



Initial Study/Negative Declaration for  
Amendments to the Development  
Code, Land Use Element of the  
General Plan, and Local Coastal  
Program to Implement Programs  
Identified in the 2020-2028 Housing  
Element, City of Grover Beach,  
California

APRIL 2022

PREPARED FOR  
**City of Grover Beach**

PREPARED BY  
**SWCA Environmental Consultants in consultation with MIG**



<b>DA NO.</b>	22-11	<b>Environmental Document No.</b>	2022-01
<b>State Clearinghouse</b>			
<b>PROJECT TITLE:</b>	Amendments to the Development Code, Land Use Element of the General Plan, and Local Coastal Program to Implement Programs Identified in the 2020-2028 Housing Element		
<b>APPLICANT NAME &amp; PHONE NUMBER:</b>	City of Grover Beach (805) 473-4528	<b>Email</b>	commdev@groverbeach.org
<b>MAILING ADDRESS:</b>	154 South 8th Street	Grover Beach, CA	93433
<b>STAFF CONTACT:</b>	Bruce Buckingham, Community Development Director	(805) 473-4520	commdev@groverbeach.org
<b>PROJECT ADDRESS:</b>	City Wide Project		

**PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

The City of Grover Beach’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 surrounding area and a detailed review of the information on file for the proposed project. In addition, available background information is reviewed for each project. Relevant information regarding soil types and characteristics, geological information, significant vegetation and/or wildlife resources, water availability, wastewater disposal service, existing land uses and surrounding land use categories and other information relevant to the environmental review process are evaluated for each project. The City of Grover Beach 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 Community Development Department, 154 South 8<sup>th</sup> Street, Grover Beach, CA 93433 or call (805) 473-4520 or via email at [commdev@groverbeach.org](mailto:commdev@groverbeach.org)



**INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE DECLARATION  
FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE DEVELOPMENT CODE, LAND  
USE ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN, AND LOCAL  
COASTAL PROGRAM TO IMPLEMENT PROGRAMS  
IDENTIFIED IN THE 2020-2028 HOUSING ELEMENT  
CITY OF GROVER BEACH, CALIFORNIA**

Prepared for

**City of Grover Beach**

Contact: Bruce Buckingham, Community Development Director  
154 South 8th Street  
Grover Beach, California 93433

Prepared by

**SWCA Environmental Consultants**

1422 Monterey Street, Suite C200  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401  
(805) 543-7095  
[www.swca.com](http://www.swca.com)

SWCA Project No. 66405

April 2022



# CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Project Location .....	1
1.2	Environmental Setting.....	1
1.3	Project Description.....	2
1.4	Required Discretionary Approvals.....	5
<b>2</b>	<b>Environmental Checklist and Environmental Evaluation.....</b>	<b>7</b>
I.	Aesthetics .....	8
II.	Agriculture and Forestry Resources .....	12
III.	Air Quality.....	14
IV.	Biological Resources.....	17
V.	Cultural Resources .....	23
VI.	Energy .....	26
VII.	Geology and Soils .....	28
VIII.	Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....	32
IX.	Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	34
X.	Hydrology and Water Quality .....	38
XI.	Land Use and Planning.....	42
XII.	Mineral Resources.....	43
XIII.	Noise.....	44
XIV.	Population and Housing .....	46
XV.	Public Services .....	48
XVI.	Recreation.....	51
XVII.	Transportation .....	52
XVIII.	Tribal Cultural Resources.....	54
XIX.	Utilities and Service Systems .....	56
XX.	Wildfire .....	59
XXI.	Mandatory Findings of Significance .....	61
<b>3</b>	<b>References .....</b>	<b>63</b>

# 1 INTRODUCTION

The City of Grover Beach (City) adopted the 2020-2028 Housing Element in November 2020. The Housing Element consolidated many goals and policies from the previous 2014 Housing Element to aid in implementation and to eliminate redundancy and created 13 new programs that remove barriers to housing construction and implement recent changes in State law. Adoption included changes to the Land Use Element (LUE) Map and the Development Code Zoning Map to rezone five parcels to increase the maximum unit capacity to 56 and resulted in a potential increase of 46 new housing units, but did not include text amendment to implement the other programs identified in the Housing Element. Many of the programs from the Housing Element look to facilitate new development with a focus on housing and aim to achieve consistency with State law.

Since 2017, several significant pieces of housing legislation have been adopted by the California Legislature. The Legislature's aim has been focused on ensuring that all jurisdictions provide real opportunities for housing development for people of all income levels—and for lower-income households in particular. In 2017, a package of 15 housing bills brought about significant change, followed each year by additional legislation. Specifically, these bills increase local by-right approvals of multi-family and mixed-use projects by removing discretionary actions, streamline projects with affordable housing units, allow transitional and supportive housing by-right, provide density bonuses and concessions for projects providing affordable housing, remove or reduce parking requirements on certain residential projects, and promote the building of accessory dwelling units.

## 1.1 Project Location

The proposed update would apply citywide within the boundaries of the City of Grover Beach. The city is approximately 2.25 square mile and is located in southern San Luis Obispo County, south of Pismo Beach, north of Oceano, and west of Arroyo Grande. United States Highway 101 (US) is located along the northern boundary of the city and State Route 1 (Highway 1) runs parallel to the western boundary, between the urban city and the Pacific Ocean, with beach lands controlled by California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks).

## 1.2 Environmental Setting

Grover Beach is situated on a broad coastal plain that stretches from the coastal dunes to the Arroyo Grande Valley. The beach and dune area adjacent to the city lie within Pismo State Beach which is managed by the California Department of Parks and Recreation. The city is separated from the beach by the northerly terminus of the coastal dune complex that has formed along the shore from Grover Beach to Point Sal. The dunes provide opportunities for recreation and for the protection of sensitive natural resources. (City of Grover Beach 2010)

The Coastal Zone in Grover Beach spans approximately 4,100 feet of coastline and extends inland to the east approximately 3,000 to 6,500 feet. The coast in Grover Beach is characterized by a sandy, flat beach with sand dunes lining the beach's eastern edge. A mixture of agricultural, residential, commercial, and industrial uses can be found east of the dunes. (City of Grover Beach 1981)

The following Chapters and/or Sections of the Development Code, Article IX, constitute the City's ordinances for the implementation of the Grover Beach Local Coastal Program (LCP).

- Chapter 1 – Purpose and Applicability. All Sections.
- Chapter 2 – Zone and Allowable Land Uses. Section 2.10 that affects the CPR1, CR1, CR2, CR3, CVS, CC, CI, CIC, CGC, COS, CPB and CVB zones; Section 2.20 that affects the CPR1, CR1, CR2 and CR3 zones; Section 2.30 that affects the CVS and CC zones; Section 2.40 that affects the CI and CIC zones; Section 2.70 that affects the CGC, COS, CPB, and CVB zones; and Section 2.90 Overlay Zones.
- Chapter 3 - Standards for All Development and Land Uses. All Sections.
- Chapter 4 - Standards for Specific Development and Land Uses. All Sections. 5. Chapter 5 - Site Development Regulations. All Sections.
- Chapter 6 - Procedures. Sections 6.10, 6.20.040, 6.20.050, 6.20.100, and 6.30.
- Chapter 7 - Administration. All Sections.
- Chapter 8 - Subdivision Regulations. All Sections.
- Chapter 9 - Definitions. Sections 9.10.020 and 9.10.030.

## 1.3 Project Description

The City of Grover Beach is proposing to amend its Development Code (Article IX of the Grover Beach Municipal Code), LUE of the General Plan, and Local Coastal Program (LCP) (referred to throughout this document as the “amendments” or “project”) in order to implement programs identified in the 2020-2028 Housing Element that was adopted in November 2020, including Senate Bill 2 (SB 2) Planning Grants programs. The Housing Element programs are the specific actions the City must undertake to implement the Housing Element within two years of adoption and require the City to update its General Plan LUE, Development Code, and Local Coastal Program. Full text of the proposed amendments is provided in Appendix A. The programs from the Housing Element covered by this update are generally categorized within three topic areas:

### **Efforts to Remove Barriers to Housing Construction**

The following amendments within the Development Code are intended to remove barriers to housing construction and encourage “affordability by design”:

- Revisions to the method of measurement for height, setback, private open space, landscaping, projections, and other site planning regulations for all zones.
- Adoption of Objective Design Standards (ODS) for all residential and mixed-use projects for consistency with the Housing Accountability Act, as amended, and implementation of the adopted Housing Element.
- Revisions to allow for an increase in height on West Grand Avenue from 40 feet to 55 feet, as measured from finished grade (currently a 50-foot-height is limited to the corner of 4<sup>th</sup> Street and Grand Avenue within the Coastal Visitor Serving (CVS) and Visitor Serving (VS) zones and the entirety of Central Business (CB) zone where it fronts West Grand Avenue). This increase would affect the entirety of the Coastal Visitor Serving (CVS), Visitor Serving (VS), Central Business (CB), and Central Business Open (CBO) zones along the West Grand Avenue corridor east of Highway 1.

- Use of fractional density citywide to incentivize smaller units consistent with the City’s desire to promote “affordable by design” housing options, which produces smaller market rate units but are not deed restricted to low-income household. These units would count as a fraction of a density unit as follows:
  - < 600 square feet = 0.50 unit
  - 601 - 1,000 square feet = 0.66 unit
  - 2-bedroom units and/or 1,000+ square feet = 1.00 unit
- Revisions to the parking standards to facilitate fractional densities. For those multi-family and mixed-use projects that incorporate at least 50 percent fractional density units, the guest parking requirement would be waived and the minimum parking requirement would be reduced to one space per unit. For planned unit developments (PUDs), the garage requirement would be removed (parking may be provided in a carport or on an open parking space).
- Elimination of the Use Permit requirement for residential development in the CBO zone, senior housing in all zones where it is permitted, and Live/Work Units in all zones where it is permitted.
- Elimination of the Office Professional (OP) zone designation and rezone the few parcels where OP applies as CBO.
- Elimination of High Occupancy Residential Use as a land use type and the related definitions.
- Elimination of subjective “view” findings for consistency with the Housing Accountability Act, limit second story construction to 80% of the ground floor area, and remove the requirement for a Development Permit in R1, CPR1, and CR1 zones.
- Reduction of front setbacks in residential zones (from 20 feet to 15 feet in R-1, CPR1, and CR1 zones and from 15 feet to 10 feet in R2, CR2, R3, and CR3 zones).
- Creation of a new Zoning Clearance process for ministerial projects to ensure compliance with Development Code standards.
- Allow Mixed Use Projects as an allowed use and Lodging as a conditionally permitted use in Coastal Industrial Commercial (CIC) zone, and increase maximum building height from 25 feet to 40 feet.
- Allow Live/Work Units as an allowed use in CVS and CC zones, subject to a Zoning Clearance.
- Modification of street improvement regulations (Development Code Section 5.20) to exempt Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) from street improvements, modify the existing 40% increase in square footage threshold to a 40% threshold or 500 square feet, whichever is greater, modify the requirements for street conforms, and eliminate the requirement to reconstruct street to the centerline if the pavement condition index is less than 60.
- Elimination of the requirement to underground primary utility lines and the current in-lieu fee, except for areas of the City that do not have existing overhead utilities and/or new subdivisions.

**Items that Directly Implement the Housing Element**

The following amendments are required to implement Housing Element programs as described below.

- Implementation of the Housing Accountability Act and Creation of Objective Design Standards including the following revisions directly related to the LUE of the General Plan and the Development Code:
  - Revisions to the LUE to remove subjective policies.
  - Revisions to the Development Code to modify the Development Permit process to remove the following from requiring a Development Permit and instead allow with ministerial review through a Zoning Clearance process:
    - Residential Projects – projects with 4 or less units
    - Mixed-Use Projects – projects with 9 or less units
    - Affordable Housing Projects – projects that provide 25% or greater of the residential units as deed restricted to very-low and low-income households
  - Revisions to the LUE to remove subjective policies and revisions to the Development Code to remove subjective standards and create objective standards for single-unit dwellings, multiple detached dwellings/cluster developments, small attached multi-unit developments (fewer than four units), large attached multi-unit development projects (five or more units) and mixed-use. Proposed objective design standards include:
    - Site planning for building orientation and primary entrances
    - Massing
    - Circulation (pedestrian and vehicular)
    - Parking area design
    - Building amenities
    - Articulation, materials, and variation in height and roof forms
    - Building transparency
    - Landscaping
    - Utilities and service areas
    - Open space
  - Revisions to the Development Code to add a “Modification to Standards” process, to allow minor modifications approved at the Director level and deviations from the objective design standards through a discretionary Planning Commission review.
  - Addition to the Development Code to establish noticing requirements for Administrative Development Permits (discretionary).
- Revisions to the Development Code Section 2.50.020 to prohibit all residential uses in the Public Facilities (PF) zone.
- Revisions to the Development Code Density Bonus Ordinance (Development Code Chapter 3.20) to comply with State law and clarify implementation procedures.
- Revisions to the Development Code ADU Ordinance (Development Code Section 4.10.15) to comply with new State laws that became effective January 1, 2021 and additional measures to encourage ADUs, including allowing for ADU construction above garages.
- Revisions to the Development Code to update the Emergency Shelter Overlay Zone (Development Section 2.90.030) to remove the maximum occupancy limitation and comply with State law pertaining to parking standards, indicating that parking shall be limited to a demonstrated need with corresponding revisions to the definition of Emergency Shelter in Development Code Section 9.10.020 to comply with State law definitions.

- Revisions to the Development Code to allow Low Barrier Navigation Centers (Section 2.30.030 [Commercial Allowed Uses] and 9.10.020) by-right in all Commercial and Coastal Commercial zones and the Industrial and Coastal Industrial zones. Development Code text amendments also include a new definition in Development Code Section 9.10.020.
- Revisions to the Development Code to allow Supportive and Transitional Housing (9.10.020: Definitions and New Section 4.10.205: Supportive Housing) by-right in zones where multi-family and mixed-uses are permitted, consistent with AB 2162, and establish no parking requirement for units occupied by supportive housing residents if the development is located within one-half mile of a public transit stop. "Public transit stop" includes local bus stops, rail stops, and bus rapid transit stops. Per State law, these uses must be allowed ministerially (not through a Development Permit process).
- Revisions to the Development Code to add incentives for Child Care Facilities within multifamily developments, including a reduced parking requirement and the addition of standard conditions for childcare facilities, including those required for compliance with SB 234 (Large Family Daycare).
- Revisions to the Development Code to establish a written procedure for the SB 35 streamlining approval process and to add standards for eligible projects, consistent with Government Code Section 65913.4.

