EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section summarizes the characteristics of the proposed San Luis Ranch Project, alternatives to the project, as well as environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts associated with the project.

PROJECT SYNOPSIS

Lead Agency

City of San Luis Obispo
Community Development Department
919 Palm Street
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

Contact:
Doug Davidson, Deputy Director
John Rickenbach, AICP, Project Manager

Project Proponent

Coastal Community Builders
c/o Marshall Ochylski (Project Representative)
~~979 Osos, Suite F7~~
~~San Luis Obispo, CA 93401~~
P.O. Box 13
Pismo Beach, CA 93449

Project Description

The San Luis Ranch Project consists of a Specific Plan, General Plan Amendment/Pre-Zoning, and Development Plan/Vesting Tentative Tract Map for a 131-acre project site, including annexation of the site into the City of San Luis Obispo. It would also address a Development Agreement/Memorandum of Understanding, which provides a mechanism for project implementation. The project is intended to be consistent with the development parameters described in the City's Land Use and Circulation Element (adopted in December 2014). The project includes construction of up to 580 residential units, 150,000 square feet of commercial development, 100,000 square feet of office development, and a 200-room hotel, with a portion of the site preserved for agriculture and open space uses. The project is planned to be constructed in six phases, beginning in 2017.

The specific location and characteristics of the project are described in greater detail in Section 2.0, *Project Description*.

ALTERNATIVES

As required by Section 15126(d) of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, this EIR examines a range of reasonable alternatives to the project that could feasibly achieve similar objectives. This includes the following four alternatives:

- Alternative 1: No Project, No Development
- Alternative 2: No Project, Measure J Entitlements
- Alternative 3: Historical Resource Preservation
- Alternative 4: 50% On-Site Agriculture/Open Space

Alternative 1 assumes that the San Luis Ranch Specific Plan is not adopted, that none of the proposed entitlements are implemented, including annexation to the City, and that no further development would occur on the project site.

Alternative 2 also assumes that the Specific Plan is not adopted and that none of the proposed entitlements are implemented, including annexation to the City. However, this alternative represents a project that would be processed by San Luis Obispo County, and considers what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future based on current plans and consistency with available infrastructure and community services. There are existing entitlements on the project site for development in the County from the voter-approved initiative known as "Measure J," which include 60 multi-family dwelling units, 560,000 square feet of regional commercial and outdoor sales areas, 198,000 square feet of office space, a 150-room hotel and ancillary facilities. Because the Measure J entitlements would leave the project site under the jurisdiction of the County, but surrounded entirely by the City limit, these entitlements would also require the use of private water from onsite wells and an onsite wastewater treatment facility. Since this alternative (Alternative 2) assumes that the project site would be developed under an existing entitlement, this alternative would not require environmental review under CEQA.

Alternative 3 would preserve the San Luis Ranch Complex, as well as associated eucalyptus trees, located in the northwest portion of the project site would be retained, and assumes that the proposed multi-family residential development would be relocated and integrated into the proposed single-family residential development area on the central portion of the project site. By preserving the San Luis Ranch Complex, this alternative would avoid the project's significant and unavoidable impact to historic resources. In addition, this alternative would also reduce other potential environmental impacts to air quality, GHG emissions, noise, biological resources, land use/policy consistency, and hydrology and water quality, while resulting in slightly increased impacts to transportation.

Alternative 4 would retain 50 percent of the net site acreage as on-site agricultural and open space uses to be consistent on-site with the City's General Plan Land Use Element Policy 8.1.4.f. This alternative would retain the portion of land designated for commercial uses (NC) southeast of Froom Ranch Way and southwest of Prado Road in agriculture. This alternative would reduce the portion of the site available for residential and commercial development on the project site.

The No Project, No Development Alternative (Alternative 1) would have the fewest environmental impacts. However, since this is a "No Project" alternative, CEQA requires that a separate alternative also be identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Because Alternative 3 would avoid the significant and unavoidable impact to historic resources identified for the project, as well as reducing other potential environmental effects due to the preservation of the eucalyptus grove in the northwest portion of the project site along Madonna Road, and due to the reduced overall development footprint this alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative over other alternatives.

The complete alternatives analysis is included in Section 6.0, *Alternatives*.

AREAS OF CONCERN

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines §15123(b)(2), this EIR acknowledges the areas of controversy and issues to be resolved which are known to the City of San Luis Obispo or were raised during the scoping process. A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was prepared and circulated for a 30-day public review period that began on October 26, 2015 and ended November 24, 2015. Several comment letters from public agencies and members of the public were received in response to the NOP. The NOP and Initial Study, and NOP comment letters are included in Appendix A of this EIR.

Primary environmental areas of concern raised by the commenting agencies and public include:

AREA OF CONCERN	EIR SECTION
Access to U.S. Highway 101	Section 4.12: Transportation
Drainage characteristics, hydrology, flooding, and other impacts associated with the area floodplain	Section 4.8: Hydrology and Water Quality
Aviation Safety and airport/aviation hazards	Section 4.7: Hazards, Section 4.9: Land Use/Policy Consistency
Construction equipment regulation and permit requirements associated with air pollution emissions	Section 4.3: Air Quality
Existing structure demolition and potential to encounter asbestos containing materials	Section 4.7: Hazards
Naturally occurring asbestos exposure	Section 4.3: Air Quality
Operational permit requirements associated with air pollutant emissions	Section 4.3: Air Quality
Long-term and short-term air quality impacts	Section 4.3: Air Quality
Impacts associated with greenhouse gas emissions	Section 4.6: Greenhouse Gas Emissions
Alternatives to the project	Section 6.0: Alternatives
Routing plans relative to access to site and nearby land uses	Section 4.12: Transportation
Residential displacement	Section 4.9: Land Use/Policy Consistency, Section 4.14: Issues Addressed in the Initial Study

FINAL EIR ERRATA

In accordance with Section 15088 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, Draft EIR was circulated for a 52-day public review period that began December 9, 2016 and concluded on January 31, 2017. Each written and verbal comment that the City received is included in Section 8.0, *Responses to Comments*. Responses to these comments have been prepared to address the environmental concerns raised by the commenters and to indicate where and how the Draft EIR addresses pertinent environmental issues. The Draft EIR and responses to comments collectively comprise the Final EIR for the project.

The responses to comments summarize the comment and direct the commenter to the section of the Draft EIR that addresses their comment. In some cases, revisions have been made to the

Draft EIR to clarify information, data, or intent, or to make minor typographical corrections or minor working changes. Any changes made to the text of the Draft EIR to are noted in the Final EIR as changes from the Draft EIR. Where a comment results in a change to the Draft EIR text, a notation is made in the response indicating that the text is revised. Changes in the Draft EIR text are signified by strikeouts where text is removed and by underline font where text is added. If text is added where the font is already bold or underlined, additions are noted using underlined bold font. Mitigation measures in the Draft EIR that were revised as part of the responses to comments are listed below. Revisions to these mitigation measures are also shown in Table ES-1, applicable sections of the Draft EIR, and in Section 8.0, *Responses to Comments*.

- AG-1. Agricultural Conservation.
- AQ-2(a). Fugitive Dust Control Measures.
- AQ-2(b). Standard Control Measures for Construction Equipment.
- AQ-2(e). Construction Activity Management Plan.
- AQ-3(a). Standard Operational Mitigation Measures.
- BIO-1(e). Steelhead Impact Avoidance and Minimization.
- BIO-1(f). Great Blue Heron and Monarch Butterfly Impact Avoidance and Minimization.
- BIO-2(b). Tree Replacement.
- CR-1(a). Historical Structure Relocation and Reconstruction Plan.
- HAZ-5(a). Groundwater Assessment for Contamination at Untested Wells.
- HAZ-5(b). Groundwater Remediation.
- HWQ-3(a). Stormwater Quality Treatment Controls.
- N-4(b). Parking Lot/Loading Dock Orientation and Noise Barrier.
- N-5(a). Interior Noise Reduction.
- N-5(c). Froom Ranch Way Noise Barrier.
- N-5(d). U.S. Highway 101 Noise Barrier at Hotel.

In addition, a portion of the Draft EIR was recirculated for a 45-day public review period that began March 3, 2017 and concluded on April 17, 2017. The portion of the Draft EIR that was recirculated ("Recirculated Portions") was Section 5.0, *Other CEQA-Related Discussions*, which was revised to include an updated discussion of energy use and conservation related to the project. This recirculation also included the relevant portions of Appendix D as originally contained in the Draft EIR. As a result of this new discussion, no new significant impacts or mitigation measures were identified. Pursuant to Section 15088.5(c) of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, if the revisions subject to recirculation are limited to a few portions of the Draft EIR, the lead agency need only recirculate the portions that have been modified. Section 8.0,

Responses to Comments, includes responses to all comments received on the recirculated portions of the Draft EIR during the additional public review period. None of the comment received in response to the recirculated portions of the Draft EIR required revisions to the Draft EIR.

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Tables ES-1 through ES-3 provide a summary of the potential environmental impacts of the project. The mitigation measures associated with each impact, which are to be implemented in order to reduce the environmental impacts to the maximum extent feasible, are also summarized therein. In accordance with the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the tables identify the following types of potential impacts associated with the project:

- Class I, Significant and Unavoidable: An impact that cannot be reduced to below the threshold level given reasonably available and feasible mitigation measures. Such an impact requires a 'Statement of Overriding Considerations' to be issued if the project is approved per §15093 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*.

- Class II, Significant but Mitigable: An impact that can be reduced to below the threshold level given reasonably available and feasible mitigation measures. Such an impact requires 'Findings' to be made under §15091 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*.

- Class III, Not Significant: An impact that may be adverse, but does not exceed the threshold levels and does not require mitigation measures. However, mitigation measures that could further lessen the environmental effect may be suggested if readily available and easily achievable.

Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

The project would result in twelve significant and unavoidable (Class I) impacts. Issue areas with Class I impacts include air quality (Clean Air Plan consistency and cumulative air quality impacts), cultural resources (historic resources and cumulative historic resources), land use/policy consistency (General Plan policy consistency), noise (construction noise), and transportation (existing and near-term intersection operations, existing and near-term lane capacities, existing and near-term segment operations, cumulative intersection operations, cumulative lane capacities, and cumulative segment operations).

Table ES-1
Class I, Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
AIR QUALITY		
Impact AQ-1. The project would be inconsistent with the SLOAPCD 2001 Clean Air Plan because it would result in an increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) that would exceed the rate of population growth. This impact would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	**AQ-1. Encourage Telecommuting**. The project applicant or developers of individual projects within the Specific Plan Area shall include provisions to encourage employers within the proposed commercial, office, and hotel components of the project to implement telecommuting programs and include teleconferencing capabilities, such as web cams or satellite linkage, which will allow employees to attend meetings remotely without requiring them to travel out of the area.	Mitigation is not available that would reduce projected VMT such that the project's vehicle trip rate increase would not exceed population growth in the region. Therefore, impacts related to consistency with the 2001 CAP would remain significant and unavoidable.
Cumulative Air Quality Impacts. The project is inconsistent with the 2001 CAP and would exceed SLOAPCD construction and operational thresholds. As such, cumulative impacts on air quality would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	No additional mitigation is available to address cumulative air quality impacts.	Cumulative air quality impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
CULTURAL RESOURCES		
Impact CR-1. The project would result in the relocation, demolition, and removal of structures on the San Luis Ranch property which are individually identified as historic resources. In addition, the project would eliminate the San Luis Ranch Complex, which is eligible for listing as a historic resource. Relocation, demolition, and/or removal of these historic resources would permanently alter the historic context of the project site and on-site structures. This impact	**CR-1(a). Historical Structure Relocation and Reconstruction Plan.** In order to implement Specific Plan Policy 2.5, a relocation and reconstruction plan for the former spectator's barn/viewing stand, ~~and~~ main residence, and main barn shall be developed by a qualified historic architect. The plan shall include a structural/architectural report documenting existing integrity and conditions and include detailed treatment methods and measures to ensure that historic integrity is retained and that all identified character defining features will be preserved. **CR-1(b). Archival Documentation of Historic Buildings.** The applicant shall provide archival documentation of the San Luis Ranch Complex in as-built and as-found condition in the form of an Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II documentation. The documentation shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Architectural and Engineering Documentation (NPS 1990), and shall include large-format photographic recordation, detailed historic narrative report, and compilation of historic research. The documentation shall be completed by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's	The removal and/or demolition of the historically significant main barn and the relocation, demolition, and removal of other structures in the San Luis Ranch Complex would change the historic context of the San Luis Ranch property. Furthermore, mitigation would not avoid the removal of the main barn, despite the proposed reuse of salvageable materials from the structure to the greatest extent possible in the construction of a new barn in the project's proposed Agricultural Heritage and Learning Center. Therefore, the potential

Table ES-1
Class I, Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	Professional Qualification Standards for History and/or Architectural History (NPS 1983). The original archival-quality documentation shall be offered as donated material to the History Center of San Luis Obispo County. Archival copies of the documentation shall also be submitted to the San Luis Obispo County Library. **CR-1(c). Informational Display of Historic Resources.** A retrospective interpretive display detailing the history of the San Luis Ranch Complex and the project site, its significance, and its important details and features shall be developed by the applicant. The information should be incorporated into a publicly-accessed building on the project site, such as the proposed Agricultural Heritage Facilities and Learning Center, or a publicly-accessed outdoor location. The display shall include images and details from the HABS documentation described in Mitigation Measure CR-1(b) and any collected research pertaining to the historic property. The content shall be prepared by a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for History and/or Architectural History (NPS 1983).	impact to the San Luis Ranch Complex and the main barn individually would remain significant and unavoidable despite implementation of the required mitigation.
Cumulative Cultural Resources Impacts. The project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact associated with the removal, relocation, or reconstruction of individually historic structures that are part of the historically significant San Luis Ranch Complex. As such, the project would contribute to the cumulative loss of historic resources in the City. Therefore, the project would result in a Class I, significant and unavoidable, cumulative impact to historical resources.	No additional mitigation is available to address cumulative cultural resources impacts.	Cumulative cultural resources impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.
LAND USE		
Impact LU-1. The project would be potentially inconsistent with adopted City policies in the General Plan designed to	The following Mitigation Measures would apply to this impact: • ~~Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*: AES-1(a) and AES-1(b)~~ • Section 4.2, *Agricultural Resources*: AG-1, AG-3 • Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*: BIO-1(a) through BIO-1(h) and BIO-2(a)	Specific Plan conflicts with Land Use Element Policy 1.10.4 (Design Standards), Land Use Element Policy 8.1.4 (SP-2, San Luis Ranch

