CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO

INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
91375

March 27, 2017

1. Project Title:

RAILROAD SAFETY TRAIL PROJECT, TAFT STREET TO PEPPER STREET

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

City of San Luis Obispo
Public Works, Engineering
919 Palm Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Dan Van Beveren, Senior Civil Engineer
(805) 783-7715

Prepared By:
Crystahl Taylor, Senior Project Manager
Padre Associates, Inc.
(805) 786-2650 x 11

4. Project Location:

West of California Boulevard, from Taft Street to Pepper Street, San Luis Obispo, CA

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Dan Van Beveren, Senior Civil Engineer
City of San Luis Obispo
Public Works, Engineering
919 Palm Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Project Representative Name and Address:

Dan Van Beveren, Senior Civil Engineer
City of San Luis Obispo
Public Works, Engineering
919 Palm Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

6. General Plan Designation:

Neighborhood Commercial, Office, Medium Density Residential

7. Zoning:

R-2 (Medium Density Residential), O (Office), Right-of Way

8. Description of the Project:

Project History and Existing Infrastructure

In June of 2001, the City of San Luis Obispo (City) adopted a preferred alignment for the Railroad Safety Trail Project. The overall Railroad Safety Trail Project spans 1.4 miles within the City limits and is primarily located adjacent to California Boulevard and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) right-of-way. The proposed Class I/Class IV bicycle trail and multi-use pathway will serve bicyclists, pedestrians, and other recreational users. The intent of the facility is to promote alternative forms of transportation and provide new recreational opportunities consistent with the goals set forth in the City's Bicycle Transportation Plan. The trail will ultimately provide a safe and direct north/south commuter route between California Polytechnic State University (Cal Poly) and the San Luis Obispo Amtrak station.

The existing California Boulevard / US 101 overcrossing structure is 58 feet wide from the barrier separating the sidewalk on the west side to the inside of the barrier on the east side of the roadway. This section of California Boulevard is a three-lane major arterial within the Project limits. The design speed for California Boulevard is 40 miles per hour (mph) with a posted speed limit of 35 mph. Pedestrians and bicyclists, accessing Cal Poly, heavily travel this corridor. The existing striping within California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) right-of-way consists of two 11-foot northbound lanes and one 11-foot southbound lane separated by a painted median that varies from 9 feet to 10 feet in width. Traveling south along California Boulevard, the median opens up to provide a left-turn pocket for the northbound US 101 on-ramp. The existing bridge also has two 5-foot sidewalks on both sides of the roadway. The east side sidewalk and barrier are not proposed to be impacted by the proposed Project.

For purposes of this discussion, the UPRR track is assumed to run from north to south, as is California Boulevard.

Project Description

As part of the City's Bicycle Transportation Plan and Railroad Safety Trail, this segment of the Railroad Safety Trail Project includes the construction of a 1,700-foot Class I and Class IV trail from Taft Street to Pepper Street, which will serve both pedestrians and two-way directional traffic

for bicyclists. The existing Class IV trail currently ends on California Boulevard at Taft Street. The proposed Project consists of a 12-foot wide shared use path with 2-foot paved shoulders. The trail will consist of a structural section of 0.33 feet Hot Mix Asphalt (Type A) over 1 foot Class 2 aggregate base. This new segment will connect to the existing trail on California Boulevard and Taft Street as described below:

The new Class IV trail will originate on the west side of California Boulevard at Taft Street, and will continue south for 450 feet, parallel to California Boulevard. The Class IV trail will continue south onto the existing California Boulevard overcrossing structure at US 101 for an additional 135 ft. The Class IV trail will continue beyond the southwest side of the overcrossing structure for approximately 65 feet. The Class IV trail will turn and continue southwest between the California Highway Patrol (CHP) property and the UPRR right-of-way where it will become a Class I trail, and continue approximately 835 feet south of California Boulevard to Phillips Lane. The trail will then continue west and cross the UPRR tracks via a new bridge structure, approximately 100 feet in length, where the trail will connect to Pepper Street. The final portion of the Project will continue south along the north side of Pepper Street for approximately 105 ft.

The Project includes re-striping the vehicle travel lanes on California Boulevard to accommodate the trail, which would decrease the number of northbound travel lanes from two to one along the California Boulevard overcrossing structure at US 101.

The profile of the trail along California Boulevard will follow the profile of the roadway and overcrossing structure. As the trail turns south, adjacent to the CHP property, the profile of the trail will gradually decrease in grade, but will fill in an existing drainage basin located between the CHP property and the UPRR tracks. As the trail approaches the end of the CHP property line, the profile of the trail rises to reach the required minimum vertical clearance requirement of 23.5 feet over the railroad tracks near Phillips Lane. The profile will then descend to match the existing grade at Pepper Street. To reduce the impact to the UPRR right-of-way, retaining walls are required to accommodate the grade change and minimize the footprint needed for the trail construction.

The trail will be constructed using Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. Along California Boulevard, the trail begins outside of the curb, gutter, and sidewalk and then transitions to be adjacent to the shoulder along the street grade. A stamped concrete section with variable width will be constructed to separate the multi-use path with the vehicle traffic on California Boulevard. ADA ramps will be provided for pedestrian access onto the existing sidewalk located on the northwest side of the California Boulevard overcrossing structure. A 42-inch picket railing with a concrete curb (Type A3) will be constructed to separate vehicle traffic from the multi-use trail. A similar ADA ramp will be constructed on the southwest side of the overcrossing structure to access the trail. Prior to crossing the railroad, the trail will have a connection to the Phillips Lane cul-de-sac. The connection will be 10 feet wide and require some fill material to get the connection to the existing sidewalk grade. In order to get back to grade, a ramping structure will be used and will be approximately 100 feet long. The trail will end on Pepper Street and serve as a connecting point to the next segment of the overall trail.

Drainage

There are existing 2:1 slopes that grade the existing ground surface from California Boulevard as well. The slopes are also adjacent to the CHP parking lot down to the UPRR tracks. At the toe of slope between the CHP property and the UPRR tracks there is an existing basin which collects

storm water runoff from the CHP property. The purpose of this basin is to retain the drainage from encroaching into the UPRR right-of-way. The proposed trail will fill in this existing basin. In order to mitigate the drainage impacts to the existing basin, a 1-foot minimum depth v-ditch with 2:1 side slopes is proposed between the CHP property and the trail. The ditch will be maintained for approximately 500 ft. In lieu of the basin, this ditch will serve as the retention area between the CHP property and the UPRR tracks.

The storm water collected in the basin currently drains to a headwall and pipe inlet near the US 101 right-of-way. To maintain the existing drainage pattern, the storm water collected in the proposed v-ditch will flow to an open pipe inlet and an 18-inch pipe that will connect from the drainage inlet to the headwall and drain at the same location. Existing storm drain pipes that outfall from the CHP property will be maintained and will outfall into the proposed ditch instead of the existing basin.

Right-of-Way

In order for the trail to be constructed along the proposed alignment, the City will need to obtain permanent easement or right-of-way take from UPRR, State of California Department of General Services (DGS) and, potentially, two private properties near the Phillips Lane cul-de-sac. Temporary construction easements will be needed from UPRR and one private property. DGS will also be contacted to determine if the parking lot at the CHP property could be made available for a construction staging area.

See the attached plans for locations and size of each permanent and temporary easement location.

Traffic

With the new trail located along California Boulevard, a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) will be prepared for the Project due to potential effect on California Boulevard travelers. California Boulevard will also need to be re-striped to accommodate the reduction of available space for traffic on the overcrossing. The proposed Project will decrease the number of northbound travel lanes from two to one for crossing the California Boulevard overcrossing. It is estimated that there will be four days of lane closures; two days for each of the planned phases for lane closure. Lane closure details will be included in the TMP prepared for the Project.

Bridge and Retaining Wall Construction

The existing California Boulevard overcrossing over US 101 (Bridge No. 49-0079) is 58 feet wide from the barrier separating the sidewalk on the west side to the inside of the barrier on the east side of the roadway. This structure will be modified to include a 1-foot raised curb. This curb will also support a 42-inch tall picket railing to separate the trail from vehicle traffic. The sidewalk barrier on the west edge of the existing western edge of the bridge will remain unchanged.

As the pathway diverts away from California Boulevard, construction for the retaining walls/approach structures and the abutments for the bridge over the railroad track could be rather difficult due in part to the steep slopes of the existing terrain. In order to minimize the impacts to the adjacent UPRR property, several retaining walls/approach structures will be required along the trail alignment described in the following table.

Retaining Wall/ Approach Structure Stations Limits	Trail Side	Total Length (ft)	Maximum Height (ft)
16+28 to 16+80	West	52	5
21+25 to 24+78	West	353	20
22+60 to 23+95	East	135	8
24+35 to 24+78	East	43	8
26+01 to 27+00	East	99	8
26+01 to 26+90	West	89	8

The retaining wall/approach structure is currently shown in many typical sections as a retaining wall either on one side of the path or on both sides in order to elevate the pathway above the original ground. These retaining walls are currently shown to be spread footings, but as geotechnical exploration is performed and analyzed, it may be determined that piles will be required to support the walls. Piles would be placed vertically so as to stay within the right-of-way of the path. Another alternative is to elevate the pathway on a slab bridge supported on pile bent foundations (i.e., two piles per bent) with the bents spaced approximately every 40 ft. The disadvantage associated with a slab bridge is the creation of habitat for homeless or transient people to take up residence beneath the bridge.

The trail will cross the railroad tracks and connect to Pepper Street using a single-span prefabricated steel truss bridge, which will be approximately 97 feet in length (station 24+91 to 25+88). A reinforced concrete abutment will support each end of the truss bridge and provide the transitions (landings) between the retaining walls/approach structures and the bridge. Finally, a large 84-inch diameter cast-in-drilled-hole reinforced concrete pile will support each abutment.

Staged Construction

A staged construction concept will be implemented. Temporary lane closures along California Boulevard across the California Overcrossing of US 101, as well as Pepper Street near Phillips Lane, will be required and will be performed pursuant to the TMP prepared for the Project. The TMP will also include the use of temporary traffic control devices to limit access to the Phillips Lane cul-de-sac during construction of the bridge and retaining wall.

Temporary staging areas have been identified for the Project. One temporary staging area will be located within the CHP visitor parking lot, along with three smaller temporary staging areas along the trail alignment.

Utilities

The following existing utilities would either be avoided or modified as described below:

- Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) underground electric exists within the south side sidewalk of California Boulevard. Overhead PG&E electric lines exist on the south side of Pepper Street. PG&E lines are not in conflict with the Project, and will not require relocation.
- An existing sewer manhole along California Boulevard at Taft Street will be raised to grade. Additional sewer facilities located between the railroad tracks and the CHP facility will also be adjusted to grade.

- Existing storm drain pipe outfalls are located behind the CHP property visitor parking lot, as well as a pipe headwall and storm drain outfall pipe. The Project will avoid the storm drain pipe outfalls, pipe headwall, and storm drain outfall pipe; therefore, no relocation is required.
- Fiber optic lines within the railroad right-of-way will not be impacted by this Project.
- A pole with a loud-speaker on it exists at the end of the Phillips Lane cul-de-sac. Initial investigation appears that the pole may belong to the County Department of Emergency Services as part of their emergency warning system. The Project will avoid the pole, and it will not require relocation.

Ground Disturbance and Vegetation Removal

Implementation of the Project would require the disturbance of approximately 3.15 acres, including approximately 0.76 acres of permanent disturbance, 2.16 acres of temporary-only disturbance, and 0.28 acres of unpaved construction staging area. The permanent impacts include an approximately 0.04-acre section of California Boulevard where the vehicle travel lane and shoulder will be converted to a Class IV trail. The City would implement standard erosion control and stormwater management measures pursuant to the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) prepared for the Project. The Project would require the removal of vegetation within the trail corridor, including the removal of eucalyptus trees, pepper trees, and an ash tree.

9. Setting and Surrounding Land Uses:

The Project is a linear trail located west of California Boulevard and primarily east of the UPRR tracks. The trail will connect to the existing trail on California Boulevard at Taft Street and will terminate on the west side of the UPRR track at Pepper Street. The Project site consists of City streets, State right-of-way (California Boulevard/Highway 101 overpass), and UPRR right-of-way adjacent to high density residential, medium density residential, and neighborhood commercial zones. A portion of the trail would traverse an office zone behind the California Highway Patrol facility and a residential zone near the terminus of Phillips Lane.

Existing uses surrounding the site area are as follows:

West: Developed with medium density residential and medium-high density residential.
North: Developed with medium density residential and medium-high density residential.
East: Developed with medium density residential and medium-high density residential. The California Highway Patrol office and medical offices are also located to the east.
South: Developed with medium density residential and medium-high density residential.

10. Project Entitlements Requested:

Architectural Review and City Council approval of Project.

11. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.): Caltrans /Federal Highways Administration (FHWA), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control Board (APCD).

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

	Aesthetics		Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Population / Housing
	Agriculture Resources	X	Hazards & Hazardous Materials		Public Services
X	Air Quality	X	Hydrology / Water Quality	X	Recreation
X	Biological Resources		Land Use / Planning	X	Transportation / Traffic
X	Cultural Resources		Mineral Resources		Utilities / Service Systems
	Geology / Soils	X	Noise	X	Mandatory Findings of Significance

FISH AND GAME FEES

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

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

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

DETERMINATION:

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.	X
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(s) or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact(s) on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed	
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR of NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.	

Signature

3-28-17
Date

Tyler Corey, Principal Planner
Print Name

For: Michael Codron
Community Development Director

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact' is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.

4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 19, "Earlier Analysis," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063 (c) (3) (D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.

