# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## ES-1 INTRODUCTION

Avila Ranch LLC (Applicant) proposes the implementation of the Avila Ranch Development Plan (Development Plan), including a General Plan amendment, amendments to the Airport Area Specific Plan (AASP), and related actions to permit development of the approximately150-acre Project site, which collectively comprise the Avila Ranch Development Project (Project). The Project is intended to implement the City of San Luis Obispo's (City's) vision for the Project site as guided by the City's 2014 Land Use and Circulation Elements of the General Plan (LUCE). The City's LUCE specifically identifies the Project site as a Special Focus Area and requires preparation of a specific plan for this area to address key planning and environmental issues including: the designation of an appropriate land use mix, the need for a variety of housing types and levels of affordability, provision of open space, parks and trails and restoration of Tank Farm Creek, protection and mitigation of impacts to agricultural resources, a circulation network and linkages to the surrounding community, and the incorporation of utility and infrastructure.

The Applicant proposes the adoption of the Development Plan and related actions to permit a mix of residential uses (68.23 acres), Neighborhood Commercial (3.34 acres), open space/park uses (71.30 acres), and roadways (7.03 acres). The proposed Project would result in construction of approximately 720 residential units as follows:

- 17.45 acres of R-1 low density uses with 105 single-family units on lots ranging between 4,000 to 8,500 square feet (sf);
- 35.03 acres of R-2 medium density uses with 305 single-family detached small lot units ranging from 1,350 sf to 2,000 sf intended to serve as workforce housing needs for moderate income households;
- 11.04 acres of R-3 medium-high density uses with 185 multiple-family attached "townhouse" and "condo" dwelling units ranging from 1,100 to 1,700 sf in size; and
- 4.71 acres of R-4 high density uses with 125 multiple-family attached units ranging from 650 to 1,150 sf in size.

The Project would also include 15,000 sf of leasable Neighborhood Commercial space concentrated in the eastern portion of the Project site in a Town Center setting. It is anticipated that the Town Center would provide small offices, retail shops, and service uses. Open space and park land uses would include of 18 acres of riparian open space along Tank Farm Creek, 9.8 acres of Neighborhood Park, 27 acres of dryland farming within the

open space buffer area along the southern boundary of the Project site, and recreational facilities (e.g., pocket park and mini-parks). The Project would include an internal network of roads and bicycle paths that would be integrated into the regional transportation and circulation system.

## ES-2 PROJECT OVERVIEW

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Project in the City of San Luis Obispo (City), California. The EIR was prepared by Amec Foster Wheeler, Environment and Infrastructure, Inc. (Amec Foster Wheeler) in cooperation with City staff. This EIR discloses the findings of the City regarding potential environmental impacts of adoption and implementation of the proposed Project.

The Project site encompasses three adjacent parcels (APN 053-259-004, -005, and -006) totaling 150 acres. The site is located at the northeast corner of Buckley Road and Vachell Lane, adjacent to the southern end of the City's jurisdictional boundary. The Project site is currently undeveloped and has historically been used for agriculture. Tank Farm Creek, a tributary to San Luis Obispo Creek, diagonally bisects the Project site from northeast to southwest and conveys storm water from the Chevron Tank Farm and adjacent properties to San Luis Creek. Prior to its annexation to the City in 2008, the Project site was zoned by the County of San Luis Obispo (County) for Business Park and Conservation/Open Space (COS) uses. The City's 2005 AASP also designated the site for Business Park uses and the Project site remained zoned Business Park and COS since its annexation. However, the City's 2014 Land Use Element of the General Plan rejected past Business Park land use designations in favor of new housing and designated the Project site as a Special Focus Area (SP-4) for provision of up to 700 residential units and small-scale neighborhood commercial uses, with associated policies and performance standards that would guide future development (Section 8.1.6 of the General Plan, Land Use Element).

