydroseeding should be utilized. Silt fences should be installed downslope of all graded slopes. Straw bales should be installed in the flow path of graded areas receiving concentrated flows, as well as around storm drain inlets;
- d. Description of erosion control measures on slopes, lots, and streets;
- e. Contour and spot elevations indicating runoff patterns before and after grading;
- f. Filter systems at catch basins (drop inlets) in public streets as a means of sediment control; and
- g. Post-construction inspection of all drainage facilities for accumulated sediment, and the clearing of these drainage structures of debris and sediment.

**OASP Final EIR D-1(b). Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan.** The applicant shall comply with NPDES General Construction Activities Storm Water Permit Requirements established by the CWA. Pursuant to the NPDES Storm Water Program, an application for coverage under the statewide General Construction Activities Storm Water Permit (General Permit) must be obtained for project development. It is the responsibility of the project applicant to obtain coverage prior to site construction.

The applicant can obtain coverage under the General Permit by filing a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resource Control Board's (SWRCB) Division of Water Quality. The filing shall describe erosion control and storm water treatment measures to be implemented during and following construction and provide a schedule for monitoring performance. These BMPs will serve to control point and non-point source (NPS) pollutants in storm water and constitute the project's SWPPP for construction activities. While the SWPPP will include several of the same components as the ECP, the SWPPP will also include BMPs for preventing the discharge of other NPS pollutants besides sediment (such as paint, concrete, etc.) to downstream waters.

- Notice of Intent. Prior to beginning construction, the applicant shall file a Notice of Intent (NOI) for discharge from the proposed development site.
- Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. The applicant shall require the building contractor to prepare and submit a SWPPP to the City forty-five (45) days prior to the start of work for approval. The contractor is responsible for understanding the State General Permit and instituting the SWPPP during construction. A SWPPP for site construction shall be developed prior to the initiation of grading and implemented for all construction activity on the project site in excess of one acre. The SWPPP shall include specific BMPs to control the discharge of material from the site. BMP methods may include, but would not be limited to, the use of temporary detention basins, straw bales, sand bagging, mulching, erosion control blankets, silt fencing, and soil stabilizers. Additional BMPs should be implemented for any fuel storage or fuel handling that could occur on-site during construction. The SWPPP must be prepared in accordance with the guidelines adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The SWPPP shall be also submitted to the City along with grading/development plans for review and approval.
- Notice of Completion of Construction. The applicant shall file a notice of completion of construction of the development, identifying that pollution sources were controlled during the construction of the project and implementing a closure SWPPP for the site.

**OASP Final EIR D-3(a). Payment of Fair Share Fees for Area Drainage Improvements.** The City/Zone 9 Waterway Management Plan (WMP, Questa, 2002) provides for imposition of a Drainage Impact Fee on new development projects that would result in adverse hydrological impacts. The Drainage Impact Fee can only be used to pay for drainage improvements made necessary by the hydrologic impacts of a project. The applicant shall pay their "fair share" of any mitigation fee established by the City of San Luis Obispo for drainage improvements made necessary by cumulative project development. These fair share fees may be used to fund components of the City's Storm Drain Master Plan (Boyle Engineering, 2000), or other improvements as identified by the City. Components of the City's Storm Drain Master Plan preferred alternative downstream of the Orcutt Plan Area include:

- A new concrete box culvert at Broad Street on Orcutt Creek,
- A new concrete slab bridge at Santa Fe Road on the East Branch of SLO Creek, and

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- A modified channel for improved conveyance capacity from Santa Fe to Buckley Road on the East Branch of SLO Creek.

**Conclusion**

Based on existing site conditions, required payment of water impact fees, and compliance with applicable state, regional, and local regulations, the project would not result in a substantial decrease in groundwater supplies or surface runoff. Mitigation Measure HYD-1 has been identified above to address potential project impacts associated with erosion. Therefore, with implementation of the mitigation measure identified above, potential impacts associated with hydrology and water quality would be less than significant with mitigation.

**11. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	1, 23	<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?	2, 23, 43	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Evaluation**

The project is located on two parcels totaling 10.93 acres within the R-3 Medium-High Density Residential and Mixed-Use/Neighborhood Commercial land use designations of the OASP. Within the 231-acre specific plan area, the OASP designated a total of 113 acres for residential uses, 0.25 acre for neighborhood commercial uses, 81 acres for open space, 21 acres for parkland, and a 5-acre site for a school.

The project site is surrounded by vacant land, two single-family residences, and a mobile home park to the north; residential developments under construction to the east; a single-family residential neighborhood currently under construction to the south; and industrial and commercial uses and the UPRR to the west.

**Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

The OASP Final EIR evaluated potential land-use impacts related to development of the OASP area. The EIR identified that the OASP analyzed in the EIR was inconsistency with policies contained in the City’s General Plan, including inconsistencies related to open space protection and consistency with the ALUP. Certain policy inconsistencies were analyzed in their respective EIR Section, such as Section 4.1 Aesthetics (viewshed protection including scenic roadways), Section 4.11 Traffic and Circulation (circulation design including pedestrian safety and driveway access), and Sections 4.7 Geologic Hazards and 4.9 Public Safety (hazards associated with fire, geologic constraints, and EMF).

**Project-Specific Review**

- 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 has been designed to be consistent with all applicable standards within the OASP. Therefore, *no impacts would occur*.
- b) The project is located within the OASP and has been designed to be consistent with all applicable standards within the OASP, including standards regarding land use types and density, compatible design, efficient and safe circulation, and compliance with applicable local service system standards.

The project site is located approximately 1 mile north of the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport and within the S-2 Safety Area, as designated in the Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP). The ALUP identifies allowable land use densities

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

for each safety area. Per OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure S-2(a), the OASP was reviewed by the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) on March 17, 2010. The ALUC found the OASP (with the originally proposed school site removed) consistent with the ALUP. The OASP Table A-3 identified a maximum allowed density for the two project parcels of 17.99 and 17.79, which was consistent with the provisions of the ALUP. The project would include development of 192 residential units on a 10.93-acre parcel, resulting in a residential density of approximately 17.5 units/acre. Based on Figure 8 of the ALUP, the project's proposed residential density would be allowable with an approved Airport-Compatible Open Space Plan (ACOSP) and detailed area plan. The OASP was considered a Detailed Area Plan (DAP), which meets the requirements of an ACOSP. Because the project is consistent with the zoning and density allowed under the OASP/ DAP, the project is considered consistent with the ALUP. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Conclusion**

The project would not result in the physical division of an established community and would be consistent with applicable plans and policies intended to address environmental impacts, including the OASP and ALUP. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, and no mitigation is 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?	2	<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?	2	<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.

**Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

The OASP Final EIR found that impacts to mineral resources in the OASP area were less than significant and no further environmental review was warranted.

**Project-Specific Review**

a-b) According to the OASP Final EIR, 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 and current restrictions on resource extraction within city limits. Therefore, *no impacts would occur*.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.



Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

**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?	54, 55, 56, 57	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	58	<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?	43	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Evaluation**  
The *City of San Luis Obispo 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 identified in Table 8, below.

**Table 8. Maximum Noise Exposure for Noise-Sensitive Uses due to Transportation Noise Sources**

Noise-Sensitive Use	Outdoor Activity Areas <sup>1</sup>	Indoor Spaces		
	Ldn or CNEL, in dB	Ldn or CNEL, in dB	Leq in db <sup>2</sup>	Lmax in dB <sup>3</sup>
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	--	--	--

Notes: CNEL = Community Noise Equivalent Level; Ldn = day-night average sound level; Leq = equivalent continuous sound level; Lmax = maximum sound level.

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> As determined for a typical worst-case hour during periods of use.

<sup>3</sup> Lmax indoor standard applies only to railroad noise at locations south of Orcutt Road.

Outdoor activity areas are not defined in the Noise Element but are defined in the *City of San Luis Obispo, Noise Guidebook, Measurement & Mitigation Techniques* (source reference 55). The guidebook states that outdoor activity areas are “patios, decks,

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

balconies, outdoor eating areas, swimming pool areas, yards of dwellings, and other areas commonly used for outdoor activities and recreation.”

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 8 for outdoor activity areas and indoor spaces of noise-sensitive land uses.

In addition, per 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 Community Development Department. The Municipal Code also 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, 80 dBA at multi-family residences, and 85 dBA at mixed residential/commercial uses. Based on the City 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).

Based on the Noise Element, the project site noise environment is generally dominated by transportation noise sources, specifically the railroad that runs adjacent to the western border of the project site. Based on the Noise Analysis prepared for the project (source reference 56), the 70 Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise contour extends approximately 15 feet from the center of the railroad tracks, the 65 CNEL contour extends 50 feet from the center of the railroad tracks, and the 60 CNEL contour extends approximately 163 feet from the center of the railroad tracks.

**Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

The OASP Final EIR analyzed potential noise-related impacts associated with construction and buildout of the OASP, including the project site. The Final EIR identified impacts related to construction, an increase in traffic, on-site operational noises, and noise associated with cumulative development in the area. Impacts associated with construction activity were deemed to be short-term in nature and less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures. Cumulative noise levels were found to exceed City standards, which was determined to be a significant and unavoidable impact.

**Project-Specific Review**

- a) A Noise Analysis (Greve & Associates, LLC 2019) was prepared to analyze noise impacts of the proposed project relative to the City’s noise standards. The project would include demolition and removal of both single-family residences and the barn located on-site, as well as tree removal, grading, paving, and construction activities. During the construction phases 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 for demolition and construction projects are shown in Table 9, below.

**Table 9. 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
Crane, Mobile	83
Dozer	85
Excavator	85

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Equipment Type	Typical Noise Level (dBA) 50 ft From Source
Heavy Truck	84
Jackhammer	85
Man Lift	85
Paver	85
Scraper	85

Source reference 56

The nearest sensitive receptor location to the project site is an existing single-family residence located approximately 25 feet to the west of the project site (3560 Bullock Lane). Additional sensitive receptors may be present by the time construction is initiated as a result of residential housing currently under construction to the northeast and southeast of the project site. Noise produced by construction equipment would be short term, intermittent, and required to comply with 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. Due to the close proximity of nearby existing and proposed (including under construction) single-family residential uses, the proposed demolition and construction project activities have the potential to periodically exceed the City’s Municipal Code standard for conducting construction activities in such a manner that prevents noise levels above 75 dBA from reaching single-family residential uses when technically and economically feasible. OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure N-1(a) requires that construction noise levels not exceed the standards in the City’s Municipal Code. Additionally, Mitigation Measures N-1 through N-5 have been identified to better implement OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure N-1(a) and to further reduce the potential for exceedances to occur and minimize potential temporary construction noise impacts to surrounding residential uses through implementation of noise BMPs, clear guidance on hours of construction, routes, and implementation standards, implementation of noise control measures, and notification of surrounding occupants of construction timelines and noise complaint procedures.

Upon completion of construction, the project would include the regular use of landscaping maintenance equipment and heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems, as well as result in increased vehicle traffic that would have the potential to contribute additional noise to the existing noise environment. Based on the surrounding land uses and adjacent railroad, these uses would be generally consistent with the noise levels of surrounding development and would not result in a noticeable increase in ambient noise levels.