#### **Additional Items that Address Recent Changes in State Housing Law**

Revisions to the Development Code pursuant to SB 9, to implement changes to allow for urban lot splits and duplexes in single family zones.

#### **Local Coastal Program Amendments**

Minor amendment to Section 1.3 of the Local Coastal Program (Relationship to the Development Code) to reference new permit procedures sections added to the Development Code (Zoning Clearance and Modifications to Standards).

#### **Additional Items**

- Removal of the Administrative Use Permit process and revising the permit requirement for any allowed uses to either by-right/Zoning Clearance review or Use Permit review, including health/fitness facilities, thrift stores, day care centers, vehicle rental, meeting facilities, and studios for art, dance, and martial arts.
- Various minor revisions to clarify rules of measurement, allowed encroachments into setbacks and height limits, and existing policies, procedures, and standards.
- Various minor revisions to development standards in the Development Code including language cleanup.
- Inclusion of standards to halt construction in the event cultural or paleontological resources are encountered during construction.

## **1.4 Required Discretionary Approvals**

The proposed amendments require review by the City's Planning Commission which will make a recommendation to the City Council. The Council will take final action on the amendments in the non-

coastal areas of the city. The amendments that apply to properties within the Coastal Zone portion of the City will require review and certification by the California Coastal Commission (CCC). The CCC can accept the amendments, make revisions to the amendments, or deny the amendments. Any revisions by the CCC to the amendments would require acceptance by the City Council before taking affect.

## 2 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST AND ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION

### 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.

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

### ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measure based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Date:

4/4/22

Signed:

Bruce Barkley

# I. Aesthetics

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:</i>				
(a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

A scenic vista is a view of natural environmental, historic, and/or architectural features possessing visual and aesthetic qualities of value to the community. The term “vista” generally implies an expansive view, usually from an elevated point or open area. According to the City’s Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE), scenic vistas are typically categorized as either panoramic views (which provide visual access to a large geographic area) or focal views (visual access to a particular object, scene, setting, or feature of interest). In Grover Beach, scenic resources and vistas include views of open spaces (i.e., beaches, coastal dunes, rolling hills, and wetlands). The goals, policies, and implementation programs in the COSE are intended to conserve and properly manage natural and scenic resources in the city. These goals, policies, and implementation programs are intended to protect the following identified scenic resources in the city: views of the hills to the north and east of the city; views of the beach, dunes, wetlands, and Pismo Lake; and views of the Pacific Ocean and Meadow Creek to the west and hills to the north from Highway 1. (City of Grover Beach 2021a)

The City’s COSE identifies scenic resources and vistas in the city as beaches, coastal dunes, rolling hills, and wetlands. Some city streets offer views of the hills to the north and east. West Grand Avenue, Fourth Street, and many other streets provide views of the beach, dunes, wetlands, and Pismo Lake. A stretch of Highway 1 that passes through Grover Beach (from Pismo Beach to Oceano) is eligible as a Caltrans state scenic highway. This stretch of Highway 1 provides views of the Pacific Ocean and Meadow Creek to the west and hills to the north. (City of Grover Beach 2020a)

A small portion of the city is located within the Coastal Zone and is also subject to visual policies identified within the City’s LCP. The City’s LCP identifies nine visual resources within the city, including Pismo State Beach; the area between the city’s northern boundary and Ocean View Avenue; the area between Ocean View Avenue and Ramona Avenue to the south along the city’s western edge; the area south of Ocean View Avenue to Ramona Avenue and east of North First Street; a six-block area between Grand Avenue, Fourth Street, and Highway 1; the area south of Rockaway Avenue along the east side of South 4<sup>th</sup> Street; the area south of Rockaway Avenue and west of South 4<sup>th</sup> Street; the area south of

Farroll Avenue; and, the area south of Calvin Court including the South 4<sup>th</sup> Street right-of-way. (City of Grover Beach 1981)

The City's COSE includes several policies related to aesthetic resources.

**Policy COS-1.1 Open Space/Resource Conservation Land.** The City shall ensure the following types of land are designated as open space in future land use element update: a. Sensitive habitats or unique resources such as oak woodlands, riparian/creek corridors, significant wetlands and corridors which connect habitats; b. Those areas which are best suited to non-urban uses due to: i. Infeasibility of providing proper access or utilities; ii. Excessive slope or slope instability; iii. Wildland fire hazard; iv. Noise exposure; v. Flood hazard; and vi. Scenic value.

**Policy COS-1.3 Natural Character.** Buildings, lighting, paving, use of vehicles, and alterations to natural landforms and native or traditional landscapes on open space lands should be minimized, so natural character and resources are maintained. Implementation COS-1.b Review development projects for consistency with the above policy as part of the development review process.

**Policy COS-1.4 Hillside.** Update development standards for hillside development to require the following:

- a. New development conforms to the natural slopes and does not exceed the 25 foot maximum building height;
- b. Avoid large, continuous walls or roof surfaces, or prominent foundation walls, poles, or columns;
- c. Minimize grading on individual lots;
- d. Use materials, colors, and textures which blend with the natural landscape and avoid high contrasts;
- e. Minimize exterior lighting and comply with International Dark-Sky Association standards.

The City's LCP defines nine Visual Resource Areas in the city as having distinct visual qualities and characteristics. The following policies are relevant to Areas 3 and 5, which are areas that would be affected by proposed height limit amendments:

**Area 3 Policy 1:** As the Coastal Visitor Serving area west of Highway 1 redevelops into consistent visitor serving uses, the allowed development shall be sited and designed to protect the existing view corridors perpendicular to Highway 1, along Grand Avenue and LeSage Drive, and create one to three additional view corridors perpendicular to Highway 1 north of LeSage Drive. The development in this area shall be complimentary and subordinate to the character of the shoreline and dune setting to the fullest extent feasible

**Area 3 Policy 2:** As the areas east of Highway 1 in this area develop or redevelop, the area shall be screened from the Highway 1 viewshed by shrubs and low growing trees (8' to 12' mature height).

**Area 3 Policy 3:** As the areas east of Highway 1 in this area develop or redevelop, the scenic and visual qualities of the dunes, shoreline and ocean shall be addressed in the siting and designing of

the projects. The viewshed over this area and to the shoreline environs are of major importance. Where feasible visually degraded areas shall be enhanced.

**Area 5 Policy 1:** Future developments along this commercial strip shall be limited to structures which are visually appealing to beach visitors and tourists. Design, material and landscaping requirements shall promote imaginative development compatible with the adopted City architectural guidelines.

**Area 5 Policy 2:** The existing slot view on Grand Avenue toward the dunes and shoreline shall be protected and enhanced where feasible.

The City's Development Code also includes standards for fences, walls, screening, outdoor lighting, landscaping requirements, and sign regulations.

## **Environmental Evaluation**

### **a) *Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?***

Grover Beach is in an area considered to have high scenic value. The city's western edge along the Pacific Ocean consists of beach, coastal dunes, and riparian habitat, and the city's northern edge contains oak-wooded hillsides and Meadow Creek. The City's LCP contains policies regarding the protection of scenic resources within the Coastal Zone (Placeworks 2020). For instance, the LCP defines nine Visual Resource Areas in the city as having distinct visual qualities and characteristics and mandates special consideration of the scenic quality of these areas during the review of all development proposals. Additionally, COSE Policy COS-1.4 regulates hillside development by mandating that new development conform to the natural slopes, avoid large, continuous walls or roof surfaces, or prominent foundation walls, poles, or columns, minimize grading of roads and on individual lots, use materials, colors, and textures that blend with the natural landscape and avoid high contrasts, and minimize exterior lighting (Placeworks 2020). Furthermore, the Development Code contains development standards, including building height restrictions and building siting requirements for the purpose of minimizing potential impacts on the local viewshed.

The project would allow for an increase in height on West Grand Avenue from 40 feet to 55 feet from finished grade in the CVS, VS, CB, and CBO zones, which are generally located along West Grand Avenue from Highway 1 to 14<sup>th</sup> Street, constituting one block on either side. Currently a 50-foot-height is limited to the corner of 4<sup>th</sup> Street and West Grand Avenue and the entire CB zone. The City's LCP identifies the six-block area between Grand Avenue, Fourth Street, and Highway 1 as a visual resource (identified as Area 5); this is within the area that already allows for a 50-foot height limit. The revision to the height limit east of 4<sup>th</sup> Street is outside the designated visual resource area, is not an area that is within a scenic vista viewshed, and would not result in impacts to scenic vistas.

Additionally, the amendments would increase the height limit in the CIC zone from 25 feet to 40 feet. This area is within a visual resource area identified by the City's LCP (Area 3), though it is described as being of poor quality and utilitarian in nature, and is not considered a scenic vista. This area, including the CIC zone, is almost entirely developed. Future development in the CIC zone utilizing the proposed height increase would not result in a substantial adverse effect on scenic views of the Pacific Ocean, which are visible east of the CIC zone, from higher elevations in the city, including along and near Ocean View Avenue, due to intervening topography and existing development. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?**

A stretch of Highway 1 that passes through Grover Beach (from Pismo Beach to Oceano) is eligible as a California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) state scenic highway but is not currently designated as a state scenic highway. This stretch of Highway 1 provides views of the Pacific Ocean and Meadow Creek to the west and hills to the north. The proposed amendments would not remove policies in the City's COSE, LCP, or Development Code that are in place with the intent of protecting scenic resources. Future residential projects resulting from the proposed amendments, including by-right development, would be required to comply with the policies in the General Plan, LCP, and Development Code requirements, including those relevant to protection of trees. Development subject to the proposed height increase along West Grand Avenue would not be visible from Highway 1. Therefore, with adherence to existing regulations, including those pertaining to tree removal, impacts resulting from future development relevant to the proposed amendments would be less than significant.

**c) In non-urbanized areas, would the project 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 proposed amendments would allow for additional development through incentives for smaller and affordable units, which, if implemented would result in denser residential development. This type of development would be located in existing residential zones and commercial zones that allow for mixed-use development (including live/work units). The amendments would also allow for an increase in height on West Grand Avenue between Highway 1 and 14<sup>th</sup> Street from 40 feet to 55 feet from finished grade. Currently a 50-foot-height is limited to corner of 4<sup>th</sup> Street and West Grand Avenue and the CB zone. The amendments would allow an addition five feet to accommodate building construction styles in areas with an existing 50-foot height limit and would allow an additional 15 feet farther east along West Grand Avenue to 14<sup>th</sup> Street. Additionally, the height of the CIC zone, along Front Street between Atlantic City Avenue and Ramona Avenue, would be increased from 25 feet to 40 feet. The amendments would require projects with five or more units that are three stories in height or taller to incorporate either upper floor step backs, setbacks, or cutouts to help reduce visual massing of multistory development. Future development utilizing the proposed height increases would not have a substantial adverse effect on the visual character of the area, including views of the Pacific Ocean, which are visible east of the CIC zone, at higher elevations along and near Ocean View Avenue, due to intervening topography and existing development. Additionally, the additional heights along West Grand Avenue would not degrade the existing visual character because these heights are already allowed further west along West Grand Avenue and they would not block views of the Pacific Ocean, which are visible traveling west along West Grand Avenue. With implementation of the proposed amendments and adherence to existing policies, impacts would be less than significant.

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

While the proposed amendments would allow for additional development through incentives for smaller and affordable units, the update does not alter or remove any existing policies related to lighting. Future development in the city would be required to be designed and constructed in accordance with Section 3.10.040 of the Development Code, which regulates outdoor lighting. With adherence to this regulation, impacts would be less than significant.

## Conclusion

Visual impacts resulting from the proposed amendments would be less than significant and would not impact scenic vistas or scenic resource within a state scenic highway, would not change the visual character of the city, and through existing regulations would not create substantial new impacts resulting from light and glare.

## Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary.

## II. Agriculture and Forestry Resources

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>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:</i>				
(a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

One 40-acre property on the southern boundary of the city remains in agricultural operation. This property is zoned Urban Reserve and will remain in agricultural use until development is initiated by the property owner. No other areas in the city contain soils that are suitable for productive agricultural uses. (City of Grover Beach 2020a). All lands within the city are identified as Urban and Built-Up Land or Other Land, with the exception of the 40-acre property on the southern boundary of the city (Okui's Strawberries), which is designated Farmland of Statewide Importance (FMMP 2021). The City of Grover Beach does not contain any forest land, timberland, or land under Williamson Act contract.

## Environmental Evaluation

- a) ***Would the project 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?***

The amendments would not create policies that would result in the rezoning or change of land use designation of the single 40-acre property at the southern boundary of the city. Therefore, there would be no impact.

- b) ***Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?***

There is no land subject to a Williamson Act contract within the city limits. Therefore, there would be no impact.

- c) ***Would the project 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))? and***

- d) ***Would the project result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?***

The city does not contain any lands zoned for forestland, timberland, or timberland production. Therefore, there would be no impact.

- e) ***Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?***

Implementation of the amendments would not result in conversion of Farmland or forestland. Additionally, there are no agricultural areas adjacent to city limits. Therefore, there would be no impact.

## Conclusion

New housing units facilitated by the proposed amendments would not impact Important Farmland, forestland, or timberland. The amendments would not facilitate the conversion of agricultural land to residential land; no property within the city limits are subject to Williamson Act contracts. No significant impacts to agricultural resources would occur.

## Mitigation Measures

No mitigation is necessary.

### III. Air Quality

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>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:</i>				
(a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Setting

Grover Beach is located within the San Luis Obispo County portion of the South Central Coast Air Basin, which is under the jurisdiction of the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD) and also includes Santa Barbara County and Ventura County. SLOAPCD regulates air quality in San Luis Obispo County through its Clean Air Plan (CAP), Particulate Matter (PM) Report, and construction monitoring, among other measures. Airflow around the county plays an important role in the movement and dispersion of pollutants. The speed and direction of local winds are controlled by the location and strength of the Pacific high-pressure system and other global weather patterns, topographical factors, and circulation patterns that result from temperature differences between the land and the sea. Throughout the county, ozone and particular matter of 10 microns or less in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>) are the pollutants of primary concern, since exceedances of state health-based standards for those pollutants are experienced in the county during most years, particularly in Paso Robles, Atascadero, and the Carrizo Plain. Ozone levels exceeding the federal and state standards have been measured in Paso Robles, Atascadero, and the Carrizo Plain in recent years.