   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they addressed site-specific conditions for the project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8. The explanation of each issue should identify:

   a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and

   b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	1, 5, 24, 29, 36			--X--	
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, open space, and historic buildings within a local or state scenic highway?	5, 11, 24, 28			--X--	
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	1, 11, 24, 29			--X--	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	5, 10,11, 12, 24, 29			--X--	

Evaluation

The City is located eight miles from the Pacific Ocean and lies at the convergence of two main drainages: the Los Osos Valley which drains westerly into Morro Bay via Los Osos Creek, and the San Luis Valley which drains to the south-southwest into the Pacific Ocean at Avila Beach via the San Luis Obispo Creek. The topography of the City and its surroundings is generally defined by several low hills and ridges such as Bishop Peak and Cerro San Luis Obispo. These peaks are also known as Morros and provide scenic focal points for much of the City. The Santa Lucia Mountains and Irish Hills are the visual limits of the area and are considered the scenic backdrop for much of the City. The surrounding hills have created a hard urban edge where development has remained in the lower elevations. The Project site vicinity within the residential neighborhoods south of Foothill Boulevard exhibits a more suburban character than those in the downtown core. The street pattern is a rectilinear grid, providing a degree of formality and long visual sightlines along some streets. As elsewhere in the City, these neighborhoods enjoy the benefits of mature street trees and the unique visual backdrop provided by Cerro San Luis Obispo and Bishop Peak.

The Project site is adjacent to high density, medium-high density, and medium density residential zones, as well as office and neighborhood commercial zones. On the eastern side of US 101, the UPRR lies between the proposed pathway and high density and medium-high density neighborhoods. The elevations of California Boulevard and the railroad are several feet higher than the base of the eastern residences, which increases the total area of visible sky via their dropped rooflines. Along the trail alignment, the visual setting includes approximately 600 feet along California Boulevard, and approximately 1,000 feet in the direct vicinity of the UPRR. Along the UPRR, the trail is bordered by residential housing and offices.

a) The proposed Project is located in an urbanized section of the City on a site with relatively flat topography and gradients not exceeding two percent. The Project site is visible from multiple public viewing areas including California Boulevard, Taft Street, Phillips Lane, Pepper Street, and UPRR tracks. Potential viewers include drivers and passengers in vehicles, bicyclists, pedestrians, and train passengers. California Boulevard and US 101 (east of California Boulevard) are identified as scenic roadways with “moderate scenic value” and no locally-designated scenic vistas are present in the Project area. The trail alignment is not visible from US 101.

Much of the Project does not elevate the current road shoulder or bridge walkway to a height greater than what currently exists, and should not create any new obstructions to scenic vistas. A portion of the Project will be within an area designated by the City as having a "moderate scenic value", but the finished structure will be low-lying pavement and asphalt, and will not significantly obstruct views from California Boulevard. Based on the location and design of the Project, views from US 101 would not be affected. On the southeastern side of US 101, the proposed pathway will slope upward until it turns into a bike and pedestrian truss bridge, which will span over the UPRR tracks from the eastern bank of the UPRR near Phillips Lane over to the eastern edge of Pepper Street. This area of Phillips Lane and Pepper Street does not contain unique visual features that would distinguish the site from surrounding areas, nor is it located within a designated scenic vista.

Review of the Project site and Project plans indicate that the Project would not result in substantial adverse impacts to the visual environment, nor would there be any negative impacts to any scenic views or other visual resources. The trail would continue from the current trail terminus, and will drop down out of site along the UPRR. The removal of some trees and exotic plant species would result in the restoration of views of the surrounding hillsides including those of Cerro San Luis Obispo, Bishop Peak, and the Santa Lucia Coastal Range as seen from California Boulevard. No scenic vistas will be significantly impacted by the Project.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

b) The affected segment of US 101 is identified as an Eligible State Scenic Highway (not officially designated) by the California Scenic Highway Mapping System. California Boulevard and US 101 (east of California Boulevard) are identified in the City's Conservation and Open Space Element as local scenic roadways with moderate scenic value. There are no rock outcroppings that would be affected by the Project and the Project site contains no scenic open space. Based on the Project's location, the Project would not obstruct any views of historical buildings or negatively impact the architectural integrity and continuity of historical buildings or neighborhoods. The pathway will not obstruct views as seen from US 101 or California Boulevard. There are multiple trees present on the Project site that will need to be removed for completion of the pathway and bridge. These include a stand of eucalyptus trees on the western bank of the railroad tracks, an Ash tree and pepper trees adjacent to the CHP parking visitor lot, and possibly additional pepper trees on the Pepper Street side of the Project. Some of the trees that will be removed are visible from California Boulevard and Pepper Street; however, the trees are not visible from US 101.

c) Due to the removal of trees along the alignment, the visual character of the Project site will be affected. There is a well-established tree canopy within the Project site. The tree removal likely not be noticeable to the public traveling in the vicinity of the alignment. The trees are not visible from US 101, and slightly visible traveling south on California Boulevard; therefore, the impacts are less than significant.

d) The Project proposes limited lighting, which will not be continuous throughout the trail. The Project is located in a developed and urbanized area accustomed to light from residential uses and vehicle circulation on neighboring streets. The Project will not contribute substantial amounts of light or glare to the daytime views in the area. The Project will conform to the City's Night Sky Preservation Ordinance (Zoning Regulations Chapter 17.23), as well as the outdoor lighting requirements in the General Plan, Policy 9.2.3 of the Conservation and Open Space Element. All light sources from the Project will conform to these standards and therefore be less than significant impacts.

Conclusion: The Project will have a less than significant impact on aesthetics.

2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. Would the project:

a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	1, 12, 13, 21, 24				--X--
b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	1, 12, 13, 21, 24				--X--
c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	1, 12, 13, 21, 24				--X--

Evaluation

The City is located in the heart of San Luis Obispo County and the Central Coast Region, both of which are important key agricultural centers within the State of California. The region's agricultural industry is an important part of the local economy. It provides employment and income directly for those in agriculture, and it helps drive growth in the tourism industry, which in turn generates further economic activity and consumer spending.

a) The Project site is not designated as Prime or Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. Therefore, the proposed Project would not result in conversion of these agricultural resources to nonagricultural use, and no impact would occur.

b) The Project site is not located on farmland, nor is it under a Williamson Act contract. The Project site is designated for residential uses in the General Plan and is zoned R-3 (Medium-High Density Residential), C-N (Neighborhood Commercial), and O (Office). The Project site is surrounded by developed properties and public streets. Therefore, the proposed Project would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract, and no impact would occur.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

c) No farmland is present within or in the vicinity of the Project site; therefore, development of the Project site will not result in the conversion of farmland. Based on the urban location of the Project, construction and operation of the Project would not result in any changes that would result in the conversion of Farmland either on or off-site, and no impact would occur.

Conclusion: The Project will have no impacts to agricultural resources.

3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	14, 22, 29, 30		--X--		
b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	14, 22, 29, 30		--X--		
c)	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 (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	14, 22, 29, 30		--X--		
d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	14, 22, 29, 30		--X--		
e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	14, 22, 29, 30			--X--	

Evaluation

Air quality in the San Luis Obispo region of the County is characteristically different than other regions of the County (i.e., the Upper Salinas River Valley and the East County Plain), although the physical features that divide them provide only limited barriers to transport pollutants between regions. The County is designated nonattainment for the one-hour California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS) for ozone and the CAAQS for respirable particulate matter (PM_{10}). The western portion of the County is designated attainment for national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). Measurements of ambient air quality from the monitoring station at 3220 South Higuera Street are representative of local air quality conditions.

a, b, c, d) The San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (SLO APCD) adopted the 2001 Clean Air Plan (CAP) in 2002. The 2001 CAP is a comprehensive planning document intended to provide guidance to the SLO APCD and other local agencies, including the City, on how to attain and maintain the State standards for ozone and PM_{10}. Conservation and Open Space Element Policy 2.3.2 states that the City will help the APCD implement the CAP. The CAP presents a detailed description of the sources and pollutants which impact the jurisdiction, 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. The Project is consistent with the CAP because it would provide an important link to the Railroad Safety Trail for both recreational and commuting users, and would provide an additional opportunity for non-vehicular transportation.

Both the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) have established ambient air quality standards for common pollutants. These ambient air quality standards are levels of contaminants representing safe levels that avoid specific adverse health effects associated with each pollutant. The ambient air quality standards cover what are called "criteria" pollutants because the health and other effects of each pollutant are described in criteria documents. Areas that meet ambient air quality standards are classified as attainment areas, while areas that do not meet these standards are classified as nonattainment areas. As mentioned above, San Luis Obispo is currently designated as nonattainment for the State and Federal ambient air quality standards for ground-level ozone and $PM_{2.5}$ as well as the state standards for PM_{10}.

CEQA Appendix G states the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make significance determinations. Assessment of potential air quality impacts that may result

from the proposed Project was conducted using the April 2012, CEQA Air Quality Handbook. The CEQA Air Quality Handbook is provided by the County of San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District for the purpose of assisting lead agencies in assessing the potential air quality impacts from residential, commercial and industrial development, and includes thresholds of significance and mitigation measures specific to criteria pollutants and impacts to sensitive receptors. Under CEQA, the SLO County APCD is a responsible agency for reviewing and commenting on projects that have the potential to cause adverse impacts to air quality.

The Project site lies within an area defined by the SLO APCD as potentially containing naturally-occurring asbestos (NOA). The City will be required to comply with the NOA Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying and Surface Mining Operations, which will include preparation and submittal of a geologic evaluation to the SLO APCD and implementation of dust control measures for the control of airborne dust during the course of construction activities. Impacts related to NOA are considered less than significant with mitigation.

Construction Significance Criteria:

Temporary impacts from the Project, including but not limited to, excavation and construction activities, vehicle emissions from heavy duty equipment, have the potential to create dust and emissions that exceed air quality standards for temporary and intermediate periods.

Construction activities can generate fugitive dust, which could be a nuisance to local residents and businesses in close proximity to the proposed Project site. The Project is within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors; therefore, the impacts related to fugitive dust and diesel particulate emissions during proposed construction activities are considered less than significant with mitigation.

Construction equipment itself can be the source of air quality emission impacts, and may be subject to CARB or SLO APCD permitting requirements. This includes portable equipment, 50 horsepower (hp) or greater or other equipment listed in the SLO APCD's 2012 CEQA Handbook, Technical Appendices, page 4-4. Impacts related to vehicle and heavy equipment emissions are considered less than significant with mitigation.

Operational Screening Criteria for Project Impacts:

The Project is a segment of a bicycle and pedestrian trail, and does not include any additional parking or trailhead staging areas; therefore, the Project would not result in operational emissions.

e) The Project is a bicycle and pedestrian trail; therefore, would not include any potential land uses which would have the potential to produce objectionable odors in the area. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:

AQ-1: During construction/ground disturbing activities, the applicant shall implement the following particulate (dust) control measures. These measures shall be shown on grading and building plans. In addition, the contractor shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, modify practices as necessary, to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the Community Development and Public Works Departments prior to commencement of construction.

a. Reduce the amount of disturbed area where possible.
b. Use water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the Project site and from exceeding the APCD's limit of 20 percent opacity for no greater than three minutes in any 60 minute period. Increased watering frequency will be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour (mph) and cessation of grading activities during periods of winds over 25 mph. Reclaimed (non-potable) water is to be used in all construction and dust-control work.
c. All dirt stock pile areas (if any) shall be sprayed daily and covered with tarps or other dust barriers as needed.
d. Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved Project revegetation and landscape plans shall be implemented as soon as possible, following completion of any soil disturbing activities.

e. Exposed grounds that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading shall be sown with a fast germinating, non-invasive, grass seed and watered until vegetation is established.
f. All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation shall be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the APCD.
g. All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
h. Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site.
i. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials, are to be covered or shall maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with California Vehicle Code Section 23114.
j. Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site.
k. Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers shall be used with reclaimed water where feasible. Roads shall be pre-wetted prior to sweeping when feasible.

AQ-2: Prior to any construction activities at the site, the Project proponent shall ensure that all equipment and operations are compliant with California Air Resource Board and APCD permitting requirements by contacting the APCD Engineering Division at (805) 781-5912 for specific information regarding permitting requirements.

AQ-3: To reduce impacts to sensitive receptors as a result of emissions from diesel vehicles and equipment used to construct the Project and export soil from the Project site, the applicant shall implement the following idling control techniques:

1. California Diesel Idling Regulations
   a. On-road diesel vehicles shall comply with Section 2485 of Title 13 of the California Code of regulations. This regulation limits idling from diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles with gross vehicular weight ratings of more than 10,000 pounds and licensed for operation on highways. It applies to California and non-California based vehicles. In general, the regulation specifies that drivers of said vehicles:
      1. Shall not idle the vehicle's primary diesel engine for greater than five minutes at any location, except as noted in Subsection (d) of the regulation; and,
      2. Shall not operate a diesel-fueled auxiliary power system (APS) to power a heater, air conditioner, or any ancillary equipment on that vehicle during sleeping or resting in a sleeper berth for greater than five minutes at any location when within 1,000 feet of restricted area, except as noted in Subsection (d) of the regulation.
   b. Off-road diesel equipment shall comply with the five minute idling restriction identified in Section 2449(d)(2) of the California Air Resources Board's In-Use Off-Road Diesel regulation.
   c. Signs must be posted in the designated queuing areas and job sites to remind drivers and operators of the state's five minute idling limit.
2. Diesel Idling Restrictions Near Sensitive Receptors (residential homes). In addition to the State required diesel idling requirements, the Project applicant shall comply with these more restrictive requirements to minimize impacts to nearby sensitive receptors:
   a. Staging and queuing areas shall not be located within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors.
   b. Diesel idling within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors shall not be permitted.
   c. Use of alternative fueled equipment is recommended.
   d. Signs that specify the no idling areas must be posed and enforced at the site.
3. Soil Transport. The final volume of soil that will be hauled off-site, together with the fleet mix, hauling route, and number of trips per day will need to be identified for the APCD. Specific standards and conditions will apply.

AQ-4: Prior to construction, a geological evaluation shall be conducted to determine the presence of NOA. If NOA is not present, an exemption request must be filed with the APCD. If NOA is found, the City must comply with all requirements outlined in the Asbestos Air Toxics Control Measure (ATCM), which may include development of an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan and an Asbestos Health and Safety Program for approval by the APCD.

Conclusion: With recommended construction mitigation measures, the Project will have a less than significant impact on air quality.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	5, 29, 30, 31		--X--		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	5, 29, 30, 31				--X--
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	5, 29, 30, 31		--X--		
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?	5, 29, 30, 31			--X--	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	5, 29, 30, 31		--X--		
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?	5, 29, 30, 31				--X--

Evaluation

The urbanized area of the City of San Luis Obispo lies at the convergence of two main geologic features: the Los Osos Valley which drains westerly into Morro Bay via Los Osos Creek, and the San Luis Valley which drains to the south- southwest into the Pacific Ocean at Avila Beach via San Luis Obispo Creek. San Luis Obispo, Stenner, Prefumo, and Brizzolara Creeks, and numerous tributary channels pass through the City, providing important riparian habitat and migration corridors connecting urbanized areas to less-developed habitats in the larger area surrounding the City.