Residential units directly fronting Bullock Lane would be within about 100 feet of the active UPRR rail line. Based on the Noise Analysis conducted for the project (Greve 2019), the closest buildings to the railroad would intermittently experience noise levels of approximately 61.7 CNEL, which exceeds the City’s outdoor noise threshold for residential uses. The OASP Final EIR identified this impact as a significant but mitigatable impact. With construction practices common in California, residential buildings achieve outdoor to indoor noise reductions of at least 20 dB. Exterior building surfaces in the project will be exposed to noise levels of less than 65 CNEL (i.e., 61.7 CNEL or less), and therefore, will meet the City’s 45 CNEL interior noise standard without building upgrades. The City also imposes a Lmax standard of 60 dBA. The average Lmax level was 79.8 dBA at 85 feet from the center of the tracks, or 77.2 dBA at the nearest building face. Residential buildings provide at least 20 dB outdoor to indoor noise reduction, so the indoor Lmax levels will be 57.2 dBA. Since the noise attenuation of a building falls to about 12 dB with windows open, all buildings exposed to noise levels greater than 57 CNEL will meet the 45 CNEL interior noise standard only with windows closed. Homes within 240 feet of the center of the tracks could experience noise levels greater than 57 CNEL. In order to assume that windows can remain closed to achieve this required attenuation, adequate ventilation (e.g., mechanical ventilation) with windows closed shall be provided per the applicable California Building Code, per Mitigation Measure N-6.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

OASP Policy 4.5.1 and Program 4.5.1a through Program 4.5.1e include design requirements that are intended to reduce the noise impacts on the development caused by the UPRR. These requirements include orienting bedrooms and windows away from the railroad tracks, providing a buffer between the centerline of the tracks and the residential area, and constructing a sound wall between the buffer and the residential uses. The Final EIR identified that a sound wall or berm would need to be 8-20 feet in height to achieve sufficient noise reduction in outdoor residential areas and open spaces (i.e. decks, patios). The Noise Analysis prepared for this project identified that a 6-foot sound wall would be sufficient to reduce noise exposure of residential decks and patios to 60 CNEL. OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure N-4(a) included the requirement for the sound wall. This mitigation measure has been revised as Mitigation Measure N-7 to reflect revisions to the sound wall requirement.

The OASP Final EIR also found that buildout of the OASP area in conjunction with the anticipated General Plan buildout would add to roadway corridor noise levels that already exceed the City’s 60 dBA threshold. This impact was determined to be significant and unavoidable. OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measure N-5(a) was identified to aid in reducing cumulative noise impacts. Cumulative noise impacts related to the project are consistent with those analyzed in the OASP Final EIR and no additional or increased impacts would occur.

Therefore, potential impacts associated with generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in excess of local standards would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

- b) The project does not propose pile driving or other high-impact activities that would generate substantial groundborne noise or groundborne vibration during construction. Use of heavy equipment would generate groundborne noise and vibration; these activities would have the potential to generate intermittent periods of vibration that may have the potential to affect occupants of surrounding residences or other buildings.

With regard to human perception, vibration levels typically begin to be perceptible at levels of 0.04 inches per second peak particle velocity (in/sec ppv) for continuous events and 0.25 in/sec ppv for transient events. Based on Caltrans vibration criteria, vibration levels at 0.1 ppv begins to annoy people, vibration levels at 0.2 ppv annoys people, and vibration levels between 0.4 and 0.6 ppv are unpleasant. Groundborne vibration levels associated with representative construction equipment are summarized in Table 10 below.

**Table 10. 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

Source reference 58

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 building occupants. Therefore, potential impacts associated with groundborne noise or vibration would be *less than significant*.

- c) The project site is located approximately 1 mile north of the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport and within the S-2 Safety Area, as designated in the ALUP. Based on Figure 1 of the ALUP, the project site is located outside of the 50 dB or higher airport noise contours. Therefore, the project would not result in the exposure of occupants to excessive noise levels due to proximity to an airport and potential impacts would be *less than significant*.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**Mitigation Measures**

**OASP Final EIR N-1(a). Compliance with City Noise Ordinance.** Construction hours and noise levels shall be compliant with the City Noise Ordinance [Municipal Code Chapter 9.12, Section 9.12.050(6)]. Methods to reduce construction noise can include, but are not limited to, the following:

**Equipment Shielding.** Stationary construction equipment that generates noise can be shielded with a barrier.

**Diesel Equipment.** All diesel equipment can be operated with closed engine doors and equipped with factory-recommended mufflers.

**Electrical Power.** Whenever feasible, electrical power can be used to run air compressors and similar power tools.

**Sound Blankets.** The use of sound blankets on noise generating equipment

**OASP Final EIR N-5(a). Fair Share of Cumulative Noise Improvements.** Applicants under the Specific Plan must contribute their fair financial share, as determined by the City, to the implementation of one or more of the mitigation approaches listed in policy 9 of the Noise Element (refer to Appendix E of this EIR). The Specific Plan shall be revised to include a specific program to contribute to mitigating cumulative impacts. Implementation of the program must occur prior home occupancy for development pursuant to the Specific Plan.

- N-1 For the entire duration of the construction phase of the project, the following BMPs shall be adhered to:
  - a. 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).
  - b. 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.
  - c. Where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed-air exhaust shall be used.
  - d. All construction equipment shall have the manufacturers’ recommended noise abatement methods (such as mufflers, engine enclosures, and engine vibration insulators) installed, intact, and operational.
  - e. 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 BMPs and 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 preconstruction meeting on construction hour limitations and how, why, and where BMP measures are to be implemented.
  
- N-3 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, the following:
  - a. Sound blankets shall be used on noise-generating equipment.
  - b. 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.
  - c. All diesel equipment shall be operated with closed engine doors and shall be equipped with factory-recommended mufflers.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

	<p>d. 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).</p> <p>e. Temporary sound barriers shall be constructed between construction sites and affected uses.</p>
N-4	Construction activities shall be conducted so that the maximum noise levels at affected properties will not exceed 75 dBA for single-family residential uses and 80 dBA for multi-family residential 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 compliant 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 Community Development Department.
N-6	All residential development within 240 feet of the centerline of the UPRR (identified by Exhibit 4 of the 2019 Noise Analysis) shall include adequate ventilation in compliance with the California Building Code so that adequate noise attenuation may be achieved with windows closed.
N-7	Indoor noise levels shall be reduced using the design and materials techniques described in OASP Programs 4.5.1a, 4.5.1b, 4.5.1c, 4.5.1d, 4.5.1e, 4.5.1f, 4.5.2a, 4.5.2b, and 4.5.2c. All residential development within 163 feet of the centerline of the UPRR (identified by Exhibit 3 of the 2019 Noise Analysis) shall include a noise barrier at least six feet in height that will shield exterior residential uses (i.e. patios, decks) from noise exposure greater than 60 CNEL. The noise barriers for the decks and patios must have a surface density of at least 3.5 pounds per square foot, and shall have no openings or gaps. The wall may be constructed of stud and stucco, 3/8-inch plate glass, 5/8-inch Plexiglas or Lexan, any masonry material, or a combination of these materials. Additionally, individual homes shall be designed so that structures block the line-of-sight from usable backyards to the railroad tracks. For homes with backyards not blocked by intervening structures, backyard fencing shall be installed of sufficient height to block line-of-sight to the railroad tracks.
<b><u>Conclusion</u></b>	
The project has the potential to periodically exceed Municipal Code standards during construction activities. With implementation of the mitigation measures identified above, potential impacts associated with temporary exceedances would be less than significant. No other potentially significant impacts associated with noise were identified, and no further 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)?	1, 59, 60	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b><u>Evaluation</u></b>
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 46,802 in 2019 according to the <i>City of San Luis Obispo General Plan 2019 Annual Report</i> (source reference 60).

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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. Many segments of the City's population have difficulty finding affordable housing within the city due to their economic, physical, or sociological circumstances. San Luis Obispo contains the largest concentration of jobs in the county, and during workdays the City's daytime population increases to an estimated 70,000 persons (source reference 59). This pattern indicates that a relatively large number of people commute to San Luis Obispo from other areas, which suggests that there is need for additional housing in or near the City to provide a better balance of jobs and housing in order to reduce commute times, vehicle miles traveled and related air emissions.

The *City of San Luis Obispo General Plan Housing Element* identifies various goals, policies, and programs based on an assessment of the City's housing needs, opportunities, and constraints. The City's overarching goals for housing include safety, affordability, conservation of existing housing, accommodation 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, maximization of affordable housing opportunities for those who live or work in the City, and developing housing on suitable sites.

The City's 5th Cycle Housing Element and RHNA Quantified Objectives ended on June 30, 2019. This was a 5-year period of housing planning that began on January 1, 2014. In this 5th Cycle, the City issued a total of 1,272 building permits for the development of new residential units. This included a total of 220 new deed-restricted affordable housing units, or housing available to Extremely Low, Very Low, and Low households, as well as 1,052 units of market-rate, or Above Moderate income housing.

For the new 6th Cycle Housing Element, the City is transitioning towards a longer housing planning period, moving from a 5-year to an 8-year timeframe. The California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) has finalized its RHNA determination for the San Luis Obispo County region at 10,810 units for the 10-year production period (December 31, 2018 to December 31, 2028) and the number of these housing units allocated to the City has been identified as 3,354. The intent of this is, in part, to provide a better balance of jobs and housing locally, and to allow for the possibility of more affordable housing.

The Land Use Element policy related to residential growth (LUE 1.11.2) states that the City's housing supply shall grow no faster than 1% per year, over the 5-year Housing Element planning period. Based on the 2019 General Plan Annual Report, the average growth rate of the City's housing supply between 2015 and 2019 was 0.47%.

**Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

The OASP Final EIR determined that impacts related to population and housing would not result in significant environmental impacts. The Final EIR also determined that the OASP would not result in a higher population anticipated by the City's General Plan in effect at the time of certification of the Final EIR.

**Project-Specific Review**

- a) The project would result in the development of 192 new residential housing units within the OASP area, resulting in an approximately 0.89% increase in the City's housing supply over the 2-year construction period. The project would be consistent with the projected population growth for the city of San Luis Obispo and Housing Element goals and policies and would contribute housing units towards the meeting the City's RHNA housing unit allocation without exceeding the target housing supply growth rate of 1% per year. The project would be consistent with the zoning and general standards set forth in the OASP, which has been identified and incorporated into City planning documents, including the adopted Housing Element, as well as the July 2020 Draft Housing Element Update. The proposed project would result in near-term increases in population of approximately 440 residents, which would not exceed the City's projected year 2025 or year 2050 population projections. The project would be consistent with the projected increases in residents within the OASP area identified in the City Land Use Element Program EIR, which concluded that the Land Use Circulation Element Update, which included the OASP, Airport Specific Plan, and Margarita Specific Plan, would not result in residential development or other associated population growth that would exceed the City's adopted average

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

annual growth rate threshold of 1%. Lastly, the project would be consistent with the level of development evaluated in the OASP Final EIR, which concluded that the OASP was consistent with population assumptions of the General Plan and San Luis Obispo 2020 CAP. Since adoption of the OASP, several other specific plans and residential subdivision projects have been adopted within the City, including the San Luis Ranch Specific Plan, Froom Ranch Specific Plan, and Avila Ranch Development Plan. The adopted OASP and associated projected population growth were included in the cumulative impact evaluation for each of these subsequent specific plans. Therefore, the project would not result in substantial unplanned population growth and impacts with *less than significant*.

