CITY OF PISMO BEACH
Community Development Department
760 Mattie Road, Pismo Beach, California 93449
(805) 773-4658 / Fax (805) 773-4684

Project Title & No.: Mittry Family Trust / General Plan Amendment and Coastal Development Permit / CEQA No. 2021-026 (P21-000054 and P21-000015)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The proposed project could have a "Potentially Significant Impact" for environmental factors checked below. Please refer to the attached pages for discussion on mitigation measures or project revisions to either reduce these impacts to less than significant levels or require further study.		
☐ Aesthetics	☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions	☐ Public Services
☐ Agriculture & Forestry Resources	☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Recreation
☐ Air Quality	☐ Hydrology & Water Quality	☐ Transportation
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Land Use & Planning	☐ Tribal Cultural Resources
☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Utilities & Service Systems
☐ Energy	☐ Noise	☐ Wildfire
☐ Geology & Soils	☐ Population & Housing	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation, the City of Pismo Beach finds that:

☒ The proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ The proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ The proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuantto that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Megan Martin, Planning Manager — Megan Martin — 11/12/2021

Prepared by (Print) — Signature — Date

Matthew Downing, Community Development Director — Matthew Downing — 11/12/2021

Reviewed by (Print) — Signature — Date

Project Environmental Analysis

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

Persons, agencies or organizations interested in obtaining more information regarding the environmental review process for a project should contact the City of Pismo Beach Community Development Department, 760 Mattie Road, Pismo Beach, CA, 93449 or call (805) 773-4658.

A. Project

DESCRIPTION: A General Plan Amendment/Local Coastal Plan Amendment to the City of Pismo Beach Land Use Element Planning Area 'E' (St. Andrews Tract) to eliminate the development restrictions imposed by Policy LU-E-1 a and b on the subject property located at 171 Naomi Avenue (APN 010-501-005); and, a subsequent request for a Coastal Development Permit and Architectural Review Permit to allow for the demolition of an existing single family residence and construction of a new 3,784 square-foot single-family residence, landscaping, decking, and lap pool.

Assessor Parcel Number(s): 010-501-005

Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required

Permit Type / Action	Agency
Local Coastal Plan Amendment	California Coastal Commission (CCC)
Coastal Development Permit	California Coastal Commission (CCC)
Building Permit	City of Pismo Beach – Community Development Dept.

B. Existing Setting

General Plan Designation: Low Density Residential

Neighborhood Planning Area: St. Andrews Tract, Planning Area 'E'

Zoning District: Single-Family Residential (R-1)

Overlay Zones: Coastal Zone, Coastal Appeal Zone, Height Limitations Overlay (HL-1)

Parcel Size: 0.16 acres (7,300 square feet)

Topography: Generally level

Vegetation: Ornamental landscaping

Existing Uses: Single-Family Residence

Surrounding Land Use Categories and Uses:
North: *Single-Family Residential / Residence*
East: *Single-Family Residential / Residence*
South: *Single-Family Residential / Residence*
West: *Single-Family Residential / Residence*

C. Environmental Analysis

The Initial Study Checklist provides detailed information about the environmental impacts of the proposed project and mitigation measures to lessen the impacts.

	Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS. Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:					
a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c)	In nonurbanized 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

CEQA establishes that it is the policy of the State to take all action necessary to provide people of the State "with…enjoyment of aesthetic, natural, scenic and historic environmental qualities" (Public Resources Code Section 21001(b)).

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 project would significantly degrade the scenic landscape as viewed from public roads or other public areas. A proposed project's potential effect on a scenic vista is largely dependent upon the degree to which it would complement or contrast with the natural setting, the degree to which it would be noticeable in the existing environment, and whether it detracts from or complements the scenic vista.

The St. Andrews Planning Area (Planning Area 'E'), described in the City of Pismo Beach Land Use Element (LUE) is almost completely developed with single-family homes, multi-family homes, and a city fire station. The ocean frontage along Seacliff Drive consists of single-family residences and Memory Park, a public park. These homes are adjacent to highly erodible cliffs, with rocky shoreline and small pocket beaches below. During low tide there are small beaches accessible to the public.

There is a bluff top access from Naomi Avenue dedicated to the City and connected to a City easement south of the planning area in the Spindrift Planning Area. This access leads to a spectacular viewpoint, which is under private ownership. There is a public access easement from Seacliff Drive to Spyglass Park in the adjacent Spyglass Planning area.

In addition to policies set forth in the LUE, the City's Design Element of the General Plan establishes policies for protection of scenic and visual qualities of the City as required by the Coastal Act of 1976. Most importantly, for both residents and visitors, the aesthetic encounter with the landscape of the Central Coast is presented along the corridors of the principal roadways and is complemented by the sense of scale and 'fit' of the townscapes within the

community.

The proposed project is located at 171 Naomi Avenue, surrounded by similarly developed residences within an urban environment. Naomi Avenue continues toward Seacliff Drive and though lined with single-family residences; offers open views to the ocean toward the culmination of Naomi Avenue into Seacliff Drive. The surrounding visual character of Naomi Avenue consists of single-family homes and ornamental landscaping. Views to the east toward Highway 101 are backdropped by steep hillsides and open space.

Discussion

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

The project is not located within an identified scenic vista, visually sensitive area, or scenic corridor; therefore, the project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista and ***no impacts would occur.***

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

The project is not located within the viewshed of a state scenic highway and the General Plan Amendment and Coastal Development Permit would result in development of a single-family residence that would not result in damage to scenic resources within the viewshed of a state scenic highway, therefore, ***no impacts would occur.***

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?*

The project is located within an urbanized area, developed with an existing single-family residence and surrounded by single-family residential development. The proposed project would not interfere with the existing visual character of the area; the General Plan Amendment would allow the property to build a new single-family residence nearer to the front setback, however, it would not encroach or inhibit the ability of pedestrians in the planning area to view the ocean and not result in a noticeable change to public views of the area, therefore, would not result in the degradation of the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surrounding***. Impacts would be less than significant.***

d) *Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?*

The project site is located on an existing and developed lot within an urbanized area of an established residential neighborhood. The project site is visible from Naomi Avenue and a portion of Seacliff Drive. The project does not propose the use or installation of highly reflective materials that would create a substantial source of glare. All proposed lighting would be downcast and shielded consistent with the Pismo Beach Municipal Code requirements (Section 17.105.150 E). Therefore, ***no impacts would occur.***

Conclusion

The project is not located within view of a scenic vista and would not result in a substantial change to scenic resources in the area. The project would be consistent with the existing policies and standards in the City's LUE and Design Element related to the protection of scenic resources. ***Impacts to aesthetic resources would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or aWilliamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g))?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, dueto their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest landto non-forest use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

The California Department of Conservation's Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) produces maps and statistical data used for analyzing impacts on California's agricultural resources. Agricultural land is rated according to soil quality and current land use. For environmental review purposes under CEQA, the FMMP categories of Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, Farmland of Local Importance, and Grazing Land are considered 'agricultural land'. Other non-agricultural designations include Urban and Built-up Land, Other Land, and Water.

Based on the FMMP, soils at the project site are within the following FMMP designation(s):

- Urban and Built-up Land

Onsite soils include:

- Still; Still gravelly sandy clay load, 2 – 9 percent slopes

The Land Conservation Act of 1965, commonly referred to as the Williamson Act, enables local governments to enter into contracts with private landowners for the purpose of restricting specific parcels of land to agriculture or related open space use. In return, landowners receive property tax assessments which are much lower than normal because they are based upon farming and open space uses as opposed to full market value. The project site is within the Single-Family Residential (R-1) zoning district and is not within lands subject to a Williamson Act contract.

According to Public Resources Code Section 12220(g), forest land is defined as land that can support 10- percent 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 board 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 is entirely developed and surrounded by similarly developed properties. Tree cover consists of ornamental landscaping with intermittent native species.

Discussion / Conclusion
The project site is not located within or adjacent to an agricultural area, is not zoned for agriculture, will not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, is not within or adjacent to land subject to Williamson Act contract, and is not within a forested area; ***therefore, no impacts would occur to agricultural or forestry resources and no mitigation measures are necessary.***

Issues		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d)	Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting
The City of Pismo Beach is part of the South Central Coast Air Basin (SCCAB) which also includes Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties. Air quality within the SCCAB is regulated by several jurisdictions including the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), California Air Resources Board (ARB), and the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD). Each of these jurisdictions develops rules, regulations, and policies to attain the goals or directives imposed upon them through legislation. The California ARB is the agency responsible for coordination and oversight of state and local air pollution control programs in California and for implementing the California Clean Air Act (CCAA) of 1988. The State Department of Public Health established California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) in 1962 to define the maximum amount of a pollutant (averaged over a specified period of time) that can be present without any harmful effects on people or the environment. The California ARB adopted the CAAQS developed by the Department of Public Health in 1969, which had established CAAQS for 10 criteria pollutants: particulate matter (PM10 and PM2.5), ozone (O3), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), sulfate, carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO2), visibility reducing particles, lead (Pb), hydrogen sulfide (H2S), and vinyl chloride.