Sources of PM<sub>10</sub> emissions include agricultural operations, construction activities, and vehicular emissions, of which, vehicular emissions are the primary source of precursors to ozone (Placeworks 2020). The county’s local air quality conditions have been increasingly adversely affected by wildfire smoke. According to SLOAPCD’s Air Quality Report (2020), in April 2018, the United States Environmental Protection Agency designated the eastern portion of the county as a marginal non-attainment zone for ozone; the western portion of the county, including the City of Grover Beach, retained its attainment status (SLOAPCD 2022).

The CAP presents a detailed description of the sources and pollutants that 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. In order to be considered consistent with the San Luis Obispo County CAP, a project must be consistent with the land use planning and transportation control measures and strategies outlined in the CAP.

The 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. This handbook includes 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 (NO<sub>x</sub>), 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. The 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 projects can also include components that generate direct emissions, such as power plants, gasoline stations, dry cleaners, and refineries (referred to as stationary source emissions). General screening criteria are used by the SLOAPCD to determine the type and scope of air quality assessment required for a particular project (Table 1-1 in the SLOAPCD 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 SLOAPCD'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 10% of exceeding the screening criteria.

## **Environmental Evaluation**

### **a) *Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?***

In order to be considered consistent with the 2001 San Luis Obispo County CAP, a project must be consistent with the land use planning and transportation control measures and strategies outlined in the CAP (SLOAPCD 2012).

The 2001 SLOCAP includes land use management strategies to guide decision makers on land use approaches that result in improved air quality. The SLOCAP calls for building compact communities to limit urban sprawl, mix complementary land uses such as commercial services with higher-density housing, increase residential and commercial densities along transit corridors, and increase pedestrian-friendly and interconnected streetscapes, helping to make alternative means of transportation more convenient.

The amendments, which implement the adopted Housing Element, are consistent with the City's Circulation Element that incorporates tactics to increase pedestrian and bicycle pathways, development of transit facilities, and other actions to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) within the city. Future development would be subject to current policies and standards described in the Circulation Element and the Development Code and would not change any programs or policies that provide regulatory guidance for air quality issues. Therefore, the proposed amendments would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of air quality plans, and impacts would be less than significant.

**b) *Would the project 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?***

Heavy equipment and earth-moving operations generate fugitive dust and combustion emissions. These may have substantial temporary impacts on local air quality. Fugitive dust emissions would result from land clearing, grading operations, and construction equipment operations over the unpaved project site. Combustion emissions, such as NO<sub>x</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, are most significant when using large diesel-fueled scrapers, loaders, bulldozers, haul trucks, compressors, generators, and other types of equipment. Most projects facilitated by the amendments would be small in nature and would not be expected to exceed the SLOAPCD emission thresholds, which typically require approximately 4 acres of ground disturbance (PM<sub>10</sub>) or approximately 44,000 cubic yards of earthwork (ROG and NO<sub>x</sub> combined).

Proposed future development resulting from the amendments would not result in a significant long-term impact to air quality. The Housing Element anticipated population and housing growth consistent with the LUE based on household size and dwelling unit potential for this planning period and has policies and programs designed to promote compact urban growth, encourage mixed use, promote housing within walking or biking distance of employment or school, and encourage downtown housing close to jobs, services, government, recreation, and more. Any proposed development resulting from the proposed amendments would be subject to policies and standards described in the 2001 SLOCAP and General Plan to mitigate short-term construction emissions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**c) *Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?***

The amendments do not propose specific development plans; therefore, exact air quality impacts including potential sensitive receptors are unknown at this time. However, future development is expected to be primarily infill development, which would be located in close proximity to residences, schools, and/or parks. Any proposed projects would be subject to policies and standards described in the SLOCAP, as well as the General Plan and Municipal Code for construction standards regarding air quality, and impacts would be less than significant. Any large-scale development would trigger discretionary permit requirements and would necessitate project-level environmental review, which would evaluate potential impacts on sensitive receptors specific to the project.

The City routinely confers with the SLOAPCD regarding the acceptability of adjacent land uses and addresses compatibility of land uses in mixed-use developments. Limits on hours of construction and operation also reduce conflicts between residents and customers in mixed-use developments. The City's use permit requirement and performance standards for mixed-use development reduce potential impacts to less-than-significant levels.

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

The proposed amendments would reduce barriers to residential construction. Residential uses are not land uses that typically result in significant odor emissions. The City's Municipal Code provides standards related to trash-receptacles that aid in reducing odors. The city is located outside the SLOAPCD-identified areas for naturally occurring asbestos. Impacts would be less than significant.

## **Conclusion**

The amendments would be consistent with air quality standards described in the General Plan and 2001 SLOCAP, and the City's Circulation Element, which is consistent with the land use planning and transportation control measures and strategies outlined in the CAP. Future development that is fostered by

the amendments would be subject to SLOAPCD standard emission control standards during project construction.

### Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are required.

## IV. Biological Resources

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

Land use within the city limits consists almost entirely of residential and commercial/industrial areas. However, there are several designated Open Space zones that provide suitable habitat for special-status species. Plant communities and habitat types observed include willow riparian woodland, riparian scrub, coastal dunes, coast live oak woodland, freshwater/brackish marsh, coastal scrub, dune scrub, non-native (ruderal) grassland, seasonal wetlands, tree groves/windrows, and open water habitat. A total of 38 special-status plant species and 19 special status wildlife species were identified as occurring in the region and have the potential to occur in the city. Most of these areas are within the designated Open Space zones that are protected from future development (Placeworks 2020).

Riparian and dune habitat in Grover Beach is related to the city's proximity to the ocean and Meadow Creek. The beach and Meadow Creek are dominated by native habitats, some of which are sensitive plant communities. Grover Beach is home to riparian, wetland, coastal strand, coastal sage scrub, and central foredunes vegetation. The riparian corridor surrounding the eastern branch of Meadow Creek comprises the majority of the open space in the northeastern portion of the city. The eastern branch of Meadow Creek feeds the Pismo Lake Ecological Reserve, and the western branch passes through Pismo State Beach before meeting Arroyo Grande Creek outside the jurisdiction of the city. Native trees are located within the Meadow Creek area, including coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), western sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*), black cottonwood (*Populus trichocarpa*), Fremont cottonwood (*Populus fremontii*), red willow (*Salix laevigata*), and arroyo willow (*Salix lasiolepis*). (City of Grover Beach 2022a)

Applicable policies from the City's COSE include:

**Policy COS-1.1 Open Space/Resource Conservation Land.** The City shall ensure the following types of land are designated as open space in future land use element update: a. Sensitive habitats or unique resources such as oak woodlands, riparian/creek corridors, significant wetlands and corridors which connect habitats; b. Those areas which are best suited to non-urban uses due to: i. Infeasibility of providing proper access or utilities; ii. Excessive slope or slope instability; iii. Wildland fire hazard; iv. Noise exposure; v. Flood hazard; and vi. Scenic value.

**Policy COS-1.2 Open Space/Resource Uses.** Lands designated Open Space/Resource Conservation should be used for purposes that do not need urban services, major structures, or extensive landform changes. Such uses include: a. Unimproved trails; b. Watershed protection; c. Wildlife and native plant habitat; and d. Passive recreation.

**Policy COS-1.6 Natural Resources as Amenities.** New public or private developments adjacent to creeks, oak woodlands and wetlands shall consider the natural environment and incorporate the natural features as project amenities, provided doing so does not diminish natural values. Developments along creeks should include public access across the development site to the creek and along the creek, provided that wildlife habitat, public safety, and reasonable privacy and security of the development can be maintained.

**Policy COS-3.1 On-site Resource Preservation.** The City shall encourage new development to preserve on-site natural elements that contribute to the community's native plant and wildlife species value and to its aesthetic character.

**Policy COS-3.2 Agency Coordination.** The City shall support, and participate in, local and regional efforts of local, state and federal resource agencies to protect, restore and maintain viable, contiguous areas of habitat for sensitive plant and animal species.

**Policy COS-3.3 Riparian Habitat Protection.** The City shall preserve the ecological integrity of creek corridors that support riparian resources by preserving native riparian plants and, to the extent feasible, removing invasive nonnative plants. If preservation of the ecological integrity of existing resources is found to be infeasible, adverse impacts to riparian resources shall be fully mitigated consistent with the requirements of applicable state and federal regulations.

**Policy COS-3.4 Wetland Protection.** The City shall preserve and protect wetland resources including creeks and other seasonal wetland areas, to the extent feasible. If preservation of the ecological integrity of existing wetland resources is found to be infeasible, adverse impacts to such resources shall be fully mitigated consistent with the requirements of applicable state and federal regulations.

**Policy COS-3.5 Monitoring.** Monitoring of mitigation and restoration activities shall be consistent with requirements for each species or habitat as prescribed by the relevant regulatory jurisdictional agencies. For listed or candidate species, species of special concern, or sensitive habitats for which no mitigation or avoidance measures have been published, the City shall require evidence of coordination with the responsible agencies prior to acceptance of mitigation, avoidance measures, or monitoring requirements.

Inland resource areas which are within or are impacted by the City's portion of the Coastal Zone include a variety of natural systems and habitats which derive much of their resource value directly or indirectly from their interrelationship with the ocean. Natural systems include an extensive groundwater basin and a coastal wetlands complex containing portions of a creek, marsh, and an open lagoon. Several sensitive habitat areas dependent upon these bodies of water also fall in the category of inland resource areas. Coastal habitats include riparian, freshwater marsh, coastal woodland, sage chaparral, and lagoon communities. All of these habitats interact with one another and are characteristic of an undisturbed coastal environment. (City of Grover Beach 1981) The City's LCP includes the following relevant policies relevant to biological resources:

**Pismo Lake and Meadow Creek Policy 3.** A natural buffer area shall be established between the riparian habitat area of Meadow Creek and the adjacent upland areas to the South. This buffer zone shall be of sufficient width to provide essential open space between the environmentally sensitive habitat area and any development. The actual width of this buffer shall be determined by precise ecological studies which define and measure the functional capacity of the Meadow Creek ecosystem. Development upland of the environmentally sensitive habitat area and its adjacent buffer shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade the Meadow Creek and downstream Pismo Lake environs, and shall be compatible with the continuance of those habitat areas.

**Pismo Lake and Meadow Creek Policy 4.** Areas designated for development in the Meadow Creek uplands shall not exceed 5 units per gross acre. Any application for development must demonstrate the following: (a) That the project does not significantly alter presently occurring plant and animal populations in the Meadow Creek ecosystem in a manner that would impair the long-term stability of the Meadow Creek ecosystem; i.e., natural species diversity, abundance and composition are essentially unchanged as a result of the project. (b) That the project does not harm or destroy a species or habitat that is rare or endangered. (c) That the project does not significantly harm a species or habitat that is essential to the natural biological functioning of the Meadow Creek ecosystem. (d) That the project does not significantly reduce consumptive values of the Meadow Creek ecosystem.

**Pismo Lake and Meadow Creek Policy 5.** As the areas designated for low density development within the City limits in the Pismo Lake area actually develop, natural buffer areas and open space dedications shall be made for as much of the undeveloped land as feasible.

**Pismo Lake and Meadow Creek Policy 6.** The area generally known as the Meadow Creek Uplands shall be developed with clustered single family detached dwellings. The cluster design will aid in development which is sensitive to surrounding habitat areas. Development in this area shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade Pismo Lake and/or Meadow Creek habitat values. Please see approved development plan (Figure 1) at the end of this component. The number of dwelling units shown on this exhibit for areas within the Coastal Zone represent the maximum number allowed.

Access to development in the Meadow Creek upland area shall be via a 30' wide private residential street extension of North 5th Street ending in a cul-de-sac, and off of Charles Place connecting to Margarita Avenue. Parking shall be required as per existing City standards.

**Pismo Lake and Meadow Creek Policy 7.** All materials used to cover any part of the ground within the proposed developable areas, other than residential structures, public roads, public street improvements, and swimming pools shall be permeable. Permeable surfaces may consist of paving blocks, porous concrete, brick, or any other similar material which will permit percolation of precipitation and runoff into the ground.

**Pismo Lake and Meadow Creek Policy 8.** (a) Lands with a slope of 25% or greater shall not be developed. Lands with a slope between 10% and 25% may be developed if the development incorporates specific measures to minimize grading and drainage systems which limit the rate of runoff, including siltation and erosion, to that which occurs naturally on the undeveloped site. Applications for development on sites between 10% and 25% shall be accompanied by site specific professional engineering plans.

(b) Prior to the transmittal of a coastal development permit, the permittee shall submit a runoff control plan designed by a licensed engineer qualified in hydrology and hydraulics, which would assure no increase in peak runoff rate from developed site over the greatest discharge expected from the existing undeveloped site as a result of a 100 year frequency storm. Runoff control shall be accomplished by such means as on-site detention/desiltation basins or other devices. Energy dissipating measures at the terminus of outflow drains shall be constructed. The runoff control plan including supporting calculations shall be in accordance with the latest adopted City Standards and shall be submitted to and determined adequate in writing by the Community Development Department.

(c) All permanent erosion control devices shall be developed and installed prior to or concurrent with any on-site grading activities and shall be maintained. Periodic monitoring of said devices shall be carried out by the City and the Department of Fish and Game.

(d) All grading activities for roads, future building pads, utilities and installation of erosion and sedimentation devices shall be prohibited during September 30 through May 1. Prior to commencement of any grading activity, the permittee shall submit a grading schedule which indicates that grading will be completed within the permitted time frame designated in this condition and that any variation from the schedule shall be promptly reported to the Community Development Department.

(e) All areas disturbed by grading shall be planted prior to October 15th with temporary or permanent (as in the case of finished slopes) erosion control vegetation. Vegetative cover must be established by November 1 of each year. Said planting shall be accomplished under the supervision of a licensed landscape architect or landscape contractor and shall consist of seeding, mulching, fertilization and irrigation adequate to provide 90% coverage within 90 days. Planting shall be repeated if the required level of coverage is not established. This requirement shall apply to all disturbed soils including stockpiles, and to all building pads.

(f) Prior to transmittal of a coastal development permit, a detailed landscape plan indicating the type, size, extent, and location of plant materials, the proposed irrigation system, and other landscape features shall be submitted, reviewed and determined to be adequate by the Community Development Department. Drought tolerant plant materials shall be utilized to the maximum extent feasible.

(g) Moderate Soil Limitations: Cut and fill slopes on areas under 20% slope shall not be over 4:1 pitch and four feet high, compacted (if fill), with straw mulch broadcast and rolled at 3000 pounds per acre, and seeded with a grass and native shrub seed mixture generally having the following basic ratio of components: Native woody shrubs--6 lbs/acre Native herbaceous annuals and perennials--15 lbs/acre Native grasses--60 lbs/acre Wood fiber mulch with soil binder--1500 lbs/acre Fertilizer--150 lbs/acre Low Soil Limitations: Cut and fill slopes on areas under 10% slope shall not exceed 3:1 pitch and four feet in height. Disturbed soil shall be hydroseeded (no straw mulch needed) with the seed mixture as recommended above, except additional wood fiber shall be incorporated at a minimum of 2000 lbs/acre.