Table ES-1
Class I, Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
protect historical resources, and ensure provision of parkland. This would be a Class I, significant and unavoidable, impact.	through BIO-2(c) • Section 4.5, *Cultural Resources*: CR-1(a) through CR-1(c) • Section 4.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*: HAZ-4, ~~HAZ-5(a), HAZ-5(b),~~ HAZ-6 • Section 4.10, *Noise*: N-1(a) through N-1(g), N-4(a), N-4(b), N-5(a) through N-5(d) • Section 4.12, *Transportation and Circulation*: T-1(a) through T-1(i), T-2(a) through T-2(j), T-3(a) through T-3(d), T-4, T-5, T-6, T-7, T-8(a) through T-8(g), T-9(a) through T-9(m), T-10(a) through T-10(c) • Section 4.14, *Issues Addressed in the Initial Study*: GEO-1, GEO-3	(Dalidio) Specific Plan Area), and Conservation and Open Space Element Policy 3.3.2 (Demolitions) would remain potentially inconsistent. The City acknowledges the importance and breadth of the potential inconsistencies associated with the Specific Plan by finding them to be Class I, significant and unavoidable impacts.
NOISE		
Impact N-1. Temporary construction activity would create noise that could exceed City of San Luis Obispo Municipal Code regulations. Mitigation is available to address construction noise, but it may not be feasible to reduce the impact to less than the applicable threshold. Impacts would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	**N-1(a). Construction Vehicle Travel Route.** Construction vehicles and haul trucks shall utilize roadways which avoid residential neighborhoods and sensitive receptors where possible. The applicant shall submit a proposed construction vehicle and hauling route for City review and approval prior to grading/building permit issuance. The approved construction vehicle and hauling route shall be used for soil hauling trips prior to construction as well as for the duration of construction. **N-1(b). Construction Activity Timing.** Except for emergency repair of public service utilities, or where an exception is issued by the Community Development Department, no operation of tools or equipment used in construction, drilling, repair, alteration, or demolition work shall occur daily between the hours of 7:00 PM and 7:00 AM, or any time on Sundays, holidays, or after sunset, such that the sound creates a noise disturbance that exceeds 75 dBA for single family residential, 80 dBA for multi-family residential, and 85 dBA for mixed residential/commercial land uses across a residential or commercial property line. **N-1(c). Construction Equipment Best Management Practices (BMPs).** For all construction activity at the project site, noise attenuation techniques shall be employed to ensure that noise levels are maintained within levels allowed by the City of San Luis Obispo Municipal Code, Title 9, Chapter 9.12 (Noise Control). Such techniques shall include: • Sound blankets on noise-generating equipment. • Stationary construction equipment that generates noise levels above 65 dBA at the project boundaries shall be shielded with barriers that meet a sound transmission class (a rating of how well noise barriers attenuate sound) of 25. • All diesel equipment shall be operated with closed engine doors and shall be	Mitigation Measures N-1(a) through N-1(g) require implementation of noise reduction devices and techniques during construction, and would reduce noise associated with on- and off-site construction activity to the maximum extent feasible. Noise from trucks can reach up to 88 dBA at 50 feet from the source. Although Mitigation Measure N-1(a) would reduce impacts from haul trucks by requiring the haul route to avoid residential areas and noise sensitive uses where possible, haul truck noise would continue to exceed the 75 dBA threshold for intermittent noise. Therefore, noise impacts from haul trucks would be minimized, but not eliminated. As a result, temporary noise impacts associated with off-site construction activity would be significant and unavoidable.

Table ES-1
Class I, Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	equipped with factory-recommended mufflers. • For stationary equipment, the applicant shall designate equipment areas with appropriate acoustic shielding on building and grading plans. Equipment and shielding shall be installed prior to construction and remain in the designated location throughout construction activities. • Electrical power shall be used to power air compressors and similar power tools. • The movement of construction-related vehicles, with the exception of passenger vehicles, along roadways adjacent to sensitive receptors shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM, Monday through Saturday. No movement of heavy equipment shall occur on Sundays or official holidays (e.g., Thanksgiving, Labor Day). • Temporary sound barriers shall be constructed between construction sites and affected uses.	
TRANSPORTATION		
Impact T-1. Under Existing and Near-Term Plus Project conditions nine study area intersections would operate at unacceptable automobile, bicycle, or pedestrian LOS based on adopted multimodal level of service standards during AM and PM peak hours. Mitigation would reduce impacts at seven of these intersections to an acceptable level. However, impacts at the Madonna Road & Dalidio Drive and Los Osos Valley Road & Froom Ranch Way intersections would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	**T-1(a) Intersection #1: Madonna Road & Los Osos Valley Road.** • City optimize signal timing to accommodate increased project volumes (ongoing) **T-1(b) Intersection #3: Madonna Road & Dalidio Drive/Prado Road.** • Extend existing westbound left turn lane on Madonna Road to Dalidio Drive/Prado Road to 310' (Phase 1) • Install 2nd westbound 310' left turn lane on Madonna Road to Dalidio Drive/Prado Road (Phase 1) • Install eastbound 250' right turn pocket on Madonna Road to Dalidio Drive/Prado Road (Phase 1) • Install 2nd northbound left shared with through-lane on Prado Road/Dalidio Drive to Madonna Road (Phase 1) • Prohibit westbound U-turns on Madonna Road (Phase 1) • Provide split phase operations & optimize signal timing (Phase 1) **T-1(c) Intersection #5: Madonna Road & U.S. 101 Southbound Ramps.** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass-Only, Phase 2) **T-1(d) Intersection #8: Higuera Street & South Street.** • Optimize Signal Timing	Potential right-of-way constraints at Madonna Road & Dalidio Drive and Los Osos Valley Road & Froom Ranch Way may reduce the feasibility of mitigation at these intersections. Accordingly, some of the potential impacts associated with multimodal level of service standards identified for Existing and Near-Term Plus Project conditions may not be feasibly mitigated to a less than significant level. As a result, impacts associated with multimodal level of service standards at these intersections under Existing and Near-Term Plus Project conditions would remain significant and unavoidable. Implementation of mitigation measures that require off-site improvements would generally not result in significant residual

Table ES-1
Class I, Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	T-1(e) Intersection #9: Los Osos Valley Road & Froom Ranch Way. • Install dedicated 230' right turn lane on ~~Los Osos Valley Road~~ northbound Froom Ranch Way approach to ~~northbound Froom Ranch Way~~ Los Osos Valley Road (with Froom Ranch Way bridge construction) • Extend right turn lane on ~~Los Osos Valley Road~~ southbound Froom Ranch Way approach to ~~southbound Froom Ranch Way~~ Los Osos Valley Road to 110' (with Froom Ranch Way bridge construction) • Install 2nd southbound left turn lane on Froom Ranch Way approach to eastbound Los Osos Valley Road (with Froom Ranch Way bridge construction) **T-1(f) Intersection #10: Los Osos Valley Road & Auto Park Way.** • Signalization (Phase 1) • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass Only, Phase 2) **T-1(g) Intersection #16: S. Higuera Street & Tank Farm Road.** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass Only Phase 2) • Extend northbound right turn pocket to 230' and channelize movement (Phase 1) **T-1(h) Intersection #21: Prado Road/Dalidio Drive & Froom Ranch Way.** • Install multilane roundabout control (when connection is constructed) **T-1(i) Intersection #25: Prado Road/Dalidio Drive & SC Project Driveway.** • Install multilane roundabout control or restricted access (when connection is constructed)	impacts, as these improvements would occur within existing roadway rights-of-way, or within urbanized paved/landscaped areas immediately adjacent to existing roadway rights-of-way. The primary exception to this is the Prado Road/U.S 101 overpass/interchange. During construction of the overpass, northbound ramps, and southbound ramps, potential issue areas that may be temporarily affected would include air quality, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, water quality, noise and transportation. Construction-related environmental impacts would be mitigated through compliance with City and Caltrans permitting and construction monitoring requirements and standard SLOAPCD dust and diesel emission control measures. Long-term impacts of the Prado Road/U.S. 101 overpass/interchange would include potential obstruction of scenic views, loss of prime agricultural land west of U.S. 101, and land use impacts associated with acquisition of additional right-of-way.
Impact T-2. Under Existing and Near-Term Plus Project conditions, the volume of traffic at 19 study area intersections would exceed lane capacities. Mitigation would reduce impacts at 18 of these intersections to an	**T-2(a) Intersection #1: Madonna Road & Los Osos Valley Road.** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass Only, Phase 2) **T-2(b) Intersection #2: Madonna Road & Oceanaire Drive.** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass Only, Phase 2) **T-2(c) Intersection #5: Madonna Road & U.S. 101 S.B Ramps.**	Potential right-of-way constraints at Los Osos Valley Road & Froom Ranch Way may reduce the feasibility of mitigation at this intersection. Accordingly, some of the potential impacts associated with lane capacities identified for

Table ES-1
Class I, Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
acceptable level. However, impacts at the Los Osos Valley Road & Froom Ranch Way intersection would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	• Extend northbound Madonna Road left turn lane to 150' (Phase 1) **T-2(d) Intersection #6: Madonna Road & U.S. 101 Northbound Ramps.** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass Only, Phase 2) **T-2(e) Intersection #7: Madonna Road & Higuera Street.** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass Plus U.S. 101 northbound ramps, Phase 2) **T-2(f) Intersection #9: Los Osos Valley Road & Froom Ranch Way.** • Install dedicated 230' right turn lane on Los Osos Valley Road approach to northbound Froom Ranch Way (with Froom Ranch Way bridge construction) • Extend right turn lane on Los Osos Valley Road approach to southbound Froom Ranch Way to 110' (with Froom Ranch Way Bridge construction) • Install 2nd southbound left turn lane on Froom Ranch Way approach to eastbound Los Osos Valley Road (with Froom Ranch Way bridge construction) **T-2(g) Intersection #12: Los Osos Valley Road & U.S. 101 Southbound Ramps.** • Extend off-ramp left turn pocket to 320' (Phase 1) **T-2(h) Intersection #13: Los Osos Valley Road & U.S. 101 Northbound Ramps.** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass Only, Phase 2) **T-2(i) Intersection #14: Los Osos Valley Road & Higuera Street.** • Extend eastbound right turn lane to 180' (Phase 1) **T-2(j) Intersection #18: Prado Road & Higuera Street.** • Install 2nd U.S. 101 northbound left turn lane (Phase 1) • Extend westbound right turn pocket to 400' (Phase 1)	Existing and Near-Term Plus Project conditions may not be feasibly mitigated to a less than significant level. As a result, impacts to lane capacities at this intersection under Existing and Near-Term Plus Project conditions would remain significant and unavoidable. Implementation of mitigation measures that require off-site improvements would generally not result in significant residual impacts, as these improvements would occur within existing roadway rights-of-way, or within urbanized paved/landscaped areas immediately adjacent to existing roadway rights-of-way. The primary exception to this is the Prado Road/U.S 101 overpass/interchange. During construction of the overpass, northbound ramps, and southbound ramps, potential issue areas that may be temporarily affected would include air quality, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, water quality, noise and transportation. Construction-related environmental impacts would be mitigated through compliance with City and Caltrans permitting and construction monitoring requirements and standard SLOAPCD dust and diesel emission control measures. Long-term impacts of the Prado Road/U.S. 101

Table ES-1
Class I, Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
		overpass/interchange would include potential obstruction of scenic views, loss of prime agricultural land west of U.S. 101, and land use impacts associated with acquisition of additional right-of-way.
Impact T-3. Under Existing and Near-Term conditions four study area segment groups would operate at unacceptable automobile, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit LOS based on adopted multimodal level of service standards during AM and PM peak hours. Mitigation would reduce impacts at three of these segment groups to an acceptable level. However, impacts at Higuera Street roadway segments would be Class I, *significant and unavoidable*	**T-3(a) Segments #1 - #6: Madonna Road (Los Osos Valley Road to Higuera Street)** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass Only, Phase 2) • Fund assessment of decreasing transit headways to 25 min • Construct parallel Class I multiuse paths or bike boulevard (Phase 1) **T-3(b) Segments #7 - #8: Higuera Street (Madonna Road to Prado Road)** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass and U.S. 101 northbound ramps, Phase 2) • Construct parallel Class I multiuse paths or bike boulevard (Phase 1) **T-3(c) Segments #13 - #17: Los Osos Valley Road (Madonna Road to Higuera Street)** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass and U.S. 101 northbound ramps, Phase 2) • Construct parallel Class I multiuse paths or bike boulevard (Phase 3) **T-3(d) Segments #18 - #20: Dalidio Drive/Prado Road (Froom Ranch Way to Higuera Street)** • Construct parallel Class I multiuse paths or bike boulevard (when Prado Road is constructed/improved)	Implementation of the identified mitigation measures would improve LOS at all impacted study area roadway segments to acceptable levels, and impacts on these facilities under Existing and Near-Term Plus Project conditions would be less than significant after mitigation. However, potential right-of-way constraints along Higuera Street (Segments #7 and #8) may reduce the feasibility of mitigation along these segments. Accordingly, some of the potential impacts associated with multimodal level of service standards identified for Existing and Near-Term Plus Project conditions may not be feasibly mitigated to a less than significant level. As a result, impacts associated with multimodal level of service standards at these roadway segments under Existing and Near-Term Plus Project conditions would remain significant and unavoidable. Implementation of mitigation measures that require off-site improvements would generally not result in significant residual impacts, as these improvements would occur within existing roadway