The Federal Clean Air Act (FCAA) later required the U.S. EPA to establish National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for pollutants considered harmful to public health and the environment, and also set deadlines for their attainment. The U.S. EPA has established NAAQS for six criteria pollutants (all of which are also regulated by CAAQS): CO, lead, NO2, ozone, PM10 and PM2.5, and SO2.

California law continues to mandate compliance with CAAQS, which are often more stringent than national standards. However, California law does not require that CAAQS be met by specified dates as is the case with NAAQS. Rather, it requires incremental progress toward attainment. The SLOAPCD is the agency primarily responsible for ensuring that NAAQS and CAAQS are not exceeded, and that air quality conditions within the county are maintained.

SLOAPCD Thresholds
The SLOAPCD has developed and updated their CEQA Air Quality Handbook (most recently updated with a November 2017 Clarification Memorandum) to help local agencies evaluate project specific impacts and determine if air quality mitigation measures are needed, or if potentially significant impacts could result.

The APCD has established thresholds for both short-term construction emissions and long-term operational emissions. Use of heavy equipment and earth moving operations during project construction can generate fugitive dust and engine combustion emissions that may have substantial temporary impacts on local air quality and climate change. Combustion emissions, such as nitrogen oxides (NOx), reactive organic gases (ROG), greenhouse gases (GHG) and diesel particulate matter (DPM), are most significant when using large, diesel-fueled scrapers, loaders, bulldozers, haul trucks, compressors, generators and other heavy equipment. SLOAPCD has established thresholds of significance for each of these contaminants.

Operational impacts are focused primarily on the indirect emissions (i.e., motor vehicles) associated with residential, commercial and industrial development. Certain types of project can also include components that generate direct emissions, such as power plants, gasoline stations, dry cleaners, and refineries (source emissions).

General screening criteria is used by the SLOAPCD to determine the type and scope of air quality assessment required for a particular project (Table 1-1 in the APCD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook). These criteria are based on project size in an urban setting and are designed to identify those projects with the potential to exceed the APCD's significance thresholds. A more refined analysis of air quality impacts specific to a given project is necessary for projects that exceed the screening criteria below or are within ten percent (10%) of exceeding the screening criteria.

San Luis Obispo County Clean Air Plan (CAP)
The SLOAPCD's San Luis Obispo County 2001 Clean Air Plan (CAP) is a comprehensive planning document intended to evaluate long-term emissions and cumulative effects and provide guidance to the SLOAPCD and other local agencies on how to attain and maintain the state standards for ozone and PM10. The CAP presents a detailed description of the sources and pollutants which impact the jurisdiction's attainment of state standards, future air quality impacts to be expected under current growth trends, and an appropriate control strategy for reducing ozone precursor emissions, thereby improving air quality.

Sensitive Receptors
Sensitive receptors are people that have an increased sensitivity to air pollution or environmental contaminants, such as the elderly, children, people with asthma or other respiratory illnesses, and others who are at a heightened risk of negative health outcomes due to exposure to air pollution. Some land uses are considered more sensitive to changes in air quality than others, due to the population that occupies the uses and the activities involved. Sensitive receptor locations include schools, parks and playgrounds, day care centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residences. The project is located within an existing residential neighborhood and is surrounded on all sides by similar residential development.

Discussion

a) *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?*

Construction Impacts
The SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook provides thresholds of significance for construction related emissions. Table 1-1 lists SLOAPCD's general thresholds for determining whether a potentially significant impact could occur as a result of a project's construction activities. Based on Table 1-1, at least 70 homes

would need to be constructed to exceed the APCD Annual GHG Bright Line Threshold.
As proposed, the project would result in the disturbance of the entire lot, approximately 7,300 square feet, and include approximately 390 cubic yards of material moved. Only one single-family residence would be constructed as a result of the project.

Operational Impacts
The SLOAPCD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook provides operational screening criteria to identify projects with the potential to exceed APCD operational significance thresholds (refer to Table 1-1 of the CEQA Handbook). Based on Table 1-1 of the CEQA Handbook, the project proposes a use that would not have the potential to result in operational emissions that would exceed APCD thresholds. **Therefore, potential operational emissions would be less than significant.**

Based on the volume of proposed grading, area of project site disturbance, estimated duration of the construction period, and the APCD's screening construction emission rates identified above, the project would not result in the emission of criteria pollutants that would exceed construction-related thresholds established by the SLOAPCD. ***Therefore, project related emissions impacts are considered less than significant.***

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.*

San Luis Obispo County is currently designated as nonattainment status for federal ozone, state ozone, and State PM 10 standards. ***Impacts related to cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant would be less than significant.***

c) *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?*

The project is located in a single-family residential zone within an urban environment. It is in close proximity to other similarly developed lots and residences. Project construction activities could result in temporary fugitive dust emissions; however, based on the volume of proposed grading, area of project site disturbance, and estimated duration of the construction period, ***impacts to sensitive receptors are considered less than significant.***

d) *Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?*

Construction could generate odors from heavy diesel machinery, equipment, and/or materials. The generation of odors during the construction period would be temporary, would be consistent with odors commonly associated with construction, and would dissipate within a short distance from the active work area. No long-term operational odors would be generated by the project. ***Therefore, potential odor-related impacts would be less than significant.***

Conclusion
The project would be consistent with the SLOAPCD's Clean Air Plan and thresholds for construction-related and operational emissions. The project would not result in cumulatively considerable emissions of any criteria pollutant for which the County is in non-attainment and would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or result in other emissions adversely affecting a substantial number of people. Therefore, **potential impacts to air quality would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.**

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernalpool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with establishednative resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, orother approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting

Pismo Beach is located in a special environment setting on a narrow marine terrace bordered by the beach and ocean on one side and the hills on the other. It is the only community in Central California where Highway 101, the ocean, and the community converge in proximity. The major physical factors and resources affecting the community's development include soil and landforms, such as sandy beaches, coastal bluffs and surrounding hills, the surface and ground-water resources, climate, air quality, unique biological habitats, and the Pacific Ocean. These resources make up the special essence of Pismo Beach's environment.

Federal Endangered Species Act

The Federal Endangered Species Act of 1973 (FESA) provides legislation to protect federally listed plant and animal species. The California Endangered Species Act of 1984 (CESA) ensures legal protection for plants listed as rare or endangered, and wildlife species formally listed as endangered or threatened, and also maintains a list of California Species of Special Concern (SSC). SSC status is assigned to species that have limited distribution, declining populations, diminishing habitat, or unusual scientific, recreational, or educational value. Under state law, the CDFW has the authority to review projects for their potential to impact special-status species and their habitats.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) protects all migratory birds, including their eggs, nests, and feathers. The MBTA was originally drafted to put an end to the commercial trade in bird feathers, popular in the latter part of the 1800s. The MBTA is enforced by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and potential impacts to species protected under the MBTA are evaluated by the USFWS in consultation with other federal agencies and are required to be evaluated under CEQA.

Clean Water Act and State Porter Cologne Water Quality Control Act

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) regulates discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. These waters include wetland and non-wetland water bodies that meet specific criteria. USACE jurisdiction

regulates almost all work in, over, and under waters listed as "navigable waters of the U.S." that results in a discharge of dredged or fill material within USACE regulatory jurisdiction, pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). Under Section 404, USACE regulates traditional navigable waters, wetlands adjacent to traditional navigable waters, relatively permanent non-navigable tributaries that have a continuous flow at least seasonally (typically 3 months), and wetlands that directly abut relatively permanent tributaries.

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCBs) regulate discharges of fill and dredged material in California, under Section 401 of the CWA and the State Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, through the State Water Quality Certification Program. State Water Quality Certification is necessary for all projects that require a USACE permit, or fall under other federal jurisdiction, and have the potential to impact waters of the State. Based on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wetlands Inventory, the project site does not support wetlands, riparian or deep-water habitats (USFWS 2019).