(h) Temporary dust controls shall be employed during construction. Watering down methods used to control dust shall not erode the soil. Downhill cut or fill areas shall be lined with straw bales to control erosion from runoff. Where exposed soil conditions exist within the landscaped and irrigated portions of the sites near dwellings, slopes shall be planted with ground cover netting to retain soil. Plant materials shall be selected, sized and spaced to achieve total soil surface coverage in one year with irrigation provided. Trees and shrubs having fibrous root systems shall be used. Any of the mulch and seed mitigation measures described in 8 (g) above may be used instead of erosion control netting.

(i) That the City and the State Department of Fish and Game be made "third party" to the project's CC and R's to the extent that the City and/or the Department of Fish and Game may come onto private property to inspect and if necessary perform maintenance on drainage and erosion control devices and place a lien on the subject properties to recover cost of said maintenance.

**Pismo Lake and Meadow Creek Policy 9.** (a) The removal of Coast Live Oaks and of Shagbark Manzanita from the developable as well as undevelopable land in the vicinity of Pismo Lake shall be prohibited except for emergency situations. Removal of vegetation, grading and other earth-moving activities in developable areas shall be minimized. Impacts of such activities shall be shown in site and grading plans and shall meet with the approval of the City. Landscaping in developable areas here shall be comprised primarily of native vegetation and shall be compatible with surrounding native vegetation.

(b) No development shall occur within 50 feet of the dripline of a solid canopy oak woodland.

(c) Areas of Shagbark Manzanita shall be left intact with other associated shrubs undisturbed. A buffer of natural vegetation 25 feet thick shall be maintained around the area of Shagbark Manzanita.

(d) As a condition of development approval lands below the 60 foot contour at a minimum in the Meadow Creek uplands areas shall be dedicated to the City or State Department of Fish and Game as public open space as an integral portion of the Pismo Lake Ecological Reserve.

**Meadow Creek (Western Branch) Policy 5.** That there shall be a minimum of a 50 foot buffer, or other appropriate buffer established by a habitat restoration plan approved by the Department of Fish and Game, on both sides of the portion of Meadow Creek north of Grand Avenue. The purpose of this buffer is to protect and enhance the habitat values and filtration capabilities of Meadow Creek while recognizing that for most of its length north of Grand Avenue there is existing development on both sides of the creek.

**General Policy 6.** Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas shall be buffered by a minimum of 50 feet. Development in areas adjacent to ESHA shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts

which would significantly degrade those areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of those habitat and recreation areas.

**General Policy 7.** New public or private developments adjacent to creeks, oak woodlands and wetlands must respect the natural environment and incorporate the natural features as project amenities, provided doing so does not diminish natural values. Developments along creeks should include public access across the development sites to the creek and along the creek, provided that wildlife habitat, public safety, and reasonable privacy and security of the development can be maintained.

**General Policy 8.** The City shall encourage new development to preserve on-site natural elements that contribute to the community's native plant and wildlife species value and to its aesthetic character.

**General Policy 9.** Policy: Prior to the approval of a project with the potential to adversely impact special status plant or animal species of their habitats, the City shall ensure compliance with the relevant provisions of state and federal laws relating to the preservation of rare, threatened, or endangered species and their habitat. Such laws include, but are not limited to, the federal and state Endangered Species Acts, and federal Clean Water Act.

**General Policy 10.** Where future development projects have the potential to impact natural plant communities or sensitive wildlife resources, the City shall require the project applicant to conduct appropriate surveys prepared by a qualified biologist in accordance with applicable regulatory guidelines. Such surveys shall identify and map any existing rare, threatened, or endangered plant and animal species and recommend appropriate mitigation measures.

## **Environmental Evaluation**

- a) ***Would the project 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? and***
- b) ***Would the project 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? and***
- c) ***Would the project 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? and***
- d) ***Would the project 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? and***
- e) ***Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?***

The proposed amendments do not identify specific development, and do not include changes to any existing policies that protect biological resources. The amendments would remove the discretionary

permit requirement for several uses and would allow other uses, consistent with State law, by-right, which would not trigger discretionary review or project-level CEQA analysis. Additionally, several of the amendments would allow higher density development, which could result in underutilized parcels being redeveloped. In general, development anticipated by the amendments would be infill development on parcels that are partially or completely disturbed and do not provide quality habitat for sensitive species.

Future by-right (and discretionary) development would remain subject to federal, state, and local policies regarding biological resources. These would include the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Federal Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act (CWA), California Fish and Game Code, the Native Plant Protection Act, California Water Code Division 7, and the California Endangered Species Act. Any development that would impact wetland features would be subject to CWA requirements, which would include a Section 404 permit and compensatory mitigation. Because of the developed nature of most of the properties affected by these amendments, it is very unlikely that any significant biological impacts would result from implementation of the proposed amendments. Compliance with federal and state law is required regardless of whether there is a CEQA process (through a discretionary permit requirement). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**f) *Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?***

There are no adopted habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans that are applicable to lands within the city and therefore there would be no impact.

**Conclusion**

The proposed amendments would primarily affect infill properties that are partially or completely disturbed and provide little habitat value for sensitive species. The amendments do not propose revisions to existing policies that protect biological resources, and future development would be subject to federal, state, and local policies regarding protection of biological resources.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are necessary.

**V. Cultural Resources**

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

The central coast of California was occupied at least as early as 10,000 years ago and lies within the ethnographic territory of the Chumash. Chumash is the term used for the family of closely related Chumashan languages spoken by the populations in this region. These languages have been divided into two broad groups—Northern Chumash (consisting only of Obispeño) and Southern Chumash (Purisimeño, Ineseño, Barbareño, Ventureño, and Island Chumash). Chumash place names in the project vicinity include Pismu (Pismo Beach), Tematatimi (along Los Berros Creek), and Tilhini (near San Luis Obispo; City of Grover Beach 2020a).

There is potential for archaeological sites to be present within the city of Grover Beach. The complete California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS) inventory, which documents known archaeological sites, is confidential and available for review on a project-by-project basis.

The City's COSE identifies the following policy relevant to cultural resources:

**Policy COS-4.1 Tribal Resources.** The City shall protect both known and potential tribal cultural resources.

**Implementation COS-4.a.** Review development projects for consistency with the above policy and other relevant provisions of State law relating to archaeological resources as part of the development review process.

**Implementation COS-4.b.** To discourage or avoid development on important cultural or archaeological sites, all available measures, including purchase of fee interest or development rights, shall be explored at the time of a development proposal. Where such measures are not feasible and development would adversely affect identified archaeological or paleontological resources, adequate mitigation shall be required.

**Implementation COS-4.c.** The City will work with appropriate resource agencies to develop and regularly update a map of cultural resource sites and structures over 50 years old where additional review may be required.

**Implementation COS-4.d.** To discourage or avoid non-development activities that could damage or destroy archaeological sites. Prohibit unauthorized collection of artifacts.

**Implementation COS-4.e.** As sites become known, the City will maintain archaeological site records to be kept confidential to protect the resources. The City will maintain, for public use, generalized maps showing known areas of archaeological sensitivity.

**Implementation COS-4.f.** Development within an archaeologically sensitive area shall be consistent with State Law and require tribal consultations. The City will work with native tribes to establish mitigation plans to protect resources with participation from archeologists and Native American tribes affected by any discoveries.

The City's LCP includes the following policies relevant to cultural resources:

**Coastal Archaeological Policy 1.** Where development would adversely impact archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historical Preservation Officer, reasonable mitigation measures shall be required by the City's Planning Commission and/or City Council.

**Coastal Archaeological Policy 2.** All of the cost associated with archaeological investigations shall be borne by the applicant.

**Coastal Archaeological Policy 3.** That during any archaeological field investigations one native American representative has access to the property during the investigation,

**Coastal Archaeological Policy 4.** That should archaeological resources be found during the construction phase of any project, all activity shall be temporarily suspended for a maximum of 30 days in which time a qualified archaeologist who has a working knowledge of Coastal Chumash archaeological sites chosen by the City's Environmental Coordinator has examined the site and recommended mitigation measures to be approved by the City. Said investigation costs shall be borne by the developer.

**Coastal Archaeological Policy 5.** That prior to the issuance of any permit within areas identified as potential archaeological sites the City shall require an initial reconnaissance by a qualified archaeologist who has a working knowledge of Coastal Chumash archaeological sites.

**Coastal Archaeological Policy 6.** That the City of Grover Beach's Planning Department shall maintain copies of maps of known areas of archaeological significance.

**Coastal Archaeological Policy 7.** That in general, the standard mitigation for development on or near archaeological sites shall be importation of 18" to 24" of sterile sand fill provided that no utility trenching be allowed in native material; or leave area in open space and that a qualified archaeologist is present during any excavation; or, as a last resort, removal of any artifacts be by a qualified archaeologist. Said artifacts to be turned over to the San Luis Obispo Archaeological Society.

## **Environmental Evaluation**

**a) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to § 15064.5?***

The proposed amendments would apply citywide. The amendments, which implement the recently adopted Housing Element, promote new development and underutilized properties may be demolished and redeveloped. Only one-third of housing units in Grover Beach are over 50 years in age. The amendments include new standards regulating the demolition of residential structures in compliance with Government Code Sections 65583.2(g) and 66300(d). The amendments also include a performance standard stating that changes to any registered historical building shall be consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards. Projects are also required to comply with California Administrative Code (CAC) Title 14, Section 4308, which prohibits destroying objects of historical interest. Future development of housing units that is facilitated by adoption of these amendments would be subject to these requirements and therefore impacts would be less than significant.

**b) *Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to § 15064.5?***

The amendments would apply citywide. Both the COSE and the LCP recognize several cultural resources within the city. While properties within the Coastal Zone would be subject to policies of the LCP halting construction in the event of inadvertent resource discovery, the same protection does not exist in the regulations for the inland portion of the city. The amendments include adding these regulations to the Development Code, requiring implementation of a similar measure in the inland portions of the city. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**c) Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of dedicated cemeteries?**

Projects facilitated as a result of implementation of the proposed amendments would be dealt with on a project-by-project basis. State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 would apply to all project, which requires that in the event of discovery of human remains, work be halted, and the coroner be called. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) would be contracted. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**Conclusion**

The proposed amendments propose revisions to add additional measures that protect archaeological and historic resources. Future development would be subject to federal, state, and local policies regarding protection of historic, archeological, and paleontological resources, and impacts would be less than significant.

**VI. Energy**

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Setting**

Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) has historically been the primary electricity provider for the City and Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas) has been the primary natural gas provider. As of January 1, 2021, The City established membership in Central Coast Community Energy (3CE). 3CE is based on a local energy model called Community Choice Energy that partners with the local utility (i.e., PG&E) which continues to provide consolidated billing, electricity transmission and distribution, customer service, and grid maintenance services. 3CE provides rate benefits and local GHG reducing energy programs for residential, commercial, and agricultural customers. Participation in 3CE as an electricity provider is voluntary and all customers are provided the option to opt out and utilize PG&E electricity services instead. 3CE will provide 100% carbon-free electricity by the year 2030, which is 15 years ahead of California’s SB 100 requirement of zero-carbon energy by 2045 (3CE 2021).

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 the mandatory California Green Building Standards Code (CALGreen) for residential and nonresidential structures, and the most recent version includes 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 non-residential lighting requirements.

The City provides information about conservation programs, rebates, retrofits, and low-income assistance. The City also participates in the Property Assessed Clean Energy program which allows homeowners to retrofit existing residences, including solar systems, and the City has a Planned Development (PD) Overlay zone (Development Code Section 2.90.020) that encourages the development of LEED-certified dwellings, which are more energy efficient providing energy conservation and efficiency benefits (City of Grover Beach 2020).

In 2014, the City adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP), a long-range plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The following Housing Element policy is applicable to energy:

**Housing Element Policy 7.1.** All new dwelling units shall be required to meet current state requirements for energy efficiency. The retrofitting of existing units during remodeling shall be encouraged.

## Environmental Evaluation

- a) ***Would the project result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?***
- b) ***Would the project conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?***

As of 2020, single-family homes and multi-family buildings that are up to three stories high must provide solar panels and conform to the new solar power standard. The City has adopted the 2019 Building Codes, including CALGreen; complies with the Title 24 standards; and enforces compliance by requiring certified energy calculations for building designs and conducting on-site inspections of energy devices and improvements needed.

Future construction activities would require the use of energy in the form of electricity, diesel fuel, and gasoline for worker and construction vehicles and equipment. Future construction activities would be subject to State and local diesel idling restrictions and other equipment standards. Therefore, construction activity is not anticipated to result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources.

The proposed project does not provide site-specific designs or development proposals. Future development facilitated by these amendments would be required to comply with the current Building Energy Efficiency Standards. The City verifies compliance with the CBC as part of the building permit issuance and construction inspection process and does not rely upon CEQA for compliance. The proposed amendments do not encourage less energy-efficient components of new development, and instead encourage smaller units, mixed-use, and live/work units, which are typically more energy efficient by design than traditional residential unit. Therefore, the proposed amendments would have a less than significant impact on energy consumption and compliance with renewable energy or energy efficiency plans.

## Conclusion

Implementation of the amendments, including future development associated with the amendments, would be consistent with State law regarding impacts to energy resources.

## Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary.

## VII. Geology and Soils

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
(i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iv) Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

Areas with seismic (earthquake) hazards are identified by earthquake fault zones as established by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Act of 1972. The California Geological Survey (CGS; formerly the California Division of Mines and Geology [CDMG]) classifies faults as active, potentially active, or inactive according to standards developed for implementation of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone Act. A fault that has exhibited surface displacement within the Holocene Epoch (the last 11,000 years) is defined as active. A fault that has exhibited surface displacement during Quaternary time (i.e., within the past 1.6 million years) but that cannot be proven to have moved or not moved during Holocene time is defined as potentially active.