Table ES-1
Class I, Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
		rights-of-way, or within urbanized paved/landscaped areas immediately adjacent to existing roadway rights-of-way. The primary exception to this is the Prado Road/U.S 101 overpass/interchange. During construction of the overpass, northbound ramps, and southbound ramps, potential issue areas that may be temporarily affected would include air quality, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, water quality, noise and transportation. Construction-related environmental impacts would be mitigated through compliance with City and Caltrans permitting and construction monitoring requirements and standard SLOAPCD dust and diesel emission control measures. Long-term impacts of the Prado Road/U.S. 101 overpass/interchange would include potential obstruction of scenic views, loss of prime agricultural land west of U.S. 101, and land use impacts associated with acquisition of additional right-of-way.
Impact T-8. Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions nine study area intersections would operate at unacceptable automobile, bicycle, or pedestrian LOS based on adopted multimodal level of service standards during AM and PM peak hours. Mitigation	**T-8(a). Intersection #3: Madonna Road & Dalidio Drive/Prado Road.** • Existing & Near-Term Plus Project Mitigation (Mitigation Measure T-1[b]) **T-8(b). Intersection #9: Los Osos Valley Road & Froom Ranch Way.** • Existing & Near-Term Plus Project Mitigation (Mitigation Measure T-1[e]/Mitigation Measure T-2[f]) **T-8(c). Intersection #10: Los Osos Valley Road & Auto Park Way.** • Existing & Near-Term Plus Project Mitigation (Mitigation Measure T-1[f])	Potential right-of-way constraints at Madonna Road & Dalidio Drive and Los Osos Valley Road & Froom Ranch Way may reduce the feasibility of mitigation at these intersections. Accordingly, some of the potential impacts associated with multimodal level of service standards identified for Cumulative

Table ES-1
Class I, Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
would reduce impacts at seven of these intersections to an acceptable level. However, impacts at the Madonna Road & Dalidio Drive and Los Osos Valley Road & Froom Ranch Way intersections would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	**T-8(d). Intersection #12: Los Osos Valley Road & U.S. 101 Southbound Ramps.** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass with U.S. 101 northbound and southbound ramps) **T-8(e). Intersection #13: Los Osos Valley Road & U.S. 101 Northbound Ramps.** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass with U.S. 101 northbound and southbound ramps) **T-8(f). Intersection #14: Los Osos Valley Road & S. Higuera Street.** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass with U.S. 101 northbound and southbound ramps) **T-8(g). Intersection #16: S. Higuera Street & Tank Farm Road.** • Existing & Near-Term Plus Project Mitigation (Mitigation Measure T-1[f])	Plus Project conditions may not be feasibly mitigated to a less than significant level. As a result, impacts associated with multimodal level of service standards at these intersections under Cumulative Plus Project conditions would remain significant and unavoidable. Implementation of mitigation measures that require off-site improvements would generally not result in significant residual impacts, as these improvements would occur within existing roadway rights-of-way, or within urbanized paved/landscaped areas immediately adjacent to existing roadway rights-of-way. The primary exception to this is the Prado Road/U.S 101 overpass/interchange. During construction of the overpass, northbound ramps, and southbound ramps, potential issue areas that may be temporarily affected would include air quality, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, water quality, noise and transportation. Construction-related environmental impacts would be mitigated through compliance with City and Caltrans permitting and construction monitoring requirements and standard SLOAPCD dust and diesel emission control measures. Long-term impacts of the Prado Road/U.S. 101 overpass/interchange would include

Table ES-1
Class I, Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
		potential obstruction of scenic views, loss of prime agricultural land west of U.S. 101, and land use impacts associated with acquisition of additional right-of-way.
Impact T-9. Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, the volume of traffic at 18 study area intersections would exceed lane capacities. Mitigation would reduce impacts at 18 of these intersections to an acceptable level. Mitigation would reduce impacts at 17 of these intersections to an acceptable level. However, impacts at the Madonna Road & Dalidio Drive and Los Osos Valley Road & Froom Ranch Way intersections would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	**T-9(a). Intersection #1: Madonna Road & Los Osos Valley Road.** • Extend northbound right turn pocket on Los Osos Valley Road to 295' • Extend southbound left turn pocket on Madonna Road to 395' **T-9(b). Intersection #2: Madonna Road & Oceanaire Drive.** • Existing & Near-Term Plus Project Mitigation (Mitigation Measure T-1[b]) • Extend westbound right turn land on Madonna Road to 200' **T-9(c). Intersection #3: Madonna Road & Dalidio Drive.** • Existing & Near-Term Plus Project Mitigation (Mitigation Measure T-1[b]) **T-9(d). Intersection #4: Madonna Road & El Mercado.** • Existing & Near-Term Plus Project Mitigation (Mitigation Measures T-1[b]) **T-9(e). Intersection #5: Madonna Road & U.S. 101 Southbound Ramps.** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass with U.S. 101 northbound and southbound ramps) **T-9(f). Intersection #6: Madonna Road & U.S. 101 Northbound Ramps.** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass with U.S. 101 northbound and southbound ramps) **T-9(g). Intersection #8: Higuera Street & South Street.** • Extend northbound Higuera Street left turn pocket to 120' • Extend eastbound South Street right turn pocket to 100' **T-9(h). Intersection #9: Los Osos Valley Road & Froom Ranch Way.** • Existing & Near-Term Plus Project Mitigation (Mitigation Measure T-1[d]/Mitigation Measure T-2[f]) **T-9(i). Intersection #11: Los Osos Valley Road & Calle Joaquin.** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass with U.S. 101 northbound and	Potential right-of-way constraints at Madonna Road & Dalidio Drive and Los Osos Valley Road & Froom Ranch Way may reduce the feasibility of mitigation at these intersections. Accordingly, some of the potential impacts associated with lane capacities identified for Cumulative Plus Project conditions may not be feasibly mitigated to a less than significant level. As a result, impacts to lane capacities at these intersections under Cumulative Plus Project conditions would remain significant and unavoidable. Implementation of mitigation measures that require off-site improvements would generally not result in significant residual impacts, as these improvements would occur within existing roadway rights-of-way, or within urbanized paved/landscaped areas immediately adjacent to existing roadway rights-of-way. The primary exception to this is the Prado Road/U.S 101 overpass/interchange. During construction of the overpass, northbound ramps, and southbound ramps, potential issue areas that may be temporarily affected would

Table ES-1
Class I, Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	southbound ramps) **T-9(j). Intersection #12: Los Osos Valley Road & U.S. 101 Southbound Ramps.** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass with U.S. 101 northbound and southbound ramps) **T-9(k). Intersection #14: Los Osos Valley Road & S. Higuera Street.** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass with U.S. 101 northbound and southbound ramps) **T-9(l). Intersection #16: S. Higuera Street & Tank Farm Road.** • Existing & Near-Term Plus Project Mitigation (Mitigation Measure T-1[g]) **T-9(m). Intersection #18: Higuera Street & Prado Road.** • Existing & Near-Term Plus Project Mitigation (Mitigation Measure T-2[j])	include air quality, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, water quality, noise and transportation. Construction-related environmental impacts would be mitigated through compliance with City and Caltrans permitting and construction monitoring requirements and standard SLOAPCD dust and diesel emission control measures. Long-term impacts of the Prado Road/U.S. 101 overpass/interchange would include potential obstruction of scenic views, loss of prime agricultural land west of U.S. 101, and land use impacts associated with acquisition of additional right-of-way.
Impact T-10. Under Cumulative Plus Project conditions five study area segment groups, as well as mainline segments of U.S. 101, would operate at unacceptable automobile, bicycle, pedestrian, and transit LOS based on adopted multimodal level of service standards during AM and PM peak hours. Mitigation would reduce impacts at each of the five study area segment groups to an acceptable level. However, impacts at the mainline segments of U.S. 101 at Los Osos Valley Road and Madonna Road would be Class I, significant and unavoidable.	**T-10(a). Segments #1 - #6: Madonna Road (Higuera Street to Los Osos Valley Road).** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass with U.S. 101 northbound and southbound ramps) **T-10(b). Segments #15 - #16: Los Osos Valley Road (Calle Joaquin to U.S. 101 Northbound Ramps).** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass with U.S. 101 northbound and southbound ramps) **T-10(c). Segment #24: Prado Road/Dalidio Drive (Project Driveway to Froom Ranch Way).** • Construct Prado Road Overpass (Overpass with U.S. 101 northbound and southbound ramps)	Potential impacts identified for the northbound and southbound lanes of the mainline segments of U.S. 101 at Los Osos Valley Road and Madonna Road under Cumulative Plus Project conditions would not be mitigated to a less than significant level. As a result, impacts under Cumulative Plus Project conditions would remain significant and unavoidable. Implementation of mitigation measures that require off-site improvements would generally not result in significant residual impacts, as these improvements would occur within existing roadway rights-of-way, or within urbanized paved/landscaped areas

Table ES-1
Class I, Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
		immediately adjacent to existing roadway rights-of-way. The primary exception to this is the Prado Road/U.S 101 overpass/interchange. During construction of the overpass, northbound ramps, and southbound ramps, potential issue areas that may be temporarily affected would include air quality, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, water quality, noise and transportation. Construction-related environmental impacts would be mitigated through compliance with City and Caltrans permitting and construction monitoring requirements and standard SLOAPCD dust and diesel emission control measures. Long-term impacts of the Prado Road/U.S. 101 overpass/interchange would include potential obstruction of scenic views, loss of prime agricultural land west of U.S. 101, and land use impacts associated with acquisition of additional right-of-way.

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES		
Impact AG-1. The project would result in the direct conversion of ~~59.3~~56 acres of Prime Farmland, as mapped by the FMMP, to non-agricultural uses. Therefore, impacts would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	**AG-1. Agricultural Conservation.** Prior to issuance of any grading permits the project proponent shall provide that for every one (1) acre of Important Farmland (Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Unique Farmland) on the site that is permanently converted to non-agricultural use as a result of project development, one (1) acre of land of comparable agricultural productivity shall be preserved in perpetuity. The land dedicated to agriculture pursuant to this measure shall be of size, location and configuration appropriate to maintain a viable, working agricultural operation. The acreage required to meet the 1:1 ratio may be met by the off-site agricultural conservation easement/deed restriction proposed by the project applicant, as long as this land meets the conditions outlined in this measure. Said mitigation shall be satisfied by the applicant through: *1) Granting a perpetual conservation easement(s), deed restriction(s), or other farmland conservation mechanism(s) to the City or qualifying entity which has been approved by the City, such as the Land Conservancy of San Luis Obispo, for the purpose of permanently preserving agricultural land. The required easement(s) area or deed restriction(s) shall therefore total a minimum of ~~59.3~~56 acres of Prime Farmland. The land covered by said on- and/or off-site easement(s) or deed restriction(s) shall be located within or contiguous to the City's Urban Reserve Line or Greenbelt subject to review and approval of the City's Natural Resources Manager; or* *2) Making an in-lieu payment to a qualifying entity which has been approved by the City, such as the Land Conservancy of San Luis Obispo, to be applied toward the future purchase of a minimum of ~~59.3~~56 acres of Prime Farmland in San Luis Obispo County, together with an endowment amount as may be required. The payment amount shall be determined by the qualifying entity or a licensed appraiser; or* *3) Making an in-lieu payment to a qualifying entity which has been approved by the City and that is organized for conservation purposes, to be applied toward a future perpetual conservation easement, deed restriction, or other farmland conservation mechanism to preserve a minimum of ~~59.3~~56 acres of Prime Farmland in San Luis Obispo County. The amount of the payment shall be determined by the qualifying entity or a licensed appraiser; or* *4) Any combination of the above.*	With implementation of Mitigation Measure AG-1, this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.
Impact AG-3. The project would include development of commercial and residential uses adjacent to agricultural uses on	**AG-3(a). Agricultural Conflict Avoidance Measures.** The following language shall be added to Section 4.2.1, *Agricultural Buffer*, of the San Luis Ranch Specific Plan: *Agricultural buffers will include City-approved measures to reduce availability of*	With implementation of Mitigation Measures AG-3(a) through AG-3(c) this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
the project site. This may result in conflict with existing or future urban and agricultural zoning and uses and adversely affect the long-term viability of the remaining agricultural uses onsite and at the adjacent SLO City Farm. However, with implementation of agricultural buffers, and compliance with standard APCD dust control measures and City policies, this impact would be Class II, *significant but mitigable*.	*public access to agricultural cultivation areas adjacent to the project site (e.g., fencing, signs, etc.). Future residents will be notified of agricultural buffers as part of purchase or lease agreements.* **AG-3(b). Agricultural Fencing.** The project applicant shall coordinate with the City to fund installation of fencing and signs along Froom Ranch Way and Dalidio Drive/Prado Road to minimize potential for increases in trespass and vandalism of adjacent agricultural areas. **AG-3(c). Buffer Landscaping.** To reduce the potential for noise, dust, and pesticide drift to affect future residents on the project site, the project applicant shall ensure that project landscape plans include planting of a windrow of trees and shrubs within the agricultural buffer along Froom Ranch Way at a sufficient density to buffer the site from surrounding agricultural operations.	
AIR QUALITY		
Impact AQ-2. Construction of the project would generate temporary increases in localized air pollutant emissions. Construction emissions of ROG, NO_X, and DPM would exceed SLOAPCD construction thresholds. Impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.	**AQ-2(a). Fugitive Dust Control Measures.** Construction projects shall implement the following dust control measures so as to reduce PM_{10} emissions in accordance with SLOAPCD requirements. • Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible; • Water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used during construction in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency shall be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 mph. Reclaimed (non-potable) water or a SLOAPCD-approved dust suppressant shall be used whenever possible~~;~~, to reduce the amount of potable water used for dust control; • All dirt stock pile areas shall be sprayed daily as needed; • 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; • Exposed ground areas 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; • 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 SLOAPCD; • All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used;	According to the SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, if estimated construction emissions are expected to exceed either of the SLOAPCD Quarterly Tier 2 thresholds of significance after the standard and BACT measures are factored into the estimation, then an SLOAPCD approved Construction Activity Management Plan (CAMP) and offsite mitigation need to be implemented in order to reduce potential air quality impacts to a less than significant level. If construction emissions do not exceed Tier 2 thresholds with implementation of standard and BACT measures, SLOAPCD considers emissions less than significant, even if Tier 1 thresholds continue to be exceeded. Table 4.3-7 shows mitigated construction emissions with implementation of