Conservation and Open Space Element
The City of Pismo Beach adopted a Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE) with conservation issues focusing on the natural resources of Pismo Beach including air, water, biology, archaeology, and physical geography. The intent of these policies is to guide the management of these resources to enhance the quality of life of residents and visitors and to prevent waste, haphazard exploitation, destruction, or neglect.

The natural resource areas discussed in the COSE host a large number of diverse plant and animal species, from tidepool organisms to shore birds and terrestrial mammals. The COSE discusses the most important habitat areas and state policies for the protection of the unique ecosystems in Pismo Beach and the animal and plant species dependent on the protection of the habitat.

The project site is not within any designated sensitive resource areas, high priority conservation areas, or undeveloped natural lands subject to any local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. The site is currently developed with an existing single family residence and ornamental landscaping. It is surrounded by similarly sized and developed parcels within an established residential neighborhood.

Discussion

a) *Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?*
b) *Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?*
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?*
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?*
e) *Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?*
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?*

The project site is located within an existing urban and residential neighborhood. The site is currently developed with a single family residence and ornamental landscaping. ***It is not anticipated, based on the location and lack of suitable habitat within the project vicinity, that the proposed project would have an adverse effect, directly or indirectly on biological resources; no impacts are anticipated and considered less than significant.***

Conclusion
The project site is currently developed with a single family residence within an existing residential neighborhood and does not contain suitable habitat for sensitive wildlife or support any natural communities. ***The project would not conflict with any local plans or policies for protection of biological resources and impacts are considered less than significant, no mitigation measures are necessary.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outsideof dedicated cemeteries?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting
The City of Pismo Beach possesses a rich and diverse cultural heritage and therefore has a wealth of historic and prehistoric resources, including sites and buildings associated with Native American inhabitation, Spanish missionaries, and immigrant settlers.

As defined by CEQA, a historical resource includes:

1. A resource listed in or determined to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR).
2. Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant. The architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural records of California may be considered to be a historical resource, provided the lead agency's determination is supported by substantial evidence.

The City's Archaeological Overlay Zone is applied to areas of the City to recognize the importance of archaeological and historic sites and/or structures important to local, state, or national history. The Central Coast area, including Pismo Beach, was the home of the Chumash people at the time of early explorations and settlements by Europeans. Evidence of the culture and occupations by the Chumash may be found at numerous sites in the vicinity of Pismo Beach. Most of the City's archaeological data comes from studies conducted as part of the CEQA process. Additionally, a general map showing the status of archaeology within the city has been prepared and is used in the processing of development proposals.

Discussion

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?

c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?

Based on existing conditions, buried human remains are not expected to be present in the site area. In the event of an accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains, California State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element Policies CO-5 and CO-6

(Archaeological Resources) require that no further disturbances shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. With adherence to State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 and City's Zoning Code, impacts related to the unanticipated disturbance of archaeological resources and human remains would be reduced to less than significant; therefore, **potential impacts would be less than significant.**

Conclusion

No archaeological or historical resources are known or expected to occur within or adjacent to the project site. In the event unanticipated sensitive archaeological resources or human remains are discovered during project construction activities, adherence with the General Plan COSE Policies CO-5 and CO-6 and State Health and Safety Code procedures would reduce potential impacts to less than significant; therefore, **potential impacts to cultural resources would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.**

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) is the primary electricity provider for urban and rural communities within the County of San Luis Obispo. Approximately 33% of electricity provided by PG&E is sourced from renewable resources and an additional 45% is sourced from greenhouse gas-free resources (PG&E 2017).

The City's Climate Action Plan (CAP) is a policy document that sets forth policies, programs, and implementation actions that can help reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from community-wide activities and City government operations in support of the State's efforts. The CAP summarizes the results of the City's GHG Emissions Inventory Update, which identifies the major sources and quantities of GHG emissions produced within Pismo Beach and forecasts how these emissions may change over time. It identifies the quantity of GHG emissions that Pismo Beach will need to reduce to meet its target of 10 percent below 2005 levels by the year 2020, consistent with AB 32. The CAP sets forth City government and community-wide GHG reduction measures, including performance standards which, if implemented, would collectively achieve the specified emission reduction target; and, the CAP identifies proactive adaptation strategies that can be implemented to help Pismo Beach prepare for anticipated climate change impacts. Overall, the CAP sets forth procedures to implement, monitor, and verify the effectiveness of the climate action measures and adapt efforts moving forward.

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

Discussion

a) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?

Construction of the proposed project is not expected to result in any potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. As for the operation of the project, based on the provided design plans, the project would likely not result in any potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources. The project will be required to comply with Title 24, California's building energy efficiency standards. The project would utilize connections to existing nearby power sources. Energy use would be limited to powering the residence. Therefore, **the project's impact on energy resources would be less than significant.**

b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?

Implementation of the project would not result in a significant new energy demand and there are no project components or operations that would conflict with any state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Compliance with State laws and regulations, including the most recent Building Code requirements, will ensure the project continues to reduce energy demands and greenhouse gas emissions, through, for example, increasing state-wide requirements that energy be sourced from renewable resources. Therefore, **no impact would occur.**

Conclusion

The project would not result in a significant energy demand during short-term construction or long-term operations and would not conflict with state or local renewable energy or energy efficiency plans. ***Therefore, potential impacts related to energy would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. 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 basedon other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial director indirect risks to life or property?	☐	☐	☒	☐

e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use ofseptic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systemswhere sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resourceor site or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act (Act) is a California state law that was developed to regulate development near active faults and mitigate the surface fault rupture potential and other hazards. The Act identifies active earthquake fault zones and restricts the construction of habitable structures over known active or potentially active faults. The City of Pismo Beach is located in a seismically active area. However, no active faults are known to be present within or in the near vicinity of Pismo Beach and surface rupture resulting from fault movement is not considered a significant problem within the City. Additionally, the potential for significant landslides is considered to be negligible in rocks that underlie most of the City and it surrounding hills.

Groundshaking refers to the motion that occurs in response to local and regional earthquakes. Groundshaking can endanger life and safety due to damage or collapse of structures or lifeline facilities. The California Building Code (CBC) currently requires structures to be designed to resist a minimum seismic force resulting from ground motion. Ground shaking could occur in Pismo Beach, primarily from the San Andreas Fault, which runs generally north-south from the Bay Area to southern California. The closest portion of which is roughly 60 miles to the east of the City. The Nacimiento Fault is considered a secondary source of strong ground shaking but would have a negligible effect on Pismo Beach.

Liquefaction is the sudden loss of soil strength due to a rapid increase in soil pore water pressures resulting from groundshaking during an earthquake. Liquefaction potential increases with earthquake magnitude and groundshaking duration. Low-lying areas adjacent to creeks, rivers, beaches, and estuaries underlain by unconsolidated alluvial soil are most likely to be vulnerable to liquefaction. The CBC requires the assessment of liquefaction in the design of all structures. The project will be developed on an existing residential lot that is generally level. Risk of liquefaction due to groundshaking is not anticipated.

Landslides and slope instability can occur as a result of wet weather, weak soils, improper grading, improper drainage, steep slopes, adverse geologic structure, earthquakes, or a combination of these factors. The City's Safety Element and Conservation and Open Space Element identifies several policies to reduce risk from landslides and slope instability. These policies include the requirement for slope and structural stability evaluations for development in areas of slopes >20% - 30%, and restrictions on new development in areas with slopes >30% unless development plans indicate that the hazard can be reduced to a less than significant level prior to beginning development. The project is not located in an area with high potential for landslides.

Shrink/swell potential is the extent to which the soil shrinks as it dries out or swells when it gets wet. Extent of shrinking and swelling is influenced by the amount and kind of clay in the soil. Shrinking and swelling of soils can cause damage to building foundations, roads, and other structures. A high shrink/swell potential indicates a hazard to maintenance of structures built in, on, or with material having this rating. Moderate and low ratings lessen the hazard accordingly. According to the NRCS, Still gravelly sandy clay load, 2 – 9 percent slopes, underlying the site is characterized as having well drained soils, with slow to medium runoff and moderately slow permeability.

The City's Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE) identifies policies (CO-10 and CO-11) for the protection of paleontological resources from the effects of development by avoiding disturbance where feasible. Paleontological sensitivity is defined as the potential for a geologic unit to produce scientifically significant fossils.