Much of area outside the City limits consist of open rangeland grazed year-round, along with agricultural lands dominated by annual crop rotations and vineyards. A variety of natural habitats and associated plant communities are present within the City, and support a diverse array of native plants and resident, migratory, and locally nomadic wildlife species, some of which are considered as rare, threatened, or endangered species. However, the largest concentrations of natural and native habitats are located in the larger and less developed areas outside the City limits.

A Natural Environment Study-Minimal Impact has been prepared for the Project (Padre, 2016a). The following discussion provides a general overview of the habitat type found on the Project site:

The biological study area (BSA) was selected to encompass the entire undeveloped alignment corridor of the Project.

The Project site is comprised of ruderal and ornamental vegetation. The northeastern slope is dominated by blue gum eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus globulus*) and pepper trees (*Schinus molle*). The understory is mainly comprised of leaf litter, scattered native (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*) and ornamental shrubs (*Cotoneaster pannosus*), and non-native annual grasses (*Bromus diandrus*, *Bromus madritensis*). The drainage ditch is dominated by non-native annual grasses, associated with tall sedge (*Cyperus eragrostis*), giant reed (*Arundo donax*), curly dock (*Rumex crispus*), Italian rye grass (*Festuca perennis*), and English plantain (*Plantago lanceolata*). Vegetation along the UPRR right-of-way appears to have been periodically cleared, as evident from willow (*Salix* sp.) stumps observed north of the UPRR tracks.

An outlet culvert located near US 101 is blocked with vegetation, sedimentation, and refuse and has caused the drainage ditch along the northern side of the UPRR tracks to retain water. An ephemeral drainage was observed along the north side of the

railroad tracks, between the toe-of-the-slope along the existing fence-line and the railroad gravel substrate. The ephemeral drainage was reportedly created in the 1950s to manage stormwater within the UPRR (Armstrong, 2016). Padre biologists identified ostracods, copepods, mosquito larva (*Diptera*), and Sierran treefrog (*Pseudacris sierra*) tadpoles and egg masses within the ephemeral drainage.

a) A desktop review of the Project site was performed that included correspondence with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), queries of ecological databases, and review of relevant technical studies performed in the vicinity or applicable to special-status species with potential to occur within the Project site. Biological surveys, including botanical surveys, were conducted on January 18, February 2, March 31, and May 9, 2016. The survey effort did not identify any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) or USFWS that would be impacted by the Project (Padre, 2016). No habitats or CDFW Natural Communities of Concern are located within the Project site. Potential habitats for vernal pool fairy shrimp (VPFS) and monarch butterflies were evaluated with proper survey and sampling techniques. A small ephemeral drainage was found to not support a VPFS population, and a stand of eucalyptus trees in the Project site was found to be too small to serve as a significant habitat for roosting monarch butterflies. In total, three butterflies were identified in the Project site.

Removal of trees and vegetation has the potential to disturb nesting birds, if present, which would result in a potentially significant impact. Project construction will be conducted outside of the bird breeding season, to the greatest extent feasible. However, if construction occurs during the breeding season, a breeding bird survey would be conducted prior to construction and all active nests would be protected and avoided. The Project will comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act; therefore, this impact is considered less than significant with mitigation.

Botanical surveys were conducted during the appropriate blooming season. No special-status plant species were observed, nor are they expected to occur. Impacts related to special-status plants are considered less than significant, and contingency mitigation is identified below to further mitigate potential impacts.

b, c) The Project does not include waters of the U.S. or streambeds under Fish and Game Code jurisdiction. The ephemeral drainage along the UPRR does not have a defined bed and/or bank, nor does it have connectivity to a navigable water; therefore, it is not jurisdictional as a Federal or State water.

d) The proposed Project is located within residential and commercial zones and is adjacent to major surface streets. The habitat within the Project is fragmented by a network of roadways and railroad tracks, including US 101 and California Boulevard. The proposed Project does not provide wildlife migration corridors or habitat linkages; therefore, no impact would occur.

e) Project construction will result in the removal of approximately 20 trees, including eucalyptus trees, pepper trees, and an ash tree. Trees identified within the Project site will be avoided to the greatest extent feasible. If removal is required, the tree will be replaced at a minimum 1:1 ratio as soon as feasible outside of the UPRR right-of-way, pursuant to a Tree Protection and Replacement Plan approved by the City Arborist. Therefore, potential impacts due to tree removal would be less than significant based on implementation of identified mitigation measures.

f) The Project will not conflict with other adopted local, regional, or State plans as there are no protected species or habitats in the Project site, and tree removal will be conducted in a manner compliant with permits obtained from the City. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures:

BIO-1: In the event that special-status plant species are observed within the Project site, all individuals will be flagged by a qualified biologist prior to construction activities, so that they may be avoided. If special-status plants cannot be avoided by Project activities, the appropriate permits will be obtained prior to the start of construction activities. A restoration plan will be prepared for the Project (BIO-2), and will be implemented as necessary.

BIO-2: Prior to construction, the City will prepare a restoration plan that provides for a 1:1 restoration ratio for temporary and permanent impacts, unless otherwise directed by regulatory agencies. Any revegetation will be conducted using only native

plant species, and will be conducted outside of the UPRR right-of-way. The restoration plan will include specifications for invasive species abatement and monitoring.

BIO-3: Prior to construction, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan or Water Pollution Control Plan for the Project will be prepared. Provisions of this plan shall be implemented during and after construction as necessary to avoid and minimize erosion and storm water pollution in and near the work area.

BIO-4: Prior to construction, all personnel will participate in an environmental awareness training program conducted by a qualified biologist.

BIO-5: During construction, the cleaning and refueling of equipment and vehicles will occur only within a designated staging area and at least 100 ft from wetlands or culverts that outflow to wetlands. At a minimum, equipment and vehicles will be checked and maintained on a daily basis to ensure proper operation and avoid potential leaks or spills.

BIO-6: Prior to removal of Eucalyptus tree or other large trees, a qualified biologist will survey the trees to determine presence of roosting monarch butterflies. If roosting is identified (e.g., a visible "clump" over a period of time), tree removal will be scheduled outside of the roosting period (generally November to March).

BIO-7: If construction activities are proposed during the typical nesting season (February 15 to September 1), a nesting bird survey will be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than two weeks prior to the start of construction to determine presence/absence of nesting birds within the Biological Study Area and immediate vicinity. Caltrans will be notified if nesting birds are observed during the surveys and will facilitate coordination with the USFWS if necessary to determine an appropriate avoidance strategy. Likewise, coordination with CDFW will be facilitated by the City if necessary to devise a suitable avoidance plan. If raptor nests are observed within the Project site during the pre-construction nesting bird surveys, the nest(s) shall be designated an Environmental Sensitive Area and protected by a minimum 500-foot avoidance buffer until the breeding season ends or until a qualified biologist determines that all young have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival. Similarly, if active passerine nests are observed within the Project site during the pre-construction nesting bird surveys, the nest(s) shall be designated an Environmentally Sensitive Area and protected by a minimum 250-foot avoidance buffer until the breeding season ends or until a qualified biologist determines that all young have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival. Resource agencies may consider proposed variances from these buffers if there is a compelling biological or ecological reason to do so, such as protection of a nest via concealment due to site topography.

BIO-8: Prior to construction, the City will prepare a Tree Protection and Restoration Plan to be reviewed and approved by the City Arborist and City Natural Resources Manager. Requirements shall include but not be limited to: the protection of trees with construction setbacks from trees; construction fencing around trees; grading limits around the base of trees as required; and a replacement plan for trees removed including replacement at a minimum 1:1 ratio. Removal of native trees shall require a minimum 4:1 replacement ratio. The Tree Protection and Restoration Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following information:

a. Specific areas proposed for revegetation and their size.
b. Implementation plan (rationale for expecting implementation success, responsible parties, schedule, site preparation, and planting plan);
c. Specific habitat management and protection concepts to be used to ensure long-term maintenance and protection of the trees (i.e.: quarterly and annual surveys to be conducted for a minimum of five years; protection fencing and signage where necessary; and weed abatement);
d. Contingency measures in the event a planted tree does not survive, including replacement of the tree to ensure no net loss of trees in the long-term;
e. Reporting requirements to ensure consistent data collection and reporting methods used by monitoring personnel;
f. Funding mechanism.

Conclusion: With recommended mitigation measures, the Project will have a less than significant impact on biological resources.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined in §15064.5.	16,17, 18,29, 30,32, 33,38			--X--	
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5)	16,17, 18,29, 30,32, 33,38		--X--		
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	16,17, 18,29, 30,32, 33			--X--	
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	16,17, 18,29, 30,32, 33,38			--X--	
e) Have a significant adverse effect on a Tribal Cultural Resource?	16,17, 18,29, 30,32, 33,38		--X--		

Evaluation

Pre-Historic Setting: As outlined in the City's Land Use and Circulation Element Update EIR, archaeological evidence demonstrates that Native American groups (including the Chumash) have occupied the Central Coast for at least 10,000 years, and that Native American use of the central coast region may have begun during the late Pleistocene, as early as 9000 B.C., demonstrating that historical resources began their accumulation on the central coast during the prehistoric era. The City of San Luis Obispo is located within the area historically occupied by the Obispeño Chumash, the northernmost of the Chumash people of California. The Obispeño Chumash occupied much of San Luis Obispo County, including the Arroyo Grande area, and from the Santa Maria River north to approximately Point Estero. The earliest evidence of human occupation in the region comes from archaeological sites along the coast.

Historic Resource Setting: The area of San Luis Obispo became colonialized by the Spanish Incursion initially in 1542, with the first official settlement on Chumash Territory occurring in 1772, when the Mission San Luis Obispo de Tolosa was established. By the 1870s (after the earliest arrivals of Chinese immigrants in 1869), a Chinatown district had been established in the downtown area near Palm and Morro Street. By 1875, 2,500 residents were documented in a 4-square mile area around what is now the City of San Luis Obispo. By 1901, the City was served by the Pacific Coast Railway and mainline Southern Pacific, and in 1903 the California Polytechnic State University was established. The last era of growth generally lasted from 1945 to the present.

a, b, c, d, e) Preliminary research for the area bounded by a 0.5 mile radius showed that no documented historical sites exist in the Area of Potential Effects (APE) and that the sites outside of the APE are generally well documented by previous studies in San Luis Obispo. No indirect impacts to surrounding cultural resources were identified. No built environment resources have been previously documented within the APE.

Research and a survey of the APE were conducted and yielded no significant findings of historic or cultural resources as defined in §15064.5 (Padre, 2016). The APE was surveyed using ten meter (m) (32 ft) intervals combined with inspections of bare soil patches, along with color photograph documentation. The entire APE was surveyed, excepting the UPRR right-of-way and a 100-foot segment behind the CHP facility that was impassible due to vegetation density.

The field survey was negative for cultural resources. Fragments of a vehicle bridge that carried Phillips Lane over the UPRR tracks were observed at the base of the slope. According to the Caltrans Programmatic Agreement (PA) (Attachment 4:

Properties Exempt from Evaluation), the following archaeological property type is exempt from evaluation: "minor, ubiquitous, or fragmentary infrastructure elements" (FHWA, 2014). As a result, the bridge fragments meet the criteria for exemption from National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) evaluation as a "fragmentary infrastructure element" in accordance with the PA, and therefore, has no potential to be a historic property and warrants no evaluation or further study. Therefore, no significant impact to built environment historic resources would occur.

Paleontological resources are not anticipated to occur within the Project area. Franciscan Formation occurs within the Project area, which further precludes the potential presence of paleontological resources. The Franciscan formation is a late Jurassic to early Cretaceous aged metamorphic rock with a low potential for flora or fauna fossils. Therefore, no significant impacts to paleontological resources would occur.

Pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52, the City mailed letters on January 11, 2017 to the individual Native American tribes that are currently on the City's list for AB 52 consultation. The City received responses from three of the Native American tribes. Consultation with the Native American tribes did not result in the identification of any tribal cultural resources. Based on these consultation efforts, the City and responding tribal representatives agreed to mitigation that would include further investigation of the area that could not be surveyed due to dense vegetation (during and immediately following vegetation removal associated with the project), and evaluation and proper treatment and mitigation for any unanticipated discoveries, pursuant to the City's *Archaeological Resource Preservation Program Guidelines*. Based on implementation of these measures, potentially significant impacts to archaeological resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures:

The following mitigation measures are proposed in the event cultural resources are discovered during construction activities:

CR-1: If, during the course of constructing and implementing the proposed Project, archaeological, paleontological, or cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric sites, historic sites, or isolated artifacts and features) are discovered, the contractor shall halt all ground disturbing activities immediately within 50 feet of the discovery, the City shall be notified, and a professional archaeologist, architectural historian, or paleontologist (depending on the nature of the finding) shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery. The City shall consider mitigation recommendations presented by the professional, and the City shall consult and agree upon implementation of a measure(s) that they deem feasible and appropriate. Such measures may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data recovery, or other appropriate measures. The City shall be required to implement any mitigation necessary for the protection of archaeological, paleontological, and cultural resources.

CR-2: In the event of human burial discovery, no further disturbance shall occur within 100 feet of the finding until the County of San Luis Obispo (County) Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the human remains are determined to be Native American, the County Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The City shall allow the MLD to complete an inspection of the site (typically within 48 hours of notification) and shall comply with MLD recommendations, which may include scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.

CR-3: Additional archaeological surveys will be conducted in association with subsequent environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act if Project limits are extended beyond the present survey limits.