- b) The project would result in the demolition and removal of two existing single-family residences and the development of 192 new residential units. Both of the existing residences are currently unoccupied and, based on staff observations, one residence has not been occupied for least several years. Displacement of current residents on-site would not be significant and would not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere; therefore, impacts would be *less than significant*.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**Conclusion**

The project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth or displace existing housing or people that would necessitate construction of replacement housing elsewhere. 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?	1, 23, 63	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	1, 23, 63	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	1, 23, 63	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	1, 23, 63	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	1, 23, 63	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Evaluation**

The San Luis Obispo City Fire Department (SLOFD) provides emergency and non-emergency fire and protection services in the city. Emergency services include fire response, emergency medical response, hazardous materials response, and public assistance. Non-emergency services include fire and life safety inspections, building inspections, fire code investigations, and public education. The SLOFD currently operates four fire stations and has 45 full-time emergency response personnel (including battalion chiefs, captains, engineers, and firefighters). According to the SLOFD, response times to lights-and-siren emergencies should be 7 minutes or less 90% of the time. Based on the *2019-2020 Fire Department Annual Report*, response times in 2019 were 7 minutes or less approximately 72% of the time (source reference 62).



Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

The City of San Luis Obispo Police Department (SLOPD), which consists of 90.5 full-time employees, 61 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 (SR 1) and U.S. Route 101. The project is located within the San Luis Coastal Unified School District (SLCUSD), and public parks and recreation trails within the city are managed and maintained by the City Parks and Recreation Department. With the current 61 sworn officers, the current service level is a ratio of 0.84 sworn officers per 1,000 service population.

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 City 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.

### Previous Program-Level Environmental Review

The OASP Final EIR analyzed potential impacts associated with development of the OASP area on public services, including fire and police services, and schools. The Final EIR determined that impacts on police services and schools would be less than significant. Potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures related to fire services were identified for parcels in the Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone.

### Project-Specific Review

a) **Fire protection:** Potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures related to fire services were identified for parcels in the Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The project site is within the Low Fire Hazard Severity Zone and therefore Mitigation Measures PS-2(b) and PS-2(c) in the OASP Final EIR are not applicable. The project would be served by the SLOFD, the closest station of which is Station 3, located at 1280 Laurel Lane. The project proposes uses generally consistent with the surrounding residential and commercial areas. While the project would not directly result in the need for construction of new fire service facilities, project development of new residential and commercial uses would result in a marginal cumulative increase of demand on City services, including fire protection. The project would be required to participate in the City's system of required developer impact fees and dedications established to address direct demand for new facilities associated with new development. Potential increases in property tax revenue associated with valuation of the new residential units, businesses, and other revenues (e.g., sales tax) would also help offset the increased ongoing cost of provision of public services to new residential and commercial uses. Therefore, impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered SLOFD facilities would be *less than significant*.

**Police protection:** The project would be served by the SLOPD. Project development of new residential and neighborhood commercial uses would result in an increase of demand on City services, including police protection. The project proposes uses generally consistent with the surrounding residential and commercial uses. While the project would result in an overall increase in residents within the city, the project would be consistent with the projected population growth for the city of San Luis Obispo. The City has a system of required developer impact fees and dedications established to address direct demand for new facilities associated with new development. Potential increases in property tax revenue associated with valuation of the new residential units, businesses, and other revenues (e.g., sales tax) would also help offset the increased ongoing cost of provision of public services to new residential and commercial uses. 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 would be subject to payment of SLCUSD developer fees to offset the potential marginal increase in student attendance in the SLCUSD's schools as a result of the project. These fees would be directed towards maintaining 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*.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**Parks:** Project development of new residential uses would result in an increase of demand on local parks and recreational facilities in the area. The project would result in a marginal increase in residents that would lead to an incremental increase in local park usership. While the project would result in an overall 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 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 marginal 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, potential project impacts on schools would be *less than significant*.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required.

**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?	1, 64	<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?	1, 64	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Evaluation**

Existing City recreation 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, healthful, or enriching activities that enhance the quality of life in the community.

As demand for recreation 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 (source reference 64). 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, 5 acres of which shall be dedicated as neighborhood parks.

The OASP calls for opportunities for active and passive recreation through the creation of public parks that are adequate to support the buildout population of the OASP area. OASP Program 2.3.3d calls for 1.5 acres of park along the western portion of the OASP area, in proximity to the project site, that is meant to provide resting points/informational areas in support of the Class I bicycle and pedestrian path that will be constructed along the western boundary of the OASP area. Program 2.3.4a allows property owners to provide improved parkland on their property instead of paying the parkland in lieu fee, under certain

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

circumstances. The project site is identified in the OASP as having the option for local parkland dedication and/or a local detention basin.

**Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

The OASP Final EIR found that the project would not cause or result in significant environmental impacts related to recreation.

**Project-Specific Review**

- a) The project would increase the demand on public parkland and neighborhood parks from an increased residential population. While the project would result in an overall increase in residents within the city, the project would be consistent with the projected population growth for the city of San Luis Obispo. Additionally, the OASP identifies 16.30 acres of active and passive parkland that will be developed in the OASP area, including a 12-acre neighborhood park. The project would be subject to parkland 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 the OASP 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/recreation 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*.
- b) The project would include the development of a centrally located recreation area consisting of a 1,766-square-foot recreation building, a 766-square-foot pool building, and a pool area. This recreation area would be open to all future residents of the project site and all environmental impacts of development of these facilities have been addressed in other sections of this document. The project does not include parkland or open space for the benefit of the greater OASP area, and therefore would be required to contribute to the parkland fee identified in the OASP Fee Program (Chapter 8 of the OASP). Earthwork and vegetation removal required for the construction of the recreational area would result in potential impacts associated with air quality, cultural resources, biological resources, and hazards and hazardous materials. With implementation of mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-4, OASP Final EIR AQ-1(c, d, and e), OASP Final EIR CR-1(d), and OASP Final EIR B-5(a), B-5(c), B-6(c), and B-6(d), potential environmental impacts associated with construction of recreation facilities would be *less than significant with mitigation*.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation is required to directly address parkland impacts, but mitigation measures AQ-1 through AQ-4, OASP Final EIR AQ-1(c, d and e), OASP Final EIR CR-1(d), and OASP Final EIR B-5(a), B-5(c), B-6(c), and B-6(d) are required to address residual impacts associated with construction of recreational facilities onsite.

**Conclusion**

The project would be subject to development impact fees to offset the increased demand on existing recreational facilities within the city resulting from the project. The project includes construction of recreational areas within the project site that would result in residual impacts associated with air quality, biological resources, and hazards and hazardous materials. With implementation of the mitigation measures identified above, potential impacts associated with recreation would be less than significant.

**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?	66, 67, 68, 69	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	67, 69	<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, 67	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	1, 67	<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 identifies 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 alternatives 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 projects 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 LOS D for all other areas and states any degradation of the LOS below these standards shall be interpreted as transportation operations deficiency under local policy thresholds. While LOS deficiencies are evaluated for local policy conformity, LOS or other measures of automobile congestion/delay are not applied when evaluating transportation impacts under CEQA.

The *City of San Luis Obispo Bicycle Transportation Plan* (source reference 66) outlines the City’s official policies for the design and development of bikeways within the city and in adjoining territory under County of San Luis Obispo jurisdiction but within the City’s Urban Reserve and includes specific objectives for reducing vehicle use and promoting other modes of transportation. A Class I bike path provides a completely separated right-of-way for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians with crossflow by motorists minimized. A Class II bike lane provides an on-street striped lane for one-way bicycle travel on the side of the street adjacent to vehicle traffic.

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 VMT per capita, VMT per employee, and net VMT as new metrics for transportation analysis under CEQA (as detailed in Section 15064.3[b]). In June 2020 the City formally adopted the transition from LOS to VMT for the purposes of CEQA evaluation and also establish local VMT thresholds of significance.

The following describes the existing roadways adjacent to the proposed project. Bicycle facilities in the study area consist of Class I and II bikeways.

- Bullock Lane is a north-south, two-way, two-lane road in the study area. It has curb, gutter, sidewalk, and on-street parking on the east side of the roadway. Bullock Lane begins at Orcutt Road and terminates approximately 230 feet to the north of the project site. Bullock Lane has been installed from the roundabout which connects Bullock Lane and Tiburon Way to the project’s south property line. Applicant will install roadway improvements consisting of curb, gutter, roadway, utilities and sidewalk between its project’s sites south property line and north property line. Bullock Lane’s posted speed limit is 30 miles per hour (mph). There are no existing bikeways on Bullock Lane except for approximately 200 feet of bikeway immediately to the south of Orcutt Road and bikeways approximately 250 feet to the north of the roundabout between Tiburon Way and Bullock Lane. A future Class I facility is proposed on the west side of Bullock Lane parallel to the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR). The applicant will extend the bike path along the

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

west side of Bullock Lane from the project’s south property line to the southwest corner of the intersection Orcutt Road and Bullock Lane.

- Orcutt Road is a two-way arterial with Class II bike lanes. Orcutt Road has four lanes from Broad Street to the UPRR tracks and two lanes from the UPRR tracks to Tank Farm Road. There is on-street parking, as well as curb, gutter, and sidewalk on both sides of the roadway between Broad Street and Fernwood Drive. The posted speed limit is 40 mph.

The intersection of Orcutt Road/Bullock Lane/Laurel Lane has crosswalks on all four legs and bicycle signal heads with a dedicated bike phase. The northwest corner provides access to the Class I Railroad Safety Trail (RRST) and the southwest corner will provide access to the planned extension of the RRST.

SLO Transit operates transit service in the city of San Luis Obispo. SLO Transit Route 1A is a weekday and weekend bus service that travels from the Downtown Transit Center to the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport via Broad Street, Marsh Street, Johnson Avenue, Laurel Lane, Orcutt Road, and Tank Farm Road in a clockwise direction with 60-minute headways. The nearest bus stop for Route 1A to the project site is located at the southeast corner of Orcutt Road/Bullock Lane/Laurel Lane intersection. SLO Transit Route 1B is similar to Route 1A, traveling in a counterclockwise direction. However, Route 1B does not travel through the Orcutt Road/Bullock Lane/Laurel Lane intersection. The nearest bus stop for Route 1B to the project site is located on Johnson Avenue. Connections to San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority (SLORTA) routes and other SLO Transit routes are available at the Downtown Transit Center. Based on the Circulation Element, a bus stop will also be located near the Tiburon Way/Ranch House Road intersection.

**Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

A traffic and circulation study was prepared by Fehr & Peers (June 2007) to support the analysis of the OASP Final EIR. The Final EIR found that implementation of the OASP would result in several traffic and circulation impacts that were determined to be significant but mitigable with the implementation of identified circulation improvements that would be either directly provided by the applicants in the OASP area, or partially funded by the applicants through the payment of fair share contributions or traffic impact fees.

**Project-Specific Review**

In June 2020 the City formally adopted the transition from LOS to VMT for the purposes of CEQA evaluation and also establish local VMT thresholds of significance. The discussion of LOS in item a) below is included for informational purposes only and to provide context for readers familiar with this metric. Potential CEQA impacts are based on the VMT analysis.

- A Transportation Impact Study (TIS) and VMT analysis memorandum was prepared for the project (source references 67, 69) to evaluate circulation needs and potential transportation impacts anticipated with addition of the project. Based on traffic counts collected in 2018, the intersection of Orcutt Road/Bullock Lane/Laurel Lane currently operates at LOS C during both a.m. and p.m. peak hours. The project is expected to generate a total of 1,626 vehicle trips per weekday, including 117 trips during the a.m. peak hour and 152 trips during the p.m. peak hour. Upon completion of project construction, the Orcutt Road/Bullock Lane/Laurel Lane intersection would operate at LOS C during peak hours under both existing plus project conditions and near-term plus project conditions, which takes into account approved and pending projects within the project vicinity.