Discussion

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

a-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 basedon other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Fault Hazard Zone, and there are no mapped active faults crossing or adjacent to the sites. The closest known fault is approximately 14 miles southwest of the project site. The project has been designed with recommendations for site preparation, grading, and foundations subject to professional engineering and construction standards to ensure the project is constructed in a stable manner. ***Therefore, the potential for impacts related to surface ground rupture to occur at the project site is low, and potential impacts would be less than significant.***

a-ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking?*

The project would be required to comply with the California Building Code (CBC) to ensure the effects of a potential seismic event would be minimized to the greatest extent feasible. The project would not be open to the public. ***Therefore, impacts related to the production of strong seismic ground shaking would be less than significant.***

a-iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?*
a-iv) *Landslides?*

The project site is located in an area with low potential for liquefaction and low potential for landslides. The geotechnical reports provide recommendations for site preparation, grading, and foundations. Incorporation of the preliminary geotechnical recommendations as well as professional engineering standards and California Building Code requirements would ensure the project is designed to adequately address potential liquefaction and landslide related impacts. ***Therefore potential impacts would be less than significant.***

b) *Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?*

The project would result in a total disturbance of approximately 7,300 square feet (entire lot), including approximately 390 cubic yards of cut. The greatest potential for onsite erosion to occur would be during the initial site preparation and grading during construction. An erosion control plan outlining best management practices is required for all construction and grading projects to minimize potential impacts related to erosion and sedimentation. Based on the topography of the lot, and the minimal amount of site disturbance associated with implementation of the project, there are no concerns of loss of topsoil as a result of the project. ***Therefore, implementation of the best management practices will result in project impacts being less than significant.***

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?*

Landslides typically occur in areas with steep slopes or in areas containing escarpments. Based on the City's Safety Element, the project site is not located in an area with slopes susceptible to local failure or landslide.

The project would be required to comply with California Building Code seismic requirements to address any potential seismic-related ground failure, including lateral spread. ***Therefore, impacts related to on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse would be less than significant.***

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

Based on the geotechnical report prepared for the project, underlying surface soils consisted of brown silty sands with some clay to a depth of 4 to 5 feet. The near surface silty sands have low expansivity and no free ground water was encountered during our field exploration. ***Therefore, there is a low likelihood for project implementation to create substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property; impacts are considered less than significant.***

e) *Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use ofseptic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systemswhere sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?*

The project includes the demolition of an existing home and construction of a new single family residence in its place. The new residence will tie into the existing infrastructure and utilities currently supporting the existing residence; a septic tank or alternative wastewater disposal system is not proposed. ***Therefore, there would be no impact.***

f) *Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resourceor site or unique geologic feature?*

There are no known unique paleontological resources or unique geologic features located within the project site. Based on the urban-built up of the neighborhood, the area has a low potential for encountering important fossils. ***Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.***

Conclusion
Based on compliance with existing regulations and recommendations in the geotechnical report, implementation of best management practices for erosion and sedimentation control, and compliance with the measures outlined in the City's municipal code and California Building Code standards, ***impacts to geologic and soil resources would be less than significant.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VIII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly orindirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adoptedfor the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting
Greenhouse gases (GHG) 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_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), and fluorinated gases. These are most commonly emitted through the burning of fossil fuels (oil, natural gas, and coal), agricultural practices, decay of organic waste in landfills, and a variety of other chemical reactions and industrial processes (e.g., the manufacturing of cement).

Carbon dioxide is the most abundant GHG and is estimated to represent approximately 80-90% of the principal GHGs that are currently affecting the earth's climate. According to the ARB, transportation (vehicle exhaust) and electricity generation are the main sources of GHGs in the state.

In October 2008, the CARB published its Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan, which is the state's plan to achieve GHG reductions in California required by Assembly Bill (AB) 32, which codifies the Statewide goal of reducing emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 (essentially a 15% reduction below 2005 emission levels) and the adoption of regulations to require reporting and verification of statewide GHG emissions. The Scoping Plan included CARB-recommended GHG reductions for each sector of the state's GHG emissions inventory. The largest proposed GHG reduction recommendations were associated with improving emissions standards for light-duty vehicles, implementing the Low Carbon Fuel Standard program, implementation of energy efficiency measures in buildings and appliances, the widespread development of combined heat and power systems, and developing a renewable portfolio standard for electricity production.

Senate Bill (SB) 32 and Executive Order (EO) S-3-05 extend the state's GHG reduction goals 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. Since SB 32 requires the state to reduce GHG levels by 40 percent below 1990 levels by the year, a reasonable SB 32-based working threshold would be 40 percent below the 1,150 MTCO2e Bright Line threshold, or 1,150 x 0.6 = 690 MTCO2e. Therefore, for the purpose of evaluating the significance of GHG emissions for a project after 2020, a project estimated to generate 690 MTCO2e or more GHG is assumed to have a significant adverse impact that is cumulatively considerable.

According to a 2018 Community-wide Greenhouse Gas Inventory Report, Pismo Beach emitted approximately 34,849 metric tons of carbon dioxide-equivalent (CO2e). Based on adjusted numbers of the 2005 Baseline Community Greenhouse Inventory, an approximately 20% reduction is represented in the 2018 Inventory. Emissions were reduced in the residential, commercial, and transportation sectors, and slight increases in both the Wastewater and Solid Waste Sectors were also noted.

Discussion

a) *Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*

The California Energy Emissions Model (CalEEMod) was used to determine the approximate GHG emissions per square foot associated with construction and operation of a single-family residence and accessory dwelling unit based on an energy use factors for construction and operation. These emission factors were then multiplied by the total area for the proposed project to estimate the project's construction-related and annual operational carbon dioxide equivalent emissions in metric tons (MTCO2e; Table 1).

Project Component	Quantity	Emissions Rate (Annual MTCO2e/sf)		Estimated Projected Annual CO2 Emissions (MT/year)
		Construction	Operation	
Existing / Baseline GHG Emissions				
Single-family residence	1 dwelling	N/A	4.2	4.2
Net Change (Increase)				**4.2**

Notes: 1. Based on 18,000 kWhr/household/year
Source: City of Pismo Beach, 2021, CalEEMod version 2020.4.0

As shown in Table 1, project related GHG emissions will be well below the threshold of 690 MTCO2e. ***Therefore, potential impacts associated with GHG emissions for the proposed single-family residence and applicable plans and policies adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions would be less than significant.***

b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

The project would be required to comply with existing state regulations, which include increased energy conservation measures, reduced potable water use, increased waste diversion, and other actions adopted to achieve the overall GHG emissions reduction goals identified in SB 32 and EO S-3-05. The project would not conflict with the control measures identified in the CAP, or other state and local regulations related to GHG emissions and renewable energy. The project would be consistent with the property's existing land use for residential development and would be designed to comply with the California Green Building Code standards. Therefore, the project would be consistent with applicable plans and programs designed to reduce GHG emissions and ***potential impacts would be less than significant.***

Conclusion
The project would not generate significant GHG emissions above existing levels and would not exceed any applicable GHG thresholds, contribute considerably to cumulatively significant GHG emissions, or conflict with plans adopted to reduce GHG emissions. ***Therefore, potential impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
IX. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazardto the public or the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting
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. Government Code section 65962.5 requires the California EPA 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's

(DTSC's) EnviroStor database tracks DTSC cleanup, permitting, enforcement, and investigation efforts at hazardous waste facilities and sites with known contamination, such as federal superfund sites, state response sites, voluntary cleanup sites, school cleanup sites, school investigation sites, and military evaluation sites. The State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB's) 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/. The project site is not located within close proximity to any site included on the Cortese List, EnviroStor database, or GeoTracker database.

The California Health and Safety Code provides regulations pertaining to the abatement of fire related hazards and requires that local jurisdictions enforce the California Building Code, which provides standards for fire resistive building and roofing materials, and other fire-related construction methods. The Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan provides a Fire Hazard Zones Map that indicates urban and rural areas throughout the County within moderate, high, and very high fire hazard severity zones The project is not located within a high fire hazard severity zone, and, based on the San Luis Obispo County's response time map and proximity to the nearest fire station (Station #63), it will take approximately 1 minute (< 5 minutes) to respond to a call regarding fire or life safety. For more information about fire-related hazards and risk assessment, see Section XXI. Wildfire.

The City has also adopted general emergency plans for multiple potential natural disasters, including the County of San Luis Obispo's Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (2019), County of San Luis Obispo Tsunami Plan (August, 2016), Tsunami Inundation Map, City of Pismo Beach Multi-hazard Emergency Response Plan (2004), Pismo Beach Pre-Attack Plan.