## ES-3 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

This EIR examines potential short- and long-term impacts of the Project. These impacts were determined through a rigorous process mandated by CEQA in which existing conditions are compared and contrasted with conditions that would exist once the project is implemented. For each impact topic, thresholds for determining impact significance are identified based on City and State CEQA Guidelines, along with descriptions of methodologies used for conducting the impact analysis. For some topics, such as air quality, traffic, and noise, the analyses of impacts are more quantitative in nature and

involve the comparison of effects against a numerical threshold. For other topics, such as land use/planning, the analyses of impacts are inherently more qualitative, involving the consideration of a variety of factors, such as adopted City policies.

The EIR impact discussions classify impact significance levels as:

1. **Significant and Unavoidable** - a significant impact to the environment that remains significant even after mitigation measures are applied;
2. **Significant but Mitigable** - a significant impact that can be avoided or reduced to a less than significant level with mitigation;
3. **Less Than Significant -** a potential impact that would not meet or exceed the identified thresholds of significance for the resource area;
4. **No Impact** – no impact would occur for the resource area; and
5. **Beneficial** – a positive effect on the natural or human environment would occur.

Determinations of significance levels in the EIR are made based on impact significance criteria and applicable CEQA Guidelines for each resource area.

## ES-4 NOTICE OF PREPARATION/SCOPING

The City prepared an Initial Study (IS) for the Project in July 2015, made publicly available through the Notice of Preparation (NOP) distribution process in August 2015. The IS found that the Project may have potentially significant impacts to the following resources: aesthetics, agriculture, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, public services, transportation, and utilities (see Appendix A). Pursuant to Section 21080(d) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15064(f)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, if there is a fair argument supported by substantial evidence that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, the Lead Agency shall prepare an EIR, even when other substantial evidence has been presented that a project will not have a significant effect. Consequently, the City has determined that the preparation of an EIR would be required to analyze potential environmental impacts of the Project.

In compliance with the procedural requirements of CEQA, the City performed a public scoping process consistent with Section 15083 of the CEQA Guidelines. The public was provided an opportunity to comment on the scope of the EIR through a NOP released on August 14, 2015, which was distributed to federal, state, regional, and City agencies, and

neighborhood groups. The NOP comment period ran from August 14, 2015 through September 14, 2015, and a public hearing was held on August 26, 2015. During the NOP comment period, City received 30 written comment letters. Comments received during the NOP comment period were considered during EIR preparation and are included in Appendix B.

## ES-5 SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS

The significance of each impact resulting from implementation of the Project has been determined based on impact significance criteria and applicable CEQA Guidelines for each impact topic. Table ES-1 presents a summary of the impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts from implementation of the Project. In summary, the proposed Project would result in significant and unavoidable construction-related and long-term impacts to air quality, construction-related noise, potential inconsistency with City General Plan policies, and long-term transportation and traffic impacts.

Agricultural Resources

Implementation of the proposed Project would result in the conversion of approximately 94.6 acres of agricultural lands and a loss of approximately 26.6 acres of farmland of statewide importance. Though the Project includes a landscaping plan that dedicates 27 acres of land outside the Urban Reserve Line to the cultivation of dryland rotational crops, conversion of prime soils within the Project site totals approximately 68 acres. Mitigation requiring offsite agricultural conservation or payment of in-lieu fees would reduce the severity of impacts of converting the property from agriculture to nonagricultural uses, but since the impact cannot be fully attenuated, impacts to agricultural land would remain significant and unavoidable.

Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions

In the short term, the projected emissions for the Project were found to be above the established APCD Tier 1 quarterly thresholds for construction emissions of ROG, $NO_x$ and $PM_{2.5}$. Implementation of mitigation measures would minimize construction-related air quality impacts; however, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable, even after mitigation.