CR-4: During removal of vegetation within any areas previously determined to be inaccessible due to vegetation, including an approximately 100-foot segment behind the California Highway Patrol facility, a qualified archaeologist shall monitor vegetation removal and conduct a surface survey to confirm the presence or absence of archaeological resources. In the event of resource discovery during the survey, and at any time during construction, the resource shall be evaluated pursuant to mitigation measure CR-1 and the City of San Luis Obispo *Archaeological Resource Preservation Program Guidelines* (October 2009). Prior to redirecting or resuming construction, a Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan, prepared by a qualified archaeologist, shall be prepared and implemented in the event of resource discovery. The Monitoring Plan shall include at a minimum:

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

a. List of personnel involved in the monitoring activities;
b. Inclusion of involvement of the Native American community, as appropriate;
c. Description of how the monitoring shall occur;
d. Description of frequency of monitoring (e.g., full-time, part time, spot checking);
e. Description of what resources are expected to be encountered;
f. Description of circumstances that would result in the halting of work at the project site (e.g., What is considered "significant" archaeological resources?);
g. Description of procedures for halting work on the site and notification procedures; and
h. Description of monitoring reporting procedures.

Conclusion: With recommended mitigation measures, the Project will have a less than significant impact on cultural resources, including tribal cultural resources.

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:					
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:	4, 9, 19, 24, 28			--X--	
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.	4, 9, 19, 24, 28			--X--	
II. Strong seismic ground shaking?	4, 9, 19, 24, 28			--X--	
III. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	4, 9, 19, 24, 28			--X--	
IV. Landslides?	4, 9, 19, 24, 28			--X--	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	4, 9, 19, 24, 28			--X--	
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?	4, 9, 19, 24, 28			--X--	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 1802.3.2 [Table 1806.2) of the California Building Code (2007) [2010], creating substantial risks to life or property?	4, 9, 19, 24, 28			--X--	
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?	4, 9, 19, 24, 28				--X--

Evaluation

As discussed in the recent City Land Use and Circulation Element Update EIR, San Luis Obispo lies within the southern Coast Range Geomorphic Province. This province lies between the Central Valley of California and the Pacific Ocean and extends from Oregon to northern Santa Barbara County. The Coast Range province is structurally complex, and is comprised of sub-parallel northwest-southeast trending faults, folds, and mountain ranges.

Rock types in the San Luis Obispo area are mainly comprised of volcanic, metavolcanics, and a mixture of serpentinite and greywacke sandstone. These rocks are highly fractured and are part of the Mesozoic aged Franciscan Formation. Intrusive and

extrusive volcanic deposits of Tertiary age and marine sedimentary deposits of the Miocene aged Monterey Formation are also found in the area. The most distinctive geomorphological feature of the San Luis Obispo area is the series of Tertiary aged volcanic plugs (remnants of volcanoes) which extend from the City of San Luis Obispo northwesterly to Morro Bay. Hollister Peak, Bishop Peak, Cerro San Luis Obispo, Islay Hill, and Morro Rock are all comprised of these volcanic plugs.

Faulting and Seismic Activity: The predominant northwest-southeast trending structures of the Coast Range Province are related to the San Andreas Fault Transform Boundary. Other faults in the San Luis Obispo area that are considered active or potentially active include the San Juan Fault, the East and West Huasna Faults, the Nacimiento Fault Zone, the Oceano Fault, the Oceanic Fault, Cambria Fault, the Edna Fault, the Hosgri Fault, and the Los Osos Fault. The East and West Huasna Faults, the Nacimiento Fault Zone, the Cambria Fault, and the Edna Fault have not yet been officially classified by the California Division of Mines and Geology.

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (formerly known as a Special Studies Zone) is an area within 500 feet from a known active fault trace that has been designated by the State Geologist. Per the Alquist-Priolo legislation, no structure for human occupancy is permitted on the trace of an active fault. The portion of the fault zone closest to the city is located near the southern flank of the Los Osos Valley, northwest of Laguna Lake, but lies just outside of the city limits.

Seismically Induced Ground Acceleration: Seismically induced ground acceleration is the shaking motion that is produced by an earthquake. Probabilistic modeling is done to predict future ground accelerations, taking into consideration design basis earthquake ground motion, applicable to residential or commercial, or upper-bound earthquake ground motion, applied to public use facilities like schools or hospitals.

Landslides: Landslides occur when the underlying support can no longer maintain the load of material above it, causing a slope failure. Ground shaking and landslide hazards are mapped by the City and are shown in the General Plan. Much of the development in San Luis Obispo is in valleys, where there is low potential for slope instability. However, the city contains extensive hillsides. Several are underlain by the rocks of the Franciscan group, which is a source of significant slope instability. The actual risk of slope instability is identified by investigation of specific sites, including subsurface sampling, by qualified professionals. The building code requires site-specific investigations and design proposals by qualified professionals in areas that are susceptible to slope instability and landslides.

Liquefaction: Liquefaction is defined as the transformation of a granular material from a solid state to a liquefied state as a consequence of increased pore water pressure. As a result, structures built on this material can sink into the alluvium, buried structures may rise to the surface or materials on sloped surfaces may run downhill. Other effects of liquefaction include lateral spread, flow failures, ground oscillations, and loss of bearing strength. Liquefaction is intrinsically linked with the depth of groundwater below the site and the types of sediments underlying an area.

The soils in the San Luis Obispo area that are most susceptible to ground shaking, and which contain shallow ground water, are the ones most likely to have a potential for settlement and for liquefaction. The actual risk of settlement or liquefaction is identified by investigation of specific sites, including subsurface sampling, by qualified professionals. Previous investigations have found that the risk of settlement for new construction can be reduced to an acceptable level through careful site preparation and proper foundation design, and that the actual risk of liquefaction is low.

Differential Settlement: Differential settlement is the downward movement of the land surface resulting from the compression of void space in underlying soils. This compression can occur naturally with the accumulation of sediments over porous alluvial soils within river valleys. Settlement can also result from human activities including improperly placed artificial fill, and structures built on soils or bedrock materials with differential settlement rates. This phenomenon can alter local drainage patterns and result in structural damage. Portions of the City have been identified as possibly being underlain by soft organic soils, resulting in a high potential for settlement (General Plan Safety Element).

Subsidence: Ground subsidence occurs where underlying geologic materials (typically loosely consolidated surficial silt, sand, and gravel) undergo a change from looser to tighter compaction. As a result, the ground surface subsides (lowers). Where compaction increases (either naturally, or due to construction), the geologic materials become denser. As a result, the ground surface overlying the compacting subsurface materials subsides as the underlying geologic materials settle. Ground subsidence can occur under several different conditions, including:

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

- Ground-water withdrawal (water is removed from pore space as the water table drops, causing the ground surface to settle);
- Tectonic subsidence (ground surface is warped or dropped lower due to geologic factors such as faulting or folding); and
- Earthquake-induced shaking causes sediment liquefaction, which in turn can lead to ground-surface subsidence.

Expansive Soils: Expansive soils are soils that are generally clayey, swell when wetted and shrink when dried. Wetting can occur in a number of ways (i.e., absorption from the air, rainfall, groundwater fluctuations, lawn watering, broken water or sewer lines, etc.). Soil expansion can cause subtle damage that can reduce structural integrity. Portions of the city are known to exhibit the soil types (refer to General Plan Safety Element) identified as having a moderate to high potential for expansion.

a, c) There are no fault lines within the Project site or within close proximity. Structures must be designed in compliance with seismic design criteria established in the California Building Code for Seismic Zone D. To minimize this potential impact, the California Building Code and City Codes require new structures be built to resist such shaking or to remain standing in an earthquake.

The Project will be partially located within an area identified as having high liquefaction potential in the Safety Element of the General Plan, which is true for most of the City. The Project site is also near or partially within a moderate landslide risk area. Development will be required to comply with all City Codes, including Building Codes, which require proper documentation of soil characteristics for designing structurally sound buildings to ensure new structures are built to resist such shaking or to remain standing in an earthquake. Incorporation of required California Building Code, City Codes, and development in accordance with the General Plan Safety Element will ensure potential impacts related to seismic hazards would be less than significant.

b) Construction methods will minimize losses of soil to erosion. The trail is designed to have adequate drainage and will not contribute to the loss of soil due to increased runoff from impervious surfaces. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

d) Two predominate soil types are present at the Project site and described as they occur from north to south. The first is the Cropley soil formation, which is characterized as a fine grained, loamy soil (silts and clays), with slow infiltration rates, and a slight erosion hazard. This formation is located along the northern most portion of the proposed trail alignment adjacent to Taft Street and north of the California Boulevard bridge over US 101. The second soil formation at the Project site is the Los Osos formation, which is characterized as a fine grained, clayey soil (silts and clays), with slow infiltration rates, and a slight erosion hazard. This formation dominates the remainder of the proposed Trail alignment. Both soil types present a high corrosion hazard to uncoated steel.

No substantial risk to life or property will result from the Project because the trail and bridge design will take into account the plasticity and expansive properties of the soil to maintain structural integrity that conforms to all State and local building codes. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

e) No septic systems or alternative wastewater systems will be used in this Project; therefore, no impact would occur.

Conclusion: With proposed development in accordance with applicable California Building Code and City Code requirements, impacts are considered less than significant.

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:					
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	1, 14, 22, 29, 30			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	1, 14, 22, 29, 30			X	

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Evaluation

As outlined in the recent City Land Use and Circulation Element Update EIR, prominent greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions contributing to the greenhouse effect are carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6). Anthropogenic (human-caused) GHG emissions in excess of natural ambient concentrations are responsible for intensifying the greenhouse effect and have led to a trend of unnatural warming of the earth's climate, known as global climate change or global warming. Global sources of GHG emissions include fossil fuel combustion in both stationary and mobile sources, fugitive emissions from landfills, wastewater treatment, agricultural sources, deforestation, high global warming potential (GWP) gases from industrial and chemical sources, and other activities.

The major sources GHG emissions in the City are transportation-related emissions from cars and trucks, followed by energy consumption in buildings. These local sources constitute the majority of GHG emissions from community-wide activities in the city, and combine with regional, statewide, national, and global GHG emissions that result in the cumulative effect of global warming, which is causing global climate change. A minimum level of climate change is expected to occur despite local, statewide, or other global efforts to mitigate GHG emissions. The increase in average global temperatures will result in a number of locally-important adverse effects, including sea-level rise, changes to precipitation patterns, and increased frequency of extreme weather events such as heat waves, drought, and severe storms.

Statewide legislation, rules and regulations that apply to GHG emissions associated with the Project Setting include the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (Assembly Bill [AB] 32), the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act of 2008 (Senate Bill [SB] 375), Advanced Clean Cars Rule, Low Carbon Fuel Standard, Renewable Portfolio Standard, California Building Codes, and recent amendments to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to SB 97 with respect to analysis of GHG emissions and climate change impacts.

Plans, policies and guidelines have also been adopted at the regional and local level that address GHG emissions and climate change effects in the City. SLO APCD adopted a CEQA Air Quality Handbook, as well as guidance on GHG emission thresholds and supporting evidence, that may be applied by lead agencies within San Luis Obispo County (APCD 2012). The City also adopted a Climate Action Plan (CAP) that includes a GHG emissions inventory, identifies GHG emission reduction targets, and includes specific measures and implementing actions to both reduce community-wide GHG emissions. The CAP also includes measures and actions to help the city build resiliency and adapt to the effects of climate change.

a, b) The proposed Project is a bicycle and pedestrian trail and would not result in any operational GHG emissions. The Project would result in development consistent with the anticipated growth under the inventory and assumptions of the 2012 CAP, because the Project is not growth inducing, would not increase land use intensity, and does not include any features that require significant energy to operate. Therefore, any GHG emissions from the Project would not conflict with California's commitment to GHG reduction under AB 32. Greater use of the bikeways in the City may encourage some commuters who currently drive to instead walk or bicycle to their workplace or destination, thereby offering commuters saved resources and less traffic congestion.

Short Term Construction-Related GHG Emissions: Construction activities would generate GHG emissions through the use of on- and off-road construction equipment. Mitigation Measures AQ-3 address vehicle and equipment exhaust, and include provisions for reducing those impacts to below a level of significance.

Long-Term Operational GHG Emissions: The Project provides an important connecting segment of the Railroad Safety Trail, which has a small potential to reduce vehicle use in the area. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Conclusion: As noted above, the Project would not result in a significant impact related to GHG emissions, and no mitigation is required.

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	4, 25, 29, 30, 34			--X--	

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	4, 25, 29, 30, 34		--X--		
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	12, 13				--X--
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?	12, 13, 29, 30, 34		--X--		
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 for people residing or working in the project area?	1, 4				--X--
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	1, 4				--X--
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	4			--X--	
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	4, 34			--X--	

Evaluation

As outlined in the recent City Land Use and Circulation Element Update EIR, the analysis of hazards and hazardous material impacts relates to hazards regarding safety risks posed by airport flight patterns, impeding of adopted emergency response/evacuation plans, and wildland fires where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas; and hazardous materials or substances regarding routine transport or disposal of substances, explosion or release of substances, and emissions or handling of substances within one-quarter mile of an existing or planned school. The following is a brief outline of the primary identified hazards:

Fire Hazards: Fires have the potential to cause significant losses to life, property, and the environment. Urban fire hazards result from the materials that make up the built environment, the size and organization of structures, and spacing of buildings. Additional factors that can accelerate fire hazards are availability of emergency access, available water volume and pressure for fire suppression, and response time for fire fighters. Fire hazard severity in rural areas, including areas on the edge between urban and rural land (commonly called the wildland interface), are highly influenced by the slope of the landscape and site vegetation and climate. This risk is somewhat amplified by the native Mediterranean vegetation common to the rural setting in which the City is located that has evolved to rely on wildfires for its ecological sustainability. Where wildland fires may be a threat, plant fuels are often managed by replacement planting, grazing, plowing, or mechanical clearing.

Hazardous Materials: Hazardous materials are defined as substances with physical and chemical properties of ignitability, corrosivity, reactivity, or toxicity which may pose a threat to human health or the environment. This includes, for example, chemical materials such as petroleum products, solvents, pesticides, herbicides, paints, metals, asbestos, and other regulated chemical materials. Additionally, hazards include known historical spills, leaks, illegal dumping, or other methods of release of hazardous materials to soil, sediment, groundwater, or surface water. If a historical release exists, then there is a risk associated with disturbing the historical release area. The potential for risks associated with hazardous materials are varied regionally. The primary risk concerns identified by the City, as stipulated in the City's General Plan Safety Element, include radiation hazards and the transportation of hazardous materials in and around the city. Most of these incidents are related to the increasing frequency of transport of chemicals over roadways, railways or through industrial accidents. US 101 and a rail corridor are major transportation corridors through the San Luis Obispo area.