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	• Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site; • 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; • Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site; • Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water shall be used where feasible; • All of these fugitive dust mitigation measures shall be shown on grading and building plans; and • The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the fugitive dust emissions and enhance the implementation of the measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints, reduce visible emissions below 20 percent opacity, and to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SLOAPCD Compliance Division prior to the start of any grading, earthwork or demolition. **AQ-2(b). Standard Control Measures for Construction Equipment**. The following standard air quality mitigation measures shall be implemented during construction activities at the project site: • Maintain all construction equipment in proper tune according to manufacturer's specifications; • Fuel all off-road and portable diesel powered equipment with ARB certified motor vehicle diesel fuel (non-taxed version suitable for sue off-road); • Use diesel construction equipment meeting ARB's Tier 2 certified engines or cleaner off-road heavy-duty diesel engines, and comply with the State Off-Road Regulation; • Use on-road heavy-duty trucks that meet the ARB's 2007 or cleaner certification standard for on-road heavy-duty diesel engines, and comply with the State On-Road Regulation; • Construction or trucking companies with fleets that do not have engines in their fleet that meet the engine standards identified in the above two measures (e.g. captive or NOX exempt area fleets) may be eligible by proving alternative compliance;	Tier 3 off-road engine compliance and level 2 diesel particulate filters required by Mitigation Measure AQ-2(c), as well as low VOC-emission paint required by Mitigation Measure AQ-2(d). As shown therein, with implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-2(c) and AQ-2(d) construction emissions would not exceed either of the SLOAPCD Quarterly Tier 2 thresholds of significance. Therefore, implementation of a CAMP and offsite mitigation is not required and impacts would be less than significant with mitigation.

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	• 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 5.0 minutes at any location when within 1,000 feet of a restricted area, except as noted in Subsection (d) of the regulation. • Off-road diesel equipment shall comply with the 5-minute idling restriction identified in Section 2449(d)(2) of the California Air Resources Board's In-Use Off-Road Diesel regulation. • ~~All on-and off-road diesel equipment shall not idle for more than 5 minutes.~~ Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas and or job sites to remind drivers and operators of the 5 minute idling limit; • 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: 1. Signs that specify the no idling areas shall be posted and enforced at the site. 2. Diesel idling within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors is not permitted; 3. Staging and queuing areas shall not be located within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors; 4. Use of alternative fueled equipment is recommended; • Electrify equipment when feasible; • Substitute gasoline-powered in place of diesel-powered equipment, where feasible; and • Use alternatively fueled construction equipment on-site where feasible, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane or biodiesel. **AQ-2(c). Best Available Control Technology (BACT) for Construction Equipment**. The following BACT for diesel-fueled construction equipment shall be implemented during construction activities at the project site, where feasible: • Further reducing emissions by expanding use of Tier 3 and Tier 4 off-road and	

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	2010 on-road compliant engines where feasible; • Repowering equipment with the cleanest engines available; and • Installing California Verified Diesel Emission Control Strategies, such as level 2 diesel particulate filters. These strategies are listed at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/diesel/verdev/vt/cvt.htm **AQ-2(d). Architectural Coating.** To reduce ROG and NO_X levels during the architectural coating phase, low or no VOC-emission paint shall be used with levels of 50 g/L or less. **AQ-2(e). Construction Activity Management Plan.** Emissions reduction measures and construction practices required to comply with Mitigation Measures AQ-2(a) through AQ-2(d) shall be documented in a Construction Activity Management Plan (CAMP) and submitted to SLOAPCD for review and approval at least three months before the start of construction. The CAMP shall include a Dust Control Management Plan, tabulation of on and off-road construction equipment (age, horse-power and miles and/or hours of operation), construction truck trip schedule, construction work-day period, and construction phasing. If implementation of the Standard Mitigation and Best Available Control Technology measures cannot bring the project below the Tier 1 threshold (2.5 tons of NOX+ROG per quarter), off-site mitigation shall be implemented in coordination with SLOAPCD to reduce NOX and ROG emissions to below the Tier 1 threshold.	
Impact AQ-3. Operation of the project would generate air pollutant emissions on an ongoing daily and annual basis. The project's daily emissions would exceed SLOAPCD daily emissions thresholds, but would not exceed annual thresholds. Implementation of SLOAPCD's standard mitigation measures and off-site mitigation would reduce emissions to a less than significant level. Impacts would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.	**AQ-3(a). Standard Operational Mitigation Measures.** Prior to issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall define and incorporate into the San Luis Ranch Specific Plan standard emission reduction measures from the SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook to reduce emissions to below daily threshold levels. Emission reduction measures ~~may~~ shall include, but would not be limited to: • ~~Prohibit residential wood burning appliances;~~ • ~~Install a 'Park and Ride' lot with bike lockers in a location of need defined by SLOCOG;~~ • ~~Trusses for south-facing portions of roofs shall be designed to handle dead weight loads of standard solar-heated water and photovoltaic panels. Roof design shall include sufficient south facing roof surface, based on structures size and use, to accommodate adequate solar panels. For south facing roof pitches, the closest standard roof pitch to the ideal average solar exposure shall be used;~~ • Increase the building energy rating by 20 percent above 2013 Title 24 requirements (used in the California Emissions Estimator Model) or consistent	Implementation of the measures identified in Mitigation Measure AQ-3(a) and AQ-3(b) would reduce impacts to regional air quality. For informational purposes, Table 4.3-11 and Table 4.3-12 show anticipated project emissions with incorporation of measures achieving a 20 percent exceedance of Title 24 requirements and a prohibition on residential wood burning devices, which are quantifiable in CalEEMod. As shown in Table 4.3-11 and Table 4.3-12, implementation of these measures alone would not reduce daily operational emissions of

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	with 2016 Title 24 requirements, whichever is stricter. Measures used to reach the 20 percent rating cannot be double counted; ~~• Design building to include roof overhangs that are sufficient to block the high summer sun, but not the lower winter sun, from penetrating south-facing windows (passive solar design);~~ ~~• Utilize high efficiency gas or solar water heaters;~~ ~~• Install door sweeps and weather stripping (if more efficient doors and windows are not available);~~ ~~• Install energy-reducing programmable thermostats;~~ ~~• Participate in and implement available energy-efficient rebate programs including air conditioning, gas heating, refrigeration, and lighting programs;~~ ~~• Use roofing material with a solar reflectance values meeting the U.S. EPA/DOE Energy Star® rating to reduce summer cooling needs.~~ • Utilize onsite renewable energy systems (e.g., solar, wind, geothermal, low-impact hydro, biomass and bio-gas); and ~~• Provide and require the use of battery powered or electric landscape maintenance equipment for new development;~~ ~~• Provide a display case or kiosk displaying transportation information in a prominent area accessible to employees or residents;~~ ~~• Provide neighborhood electric vehicles/ car share program;~~ • Provide bicycle-share program~~;~~. ~~• Provide bicycle lockers for 'Park and Ride' lots;~~ ~~• Provide vanpool, shuttle, mini bus service (alternative fueled preferred);~~ ~~• Provide free-access telework terminals and/or wi-fi access in multi-family projects.~~ In addition, the proposed hotel component of the Specific Plan shall participate in the SLO Car Free Program, provide incentives to car-free travelers, and promote the program in their communication tools. **AQ-3(b). Off-Site Mitigation.** If implementation of standard emission reduction measures from the SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook described in Mitigation Measure AQ-3(a) is insufficient to reduce emissions to below daily threshold levels, then the applicant shall coordinate with SLOAPCD to provide funding for off-site emission reduction measures to reduce emissions to below daily threshold levels. In accordance with SLOAPCD methodology, the excess emissions shall be multiplied by the cost effectiveness of mitigation as defined in the State's current Carl Moyer Incentive Program Guidelines to determine the annual off-site mitigation amount. This amount shall then be extrapolated over the life of the project to determine total	ROG, NO_X, DPM, or dust to below SLOAPCD's daily significance thresholds. However, with implementation of Mitigation Measures AQ-3(a), Standard Operational Mitigation Measures, and AQ-3(b), Off-Site Mitigation, annual emissions would be reduced below SLOAPCD's annual operational thresholds. Therefore, long-term operational impacts would be less than significant.

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	off-site mitigation. Off-site emission reduction measures may include, but would not be limited to: • Developing or improving park-and-ride lots; • Retrofitting existing homes in the project area with SLOAPCD-approved wood combustion devices; • Retrofitting existing homes in the project area with energy-efficient devices; • Constructing satellite worksites; • Funding a program to buy and scrap older, higher emission passenger and heavy-duty vehicles; • Replacing/re-powering transit buses; • Replacing/re-powering heavy-duty diesel school vehicles (i.e. bus, passenger or maintenance vehicles); • Funding an electric lawn and garden equipment exchange program; • Retrofitting or re-powering heavy-duty construction equipment, or on-road vehicles; • Re-powering marine vessels; • Re-powering or contributing to funding clean diesel locomotive main or auxiliary engines; • Installing bicycle racks on transit buses; • Purchasing particulate filters or oxidation catalysts for local school buses, transit buses or construction fleets; • Installing or contributing to funding alternative fueling infrastructure (i.e. fueling stations for CNG, LPG, conductive and inductive electric vehicle charging, etc.); • Funding expansion of existing transit services; • Funding public transit bus shelters; • Subsidizing vanpool programs; • Subsidizing transportation alternative incentive programs; • Contributing to funding of new bike lanes; • Installing bicycle storage facilities; and • Providing assistance in the implementation of projects that are identified in City or County Bicycle Master Plans.	
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES		
Impact BIO-1. Implementation of the project could have a substantial adverse effect on candidate, sensitive, or special status species that may occur	**BIO-1(a). Best Management Practices.** The applicant shall ensure the following general wildlife Best Management Practices (BMPs) are required for construction activity within the San Luis Ranch Specific Plan Area: • No pets or firearms shall be allowed at the project site during construction activities.	Implementation of BIO-1(a) through BIO-1(h) would reduce impacts to listed, candidate or special-status plant and wildlife species to a less than significant level and ensure

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
on the project site. Impacts would be Class II, potentially significant but mitigable.	• All trash that may attract predators must be properly contained and removed from the work site. All such debris and waste shall be picked up daily and properly disposed of at an appropriate site. • All refueling, maintenance, and staging of equipment and vehicles shall occur at least 100 feet from Prefumo Creek and in a location where a spill would not drain toward aquatic habitat. A plan must be in place for prompt and effective response to any accidental spills prior to the onset of work activities. All workers shall be informed of the appropriate measures to take should an accidental spill occur. • Pallets or secondary containment areas for chemicals, drums, or bagged materials shall be provided. Should material spills occur, materials and/or contaminants shall be cleaned from the project site and recycled or disposed of to the satisfaction of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). • Prior to construction activities in areas adjacent to Prefumo Creek and Cerro San Luis Channel, the drainage features shall be fenced with orange construction fencing and signed to prohibit entry of construction equipment and personnel unless authorized by the City. Fencing should be located a minimum of 20 feet from the edge of the riparian canopy or top of bank and shall be maintained throughout the construction period for each phase of development. Once all phases of construction in this area are complete, the fencing may be removed. • To control sedimentation during and after project implementation, appropriate erosion control BMPs (e.g., use of coir rolls, jute netting, etc.) shall be implemented to minimize adverse effects on Prefumo Creek. No plastic monofilament netting shall be utilized on site. • Construction equipment shall be inspected at the beginning of each day to ensure that wildlife species have not climbed into wheel wells or under tracks since the equipment was last parked. Any sensitive wildlife species found during inspections shall be gently encouraged to leave the area by a qualified biological monitor or otherwise trained personnel. • All vehicles and equipment shall be in good working condition and free of leaks. • Environmentally Sensitive Areas shall be delineated by a qualified biologist prior to construction to confine access routes and construction areas. • Construction work shall be restricted to daylight hours (7:00 AM to 7:00 PM) to avoid impacts to nocturnal and crepuscular (dawn and dusk activity period) species. No construction night lighting shall be permitted within 100 yards of the top of the Prefumo Creek bank. • Concrete truck and tool washout shall be limited to locations designated by a qualified biologist such that no runoff will reach Prefumo Creek or Cerro San	that the project would comply with COSE Policies 7.3.1, Protect Listed Species, and 7.3.2, Species of Local Concern.