Grover Beach is located in a geologically complex and seismically active region (City of Grover Beach 2000). Groundshaking (or seismic shaking) caused by fault movement during an earthquake has the potential to result in the damage or destruction of buildings, infrastructure, and possible injury or loss of life. Groundshaking may occur as a result of movement along a fault located within the city or along a more distant fault. The intensity of groundshaking in a particular area is dependent on several factors, including the earthquake magnitude, the distance from the epicenter, the duration of strong ground motion, local geologic conditions, and the fundamental period of the structure. Groundshaking can also trigger secondary seismic phenomena, such as liquefaction, lateral spreading, seismically induced settlement and slope instability, tsunami and seiche, and other forms of ground rupture and seismic responses. The Wilmar Avenue Fault is the only mapped potentially active fault within the vicinity of the city; it runs along a portion of the northern city limits (City of Grover Beach 2000). The city is proximal to a number of active and potentially active faults capable of producing strong ground motion, including Wilmar Avenue, Blind Thrust Point San Luis, Los Osos, Pecho, Casmalia-Orcutt-Little Pine, Hosgri, Rinconada, Los Alamos-Baseline, and San Andreas.

Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which the strength and stiffness of a soil is reduced by earthquake shaking. Soils transform from a solid to a liquid state as a result of rapid loss of shear strength and increased pore water pressure induced by earthquake vibrations.

Tsunamis, also called seismic sea waves, are a series of waves generated by large, violent earthquakes occurring near the ocean. Seiches are oscillations of enclosed and semi-enclosed bodies of water, such as bays, lakes, or reservoirs, due to strong ground motion from seismic events, wind stress, volcanic eruptions, and local basin reflections of tsunami. Seiches could occur in any reservoir.

Slope instability may result from natural processes, such as the erosion of the toe of a slope by a stream, or by ground shaking caused by an earthquake. Slopes can also be modified artificially by grading, or by the addition of water or structures to a slope. Areas that are generally prone to landslide hazards include previous landslide locations, the bases of steep slopes, the bases of drainage channels, and developed hillsides where leach-field septic systems are used.

Soils in the city are primarily marine terrace deposits and dune sand (City of Grover Beach 2022a).

The following Safety Element policies are relevant to the proposed amendments:

**Policy 4.4 Liquefaction and Seismic Settlement.** Require design professionals to evaluate the potential for liquefaction or seismic settlement to impact structures in accordance with the currently adopted Uniform Building Code.

**Standard 4.4.1.** The Building Division of the Community Development Department will enforce current building code requirements that require the potential for liquefaction to be addressed in the design of structures. The City will prohibit the construction of critical facilities in areas of potential liquefaction.

**Standard 4.4.2.** The Building Division of the Community Development Department will require geotechnical studies to be performed for habitable or important structures (as defined by the building code) sited in areas having a medium to high potential. The geotechnical study should evaluate the potential for liquefaction and/or seismic related settlement to impact the development, and mitigation to reduce these potential impacts, if needed.

**Policy 4.5 Slope Instability.** Continue to encourage that developments on sloping ground use design and construction techniques appropriate for those areas. The City acknowledges that areas of known landslide activity are generally not suitable for residential development.

**Standard 4.5.1.** The City will not permit new development in areas of known landslide activity unless development plans indicate that the hazard can be reduced to a less than significant level prior to beginning development. Do not permit expansion to existing structures or developments in areas of known landslide activity except when it will reduce the potential for loss of life and property.

**Standard 4.5.2.** The City will require development proposals to mitigate the impacts that their projects contribute to landslides and slope instability hazards on neighboring property, and appurtenant structures, utilities, and roads.

**Standard 4.5.3.** The Community Development Department will require proposals for hillside development to conduct thorough geologic/geotechnical studies by qualified geotechnical engineers, and to confirm preliminary findings during construction.

**Standard 4.5.4.** The Community Development Department will require certification of the proposed building site stability in relation to the adverse effects of rain and earthquakes prior to the issuance of building permits.

## **Environmental Evaluation**

- a) *Would the project 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 based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.***

There are no active or potentially active faults within the City limits that would subject future development resulting from these amendments to impacts resulting from fault rupture. Impacts would be less than significant.

- a-ii) *Strong seismic ground shaking? and***
- a-iii) *Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? and***
- a-iv) *Landslides?***

Any future development that is facilitated by these amendments would be required to adhere to the CBC and other standards and regulations for building designs. Impacts resulting from ground shaking, expansive soils, landslides, and liquefaction hazards would be mitigated to less than significant through compliance with existing codes and adherence with the recommendations of the project-specific geotechnical report, including engineered site preparation and adequate structural design. Any proposed construction would require the adoption of appropriate engineering design in conformance with the recommended geotechnical standards for construction.

The City's General Plan addresses geology and soils as part of the Safety Element, and the City has adopted the 2019 edition of the CBC that includes provisions for construction in seismically active areas,

and on different soil types. The City ensures compliance with these requirements occurs at the time of building permit issuance and would therefore continue even after the change in process that would allow some units to be developed by-right. The by-right provisions of the proposed amendments, and the potential for denser development do not change the requirement that all existing and future development in the City must comply with the General Plan policies and the CBC. While compliance with these policies may alter design by requiring additional strengthening, over excavation of soil, or other project-specific design elements, the proposed amendments have no impact on these requirements. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

The amendments do not propose specific development plans for new housing units at this time. Therefore, project components such as amount of grading, excavation, vegetation removal, etc. for future housing units is unknown. If a project proposes to disturb more than one acre of soils, it is required by the State to prepare a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), which includes best management practices (BMPs) for erosion and sedimentation control. BMP examples generally include an effective combination of erosion and sediment controls, which include barriers such as silt fences, hay bales, drain inlet protection, gravel bags, etc., and requires that existing vegetation should be preserved as much as possible. Additionally, the City's Grading and Stormwater Standards (Section 5.50.070 and 5.60 of the Development Code) require the submittal of a site-specific erosion and sediment control measures with each grading or building permit. Future development of housing units that is facilitated by adoption of these amendments would be subject to these conditions for a construction permit and therefore impacts would be less than significant.

**c) *Would the project 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? and***

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

Any future development that is facilitated by these amendments would be required to adhere to the CBC and other standards and regulations for building designs. Impacts resulting from ground shaking, expansive soils, landslides, and liquefaction hazards would be mitigated to less than significant through compliance with existing codes and adherence with the recommendations of the project-specific geotechnical report, including engineered site preparation and adequate structural design. Any proposed construction would require the adoption of appropriate engineering design in conformance with the recommended geotechnical standards for construction.

The General Plan addresses geology and soils as part of the Safety Element, and the City has adopted the 2019 edition of the CBC that includes provisions for construction in seismically active areas, and on different soil types. The City ensures compliance with these requirements occurs at the time of building permit issuance and would therefore continue even after the change in process that would allow some units to be developed by-right. The by-right provisions of the proposed amendments, and the potential for denser development do not change the requirement that all existing and future development in the City must comply with the General Plan policies and the CBC. While compliance with these policies may alter design by requiring additional strengthening, over excavation of soil, or other project-specific design elements, the proposed project has no impact on these requirements. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**e) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?**

The city is served by a municipal sewer. No future development projects facilitated by these amendments would use septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems. Therefore, there would be no impact.

**f) Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

While most of the development implemented as a part of the amendments would be located on previously disturbed, redevelopment, particularly multi-story development with deeper foundations and footings, could impact intact resources. Marine terrace deposits are considered to be moderately to highly sensitive for fossil resources. The amendments include provisions to protect paleontological resources via a stop-work order and professional recovery of any discovered paleontological resources (Section 3.10.050L). Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**Conclusion**

Geological impacts would be less than significant based on compliance with existing state and local regulations. Impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant with mitigation.

**VIII. Greenhouse Gas Emissions**

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Setting**

Certain gases in the earth’s atmosphere, classified as GHGs, play a critical role in determining the earth’s surface temperature. Solar radiation enters the earth’s atmosphere from space. A portion of the radiation is absorbed by the earth’s surface and a smaller portion of this radiation is reflected back toward space. This absorbed radiation is then emitted from the earth as low-frequency infrared radiation. The frequencies at which bodies emit radiation are proportional to temperature. Because the earth has a much lower temperature than the sun, it emits lower-frequency radiation. Most solar radiation passes through GHGs; however, infrared radiation is absorbed by these gases. As a result, radiation that otherwise would have escaped back into space is instead “trapped,” resulting in a warming of the atmosphere. This phenomenon, known as the greenhouse effect, is responsible for maintaining a habitable climate on earth. Without the greenhouse effect, the earth would not be able to support life as we know it.

Prominent GHGs contributing to the greenhouse effect are CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O. Fluorinated gases also make up a small fraction of the GHGs that contribute to climate change. Fluorinated gases include

chlorofluorocarbons, HFCs, PFCs, sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>), and nitrogen trifluoride (NF<sub>3</sub>); however, it is noted that these gases are not associated with typical land use development. Human-caused emissions of these GHGs in excess of natural ambient concentrations are believed to be responsible for intensifying the greenhouse effect and leading to a trend of unnatural warming of the earth's climate, known as global climate change or global warming. It is "extremely likely" that more than half of the observed increase in global average surface temperature from 1951 to 2010 was caused by the anthropogenic increase in GHG concentrations and other anthropogenic factors together.

Each GHG differs in its ability to absorb heat in the atmosphere based on the lifetime, or persistence, of the gas molecule in the atmosphere. CH<sub>4</sub> traps over 25 times more heat per molecule than CO<sub>2</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O absorbs 298 times more heat per molecule than CO<sub>2</sub>. Often, estimates of GHG emissions are presented in CO<sub>2</sub>e, which weighs each gas by its global warming potential. Expressing GHG emissions in CO<sub>2</sub>e takes the contribution of all GHG emissions to the greenhouse effect and converts them to a single unit equivalent to the effect that would occur if only CO<sub>2</sub> were being emitted.

Climate change is global in nature. GHGs are global pollutants, unlike criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants (TACs), which are pollutants of regional and local concern. Whereas pollutants with localized air quality effects have relatively short atmospheric lifetimes (about 1 day), GHGs have long atmospheric lifetimes (1 to several thousand years). GHGs persist in the atmosphere for long enough time periods to be dispersed around the globe. Although the exact lifetime of any particular GHG molecule is dependent on multiple variables and cannot be pinpointed, it is understood that more CO<sub>2</sub> is emitted into the atmosphere than is sequestered by ocean uptake, vegetation, or other forms. Of the total annual human-caused CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, approximately 55% is sequestered through ocean and land uptakes every year, averaged over the last 50 years, whereas the remaining 45% of human-caused CO<sub>2</sub> emissions remains stored in the atmosphere.

The quantity of GHGs that it takes to ultimately result in climate change is not precisely known; suffice it to say the quantity is enormous, and no single project alone would measurably contribute to a noticeable incremental change in the global average temperature or to global, local, or microclimates. From the standpoint of CEQA, GHG impacts to global climate change are inherently cumulative.

In 2019, CARB released the 2019 edition of the California GHG inventory covering calendar year 2017 emissions. In 2017, California emitted 424.1 million gross MTCO<sub>2</sub>e, including from imported electricity. Combustion of fossil fuel in the transportation sector was the single largest source of California's GHG emissions in 2017, accounting for approximately 41% of total GHG emissions in the state. This sector was followed by the industrial sector (24%) and the electric power sector, including both in-state and out-of-state sources (15%).

Emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> are byproducts of fossil fuel combustion. CH<sub>4</sub>, a highly potent GHG, primarily results from off-gassing (the release of chemicals from nonmetallic substances under ambient or greater pressure conditions) and is largely associated with agricultural practices and landfills. N<sub>2</sub>O is also largely attributable to agricultural practices and soil management. CO<sub>2</sub> sinks, or reservoirs, include vegetation and the ocean, which absorb CO<sub>2</sub> through sequestration and dissolution (CO<sub>2</sub> dissolving into the water), respectively, two of the most common processes for removing CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere.

## Environmental Evaluation

- a) **Would the project generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? and**
- b) **Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?**

Future development of housing units resulting from these amendments could result in an increase in GHG emissions during both construction and operational activities. Future development as a result of the amendments would occur in developed areas of the city where public services and infrastructure are currently provided. The proposed amendments promote smaller, compact development (which would likely occur on infill parcels), promote mixed-use projects and live/work units that are generally more energy efficient by design than traditional units, and eliminate or reduce the amount of parking that would be required for residential developments, which promote alternative transportation which reduced energy consumption in the form of fuel use. These provisions are consistent with the City’s efforts to reduce VMT through zoning and development features.

The City has adopted the 2019 Building Codes, including CALGreen; complies with the Title 24 standards; and enforces compliance by requiring certified energy calculations for building designs and conducting on-site inspections of energy devices and improvements needed. Additionally, 3CE will provide 100% carbon-free electricity by the year 2030, which is 15 years ahead of California’s SB 100 requirement of zero-carbon energy by 2045 (3CE 2021). As a result, the future development resulting from the proposed amendments would result in less than significant impacts to GHGs.

## Conclusion

The amendments would be consistent with applicable plans and programs designed to reduce GHG emissions.

## Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary.

## IX. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

As defined in Chapter 6.95 of Division 20 of the California Health and Safety Code, Section 25501(o), a hazardous material is "...any material that, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics, poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment. Hazardous materials include, but are not limited to, hazardous substances, hazardous waste, and any material which a handler or the administering agency has a reasonable basis for believing that it would be injurious to the health and safety of persons or harmful to the environment if released into the workplace or the environment."

The County Division of Environmental Health (SLODEH) conducts inspections to ensure proper handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials and proper remediation of contaminated sites. In addition, the Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans and Inventory Law of 1985 (Business Plan Act) requires that any business that handles or stores hazardous materials prepare a Hazardous Materials Business Plan. Under this law, businesses are required to submit inventories of on-site hazardous materials and wastes and locations where these materials are stored and handled. This information is collected and reviewed by the SLODEH for emergency response planning. The County also enforces Title 26, Division 6, California Highway Patrol, of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) to reduce impacts associated with accidental release from the transportation of hazardous materials on roads in the County, and the potential for an increased demand for incident emergency response.

The City's Safety Element identifies the following policies relevant to hazards:

**Policy 3.1 Pre-Fire Management.** New development should be designed and constructed to minimize urban fire hazards, with special attention given to adequate access to fire hydrants.

**Standard 3.1.1.** The Fire Department will review the design of new subdivisions to ensure that all new development provides adequate access to fire hydrants.

**Standard 3.1.2.** The City will require fire resistant material be used for building construction in fire hazard areas. The City will require the installation of smoke detectors in all new residences per the UBC and encourage their installation in older residences.

**Policy 5.2 Hazardous Materials.** Reduce the potential for exposure to humans and the environment by hazardous substances.

**Standard 5.2.2.** The City will work with Caltrans to require all transport of hazardous materials to follow Caltrans approved routes, with all necessary safety precautions taken to prevent hazardous materials spills.