Airport Hazards: The San Luis Obispo County Airport provides commuter, charter, and private aviation service to the area. The primary hazard associated with land uses near the airport is the risk of aircraft incidents on approach and take-off. Aircraft flight operations are determined largely by the physical layout of the airport and rules of the Federal Aviation Administration. The County manages activities on the airport property through the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). As the means of fulfilling these basic obligations, the ALUC, must prepare and adopt Airport Land Use Plans for each airport within their jurisdiction. The policies in the ALUP are intended to minimize the public's exposure to excessive noise and safety hazards while providing for the orderly expansion of airports (Public Utility Code Section 21670(a)(2). The ALUC has developed an Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) for the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport that was first adopted in 1973, was updated in May 2005, and is currently being updated. The ALUP has identified safety zones with associated land use density and intensity restrictions. The ALUP defines these as:

- Runway Protection Zones – Areas immediately adjacent to the ends of each active runway, within which the level of aviation safety risk is very high and in which, consequently, structures are prohibited and human activities are restricted to those which require only very low levels of occupancy.
- Safety Areas S-1 a through c– The area within the vicinity of which aircraft operate frequently or in conditions of reduced visibility at altitudes less than 500 feet above ground level (AGL).
- Safety Area S-2 – The area within the vicinity of which aircraft operate frequently or in conditions of reduced visibility at altitudes between 501 and 1000 feet AGL. Because aircraft in Area S-2 are at greater altitude and are less densely concentrated than in other portions of the Airport Planning Area, the overall level of aviation safety risk is considered to be lower than that in Area S-1 or the Runway Protection Zones.

a) The proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or to the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Construction of the proposed Project would be required to comply with applicable building, health, fire, and safety codes. Hazardous materials would be used in varying amounts during construction and occupancy of the Project. Construction and maintenance activities would use hazardous materials such as fuels (gasoline and diesel), oils, and lubricants; paints and paint thinners; glues; cleaners (which could include solvents and corrosives in addition to soaps and detergents); and possibly pesticides and herbicides. The amount of materials used would be small, so the Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or to the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, as such uses would have to comply with applicable federal, state, and local regulations, including but not limited to Titles 8 and 22 of the CCR, the Uniform Fire Code, and Chapter 6.95 of the California Health and Safety Code. No foreseeable reasonable use of the completed Project would include the use or transport of hazardous materials on the Railroad Safety Trail. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

b) As discussed in impact a, the proposed Project would not result in the routine transport, use, disposal, handling, or emission of any hazardous materials that would create a significant hazard to the public or to the environment. Implementation of Title 49, Parts 171–180, of the Code of Federal Regulations and stipulations in the General Plan Safety Element would reduce any impacts associated with the potential for accidental release during construction or occupancy of the proposed Project or by transporters picking up or delivering hazardous materials to the Project site. These regulations establish standards by which hazardous materials would be transported, within and adjacent to the proposed Project. Where transport of these materials occurs on roads, the CHP is the responsible agency for enforcement of regulations. Therefore, based on the nature of the Project and compliance with existing regulations, potential impacts due to the use of potentially hazardous materials during construction and maintenance of the project would be less than significant.

There is a potential for some amount of lead contamination to exist on the Project site (Padre 2016). Painted wood railings along the western edge of Phillips Lane and the eastern edge of Pepper Street may be painted with lead-based paint (LBP), which is assumed to contain lead levels above regulatory limits and should be removed/disposed of according with local, State, and Federal regulations unless objectively determined otherwise by laboratory data. The immediate shoulders and medians along U.S. 101 are known to potentially contain elevated lead concentrations due to the historical use of leaded gasoline. Due to the distance and elevation difference between the US 101 roadway and the planned areas of ground disturbance, aerially-deposited lead is not considered a significant risk to the environment or public because the material can be segregated and transported off-site for disposal at a licensed disposal facility.

Based upon a review of available historical information, the Project site has been used as undeveloped land and as Southern Pacific Railroad (now UPRR) right-of way since 1897 (Padre 2016). Railroad right-of-ways are known to be routinely sprayed with herbicides to reduce vegetative growth and resulting fire hazard. Due to the Project site's proximity to the UPRR, arsenic,

lead, and organophosphorus and chlorinated herbicide concentrations resulting from historical herbicide applications may be present in the shallow soil located within a portion of the Project site. This is not considered a significant risk to the environment or public because the impacted soil can be segregated and transported off-site for disposal at a licensed disposal facility.

The Initial Site Assessment (ISA) prepared for the project concluded that the Project site may contain elevated concentrations of chlorinated herbicides associated with historical spraying of the railroad right-of-way. Additionally, the Project may encounter petroleum hydrocarbon-containing soils during grading activities at the CHP property, as described below (see d). The potential for elevated concentrations of lead in surface and shallow subsurface soils associated with historical use of leaded gasoline was determined to not pose a significant risk to the Project because it can be segregated and transported off-site. Finally, existing painted wood railings at Phillips Lane and Pepper Street may contain lead-based paint. This is not considered a significant risk to the environment or public because the painted wood railings can be segregated and transported off-site for disposal at a licensed disposal facility.

Therefore, based on implementation of identified mitigation measures, including soil testing within areas to be disturbed and graded and preparation and implementation of a site-specific Contaminated Materials Management Plan and Health and Safety Plan, potential impacts would be mitigated to less than significant.

c) There are no schools, proposed or existing, within a quarter mile (1,320 ft) of the Project site; therefore, no impact would occur. The nearest school is the Love to Learn Preschool, which is approximately 1,700 ft from the Project site. In addition, as discussed in impacts a and b, the proposed Project is a pedestrian and bicycle path that would not result in the routine transport, use, disposal, handling, or emission of any hazardous materials that would create a significant hazard to the public or to the environment.

d) The Project would not be located on one of the Hazardous Waste and Substances sites, known collectively as the "Cortese" list compiled by the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) under Government Code Section 65962.5.

Other sites of interest that meet "Cortese List" requirements pursuant to the California Environmental Protection Agency, are: a 7-11, former Chevron Station, former Cosley's Union, and the CHP Station, known as Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) case numbers 406, 413, 3345, and 3691, respectively. These sites were once designated as active Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Cleanup Sites, but are all now considered closed cases according to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) GEOTRACKER database. These are the only such sites listed within 500 feet of any given point on the Project site. According to the ISA, the 7-11 and former Chevron Station sites are not anticipated to pose an environmental concern to the Project site based on distance, direction, media affected, and current regulatory status. Similarly, the former Cosley's Union site is not anticipated to pose an environmental concern to the Project site.

Project construction near the CHP Station will disturb a small amount of soil contaminated with hydrocarbons (RWQCB Case Number 3691). The site is listed with soil only affected by a release of both diesel fuel and waste oil (motor, hydraulic, lubricating) from a historical LUST Site. A total of three Underground Storage Tanks (USTs) and their associated components were removed from the site in December of 2008, and were replaced with an above-ground storage tank (AST) system. Several site assessment activities have been performed at this site. Soil assessment activities performed by ASR Engineering Inc. (ASR) and AMEC Geomatrix Inc. (AMEC) indicate that impacted soil material associated with the fuel dispenser, former product line, and the former waste oil UST is concentrated centrally at the facility as well as total petroleum hydrocarbon (TPH) concentrations downgradient and westward toward the Project alignment. However, it is noted that land-use restrictions and notification requirements have been instituted at the site by the RWQCB due to the remaining TPH contaminated soil remaining on-site. No records or reports were available to indicate soil remediation has taken place at the CHP property. The Project alignment is approximately 100 feet west and topographically down-gradient from TPH-containing soil at the CHP station. Project construction within this corridor proposes soil fill activities, and minor ground disturbance during the retaining wall construction. TPH-containing soil at the CHP station does not pose an environmental concern to the proposed trail construction activities at the Project site because the impacted soil can be segregated and transported off-site for disposal at a licensed disposal facility.

Therefore, based on implementation of identified mitigation measures, including soil testing within areas to be disturbed and graded and preparation and implementation of a site-specific Contaminated Materials Management Plan and Health and Safety Plan, potential impacts would be mitigated to less than significant.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

e, f) The Project site is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of a public use airport or airstrip. There are no private airstrips in the vicinity of the Project site that would result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the Project area, or future users of the Project. Therefore, no impact would occur.

g) The Project would be subject to the requirements contained in the City's emergency response and evacuation plans. Therefore, impacts related to impaired implementation or physical interference with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan are considered less than significant.

h) The Project site is located in the City of San Luis Obispo and is not located within a wildland hazard area. The surrounding land is developed with urban and residential uses. The proposed Project will have no significant impact on the placement of people or structures next to wildland areas that could result in loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.

Mitigation Measures:

HAZ-1: Prior to construction, as recommended in the Initial Site Assessment (Padre, April 2016), the City shall complete a Preliminary Site Investigation Report including, but not limited to, testing and analysis of soils to be disturbed as a result of grading and construction activities. The Report shall include, but not be limited to: sampling and analysis methodology, including the advancement of shallow drill holes along the proposed ground disturbance areas, collection of discrete soil samples from shallow soils, and chemical analysis of selected soil samples for presence of total petroleum hydrocarbon constituents, lead, arsenic, and chlorinated herbicides; and identification of the concentration of petroleum hydrocarbons and chlorinated herbicides. In the event elevated concentrations of suspected contaminants are indicated in shallow soils, the City will prepare a Contaminated Materials Management Plan (CMMP) for implementation during the course of the construction activities. The CMMP shall include but not be limited to detailed procedures to properly manage and dispose contaminated soils disturbed during the course of the Project construction activities, in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations.

HAZ-2: TPH-containing soil, lead contaminated soil, herbicide-containing soil, and lead-based paint containing building materials demolished as part of the Project will be segregated and properly packaged and disposed of at a licensed facility.

Conclusion: With recommended mitigation measures, the Project will have less than significant impacts on hazards and hazardous materials.

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:					
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	5, 7, 15, 24		--X--		
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	5, 7, 15, 24				--X--
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?	5, 7, 15, 24			--X--	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?	5, 7, 15, 24			--X--	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	5, 7, 15, 24			--X--	

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	5, 7, 15, 24		--X--		
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	5, 7, 15, 24				--X--
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	5, 7, 15, 24				--X--
i) Expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	4, 5, 7, 15, 24				--X--
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	4, 5, 7, 15, 24				--X--

Evaluation

As discussed in the City's Land Use and Circulation Element Update EIR, the Project site is located within the San Luis Obispo Creek Hydrologic Subarea of the Estero Bay Hydrologic Unit, an area that corresponds to the coastal draining watersheds west of the Coastal Range. The Estero Bay Hydrologic Unit stretches roughly 80 miles between the Santa Maria River and the Monterey County line and includes numerous individual stream systems. Within the Estero Bay Hydrologic Unit, the San Luis Obispo Creek watershed drains approximately 84 square miles.

The City of San Luis Obispo is generally located within a low-lying valley centered on San Luis Obispo Creek. San Luis Obispo Creek is one of four major drainage features that create flood hazards in the City, with the others being Stenner Creek, Prefumo Creek, and Old Garden Creek. In addition, many minor waterways drain into these creeks, and these can also present flood hazards. Because of the high surrounding hills and mountains in the area, the drainage sheds of these creeks are relatively small, but the steep slopes and high gradient can lead to intense, fast moving flood events in the City.

According to the RWQCB, water quality in the San Luis Obispo Creek drainage system is generally considered to be good. However, the water quality fluctuates along with seasonal changes in flow rates. In summer months, when the flows decrease and dilution is reduced, water quality decreases. According to the RWQCB Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Project for San Luis Obispo Creek, the creek has been reported to exceed nutrient and pathogen levels.

Groundwater within the San Luis Obispo Valley Sub-basin flows toward the south-southwest, following the general gradient of surface topography. Groundwater within the San Luis Obispo area is considered suitable for agricultural water supply, municipal and domestic supply, and industrial use.

a, f) Construction of the Project would result in the disturbance of approximately 3.15 acres. Project construction activities will minimize risks of discharging pollutants on or off-site by implementing the measures provided in the SWPPP. The completed trail segment will not generate any discharges beside the expected runoff from wet weather events, which would be directed into the v-ditch adjacent to the trail which flows to an open pipe inlet and an 18-inch pipe that connects to the City's drainage infrastructure. No planned uses for the trail include occasions for solid or liquid waste to be generated, stored, or released. Prior to reaching any natural stream or channel, storm water discharges from the Project site first reach the City's wastewater treatment facility, which ensures National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) discharges are within the standards set by the permit.

The Project is subject to Drainage Design review according to the City's Water Way Management Plan (WWMP).

The Project would include the preparation and implementation of a SWPPP, and Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention Methods are required to be incorporated into grading and construction plans for the short and long-term management and protection of water quality (refer to BIO-3). Based on compliance with existing regulations, and incorporation of identified mitigation measures to protect water quality, the Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and potential impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

b) The Project will not involve the creation of any new production wells for water that could lower the local water table and will not significantly alter groundwater recharge. The creation of more pervious surfaces for the pathway will not significantly affect the groundwater supply because water will be able to penetrate into the ground. Therefore, no impact would occur.

c) The Project will result in an incremental increase to the local drainage volumes, but the design of the trail will ensure proper drainage for rain events and will not increase the risk of erosion in the area. The Project is not located near a natural channel and would not result in the alteration of any stream or river courses.

Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

d) The Project will not result in flooding on or off-site from the alteration of drainage patterns or alteration of a stream or river course. The Project does not include any work in a stream bed or stream banks. The Project site is not within the City's Special Floodplain Management Zones or the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year floodplain, and its drainage will not contribute significantly to flooding in areas within those zones or floodplains. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

e) The Project will have a total impervious surface area of 13,870 ft^2 (0.32 acre), which will drain into existing storm water system connections. The 18-inch drain inlet that will drain the site has a capacity of 7.5 cubic feet per second (cfs) according to calculations done with Caltrans right-of-way standards. A 10-minute storm with a 100-year return interval would result in a flow of 5.02 cfs, which is safely below the rated capacity of the drain. The approximate return interval for a storm needed to exceed this drainage inlet would be at least 1,000 years, or a less than 0.1% chance per year. This is well within State and local requirements for post-construction drainage requirements. The Project would comply with RWQCB Post Construction Requirements (refer to Section 17. Utilities for post-construction requirements). Therefore, based on compliance with existing regulations, potential impacts would be less than significant.

g, h) This is not a housing Project and is not located within the 100-year flood hazard area; therefore, no impact would occur.

i) The Project site is not within the potential path of a flood from levee or dam failure. Its construction does not increase the risk of flooding to existing residences or other structures. Therefore, no impact would occur.

j) The proposed Project is outside the zone of impacts from seiche or tsunami, and the existing upslope Projects do not generate significant storm water runoff such to create a potential for inundation by mudflow. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Conclusion: Hydrology and Water Quality impacts are considered less than significant with mitigation based on compliance with existing regulations and implementation of BIO-3.

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	1, 2, 10, 12, 24				--X--
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	1, 2, 10, 12, 24			--X--	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	1, 5, 12				--X--

Evaluation

a) The Project will not divide any community; it will create a new pedestrian and bicycle connection between two neighborhoods. The Project conforms to the Circulation Element of the City's General Plan to prioritize pedestrian and bicycle use in residential corridors and neighborhoods. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

b) The Project does not conflict with any zoning ordinances, coastal plans, or specific plans. The Project will serve to accomplish goals of the City's Railroad District Plan. Tree removal is required for this Project, but appropriate replacement mitigation measures will be taken to reduce the impact in compliance with the City Tree Ordinance. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

c) The proposed Project would not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

Conclusion: The Project will have a less than significant impact on Land Use and Planning.

11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:					
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	5, 24				--X--
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?	5, 24				--X--

Evaluation

a, b) No known mineral resources are present at the Project site. Implementation of the proposed Project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. The Project site is not designated by the general plan, specific plan, or other land use plans as a locally important mineral recovery site. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Conclusion: The Project will have no impact on Mineral Resources.

12. NOISE. Would the project result in:					
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	3, 24, 35		--X--		
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	3, 24, 35			--X--	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	3, 24, 35			--X--	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	3, 24, 35		--X--		
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 expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	1, 3, 24, 35				--X--
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	12, 24				--X--

Evaluation

The City's General Plan Noise Element includes standards for the acceptability of noise sensitive uses to be constructed near transportation noise sources (refer to Table 1). In addition, the Noise Element includes maximum noise exposure levels for proposed new transportation noise sources, including:

- Outdoor activity area standard of 60 dBA Ldn (or Community Noise Equivalent Level [CNEL]) for residences, hotels, motels hospitals, nursing homes, theaters, auditoriums, music halls, churches, meeting halls, office buildings and mortuaries.
- Indoor standard of 45 dBA Ldn (or CNEL) for residences, hotels, motels hospitals and nursing homes.
- Indoor standard of 35 dBA Leq(h) for theaters, auditoriums and music halls.
- Indoor standard of 45 dBA Leq(h) for churches, meeting halls, office buildings and mortuaries.

Table 1. Acceptability of New Noise Sensitive Uses Exposed to Transportation Noise Sources

Land Use Category	Community Noise Exposure Ldn or CNEL, dBA						
	55	60	65	70	75	80	
Residences, Theaters, Auditoriums, Music Halls							
Motels, Hotels							
Schools, Libraries, Churches, Hospitals, Nursing Homes, Meeting Halls, Churches, Mortuaries							
Playgrounds							
Office Buildings							
Neighborhood Parks							

	Acceptable: development may be permitted without specific noise studies or mitigation.
	Conditionally Acceptable: development may be permitted if designed to meet noise exposure standards; a specific noise study is usually required.
	Unacceptable: development with acceptable noise exposure is generally not possible.

The Noise Element also includes maximum noise exposure levels for proposed new noise-sensitive uses due to existing stationary noise sources, including:

- Daytime (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.) standard of 50 dBA Leq(h).
- Nighttime (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.) standard of 45 dBA Leq(h).

These City standards do not apply to the proposed Project as it consists of a bicycle/pedestrian trail and not a roadway or railroad line. Therefore, operational noise would be limited to user's voices, and bicycle tire and chain noise, which is typical of surrounding residential and commercial land uses and would not cause exceedances of noise exposure levels.

A Noise Study Report has been prepared for the Project (Padre, 2016c). The proposed bicycle/pedestrian multi-use trail would not generate any vehicle trips or modify local traffic patterns, such that no long-term noise increases would occur. Therefore, Project noise impacts would only be from short-term construction noise.

The noise environment of the Project area is dominated by vehicle traffic on US 101 (trail alignment crosses over US 101), rail traffic on the UPRR tracks, and local traffic (including California Boulevard). Other noise sources include outdoor activities (baseball, basketball, skating) at Santa Rosa Park, and landscape maintenance activities at surrounding residential and commercial land uses.

a) Residences are designated as noise sensitive by the Noise Element. The Noise Element indicates that noise levels of 60 dB are acceptable for outdoor activity areas and 45 dB for indoor areas. Exterior noise levels will be less than 60 dB when attenuation afforded by building features and elevation is taken into account. No adverse noise impacts from construction are anticipated because construction would be conducted in accordance with Caltrans Standard Specifications Section 14-8 (Noise

& Vibration), applicable City noise standards, and noise mitigation identified below. Construction noise would be short-term, intermittent, and overshadowed by local traffic noise.

The trail would generally parallel the railroad, and users would occasionally be exposed to high noise levels exceeding 65 dBA Ldn when trains pass. However, infrequent and short duration noise would not significantly impact potential trail users, who are accustomed to varying levels of ambient noise within urban areas.

b) Increases in groundborne vibration levels attributable to the proposed Project would be primarily associated with short-term construction-related activities. Construction activities would likely require use of rotary drill rig and wheeled loader, motor grader, and roller compactor. Construction activities will be limited to the days, hours, and sound levels allowed by City ordinance (Chapter 9.12 of the Municipal Code), impacts associated with groundborne vibration and noise would be less than significant. The proposed Project is a trail project; therefore, no long-term operational groundborne noise or vibration impacts will result from the Project.

c) Operation of the Project does not include any features or uses that would generate significant levels of noise above ambient conditions; therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

d) Noise generated by the Project would occur during short-term construction. Noise levels during construction would be higher than existing noise levels, but only for the duration of construction. Although there would be intermittent construction noise in the Project area during the construction period, noise impacts would be less than significant based on compliance with mitigation identified below. In addition, construction would be short term and restricted to the hours and noise levels allowed by City ordinance.

e, f) The Project Site is not located within an airport land use plan area or within two miles of a public use airport or private airstrip. Implementation of the proposed Project would not expose individuals to excessive noise levels associated with aircraft operations. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures:

N-1: All equipment will have sound-control devices that are no less effective than those provided on the original equipment. No equipment will have an unmuffled exhaust.

N-2: As directed by Caltrans, the contractor will implement appropriate additional noise mitigation measures, including changing the location of stationary construction equipment, turning off idling equipment, rescheduling construction activity, notifying adjacent residents in advance of construction work, and installing acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources.

N-3: At least twenty (20) days prior to commencement of construction, the contractor shall provide written notice to all property owners, businesses, and residents within 300 feet of the trail alignment. The notice shall contain a description of the Project, the construction schedule, including days and hours of construction, the name and phone number of the City's Project environmental coordinator and contractor(s), site rules and conditions of approval pertaining to construction activities.

N-4: Construction (including preparation for construction work, such as equipment transportation) shall only be permitted Monday through Saturday between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Construction shall not occur on legal holidays.

N-5: All construction equipment, including trucks and stationary equipment, shall be professionally maintained and fitted with standard manufacturers' mufflers, silencing devices and engine covers.

N-6: Temporary construction noise barriers (blanket type or non-reflective solid type, minimum 10 feet tall at road grade, rated at STC-25 or better) shall be installed and maintained between pile drilling work areas and affected residences on Pepper Street during bridge construction. Noise levels shall be monitored for compliance.

Conclusion: With recommended construction mitigation measures, the Project will have less than significant Noise impacts.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:					
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	1, 6, 24				--X--
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	1, 6, 24				--X--
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	1, 6, 24				--X--
Evaluation a) The Project will not contribute to population or housing growth directly. The City's goal in the Land Use Element for population growth in San Luis Obispo is a rate of one percent per year. As of 2013, the City's population is estimated at 46,377. A one percent increase in population would be approximately 463 individuals. There is no foreseeable nexus between this expansion of the Railroad Safety Trail and an increase of 463 residents in the City or a cumulative contribution to this number Therefore, no impact would occur. b, c) No housing will be removed by the Project. The Project would not be built on any residential zoned parcels or areas used by people for housing. Therefore, no impact would occur. **Conclusion:** The Project will have no impact on Population and Housing.					
14. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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:					
a) Fire protection?	1, 4, 9,24			--X--	
b) Police protection?	1, 4, 9,24			--X--	
c) Schools?	1, 4, 9,24			--X--	
d) Parks?	1, 4, 9,24			--X--	
e) Roads and other transportation infrastructure?	1, 4, 9,24			--X--	
f) Other public facilities?	1, 4, 9,24			--X--	
Evaluation Fire Protection: The San Luis Obispo Fire Department (SLOFD) provides fire and emergency services to the City of San Luis Obispo. The Fire Department is organized into five divisions: Emergency Operations, Fire Prevention and Life Safety, Training and Equipment, Administrative, and Support Services. In addition to providing fire and emergency services to the city, SLOFD maintains an Emergency Services Contract with Cal Poly. Under the current contract, SLOFD provides fire and emergency services to the university in return for a set annual fee. Police Protection: The San Luis Obispo Police Department (SLOPD) provides police protection services within the city limits. SLOPD is responsible for responding to calls for service, investigating crimes and arresting offenders, enforcing traffic and other laws, and promoting community safety through crime prevention and school-safety patrols. The Police Department consists of two bureaus, Administration and Operations, each of which has four divisions. The Police Department operates out of one main facility located at 1042 Walnut Street and a small additional office at 1016 Walnut Street.					

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

Public Schools: The San Luis Coastal Unified School District (SLCUSD) serves an area between the coast and the Los Padres National Forest, and from Morro Bay to the north and Arroyo Grande to the south. In total, the District operates ten elementary schools, two middle schools, two high schools, one continuation high school, and an adult education facility. In addition to the K-12 educational program, the SLCUSD offers a variety of additional educational programs, including: cooperative preschool, preschool early education, and parent participation. Within the San Luis Obispo Land Use and Circulation Element Planning Subarea, the District operates six elementary schools, one middle school, one high school, and one continuation high school.

a) The proposed Project site is served by the SLOFD. Implementation of the proposed Project would increase the intensity of use of the Project site and would marginally increase the demand for fire protection services over existing conditions. The Project would be similar to the land uses on surrounding properties, and the Project site is already served by the City for fire protection. The development of the Project site is consistent with the anticipated land use for the Project site and proposed development would be consistent with the neighborhood commercial zoning for the Project site and consistent with the neighboring residential uses. As stated in the recent City Land Use and Circulation Element Update EIR, adherence to the Safety Element Policy 3.0 (Adequate Fire Services) will reduce impacts related to increased fire protection needs. Trail design objectives include secure and controlled fire access. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

b) The Project site is served by the SLOPD for police protection services. The subject property is currently developed with residential uses and redevelopment of the Project site would not result in the need for increased patrols or additional units such that new police facilities would need to be constructed. There would be no physical impacts related to the construction of new police facilities, and impacts related to police protection would be less than significant. Trail design objectives include secure and controlled police access.

c) The trail will enhance neighborhood pedestrian and bicyclist access to California Polytechnic State University (Cal Poly). The Project would not have a less than significant impact on schools.

d) Although the proposed Project would result in an increase in the number of people utilizing park facilities relative to the City's existing population, and may increase activity at nearby parks that may be made more accessible by the trail (such as Santa Rosa Park), a significant deterioration or accelerated deterioration at parks and recreation-oriented public facilities is not expected. As a recreational amenity, the trail would inherently improve recreational opportunities in the City. Therefore, the proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on parks.

e, f) As noted above, because the proposed use is similar to surrounding uses and would result in a relatively minor increase in users relative to the existing volume of travelers in the area, significant deterioration or accelerated deterioration of transportation infrastructure and other public facilities from possible increased usage is not expected. The proposed Project would have a less than significant impact on transportation infrastructure and public facilities.

Conclusion: The Project will have a less than significant on Public Services.

15. RECREATION.					
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	1, 24			--X--	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	1, 10, 24		--X--		

Evaluation

a) As stated in 14d of this document, this Project is not expected to produce such a volume of new users that any nearby parks or recreation areas will be significantly impacted or deteriorated. The proposed Project is in part a recreational facility and is described as a City and regional amenity in the City's General Plan. Impacts would be beneficial; the Project's implementation would help further the City and County's recreational goals.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

b) The physical impacts of the Project on biological resources and the local environment are discussed in sections 1, 4, 6, 8, and 9 of this document, including identification of mitigation measures to address potentially significant impacts.

Conclusion: Overall, the project would have beneficial effects on recreation, because it would provide an important link in the Railroad Safety Trail. Potential impacts resulting from the construction and operation of the project are assessed in applicable resource sections in this Initial Study.

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:					
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	2, 12, 23, 24			--X--	
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	1, 2, 4, 24			--X--	
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	12, 24				--X--
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	2, 23, 24, 29			--X--	
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	4, 24		--X--		
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	2,24				--X--

Evaluation

As discussed in the recent City Land Use and Circulation Element Update EIR, the City is accessed primarily by roadways including US 101, State Route (SR) 1 and SR 227. Routes of regional significance providing access include Los Osos Valley Road, Foothill Road, Broad Street, O'Connor Way, Prefumo Canyon Road, South Higuera Street and Orcutt Road. The local roadway system is characterized by a regular street grid in the downtown area and neighborhood street patterns in other parts of the City.