In the long term, air emission impacts from ROG + $NO_x$, $PM_{10}$, and $PM_{2.5}$ as a result of vehicle trips, natural gas energy emissions, and additional area source emissions associated with the Project would be significant and unavoidable. In accordance with the San Luis

Obispo APCD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook, all standard mitigation measures and feasible discretionary mitigation measures would be incorporated into the Project. Even so, the residual impacts would remain above the significance threshold.

The Project was also found to have significant and unavoidable impacts related to consistency with the County of San Luis Obispo APCD's 2001 Clean Air Plan. The design of the Project would require relatively substantial changes to reduce inconsistency with overall land use planning principles contained in the Clean Air Plan to less than significant. The Project could hinder the County's ability to maintain attainment of the state ozone standard because the emissions reductions projected in the Clean Air Plan may not be met. The anticipated population growth and increase in vehicle trips associated with the Project is inconsistent with the projections contained within the 2001 Clean Air Plan. Therefore, inconsistencies with assumptions in the Clean Air Plan would remain significant and unavoidable, even after implementation of mitigation measures.

Noise

In the short term, even with implementation of mitigation measures, construction-associated noise levels from equipment and vehicles would temporarily exceed City noise thresholds established in the City's General Plan Noise Element and Noise Guidebook for noise-sensitive residential uses approximately 100 feet from the Project site during grading and construction activities. Standard mitigation measures restricting hours of construction would minimize impacts; however, due to the location of sensitive land uses adjacent to the Project site, noise standards would be periodically exceeded and therefore significant and unavoidable.

Land Use

After a review for consistency with City General Plan policies, the Project is potentially inconsistent with several policies designed to protect agricultural resources. The Project would not fully replace or recreate the lost agricultural land onsite, which is inconsistent with Policy 1.9.2, Prime Agricultural Land allowing development on prime agricultural land if the development contributes to the protection of agricultural land within the City Urban Reserve Line (URL) and, therefore, would be significant and unavoidable.

Transportation and Traffic

Impacts to traffic and transportation upon implementation of the Project would consist of delays and/or exceedance of intersection capacities. More specifically, Project generated

traffic would cause exceedance of intersection capacities at the Buckley Road/State Route (SR) 227 intersection, resulting in significant and unavoidable impacts. Although the Project would implement mitigation measures and the Applicant would pay a fair share fee to offset Project contributions to this impact, as no County or Caltrans program for improvements is currently adopted, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

In addition, the Project would contribute to significant and unavoidable impacts related to operational conditions for the Prado Road/South Higuera Street. Although mitigation would apply, there currently are no feasible funded or scheduled programs for improvements to this intersection to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

**Table ES-1. Project Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Residual Significance |
|---|---|---|
| **3.1 Aesthetics and Visual Resources** | | |
| VIS-1. Implementation of the Project would result in impacts to the existing scenic resources present at the site, particularly due to conversion of agricultural land to urban development, loss of mature native trees along Tank Farm Creek, and impairment of distant views of the Santa Lucia Mountains, Islay Hill, and Irish Hills from adjacent public roads. | None required | Less than Significant |
| VIS-2. The proposed Project would result in a change in the existing visual character of the site with the change of the rural character to a commercial and residential neighborhood. | None required | Less than Significant |
| VIS-3. Construction of the Project would create short-term disruption of the visual appearance of the site for travelers along Buckley Road, Vachell Lane, and Venture Drive. | MM VIS-3 | Significant but Mitigable |
| VIS-4. The proposed Project would introduce a major new source of nighttime light, impacting the quality of the nighttime sky and increasing ambient light. | None required | Less than Significant |
| **3.2 Agricultural Resources** | | |
| AG-1. The proposed Project would impact agricultural land within the Project site and offsite Buckley Road Extension with the direct conversion of historically cultivated farmland to urban development. | MM AG-1 | Significant and Unavoidable |
| AG-2. Development of the proposed Project would create potential land use conflicts with continued agricultural operations to the south and east of the Project site. | MM AG-2a<br>MM AG-2b | Significant but Mitigable |