Cumulative conditions represent buildout of the developable land in the region. The intersection of Orcutt Road/Bullock Lane/Laurel Lane would operate at LOS F under cumulative conditions both with and without the project during the a.m. peak hour. Therefore, the project would contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact associated with a conflict with Circulation Element Policy 6.1.2, which specifies that LOS E or better operations shall be maintained for vehicles in the downtown area and LOS D or better shall be maintained for all other routes in the City, including the project area.

Based on State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, a project’s effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant environmental impact. Therefore, no potentially significant environmental impacts would occur as a result

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

of potential inconsistency with the Circulation Element. Any necessary circulation improvements associated with addressing automobile delay (LOS) would be addressed through the discretionary permit approval process and conditions of approval imposed on the project, which would include payments of fair-share contributions towards off-site circulation improvements through participation in the Citywide Transportation Impact Fee Program and Orcutt Area Transportation Impact Fee Program.

The project includes the extension of the Class I RRST on the west side of Bullock Lane adjacent to the project site to Tiburon Way. The project also includes the addition of Class II bikeways on the future Ranch House Road and Tiburon Way. The proposed typical section on Bullock Lane adjacent to the project site is consistent with the Bicycle Transportation Plan Class I standards. The project would also include landscaped sidewalks to connect the proposed recreation area to the residences, internal courtyards, the regional Class I bike path along the west side of Bullock Lane, and the rest of the Orcutt community to the east. The project would be generally consistent with the policies within the Circulation Element associated with provision of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure to promote walkability and bicycle usage. Therefore, potential impacts associated with a conflict with a program, plan, or ordinance addressing the circulation system would be *less than significant*.

- The City’s Travel Demand Model (TDM) was run under base year (2016) conditions both with and without the project to determine regional VMT with and without the project. With development of the project, regional VMT would be reduced from 8,486,113 to 8,482,745 (reduction of approximately 3.97%). This is likely attributable to the fact that the city of San Luis Obispo currently has substantially more jobs than residences; therefore, development of new housing within the city would likely house a large amount of individuals who currently commute in and out of the city for work. In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b), projects that reduce or have no impact on VMT should be presumed to have a less-than-significant transportation impact. In addition, the project would extend an existing regional Class I bike path and would provide bicycle infrastructure (e.g., bicycle racks, etc.) throughout the project site, which would further reduce project VMT by providing future project occupants with alternative transportation mode options. Therefore, potential impacts associated with a conflict or inconsistency with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b) would be *less than significant*.
- A general review of the project proposed on- and off-site circulation elements was conducted during preparation of the TIS for consistency with standard circulation component safety and design standards. Based on buildout of the project and completion of residential development located to the east of the project on the opposite side of Ranch House Road, pedestrians will likely cross Ranch House Road at multiple locations to access the Class I RRST and Bullock Ranch pedestrian walkways. While pedestrian volumes are not projected to be substantial enough to warrant installation of a marked crosswalk, the TIS recommended installation of standard pedestrian warning signage to reduce potential safety hazards in this area. Mitigation Measure TR-1 has been identified to require installation of pedestrian warning signage for oncoming traffic at this location. Upon implementation of measure TR-1, potential impacts associated with substantial increases in hazards due to a geometric design feature would be *less than significant with mitigation*.
- The project has been designed to comply with the state and City fire codes to allow for adequate emergency vehicle access on-site. In addition, the project would be subject to review by the City Fire Marshal to ensure adequate emergency access and other infrastructure (e.g., fire hydrants, etc.) have been provided. Therefore, potential impacts related to inadequate emergency access would be *less than significant*.

**Mitigation Measures**

*Note: OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measures T-1(a) and T-2(a) through T-2(e) were included in the Final EIR as mitigation to offset impacts resulting from to buildout of the OASP related to LOS/automobile delay. Based on State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, a project’s effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant environmental impact. The projects associated with these mitigation measures are now included in the Citywide Transportation Impact Fee Program and Orcutt Area Transportation Impact Fee Program, which the project is subject to. These mitigation measures have not been included in this document and instead will be satisfied through discretionary permit conditions of approval.*

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

**TR-1** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant/owner(s) shall provide finalized circulation plans indicating addition of W11-2 pedestrian warning signage along Ranch House Road in both directions approaching the Ranch House Road/Sponza Place intersection.

**Conclusion**

The project would provide adequate emergency access and would be consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3(b). While project-level impacts would not result in a conflict with applicable policies addressing the circulation system, the project would contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact associated with exceedance of the City’s LOS standards set forth in the Circulation Element Policy 6.1.2. Based on State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, a project’s effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant environmental impact. Therefore, no potentially significant environmental impacts would occur as a result of potential inconsistency with the Circulation Element. Mitigation Measure TR-1 has been identified to reduce potential impacts associated with circulation safety hazards through installation of pedestrian warning signage along Ranch House Road between Orcutt Way and Tiburon Road. Therefore, with implementation of the mitigation measure identified above, potential impacts associated with transportation would be less than significant with mitigation.

**18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES**

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:

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)?	27	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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.	27	<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 California Register of Historical Resources; or
  - b. Included in a local register of historical resources as defined in subdivision (k) of California Public Resources Code Section 5020.1.
- 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 subdivision (c) of California Public Resources Code Section 5024.1. 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

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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.

**Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

The OASP Final EIR did not specifically analyze tribal cultural resources, as this topic area was not added to CEQA until after the Final EIR was certified. The Final EIR did analyze impacts to cultural resources, including the potential for significant but mitigatable impacts to previously unidentified archaeological deposits and/or human remains. OASP Policies 2.51 and 2.7.1a and Program 2.7.1a call for the protection of known and unknown archaeological resources through the implementation of the OASP Final EIR mitigation measures. OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measures CR-1(a) through CR-1(d) require surveys for previously un-surveyed parcels, monitoring during vegetation removal (limited to certain areas) and construction, and CR-2(a) and CR-2(b) require additional testing and monitoring should avoidance of known sites be impossible.

**Project-Specific Review**

a.i-ii) The City has provided notice of the opportunity to consult with appropriate tribes per the requirements of AB 52 and received a consultation request from one tribe. Consultation has been completed and no changes to the project are proposed.

The project site does not contain any known tribal cultural resources that have been listed or been found eligible for listing in the CRHR, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in PRC Section 5020.1. In the event resources are discovered during project ground-disturbing activities, OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measures CR-1(d) has been identified to require cessation of work and implementation of appropriate protocol if cultural resource or human remains are discovered during ground-disturbing activities. 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 OASP Final EIR Mitigation Measures CR-1(d). CR-1(d) requires construction worker awareness training and includes provisions should resources be identified during construction. The full text of the measure can be found in Section 5, Cultural Resources, and in the Required Mitigation and Monitoring Programs section at the end of this document.

**Conclusion**

With implementation of the mitigation measure identified above, potential impacts to previously undiscovered tribal cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant.

**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, 70	<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?	1, 70	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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?	71, 72	<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?	73, 74	<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?	72, 73, 74	<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 facility treated an average of 3.57 million gallons of wastewater daily in 2019. 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, landscape, and other appropriate uses are being implemented under the City's Water Reuse Program.

### **Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

The OASP Final EIR evaluated the impacts of the OASP on water and wastewater resources. The Final EIR determined that the OASP would generate the need for 264 acre-feet per year, and that the City had sufficient supplies to meet this demand. Impacts related to water supply were determined to be less than significant. Impacts related to solid waste disposal were determined to be not significant and no further environmental review was completed.

### **Project-Specific Review**

- a) The project would include the installation of new water, wastewater, and stormwater 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-4, OASP Final EIR AQ-1(c, d and e), OASP Final EIR CR-1(d), OASP Final EIR B-5(a), B-5(c), B-6(c), and B-6(d), and OASP Final EIR D-1(a), D-1(b), and D-3(a) would reduce potentially significant residual environmental impacts resulting from installation and establishment of new utility connections associated with air quality, cultural resources, biological resources, and hazards and hazardous materials to less than significant. Therefore, potential environmental impacts associated with construction or extension of existing utilities would be *less than significant with mitigation*.
- b) Per the *City of San Luis Obispo General Plan Water and Wastewater Management Element*, Policy A2.2.1, the City uses multiple water sources to meet its water supply needs. The City has four primary water supply sources, including Whale Rock Reservoir, Salinas Reservoir, Nacimiento Reservoir, and recycled water. Groundwater serves as a fifth supplemental source, which was suspended by the City from potable uses in April 2015. During water year 2019, the city's total water demand was 4,762 acre-feet, and the total water availability for 2019 was 10,136 acre-feet. Water demand for the project is estimated to be 37.68 acre-feet per year, based on Table 4.12-4 of the OASP Final EIR. This amount represents 0.8% of the city's 2019 water demand and 0.4% of the city's 2019 total water availability. Therefore, based on the City's 2019 Water Resources Status Report, the City maintains a robust water supply portfolio with greater than five years of water available, including with the addition of the project demand.

At the time of submittal of development plans and application for a building permit, the applicant would be required to pay a Water Impact Fee to offset the project's marginal impact on the City's water resources. Therefore, based on the

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

<p>City’s current surplus of water supplies and payment of Water Impact Fees to offset use, potential impacts associated with having sufficient water supplies during normal, dry, and multiple dry years would be <i>less than significant</i>.</p>					
c)	<p>The project would be served by the City’s sewer system and would include the installation of a new sewer lateral to connect to existing City sewer infrastructure. The project would result in an incremental increase in wastewater demand on the WRRF, estimated at 26,175 gallons per day based on the City’s Wastewater Flow Offset Program generation rates. 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 wastewater treatment provider’s capacity to serve the project’s wastewater needs would be <i>less than significant</i>.</p>				
d)	<p>Based on information provided by the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle), the project would result in the generation of approximately 768 pounds of solid waste per day. The project has been designed to include solid waste receptacles and enclosures throughout the site to be serviced by San Luis Garbage Company, which has provided a will-serve letter ensuring service will be provided to the site during operation, dated May 2019. Project solid waste would be collected regularly and would eventually be disposed of at Cold Canyon Landfill. In addition, project demolition and other construction solid waste materials would likely be disposed of at the Cold Canyon Landfill. The Cold Canyon Landfill has approximately 13,100,000 cubic yards of remaining capacity as of February 2020 and is expected to reach capacity in 2040. Therefore, potential impacts would be <i>less than significant</i>.</p>				
e)	<p>Background research for the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB 939) identified 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. To help reduce the waste stream generated by this project, consistent with the COSE policies to coordinate waste reduction and recycling efforts (COSE 5.5.3), and the City’s Development Standards for Solid Waste Services, recycling facilities have been accommodated into the project site and a solid waste reduction plan for recycling discarded construction materials is a submittal requirement with the building permit application. 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 <i>less than significant</i>.</p>				
<p><b><u>Mitigation Measures</u></b></p> <p>To address residual impacts resulting from installation of required infrastructure, implement Mitigation Measures AQ-1 through AQ-4, OASP Final EIR AQ-1(c, d, and e), OASP Final EIR CR-1(d), OASP Final EIR B-5(a), B-5(c), B-6(c), and B-6(d), and OASP Final EIR D-1(a), D-1(b), and D-3(a).</p>					
<p><b><u>Conclusion</u></b></p> <p>With implementation of the mitigation measures identified above, the project’s potential impacts associated with utilities and service systems would be less than significant.</p>					

**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?	44, 45	<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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	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	<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?	25, 31, 32	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Evaluation**

The project 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 are access, available water volume and pressure, and response time for fire fighters. Based on the LHMP, 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 project site is within the Low Fire Hazard Severity Zone and therefore mitigation measures identified in the OASP Final EIR that relate to development in Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zones are not applicable.