Additionally, the Oceano Airport Land Use Plan includes the following policies relative to noise-sensitive land uses (such as residences):

**Policy N-1 Avoidance of noise-sensitive land uses.** No new noise-sensitive land uses shall be permitted in Airport Planning Areas Oa, C, I-1, I-2, I-3, or AGa.

**Policy N-2 Mitigation of interior sound levels.** Any noise-sensitive land use established within the Airport Planning Area must include design features and/or construction techniques sufficient to mitigate aviation-related interior single-event noise levels to a degree equal to or greater than indicated in Table 2. The anticipated exterior aviation noise exposure shall be determined by reference to Figure 3 of this ALUP. If the degree of sound attenuation necessary to achieve the interior noise level indicated by Table 2 is greater than 15 dB, the design features and construction techniques required to effect such mitigation are to be determined by an analysis performed by a person or firm qualified in acoustic design and noise mitigation and the report of such consultant must be submitted, in its entirety, to the ALUC as a part of the project referral.

The requirement for an airport noise study imposed by this policy, however, will be eliminated if the County of San Luis Obispo has prepared and adopted a planning document which has been reviewed and approved by the ALUC and which specifies, in detail, the design features and construction techniques required to attain the above interior noise levels for projects located in the vicinity of the Oceano County Airport, and if the developer of a project demonstrates that the design features and/or construction techniques called for by such document have been fully incorporated.

## Environmental Evaluation

- a) ***Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? and***
- b) ***Would the project 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? and***
- c) ***Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?***

The amendments would facilitate the development of new housing by creating a regulatory setting that encourages housing development. During construction of new housing units, construction equipment would require the use of fuel and petroleum-based lubricants and would require regular maintenance of equipment. Both the frequency of maintenance and the large volumes of fluids required to service the

equipment increase the risk of accidental spillage. Any new units would be required to adhere to federal, state, and local regulations regarding handling hazardous materials and cleanup standards in case of a spill.

New residential units may contain household hazardous materials such as paint, herbicides/pesticides, diesel fuel, and cleaning products that have the potential to spill. Residential uses typically do not use or store large quantities of hazardous materials. Adherence to regulations and standard protocols during the storage, transportation, and usage of any hazardous materials, as discussed above, would minimize and avoid the potential for significant upset and accident condition impacts. Following these standards and regulations at the time of future development would make impacts less than significant.

**d) *Would the project 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?***

According to the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) EnviroStor database, the City does not have any active cleanup sites for toxic materials (DTSC 2020). The SWRCB Geotracker database identifies five closed cleanup sites along West Grand Avenue; no active cleanup sites were identified. Therefore, future housing development would not be located on a hazardous materials site and there would be no impact.

**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?***

Airport-related hazards are generally associated with aircraft accidents, particularly during takeoffs and landings. Airport operation hazards include incompatible land uses, power transmission lines, wildlife hazards (e.g., bird strikes), and tall structures that penetrate the imaginary surfaces surrounding an airport. The proposed project does not provide site-specific design or development proposals. The southwestern portion of the city is located within the Oceano County Airport Land Use Plan (2007) planning area and is classified as Review Area TP-2 due to aircraft traffic arriving at the Oceano County Airport. Area TP-2 is defined as properties within the Airport Planning Area that are expected to be exposed to very low safety impacts (Placeworks 2020). The proposed amendments to implement the Housing Element would not create additional residential opportunities within any noise contour of the Ocean Airport, as the single-runway airport's noise contours are located west of Highway 1 and the railroad, which is primarily State Parks property and the Oceano Dunes/Pismo State Beach. Therefore, there would be no impact.

**f) *Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

The proposed amendments do not propose any changes to the City's existing Safety Element. Future development within the city resulting from the proposed amendments would be required to comply with local regulations, including the General Plan (Safety Element) and Development Code. New development would be primarily located on infill lots and would generally not require closure of roadways that would interfere with emergency response or evacuation. Larger development projects within the city usually require traffic control plans to manage construction traffic and ensure development does not result in congestion on local roadways. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

According to the Safety Element, the city is not located within a fire hazard severity zone and is not subject to a significant wildfire hazard because of its location on the coast away from vegetated hillsides. Any future housing development that is facilitated by the amendments would be subject to design features that are consistent with the most recent fire and building codes. Safety Element Implementation Measure 3.1.1 requires that all new subdivisions be reviewed by the Five Cities Fire Authority to ensure that new development provides adequate access to fire hydrants, and Safety Element Implementation Measure 3.1.2 requires fire-resistant material to be used for new buildings. Development fees are required for new developments for public services, which includes the City’s fire department (Five Cities Fire); any new developments would be required to pay this fee. Development facilitated by the amendments would primarily be infill development and would not encroach into rural lands. Therefore, impacts related to wildfire hazard would be less than significant.

**Conclusion**

Impacts resulting from storage and use of hazardous materials on the project site, and exposure to hazards, such as wildfire, are less than significant with compliance of existing regulations.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are necessary.

**X. Hydrology and Water Quality**

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:				
(i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(iii) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(iv) Impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

Since 1990, regulations have increasingly emphasized the control of water pollution from non-point sources, which include stormwater systems and runoff from point-source construction sites and industrial areas. In California, the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) issued a statewide General Permit to regulate runoff from construction sites involving grading and earth moving in areas over 1 acre. The SWRCB is acting to enforce requirements of the federal CWA, pursuant to regulations issued by the Environmental Protection Agency for the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). This State Order (Water Quality Order 99-08-DWQ) requires construction projects covered under the General Permit to use the “best available technology economically achievable” and the “best conventional pollution control technology.” Each construction project subject to the permit is required to have a SWPPP prepared, which identifies likely sources of sediment and pollution and incorporates measures to minimize sediment and pollution in runoff water. These objectives are established based on the designated beneficial uses (e.g., water supply, recreation, habitat) for a particular surface water or groundwater.

The Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) regulates all municipal wastewater discharges to protect the quality and beneficial uses of groundwater and surface water resources, to maximize reclamation and reuse, and to eliminate waste associated health hazards. Municipal and industrial point-source discharges to surface waters are generally controlled through NPDES permits. Although the NPDES program is established by the federal Clean Water Act, the permits are prepared and enforced by the RWQCBs through program delegation to California and implementing authority in the California Water Code. The RWQCB will issue NPDES permits and waste discharge requirements for municipal waste discharges to protect water quality.

The RWQCB Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coast Basin (Basin Plan) 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, and other 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 RWQCB implements the Basin Plan by issuing and enforcing waste discharge requirements to individuals, communities, or businesses whose discharges can affect water quality.

The National Flood Insurance Program 100-year floodplain is considered to be the base flood condition. This is defined as a flood event of a magnitude that would be equal to or exceeded at an average of once during a 100-year period. Floodways are defined as stream channels plus adjacent floodplains that must be kept free of encroachment as much as possible so that 100-year floods can be carried without

substantial increases (no more than 1 foot) in flood elevations. The city encompasses two areas with a potential of 100-year flooding in the northern and western portions of the city adjacent to Meadow Creek.

The following LCP policies are applicable to the proposed amendments:

**Water Supply Policy 2:** The City shall continue to implement water conservation programs related to new development including requirements for water efficient landscaping, water conserving fixtures and programs to encourage purchase of water conserving appliances which have shown to be effective based on the per capita use declines. The City shall continue to implement water policies and infrastructure improvements including replacement of undersized water mains and extension of new mains to serve new development so that the water system can provide adequate pressure at acceptable velocities during all demand scenarios.

**Water Supply Policy 4:** The City shall condition all new developments to install new water infrastructure designed to provide adequate pressure at acceptable velocities for the proposed use unless adequate mains already exist or the City has adopted a development impact fee for installation of the water infrastructure needed to supply the proposed development in which case the applicant shall be required to pay the adopted fee.

**Water Supply Policy:** In compliance with Section 30254 of the Coastal Act, proposed new development within the Coastal Zone that provides; services to coastal-dependent land uses; essential public services; basic industries vital to the economic health of the region, state, or nation; public recreation; commercial recreation, and visitor-serving land uses shall be given priority over other new proposed developments in the Coastal Zone in the event that existing or planned public works facilities serving the Coastal Zone can accommodate only limited amounts of new development.

**Water Supply Policy 6:** Development shall only be approved if it is first clearly demonstrated that the development will be served by an adequate, long-term public water supply.

## Environmental Evaluation

- a) ***Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality? and***
- b) ***Would the project substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin? and***
- e) ***Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?***

During future construction activities, grading and vegetation removal could result in soil erosion and siltation, which if unmanaged could result in runoff and impact water quality. If a project proposes to disturb more than one acre of soil, the state requires that a stormwater pollution and prevention plan (SWPPP), which includes BMPs, be prepared. BMP examples generally include an effective combination of erosion and sediment controls, which include barriers such as silt fences, hay bales, drain inlet protection, gravel bags, etc. As required by state law, all new development projects within the city would be subject to the City's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Permit (No. CA-0047881), which is enforced by the RWQCB. The NPDES includes a requirement that Post Construction Requirements (PCRs) be followed after project construction has finished. Additionally,

Section 5.50.080 of the Development Code details grading and drainage standards that are required with submittal of site-specific building permits. The proposed amendments would not alter any existing water quality standards, and all future development resulting from the amendments would be required to adhere with state and local requirements regarding water quality. Development of residences facilitated by these amendments would not affect groundwater quality since these uses would not directly extract groundwater or otherwise affect groundwater resources and would not utilize materials or methods that would result in reduced groundwater quality. Required stormwater facilities would ensure on-site groundwater infiltration would be similar to existing conditions.

The additional density units facilitated by the amendments would not increase the City's population beyond the projections of the General Plan buildout (2035), which is the basis for resource capacity. These amendments would encourage smaller units that are affordable by design by recognizing fractional density units. Studio and one-bedroom units that are less than 1,000 square-feet in size would be counted as less than one density unit. These units are expected to result in an average household size that is less than the 2020 Department of Finance estimate of persons per household. This approach allows the City to increase dwelling units in the city, while maintaining population and density anticipated by the General Plan. According to the City's 2020 Urban Water Management Plan, groundwater supply is projected to be sufficient to serve the city through 2035, which accounts for General Plan Buildout conditions. The Urban Water Management Plan also provides a water shortage contingency analysis and a Water Shortage Contingency Plan that identifies stages of action to be undertaken by the City in response to water supply shortages. Therefore, impacts of the amendments would be less than significant.

**c) *Would the project 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? and***

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

**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? and***

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

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

The FEMA flood map for Grover Beach (excluding State Parks lands) indicates that three residential streets (Nacimiento Avenue, Mono Court, and Owens Court) in the city are in a high-flood hazard zone. The City's Safety Element identifies potential tsunami zones in those portions of the community at sea level elevation and along the mouth of Meadow Creek, and potential dam inundation areas as the low-lying areas south of Grand Avenue and West of Highway 1. Flood and tsunami vulnerability relating to sea-level rise is likely to increase in severity as a result of climate change in the future. All future development within the city would be required to comply with local regulations, including the General Plan, LCP, and Development Code. The proposed amendments would not change regulations related to flood zones or water quality. Therefore, impacts on hydrology and water quality would be less than significant.

## Conclusion

Impacts would be less than significant.

## Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary.

## XI. Land Use and Planning

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

Grover Beach is a city of about 2.25 square miles situated on a broad coastal plain that stretches from the coastal dunes to the Arroyo Grande Valley. The beach and dune area adjacent to the city lie within Pismo State Beach which is managed by the California Department of Parks and Recreation. The city is separated from the beach by the northerly terminus of the coastal dune complex that has formed along the shore from Grover Beach to Point Sal. The dunes provide opportunities for recreation and for the protection of sensitive natural resources. (City of Grover Beach 2010)

## Environmental Evaluation

### a) **Would the project physically divide an established community?**

The proposed amendments would not create policies that would allow a future project facilitated by the amendments to physically divide the community. Future projects resulting from implementation of the amendments are located within infill areas in the city and would not result in major development or infrastructure (such as new major roadways) that would create physical barriers within the city. Impacts would be less than significant.

### b) **Would the project 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?**

The proposed amendments would incentivize more housing by removing barriers to construct housing and encouraging affordable by design housing. The amendments would include incentivizing small units by using fractional density and removing discretionary use permit requirements for certain types of residential development. It is anticipated that most of the development facilitated by these amendments would be considered infill development. All future development would be required to comply with the policies in the General Plan regarding land use, the Development Code requirements associated with

zoning districts, allowable uses, and development standards, and, for parcels within the Coastal Zone, the City’s Local Coastal Program. Impacts would be less than significant.

**Conclusion**

The amendments would not result in any land use compatibility-related impacts.

**Mitigation Measures**

Mitigation measures are not necessary.

**XII. Mineral Resources**

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally- important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Setting**

The State Mining and Geology Board has the responsibility to inventory and classify mineral resources and could designate such mineral resources as having statewide or regional significance. If this designation occurs, the local agency must adopt a management plan for such identified resources. Grover Beach does not contain any areas identified as having substantial mineral resources and has no operating mine or quarry operations (Placeworks 2020).

**Environmental Evaluation**

- a) ***Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? and***
- b) ***Would the project 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?***

The proposed project involves Development Code, Land Use Element, and LCP amendments that would remove barriers to the construction of housing, including specifically affordable housing. The city does not contain areas for mineral extraction, nor does it have operating mines or quarry operations. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on mineral resources and mineral resource recovery sites.

**Conclusion**

There are no areas of mineral extraction in the city and the implementation of the proposed amendments would result in no impact.

## Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary.

## XIII. Noise

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project result in:</i>				
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

Noise varies with time, geographic location, proximity to the source, and duration of the noise event. The effects of noise are considered in several ways: how a proposed project may increase existing noise levels, how those noise levels would affect surrounding land uses, and how a proposed land use may be affected by noise from existing and surrounding land uses. Certain land uses are considered more sensitive to ambient noise levels than others, due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities involved. In general, noise-sensitive land uses typically include but are not limited to:

- Residential development;
- Schools/daycare;
- Public assembly and entertainment;
- Commercial/retail;
- Industrial;
- Restaurants, and eateries; an
- Offices.

Highway 1 and US 101 are the primary sources of mobile source traffic noise in the city. The primary sources of stationary noise are industrial and commercial uses.

The City's Noise Element establishes the following policies related to noise:

**Noise Policy 4.3.2.** Noise-sensitive land uses shall not be permitted in areas exposed to existing or projected future levels of noise from transportation sources which exceed 60 dB Ldn or CNEL (70 dB Ldn/CNEL for playgrounds and parks) unless the project design includes effective

mitigation measures to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas and interior spaces to levels specified for the given land use in Table 2 (of the Noise Element).