Discussion

a) *Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?*

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. ***No impacts associated with the routine transport of hazardous materials would occur.***

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?*

The project does not propose the handling or use of hazardous materials or volatile substances that would result in a significant risk of upset or accidental release conditions. Construction of the proposed project is anticipated to require use of limited quantities of hazardous substances, including gasoline, diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid, solvents, oils, paints, etc. Construction contractors would be required to comply with applicable federal and state environmental and workplace safety laws for the handling of hazardous materials, including response and clean-up requirements for any minor spills. **Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.**

c) *Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?*

The project site is located approximately 0.5 miles from Shell Beach Elementary School. However, the project does not propose the handling or use of hazardous materials or volatile substances that would result in a significant risk of upset or accidental release conditions. Construction of the proposed project

is anticipated to require use of limited quantities of hazardous substances, including gasoline, diesel fuel, hydraulic fluid, solvents, oils, paints, etc. Construction contractors would be required to comply with applicable federal and state environmental and workplace safety laws for the handling of hazardous materials, including response and clean-up requirements for any minor spills.; ***therefore, impacts would be less than significant***.

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?*

Based on a search of the California Department of Toxic Substance Control's EnviroStar database, the State Water Resources Control Board's Geotracker database, and CalEPA's Cortese List website, there are no hazardous waste cleanup sites within the project site. ***Therefore, no impacts would occur.***

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?*

The project site is not located within an airport land use plan or within two (2) miles of a public airport or private airstrip; ***therefore, no impacts would occur.***

f) *Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant temporary or permanent impact on any adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. No breaks in utility service or road closures would occur as a result of project implementation. Any construction related detours would include proper signage and notification and be short-term and limited in nature and duration. ***Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.***

g) *Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?*

The project site is not located within a wildland area and based on the MJLHMP, the project is not within a moderate to very high hazard severity zone. The project is designed in accordance with State adopted fire safety standards and would be required to adhere to a project specific fire safety plan. These measures will ensure that no people or structures are either directly or indirectly exposed to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires. ***Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.***

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 and is not within close proximity to populations that could be substantially affected by upset or release of hazardous substances. With adherence to a fire safety plan, project implementation would not subject people or structures to substantial risks associated with wildland fires and would not impair implementation or interfere with any adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. ***Therefore, potential impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a streamor river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
i) result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	☐	☐	☒	☐
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	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) impede or redirect flood flows?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

The Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) has established Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) thresholds for waterbodies within the County. A TMDL establishes the allowable amount of a particular pollutant a waterbody can receive on a regular basis and still remain at levels that protect beneficial uses designated for that waterbody. A TMDL also establishes proportional responsibility for controlling the pollutant, numeric indicators of water quality, and measures to achieve the allowable amount of pollutant loading. Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) requires states to maintain a list of bodies of water that are designated as "impaired". A body of water is considered impaired when a particularwater quality objective or standard is not being met.

The RWQCB's Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coast Basin (Basin Plan; 2017) describes how the quality of surface water and groundwater in the Central Coast Region should be managed to provide the highest water quality reasonably possible. The Basin Plan outlines the beneficial uses of streams, lakes, andother water bodies for humans and other life. There are 24 categories of beneficial uses, including, but not limited to, municipal water supply, water contact recreation, non-water contact recreation, and cold freshwater habitat. Water quality objectives are then established to protect the beneficial uses of those water resources. The Regional Board implements the Basin Plan by issuing and enforcing waste discharge requirements to individuals, communities, or businesses whose discharges can affect water quality.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), through Section 404 of the CWA, regulates the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S., including wetlands. Waters of the U.S. are typically identified by the presence of an ordinary high water mark (OHWM) and connectivity to traditional navigable waters or other jurisdictional features. The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and nine RWQCBs regulate discharges of fill and dredged material in California, under Section 401 of the CWA and the State Porter- Cologne Water Quality Control Act, through the State Water Quality Certification Program. State Water Quality Certification is necessary for all

projects that require a USACE permit, or fall under other federal jurisdiction, or have the potential to impact waters of the State. Waters of the State are defined by the Porter-Cologne Act as any surface water or groundwater, including saline waters, within the boundaries of the state. The project is not located within a groundwater basin.

The City's municipal code dictates which projects are required to prepare a drainage plan, including any project that would, for example, change the runoff volume or velocity leaving any point of the site, alters natural drainage courses, for properties whose slopes are greater than 10%, and for development requiring grading plans by the Grading and Erosion Control Ordinance (Title 18 of the Municipal Code).

Per the City's Stormwater Program, the Public Work's Department is responsible for ensuring that new construction sites implement best management practices during construction, and that site plans incorporate appropriate post-construction stormwater runoff controls.

For planning purposes, the flood event most often used to delineate areas subject to flooding is the 100-year flood. The City's Safety Element and the Multi-jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan establishes policies to reduce flood hazards and flood damage, including but not limited to prohibition of development in areas of high flood hazard potential. All development located in a 100-year flood zone is subject to Federal Emergency Management Act (FEMA) regulations. The City designates flood hazard areas within areas shown on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) provided by FEMA. Development within these areas are required to comply with all applicable provisions of Chapter 15.44 of the Municipal Code (Flood Hazard Area Use Control).

Discussion

a) *Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?*

The project will result in the disturbance of the entire lot (7,300 square feet) and result in approximately 390 cubic yards of cut materials to be balanced and exported off-site. The project is on a generally level site and will be subject to the standard City requirements for drainage, sedimentation and erosion control for construction and permanent use. Project grading will create exposed soil, however, adherence with the City's standards will adequately address these impacts. Additionally, landscaping and stockpiles will be properly managed during construction to avoid material loss.

Existing regulations within the City's municipal code and building code will adequately address surface water quality impacts during construction and permanent use of the project site as a single family residence. No additional measures above what are required or proposed are needed to protect water quality; ***impacts are considered less than significant.***

b) *Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?*

The project site is located within an established residential neighborhood on an existing residentially zoned lot. The existing residence on the property will be demolished and replaced with a new single-family home. The project would not substantially increase water demand, deplete groundwater supplies, or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge; therefore, the project would not interfere with sustainable management of a groundwater basin and ***potential impacts associated with groundwater supplies would be less than significant.***

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:*

(c-i) *Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?*

The project site is not located in proximity to any surface stream or body of standing water that would be subject to risk associated with erosion or siltation as the result of project construction or operation. The project is required to design best management practices to address and minimize any construction and grading impacts associated with implementation of the project. The project is not expected to result in any substantial erosion or siltation on or off site; ***therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.***

(c-ii) *Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?*

The project is not expected to result in substantial increases to the rate or amount of surface runoff which could result in flooding on or off site. ***Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant.***

The project would not substantially increase the amount of impervious surface area or the rate and volume of surface runoff in a manner that could result in flooding on- or off-site. Based on the nature and size of the project, changes in surface hydrology would be negligible. ***Therefore, potential impacts related to increased surface runoff resulting in flooding would be less than significant.***

(c-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?*

The proposed location of the single-family dwelling would be outside of the 100-year flood hazard area. The project would be at a great enough distance from the potential flood area to not be considered at risk of hazards associated with periodic flooding, including the possible release of pollutants. Therefore, impacts would be less thansignificant.

The project would not substantially increase the amount of impervious surface area or the rate and volume of surface runoff in a manner that could exceed the capacity of existing stormwater or drainage systems. Based on the nature and size of the project, changes in surface hydrology would be negligible. ***Therefore, potential impacts related to increased surface runoff exceeding stormwater capacity would be less than significant.***

(c-iv) *Impede or redirect flood flows?*

Based on the County of San Luis Obispo Flood Hazard Maps, the City's Safety Element, and Multi-jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone. The project would be subject to standard requirements for drainage, sedimentation, and erosion control for construction and operation; ***therefore, no impacts would occur.***

d) *In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?*

Based on the City's Safety Element and reference in the Multi-jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, the project site is not located within a 100-year flood zone or within an area that would be inundated if dam failure were to occur. Based on the San Luis Obispo County 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 potential for seiche to occur; ***therefore, the project site has no potential to release pollutants due to project inundation and no impacts would occur.***

e) *Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?*

Development such as construction of a single family residence will not require special attention

to water use beyond what is required in the City's Building Ordinance and Zoning Code requirements. ***The project will not conflict or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable management plan. No impacts are anticipated to occur.***

Conclusion
The project site is not within the 100-year flood zone and does not include existing drainages or other surface waters. The project does not propose alterations to existing water courses or other significant alterations to existing on-site drainage patterns. ***Therefore, potential impacts related to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting
The City's Zoning Code was established to guide and manage the future growth in the City in accordance with the General Plan, to regulate land use in a manner that will encourage and support orderly development and beneficial use of lands, to minimize adverse effects on the public resulting from inappropriate creation, location, use or design of buildings or land uses, and to protect and enhance significant natural, historic, archaeological, and scenic resources within the City.