## Table ES-1. Project Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts (Continued)

| Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Residual Significance |
|---|---|---|
| **3.3 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Emissions** | | |
| AQ-1. The Project would result in potentially significant construction-related air quality impacts from dust and air pollutant emissions generated by grading and construction equipment operation. | MM AQ-1a<br>MM AQ-1b<br>MM AQ-1c | Significant and Unavoidable |
| AQ-2. The Project would result in significant long-term operation-related air quality impacts generated by area, energy, and mobile emissions. | MM AQ-2a<br>MM AQ-2b | Significant and Unavoidable |
| AQ-3. Release of toxic diesel emissions during initial construction and long-term operation of the Project could expose nearby sensitive receptors to such emissions. | None required | Less than Significant |
| AQ-4. Construction and operation of the Project would result in impacts to global climate change from the emissions of GHGs and would be potentially inconsistent with the City's Climate Action Plan. | MM AQ-2a<br>MM AQ-2b<br>MM TRANS-2d<br>MM TRANS-2f<br>MM TRANS-10a<br>MM TRANS-10b<br>MM TRANS-10c<br>MM TRANS-11<br>MM TRANS-12 | Significant but Mitigable |
| AQ-5. The Project is potentially inconsistent with the County of San Luis Obispo APCD's 2001 Clean Air Plan. | MM AQ-2b<br>MM TRANS-12 | Significant and Unavoidable |
| **3.4 Biological Resources** | | |
| BIO-1. Construction activities within the Project site and Buckley Road Extension site, including extensive grading, excavation, and fill, would result in permanent and temporary impacts to sensitive habitats and species, particularly in areas within or near Tank Farm Creek. | MM BIO-1a<br>MM BIO-1b<br>MM HYD-1a – 1c | Significant and Mitigable |
| BIO-2. Onsite Project development would result in permanent loss of habitats within the Project site, including protected wetlands and riparian areas associated with Tank Farm Creek. | MM AG-1<br>MM BIO-1a<br>MM BIO-1b<br>MM BIO-2a – 2j<br>MM HYD-4a<br>MM HYD-4b | Significant but Mitigable |
| BIO-3. Onsite Project development would interfere with the movement of common wildlife and special status species through establishment of confined wildlife corridors within the Project site. | MM BIO-1a<br>MM BIO-1b<br>MM BIO-2a – 2j<br>MM BIO-3a – 3e | Significant but Mitigable |

## Table ES-1. Project Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts (Continued)

| Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Residual Significance |
|---|---|---|
| BIO-4. Offsite improvements to and extension of Buckley Road and associated bicycle and pedestrian paths have the potential to create permanent impacts to special status species through removal of suitable habitat. | MM BIO-1a<br>MM BIO-1b<br>MM BIO-3a<br>MM BIO-3b<br>MM BIO-4 | Significant but Mitigable |
| BIO-5. Long-term operation of the Project has the potential to create significant impacts to biological resources as a result of increased light, noise, and increased human presence and other urban edge effects. | MM BIO-5a<br>MM BIO-5b | Significant but Mitigable |
| BIO-6. Project development could impact offsite biological resources from sedimentation into Tank Farm Creek. | MM BIO-1a<br>MM BIO-1b<br>MM BIO-2a<br>MM BIO-2f<br>MM BIO-2h<br>MM BIO-2j<br>MM BIO-6<br>MM HYD-1a – 1c | Significant but Mitigable |
| **3.5 Cultural Resources** | | |
| CR-1. The Project would result in adverse impacts to the octagonal silo foundation, historic feature P-40-038310. | None required | Less than Significant |
| CR-2. Development and grading would result in direct significant impacts to known prehistoric resources within the site. | MM CR-2a<br>MM CR-2b | Significant but Mitigable |
| CR-3. Earthwork and ground disturbing construction activities for the Project could potentially uncover significant unknown prehistoric or historic archaeological resources. If improperly handled, such resource could be adversely impacted. | MM CR-3a<br>MM CR-3b | Significant but Mitigable |
| **3.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials** | | |
| HAZ-1. During grading/construction activities and Project operations, the Project would potentially expose persons to potentially toxic, hazardous, or otherwise harmful chemicals through reasonably foreseeable upset and accidental conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. | MM HAZ-1 | Significant but Mitigable |
| HAZ-2. The proposed Project would not create a hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. | None required | Less than Significant |