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	Luis Channel. • All open trenches shall be constructed with appropriate exit ramps to allow species that accidentally fall into a trench to escape. Trenches will remain open for the shortest period necessary to complete required work. • Existing facilities and disturbed areas shall be used to the extent possible to minimize the amount of disturbance and all new access roads other than the Froom Ranch Way Bridge shall be cited to avoid high quality habitat and minimize habitat fragmentation. • In the event that construction must occur within the creek or creek setback, a biological monitor shall be present during all such activities with the authority to stop or redirect work as needed to protect biological resources. **BIO-1(b). Worker Environmental Awareness Program Training.** Prior to the initiation of construction activities (including staging and mobilization), the applicant shall ensure all personnel associated with project construction attend a Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP) training. • The training shall be conducted by a qualified biologist, to aid workers in recognizing special status resources that may occur in the project area. The specifics of this program shall include identification of the sensitive species and habitats, a description of the regulatory status and general ecological characteristics of sensitive resources, and review of the limits of construction and avoidance measures required to reduce impacts to biological resources within the work area. A fact sheet conveying this information shall also be prepared for distribution to all contractors, their employers, and other personnel involved with construction of the project. All employees shall sign a form provided by the trainer documenting they have attended the WEAP and understand the information presented to them. **BIO-1(c). Western Pond Turtle and Two-Striped Garter Snake Impact Avoidance and Minimization.** The applicant shall ensure the following actions are implemented to avoid and minimize potential impacts to western pond turtle and two-striped garter snake (these reptiles utilize similar habitats; therefore, implementation of the proposed measures for western pond turtle are also suitable and appropriate for two-striped garter snake): • A qualified biologist(s) shall conduct a pre-construction survey within 24 hours prior to the onset of work activities within and around areas that may serve as potential western pond turtle habitat. If this species is found and the individuals are likely to be injured or killed by work activities, the approved biologist shall be allowed sufficient time to move them from the project site before work	

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	activities begin. The biologist(s) must relocate the any western pond turtle the shortest distance possible to a location that contains suitable habitat that is not likely to be affected by activities associated with the project. • Access routes, staging, and construction areas shall be limited to the minimum area necessary to achieve the project goal and minimize potential impacts to western pond turtle habitat including locating access routes and construction staging areas outside of wetlands and riparian areas to the maximum extent practicable. **BIO-1(d). California Red-legged Frog**, Western spadefoot, and Coast Range Newt Impact Avoidance and Minimization. The applicant shall implement the following to avoid and minimize potential impacts to CRLF. Because coast range newt and western spadefoot are amphibians that utilize similar habitats to CRLF, implementation of the following measures provided for CRLF shall be implemented for these species as well. • Only USFWS-approved biologists shall participate in activities associated with the capture, handling, and monitoring of CRLF. • Ground disturbance shall not begin until written approval is received from the USFWS that the biologist is qualified to conduct the work. If the USFWS does not authorize the relocation of CRLF occurring within the project site, CRLF found within the project site shall be avoided with a 100-foot buffer and no activities shall occur within that buffer until the CRLF has left the project site on its own. • Areas of the project site that lie within 100 feet upland from riparian or jurisdictional areas shall be surrounded by a solid temporary exclusion fence (such as silt fencing) that shall extend at least three feet above the ground and be buried into the ground at least 6 inches to exclude CRLF from the project site. Plastic monofilament netting or other similar material will not be used. The location of the fencing shall be determined by a qualified biologist. The fence shall remain in place throughout construction activities. Installation of the exclusion fencing shall be monitored by a qualified biologist to ensure that it is installed correctly. • During new grading activities in habitats within 100 feet upland from riparian or jurisdictional areas, a qualified biologist shall be on-site to recover any spadefoot toads that may be excavated/unearthed with native material or found under vegetation. If the animals are in good health, they shall be immediately relocated to a designated release area. If they are injured, the animals shall be turned over to an approved wildlife rehabilitator until they are in a condition to be released into the designated release area.	

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	• To ensure that diseases are not conveyed between work sites by the approved biologist, the fieldwork code of practice developed by the Declining Amphibian Populations Task Force shall be followed at all times. **BIO-1(e). Steelhead Impact Avoidance and Minimization**. The applicant shall ensure the following actions are undertaken to avoid and minimize potential impacts to steelhead: • Before any activities begin on the project, a qualified biologist will conduct a training session for all construction personnel. At a minimum, the training will include a description of the steelhead and its habitat, the specific measures that are being implemented to conserve this species for the project, and the boundaries within which the project may be accomplished. Brochures, books, and briefings may be used in the training session, provided that a qualified person is on hand to answer any questions. • During the duration of project activities, all trash that may attract predators will be properly contained and secured, promptly removed from the work site, and disposed of regularly. Following construction, all trash and construction debris will be removed from the work areas. • All refueling, maintenance, and staging of equipment and vehicles will occur at least 100 feet from riparian habitat or bodies of water and in a location where a potential spill would not drain directly toward aquatic habitat (e.g., on a slope that drains away from the water source). The monitor shall ensure that contamination of suitable habitat does not occur during such operations. Prior to the onset of work activities, a plan must be in place for prompt and effective response to any accidental spills. All workers shall be informed of the importance of preventing spills and of the appropriate measures to take should an accidental spill occur. • The number of access routes, size of staging areas, and the total area used for construction activities shall be limited to the minimum area necessary to achieve the project goals. • The City will only permit work within the immediate vicinity of Prefumo Creek for times of the year when potential impacts to steelhead would be minimal. Work shall be restricted during the wet season (October 15 through April 30) and should ideally occur during the late summer and early fall during the driest portion of the year; however, water may still be present during construction. If work is proposed in the streambed and water is present during construction, a diversion will be required to dewater the work area and the following avoidance and minimization measures will apply: (1) Upstream and downstream passage for fish, including juvenile	

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	steelhead, shall be provided through or around the construction site at all times construction is occurring within the Prefumo Creek streambed. (2) A qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey and be present onsite during the diversion installation and dewatering process to capture and relocate any trapped steelhead and/or other fish. Upon approval from the NMFS, the biologist(s) must relocate these individuals the shortest distance possible to a location that contains suitable habitat that is not likely to be affected by activities associated with the project. (3) Dewatering operations shall employ a five millimeter mesh screen fastened to the intake hose to exclude fish and other wildlife species from the pump. (4) Steelhead shall be excluded from the construction zone with block nets installed upstream and downstream the of the bridge construction zone. The distance upstream and downstream for block net installation will depend on the type of construction activities occurring in the streambed. • To control sedimentation during and after project implementation, the following BMPs shall be implemented. If the BMPs are somehow ineffective, consultation with the City and appropriate resource agencies will be undertaken, and all attempts to remedy the situation will commence immediately. (1) It shall be the owner's/contractor's responsibility to maintain control of the entire construction operations and to keep the entire site in compliance. (2) The owner/contractor shall be responsible for monitoring erosion and sediment control measures (including but not limited to fiber rolls, inlet protections, silt fences, and gravel bags) prior, during and after storm events, monitoring includes maintaining a file documenting onsite inspections, problems encountered, corrective actions, and notes and a map of remedial implementation measures. (3) Erosion shall be controlled by covering stockpiled construction materials (i.e. soil, spoils, aggregate, fly-ash, stucco, hydrated lime, etc.) ~~All earth stockpiles~~ over 2.0 cubic yards that are not actively being used, ~~shall be covered with a tarp~~ consistent with the applicable construction general permit, or through other means of erosion control approved by the City (e.g., ~~and ringed~~surrounding with straw bales or silt fencing). The site shall be maintained to minimize sediment-laden runoff to any storm drainage system including existing drainage swales and/or sand watercourses. (a) Construction operations shall be carried out in such a manner that erosion and water pollution will be minimized.	

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	(b) State and local laws concerning pollution abatement shall be complied with. (c) If grading operations are expected to denude slopes, the slopes shall be protected with erosion control measures immediately following grading on the slopes. (4) Specifically, in order to prevent sedimentation and debris from entering Prefumo Creek during construction, silt fencing shall be installed along the top of the banks on the west side of the channel prior to the onset of construction activities. • The project biologist will monitor construction activities, in stream habitat, and overall performance of BMPs and sediment controls for the purpose of identifying and reconciling any condition that could adversely affect steelhead or their habitat. The biologist will halt work if necessary and will recommend site-specific measures to avoid adverse effects to steelhead and their habitat. • Equipment will be checked daily for leaks prior to the initiation of construction activities. A spill kit will be placed near the creek and will remain readily available during construction in the event that any contaminant is accidentally released. • In addition to these avoidance and minimization measures, Mitigation Measure BIO-2(a) would also ensure that potential temporary and permanent indirect impacts to steelhead from the project are reduced as much as practicable. **BIO-1(f). Great Blue Heron and Monarch Butterfly Impact Avoidance and Minimization**. The applicant shall ensure the following actions are undertaken to avoid and minimize potential impacts to overwintering monarch butterflies and nesting great blue herons. • Tree trimming/removal and construction activities that affect eucalyptus trees near or within the monarch overwintering grove or active great blue heron nests identified in the San Luis Ranch Monarch Trees Inspection Memo, Results of 2015 and 2016 San Luis Ranch Heron Rookery Surveys Memo, and San Luis Ranch – Prefumo Creek Widening Biological Constraints Memo prepared by Althouse and Meade (Appendix F), shall not be conducted during the monarch butterfly overwintering season from October 1 through March 31 if monarch butterflies are present, or while great blue heron nests are active from February 1 to August 31. If construction activities must be conducted during these periods, a qualified biologist shall conduct overwintering monarch surveys and/or nesting great blue heron surveys within one week of habitat disturbance. If surveys do not locate clustering monarchs or nesting great blue herons, construction activities may be conducted. If clustering monarchs and/or nesting	

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	great blue herons are located, no construction activities shall occur within 100 feet of the edge of the overwintering grove and/or active nest(s) until the qualified biologist determines that no more monarchs are overwintering in the grove or the nest(s) are no longer active. • A qualified biologist shall prepare and implement a habitat enhancement plan prior to issuance of grading permits to enhance and restore overwintering and nesting habitat that is to be preserved. The habitat enhancement plan shall include native shrubs and trees such as Monterey Cypress (Hesperocyparis macrocarpa) that may support heron roosting and monarch butterfly overwintering. As eucalyptus trees senesce, they shall be replaced with native species. Native trees and shrubs shall also be used to supplement gaps in canopy or act as windbreaks. • Create new offsite nesting habitat for great blue herons to mitigate for removal of onsite nesting habitat. With a qualified biologist present, the current rookery may be moved to a suitable offsite location where the same great blue herons can resume nesting, following methods detailed in Crouch et al. (2002). It should be noted that creating offsite nesting habitat for great blue herons is experimental and that the relocation techniques described in Crouch et al. (2002) were used to relocate black-crowned night heron (Nycticorax nycticorax). In addition, an agreement with the City will be required prior to implementation of the offsite strategy on their property. The methods detailed in Crouch et al. (2002) include: (a) This entails at least one year of pre-construction monitoring of the rookery, where the timing of rookery activities will be noted: arrival of breeding adults, egg laying, hatching, and fledging. During this time, audio recordings of adults and juveniles shall be made. (b) Following the completion of the nesting season in late summer, a certified arborist specializing in the translocation of trees will examine the mature trees onsite and work with the City's Natural Resources Manager to determine whether or not it is feasible to relocate the mature trees containing nests ~~the mature trees containing nests shall be boxed and moved~~ across Madonna Road to a suitable location at Laguna Lake Open Space. (c) Prior to the start of the next nesting season (based on timing of adult arrival in previous years), nesting adults will be recruited to the new location via decoys and playback of vocalizations. The new location will be monitored regularly by a qualified biologist for the following three breeding seasons. **BIO-1(g). Nesting Birds Impact Avoidance and Minimization.** The applicant shall	

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	ensure the following actions are undertaken to avoid and minimize potential impacts to nesting birds: • For construction activities occurring during the nesting season (generally February 1 to September 15), surveys for nesting birds covered by the California Fish and Game Code and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act shall be conducted by a qualified biologist no more than 14 days prior to vegetation removal. The surveys shall include the disturbance area plus a 500-foot buffer around the site. If active nests are located, all construction work shall be conducted outside a buffer zone from the nest to be determined by the qualified biologist. The buffer shall be a minimum of 50 feet for non-raptor bird species and at least 300 feet for raptor species. Larger buffers may be required depending upon the status of the nest and the construction activities occurring in the vicinity of the nest. The buffer area(s) shall be closed to all construction personnel and equipment until the adults and young are no longer reliant on the nest site. A qualified biologist shall confirm that breeding/nesting is completed and young have fledged the nest prior to removal of the buffer. • If feasible, removal of vegetation within suitable nesting bird habitats will be scheduled to occur in the fall and winter (between September 1 and February 14), after fledging and before the initiation of the nesting season. **BIO-1(h). Roosting Bats Impact Avoidance and Minimization.** The applicant shall ensure the following actions are undertaken to avoid and minimize potential impacts to roosting bats: • Prior to issuance of grading permits, a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey of existing structures within the project site to determine if roosting bats are present. The survey shall be conducted during the non-breeding season (November through March). The biologist shall have access to all interior attics, as needed. If a colony of bats is found roosting in any structure, further surveys shall be conducted sufficient to determine the species present and the type of roost (day, night, maternity, etc.) If the bats are not part of an active maternity colony, passive exclusion measures may be implemented in close coordination with CDFW. These exclusion measures must include one-way valves that allow bats to exit the structure but are designed so that the bats may not re-enter the structure. • If a bat colony is excluded from the project site, appropriate alternate bat habitat as determined by a qualified biologist shall be installed on the project site or at an approved location offsite. • Prior to removal of any trees over 20 inches diameter-at-breast-height (DBH), a survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if any of the	