The Safety Element identifies four policies to address the potential hazards associated with wildfire, which include approval of development only when adequate fire suppression services and facilities are available, classification of wildland fire hazard severity zones as prescribed by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), prohibition of new subdivisions located within “Very High” wildland fire hazard severity zones, and continuation of enhancement of fire safety and construction codes for buildings.

**Previous Program-Level Environmental Review**

Potentially significant impacts and mitigation measures related to fire services were identified for parcels in the Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone. The project site is within the Low Fire Hazard Severity Zone and therefore these mitigation measures are not applicable.

**Project-Specific Review**

- a) 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 closures of currently operating roadways would occur as a result of project implementation. Upon completion of construction and occupancy of the proposed residential units, the project would result in additional vehicle traffic along the Broad Street and Orcutt Road evacuation routes in the event of an emergency. While increased traffic along these routes would occur, it would not result in a conflict or directly inhibit the implementation of the LHMP or Evacuation Plan. Therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.
- b) The project is located within a partially developed site located within an urban area in the city of San Luis Obispo. The project site is generally flat, and the project would not result in any substantial changes to existing site topography or removal of any substantial natural windbreaks. 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 PRC prior to issuance of building permits; therefore, potential impacts would be *less than significant*.
- c) The project would include the installation of new water, emergency water, wastewater, and stormwater infrastructure and connections to City infrastructure. These proposed infrastructure components would occur 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*.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

<p>d) The project site is generally flat and would not be 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 <i>less than significant</i>.</p> <p><b><u>Mitigation Measures</u></b></p> <p>No mitigation is required.</p> <p><b><u>Conclusion</u></b></p> <p>The project would not result in potentially significant impacts associated with wildfire; therefore, no mitigation is necessary.</p>
--

**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"/>
<p>As discussed in each resource section above, the proposed project would have the potential to result in significant impacts to biological and cultural resources during the construction phase. Mitigation measures have been identified to require appropriate construction work timeframes, wildlife preconstruction surveys, no-work buffers, and cultural resource discovery protocol to reduce potential impacts to less than significant. Therefore, impacts would be <i>less than significant with mitigation incorporated</i>.</p>					
<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"/>
<p>Evaluation of cumulative impacts has been incorporated into each resource section above. Cumulatively considerable impacts were identified associated with air quality, greenhouse gasses, and transportation impacts (see Section 17, Transportation). A mitigation measure has been identified to reduce cumulatively considerable transportation impacts to less than cumulatively considerable through payment of a fair-share contribution to fund the construction of an additional westbound through lane at the Orcutt Road/Bullock Lane/Laurel Lane intersection. Therefore, impacts would be <i>less than significant with mitigation incorporated</i>.</p>					
<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"/>
<p>The project has the potential to result in significant impacts associated with air quality, biological resources, cultural/tribal cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, noise, recreation, transportation, and utilities/service systems 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 ACM, and installation of pedestrian warning signage to reduce potential safety hazards. With incorporation of</p>					

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

mitigation 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 incorporated*.

## 22. EARLIER ANALYSES

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:

a) **Earlier analysis used.** Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.

This document tiers off of the analysis provided in the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Orcutt Area Specific Plan, which is available on the City of San Luis Obispo website under Environmental Review Documents (<http://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=5021>).

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.

All effects from the above checklist were evaluated on a project-level basis within this document and none relied solely on the analysis provided in the OASP EIR.

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.

- Mitigation measures from the OASP EIR that were incorporated in to this document include the following:
- AES-3(a) Minimize Lighting on Public Areas
  - AQ-1(c) Shade Trees
  - AQ-1(d) Telecommuting
  - AQ-1(e) Pathways
  - B-5(a) Bird Pre-Construction Survey
  - B-5(c) Monarch Pre-Construction Survey
  - B-6(c) Educational Pet Brochure
  - B-6(d) Landscaping Plan Review
  - CR-1(d) Archaeological Resource Construction Monitoring
  - D-1(a) Erosion Control Plan
  - D-1(b) Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
  - D-3(a) Payment of Fair Share Fees for Area Drainage Improvements
  - G-4(a) Expansive Soils Grading
  - N-1(a) Compliance with City Noise Ordinance
  - N-5(a) Fair Share of Cumulative Noise Improvements
  - S-4(d) 55-Gallon Drums

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

### 23. SOURCE REFERENCES

Number	Reference
1.	Bullock Ranch Concept Design and Site Plan, December 10, 2019
2.	City of San Luis Obispo Conservation & Open Space Element (COSE), 2006. Available at: < <a href="https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=6651">https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=6651</a> >.
3.	California Scenic Highways, February 2017. Available at: < <a href="https://www.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?useExisting=1&amp;layers=f0259b1ad0fe4093a5604c9b838a486a">https://www.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?useExisting=1&amp;layers=f0259b1ad0fe4093a5604c9b838a486a</a> >.
4.	City of San Luis Obispo Community Design Guidelines, June 2010. Available at: < <a href="https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=2104">https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=2104</a> >.
5.	City of San Luis Obispo Municipal Code, July 2020. Available at: < <a href="https://sanluisobispo.municipal.codes/Code">https://sanluisobispo.municipal.codes/Code</a> >.
6.	City of San Luis Obispo Zoning Regulations, 2019. Available at: < <a href="https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=5861">https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=5861</a> >.
7.	California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, 2016. Available at: < <a href="https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/">https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/DLRP/CIFF/</a> >.
8.	County of San Luis Obispo Land Use View, 2020. Accessed August 2020. Available at: <a href="http://gis.slocounty.ca.gov/Html5Viewer/Index.html?configBase=/Geocortex/Essentials/REST/sites/PL_LandUseView/viewers/PL_LandUseView/virtualdirectory/Resources/Config/Default">http://gis.slocounty.ca.gov/Html5Viewer/Index.html?configBase=/Geocortex/Essentials/REST/sites/PL_LandUseView/viewers/PL_LandUseView/virtualdirectory/Resources/Config/Default</a> .
9.	City of San Luis Obispo Interactive Parcel Viewer, January 2015. Available at: < <a href="http://slocity.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=3e0adee3aabd4805bd13f0d4705a4193">http://slocity.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=3e0adee3aabd4805bd13f0d4705a4193</a> >.
10.	Bullock Lane Tree Survey, SWCA Environmental Consultants, 2019.
11.	California Air Resources Board Area Designation Maps / State and National, December 2018. Available at: < <a href="https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm">https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm</a> >.
12.	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control Board Naturally Occurring Asbestos Mapping Tool, 2017. Available at: < <a href="https://www.google.com/maps/d/u/0/viewer?mid=1YAKjBzVkwilbZ4rQ1p6b2OMyvIM&amp;ll=35.364986805363756%2C-120.52563349999997&amp;z=10">https://www.google.com/maps/d/u/0/viewer?mid=1YAKjBzVkwilbZ4rQ1p6b2OMyvIM&amp;ll=35.364986805363756%2C-120.52563349999997&amp;z=10</a> >.
13.	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District CEQA Air Quality Handbook, April 2012. Available at: < <a href="https://storage.googleapis.com/slocleanair-org/images/cms/upload/files/CEQA_Handbook_2012_v2%20%28Updated%20Map2019%29_LinkedwithMemo.pdf">https://storage.googleapis.com/slocleanair-org/images/cms/upload/files/CEQA_Handbook_2012_v2%20%28Updated%20Map2019%29_LinkedwithMemo.pdf</a> >.
14.	Air Quality & Greenhouse Gas Impact Assessment for the Proposed Bullock Ranch Project San Luis Obispo, CA. Ambient Air Quality and Noise Consulting, Inc. August 2020.
15.	San Luis Obispo County Clean Air Plan, December 2001. Available at: < <a href="https://storage.googleapis.com/slocleanair-org/images/cms/upload/files/business/pdf/CAP.pdf">https://storage.googleapis.com/slocleanair-org/images/cms/upload/files/business/pdf/CAP.pdf</a> >.
16.	California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2017. California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan. November 2017. <a href="https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf">https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf</a>
17.	2050 Regional Growth Forecast for San Luis Obispo County. 2017. San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG). Available at: <a href="https://www.dropbox.com/s/gia0tleyqs51a3w/2050RegionalGrowthForecast_01FullReport_RevDec2018.pdf?dl=0">https://www.dropbox.com/s/gia0tleyqs51a3w/2050RegionalGrowthForecast_01FullReport_RevDec2018.pdf?dl=0</a> .
18.	Clarification Memorandum for the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District's 2012 CEQA Air Quality Handbook, November 2017. Available at: < <a href="https://storage.googleapis.com/slocleanair-org/images/cms/upload/files/FINAL_Clarification%20Memorandum%2020172.pdf">https://storage.googleapis.com/slocleanair-org/images/cms/upload/files/FINAL_Clarification%20Memorandum%2020172.pdf</a> >.
19.	Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations, California Air Resources Board, 2015. Available at: < <a href="https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/toxics/atcm/asb2atcm.htm">https://ww3.arb.ca.gov/toxics/atcm/asb2atcm.htm</a> >.
20.	San Luis Obispo Heritage Trees Map, 2020. Available at: < <a href="http://slocity.maps.arcgis.com/apps/Solutions/s2.html?appid=74e2e5bf9e534eabf95b0917da8bbc7">http://slocity.maps.arcgis.com/apps/Solutions/s2.html?appid=74e2e5bf9e534eabf95b0917da8bbc7</a> >.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