Although Federal transportation regulations mandate the use of a Federal classification system, local jurisdictions, such as City of San Luis Obispo, also develop classification systems to define their own roadways. A total of 75 roadway segments in the local, county, and State roadway system were studied under the Land Use and Circulation Element Update EIR using the City's AADT LOS thresholds. The City considers roadways operating at LOS D or better to be acceptable, excepting segments downtown where LOS is allowed to drop to E. The only segment noted to be deficient under existing conditions is Broad Street south of Buckley Road, which is under State of California and County jurisdiction.

According to the 2014 Circulation Element, the City's objectives for the proportions of transportation modes by trip percentage is 50% motor vehicle, 12% transit, 20% bicycles, and 18% walking, carpools, and other forms. These objectives are tied to the City's adoption of a Multimodal Level of Service (MLOS) standard for determining traffic impacts and conducting traffic analysis.

a, b) This Project complies with the City's Circulation Element. The Project also furthers City transportation objectives in the Circulation Element in sections 1.7.2, 4.1.1, 4.2.5, 4.2.6, and the MLOS objectives in general. The Project is a portion of the larger Railroad Safety Trail, designed to increase use of the bicycle transportation mode. Development of the trail facility is intended to change existing vehicular traffic patterns. It is anticipated that a small percentage of commuters currently using

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

automobiles would instead use bicycles on the trail facility. The trail is consistent with regional and local goals and policies that encourage alternative modes of transportation. It would not result in increased traffic or parking demand on regional roadways. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

c) The Project is not located in the vicinity of any public or private airports and will not result in any changes to air traffic patterns, nor does it conflict with any safety plans of the Airport Land Use Plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.

d) The Project involves the loss of one travel lane on California Boulevard, and restriping on California Boulevard. In addition, the Project will involve the creation of a new paved surface adjacent to California Boulevard, Pepper Street, and Philips Lane. The road restriping will be completed according to City and Caltrans specifications and will involve no significant alterations to the curves or slopes of the road. The bridge that connects Pepper Street to the Railroad Safety Trail will create a new source of pedestrian and bicycle traffic. This will require an extension of the trail down the length of Pepper Street to the next sidewalk or a crosswalk from the trail end to the other side of Pepper Street where a sidewalk already exists. The section of Pepper Street where the Project will be built is not a major artery. The connection to Philips Lane is within a cul-de-sac, which has existing sidewalks and does not experience heavy traffic.

The trail design does include some varying slopes, with a maximum 8.25 percent grade with two percent grade breaks in these steepest sections.

e) The Project has been designed to allow emergency vehicle access and Project objectives include bridges capable of safely supporting maintenance and emergency vehicles. The Project must adhere to emergency access requirements identified in the County's 2011 Hazard Mitigation Plan and Land Use Ordinance. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

f) The Project is in conformance with City's plans and policies regarding public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. The Project will provide a benefit for public transportation for the City. Therefore, no impact would occur.

Mitigation Measures:

T-1: Prior to construction, a Traffic Management Plan will be prepared for the Project, which will identify measures to follow during lane closure, reconfiguration, and striping on California Boulevard. The Traffic Management Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

a. Identified lane closures, including vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian sidewalk closures or limitations.
b. Safety measures including signage, safety cones, and temporary lighting.
c. Use of personnel to direct vehicular traffic, bicycle traffic, and pedestrians.

Conclusion: With recommended mitigation measures, the Project will have less than significant impacts to Transportation/Traffic.

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:					
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	7, 20, 24			--X--	
b) Require or result in the construction or expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	7, 20, 24, 26, 27			--X--	
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	7, 20			--X--	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new and expanded entitlements needed?	7, 20, 34			--X--	

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) 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?	7, 20, 24, 26, 27			--X--	
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	5, 8, 24			--X--	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	5, 8, 24			--X--	

Evaluation

Barring certain exemptions, projects within the City are subject to the RWQCB Post Construction Requirements (PCR) regarding the runoff of stormwater and the Project's associated best management practices (BMPs) or low impact development (LID) measures. The City has adopted these measures for its own stormwater requirements and Stormwater Control Plan (SWCP). The PCR detail specifications, such as total impervious surface area and BMP performance standards, that are systematically determined through a series of questions about the project. There is a total of five possible performance requirements with several conditions in each. It is not possible for a project to be subject to all five of the requirements, as the fifth is exclusive of requirements three and four. Projects are categorized under the PCR as being either Exempt or Regulated. Exempt projects, meeting predefined conditions in the PCR, do not need to satisfy any of the stormwater performance requirements. Regulated projects must prepare a SWCP and SWCP Application.

Part of the PCR determination relies on the Watershed Management Zone (WMZ) designation for a given project site. There are ten possible zones classified by the RWQCB that are defined by various hydrologic characteristics. Depending on which WMZ a given project may occupy, the Peak Management requirement can have varying conditions. These conditions include the use of an applicable rainfall event, defined as either the 85^{th} or 95^{th} percentile 24-hour storm, and the means of compliance required to achieve a pre-development hydrology condition that performs similarly to the natural infiltration of the site.

a, b) The Project will not generate a significant amount of wastewater in its construction or long-term operation, and will not require wastewater connections. The Project will connect to currently existing storm water systems. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

c) There are existing 2:1 slopes that grade the existing ground surface from California Boulevard as well as adjacent to the CHP parking lot down to the UPRR tracks. At the toe of slope between the CHP property and the UPRR tracks, there is an existing basin, which collects storm water runoff from the CHP property. The purpose of this basin is to retain the drainage from encroaching into the UPRR right-of-way. As mentioned earlier, the proposed trail will fill in this existing basin. In order to mitigate the drainage impacts to the existing basin, a 1 ft minimum depth v-ditch with 2:1 side slopes is proposed between the CHP property and the trail. The ditch will be maintained for approximately 500 ft. In lieu of the basin, this ditch will serve as the retention area between the CHP property and the UPRR tracks.

The storm water collected in the basin currently drains to a headwall and pipe inlet near the US 101 right-of-way. To maintain the existing drainage pattern, the storm water collected in the proposed v-ditch will flow to an open pipe inlet and an 18-inch pipe that will connect from the drainage inlet to the headwall and drain at the same location. Existing storm drain pipes that outfall from the CHP property will be maintained and will outfall into the proposed ditch instead of the existing basin.

The total increase to existing drain inputs from the post-construction site is 6.8%, or a total increase of 0.22 cfs. This volume of water will not overwhelm the existing infrastructure, which is capable of draining water from a ten-minute storm at the 100 year interval.

The Project would not contribute to the average dry weather flow for the City. A significant increase in dry weather sewer flow would be two percent of 3.72 million gallons per day (mgd), or 74,400 gallons per day. Dry weather flows from the Project will be negligible and well below this threshold.

Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

d) The Project will be landscaped with vegetation having low water and maintenance requirements; irrigation works will not use a significant amount of water. Sufficient water supply is available to serve the Project, and the potential impact is less than significant.

e) The incremental increase in runoff from the Project will not significantly burden wastewater treatment facilities; therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

f) The Project itself will not generate solid waste besides what will be initially required for construction. Construction operations will be conducted in a manner that reduces solid waste generation to the maximum extent feasible.

g) All Project construction and operational activities will conform to state and federal solid waste regulations, and local landfills have the capacity to serve the Project. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

Conclusion: The Project will have a less than significant impact on Utilities and Service Systems.

18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to 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, 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?			--X--		

The Project is an infill development in an urbanized area of the City. As discussed above, potential impacts to air quality, biological and cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and noise will be less than significant with incorporation of recommended mitigation measures.

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 the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				--X--	

The impacts of the proposed Project are individually limited and not considered "cumulatively considerable." Although incremental changes in certain issue areas can be expected as a result of the proposed Project, all environmental impacts that could occur as a result of the proposed Project would be reduced to a less than significant level through compliance with existing regulations discussed in this Initial Study and/or implementation of the mitigation measures recommended in this Initial Study for the following resource areas: air quality, biological and cultural resources, hydrology and water quality, and noise.

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

Implementation of the proposed Project would result in no environmental effects that would cause substantial direct or indirect adverse effects on human beings with incorporation of the mitigation measures recommended in this Initial Study.

19. EARLIER ANALYSES.

Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (D). In this case a discussion should identify the following items:

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

City of San Luis Obispo Land Use and Circulation Element Update EIR, available for review at the City Community Development Department (919 Palm Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401), or at the following web site: http://www.slocity.org/government/department-directory/community-development/planning-zoning/general-plan

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

b) Impacts adequately addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

Applicable excerpts, analysis and conclusions from the Land Use and Circulation Element Update EIR have been added to each impact issue area discussion. Where Project specific impacts and mitigation measures have been identified that are not addressed in the Land Use and Circulation Element Update EIR, original analysis has been provided and mitigation has been recommended to reduce impact levels as needed.

c) Mitigation measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions of the project.

N/A

20. SOURCE REFERENCES.

1.	City of San Luis Obispo General Plan Land Use Element, December 2014
2.	City of San Luis Obispo General Plan Circulation Element, December 2014
3.	City of San Luis Obispo General Plan Noise Element, May 1996
4.	City of San Luis Obispo General Plan Safety Element, March 2014
5.	City of San Luis Obispo General Plan Conservation & Open Space Element, April 2006 (December 2014 Revision)
6.	City of San Luis Obispo General Plan Housing Element, January 2015
7.	City of San Luis Obispo Water and Wastewater Element, July 2010
8.	City of San Luis Obispo Source Reduction and Recycling Element, on file in the Utilities Department
9.	City of San Luis Obispo Municipal Code
10.	City of San Luis Obispo Community Design Guidelines, June 2010
11.	City of San Luis Obispo, Land Use Inventory Database
12.	City of San Luis Obispo Zoning Regulations March 2015
13.	City of San Luis Obispo Zoning Map. January, 2015
14.	City of San Luis Obispo Climate Action Plan, August 2012
15.	City of San Luis Obispo Waterways Management Plan
16.	City of San Luis Obispo, Archaeological Resource Preservation Guidelines, on file in the Community Development Department
17.	City of San Luis Obispo, Historic Site Map
18.	City of San Luis Obispo Burial Sensitivity Map
19.	2013 California Building Code
20.	2015 Water Resources Status Report, 2015, on file with in the Utilities Department
21.	Website of the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency: http://www.consrv.ca.gov/dlrp/FMMP/
22.	CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Air Pollution Control District, April 2012
23.	Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition, on file in the Community Development Department
24.	San Luis Obispo Land Use and Circulation Element Update EIR. June 13, 2014
25.	Website of the California Environmental Protection Agency, Cortese List: http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/SectionA.htm
26.	Sanitary Sewer Flow Monitoring and Inflow/Infiltration Study 2012
27.	Wastewater Collection System Infrastructure Renewal Strategy 2016
28.	NRCS Soil Survey Website
29.	Applicant Project Plans
30.	Applicant Project Description
31.	Natural Environment Study-Minimal Impact, Railroad Safety Trail Taft to Pepper Street Project. Padre, August, 2016
32.	Archaeological Survey Report, Railroad Safety Trail Taft to Pepper Street Project. Padre, September 2016
33.	Caltrans Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, FHWA 2014
34.	Initial Site Assessment Railroad Safety Trail Project Taft Street to Pepper Street. Padre, April 2016

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources 91375	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact

35.	Noise Study Report. Padre, February 2016
36.	Scenic Resource Evaluation and Visual Impact Assessment. City of San Luis Obispo, August 2016
37.	Personal Communication: Glenn Armstrong, TRC, October 2016
38.	Archaeological Resource Preservation Program Guidelines, City of San Luis Obispo, October 2009
Note	All of the above reference sources that are not attached as appendices to this Initial Study are available upon request in the Community Development Department, City of San Luis Obispo

Attachments:

1. Site Vicinity/Project Location Map (Figure 1)
2. Project Site Plan/Aerial Photo Overlay (Figure 2)
3. Project Plans
4. Natural Environment Study, Minimal Impacts (Padre, October 2016)
5. Initial Site Assessment (Padre, April 2016)
6. Noise Study Report (Padre, February 2016)

REQUIRED MITIGATION AND MONITORING PROGRAMS

Air Quality

AQ-1: During construction/ground disturbing activities, the applicant shall implement the following particulate (dust) control measures. These measures shall be shown on grading and building plans. In addition, the contractor shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, modify practices as necessary, to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the Community Development and Public Works Departments prior to commencement of construction.

a. Reduce the amount of disturbed area where possible.
b. Use water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the Project site and from exceeding the APCD's limit of 20 percent opacity for no greater than three minutes in any 60 minute period. Increased watering frequency will be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 mph and cessation of grading activities during periods of winds over 25 mph. Reclaimed (non-potable) water is to be used in all construction and dust-control work.
c. All dirt stock pile areas (if any) shall be sprayed daily and covered with tarps or other dust barriers as needed.
d. Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved Project revegetation and landscape plans shall be implemented as soon as possible, following completion of any soil disturbing activities.
e. Exposed grounds that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading shall be sown with a fast germinating, non-invasive, grass seed and watered until vegetation is established.
f. All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation shall be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the APCD.
g. All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
h. Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site.
i. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials, are to be covered or shall maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with California Vehicle Code Section 23114.
j. Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site.
k. Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers shall be used with reclaimed water where feasible. Roads shall be pre-wetted prior to sweeping when feasible.

Monitoring Program, AQ-1: These conditions shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans. Public Works Inspectors shall conduct field monitoring.

AQ-2: Prior to any construction activities at the site, the Project proponent shall ensure that all equipment and operations are compliant with California Air Resource Board and APCD permitting requirements, by contacting the APCD Engineering Division at (805) 781-5912 for specific information regarding permitting requirements.

Monitoring Program, AQ-2: These conditions shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans. Public Works Inspectors shall conduct field monitoring.