## Table ES-1. Project Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts (Continued)

| Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Residual Significance |
|---|---|---|
| HAZ-3. The Project site is located within the LUCE defined AOZs and ALUP Safety Areas and would potentially result in an airport-related safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project site. | None required | Less than Significant |
| HAZ-4. Implementation of the proposed Project could expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildfire. | None required | Less than Significant |
| **3.7 Hydrology and Water Quality** | | |
| HYD-1. The Project would result in potentially significant impacts to water quality due to polluted runoff during construction activities. | MM HYD-1a<br>MM HYD-1b<br>MM HYD-1c | Significant but Mitigable |
| HYD-2. Project development would substantially alter existing drainage patterns on the Project site and Buckley Road Extension property, including burial of two segments of Tank Farm Creek and realignment of restored upstream reaches of the creek, which could potentially result in substantial flooding, erosion, or siltation onsite and offsite. | MM BIO-2a<br>MM HYD-2a<br>MM HYD-2b<br>MM HYD-2c | Significant but Mitigable |
| HYD-3. The Project could potentially result in flooding, including increased flood water surface elevations across the Project site, adjacent properties, and within Tank Farm Creek. | MM HYD-3a<br>MM HYD-3b | Significant but Mitigable |
| HYD-4. Installation of at least two utility lines using horizontal directional drilling would bisect Tank Farm Creek and has the potential to impact water quality. | MM HYD-4a<br>MM HYD-4b | Significant but Mitigable |
| HYD-5. Operation of the Project would result in potentially significant impacts to water quality of Tank Farm and San Luis Obispo Creeks due to polluted urban runoff and sedimentation. | MM HYD-2a<br>MM HYD-5 | Significant but Mitigable |
| HYD-6. The Project would potentially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge. | None required | Less than Significant |
| **3.8 Land Use and Planning** | | |
| LU-1. Project development would include residential uses located within the LUCE-defined Airport Overlay Zones (AOZs) that would be consistent with AOZ density and use restrictions and that would not interfere with airport operations or create safety impacts under recognized state and federal guidance for airport operations and safety. | None required | Less than Significant |
| LU-2. The proposed Project would include development within ALUP Safety Areas S-1B, S-1C, and S-2; however, the Project would be potentially consistent with the ALUP. | None required | Less than Significant |

## Table ES-1. Project Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts (Continued)

| Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Residual Significance |
|---|---|---|
| LU-3. The proposed Project would be potentially inconsistent with several adopted City policies in the General Plan designed to protect biological resources and agricultural resources and ensure provision of adequate utilities and public services. | MM AG-1<br>MM BIO-2a – j<br>MM PS-2<br>MM TRANS-2a – f,<br>MM TRANS-4<br>MM TRANS-11<br>MM TRANS-12 | Significant and Unavoidable |
| **3.9 Noise** | | |
| NO-1. Short-term construction activities would generate noise levels that would exceed thresholds established in the City's General Plan Noise Element and Noise Guidebook, with potential impacts to sensitive receptors. | MM NO-1a<br>MM NO-1b<br>MM NO-1c | Significant and Unavoidable |
| NO-2. Short-term noise construction activities could result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration. | None required | Less than Significant |
| NO-3. Long-term operational noise impacts would include higher roadway noise levels from increased vehicle traffic generated by the Project, Project operational noise, and exposure of future residents to high noise levels that could result in the exceedance of thresholds in the City's General Plan Noise Element and Noise Guidebook. | MM NO-3a<br>MM NO-3b | Significant but Mitigable |
| NO-4. Development within the ALUP noise contours could cause persons within the Project site to be exposed to unacceptable noise levels. | None required | Less than Significant |
| **3.10 Population and Housing** | | |
| PH-1. Residential development and associated population growth resulting from the Project would not exceed the adopted annual growth rate threshold. | None required | Less than Significant |
| PH-2. The construction of 720 units under the Project would provide additional housing for the City of San Luis Obispo, having beneficial impacts related to the jobs/housing imbalance. | None required | Beneficial |
| PH-3. The construction of affordable housing units under the Project would provide additional affordable housing for the City of San Luis Obispo. | Non required | Less than Significant |
| **3.11 Public Services** | | |
| PS-1. Implementation of the Project would potentially increase demand on the SLOPD for police protection services. | MM PS-1 | Significant but Mitigable |