21.	Bullock Lane Botanical Surveys Report for Bullock Ranch, San Luis Obispo, California. SWCA Environmental Consultants, June 2019.				
22.	Cambria Morning Glory at Bullock Ranch, San Luis Obispo, California Memorandum. SWCA Environmental Consultants, October 2019.				
23.	Final Environmental Impact Report for the Orcutt Area Specific Plan, Rincon Consultants, Inc. December 2009.				
24.	Burrowing Owl Survey Report for the Bullock Ranch Project, City of San Luis Obispo, CA. Sage Institute, Inc, June 2019.				
25.	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory Map, 2020. Available at: <a href="https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html">https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html</a> .				
26.	Architectural Evaluations for 3580 and 3584 Bullock Lane, San Luis Obispo, San Luis Obispo County, California. SWCA Environmental Consultants, May 2019.				
27.	Phase I Archaeological Survey for 3584 Bullock Lane, San Luis Obispo, San Luis Obispo County, California, SWCA Environmental Consultants, May 2019.				
28.	City of San Luis Obispo Website Community Choice Energy. Available at: <a href="https://www.slocity.org/government/department-directory/city-administration/sustainability/community-choice-energy">https://www.slocity.org/government/department-directory/city-administration/sustainability/community-choice-energy</a> .				
29.	City of San Luis Obispo Climate Action Plan for Community Recovery, July 2020. Available at: <a href="https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=27889">https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=27889</a> .				
30.	Areas of Land Subsidence in California, USGS, Accessed August 2020. Available at: <a href="https://ca.water.usgs.gov/land_subsidence/california-subsidence-areas.html">https://ca.water.usgs.gov/land_subsidence/california-subsidence-areas.html</a> .				
31.	NRCS Web Soil Survey, 2019. Available at: <a href="https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx">https://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/WebSoilSurvey.aspx</a> .				
32.	Geotechnical Engineering Report for Proposed Residential Development Bullock Lane APN 076-481-008 and 076-491-001 San Luis Obispo, California, Beacon Geotechnical, Inc., October 2018.				
33.	California Building Code, 2019. Available at: <a href="https://up.codes/viewer/california/ibc-2018">https://up.codes/viewer/california/ibc-2018</a> .				
34.	California Department of Conservation Fault Activity Map of California, 2015. Available at: <a href="https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/">https://maps.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/fam/</a> .				
35.	City of San Luis Obispo Safety Element, 2014. Available at: <a href="https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=6645">https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=6645</a> .				
36.	Geologic Map of the San Luis Obispo Quadrangle, San Luis Obispo County, California, 2004. Available at: <a href="https://ngmdb.usgs.gov/Prodesc/proddesc_71738.htm">https://ngmdb.usgs.gov/Prodesc/proddesc_71738.htm</a> .				
37.	Estrella Substation and Paso Robles Area Reinforcement Project Paleontological Resources Technical Report for the Estrella route San Luis Obispo County, California, SWCA Environmental Consultants, January 2017.				
38.	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment 3580 Bullock Lane San Luis Obispo, California 93401. Haro Environmental, December 2017.				
39.	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment 3584 Bullock Lane San Luis Obispo, California 93401. Haro Environmental September 2018.				
40.	California Department of Toxic Substances Control, Envirostor. Accessed August 2020. Available at: <a href="https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/">https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/</a> .				
41.	State Water Resources Control Board, Geotracker. Accessed August 2020. Available at: <a href="https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/">https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/</a> .				
42.	California Environmental Protection Agency, Cortese List Data Resources Accessed August, 2020. Available at: <a href="https://calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/">https://calepa.ca.gov/sitecleanup/corteselist/</a>				
43.	County of San Luis Obispo Airport Land Use Plan, May 2005. Available at: <a href="https://www.sloairport.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/ALUP_TXT.pdf">https://www.sloairport.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/ALUP_TXT.pdf</a> .				
44.	City of San Luis Obispo Fire Evacuation Plan 2018. Available at: <a href="https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=24028">https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=24028</a> .				
45.	City of San Luis Obispo Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, 2006. Available at: <a href="http://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=60">http://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=60</a> .				

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

46.	SLO Watershed Project, San Luis Obispo Creek Description, 2014. Available at: <a href="http://slowatershedproject.org/watersheds/san-luis-obispo-creek/">http://slowatershedproject.org/watersheds/san-luis-obispo-creek/</a> .				
47.	FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL), Accessed August 2020, Available at: <a href="https://hazards-fema.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8b0adb51996444d4879338b5529aa9cd&amp;extent=-119.52305501330595,34.389289302821936,-119.50228398669405,34.39814247501446">https://hazards-fema.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8b0adb51996444d4879338b5529aa9cd&amp;extent=-119.52305501330595,34.389289302821936,-119.50228398669405,34.39814247501446</a> .				
48.	City of San Luis Obispo Flood Preparedness Map, 2019. Available at: <a href="http://slocity.maps.arcgis.com/apps/Viewer/index.html?appid=e790e7eb2923499b9ddc91126d6376e0">http://slocity.maps.arcgis.com/apps/Viewer/index.html?appid=e790e7eb2923499b9ddc91126d6376e0</a> .				
49.	SGMA Groundwater Management, California Department of Water Resources Webpage, 2019. Available at: <a href="https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Groundwater-Management/SGMA-Groundwater-Management">https://water.ca.gov/Programs/Groundwater-Management/SGMA-Groundwater-Management</a> .				
50.	Water Sources, City of San Luis Obispo Utilities Webpage, Accessed August 2020. Available at: <a href="https://www.slocity.org/government/department-directory/utilities-department/water/water-sources">https://www.slocity.org/government/department-directory/utilities-department/water/water-sources</a> .				
51.	Department of Conservation (DOC) Tsunami Inundation Map for Emergency Planning Port San Luis Quadrangle, 2009. Available at: <a href="https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps/San-Luis-Obispo">https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps/San-Luis-Obispo</a> .				
52.	Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coast Basin, 2019. Available at: <a href="https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/publications_forms/publications/basin_plan/amendment/draft_reso_1_attch_a_basin_plan_edits_only.pdf">https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralcoast/publications_forms/publications/basin_plan/amendment/draft_reso_1_attch_a_basin_plan_edits_only.pdf</a> .				
53.	Orcutt Area Specific Plan, City of San Luis Obispo, March 2010. Available at: <a href="http://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=4262">http://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=4262</a> .				
54.	City of San Luis Obispo Noise Element, 1996. Available at: <a href="https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=6643">https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=6643</a> .				
55.	City of San Luis Obispo Noise Guidebook, 1996. Available at: <a href="http://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=4122">http://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=4122</a> .				
56.	Construction Noise Handbook: Construction Equipment Noise Levels and Ranges, Federal Highway Administration, September 2017. Available at: <a href="https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/Environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/handbook00.cfm">https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/Environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/handbook00.cfm</a> .				
57.	Noise Analysis for Bullock Ranch City of San Luis Obispo, Greve & Associates, LLC, May 2019.				
58.	Transportation and Construction-Induced Vibration Guidance Manual. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). September 2013. Available at: <a href="http://website.dot.ca.gov/env/noise/docs/tcvgm-sep2013.pdf">http://website.dot.ca.gov/env/noise/docs/tcvgm-sep2013.pdf</a> .				
59.	City of San Luis Obispo 2014-2019 General Plan Housing Element, January 2015. Available at: <a href="https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=5204">https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=5204</a> .				
60.	City of San Luis Obispo General Plan Annual Report, 2019. Available at: <a href="https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=27646">https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=27646</a> .				
61.	City of San Luis Obispo Land Use Element, 2014. Available at: <a href="https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=6635">https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=6635</a> .				
62.	City of San Luis Obispo Fire Department Annual Report and 2020-2021 Strategic Operational Plan, July 2020. Available at: <a href="https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=27570">https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=27570</a> .				
63.	Community Development Department Development Impact Fees, 2019. Available at: <a href="https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=20198">https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=20198</a> .				
64.	City of San Luis Obispo Parks and Recreation Element, 2001. Available at: <a href="https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=6647">https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=6647</a> .				
65.	2019 Regional Transportation Plan, San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG) June 2019.				
66.	City of San Luis Obispo Bicycle Transportation Plan, November 2013. Available at: <a href="https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=3785">https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=3785</a> .				
67.	Bullock Ranch Transportation Impact Study, Central Coast Transportation Consulting April 2020.				
68.	City of San Luis Obispo Circulation Element, October 2017. Available at: <a href="https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=20412">https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=20412</a> .				
69.	Bullock Ranch VMT Estimate Memorandum, Central Coast Transportation Consulting July 2020.				
70.	City of San Luis Obispo Water and Wastewater Element, February 1987. Last revised May 2018. Available at: <a href="https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=22356">https://www.slocity.org/home/showdocument?id=22356</a> .				



Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

71.	Wastewater Treatment, City of San Luis Obispo Utilities Department Webpage, Accessed August 2020. Available at: < <a href="https://www.slocity.org/government/department-directory/utilities-department/wastewater/wastewater-treatment">https://www.slocity.org/government/department-directory/utilities-department/wastewater/wastewater-treatment</a> >.
72.	San Luis Obispo Garbage Company Bullock Ranch Will-Serve Letter, May 2019.
73.	SWIS Facility Detail Cold Canyon Landfill, Inc., California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery, Accessed March, 2020. Available at: < <a href="https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/40-AA-0004/Detail/">https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/40-AA-0004/Detail/</a> >.
74.	Estimated Solid Waste Generation Rates, California Department of Resources, Recycling, and Recovery (CalRecycle), accessed August 2020. Available at: < <a href="https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates/">https://www2.calrecycle.ca.gov/WasteCharacterization/General/Rates/</a> >.
75.	Energy Use Assessment for the Proposed Bullock Ranch Project San Luis Obispo, CA. Ambient Air Quality and Noise Consulting, Inc. August 2020.

## Attachments

1. Proposed Project Plan Set
2. Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Impact Assessment for the Proposed Bullock Ranch Project San Luis Obispo, CA
3. Bullock Lane Botanical Surveys Report for Bullock Ranch, San Luis Obispo, California
4. Burrowing Owl Survey Report for the Bullock Ranch Project, City of San Luis Obispo, CA
5. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment 3580 Bullock Lane San Luis Obispo, California 93401
6. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment 3584 Bullock Lane San Luis Obispo, California 93401
7. Geotechnical Engineering Report for Proposed Residential Development Bullock Lane APN 076-481-008 and 076-491-001 San Luis Obispo, California Bullock Ranch Transportation Impact Study
8. Bullock Ranch VMT Estimate Memorandum

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources EID-0345-2020	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

## REQUIRED MITIGATION AND MONITORING PROGRAMS

### Aesthetics

**OASP Final EIR AES-3(a). Minimize Lighting on Public Areas.** Lighting shall be shielded as shown in the Specific Plan and directed downward. Lighting shall not be mounted more than 16 feet high. Streetlights, where they are included, shall be primarily for pedestrian safety, and shall not provide widespread illumination unless necessary to comply with safety requirements, as determined by the Public Works Director. Street lighting should focus on intersections and should be placed between intersections only when it is necessary to comply with safety requirements, as determined by the Public Works Director. Trail lighting shall be at a scale appropriate for pedestrians, utilizing bollards, although overhead lighting may be used where vandalism of bollard lights is a concern. Prior to development of individual lots, proposed lighting shall be indicated on site plans and shall demonstrate that spill-over of lighting would not affect nearby residential areas.

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

### Air Quality

**AQ-1** The following SLOAPCD-recommended *Standard Mitigation Measures* shall be implemented to reduce construction-generated NO<sub>x</sub>, ROG, and DPM:

- a. Maintain all construction equipment in proper tune according to manufacturer’s specifications;
- b. Fuel all off-road and portable diesel-powered equipment with CARB-certified motor vehicle diesel fuel (non-taxed version suitable for use off-road);
- c. Diesel-fueled construction equipment shall meet, at a minimum, CARB’s Tier 2-certified engines or cleaner off-road heavy-duty diesel engines, and comply with the State Off-Road Regulation;
- d. Use on-road heavy-duty trucks that meet the CARB’s 2007 or cleaner certification standard for on-road heavy-duty diesel engines, and comply with the State On-Road Regulation;
- e. Construction or trucking companies with fleets that do not have engines in their fleet that meet the engine standards identified in the above two measures (e.g. captive or NO<sub>x</sub> exempt area fleets) may be eligible by proving alternative compliance;
- f. All on- and off-road diesel equipment shall not idle for more than 5 minutes. Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas and or job sites to remind drivers and operators of the 5-minute idling limit;
- g. Diesel idling within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors is not permitted;
- h. Staging and queuing areas shall not be located within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors, if feasible;
- i. Electrify equipment, when feasible;
- j. Substitute gasoline-powered in place of diesel-powered equipment, where feasible; and
- k. Use alternative-fueled construction equipment on-site where feasible, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane, or biodiesel.