The City's Municipal Code Chapter 17.127 establishes the procedures for amendment procedures for the City's Local Coastal Program (LCP). The LCP may be amended (general plan amendment, GPA) by the Planning Commission and City Council and is considered effected once certified by the California Coastal Commission (Section 17.127.070). The review authority is responsible for taking action on a GPA when it first determines that the GPA satisfies the following:

- Internally consistent with the adopted General Plan and LCP;
- Would not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare of the city;
- Physically suitable (including access, provision of utilities, compatibility with adjoining land uses, and absence of physical constraints) for the requested/anticipated land use development(s); and,
- In compliance with the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The City's Land Use Element of the General Plan contains planning areas that establish policies and programs for the general distribution, location, and extent of the uses of the land for housing, business, industry, open space, recreation, natural resources and other uses of public and private lands. The project site is located within the Planning Area 'E' – St. Andrews Tract. The St. Andrews Planning Area is almost completely developed with single-family homes. the ocean frontage consists of single-family residences and Memory Park. Policy LU-E-1 focuses on conserving the existing housing stock and assuring that home additions and replacements are compatible with the scale and character of existing development.

Discussion
a) *Physically divide an established community?*

The project does not propose project elements or components that would physically divide the site from surrounding areas and uses. The project would be consistent with the general level of development within the project vicinity and would not create, close, or impede any existing public or private roads, or create any other barriers to movement or accessibility within the community. ***Therefore, the proposed project would not physically divide an established community and no impacts would occur.***

b) *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?*

Single-family residences are considered an allowed use within the single family residential (R-1) zoning district. The project is consistent with existing surrounding developments and does not contain sensitive on-site resources; therefore, the project would not conflict with policies or regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. the project would be consistent with existing land uses and designations for the proposed site and, therefore, would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. ***No impacts would occur.***

Conclusion
The project would be consistent with local and regional land use designations, plans, and policies and would not divide an established community. ***Therefore, there would be no impacts to land use and planning and no mitigation measures are necessary.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XII. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resourcethat would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting
The California Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 (SMARA) requires that the State Geologist classify land into mineral resource zones (MRZ) according to the known or inferred mineral potential of the land (Public Resources Code Sections 2710–2796).

The three MRZs used in the SMARA classification-designation process in the San Luis Obispo-Santa Barbara Production-Consumption Region are defined below (California Geological Survey 2011a):

- MRZ-1: Areas where available geologic information indicates that little likelihood exists for the presence of significant mineral resources.
- MRZ-2: Areas where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that a high likelihood for their presence exists. This zone shall be applied to known mineral deposits or where well-developed lines of reasoning, based upon economic-geologic principles and adequate data, demonstrate that the likelihood for occurrence of significant mineral deposits is high.
- MRZ-3: Areas containing known or inferred aggregate resources of undetermined significance.

There are no known mineral resources that fall into the three MRZ categories as defined by the SMARA classification within the vicinity of the project site.

Discussion

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be a value to the region and the residents of the state?

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan

There are no known mineral resources within the vicinity of the project site. Result of the project would not result in the loss of any mineral resources. ***No impacts would result from project implementation.***

Conclusion

There are no known mineral resources within the vicinity of the project site. Result of the project would not result in the loss of any mineral resources. ***No impacts would result from project implementation and no mitigation measures are necessary.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIII. NOISE. Would the project:				
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increasein 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration orgroundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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 inthe project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

The City of Pismo Beach Noise Element of the General Plan provides a policy framework for addressing potential noise impacts in the planning process. The purpose of the Noise Element is to minimize future noise conflicts. The Noise Element identifies the major noise sources in the City (highways, primary and major local streets, railroad operations, aircraft and airport operations, local industrial facilities, and other stationary sources) and includes goals, policies, and implementation programs to reduce future noise impacts. Among the most significant policies of the Noise Element are numerical noise standards that limit noise exposure within noise-sensitive land uses, and performance standards for new commercial and industrial uses that might adversely impact noise-sensitive land uses.

In order to determine the existing noise environment in Pismo Beach, a community noise survey was conducted during August 1990 by Brown-Buntin Associates, Inc. under contract to the County of San Luis Obispo. Maximum noise levels ranged from 63-70 dB and generally were due to traffic. Minimum levels were from traffic and wind and ranged from 25 to 40 dB. Based on these measurements, background noise levels in terms of Ldn were estimated to range from 41 to 57 dB. Noise sensitive uses that have been identified by the City include the following: residences, churches, and schools. Uses that are noise-producing have been identified as well and include the following: highways, and certain forms of industry.

Brown-Buntin Associates developed existing and projected noise contour data for the major transportation routes in the county. Traffic data was provided by CALTRANS, the county and the cities. Estimates for future traffic volumes

for certain county and city roadway segments are based on growth rates of comparable roadways since these data were not available from the jurisdictions. The noise contours affecting Pismo Beach are presented on Table N-1 and are displayed in Figures N-1 and N-2 of the Noise Element.

The measurement of noise, and particularly the measurement of potential noise from, or affecting, a proposed project requires the use of sophisticated equipment and considerable technical expertise. To assist the City in making preliminary assessments of potential problems as well as potential solutions, the County of San Luis Obispo has provided all cities in the county with a Technical Reference Manual that supplies specific technical information for individual jurisdictions and an Acoustical Design Manual that can be used as an aid to site design review.

The existing ambient noise environment of the project site (residential neighborhood) is characterized by light traffic along Naomi Avenue and Seacliff Drive, as well as wave noise from the cliffs below Seacliff Drive. The nearest sensitive receptors to the project site are those residences in the immediate vicinity and adjacent to the project site. The project site is not within close proximity to an Airport or subject to airport operational noise.

Discussion

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?*

   Project construction would result in a temporary increase in noise levels associated with construction activities, equipment, and vehicle trips. construction noise would be variable, temporary, and limited in nature and duration. The City requires that construction activities be conducted during daytime hours to utilize City construction noise exception standards and that construction equipment be equipped with appropriate mufflers recommended by the manufacturer. ***Compliance with these standards would ensure short-term construction noise would be less than significant.***

   The project does not propose any uses or features that would generate a significant permanent source of mobile or stationary noise sources. Ambient noise levels in the residential neighborhood and at the project site after project implementation would not be significantly different than existing levels. Therefore, potential operational noise impacts would be less than significant.

   Based on the limited nature of construction and operation activities, ***impacts associated with the generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels would be less than significant.***

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

   The project does not propose substantial grading/earthmoving activities, pile driving, or other high impact activities that would generate substantial groundborne noise or groundborne vibration during construction. Construction equipment has the potential to generate minor groundborne noise and/or vibration, but these activities would be limited in duration and are not likely to be perceptible from adjacent areas. The project does not propose a use that would generate long-term operational groundborne noise or vibration. ***Therefore, impacts related to exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels would be less than significant.***

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?*

   The project site is not located within or adjacent to an airport land use plan or within two (2) miles of a public airport or private airstrip; therefore, ***no impact would occur.***

Conclusion
Short-term construction activities would be limited in nature and duration and conducted during daytime periods per City standards. No long-term operational noise or ground vibration would occur as a result of the project. the project is located adjacent to residential uses, identified as noise sensitive receptors, however, ***potential impacts related to noise during construction are anticipated and would be less than significant as they are short-term in nature. No mitigation measures are necessary.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. 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 ofroads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting
The City of Pismo Beach General Plan 2020-2028 Housing Element addresses the city's plans to meet its housing needs, particularly the availability, affordability, and adequacy of housing supply. The Housing Element defines strategies and programs that will serve all socioeconomic groups.

The City faces many challenges related to establishing housing within the community: balancing employment and housing opportunities, matching the supply and demand for housing, enhancing the affordability of housing for all segments of the population, ensuring that adequate water and public services are available, and conserving natural resources that distinguish Pismo Beach. The 2020-2028 Housing Element sets forth strategies to address these issues and provide guidance for local government decision making.

The City's inclusionary housing requirements are in Chapter 17.26 of the municipal code and require the provision of new affordable housing in conjunction with both residential and nonresidential development and subdivisions. In its efforts to provide for affordable housing, the City currently participates in the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, administered by the County of San Luis Obispo, which provides limited financial assistance to projects relating to affordable housing throughout the community.

The project site is located within an established residential neighborhood and is developed with an existing single-family residence. The proposed project will allow the lot to be redeveloped with a new single-family residence.