**Noise Policy 4.3.3.** Noise created by new transportation noise sources, including roadway improvement projects, shall be mitigated so they will not exceed the levels specified in Table 2 (of the Noise Element) within the outdoor activity areas and interior spaces of existing noise-sensitive land uses.

**Noise Policy 4.3.4.** The development of new noise-sensitive uses is prohibited where the noise level from existing stationary noise sources exceeds the standards of Table 3 (of the Noise Element). If noise mitigation measures designed into the project reduce noise levels to the standards of Table 3 (of the Noise Element), the project may be permitted.

**Noise Policy 4.3.5.** Modifications of existing stationary noise sources that increase noise levels on lands designated for noise-sensitive uses in excess of the standards of Table 3 (of the Noise Element) are prohibited. This policy does not apply to noise levels associated with agricultural uses.

**Noise Policy 4.3.6.** No new stationary noise sources shall be allowed if they increase the noise on lands designated for noise-sensitive uses to a level that exceeds the standards of Table 3 (of the Noise Element). This policy does not apply to noise levels associated with agricultural uses.

**Noise Policy 4.3.7.** The City should consider implementing or requiring noise mitigation measures where existing noise levels produce significant noise impacts within noise-sensitive land uses or where new development may result in cumulative increases of noise upon noise sensitive land uses.

Additionally, noise standards contained in Section 1.01 of the City's Municipal Code, establish standards for acceptable exterior and interior noise levels and vibrations and describes how noise shall be measured. Municipal Code Section 3120.7 requires that noise levels are measured at the property line.

## **Environmental Evaluation**

- a) *Would the project result in 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? and***
- b) *Would the project result in generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?***

Housing is not considered a major source of noise in the city, though placing housing adjacent to major sources of noise could expose people to temporary or permanent noise levels exceeding acceptable standards. However, future development of housing units would likely lead to a short-term increase in construction-related noise to surrounding areas. Construction-related noise would not result in a permanent increase in ambient noise within the city. Long-term increases in noise would not be significantly different than ambient noise levels given that housing is not a major source of noise in the city. All future development would be subject to the noise standards contained in the City's Municipal Code. The proposed amendments would not change the City's existing noise policies. Impacts 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 southwestern portion of the city is located within the Oceano County Airport Land Use Plan (2007) planning area and is classified as Review Area TP-2 due to aircraft traffic arriving at the Oceano County Airport. Area TP-2 is defined as properties within the Airport Planning Area which lie to the north and east of the extended runway centerline. Because the entire traffic pattern for aircraft arriving at the Airport is on the southwest of the extended centerline, overflight in Area TP-2 is to be expected only by departing aircraft, which is expected to be exposed to very low safety impacts (Placeworks 2020). The proposed amendments would not create additional residential opportunities within any noise contour of the Ocean Airport, as the single-runway airport’s noise contours are located west of Highway 1 and the railroad, which is primarily State Parks property and the Oceano Dunes/Pismo State Beach. Therefore, there would be no impact.

### Conclusion

The proposed amendments and future development resulting from the amendments would be consistent with currently policies regarding noise.

### Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary.

## XIV. Population and Housing

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

The Housing Element is one of the seven state-mandated elements of the General Plan (CGC Sections 65300 through 65303.4). Jurisdictions that have identified disadvantaged communities must also address environmental justice in their general plans, including air quality. (Note that the City of Grover Beach is not identified as a disadvantaged community). The Housing Element serves as a tool to identify and provide for the housing needs of the community. It identifies recent demographic and employment trends that may affect existing and future housing demand and supply. California law requires the Housing Element to establish policies and programs that will support the provision of an adequate housing supply for citizens of all income levels. The element addresses the city’s ability to meet the regional housing needs as determined by the State of California. The recently adopted Housing Element includes a detailed

analysis of housing needs, resources, and constraints, as well as a review of the current Housing Element goals, policies, and programs, which were used to develop new policies and implementation programs.

The proposed amendments would implement programs identified in the 2020-2028 Housing Element that was adopted in November 2020, including Senate Bill 2 (SB 2) Planning Grants programs. The City's population more than doubled from 1970 to 2000. However, growth has dramatically slowed since then. Between 2000 and 2010, the City's population only grew one percent. Between 2010 and 2020, the city's population declined by 3.5% (U.S. Census Bureau 2020). In comparison, between 2019 and 2020 the City of Pismo Beach and San Luis Obispo County, both grew by 5 percent, and Arroyo Grande's rate of population growth was the highest at 6 percent (U.S. Census Bureau 2020).

Over the 7-year period between 2010 and 2017, the number of households increased by approximately 4 percent. Since 2010, there have been 139 new single family (includes PUDs) and 53 new multifamily residences constructed in the city totaling 192 new residences over the last 11 years or an average of about 17 new residences per year. Approximately 25% of the 192 residences were developed on the formerly vacant six-acre Green Park site in 2016 at the northeast corner of South 16th Street and Farroll Road. Another 19 residences were developed in 2020 on the formerly vacant two-acre Ron's Nursery site at the corner of South 13th Street and Highland Way (City of Grover Beach 2020b).

Small households (one to two persons per household [pph]) traditionally reside in units with one to two bedrooms; family households (three to four pph) normally reside in units with three to four bedrooms; and large households (five or more pph) typically reside in units with four or more bedrooms. However, the number of units in relation to the household size may also reflect preference and economics. Many small households obtain larger units, and some larger households live in small units for economic reasons.

The average household size in Grover Beach decreased from 2.54 pph in 2010 to 2.43 pph in 2020 (a decrease of 4.3%). Over the same period, household size in the county decreased from 2.48 to 2.37 pph (a decrease of 4.4%) and household size in the state increased from 2.90 to 2.91 pph (an increase of 0.03%). Between 2010 and 2020, the city maintained a lower average household size in comparison to the state household sizes.

The proposed amendments would seek to remove barriers to and encourage the development of new housing projects by allowing some projects by-right, encouraging smaller (affordable by design) units, and removing subjective design standards.

## **Environmental Evaluation**

### ***a) Would the project 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 proposed amendments implement housing goals intended to encourage housing to meet the City's housing needs. The expectation is that as growth occurs consistent with the existing General Plan, housing would serve all income levels of the city, including both moderate- and low-income residents. By 2050, the population of the city is expected to increase to 15,091, which is an increase of 15 percent from the 2020 population (City of Grover Beach 2020b; US Census Bureau 2020). The City's LUE identifies a potential population at buildout (2035 or later) of 16,080.

The amendments would implement Housing Element programs to encourage smaller units that are affordable by design by allowing fractional density units. Studio and one-bedroom units that are less than 1,000 square-feet in size would be counted as less than one density unit. These units are expected to result in an average household size that is less than the Department of Finance estimate of household sizes. For

example, studios are anticipated to generally house one person. This approach allows the City to increase dwelling units in the city, while maintaining population and density anticipated by the General Plan. Therefore, there impacts on population growth would be less than significant.

**b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?**

The amendments encourage the development of new affordable housing units without displacing other housing units. The amendments include provisions pertaining to the demolition of residential units and require compliance with Government Code Sections 65583.2(g) and 66300(d), including creation of at least as many residential dwelling units, protection of affordable units, and relocation benefits to the occupants of affordable units. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

**Conclusion**

The amendments would be consistent with current population and housing policies.

**Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are necessary.

**XV. Public Services**

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Setting**

**Fire Protection**

In 2010, the communities of Grover Beach, Arroyo Grande, and Oceano consolidated their fire departments to form the Five Cities Fire Authority. The authority’s response area is approximately 10 square miles and protects 37,000 residents year-round (Placeworks 2020). In addition to protecting Grover Beach, Arroyo Grande, and Oceano, the Five Cities Fire Authority also provides services to the

Oceano Dunes State Vehicle Recreation Area. The Five Cities Fire Authority provides a variety of services, including fire suppression, rescue, emergency medical, hazardous materials, fire prevention, community outreach/education, and emergency preparedness (Placeworks 2020). The authority has three stations and uses the following apparatus:

- Four Type I (Structural) Fire Engines
- One Type III (Wildland) Brush Engine
- One 100-foot Aerial Platform (Truck)
- One Type IV Patrol (Dunes Response)
- One Reserve Type I Fire Engine
- One Type II Urban Search and Rescue/Breathing Support Unit
- Three Staff/Fleet Vehicles
- Three Command Vehicles

### **Police Department**

Police protection services in the city are provided by the Grover Beach Police Department, which operates from the main police station located at 711 Rockaway Avenue. The Police Department is staffed by 21 full-time and 2 part-time sworn (peace officer) personnel supported by 10 non-sworn support personnel. The department has a mutual aid agreement with Arroyo Grande and Pismo Beach, as well as with the County Sheriff's Department and the California Highway Patrol. These agencies may be called upon for backup assistance (Placeworks 2020).

### **Schools**

The city is located within the Lucia Mar Unified School District, which provides education to students in grade levels K–12. The district serves more than 10,600 students who attend Lucia Mar's 11 elementary schools, three middle schools, three comprehensive high schools, one continuation high school, and one adult education program. (Placeworks 2020). Lucia Mar Unified School District operates two elementary schools within Grover Beach.

### **Parks and Recreation**

The City manages seven parks, two dedicated open space areas, a skate park, the Community Center, and the Ramona Garden Park Center. The City has a Parks and Recreation Element that contains goals to provide a wide range of recreational opportunities for all ages. The California Department of Parks and Recreation manages the recreational facilities within Pismo State Beach (Placeworks 2020).

## Environmental Evaluation

- 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? and***

### ***Police protection?***

The Safety Element describes action items that include incorporation of the Five Cities Fire Authority and Police Department into review of new development. The City has also outlined building safety regarding building and fire codes as well as security and lighting measures. New development resulting from the proposed amendments would be subject to Development Impact Fees put toward fire and police protection services. With incorporation of these fees for new housing development, impacts would be less than significant.

### ***Schools?***

The amendments have the potential to increase the number of students in the area. New development is subject to development impact fees to be paid towards impacts to public schools.. With incorporation of these fees for new housing development, impacts would be less than significant.

### ***Parks?***

The creation of new housing as facilitated by the amendments would increase the volume of residents that may utilize public parks. The City maintains several public parks and open space areas for the community, in addition to the outdoor recreational facilities provided within Pismo State Beach. New development is subject to development impact fees put toward public parks in the area. With incorporation of these fees for new housing development, impacts would be less than significant.

### ***Other public facilities?***

Other public facilities that are maintained by the City, such as the Community Library, and public facilities based on public services, such as the Administrative Services building, would require standard development impact fees from new development for continued maintenance of the facilities. With incorporation of these fees for new housing development, impacts would be less than significant.

## Conclusion

Potential impacts to public services would be less than significant.

## Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary.

## XVI. Recreation

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

Recreational opportunities for both youth and adults are varied in Grover Beach. A well-rounded variety of programs and activities is available to Grover Beach’s residents at City, school, and private recreational facilities. Funded by the City’s General Fund, the City manages seven parks, two dedicated open space areas, a skate park, the Community Center, and the Ramona Garden Park Center. The City has a Parks and Recreation Element that contains goals to provide a wide range of recreational opportunities for all ages. The California Department of Parks and Recreation manages the recreational facilities within Pismo State Beach. (Placeworks 2020)

### Environmental Evaluation

- 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 proposed amendments do not have the potential to increase the number of residents that would use public recreation facilities in the area above the number that was anticipated in the General Plan at buildout. New development would be subject to development impact fees that would be put toward continued maintenance of the facilities. With the incorporation of fees, the impact on public recreational facilities would be 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?***

A proposed recreational facility resulting from future development would be subject to environmental review. Therefore, impacts related to the amendments would be less than significant.

### Conclusion

The amendments would not increase the projected population of the city from the thresholds in the General Plan. The implementation of development impact fees would make impacts to public services less than significant.

## Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary.

## XVII. Transportation

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(a) Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Would the project conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

Grover Beach is served by State Route 1, U.S. Highway 101, and a series of arterial and secondary streets. The city is also served by a regional transit station and an Amtrak station. Transit service is provided by Regional Transit Authority South County Area Transit (RTA/SCAT) with four routes. Ride-On Transportation operates a Transportation Management Association with a fleet of 90 vans and buses countywide, some of which serve Grover Beach. The City has an adopted Bicycle Master Plan. The generally flat terrain and layout of Grover Beach is favorable for bicycle and pedestrian circulation. Additionally, most streets have sufficient width and low traffic volumes, permitting safe use by bicyclists (Placeworks 2020).

The San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is a long-range planning document for the region's transportation system. The RTP analyzes the transportation needs of the region into the future and identifies project priorities in order to improve the transportation system. The Plan offers a mix of mobility options and commits to a more sustainable transportation system through investments in public transportation, active transportation, highways, streets, and roads, and system efficiency.

Relevant policies from the City's Circulation Element include:

**Policy 2.2.** Review the impact of land use proposals on the circulation system.

**Program 2.2.1.** Development proposals shall be reviewed according to the provisions of the zoning and subdivision ordinance to ensure that adequate access, on-site circulation, parking and loading areas are provided.

**Program 2.2.2.** The City shall require developers to provide mitigations to potential adverse impacts of development on the existing street system. This may include necessary street improvements, traffic signs or signals.

**Program 2.2.3.** Roads created in subdividing or land parceling will be designed to tie into existing and anticipated road systems.

**Program 2.2.4.** Development review will analyze of visibility at intersections.

## Environmental Evaluation

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

The amendments do not propose any programs, policies, or ordinances that are inconsistent with current regulations described in the Circulation Element. The Circulation Element promotes the use of alternative modes of transportation through the use of pedestrian and bicycle pathways, development of transit facilities, and creation of a balanced community where residents can live, work, play, and shop. Future housing development that would be facilitated by the amendments would not increase residents within the city beyond General Plan projections, and would be consistent with the General Plan by conducting infill development so that residents could work, live, play, and shop within the city's limits. Additionally, prior to issuance of any building permit, a project applicant is required to pay development impact fees that would address potential traffic impacts. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

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

The amendments would be consistent with Circulation Element policies to promote pedestrian and bicycle pathways, transit, and other actions that ultimately decrease VMT within the city. The proposed amendments promote smaller, compact development (which would likely occur on infill parcels), promotes mixed-use projects and live/work units, and eliminates or reduces the amount of parking that would be required for residential developments, all of which promote the reduction of VMT. Additionally, most new residential units facilitated by these amendments would likely generate less than 110 daily vehicle trips, which the Governor's Office of Planning and Research (OPR) Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA identifies as having a less than significant impact relative to VMT. Compliance with applicable regulations and incorporation of fees makes impacts of future development less than significant.