**AQ-2** The following SLOAPCD-recommended mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce construction generated fugitive dust. These measures shall be shown on grading and building plans.

- a. Reduce the amount of disturbed area where possible.

- b. Use water trucks, SLOAPCD-approved dust suppressants (see Section 4.3 in the CEQA Air Quality Handbook), 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 (mph). Reclaimed (non-potable) water should be used whenever possible. Please note that since water use is a concern due to drought conditions, the contractor or builder shall consider the use of a SLOAPCD-approved dust suppressant where feasible to reduce the amount of water used for dust control. For a list of suppressants, see Section 4.3 of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook.
- c. All dirt stockpile areas should be sprayed and covered daily, as needed.
- d. Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans should be implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil-disturbing activities;
- e. Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than 1 month after initial grading should 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 should 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 should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- h. Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site.
- i. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between the top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section 23114.
- j. Install wheel washers at the construction site entrance/exit, wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site, or implement other SLOAPCD-approved track-out prevention devices sufficient to minimize the track-out of soil onto paved roadways.
- k. Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water should be used where feasible.
- l. The burning of vegetative material shall be prohibited. Effective February 25, 2000, the SLOAPCD prohibited developmental burning of vegetative material within San Luis Obispo County. If you have any questions regarding these requirements, contact the SLOAPCD Engineering & Compliance Division at (805) 781-5912.
- m. The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the fugitive dust emissions and enhance the implementation of the measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints, reduce visible emissions below 20% opacity, and to prevent the transport of dust off-site. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SLOAPCD Compliance Division prior to the start of any grading, earthwork, or demolition.
- n. When applicable, portable equipment, 50 horsepower (hp) or greater, used during construction activities shall be registered with the California statewide portable equipment registration program (issued by the CARB) or be permitted by the SLOAPCD. Such equipment may include power screens, conveyors, internal combustion engines, crushers, portable generators, tub grinders, trammel screens, and portable plants (e.g., aggregate plant, asphalt plant, concrete plant). For more information, contact the SLOAPCD Engineering & Compliance Division at (805) 781-5912.
- o. Construction of the proposed project shall use low volatile organic compound (VOC)-content paints not exceeding 50 grams per liter.
- p. To the extent locally available, use prefinished building materials or materials that do not require the application of architectural coatings.

**AQ-3** The following measures shall be implemented to reduce construction emissions from on- and off-road construction equipment (NO<sub>x</sub>, ROG, and DPM). These measures shall be shown on grading and building plans:

- a. Idling Restrictions Near Sensitive Receptors for Both On- and Off-Road Equipment.
  1. Staging and queuing areas shall not be located within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors;
  2. Diesel idling within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors is not permitted;
  3. Use of alternative-fueled equipment is recommended whenever possible; and
  4. Signs that specify the no-idling requirements must be posted and enforced at the construction site.
- b. Idling Restrictions for On-Road Vehicles. Section 2485 of 13 CCR limits diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles that operate in the state of California with gross vehicular weight ratings of greater 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:
  1. 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
  2. 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 minutes at any location when within 100 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 web site: [www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/truck-idling/2485.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/truck-idling/2485.pdf).

- c. Idling Restrictions for Off-Road Equipment. Off-road diesel equipment shall comply with the 5-minute idling restriction identified in Section 2449(d)(3) of the CARB's In-Use Off-Road Diesel regulation: [www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2007/ordies107/froal.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/regact/2007/ordies107/froal.pdf).

Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas and job sites to remind off-road equipment operators of the 5-minute idling limit.

**AQ-4** The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce the disturbance of asbestos and lead. Strategies include but are not limited to the following:

- a. Demolition of on-site structures shall comply with the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Emissions (NESHAP) requirements (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Part 61, Subpart M) for the demolition of existing structures. The SLOAPCD is delegated authority by the EPA to implement the federal Asbestos NESHAP. Prior to demolition of on-site structures, the SLOAPCD shall be notified, per NESHAP requirements. The SLOAPCD notification form and reporting requirements are included in Appendix A. Additional information may be obtained at the following website: <http://slocleanair.org/business/asbestos.php>.
- b. If during the demolition of existing structures paint is separated from the construction materials (e.g., chemically or physically), the paint waste will 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 federal, state, and local regulations. According to the California 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 construction debris (a non-hazardous waste). The landfill operator will be contacted prior to disposal of building material debris to determine any specific requirements the landfill may have regarding the disposal of lead-based paint materials. The disposal of demolition debris shall comply with any such requirements. Contact the SLOAPCD Enforcement Division at (805) 781-5912 for more information. Approval of a lead work plan and permit may be required. Lead work plans, if required, will need to be submitted to SLOAPCD 10 days prior to the start of demolition.

- c. Prior to any grading activities, a geologic evaluation shall be conducted to determine if NOA is present within the area that will be disturbed unless the applicant agrees to comply with the Asbestos ATCM without an evaluation. If NOA is not present, an exemption request must be filed with the SLOAPCD. If NOA is found at the site, the applicant must comply with all requirements outlined in the Asbestos ATCM. These requirements may include but are not limited to:
1. Development of an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan, which must be approved by the SLOAPCD before operations begin; and
  2. Development and approval of an Asbestos Health and Safety Program (required for some projects).

**OASP Final EIR AQ-1(c). Shade Trees.** All parking lots shall include shade trees within the parking area. There shall be at least one shade tree for every six vehicle parking spaces.

**OASP Final EIR AQ-1(d). Telecommuting.** All new homes within the Specific Plan area shall be constructed with internal wiring/cabling that allows telecommuting, teleconferencing, and telelearning to occur simultaneously in at least three locations in each home.

**OASP Final EIR AQ-1(e). Pathways.** Where feasible, all cul-de-sacs and dead-end streets shall be links by pathways to encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel.

**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, in coordination with the County of San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District, as necessary.

## Biological Resources

**OASP Final EIR B-5(a). Bird Pre-Construction Survey.** To avoid impacts to nesting special-status bird species and raptors including the ground nesting burrowing owl, all initial ground-disturbing activities and tree removal shall be limited to the time period between September 15 and February 1. If initial site disturbance, grading, and tree removal cannot be conducted during this time period, a pre-construction survey for active nests within the limits of grading shall be conducted by a qualified biologist at the site no more than 30 days prior to the start of any construction activities (for ground-nesting burrowing owl survey see below). If active nests are located, all construction work must be conducted outside a buffer zone of 250 feet to 500 feet from the nests as determined in consultation with the CDFG. No direct disturbance to nests shall occur until the adults and young are no longer reliant on the nest site. A qualified biologist shall confirm that breeding/nesting is completed and young have fledged the nest prior to the start of construction.

**OASP Final EIR B-5(c). Monarch Pre-Construction Survey.** If initial ground-breaking is to occur between the months of October and March a preconstruction survey for active monarch roost sites within the limits of grading shall be conducted by a qualified biologist at the site two weeks prior to any construction activities. If active roost sites are located no ground-disturbing activities shall occur within 50 feet of the perimeter of the habitat. Construction shall not resume within the setback until a qualified biologist has determined that the monarch butterfly has vacated the site.

**OASP Final EIR B-6(c). Educational Pet Brochure.** Any development pursuant to the Specific Plan shall prepare a brochure that informs prospective homebuyers and Home Owners Association (HOA) members about the impacts associated with non-native animals, especially cats and dogs, to the project site; similarly, the brochure must inform potential homebuyers and all HOA members of the potential for coyotes to prey on domestic animals.

**OASP Final EIR B-6(d). Landscaping Plan Review.** To ensure that project landscaping does not introduce invasive non-native plant and tree species to the region of the site, the final landscaping plan shall be reviewed and approved by a qualified biologist. The California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC) maintains several lists of the most important invasive plants to avoid. The lists shall be used when creating a plant palette for landscaping to ensure that plants on the lists are not used. The following plants shall not allowed as part of potential landscaping plans pursuant to development under the Specific Plan:

- African sumac (*Rhus lancea*)

- Australian saltbush (*Atriplex semibaccata*)
- Black locust (*Robinia pseudoacacia*)
- California pepper (*Schinus molle*) and Brazilian pepper (*S. terebinthifolius*)
- Cape weed (*Arctotheca calendula*)
- Cotoneaster (*Cotoneaster pannosus*), (*C. lacteus*)
- Edible fig (*Ficus carica*)
- Fountain grass (*Pennisetum setaceum*)
- French broom (*Genista monspessulana*)
- Ice plant, sea fig (*Carpobrotus edulis*)
- Leafy spurge (*Euphorbia esula*)
- Myoporum (*Myoporum* spp.)
- Olive (*Olea europaea*)
- Pampas grass (*Cortaderia selloana*), and Andean pampas grass (*C. jubata*)
- Russian olive (*Elaeagnus angustifolia*)
- Scotch broom (*Cytisus scoparius*) and striated broom (*C. striatus*)
- Spanish broom (*Spartium junceum*)
- Tamarix, salt cedar (*Tamarix chinensis*), (*T. gallica*), (*T. parviflora*), (*T. ramosissima*)
- Blue gum (*Eucalyptus globulus*)
- Athel tamarisk (*Tamarix aphylla*)

With the exception of poison oak, only those species listed in the Specific Plan's Suggested Plant List (Appendix E) shall not be planted anywhere on-site because they are invasive non-native plant species. Poison oak is a native plant species and could be used to deter human entrance to an area such as a mitigation/enhancement area.

**Monitoring Program:** These conditions and measures shall be noted on all grading and construction plans for review and approval by the City Community Development Department. The pre-construction surveys shall be completed prior to any site disturbance, including grading, trenching, or demolition. The biologist completing the surveys shall provide a report to the City Community Development Department and Natural Resources Manager within 5 days of completion of surveys. The Educational Pet Brochure shall be reviewed and approved by the City Community Development Department prior to occupancy of the first unit. The City Community Development Department and Natural Resources Manager shall review the final landscape plan after it has been reviewed and approved by the project qualified biologist. The City Community Development Department and Natural Resources Manager verify compliance of all measures.

## Cultural Resources

**OASP Final EIR CR-1(d). Archaeological Resource Construction Monitoring.** At the commencement of project construction, an orientation meeting shall be conducted by an archaeologist for construction workers associated with earth disturbing procedures. The orientation meeting shall describe the possibility of exposing unexpected archaeological resources and directions as to what steps are to be taken if such a find is encountered.

An archaeologist shall monitor construction grading within 50 meters (164 feet) of the two isolated finds. In the event that prehistoric or historic archaeological resources are exposed during project construction, all earth disturbing work within 50 meters (164 feet) of the find must be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist has evaluated the nature and significance of the find. After the find has been appropriately mitigated (e.g., curation, preservation in place, etc.), work in the area may resume. The City should consider retaining a Chumash representative to monitor any field work associated with Native American cultural material.

If human remains are exposed, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98.

**Monitoring Program:** These conditions shall be noted on all grading and construction plans. The City Community Development Department shall verify compliance, including preparation and implementation of the Monitoring Plan, and review and approval of cultural resources monitoring reports documenting compliance with required mitigation measures.

*Note: Isolated finds were not identified on the proposed project site and the requirement for monitoring during construction within 50 meters of the two isolated finds does not apply to this project.*

## **Geology and Soils**

**GEO-1** Prior to application for construction permits of any development at the project site, the applicant shall retain a qualified soil engineer to prepare a revised Soils Engineering Report to evaluate on-site soil stability risks, including expansive soils. This report shall include specific design recommendations to properly safeguard against risks identified. The applicant shall incorporate all recommendations identified in the geotechnical report into the final design and construction plans for the project.