AQ-3: To reduce impacts to sensitive receptors as a result of emissions from diesel vehicles and equipment used to construct the Project and export soil from the Project site, the applicant shall implement the following idling control techniques:

1. California Diesel Idling Regulations
    a. On-road diesel vehicles shall comply with Section 2485 of Title 13 of the California Code of regulations. This regulation limits idling from diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles with gross vehicular weight ratings of more than 10,000 pounds and licensed for operation on highways. It applies to California and non-California based vehicles. In general, the regulation specifies that drivers of said vehicles:
        1. Shall not idle the vehicle's primary diesel engine for greater than 5 minutes at any location, except as noted in Subsection (d) of the regulation; and,
        2. Shall not operate a diesel-fueled auxiliary power system (APS) to power a heater, air conditioner, or any ancillary equipment on that vehicle during sleeping or resting in a sleeper berth for greater than five minutes at any location when within 1,000 feet of restricted area, except as noted in Subsection (d) of the regulation.
    b. Off-road diesel equipment shall comply with the five minute idling restriction identified in Section 2449(d)(2) of the California Air Resources Board's In-Use Off-Road Diesel regulation.
    c. Signs must be posted in the designated queuing areas and job sites to remind drivers and operators of the state's 5 minute idling limit.
2. Diesel Idling Restrictions Near Sensitive Receptors (residential homes). In addition to the State required diesel idling requirements, the Project applicant shall comply with these more restrictive requirements to minimize impacts to nearby sensitive receptors:
    a. Staging and queuing areas shall not be located within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors.
    b. Diesel idling within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors shall not be permitted.
    c. Use of alternative fueled equipment is recommended.
    d. Signs that specify the no idling areas must be posed and enforced at the site.
3. Soil Transport. The final volume of soil that will be hauled off-site, together with the fleet mix, hauling route, and number of trips per day will need to be identified for the APCD. Specific standards and conditions will apply.

Monitoring Program, AQ-3: These conditions shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans. Public Works Inspectors shall conduct field monitoring.

AQ-4: Prior to construction, a geological evaluation shall be conducted to determine the presence of NOA. If NOA is not present, an exemption request must be filed with the APCD. If NOA is found, the City must comply with all requirements outlined in the Asbestos Air Toxics Control Measure (ATCM), which may include development of an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan and an Asbestos Health and Safety Program for approval by the APCD.

Monitoring Program, AQ-4: These conditions shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans. Public Works Inspectors shall conduct field monitoring. If required, the Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan and Asbestos Health and Safety Program shall be submitted to APCD prior to grading and construction. A copy of the Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan and Asbestos Health and Safety Program shall be available onsite during grading and construction, and shall be implemented as necessary.

Biological Resources

BIO-1: In the event that special-status plant species are observed within the Project site, all individuals will be flagged by a qualified biologist prior to construction activities, so that they may be avoided. If special-status plants cannot be avoided by Project activities, the appropriate permits will be obtained prior to the

start of construction activities. A restoration plan will be prepared for the Project (BIO-2), and will be implemented as necessary.

Monitoring Program, BIO-1: This condition shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans. City staff will periodically inspect the site regarding continued compliance with the above mitigation measure.

BIO-2: Prior to construction, the City will prepare a restoration plan that provides for a 1:1 restoration ratio for temporary and permanent impacts, unless otherwise directed by regulatory agencies. Any revegetation will be conducted using only native plant species, and will be conducted outside of the UPRR right-of-way. The restoration plan will include specifications for invasive species abatement and monitoring.

Monitoring Program, BIO-2: This condition shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans. The restoration plan shall be reviewed by the City's Natural Resources Manager. City staff will periodically inspect the site for implementation of the restoration plan and continued compliance with the above mitigation measure.

BIO-3: Prior to construction, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan or Water Pollution Control Plan for the Project will be prepared. Provisions of this plan shall be implemented during and after construction as necessary to avoid and minimize erosion and storm water pollution in and near the work area.

Monitoring Program, BIO-3: This condition shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans. The Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan or Water Pollution Control Plan shall be reviewed by the RWQCB and City's Natural Resources Manager. City staff will periodically inspect the site for implementation of the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan or Water Pollution Control Plan and continued compliance with the above mitigation measure.

BIO-4: Prior to construction, all personnel will participate in an environmental awareness training program conducted by a qualified biologist.

Monitoring Program, BIO-4: The contractor shall provide City staff proof of compliance regarding implementation of the environmental awareness training program.

BIO-5: During construction, the cleaning and refueling of equipment and vehicles will occur only within a designated staging area and at least 100 ft from wetlands or culverts that outflow to wetlands. At a minimum, equipment and vehicles will be checked and maintained on a daily basis to ensure proper operation and avoid potential leaks or spills.

Monitoring Program, BIO-5: This condition shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans. City staff will periodically inspect the site regarding continued compliance with the above mitigation measure.

BIO 6: Prior to removal of Eucalyptus tree or other large trees, a qualified biologist will survey the trees to determine presence of roosting monarch butterflies. If roosting is identified (e.g., a visible "clump" over a a period of time), tree removal will be scheduled outside of the roosting period (generally November to March).

Monitoring Program, BIO-6: This condition shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans. City staff will periodically inspect the site regarding continued compliance with the above mitigation measure.

BIO-7: If construction activities are proposed during the typical nesting season (February 15 to September 1), a nesting bird survey will be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than two weeks prior to the start of construction to determine presence/absence of nesting birds within the Biological Study Area and immediate vicinity. Caltrans will be notified if nesting birds are observed during the surveys and will

facilitate coordination with the USFWS if necessary to determine an appropriate avoidance strategy. Likewise, coordination with CDFW will be facilitated by the City if necessary to devise a suitable avoidance plan. If raptor nests are observed within the Project site during the pre-construction nesting bird surveys, the nest(s) shall be designated an Environmental Sensitive Area and protected by a minimum 500-foot avoidance buffer until the breeding season ends or until a qualified biologist determines that all young have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival. Similarly, if active passerine nests are observed within the Project Site during the pre-construction nesting bird surveys, the nest(s) shall be designated an Environmentally Sensitive Area and protected by a minimum 250-foot avoidance buffer until the breeding season ends or until a qualified biologist determines that all young have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival. Resource agencies may consider proposed variances from these buffers if there is a compelling biological or ecological reason to do so, such as protection of a nest via concealment due to site topography.

Monitoring Program, BIO-7: This condition shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans. City staff will periodically inspect the site regarding continued compliance with the above mitigation measure.

BIO-8: Prior to construction, the City will prepare a Tree Protection and Restoration Plan to be reviewed and approved by the City Arborist and City Natural Resources Manager. Requirements shall include but not be limited to: the protection of trees with construction setbacks from trees; construction fencing around trees; grading limits around the base of trees as required; and a replacement plan for trees removed including replacement at a minimum 1:1 ratio. Removal of native trees shall require a minimum 4:1 replacement ratio. The Tree Protection and Restoration Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following information:

a. Specific areas proposed for revegetation and their size.
b. Implementation plan (rationale for expecting implementation success, responsible parties, schedule, site preparation, and planting plan);
c. Specific habitat management and protection concepts to be used to ensure long-term maintenance and protection of the trees (i.e.: quarterly and annual surveys to be conducted for a minimum of five years; protection fencing and signage where necessary; and weed abatement);
d. Contingency measures in the event a planted tree does not survive, including replacement of the tree to ensure no net loss of trees in the long-term;
e. Reporting requirements to ensure consistent data collection and reporting methods used by monitoring personnel;
f. Funding mechanism.

Monitoring Program, BIO-8: The Tree Protection and Restoration Plan shall be approved by the City Arborist and Natural Resources Manager prior to construction. Compliance with the Plan and submittal of required Monitoring Reports will be verified by the City Arborist and Natural Resources Manager.

Cultural Resources

CR-1: If, during the course of constructing and implementing the proposed Project, archaeological, paleontological, or cultural resources (i.e., prehistoric sites, historic sites, or isolated artifacts and features) are discovered, the contractor shall halt all ground disturbing activities immediately within 50 feet of the discovery, the City shall be notified, and a professional archaeologist, architectural historian, or paleontologist (depending on the nature of the finding) shall be retained to determine the significance of the discovery. The City shall consider mitigation recommendations presented by the professional, and the City shall consult and agree upon implementation of a measure(s) that they deem feasible and appropriate. Such measures may include avoidance, preservation in place, excavation, documentation, curation, data

recovery, or other appropriate measures. The City shall be required to implement any mitigation necessary for the protection of archaeological, paleontological, and cultural resources.

Monitoring Program, CR-1: All mitigation measures shall be noted on Project grading and building plans, and be clearly visible to contractor and City inspectors. City staff will periodically inspect the site for continued compliance with the above mitigation measure.

CR-2: In the event of human burial discovery, no further disturbance shall occur within 100 feet of the finding until the County of San Luis Obispo (County) Coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to PRC Section 5097.98. The County Coroner must be notified of the find immediately. If the human remains are determined to be Native American, the County Coroner will notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours, which will determine and notify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD). The City shall allow the MLD to complete an inspection of the site (typically within 48 hours of notification) and shall comply with MLD recommendations, which may include scientific removal and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials.

Monitoring Program, CR-2: All mitigation measures shall be noted on Project grading and building plans, and be clearly visible to contractor and City inspectors. City staff will periodically inspect the site for continued compliance with the above mitigation measure.

CR-3: Additional archaeological surveys will be conducted in association with subsequent environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act if Project limits are extended beyond the present survey limits.

Monitoring Program, CR-3: If Project conditions change, additional cultural surveys and reporting will be conducted.

CR-4: During removal of vegetation within any areas previously determined to be inaccessible due to vegetation, including an approximately 100-foot segment behind the California Highway Patrol facility, a qualified archaeologist shall monitor vegetation removal and conduct a surface survey to confirm the presence or absence of archaeological resources. In the event of resource discovery during the survey, and at any time during construction, the resource shall be evaluated pursuant to mitigation measure CR-1 and the City of San Luis Obispo *Archaeological Resource Preservation Program Guidelines* (October 2009). Prior to redirecting or resuming construction, a Cultural Resources Monitoring Plan, prepared by a qualified archaeologist, shall be prepared and implemented in the event of resource discovery. The Monitoring Plan shall include at a minimum:

a. List of personnel involved in the monitoring activities;
b. Inclusion of involvement of the Native American community, as appropriate;
c. Description of how the monitoring shall occur;
d. Description of frequency of monitoring (e.g., full-time, part time, spot checking);
e. Description of what resources are expected to be encountered;
f. Description of circumstances that would result in the halting of work at the project site (e.g., What is considered “significant” archaeological resources?);
g. Description of procedures for halting work on the site and notification procedures; and
h. Description of monitoring reporting procedures.

Monitoring Program, CR-4: All mitigation measures shall be noted on Project grading and building plans, and be clearly visible to contractor and City inspectors. The City shall oversee survey efforts, and shall review and approve the Monitoring Plan, as required.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

HAZ-1: Prior to construction, as recommended in the Initial Site Assessment (Padre, April 2016), the City shall complete a Preliminary Site Investigation Report including, but not limited to, testing and analysis of soils to be disturbed as a result of grading and construction activities. The Report shall include, but not be limited to: sampling and analysis methodology, including the advancement of shallow drill holes along the proposed ground disturbance areas, collection of discrete soil samples from shallow soils, and chemical analysis of selected soil samples for presence of total petroleum hydrocarbon constituents, lead, arsenic, and chlorinated herbicides; and identification of the concentration of petroleum hydrocarbons and chlorinated herbicides. In the event elevated concentrations of suspected contaminants are indicated in shallow soils, the City will prepare a Contaminated Materials Management Plan (CMMP) for implementation during the course of the construction activities. The CMMP shall include but not be limited to detailed procedures to properly manage and dispose contaminated soils disturbed during the course of the Project construction activities, in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations.

Monitoring Program, HAZ-1: These conditions shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans. Public Works Inspectors shall conduct field monitoring. If required, the CMMP shall be submitted to the City prior to grading and construction. A copy of the CMMP shall be available onsite during grading and construction, and shall be implemented as necessary.

HAZ-2: TPH-containing soil, lead contaminated soil, herbicide-containing soil, and lead-based paint containing building materials demolished as part of the Project will be segregated and properly packaged and disposed of at a licensed facility.

Monitoring Program, HAZ-2: These conditions shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans. Public Works Inspectors shall conduct field monitoring.

Noise

N-1: All equipment will have sound-control devices that are no less effective than those provided on the original equipment. No equipment will have an unmuffled exhaust.

Monitoring Program, N-1: These conditions shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans. Public Works Inspectors shall conduct field monitoring.

N-2: As directed by Caltrans, the contractor will implement appropriate additional noise mitigation measures, including changing the location of stationary construction equipment, turning off idling equipment, rescheduling construction activity, notifying adjacent residents in advance of construction work, and installing acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources.

Monitoring Program, N-2: These conditions shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans. Public Works Inspectors shall conduct field monitoring.

N-3: At least twenty (20) days prior to commencement of construction, the contractor shall provide written notice to all property owners, businesses, and residents within 300 feet of the trail alignment. The notice shall contain a description of the Project, the construction schedule, including days and hours of construction, the name and phone number of the City's Project environmental coordinator and contractor(s), site rules and conditions of approval pertaining to construction activities.

Monitoring Program, N-3: These conditions shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans.

N-4: Construction (including preparation for construction work, such as equipment transportation) shall only be permitted Monday through Saturday between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. Construction shall not occur on legal holidays.

Monitoring Program, N-4: These conditions shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans. Public Works Inspectors shall conduct field monitoring.

N-5: All construction equipment, including trucks and stationary equipment, shall be professionally maintained and fitted with standard manufacturers' mufflers, silencing devices and engine covers.

Monitoring Program, N-5: These conditions shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans. Public Works Inspectors shall conduct field monitoring.

N-6: Temporary construction noise barriers (blanket type or non-reflective solid type, minimum 10 feet tall at road grade, rated at STC-25 or better) shall be installed and maintained between pile drilling work areas and affected residences on Pepper Street during bridge construction. Noise levels shall be monitored for compliance.

Monitoring Program, N-6: These conditions shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans. Public Works Inspectors shall conduct field monitoring.

Transportation/Traffic

T-1: Prior to construction, a Traffic Management Plan will be prepared for the Project, which will identify measures to follow during lane closure, reconfiguration, and striping on California Boulevard. The Traffic Management Plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

a. Identified lane closures, including vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian sidewalk closures or limitations.
b. Safety measures including signage, safety cones, and temporary lighting.
c. Use of personnel to direct vehicular traffic, bicycle traffic, and pedestrians.

Monitoring Program, T-1: This condition shall be noted on all Project grading and building plans. Public Works Inspectors shall conduct field monitoring.