Discussion

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)?

The project is not expected to cause any substantial population growth as it would involve reconstruction and remodel of an existing single-family residence. The project does not include the construction of businesses or extension or establishment of roads, utilities, or other infrastructure that would induce substantial development and population growth in new areas. The project would not generate a substantial number of new employment opportunities that would encourage population growth in the area. ***Therefore,***

***the project would not directly or indirectly induce substantial growth and no impacts would occur*.**

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

The project would not displace existing housing or necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere*; **therefore, no impacts would occur.***

Conclusion
No impacts to population and housing would occur and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:				
a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilties, 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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Police Protection?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Schools?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Parks?	☐	☐	☒	☐
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting
Fire protection services in the City of Pismo Beach (City) are provided by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL Fire), which has been under contract with the City to provide full-service fire protection. CAL FIRE responds to emergencies and other requests for assistance, plans for and takes action to prevent emergencies and to reduce their impact, coordinates citywide and regional response efforts, and provides public education and training in the community. The project would be served by Station #63, located approximately 4/10th of a mile to the east-northeast of the project site. Based on the County of San Luis Obispo response time map, it will take approximately 1 minute to respond to a call regarding fire or life safety at this location.

Police protection and emergency services in the City are provided by the City Police Department. The Police Department responds to calls for service, conducts proactive law enforcement activities, and performs initial investigations of crimes. Patrol personnel are deployed from the City's Police Station located at 1000 Bello Street in Pismo Beach.

Pismo Beach is within the Lucia Mar School District and includes one elementary school and one middle school.

Discussion

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?
The project would be required to comply with all fire safety rules and regulations including the California Fire Code and Public Resources Code prior to issuance of a building permit. Based on the limited nature of the proposed development, the project would not result in a significant increase in demand for fire protection services. The project would be served by existing fire protection services and would not result in the need for new or altered fire protection services or facilities; therefore, ***impacts would be less than significant.***

Police protection?
The project does not propose a new use or activity that would require additional police services above what is normally provided for within an established residential neighborhood with similar surrounding land uses; therefore, ***impacts related to police services would be less than significant.***

Schools?
The project would not induce a substantial increase in population growth and would not result in the need for additional parks or recreational services or facilities to serve new populations. Therefore, potential ***impacts would be less than significant.***

Parks?
The project would not induce a substantial increase in population growth and would not result in the need for additional parks or recreational services or facilities to serve new populations. ***Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.***

Other public facilities?
As discussed above, the proposed project would be subject to applicable fees to offset negligible increased demands on public facilities; ***therefore, impacts related to other public facilities would be less than significant.***

Conclusion
The project does not propose development that would substantially increase demands on public services and would not induce population growth that would substantially increase demands on public services; ***therefore, potential impacts related to public services would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. RECREATION Would the project:				
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 orbe accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting
The City of Pismo Beach Parks, Recreation, and Access Element of the General Plan is viewed in the context of the background, principles, and policies found in the Conservation and Open Space Element, much of which is integral

to recreation and access concerns.

Pismo Beach has always relied on the Pacific Ocean and the beach to be its chief recreational resource. In addition to this natural resource, the city contains both state and local parks and recreational areas. Pismo State Beach, under the direction of the State Department of Parks and Recreation, comprises 1.5 miles of the city's only major sandy beach (approximately 60 acres) and is the major recreational area of the city. The city has approximately 315 acres of additional public park area either developed or proposed. Forty percent of the park area is within the Coastal Zone.

The project site is located within an existing residential neighborhood adjacent to ocean frontage along Seacliff Drive. The ocean frontage consists of single-family residences and Memory Park. These homes are adjacent to highly erodible cliffs, with rocky shoreline and small pocket beaches below. During low tide there are small beaches accessible to the public. There is also bluff top access from Naomi Avenue dedicated to the City and connected to a city easement south of St. Andrews Tract in the Spindrift Planning Area. This access leads to a spectacular viewpoint, which is under private ownership. There is a public access easement from Seacliff Drive to Spyglass Park in the adjacent Spyglass Planning Area. The proposed project will be located entirely within the existing lot and will not obstruct access or increase use of the existing neighborhood, otherwise triggering the need to replace access or add recreational facilities to the area.

Discussion

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?

The project would not result in a substantial growth within the area and would not substantially increase demand on any proximate existing neighborhood or regional park or other recreational facility(ies). ***Payment of standard development impact fees would ensure any incremental use of existing parks and recreational facilities would be reduced to less than significant.***

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?

The project does not include the construction of new recreational facilities and would not result in a substantial increase in demand or use of parks and recreational facilities. Implementation of the project would not require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities; therefore, ***no impacts would occur.***

Conclusion

The project would not result in the significant increase in use, construction, or expansion of parks or recreational facilities. Therefore, ***potential impacts related to recreation would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. TRANSPORTATION Would the project:				
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressingthe circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines § 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	☐	☐	☒	☐

c)	Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric designfeature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

The City of Pismo Beach maintains traffic data for all City-maintained roadways. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) maintains annual traffic data on state highways and interchanges within the county and urban areas. The project site is located within an existing residential neighborhood, accessed from Shell Beach Road, a minor arterial (Circulation Element).

In 2013, Senate Bill 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 Senate Bill 743 and identified vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita, VMT per employee, and net VMT as new metrics for transportation analysis under CEQA (as detailed in Section 15064.3 [b]). Beginning July 1, 2020, the newly adopted VMT criteria for determining significance of transportation impacts must be implemented statewide.

The City's Land Use and Circulation Elements of the City's General Plan establishes goals and strategies to meet pedestrian circulation needs by providing usable and attractive sidewalks, pathways, and trails to establish maximum access and connectivity between land use and zoning districts.

The project includes construction of a new single-family residence on an existing residential lot. The lot is currently developed with a single-family residence. Access to the lot is from Naomi Avenue, which is developed with curb, gutter, and sidewalks. There is a bus stop located approximately 0.4 miles from the project site (Shell Beach Road and Seacliff Drive); there are bicycle and pedestrian facilities along Shell Beach Road, within 1 mile of the project site.

Discussion

a) *Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?*

The project does not propose the substantial temporary or long-term alteration of any proximate transportation facilities. Marginal increases in traffic can be accommodated by existing local streets and the project would not result in any long-term changes in traffic or circulation. The project does not propose uses that would interfere or conflict with applicable policies related to circulation, transit, roadway, bicycle, or pedestrian systems or facilities. The project would be consistent with the Circulation Element of the City's General Plan***. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.***

b) *Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?*

Based on the nature and location of the project, the project would not generate a significant increase in construction-related or operational traffic trips or vehicle miles traveled. The project would not substantially change existing land uses and would not result in the need for additional new or expanded transportation facilities and is below the trip threshold identified by the State and would not be considered significant. The project would be subject to standard development impact fees to offset the relative impacts on surrounding roadways. ***Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.***

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

The project proposes the construction of a single-family residence with attached garage. Though the unique configuration of the lot is cause for the request for a General Plan Amendment, there are no identified hazards (e.g. sharp curves, dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses at the site or within the immediate area. The residence and driveway will be constructed to meet all standards of the City's Zoning Codes, including the California Building Code. ***Therefore, there would be no impacts.***

d) *Result in inadequate emergency access?*

The project would not result in road closures during short-term construction activities or long-term operations. Individual access to adjacent properties would be maintained during construction activities and throughout the project area. Project implementation would not affect long-term access through the project area and sufficient alternative access exists to accommodate regional trips. ***Therefore, the project would not adversely affect existing emergency access and no impacts would occur.***

Conclusion
The project would not alter existing transportation facilities or result in the generation of additional trips or vehicle miles traveled. Payment of standard development fees, if applicable, and compliance with existing regulations would ensure potential impacts were reduced to less than significant. ***Therefore, potential impacts related to transportation would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVIII. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code § 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or objectwith cultural value to a California Native American tribe, andthat is:	☐	☐	☒	☐
i) 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), or	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to besignificant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c)of Public Resources Code § 5024.1. In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resource Code § 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting
AB 52 was approved in 2014, adding 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 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.