## Table ES-1. Project Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts (Continued)

| Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Residual Significance |
|---|---|---|
| PS-2. Project implementation would increase the demand for SLOFD fire protection services, create potential declines in firefighter to resident ratios, be located outside of accepted response time performance area and necessitate construction of an additional fire protection facility, with potential for secondary environmental impacts. | MM PS-2 | Significant but Mitigable |
| PS-3. Development of 720 new homes as part of the Project would generate increases in enrollment at public schools (Los Ranchos Elementary, Laguna Middle, and San Luis High). | None required | Less than Significant |
| PS-4. Implementation of the Project would potentially increase the demand for park services beyond current capacity. | None required | Less than Significant |
| **3.12 Transportation and Traffic** | | |
| TRANS-1. Project construction activities would potentially create traffic impacts due to congestion from construction vehicles (e.g., construction trucks, construction worker vehicles, equipment, etc.) as well as temporary traffic lane and sidewalk closures. | MM TRANS-1 | Significant but Mitigable |
| TRANS-2. Phased Project development combined with limited site access and related increases in congestion on surrounding roadways would have the potential to cause transportation deficiencies throughout the Project vicinity. | MM TRANS-2a<br>MM TRANS-2b<br>MM TRANS-2c<br>MM TRANS-2d<br>MM TRANS-2e<br>MM TRANS-2f<br>MM TRANS-4<br>MM TRANS-5 | Significant but Mitigable |
| TRANS-3. Project-generated traffic would potentially create turning movement conflicts at driveways and intersections on the Project site. | MM TRANS-3a<br>MM TRANS-3b | Significant but Mitigable |
| TRANS-4. Project-generated traffic would exceed Circulation Element maximum volume thresholds at Vachell Lane, Earthwood Lane, Horizon Lane, and Suburban Road. | MM TRANS-2a – f<br>MM TRANS-3b<br>MM TRANS-4 | Significant but Mitigable |
| TRANS-5. Project-generated traffic would cause increase delays and cause exceedance of intersection capacity at the Buckley Road/SR 227 intersection in both the AM and PM peak hours. | MM TRANS-5 | Significant and Unavoidable |
| TRANS-6. Project-generated traffic would exacerbate existing queuing at the South Street/Higuera Street intersection northbound right-turn lane, resulting in significant impacts. | MM TRANS-6 | Significant but Mitigable |