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	trees proposed for removal or trimming harbor sensitive bat species or maternal bat colonies. If a non-maternal roost is found, the qualified biologist, in close coordination with CDFW shall install one-way valves or other appropriate passive relocation method. For each occupied roost removed, one bat box shall be installed in similar habitat and should have similar cavity or crevices properties to those which are removed, including access, ventilation, dimensions, height above ground, and thermal conditions. Maternal bat colonies may not be disturbed.	
Impact BIO-2. Implementation of the project would have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive habitats, including riparian areas. Impacts would be Class II, potentially significant but mitigable.	**BIO-2(a). Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan.** A Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plan (HMMP) shall be prepared which will provide a minimum 2:1 ratio (replaced: removed) for temporary and permanent impacts to riparian habitat. The HMMP will identify the specific mitigation sites and it will be implemented immediately following project completion. The HMMP shall include, at a minimum, the following components: • Description of the project/impact site (i.e. location, responsible parties, areas to be impacted by habitat type); • Goal(s) of the compensatory mitigation project [type(s) and area(s) of habitat to be established, restored, enhanced, and/or preserved; specific functions and values of habitat type(s) to be established, restored, enhanced, and/or preserved]; • Description of the proposed compensatory mitigation site (location and size, ownership status, existing functions and values of the compensatory mitigation site); • Implementation plan for the compensatory mitigation site (rationale for expecting implementation success, responsible parties, schedule, site preparation, planting plan [including plant species to be used, container sizes, seeding rates, etc.]); • Maintenance activities during the monitoring period, including weed removal and irrigation as appropriate (activities, responsible parties, schedule); • Monitoring plan for the compensatory mitigation site, including no less than quarterly monitoring for the first year (performance standards, target functions and values, target acreages to be established, restored, enhanced, and/or preserved, annual monitoring reports); • Success criteria based on the goals and measurable objectives; said criteria to be, at a minimum, at least 80 percent survival of container plants and 80 percent relative cover by vegetation type; • An adaptive management program and remedial measures to address negative impacts to restoration efforts;	Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1(a), BIO-2(a), BIO-2(b), BIO-2(c), and BIO-3 would reduce direct impacts to sensitive habitats, including riparian areas, by implementing construction BMPs, including containing construction activities, debris, and sediment in appropriate locations outside of sensitive habitat to the maximum extent practicable, and by providing compensatory mitigation for permanently impacted riparian habitat. In addition Mitigation Measures HWQ-1(a) and HWQ-1(b) include construction management practices that would reduce construction related impacts to water quality. When combined with standard regulatory measures (including required permitting from USACE, CDFW, and RWQCB), and regulatory oversight during construction by the Environmental Monitor, implementation of required mitigation measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level and ensure that the project would comply with applicable General Plan policies for the protection of habitat and other

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	• Notification of completion of compensatory mitigation and agency confirmation; and • Contingency measures (initiating procedures, alternative locations for contingency compensatory mitigation, funding mechanism). **BIO-2(b). Tree Replacement**. Riparian trees four inches or greater measured at diameter-at-breast-height (DBH) shall be replaced in-kind at a minimum ratio of 3:1 (replaced: removed). Trees 24 inches or greater inches DBH shall be replaced in-kind at a minimum ratio of 10:1. Willows and cottonwoods may be planted from live stakes following guidelines provided in the California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual for planting dormant cuttings and container stock (CDFW 2010). • Tree replacement shall be conducted in accordance with a Natural Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Plan to be approved by the City's Natural Resource Manager. • The Natural Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Plan shall prioritize the planting of replacement trees on-site where feasible, but shall allow that replacement trees may be planted off-site with approval of the City's Natural Resource Manager. • Replacement trees may be planted in the fall or winter of the year in which trees were removed. All replacement trees will be planted no more than one year following the date upon which the native trees were removed. **BIO-2(c). Froom Ranch Way Bridge Design to Avoid Riparian Areas.** The Froom Ranch Way Bridge crossing footings shall be placed outside mapped riparian areas. The placement of the bridge and footings shall be indicated on the Development Plan, VTM, and HMMP, and shall show the bridge's placement in relation to existing vegetation and the bed and bank of Prefumo Creek.	biological resources.
Impact BIO-3. Construction of the project could have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Impacts would be Class II, potentially significant but mitigable.	Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1(a) and BIO-2(a) would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. No additional mitigation is required.	Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1(a) andBIO-2(a would reduce potential impacts to federally protected wetlands, any riparian habitat, or other sensitive natural communities to a less than significant level and ensure that the project would be consistent with COSE Policy 7.5.5.

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
Impact BIO-4. Development of the San Luis Ranch Specific Plan Area would not permanently interfere with the movement of resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established resident or migratory wildlife corridors along Prefumo Creek and through open agricultural lands on the project site. This impact would be Class II, *potentially significant but mitigable.*	Implementation of BIO-1(a) requires construction BMPs that would reduce potential impacts to riparian habitat within the Prefumo Creek corridor. Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1(c), BIO-1(d), and BIO-1(e), would reduce impacts to western pond turtle, CRLF, coast range newt, and steelhead by requiring pre-construction surveys by qualified biological staff and construction worker training to ensure individuals of these species are not impacts during project construction activity within or adjacent to riparian and riverine habitat. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1(f) would reduce impacts to heron rookeries by requiring preconstruction surveys, mapping, exclusionary fencing, and offsite compensatory mitigation. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1(h) would reduce impacts to birds by requiring construction monitoring for nesting birds, and requiring appropriate buffers for construction activity in proximity to active nests. Implementation of Mitigation Measure BIO-1(h) would reduce impacts to bats roosting in trees by requiring trees that may provide habitat for roosting bats to be surveyed by a qualified biologist prior to removal. Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-2(a) would reduce potential impacts to federally protected wetlands, any riparian habitat, or other sensitive natural community to a less than significant level.	Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1(a), BIO-1(c), BIO-1(d), BIO-1(e), BIO-1(f), BIO-1-(h), and BIO-2(a) would reduce potential impacts to wildlife species, wildlife nursery sites, riparian corridors, and other sensitive natural communities to a less than significant level.
Cumulative Biological Resources Impacts. Consistent with the LUCE Update EIR, the project would implement mitigation measures to ensure compliance with the applicable goals and policies of the General Plan. As a result, the project's contribution to this cumulative impact would be potentially significant but mitigable.	Implementation of Mitigation Measures BIO-1(a) through BIO-1(h) and BIO-2(a) through BIO-2(c) would reduce cumulative impacts to biological resources to a less than significant level.	Implementation of required mitigation measures would reduce cumulative impacts to a less than significant level.
CULTURAL RESOURCES		
Impact CR-2. Identified archaeological resources on the project site are ineligible for listing in the CRHR and NRHP, and disturbance of these resources would not constitute a significant impact. However, the	**CR-2(a). Retain a Qualified Principal Investigator.** In accordance with Conservation and Open Space Policies 3.5.6 and 3.5.7, a qualified principal investigator, defined as an archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for professional archaeology (hereafter qualified archaeologist), shall be retained to carry out all mitigation measures related to archaeological resources. Monitoring shall involve inspection of subsurface construction disturbance at or in	Implementation of Mitigation Measures CR-2(a) and CR-2(b) would reduce impacts to archaeological resources to a less than significant level.

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
potential remains for the project to result in impacts to previously unidentified archaeological resources. Therefore, this impact would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	the immediate vicinity of known sites, or at locations that may harbor buried resources that were not identified on the site surface. A Native American monitor shall also be present because the area is a culturally sensitive location. The monitor(s) shall be on-site on a full-time basis during earthmoving activities, including grading, trenching, vegetation removal, or other excavation activities. **CR-2(b). Unanticipated Discovery of Archaeological Resources.** In the event that archaeological resources are exposed during construction, all work shall be halted in the vicinity of the archaeological discovery until a qualified archaeologist can visit the site of discovery and assess the significance of the cultural resource. In the event that any artifact or an unusual amount of bone or shell is encountered during construction, work shall be immediately stopped and relocated to another area. The lead agency shall stop construction within 100 feet of the exposed resource until a qualified archaeologist/paleontologist can evaluate the find (see 36 CFR 800.11.1 and CCR, Title 14, Section 15064.5[f]). Examples of such cultural materials might include: ground stone tools such as mortars, bowls, pestles, and manos; chipped stone tools such as projectile points or choppers; flakes of stone not consistent with the immediate geology such as obsidian or fused shale; historic trash pits containing bottles and/or ceramics; or structural remains. If the resources are found to be significant, they must be avoided or will be mitigated consistent with State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) Guidelines.	

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS		
Impact HAZ-4. Hazardous materials sites identified on and upgradient to the project site as well as residual pesticides and agricultural chemicals in soil due to historical use of pesticides and other agricultural chemicals onsite could create a hazard to construction workers during the construction phase of the project. Impacts would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	**HAZ-4. Soil Sampling and Remediation.** Prior to issuance of any grading permits, a contaminated soil assessment shall be completed in the portions of land to be graded for development. Soil samples shall be collected under the supervision of a professional geologist or environmental professional to determine the presence or absence of contaminated soil in these areas. The sampling density shall be in accordance with guidance from San Luis Obispo County Environmental Health Services, so as to define the volume of soil that may require remediation. Laboratory analysis of soil samples shall be analyzed for the presence of organochlorine pesticides, in accordance with EPA Test Method SW8081A, and heavy metals in accordance with EPA Test Methods 6010B and 7471A. If soil sampling indicates the presence of pesticides or heavy metals exceeding applicable environmental screening levels, the soil assessment shall identify the volume of contaminated soil to be excavated. If concentrations of contaminants exceed EPA action levels and therefore warrant remediation, contaminated materials shall be remediated either prior to concurrent with construction and an Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) shall be prepared. Cleanup may include excavation, disposal, bio-remediation, or any other treatment of conditions subject to regulatory action. All necessary reports, regulations and permits shall be followed to achieve cleanup of the site. The contaminated materials shall be remediated under the supervision of an environmental consultant licensed to oversee such remediation and under the direction of the lead oversight agency. The remediation program shall also be approved by a regulatory oversight agency, such as the San Luis Obispo County Environmental Health Services, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), or DTSC. All proper waste handling and disposal procedures shall be followed. Upon completion of the remediation, the environmental consultant shall prepare a report summarizing the project, the remediation approach implemented, and the analytical results after completion of the remediation, including all waste disposal or treatment manifests.	With implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-4, impacts related to exposure to residual agricultural chemicals would be reduced to a less than significant level.
~~**Impact HAZ-5.** Tetrachloroethene (also called perchloroethylene, or PCE) has been detected in the shallow aquifer in concentrations that exceed the Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) in active irrigation wells on the~~	~~**HAZ-5(a). Groundwater Assessment for Contamination at Untested Wells.** Any groundwater wells on the project site that would be used for agricultural irrigation shall be sampled by a registered soils engineer or remediation specialist to determine the presence or absence of regulated contaminants prior to issuance of grading permits. This assessment shall target on-site PCE associated with off-site dry cleaning operations. **HAZ-5(b). Groundwater Remediation.** If groundwater sampling indicates the~~	~~With incorporation of these mitigation measures, this impact would be less than significant.~~

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
~~eastern portion of the site. As future on-site residents or workers could potentially be exposed to PCE from irrigation water, this would be a Class II, significant but mitigable, impact.~~	~~presence of any contaminant in hazardous quantities, the project applicant (or authorized agent thereof) shall contact the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and Department of Toxic Substances (DTSC) to determine the level of any necessary remediation efforts. These may include:~~ ~~• Installation of charcoal filtration into well-head systems at wells where PCE is identified in hazardous quantities. After installation of charcoal filtration, groundwater wells shall be re-sampled consistent with Mitigation Measure HAZ-5(a).~~ ~~• Groundwater remediation to contaminant concentrations below applicable standards in compliance with applicable laws prior to issuance of grading permits. A copy of the applicable remediation certification from Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and/or Department of Toxic Substances (DTSC), or written confirmation that a certification is not required, shall be submitted to the Community Development Department.~~	
Impact HAZ-6. The project site is located in an area where geologic analysis for NOA is required prior to grading and could potentially result in exposure of people to NOA during grading and construction activities. Therefore, this impact would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	**HAZ-6. Naturally Occurring Asbestos Exposure Avoidance and Minimization:** a. Prior to earthwork activities, a site-specific health and safety plan shall be developed per California Occupational Safety and Health Administration (CalOSHA) requirements. The plan shall include appropriate health and safety measures if NOA is detected in soil or bedrock beneath the project site. All construction workers that have the potential to come into contact with contaminated soil/bedrock and groundwater shall be knowledgeable of the requirements in the health and safety plan, which includes proper training and personal protective equipment. The health and safety plan shall prescribe appropriate respiratory protection for construction workers. b. Prior to beginning construction, a soil and bedrock analysis for asbestos using polarized light microscopy and transmission electron microscopy by a qualified laboratory shall be conducted. Samples of soil shall be collected from multiple locations across the site, and bedrock samples shall be collected from locations where excavation into bedrock is anticipated. If NOA is detected, appropriate regulations pertaining to excavation, removal, transportation, and disposal of NOA shall be followed. The sampling strategy shall take into account the locations of potential source areas, and the anticipated lateral and vertical distribution of contaminants in soil and/or groundwater. The results of the investigation shall be documented in a report that is signed by a California Professional Geologist. The report shall include recommendations based upon the findings for additional investigation/remediation if contaminants are detected above applicable screening levels (e.g., excavate and dispose, groundwater and/or soil vapor extraction, or in situ bioremediation).	With implementation of Mitigation Measure HAZ-6, impacts related to exposure to NOA would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	c. During earthwork activities, appropriate procedures shall be incorporated in the event that NOA is detected in soil or bedrock beneath the project site. These procedures shall be followed to eliminate or minimize construction worker or general public exposure to potential contaminants in soil. Procedures shall include efforts to control fugitive dust, contain and cover excavation debris piles, appropriate laboratory analysis of soil for waste characterization, and segregation of contaminated soil from uncontaminated soil. The applicable regulations associated with excavation, removal, transportation, and disposal of contaminated soil shall be followed (e.g., tarping of trucks and waste manifesting). These procedures may be subject to San Luis Obispo APCD requirements under the California ARB ATCM for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations.	
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY		
Impact HWQ-1. During project construction, the surface soil would be subject to erosion and the downstream watershed would be subject to pollution. The project's impact on water quality during construction would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	**HWQ-1(a). Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.** All required actions shall be implemented pursuant to a SWPPP and SWMP to be prepared by the project applicant and submitted by the City to the Regional Water Quality Control Board under the NPDES Phase II program. At a minimum, the SWPPP/SWMP shall including the following BMPs: • The use of sandbags, straw bales, and temporary de-silting basins during project grading and construction during the rainy season to prevent discharge of sediment-laden runoff into stormwater facilities; • Revegetation as soon as practicable after completion of grading to reduce sediment transport during storms; • Installation of straw bales, wattles, or silt fencing at the base of bare slopes before the onset of the rainy season (October 15th through April 15th); • Installation of straw bales, wattles, or silt fencing at the project perimeter and in front of storm drains before the onset of the rainy season (October 15th through April 15th); and/or • Alternative BMPs as approved by the RWQCB as part of the SWPPP submittal. **HWQ-1(b). Berms and Basins**. As specified in the SWPPP, the applicant shall be required to manage and control runoff by constructing temporary berms, sediment basins, runoff diversions, or alternative BMP's as approved by the RWQCB as part of the SWPPP submittal, in order to avoid unnecessary siltation into local streams during construction activities where grading and construction shall occur in the vicinity of such streams. • Berms and basins shall be constructed when grading commences and be periodically inspected and maintained. The project applicant shall sufficiently	Implementation of the mitigation measures and compliance with existing regulations would ensure that the potentially significant construction runoff and associated impacts to water quality would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	document, to the CCRWQCB satisfaction, the proper installation of such berms and basins during grading. **HWQ-1(c). Concept Grading Plan and Master Drainage Plan**. As specified in the SWPPP and the City's Floodplain Management Regulations, the applicant shall be required to submit a Grading Plan and Master Drainage Plan to the Planning Division and City Public Works Director for approval prior to approval of the VTTM. The grading and drainage plans shall be designed to minimize erosion and water quality impacts, to the extent feasible, and shall be consistent with the project's SWPPP. The plans shall include the following: a. Graded areas shall be revegetated with deep-rooted, native, non-invasive drought tolerant species to minimize slope failure and erosion potential. Geotextile fabrics shall be used if necessary to hold slope soils until vegetation is established; b. Temporary storage of construction equipment shall be limited to a minimum of 100 feet away from drainages on the project site; and c. Erosion control structures shall be installed. d. Demonstrate peak flows and runoff for each phase of construction. e. Be coordinated with habitat restoration efforts, including measures to minimize removal of riparian and wetland habitats and trees (Mitigation Measures BIO-2[a] and BIO-2[b]). f. Grading and drainage plans shall be submitted for review and approval by the Planning Division. The applicant shall ensure installation of erosion control structures prior to beginning of construction of any structures, subject to review and approval by the City.	
Impact HWQ-3. During operation, the proposed residential~~,~~ and commercial~~, and agricultural~~ uses would increase the quantities of pollutants associated with runoff and sedimentation. The project's impact on water quality would be Class II, significant but mitigable impact.	**HWQ-3(a). Stormwater Quality Treatment Controls.** BMP devices shall be incorporated into the stormwater quality system depicted in the Master Drainage Plan (refer to Mitigation Measure HWQ-1[c]). The final design of the stormwater quality system shall be reviewed and approved by the City. The Master Drainage Plan shall contain the following relevant BMPs: • Vegetated bioswales to reduce sediment and particulate forms of metals and other pollutants along corridors of planted grasses. • Vegetated buffer strips to reduce sediment and particulate forms of metals and nutrients. ~~• Hydrodynamic separation products to reduce suspended solids greater than 240 microns, trash, and hydrocarbons. These hydrodynamic separators shall be sized to handle peak flows from the project site consistent with applicable regulatory standards.~~	Implementation of required mitigation measures and compliance with existing regulations would ensure that the potentially significant impacts to water quality resulting from runoff during operation of the project would be reduced to a less than significant level.