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

**d) *Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?***

The amendments do not propose specific development at this time. Design features of future development would need to be consistent with road design features described in the Circulation Element as well as other applicable regulations determined by the City Engineer. Most development anticipated to be facilitated by the amendments would likely be infill development and would not create or realign roads. Individual proposals for housing development would be reviewed for road design features regarding hazards and emergency access. Impacts would be less than significant

## Conclusion

No significant impacts would occur.

## Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary.

## XVIII. Tribal Cultural Resources

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(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), or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

As of July 1, 2015, Assembly Bill (AB) 52 was enacted and expands CEQA by establishing a formal consultation process for California Native American tribes within the CEQA process. AB 52 specifies that any project that may affect or cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource would require a lead agency to “begin consultation with a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project.” According to the legislative intent for AB 52, “tribes may have knowledge about land and cultural resources that should be included in the environmental analysis for projects that may have a significant impact on those resources.” Section 21074 of AB 52 also defines a new category of resources under CEQA called “tribal cultural resources.” Tribal cultural resources are defined as “sites, features, places, cultural landscapes, sacred places, and objects with cultural value to a California Native American tribe” and are either listed in or eligible for listing in the CRHR or a local historic register or have been determined by the lead agency to be a tribal cultural resource. See also PRC 21074 (a)(1)(A)–(B).

CGC Section 65352.3 (adopted pursuant to the requirements of SB 18) requires local governments to contact, refer plans to, and consult with tribal organizations prior to making a decision to adopt or amend a general or specific plan. The tribal organizations eligible to consult have traditional lands in a local government’s jurisdiction, and are identified, upon request, by the NAHC. As noted in the State of California Tribal Consultation Guidelines (California Office of Planning and Research 2005), “The intent of SB 18 is to provide California Native American tribes an opportunity to participate in local land use

decisions at an early planning stage, for the purpose of protecting, or mitigating impacts to, cultural places.”.

The City’s COSE identifies the following policies relevant to cultural resources:

**Policy COS-4.1 Tribal Resources.** The City shall protect both known and potential tribal cultural resources.

## **Environmental Evaluation**

- 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:***
  - a-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)? and***
  - a-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 Resource Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.***

The City conducted AB 52 and SB 18 outreach to California Native American tribes and provided an opportunity for the tribes to consult regarding the Development Code and Land Use Element amendments to implement the Housing Element programs. The consultation request period is ongoing, and this section will be updated prior to adoption. To date, no requests for consultation have been received and no information regarding significant tribal cultural resources has been discovered. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

## **Conclusion**

The amendments would be consistent with current policies regarding impacts to tribal cultural resources.

## **Mitigation Measures**

No mitigation measures are necessary.

## XIX. Utilities and Service Systems

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>Would the project:</i>				
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

#### Wastewater

The South San Luis Obispo County Sanitation District (SSLOCSD) is responsible for the collection and treatment of sewage and wastewater in Grover Beach. Operation of the SSLOCSD is overseen by a Board of Directors that includes representatives from the City of Arroyo Grande, City of Grover Beach, and the Oceano Community Services District. The SSLOCSD's sewage treatment facility is located on a 7.6-acre site between the Oceano Airport and the Arroyo Grande Creek Channel, in unincorporated Oceano. The sewage collected by Grover Beach is transported through its own collection system to the plant via trunk sewers that are owned and operated by the SSLOCSD. SSLOCSD wastewater facilities are capable of processing five million gallons of wastewater per day, of which the City has a contractual allocation of 1.5 million gallons per day (33%; City of Grover Beach 2019). In 2019, the total average wastewater flow per day of the facility was 2.3 million gallons, with the City's contribution at 0.8 million gallons per day (City of Grover Beach 2019). Projected population growth for Arroyo Grande, Oceano, and Grover Beach indicates that at buildout of these three communities, the average flow per day will equal 75 percent of the system's capacity. The City's estimated flow at General Plan population buildout is anticipated to be 1.2 million gallons per day. Thus, wastewater capacity is not an immediate constraint to future housing development (City of Grover Beach 2020b).

#### Water

The City delivers both groundwater and surface water through its pressurized distribution system. The distribution system is composed of 48 miles of distribution mains, three storage reservoirs, one pumping

station, and approximately 5,278 service connections. The City receives surface water from the Lopez Project, which includes the Lopez Reservoir, the Lopez Terminal Reservoir, the Lopez Water Treatment Plant and the Lopez Pipeline and has a contractual entitlement of 800 acre-feet per year (City of Grover Beach 2015, 2021). The City's operates a well system that consists of four wells and chlorination facilities draw water from the Santa Maria River Valley Groundwater Basin, an adjudicated basin. Grover Beach's current water supply of 2,207 acre-feet per year comes from a combination of approximately 65 percent groundwater and 35 percent surface water. In 2020, the City's total water use was 1,288 acre-feet. It is expected that the City's water demands will reach 1,550-acre feet per year by 2035, based on a 20% reduction in water use required by SB7 and future water demands calculated in the City's 2019 Water System Master Plan (City of Grover Beach 2021). According to Grover Beach's 2020 Urban Water Management Plan, groundwater supply is projected to be sufficient to serve the city through 2035 General Plan buildout during normal year, single dry years, and five consecutive dry years. The City would need to increase groundwater pumping in 2040 and 2045 to meet future demands (City of Grover Beach 2021).

### **Storm Drainage**

The City manages its stormwater and drainage infrastructure. The system is characterized by small- to medium-sized retention basins that serve dual uses as parks (Mentone Basin), individual properties or common areas on properties throughout the city. Small portions of the city are served by drainage infrastructure that terminates in a waterbody or watercourse. Most properties in Grover Beach drain to retention facilities either on or off-site. Regulations are in place to control runoff and to cause runoff generated by on-site impervious surfaces to be retained on-site and infiltrated. These regulations were implemented to control downstream flooding caused by the lack of detention/retention facilities. (Placeworks 2020)

### **Solid Waste**

The collection and disposal of solid waste in Grover Beach is managed by the San Luis Obispo County Integrated Waste Management Association (IWMA). Garbage and recycling in Grover Beach are collected by the South County Sanitary Service and are taken to Cold Canyon Landfill. In 2012, the Cold Canyon Landfill was approved for expansion, which allowed the landfill to divert recoverable waste more efficiently and effectively from the disposal area and increase disposal capacity, extending its life to approximately 2040. (Placeworks 2020)

## Environmental Evaluation

- a) ***Would the project 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? and***
- b) ***Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years? and***
- c) ***Would the project 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? and***
- d) ***Would the project 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? and***
- e) ***Would the project comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?***

The amendments do not propose specific development at this time or establish new land uses. The additional housing units facilitated by the amendments would not increase the City's population beyond the projections of the General Plan buildout (2035), which is the basis for resource capacity, and therefore would not exceed the capacity of utility services. New development would be subject to development fees for wastewater treatment and other utility services. Individual proposals for housing development would be subject to policies outlined in the Conservation Element, as well as other regulations for utility services, including development fees mentioned above.

The SSLOCSW wastewater treatment facility has adequate capacity to serve these additional housing units. Projected population growth for Arroyo Grande, Oceano, and Grover Beach indicates that at buildout of these three communities, the average flow per day will equal 75 percent of the system's capacity. Thus, wastewater capacity is not an immediate constraint to future housing development. (City of Grover Beach 2020b)

According to Grover the City's 2020 Urban Water Management Plan, groundwater supply is projected to be sufficient to serve the city through 2035, which accounts for General Plan Buildout conditions. The City also has entitlements for surface water allocations from Lopez Reservoir, which is intended to provide a sustainable water supply for the city, and buffer impacts to groundwater during drought years (City of Grover Beach 2021). The Urban Water Management Plan also provides a water shortage contingency analysis and a Water Shortage Contingency Plan that identifies stages of action to be undertaken by the City in response to water supply shortages.

Future development of residential units constructed consistent with the proposed amendments would be served by Cold Canyon Landfill, which has a remaining capacity of 14.5 million cubic yards and a closure date of December 31, 2040.

With incorporation of development fees, impacts would be less than significant.

## Conclusion

Potential impacts to utilities and service systems would be less than significant.

## Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary.

## XX. Wildfire

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</i>				
(a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Setting

CAL FIRE maps areas of significant fire risks in California, which are identified based on weather, topography, fuels, and other factors. Fire hazards are greatest in areas with steep slopes, volatile vegetation, and windy conditions.

According to the Safety Element, the city is not located within a fire hazard severity zone and is not confronted with a significant wildfire hazard because of its location on the coast away from vegetated hillsides. High humidity levels and cool ocean-influenced temperatures also limit the potential for wildfires to occur. Open areas containing annual grasses are present in areas throughout the city, but do not represent a major wildfire risk.

## Environmental Evaluation

- a) ***If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? and***
- b) ***Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, if located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire? and***
- c) ***If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project 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? and***
- d) ***If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project 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 topography of the city is relatively flat, with a few hillside areas in the northern portion. The city is not within a state responsibility area on lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones. The Pismo State Beach southwest of the city is classified as a state responsibility area. Development facilitated by the proposed amendments would increase density on mostly infill parcels. The amendments would not expose residents to additional risks from wildfire and future development generally would not require new infrastructure such as roads or fuel breaks. As part of the building permit review process, the City routinely involves the police and fire department to ensure that access and improvements meet with their requirements. This coordination is independent of the CEQA process and would be unaffected by the proposed project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

## Conclusion

Potential wildfire impacts would be less than significant.

## Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary.

## XXI. Mandatory Findings of Significance

Environmental Issues	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Setting

#### Environmental Evaluation

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

Individual development project impacts on natural and cultural resources will be evaluated and mitigated, consistent with CEQA and applicable General Plan policies, LCP policies, and Development Code requirements. The proposed amendments would not affect City policies on protecting and enhancing biological or cultural resources or preclude the City from achieving resource protection goals.

The amendments would foster infill development within city limits. The additional density units created by the amendments would not increase the city's population beyond that envisioned in the General Plan. The amendments are consistent with General Plan Land Use policies regarding residential growth. The

amendments do not propose the conversion of agricultural or any other land use that is not already zoned for residential use. The amendments are intended to facilitate meeting the City's RHNA for the planning period. There is no evidence that the amendments (policies and development standards) will have significant, adverse impacts on humans, either directly or indirectly.

### 3 REFERENCES

- 3CE. 2021. Understanding Clean Energy. Website. Available at: <https://3cenergy.org/understanding-clean-energy/>. Accessed March 4, 2022.
- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2017. *California's 2017 Climate Change Scoping Plan*. November. Available at: [https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/classic/cc/scopingplan/scoping\\_plan\\_2017.pdf?utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_source=govdelivery](https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/sites/default/files/classic/cc/scopingplan/scoping_plan_2017.pdf?utm_medium=email&utm_source=govdelivery). Accessed March 1, 2022.
- California Department of Conservation. 2018. San Luis Obispo County Important Farmland 2016. California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. Available at: <ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/2016/slo16.pdf>. Accessed February 28, 2022.
- California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC). 2020. EnviroStor database. Available at: <https://www.envirostor.dtsc.ca.gov>. Accessed March 4, 2022.
- California Department of Transportation. 2019. Scenic Highways Program. Electronic Document. Available at: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/design/lap-landscape-architecture-and-community-livability/lap-liv-i-scenic-highways>. Accessed March 4, 2022.
- California Department of Water Resources Control Board. 2020. Geotracker Database. Available at: <https://geotracker.waterboards.ca.gov/map/?CMD=runreport&myaddress=Paso+Robles>. Accessed March 1, 2022.
- City of Grover Beach. 1981. Local Coastal Program. Electronic Document. Available at: <https://www.grover.org/DocumentCenter/View/1808/LocalCoastalProgram?bidId=>. Accessed February 28, 2022.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2010. Land Use Element. Electronic Document. Available at: [https://www.grover.org/DocumentCenter/View/50/LandUseElement\\_Amended-07-06-2020?bidId=](https://www.grover.org/DocumentCenter/View/50/LandUseElement_Amended-07-06-2020?bidId=). Accessed March 1, 2022.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2019. City of Grover Beach Sewer Master Plan. Electronic Document. Available at: <https://www.grover.org/DocumentCenter/View/10423/City-of-Grover-Beach-SMP-Report-Final?bidId=>. Accessed March 29, 2022.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2020a. Conservation and Open Space Element Update. Electronic Document. Available at: <https://www.grover.org/DocumentCenter/View/4134/Open-Space-Conservation-Element>. Accessed March 3, 2022.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2020b. City of Grover Beach 2020-2028 Housing Element. Electronic Document. Available at: [https://www.grover.org/DocumentCenter/View/10920/Housing-Element\\_11\\_16\\_20\\_final](https://www.grover.org/DocumentCenter/View/10920/Housing-Element_11_16_20_final). Accessed February 28, 2022.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2021. City of Grover Beach 2020 Urban Water Management Plan. Available at: [https://www.groverbeach.org/DocumentCenter/View/12188/Item14\\_Urban-Water-Management-Plan-Final](https://www.groverbeach.org/DocumentCenter/View/12188/Item14_Urban-Water-Management-Plan-Final). Accessed March 1, 2022.

Placeworks. 2020. Initial Study for Grover Beach 2020-2028 Housing Element Update and Opportunity Site Rezoning. Electronic Document. Available at: <https://www.grover.org/DocumentCenter/View/10921/2020-2028-Housing-Element---Initial-Study---With-Errata---Final>. Accessed March 3, 2022.

San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD). 2022. Annual Air Quality Report 2020. Electronic Document. Available at: <https://storage.googleapis.com/slocleanair-org/images/cms/upload/files/%28E-2%29.pdf>. Accessed March 1, 2022.

San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG). 2019. *2019 Regional Housing Needs Allocation Plan*. Adopted October 2019. Available at: [https://www.dropbox.com/s/stbw4b26apatv3f/\\_2019%20RHNA%20Plan\\_adopted\\_final.pdf?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/s/stbw4b26apatv3f/_2019%20RHNA%20Plan_adopted_final.pdf?dl=0). Accessed September 21, 2020.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS). 2021. Farmland Protection Policy Act. Website. Available at: [https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/landuse/fppa/?cid=nrcs143\\_008275](https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/landuse/fppa/?cid=nrcs143_008275). Accessed March 1, 2022.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2020. Quickfacts Grover Beach City, California. Website. Available at: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/groverbeachcitycalifornia/POP010220#POP010220>. Accessed March 29, 2022.