## Table ES-1. Project Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts (Continued)

| Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Residual Significance |
|---|---|---|
| TRANS-7 Project-generated traffic would cause exceedance of storage capacities at several intersections along South Higuera Street. | MM TRANS-7a<br>MM TRANS-7b<br>MM TRANS-7c<br>MM TRANS-7d | Significant but Mitigable |
| TRANS-8. Project-generated traffic would cause delays and exceedance of intersection capacities at several intersections along Los Osos Valley Road. | MM TRANS-8a<br>MM TRANS-8b | Significant but Mitigable |
| TRAN-9. The proposed Project would generate and attract trips to and from U.S. Highway 101, incrementally increasing congestion of the region's main highway. | None required | Less than Significant |
| TRANS-10. The proposed Project would potentially degrade level of service for various pedestrian facilities serving the Project vicinity. | MM TRANS-3b<br>MM TRANS-4<br>MM TRANS-8a<br>MM TRANS-10a<br>MM TRANS-10b<br>MM TRANS-10c | Significant but Mitigable |
| TRANS-11. Project development would increase demand for bicycle facilities in an underserved area and would potentially conflict with the City's Bicycle Transportation Plan regulations and General Plan thresholds. | MM TRANS-2d<br>MM TRANS-8a<br>MM TRANS-11 | Significant but Mitigable |
| TRANS-12. The proposed Project would increase demand for transit services in an underserved area, presenting a barrier to both transit dependent and non-transit dependent households for using transit. | MM TRANS-12 | Significant but Mitigable |
| TRANS-13. Under near-term plus Project conditions, Project-generated traffic would cause delays and exceedance of storage capacities at Buckley/SR 227 and Los Osos Valley Road/South Higuera Street and contribute to road segment congestion. | MM TRANS-5<br>MM TRANS-13 | Significant but Mitigable |
| TRANS-14. Under near-term conditions, the proposed Project would cumulatively contribute incrementally to increased demand for bicycle and pedestrian facilities, potentially conflicting with the City's BTP regulations and General Plan thresholds. | MM TRANS-10b<br>MM TRANS-14 | Significant but Mitigable |
| TRANS-15. Under long-term cumulative plus Project conditions, Project-generated traffic would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to potentially significant impacts to the operational conditions at four intersections. | MM TRANS-5<br>MM TRANS-7a<br>MM TRANS-15a<br>MM TRANS-15b<br>MM TRANS-15c<br>MM TRANS-15d | Significant and Unavoidable |

**Table ES-1. Project Impacts, Mitigation Measures and Residual Impacts (Continued)**

| Impacts | Mitigation Measures | Residual Significance |
|---|---|---|
| **3.13 Utilities** | | |
| UT-1. Project generated wastewater would contribute to demand for wastewater collection facilities and remaining capacity of the City's Water Resource Recovery Facility (WRRF). | None required | Less than Significant |
| UT-2. The Project would require the expansion of utility infrastructure to serve new development, including water, sewer, gas and electricity into the site; the construction of which could cause environmental effects. | MM AQ-1a – 1c<br>MM BIO-1a – 1c<br>BIO-2a – 2j<br>BIO-3a – 3e<br>BIO-6<br>MM CR-2a – 2b<br>MM CR-3a – 3b<br>MM HAZ-1<br>MM HYD-1a – 1c<br>HYD-4a – 4b<br>MM NO-1a – 1c<br>MM TRANS-1<br>MM UT-2 | Significant but Mitigable |
| UT-3. Project-related increases in water use would incrementally increase demand for the City's potable water supply. | None required | Less than Significant. |
| UT-4. The Project would generate additional solid waste for disposal at the Cold Canyon Landfill. | None required | Less than Significant |

## ES-6 SUMMARY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The CEQA Guidelines state that an "EIR shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the Project, or to the location of the Project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the Project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives" (Section 15126.6). Several alternatives to the proposed Project, including the No Project Alternative and Reduced Development Alternative, were considered. Each alternative considers the ability of a particular alternative to substantially reduce or eliminate the Project's significant environmental impacts, while still meeting basic Project objectives.

This EIR discusses alternatives to the proposed Project, including the No Project Alternative, Mitigated Project Alternative, Residential Plus Business Park Land Use Alternative, and alternatives that were considered and discarded. Each of these considers the ability of a particular alternative to substantially reduce or eliminate the Project's significant environmental impacts, while still meeting basic Project objectives. Consistent

with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c), a range of alternatives that do not provide any environmental advantages compared to the proposed Project, meet key Project objectives, nor achieve overall agency policy goals were eliminated from further consideration, including retention of agricultural uses on site, increasing housing development, majorly reducing the Project, and developing a business park.