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	HWQ-3(b). Stormwater BMP Maintenance Manual. The project applicant shall prepare a development maintenance manual for the stormwater quality system BMPs (refer to Mitigation Measure HWQ-3[a]). The maintenance manual shall include detailed procedures for maintenance and operations of all stormwater facilities to ensure long-term operation and maintenance of post-construction stormwater controls. The maintenance manual shall require that stormwater BMP devices be inspected, cleaned, and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's maintenance specifications. The manual shall require that devices be cleaned prior to the onset of the rainy season (i.e., October 15th) and immediately after the end of the rainy season (i.e., May 15th). The manual shall also require that all devices be checked after major storm events. **HWQ-3(c). Stormwater BMP Semi-Annual Maintenance Report.** The property manager(s) or acceptable maintenance organization shall submit to the City of San Luis Obispo Public Works Department a detailed report prepared by a licensed Civil Engineer addressing the condition of all private stormwater facilities, BMPs, and any necessary maintenance activities on a semi-annual basis (October 15th and May 15th of each year). The requirement for maintenance and report submittal shall be recorded against the property.	
Impact HWQ-4. Approximately 98 acres of the project site is within the existing 100-year flood zone. However, proposed grading and elevation modifications would ensure that the project would not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area or expose people or structures downstream of the Specific Plan Area to flood hazards due to increased runoff or loss of floodplain storage. This impact would be Class II, significant but mitigable.	**HWQ-4. Conditional Letter of Map Revision/Letter of Map Revision.** The applicant, in conjunction with the City of San Luis Obispo, shall prepare the CLOMR application and obtain a LOMR from FEMA.	Implementation of Mitigation Measure HWQ-4 and compliance with existing regulations would ensure that this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level.
LAND USE		
Impact LU-2. The Specific Plan would be potentially consistent with LAFCO policies for	Mitigation Measures AG-1 and AG-3 would ensure that the Specific Plan would not result in conflicts between the San Luis Obispo LAFCO agricultural policies and the Specific Plan.	Implementation of Mitigation Measures AG-1 and AG-3 would ensure that this impact would

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
annexation. This impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.		remain less than significant.
Cumulative Land Use Impacts. The proposed uses are consistent with the intent of the goals and policies established within the City's General Plan and Zoning Regulations after implementation of mitigation, and would not cumulatively contribute to the loss of open space or agricultural land beyond that already anticipated in the City's LUCE Update and EIR. Furthermore, the Specific Plan is not expected to cumulatively contribute to potential airport noise and/or safety issues. As such, cumulative land use impacts would be less than significant with incorporation of the mitigation included in this EIR.	The following Mitigation Measures would apply to this impact: • ~~Section 4.1, *Aesthetics*: AES-1(a) and AES-1(b)~~ • Section 4.2, *Agricultural Resources*: AG-1, AG-3 • Section 4.4, *Biological Resources*: BIO-1(a) through BIO-1(h) and BIO-2(a) through BIO-2(c) • Section 4.5, *Cultural Resources*: CR-1(a) through CR-1(c) • Section 4.7, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*: HAZ-4, ~~HAZ-5(a), HAZ-5(b),~~ HAZ-6 • Section 4.10, *Noise*: N-1(a) through N-1(g), N-4(a), N-4(b), N-5(a) through N-5(d) • Section 4.12, *Transportation and Circulation*: T-1(a) through T-1(i), T-2(a) through T-2(j), T-3(a) through T-3(d), T-4, T-5, T-6, T-7, T-8(a) through T-8(g), T-9(a) through T-9(m), T-10(a) through T-10(c) • Section 4.14, *Issues Addressed in the Initial Study*: GEO-1, GEO-3	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.
NOISE		
Impact N-4. Future development on the project site would generate operational noise typically associated with residential, commercial, office, and hotel development. Noise from the project would not exceed acceptable levels at existing off-site sensitive receptors. However, noise from new on-site commercial uses may exceed applicable City standards at proposed on-site	**N-4(a). HVAC Equipment.** Retail HVAC equipment shall be shielded and located on building rooftops, or a minimum of 100 feet from the nearest residential property line. **N-4(b). Parking Lot/Loading Dock Orientation and Noise Barrier**. ~~Parking areas and loading docks within the proposed retail areas shall be located a minimum of 100 feet from the property lines of the nearest residential properties. For parking areas and loading docks located a minimum of 250 feet from the property line of residential properties to the west, or for parking areas and loading docks located a minimum of 150 feet from the property line of residential properties to the west with a building intervening line-of-sight between the parking area/loading dock and the residential property, no further mitigation would be required.~~ If parking areas or loading docks would be located ~~closer to the~~ <u>within 250 feet of</u>	This mitigation would ensure that noise levels at residences on the project site would not exceed the City's standards for intermittent noise.

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
residences. This impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.	the residential properties to the west ~~than described above~~, a masonry noise barrier shall be installed along the eastern boundary of the proposed residences adjacent to the commercial land use area on the eastern portion of the project site. The noise barrier shall be constructed of any masonry material with a surface density of at least three pounds per square foot, and shall have no openings or gaps.	
Impact N-5. Existing noise sources near the project site include vehicles on local roadways and U.S. 101. Development of the project would expose future residents on the project site to traffic noise from local roadways and U.S. 101. With mitigation, traffic noise levels on the project site would not exceed City standards. Therefore, this impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation incorporated.	**N-5(a). Interior Noise Reduction.** The project applicant shall implement the following measures, or similar combination of measures, which demonstrate that interior noise levels in proposed residences adjacent to Froom Ranch Way and Madonna Road, hotel, and offices would be reduced below the City's 45 dBA CNEL interior noise standard. The required interior noise reduction shall be achieved through a combination of standard interior noise reduction techniques, which may include (but are not limited to): • In order for windows and doors to remain closed, mechanical ventilation such as air conditioning shall be provided for all units (Passive ventilation may be provided, if mechanical ventilation is not necessary to achieve interior noise standards, as demonstrated by a qualified acoustical consultant). • All exterior walls shall be constructed with a minimum STC rating of 50, consisting of construction of 2 inch by 4 inch wood studs with one layer of 5/8 inch Type "X" gypsum board on each side of resilient channels on 24 inch centers and 3 ½ inch fiberglass insulation. • All windows and glass doors shall be rated STC 39 or higher such that the noise reduction provided will satisfy the interior noise standard of 45 dBA CNEL. • An acoustical test report of all the sound-rated windows and doors shall be provided to the City for review by a qualified acoustical consultant to ensure that the selected windows and doors in combination with wall assemblies would reduce interior noise levels sufficiently to meet the City's interior noise standard. • All vent ducts connecting interior spaces to the exterior (i.e., bathroom exhaust, etc.) shall have at least two 90 degree turns in the duct. • All windows and doors shall be installed in an acoustically-effective manner. Sliding window panels shall form an air-tight seal when in the closed position and the window frames shall be caulked to the wall opening around the perimeter with a non-hardening caulking compound to prevent sound infiltration. Exterior doors shall seal air-tight around the full perimeter when in the closed position. The applicant shall submit a report to the Community Development Department by a qualified acoustical consultant certifying that the specific interior noise reduction techniques included in residential, hotel, and office components of the project would	This mitigation would ensure that traffic noise levels would not exceed City standards.

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	achieve interior noise levels that would not exceed 45 dBA CNEL. **N-5(b). Residential Outdoor Activity Area Noise Attenuation.** Outdoor activity areas (e.g., patios and hotel pool areas) associated with shared multifamily residential recreational spaces, hotel, commercial, and office uses shall be protected from sound intrusion so that they meet the City's exterior standard of 60 dBA CNEL. Outdoor activity areas shall be oriented away from traffic noise such that intervening buildings reduce traffic noise or shall include noise barriers capable of reducing traffic noise levels to meet the City's exterior standard. Hotel pool areas shall be located a minimum of 500 feet from the U.S. 101 right-of-way. Noise barriers may be constructed of a material such as tempered glass, acrylic glass, or masonry material with a surface density of at least three pounds per square foot, and shall have no openings or gaps. The applicant shall submit a report to the Community Development Department by a qualified acoustic consultant certifying that the specific outdoor noise reduction techniques in combination with the orientation of outdoor activity areas of shared multifamily residential recreational spaces, hotel, commercial, and offices would achieve exterior noise levels that would not exceed 60 dBA CNEL. **N-5(c). Froom Ranch Way Noise Barrier.** A masonry noise barrier or alternative barrier, such as a landscaped berm, shall be installed along the southern property line of residential lots that abut Froom Ranch Way to protect outdoor activity areas (patios and pools) at these residences from sound intrusion from traffic along Froom Ranch Way. The noise barrier or berm shall provide, at minimum, a 6 foot high barrier between Froom Ranch Way and the neighboring residences from the final grade of whichever use (i.e., Froom Ranch Way or residences) has a higher final elevation. If a masonry noise barrier is implemented, t~~T~~he noise barrier shall be constructed of any masonry material with a surface density of at least three pounds per square foot, and shall have no openings or gaps. If an alternative material is used, the developer shall submit a report to the Community Development Department by a qualified acoustical consultant certifying that the specific exterior noise reduction techniques included would achieve exterior noise levels that would not exceed 60 dBA CNEL. **N-5(d). U.S. Highway 101 Noise Barrier at Hotel.** If the hotel includes an outdoor activity area (such as a patio or pool) a masonry noise barrier or alternative barrier, such as berms, landscaping, or glass, must be installed along the eastern property line of the hotel where it abuts the U.S. 101 right of way to protect these outdoor activity areas from sound intrusion from traffic along U.S. 101. If a masonry noise	

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
	barrier is implemented, t~~T~~he noise barrier shall provide, at minimum, an 8 foot high barrier between U.S. 101 and the hotel from the final grade of whichever use (i.e., U.S. 101 or hotel) has a higher final elevation. Such a ~~The~~ noise barrier shall be constructed of any masonry material with a surface density of at least three pounds per square foot, and shall have no openings or gaps. If an alternative material is used, the developer shall submit a report to the Community Development Department by a qualified acoustical consultant demonstrating that the specific exterior noise reduction techniques included in the hotel component of the project would achieve exterior noise levels that would not exceed 60 dBA CNEL.	
RECREATION		
Impact REC-1. The project would accommodate new residents in the City of San Luis Obispo who will use existing and planned parks and recreation facilities. Provision of on-site parks and recreation facilities would not meet the adopted City parkland standard for the San Luis Ranch Specific Plan Area. Therefore, impacts to parks and recreational facilities would be Class II, potentially significant but mitigable.	**REC-1. Parkland In-lieu Fees.** The project applicant shall pay parkland in-lieu fees in accordance with the City's parkland in-lieu fee program for the parkland shortage. The project's specific fee shall be determined by the City at the time of project approval, after accounting for parkland provided within the San Luis Ranch Specific Plan Area. The in-lieu fees collected from the project shall be directed to new projects or improvements to existing parks and recreation facilities within the City of San Luis Obispo parks system.	With payment of the City's required parkland in-lieu fees to ensure compliance with the policies and performance standards in the City's General Plan as part of the project, impacts associated with parks and recreational facilities would be less than significant.
Cumulative Recreation Impacts. The project would not meet the Citywide parkland standards and would exacerbate the exiting shortfall of parks and recreational facilities within the City. As a result, cumulative adverse physical effects on the environment from recreational development would be potentially significant, and the project's contribution to this impact would be cumulatively considerable.	With payment of the City's required parkland in-lieu fees to ensure compliance with the policies and performance standards in the City's General Plan as part of the project, required by Mitigation Measure REC-1, the project contribution to cumulative impacts associated with parks and recreational facilities would be reduced to a less than significant level.	Implementation of required mitigation measures would reduce cumulative impacts to a less than significant level.