Discussion

a) 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, 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:

i. *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)?*

The City has provided notice of the opportunity to consult with appropriate tribes per the requirements of AB 52. No tribal groups requested consultation. The project site is fully developed with a single-family residence, attached garage, and ornamental landscaping in both the front and rear yards. The project site does not contain any known tribal cultural resources that have been listed or been found 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. Potential impacts associated with the inadvertent discovery of tribal cultural resources would be subject to the City's Municipal Code and General Plan Policies related to protection of Archaeological Resources, which requires that in the event resources are encountered during project construction, construction activities shall cease, and the City shall be notified of the discovery so that the extent and location of discovered materials may be recorded by a qualified archaeologist, and the disposition of artifacts may be accomplished in accordance with state and federal law. ***Therefore, impacts related to a substantial adverse change in the significance of tribal cultural resources would be less than significant.***

ii. *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.*

The project site does not contain any resources determined by the City to be a potentially significant tribal cultural resource. Impacts associated with potential inadvertent discovery would be minimized through compliance with existing standards and regulations (COSE Policies CO-5 and CO-6). ***Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.***

Conclusion

No tribal cultural resources are known or expected to occur within or adjacent to the project site. In the event unanticipated sensitive resources are discovered during project activities, adherence with City standards and State

Health and Safety Code procedures would reduce potential impacts to less than significant; therefore, ***potential impacts to tribal cultural resources would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIX. 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?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the projectand reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Result in a determination by the waste water treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand inaddition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, orin excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Setting

The proposed project includes development of a new single-family residence, replacing an existing residence, on an existing single-family residential lot within an established residential neighborhood. The neighborhood, and its residences, are served by the City's Public Works Department related to water and wastewater. Regulations for City services is provided for in Chapter 13 of the City's Municipal Code. The project's solid waste needs would continue to be served by South County Sanitation.

Discussion

a) *Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electrical power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?*

The project includes the development of a new single-family residence within an existing residential neighborhood. The new residence will connect to the existing infrastructure and will not require the expansion of existing community facilities. ***Therefore, no impacts will occur.***

b) *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?*

The project site is currently served by City services related to water and wastewater. The proposed project will continue to use these same services at the same capacity as the original single-family residence. Additionally, to conserve water, the project will be subject to the City's General Plan Design Element (Policy D-17) and Building Code (Title 15), which requires specific native and drought tolerant plant species for use in landscaping and water-conserving fixtures for domestic use. ***Therefore, no impacts would occur.***

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?

The project site is currently served by the City's wastewater system and as a result of development will continue to utilize this service. Development of the single-family residence would not substantially increase demands on existing wastewater collection, treatment, and disposal facilities. The project does not include new connections to wastewater treatment facilities; ***therefore, no impact would occur.***

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?*

Construction would resulti n the generation of minimal solid waste materials. The proposed project is a single-family residence with attached garage, which is expected to generate a limited amount of solid waste and will likely not result in the impairment of solid waste reduction goals. ***Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.***

e) *Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?*

The project is required to abide by federal, state, and local management reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. ***Therefore, the project will comply with all statutes and regulations related to solid waste, and impacts will be less than significant.***

Conclusion
The property is currently connected to the City's utilities and service systems related to water and wastewater. The project includes the development of a new single-family residence and will utilize existing services. ***Therefore, there are no impacts to the utilities and service systems and no mitigation measures are necessary.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XX. WILDFIRE Would the project:				
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐
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?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Setting
In central California, the fire season usually extends from roughly May through October, however, recent events indicate that wildfire behavior, frequency, and duration of the fire season are changing in California. Fire Hazard Severity Zones (FHSZ) are defined by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CALFIRE) based on the presence of fire-prone vegetation, climate, topography, assets at risk (e.g., high population centers), and a fire

protection agency's ability to provide service to the area (CALFIRE 2007). FHSZs throughout the County have been designated as "Very High," "High," or "Moderate."

The project site is located in an established residential neighborhood on an existing residential lot and is not in proximity to areas at high risk of wildfire events and not within a designated FHSZs. Fire protection services, as mentioned in the 'Public Services' resource in the City of Pismo Beach (City) are provided by CALFIRE, which has been under contract with the City to provide full-service fire protection. Based on the project's location and the County of San Luis Obispo response time maps, it will take CALFIRE less than 5 minutes to respond to a call regarding fire or life safety.

The City's Safety Element and County of San Luis Obispo Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan establishes goals, policies, and programs to reduce the threat to life, structures, and the environment caused by fire. Policy S-2 identifies that new development should be designed to withstand natural and manmade hazards to acceptable levels of risk. Implementation strategies include adoption of the most recent safety requirements in the California Building and Fire Codes, using the planning and technical criteria presented in the Safety Element, and avoiding portions of sites with high hazard areas.

The California Fire Code provides minimum standards for many aspects of fire prevention and suppression activities. These standards include provisions for emergency vehicle access, water supply, fire protection systems, and the use of fire-resistant building materials.

Discussion

a) *Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?*

   Implementation of the proposed project would not have a permanent impact on any adopted emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans. Temporary construction activities and staging would not substantially alter existing circulation patterns or trips. Access to adjacent areas would be maintained throughout the duration of the project. Therefore, the project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. **Potential impacts would be less than significant.**

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?*

   The project site is located within an established residential neighborhood adjacent to the ocean. It is not in close proximity to areas subject to wildfire risks, is generally level, and therefore would not expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or an uncontrolled spread of a wildfire. ***Potential impacts would be less than significant.***

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?*

   The proposed project includes a request to demolish portions of an existing residence on an existing residential lot and construct a new single-family residence. Redesign of the residence will include a new driveway; all other utilities are existing and would continue to serve the property. ***Impacts would be less than significant.***

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?*

   The project site is located in a residential zone on an existing single-family residential lot. The lot is generally

level and does not pose a risk to people or structures related to downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes. Therefore, ***impact would be less than significant.***

Conclusion
The project site is located within an existing residential neighborhood and is not adjacent or within close proximity to areas at high risk of wildfire or similar events. Development of the proposed residence will comply with California Building and Fire Code standards; ***the project would result in less than significant impacts related to wildfire and no mitigation measures are required.***

Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XXI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitatof 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 orrestrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☐	☒
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.)	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

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?

The project is located in an urban area within an existing single-family residential neighborhood, surrounded by similarly developed residential lots. The project site is not located within or adjacent to an area known to support sensitive fish or wildlife species. Development of a residence on an existing single-family lot does not have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, or impact the habitat, population, or community of a fish or wildlife species. ***There are no anticipated project-related impacts.***

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)?

Potential cumulative impacts of the proposed project have been analyzed within the discussion of each

environmental topical/resource area above. ***Cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project would be less than significant.***

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

Environmental impacts that may have an adverse effect on human beings, either directly or indirectly, are analyzed in each environmental topical/resource section above. ***Impacts would be considered less than significant.***

Conclusion

In light of the whole record, as discussed and analyzed in each environmental topical/resource section, implementation of the General Plan Amendment and subsequent development of a new single-family residence on an existing residential lot in an urban area, would not meet or exceed the identified thresholds and therefore, ***impacts are considered less than significant.***

References

CAL FIRE. 2007. "Draft Fire Hazard Severity Zones in Local Responsibility Areas." Available at http://frap.fire.ca.gov/webdata/maps/san_luis_obispo/fhszl06_1_map.40.pdf

California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2019. EnviroStor. Available at: https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov/public/

United States Geological Survey (USGS). 2019. Areas of Land Subsidence in California. Available at: <https://ca.water.usgs.gov/land_subsidence/california-subsidence-areas.html>

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2019. National Wetlands Inventory Surface Waters and Wetlands. May 5, 2019. Available at: <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/Mapper.html>

Flood Emergency Management Agency, Flood Map Service Center (2017).

Pacific Coast Testing, 2021. Geotechnical Investigation Report.

The following checked (☒) reference materials have been used in the environmental review for the proposed project and are hereby incorporated by reference into the Initial Study. The following information is available at the City of Pismo Beach Community Development Department.

☒ Project File for the Subject Application
☐ General Plan, includes all maps/elements, more pertinent elements
- ☒ Circulation
- ☒ Conservation & Open Space
- ☒ Design
- ☐ Facilities
- ☐ Growth Management
- ☒ Housing
- ☒ Land Use
- ☒ Noise
- ☒ Parks, Recreation, and Access
- ☒ Safety

☒ 1983 Zoning Code
☐ 1998 Zoning Code
☒ Building and Construction Ordinance
☒ Public Facilities Fee Ordinance
☒ Climate Action Plan
☒ Multi-Jurisdictional Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
☒ Clean Air Plan / APCD Handbook
☒ Uniform Fire Code
☐ Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for San Luis Obispo County
☐ Stormwater Management Program
☒ Water Quality Control Plan (Region 3)
☒ Fire Hazard Severity Map
☒ Flood Hazard Maps