The alternatives analyzed in the EIR include:

**No Project Alternative:**

Under the No Project Alternative, the Project would not be approved. This alternative could result in two possible outcomes. Under one possible outcome, the No Project Alternative would be a continuation of the existing agricultural uses within the site. The Project site would remain vacant for the foreseeable future and no development would occur. A second possible outcome of the No Project Alternative would be development of the Project site in accordance with the City's General Plan/LUCE.

**Mitigated Project Alternative:**

The Mitigated Project Alternative is designed to meet the central Project objectives of the Project, namely, to provide for residential development, park and open space, and neighborhood residential opportunities that complement the intended uses for the site under the LUCE. The MPA would include five primary features intended to reduce Project identified impacts: 1) Tank Farm Creek would not be realigned and the existing 600-foot long North-South Creek Segment would be retained to protect riparian habitat and no direct connection with the Chevron Tank Farm property would be provided; 2) the East-West Channel in the northeastern part of the site would be retained to accommodate surface drainage; 3) the mix of allowable uses within the Town Center development would be modified with the intention to reduce trip generation; 4) development setbacks from Tank Farm Creek would be increased to a minimum of 35 feet along a majority of the creek, with a minimum 20-foot setback along approximately 700 feet, primarily from the proposed Class I paved bicycle path, instead of the Project's setbacks of as low as 5 feet; and, 5) a number of onsite and offsite road and circulation improvements would be included as part of the MPA

**Residential Plus Business Park Land Use Alternative:**

This alternative would combine development of the site as a residential area with development of the site as a business park with supporting commercial development. This alternative would provide for development of a business area, following the site's current zoning for "BP-SP", or Business Park – Specific Plan, encouraging employment growth in the eastern region of the Project site. The residential component of the alternative would allow up to 700 units, 35,000 sf of neighborhood commercial space, and 120,000 sf of business park development.

Impacts associated with each of these alternatives is summarized in Table ES-2.

## ES-7 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Table ES-2 summarizes the environmental impacts associated with the proposed Project and the analyzed alternatives. The *No Project Alternative* would involve no development on site and, as a result, would have the fewest impacts and would be environmentally superior to the Project. However, the No Project Alternative would not achieve the Project objectives. Further, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 states that if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative from among the other alternatives.

The *Mitigated Project Alternative* is considered to be the environmentally superior alternative since impacts would be reduced for most issue areas and all Project objectives would be met. The Mitigated Project Alternative would result in the fewest impacts to the following resource areas: biological resources, hydrology and water quality, land use, transportation and traffic, and utilities.

## Table ES-2. Impact Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Project

| Issue Area | No Project | | Mitigated Project | Business Park |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | A. No Development | B. General Plan Development | | |
| **Aesthetics and Visual Resources** | Less | Similar | Similar | Greater |
| **Agricultural Resources** | Less | Similar | Similar | Similar |
| **Air Quality** | Less | Similar | Similar | Greater |
| **Biological Resources** | Less | Similar | Less | Less |
| **Cultural Resources** | Less | Similar | Similar | Greater |
| **Hazardous Materials** | Less | Similar | Similar | Greater |
| **Hydrology and Water Quality** | Less | Less | Less | Less |
| **Land Use and Planning** | Less | Less | Less | Greater |
| **Noise** | Less | Similar | Similar | Greater |
| **Population and Housing** | Greater | Similar | Similar | Similar |
| **Public Services** | Less | Similar | Similar | Similar |
| **Transportation and Traffic** | Less | Similar | Less | Greater |
| **Utilities** | Less | Similar | Less | Greater |
| **Project Objectives Met?** | No | Partially | Yes | Yes |