**OASP Final EIR G-4(a). Expansive Soils Grading.** If the project area is identified as having expansive soils (through the Soils Engineering Report required in [OASP Final EIR] Mitigation Measure G-2(a)), the foundations and transportation infrastructure shall be designed by a structural engineer to withstand the existing conditions, or the site shall be graded in such a manner to address the condition. Suitable measures to reduce impacts from expansive soils could include, but need not be limited to:

- a. Excavation of existing soils and importation of non-expansive soils; and/or
- b. Foundation design to accommodate certain amounts of differential expansion such as post-tensional slab and/or ribbed foundations designed in accordance with Chapter 18, Division III of the Uniform Building Code (UBC).

**GEO-2** Should any vertebrate fossils or potentially significant finds (e.g., numerous well-preserved invertebrate or plant fossils) be encountered during work on the site, all activities in the immediate vicinity of the find shall cease until a qualified paleontologist evaluates the find for its scientific value. If deemed significant, the paleontological resource(s) shall be salvaged and deposited in an accredited and permanent scientific institution where they will be properly curated and preserved.

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

## **Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

**GHG-1** The following mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce long-term operational GHG emissions:

- a. The project shall be served by CCCE.
- b. The project shall provide on-site bicycle parking/amenities and electric vehicle (EV) charging stations in accordance with applicable building code requirements.
- c. The project shall incorporate a pedestrian and bicycle access network that connects proposed on-site land uses to adjacent existing or planned pedestrian and bicycle facilities contiguous with the project site.
- d. The project shall be designed to minimize barriers to pedestrian access and interconnectivity.
- e. The project shall be designed to provide safe and convenient access to public transit contiguous to the project site.
- f. The project shall provide organic waste pick up and shall provide the appropriate on-site enclosures consistent with the provisions of the City of San Luis Obispo Development Standards for Solid Waste Services.
- g. Trees shall be planted in accordance with the City's municipal code requirements.

**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, in coordination with the County of San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District, as necessary.

## Hazards

**OASP Final EIR S-4(d). 55-Gallon Drums.** Prior to development on the property where 55-gallon drums were identified as shown in Figure 4.9-1 [of the Final EIR for the OASP], soils samples shall be taken in the vicinity of the drums and analyzed for total extractable petroleum hydrocarbons (TEPH) by EPA method 8015, heavy metals by CCR Title 22 metals, and solvents by EPA method 8260B. If levels of contaminants are found to exist in concentrations that exceed regulatory thresholds, further sampling may be needed to determine the extent of contamination. Once the extent of contamination is delineated, an appropriate remediation method should be implemented according to the size of the area contaminated and the contaminant involved.

**Monitoring Program:** The applicant shall provide the City Community Development Department with the soil sample analysis and report prior to issuance of any construction, grading, or site improvement permits. Compliance shall be verified by the City Community Development Department. *[Note the 55-gallon drums and equipment identified in Figure 4.9-1 are a few yards to the north of this project site. Applicant will provide a soil sample analysis and report for samples take on its property in the vicinity of the drums. Applicant shall not be required to obtain samples on property it does not own.]*

## Hydrology and Water Quality

**OASP Final EIR D-1(a). Erosion Control Plan.** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall submit a detailed erosion control plan (ECP) to the City Community Development Department for review and approval. At a minimum, the ECP should be prepared according to the guidelines outlined in the Drainage Design Manual and should include the following:

- a. A proposed schedule of grading activities, monitoring, and infrastructure milestones in chronological format;
- b. Identification of critical areas of high erodibility potential and/or unstable slopes;
- c. Soil stabilization techniques such as short-term biodegradable erosion control blankets and hydroseeding should be utilized. Silt fences should be installed downslope of all graded slopes. Straw bales should be installed in the flow path of graded areas receiving concentrated flows, as well as around storm drain inlets;
- d. Description of erosion control measures on slopes, lots, and streets;
- e. Contour and spot elevations indicating runoff patterns before and after grading;
- f. Filter systems at catch basins (drop inlets) in public streets as a means of sediment control; and
- g. Post-construction inspection of all drainage facilities for accumulated sediment, and the clearing of these drainage structures of debris and sediment.

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

**OASP Final EIR D-1(b). Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan.** The applicant shall comply with NPDES General Construction Activities Storm Water Permit Requirements established by the CWA. Pursuant to the NPDES Storm Water Program, an application for coverage under the statewide General Construction Activities Storm Water Permit (General Permit) must be obtained for project development. It is the responsibility of the project applicant to obtain coverage prior to site construction.

The applicant can obtain coverage under the General Permit by filing a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resource Control Board's (SWRCB) Division of Water Quality. The filing shall describe erosion control and storm water treatment measures to be implemented during and following construction and provide a schedule for monitoring performance. These BMPs will serve to control point and non-point source (NPS) pollutants in storm water and constitute the project's SWPPP for construction activities. While the SWPPP will include several of the same components as the ECP, the SWPPP will also include BMPs for preventing the discharge of other NPS pollutants besides sediment (such as paint, concrete, etc.) to downstream waters.

- Notice of Intent. Prior to beginning construction, the applicant shall file a Notice of Intent (NOI) for discharge from the proposed development site.



- Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. The applicant shall require the building contractor to prepare and submit a SWPPP to the City forty-five (45) days prior to the start of work for approval. The contractor is responsible for understanding the State General Permit and instituting the SWPPP during construction. A SWPPP for site construction shall be developed prior to the initiation of grading and implemented for all construction activity on the project site in excess of one acre. The SWPPP shall include specific BMPs to control the discharge of material from the site. BMP methods may include, but would not be limited to, the use of temporary detention basins, straw bales, sand bagging, mulching, erosion control blankets, silt fencing, and soil stabilizers. Additional BMPs should be implemented for any fuel storage or fuel handling that could occur on-site during construction. The SWPPP must be prepared in accordance with the guidelines adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The SWPPP shall be also submitted to the City along with grading/development plans for review and approval.
- Notice of Completion of Construction. The applicant shall file a notice of completion of construction of the development, identifying that pollution sources were controlled during the construction of the project and implementing a closure SWPPP for the site.

**Monitoring Program:** The SWPPP shall be obtained prior to issuance of any grading permits, subdivision improvement plans, or public improvement plans. The applicant shall provide a copy of the approved SWPPP or NOI to the City Public Works Department for review.

**OASP Final EIR D-3(a). Payment of Fair Share Fees for Area Drainage Improvements.** The City/Zone 9 Waterway Management Plan (WMP, Questa, 2002) provides for imposition of a Drainage Impact Fee on new development projects that would result in adverse hydrological impacts. The Drainage Impact Fee can only be used to pay for drainage improvements made necessary by the hydrologic impacts of a project. The applicant shall pay their “fair share” of any mitigation fee established by the City of San Luis Obispo for drainage improvements made necessary by cumulative project development. These fair share fees may be used to fund components of the City’s Storm Drain Master Plan (Boyle Engineering, 2000), or other improvements as identified by the City. Components of the City’s Storm Drain Master Plan preferred alternative downstream of the Orcutt Plan Area include:

- A new concrete box culvert at Broad Street on Orcutt Creek,
- A new concrete slab bridge at Santa Fe Road on the East Branch of SLO Creek, and
- A modified channel for improved conveyance capacity from Santa Fe to Buckley Road on the East Branch of SLO Creek.

**Monitoring Program:** The fee shall be paid prior to issuance of building, grading, or site improvement permits.

**Noise**

**OASP Final EIR N-1(a). Compliance with City Noise Ordinance.** Construction hours and noise levels shall be compliant with the City Noise Ordinance [Municipal Code Chapter 9.12, Section 9.12.050(6)]. Methods to reduce construction noise can include, but are not limited to, the following:

**Equipment Shielding.** Stationary construction equipment that generates noise can be shielded with a barrier.

**Diesel Equipment.** All diesel equipment can be operated with closed engine doors and equipped with factory-recommended mufflers.

**Electrical Power.** Whenever feasible, electrical power can be used to run air compressors and similar power tools.

**Sound Blankets.** The use of sound blankets on noise generating equipment

**N-1** For the entire duration of the construction phase of the project, the following BMPs shall be adhered to:

- h. Stationary construction equipment that generates noise that exceeds 60 dBA at the project boundaries shall be shielded with the most modern noise control devises (i.e., mufflers, lagging, and/or motor enclosures).

- i. 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.
  - j. Where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed-air exhaust shall be used.
  - k. All construction equipment shall have the manufacturers' recommended noise abatement methods (such as mufflers, engine enclosures, and engine vibration insulators) installed, intact, and operational.
  - l. 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 BMPs and 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 preconstruction meeting on construction hour limitations and how, why, and where BMP measures are to be implemented.
- N-3** 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, the following:
- a. Sound blankets shall be used on noise-generating equipment.
  - b. 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.
  - c. All diesel equipment shall be operated with closed engine doors and shall be equipped with factory-recommended mufflers.
  - d. 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).
  - e. Temporary sound barriers shall be constructed between construction sites and affected uses.
- N-4** Construction activities shall be conducted so that the maximum noise levels at affected properties will not exceed 75 dBA for single-family residential uses and 80 dBA for multi-family residential 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 compliant 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 Community Development Department.
- N-6** All residential development within 240 feet of the centerline of the UPRR (identified by Exhibit 4 of the 2019 Noise Analysis) shall include adequate ventilation in compliance with the California Building Code so that adequate noise attenuation may be achieved with windows closed.
- N-7** Indoor noise levels shall be reduced using the design and materials techniques described in OASP Programs 4.5.1a, 4.5.1b, 4.5.1c, 4.5.1d, 4.5.1e, 4.5.1f, 4.5.2a, 4.5.2b, and 4.5.2c. All residential development within 163 feet of the centerline of the UPRR (identified by Exhibit 3 of the 2019 Noise Analysis) shall include a noise barrier at least six feet in height that will shield exterior residential uses (i.e. patios, decks) from noise exposure greater than 60 CNEL. The noise barriers for the decks and patios must have a surface density of at least 3.5 pounds per square foot, and shall have no openings or gaps. The wall may be constructed of stud and stucco, 3/8-inch plate glass, 5/8-inch Plexiglas or Lexan, any masonry material, or a combination of these materials. Additionally, individual homes shall be designed

so that structures block the line-of-sight from usable backyards to the railroad tracks. For homes with backyards not blocked by intervening structures, backyard fencing shall be installed of sufficient height to block line-of-sight to the railroad tracks.

**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.

**OASP Final EIR N-5(a). Fair Share of Cumulative Noise Improvements.** Applicants under the Specific Plan must contribute their fair financial share, as determined by the City, to the implementation of one or more of the mitigation approaches listed in policy 9 of the Noise Element (refer to Appendix E of this EIR). The Specific Plan shall be revised to include a specific program to contribute to mitigating cumulative impacts. Implementation of the program must occur prior home occupancy for development pursuant to the Specific Plan.

**Monitoring Program:** The fee shall be paid prior to issuance of any building permits.

## **Transportation**

**TR-1** Prior to issuance of building permits, the project applicant/owner(s) shall provide finalized circulation plans indicating addition of W11-2 pedestrian warning signage along Ranch House Road in both directions approaching the Ranch House Road/Sponza Place intersection.

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

# ATTACHMENTS