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
TRANSPORTATION		
Impact T-4. Project construction activities would create traffic impacts due to construction vehicles causing congestion and deteriorating pavement conditions. Mitigation would reduce these impacts to an acceptable level. This impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation.	**T-4. Construction Traffic Management Plan.** Prior to construction, a traffic management plan shall be prepared for review and approval by the City of San Luis Obispo Public Works Department. The traffic management plan shall be based on the type of roadway traffic conditions, duration of construction, physical constraints, nearness of the work zone to traffic and other facilities (bicycle, pedestrian, driveway access, etc.). The traffic management plan shall include: • *Advertisement*. The project developer shall prepare an advertisement campaign informing the public of the proposed construction activities. Advertisements shall occur prior to beginning work and periodically during the course of the project construction. The advertising shall include notification of changes to bus schedules and potential changes to bus stop locations, potential impacts during school drop-off and pick-up times, and major intersections that may be impacted during construction. • *Property Access*. Access to parcels along the construction area shall be maintained to the greatest extent feasible. Affected property owners shall receive advance notice of work adjacent to their property access and when driveways would be potentially closed. • *Schools*. Any construction adjacent to schools shall ensure that access is maintained for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists, particularly at the beginning and end of the school day. • *Buses, Bicycles, and Pedestrians*. The work zone shall provide for passage by buses, bicyclists, and pedestrians, particularly in the vicinity of schools. • *Intersections*. Traffic control (i.e., use of flag persons) shall be used at intersections that are determined to be unacceptably congested due to construction traffic.	Implementation of the identified mitigation would ensure that impacts associated with construction traffic would be less than significant after mitigation.
Impact T-5. Construction of the proposed Froom Ranch Way bridge during phase 3 of the Specific Plan buildout would result in significant level of service and queuing impacts at study area intersections and roadway segments. Mitigation would reduce these impacts to an acceptable level. This impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation.	**T-5. Froom Ranch Way Bridge Phasing**. The Froom Ranch Way bridge connection shall be completed prior to occupancy of Phase 1 of the Specific Plan buildout.	Implementation of the identified mitigation would ensure that LOS and queuing impacts associated with the project's proposed infrastructure phasing would be less than significant after mitigation.

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
Impact T-6. The project site plan would result in and contribute to increased access conflicts. Proposed access controls are not consistent with General Plan policy. Mitigation would reduce these impacts to an acceptable level. This impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation.	**T-6. Project Site Intersection Roundabout Control**. New roadway intersections within the Specific Plan Area shall be controlled using roundabout design, unless the City Public Works Department determines that roundabout control is infeasible.	Implementation of the identified mitigation would ensure that the project would be consistent with General Plan Circulation Element Policy 7.1.2, and would ensure that transportation impacts due to access conflicts would be reduced to a less than significant level after mitigation.
Impact T-7. The project site plan would result in on-site traffic volumes and speeds that may exceed General Plan policy thresholds, resulting potential traffic hazards within the project site. Mitigation would reduce these impacts to an acceptable level. This impact would be Class II, less than significant with mitigation.	**T-7. Traffic Calming Features.** New roadway intersections along San Luis Ranch Road shall include neighborhood traffic circles at key intersections, and traffic-calming features, such as diverters, along longer uninterrupted segments.	This mitigation would ensure that potential traffic hazards within the Specific Plan area would be reduced to a less than significant level after mitigation.
ISSUES ADDRESSED IN THE INITIAL STUDY		
Due to the proximity of the site to the Los Osos Fault and Alquist-Priolo Zone, impacts associated with earthquakes and ground shaking would be potentially significant. In addition, the project site has been identified as being located in an area of very high liquefaction potential, moderate to high expansion potential, and high settlement potential. In addition, during historical drought years, groundwater levels in the site vicinity were lowered enough to cause	**GEO-1. Earthquake and Ground Acceleration Design and Construction Measures**. Design and construction of the buildings, roadway infrastructure and all subgrades shall be specifically proportioned to resist Design Earthquake Ground Motions (Design amax) of SD1=0.481 and SDS=0.832 and engineered to withstand Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE) peak ground acceleration (PGAM) equal to 0.519 g, as described in the Soils Engineering Report for the project (GeoSolutions, Inc., 2015). The design should take into consideration the soil type, potential for liquefaction, and the most current and applicable seismic attenuation methods that are available. **GEO-2. Operational Seismic Safety Requirement**. For retail stores included in the project, goods for sale may be stacked no higher than 8 feet from the floor in any area where customers are present, unless provisions are made to prevent the goods from falling during an earthquake of up to 7.5 magnitude. The stacking or restraint methods shall be reviewed and approved by the City before approval of occupancy permits, and shall be a standing condition of occupancy.	With implementation of the mitigation described above, impacts related to geology and soils would be less than significant.

Table ES-2
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
subsidence.	**GEO-3. Geotechnical Design**. The project plans and specifications shall include the geotechnical recommendations included in the Soils Engineering Report, prepared by GeoSolutions, Inc. on May 29, 2015. Recommendations therein that shall be incorporated into the final project building plans include specification for the following components of development preparation and design: • Building Pad Preparation • Paved Areas Preparation • Pavement Design • Interlocking Concrete Pavers • Conventional Foundations • Post-Tensioned Slabs • Slab-On-Grade Construction • Retaining Walls • Exterior Concrete Flatwork	

Table ES-3
Class III, Less than Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
AESTHETICS		
Impact AES-1. Although there are potentially adverse impacts to scenic viewsheds, the project would implement the open space and agricultural preservation and design elements included in the proposed Specific Plan. Therefore, potential impacts to scenic vistas and scenic resources within a state scenic highway would be Class III, *less than significant*.	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.
Impact AES-2. The project would alter the existing visual character of the site by converting over half of the agricultural site into a predominantly residential and commercial use site. Due to the project's visual compatibility with surrounding development, preservation of on-site open space and agricultural land, and compliance with design guidelines, the project's impact on the visual character and quality of the site would be Class III, *less than significant*.	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.
Impact AES-3. The project would introduce a new source of nighttime lighting and daytime glare, which could increase ambient light and affect the quality of the nighttime sky. However, project compliance with existing City requirements	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.

Table ES-3
Class III, Less than Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
and design guidelines would limit the magnitude of these effects. This would be Class III, *less than significant*.		
Cumulative Aesthetics Impacts. As determined in the LUCE Update EIR, all development that adheres to applicable General Plan policies would result in less than significant aesthetic impacts. Therefore, the overall aesthetic impact of cumulative development in the project vicinity would be less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.
AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES		
Impact AG-2. The project would alter the existing land use and zoning on the project site. However, these alterations would be consistent with the General Plan's identification of the San Luis Ranch Specific Plan for a mix of urban, agricultural, and open space use. Therefore, this impact would be Class III, less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.
Impact AG-4. Re-grading of the project site would not result in significant degradation of viability of on-site agricultural land. Therefore, this impact would be Class III, *less than significant*.	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.

Table ES-3
Class III, Less than Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
Cumulative Agricultural Resources Impacts. Consistent with the LUCE Update EIR, the project would implement Land Use Element Policies 1.8.1 and 1.9.2, and Conservation and Open Space Element Policy 8.6.3. As a result, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.
AIR QUALITY		
Impact AQ-4. The project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS		
Impact GHG-1. The San Luis Ranch Specific Plan is consistent with the City's Climate Action Plan. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	The San Luis Ranch Specific Plan is consistent with the City's Climate Action Plan. No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.
HAZARDS/ HAZARDOUS MATERIALS		
Impact HAZ-1. Small quantities of hazardous materials may be used in conjunction with the proposed residential and commercial retail uses on site. However, these materials would be limited in type and quantity such that they would not create a hazard to the public or environment. Therefore, this impact would be Class III, less	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.

Table ES-3
Class III, Less than Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
than significant.		
Impact HAZ-2. The project site is adjacent to U.S. Highway 101, on which accidents that involve hazardous materials could occur. Such accidents could potentially create a significant hazard to the public or environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. However, compliance with applicable regulations related to the handling and storage of hazardous materials would minimize the risk of the public's potential exposure to these substances, resulting in a Class III, less than significant, impact.	Transport of hazardous materials on U.S. 101 and other roadways, including U.S. 101, would be required to comply with all federal, State, and local laws pertaining to the handling of hazardous materials. No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.
Impact HAZ-3. Two schools are located within one-quarter mile of the project site. Compliance with existing federal, State, and local regulations would ensure that hazardous materials impacts to schools would remain Class III, less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.
Impact HAZ-7. Asbestos Containing Material (ACM) and Lead Based Paint (LBP) may be present in existing on-site structures. Demolition of these structures would be required to comply with applicable State and local policies and regulations for the control and	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.

Table ES-3
Class III, Less than Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
remediation of hazardous materials to prevent human exposure. Therefore, this impact would be Class III, less than significant.		
Impact HAZ-8. The project site is located within a San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport area of influence. The project would be consistent with the CALUPH Airport Safety Zones, which represent the extent of Airport-related safety hazard zones for people residing or working in these areas. Therefore, this impact would be Class III, less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.
Cumulative Hazards and Hazardous Materials Impacts. As described in the LUCE Update EIR, adherence to applicable General Plan policies and applicable State and federal regulatory requirements would reduce any cumulative hazards and hazardous materials impacts resulting from buildout of the City under the General Plan, including buildout of the San Luis Ranch Specific Plan, to a less than significant level. The uses proposed for the San Luis Ranch Project would be consistent with the CALUPH Airport Safety Zones, which represent the extent of Airport-related safety hazard zones for	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.

Table ES-3
Class III, Less than Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
people residing or working in these areas. As such, the project would not result in a substantial contribution to cumulative aircraft related hazards in the City.		
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY		
Impact HWQ-2. The project would alter the existing drainage pattern of the project site, which could result in flooding, erosion, or siltation onsite and offsite. However, the proposed retention and detention systems, along with compliance with applicable regulations, would ensure that this impact would remain Class III, less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.
Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts. Water Quality. The project, in conjunction with pending cumulative development would not significantly increase the concentration of urban pollutants such as oil, grease, and vehicular heavy metals in surface runoff. Polluted runoff which may be generated during construction activities of cumulative development and projects considered in this analysis would be regulated by the SWRCB under General Construction, NPDES permits, and would be minimized through the implementation of standard	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.

Table ES-3
Class III, Less than Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
construction BMPs. Cumulative impacts would therefore be less than significant for water quality. Flooding. The proposed on-site drainage system would adequately capture associated runoff, and the project would not substantially contribute to flooding on- or off-site. The project grading plan has been designed such that the resulting post-development floodplain would exclude areas proposed for housing. Overall, cumulative impacts to hydrology and water quality would be less than significant.		
LAND USE		
Impact LU-3. The Specific Plan would be consistent with the land use strategy in SLOCOG's 2014 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. This impact would be Class III, *less than significant*.	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.
Impact LU-4. The Specific Plan would allow residential and non-residential land uses consistent with density and use restrictions in the City's Airport Safety Zones, which represent the extent of Airport-related safety hazard zones for people residing or working in these areas. The LUCE Update EIR provided substantial evidence that the development of the San Luis	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.

Table ES-3
Class III, Less than Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
Ranch Specific Plan Area under the updated General Plan land use designations would be consistent with ALUP safety and noise standards. The project would not conflict with land use policies intended to prevent airport-related safety hazards. Therefore, this impact would be Class III, *less than significant*.		
NOISE		
Impact N-2. Short-term construction activities would generate intermittent levels of groundborne vibration. However, the expected vibration level during construction of the project would not be perceptible at the nearest residential receptors. This impact would be Class III, less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.
Impact N-3. Project-generated traffic would incrementally increase traffic-related noise on study area roadway segments, except on Madonna Road near the project site, which would potentially affect existing noise-sensitive receptors along local roadways. However, the increase in traffic noise levels along area roadways would not exceed 3 dBA, which is the increase threshold typically audible to the human ear. Therefore, the effect of increased traffic noise would be Class III, less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.

Table ES-3
Class III, Less than Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
Cumulative Noise Impacts. Traffic noise levels along roadways in the project vicinity would not increase by more than 0.5 dBA due to cumulative traffic. This increase would not be significant based on the applicable traffic noise increase threshold of 3 dBA. Therefore, the project's contribution to traffic noise would not be cumulatively considerable or significant.	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.
WATER RESOURCES		
Impact WR-1. The project would increase water demand as a result of new residential and commercial development on the project site. However, the project's water demand would be within the City of San Luis Obispo's projected primary water supply. Therefore, impacts to water supply would be Class III, less than significant.	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.
Cumulative Water Resources Impacts. The project's water demand would not exceed supply when combined with all possible future development within the City. In addition, the project would reduce the overall demand on the San Luis Obispo groundwater basin as a result of reduced on-site agricultural uses and, therefore, would not exacerbate potential cumulative impacts on the local	No mitigation is required.	This impact would be less than significant without mitigation.

Table ES-3
Class III, Less than Significant Environmental Impacts

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Residual Impact
groundwater basin associate with future development within the City. Accordingly, the project's cumulative water supply impact would be less than significant.		