

# Los Osos Community Plan Final Environmental Impact Report

## *Executive Summary*

*State Clearinghouse Number 2015031090*



*Prepared for:*  
**County of San Luis Obispo**  
**Department of Planning and Building**

**June 2020**



**John F. Rickenbach Consulting**

7675 Bella Vista Road

Atascadero, California 93422

---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section summarizes the characteristics of the proposed Los Osos Community Plan, alternatives to the proposed project, as well as environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts associated with the project.

### PROJECT SYNOPSIS

#### Lead Agency/Project Applicant

San Luis Obispo County  
Department of Planning and Building  
County Government Center, Room 300  
San Luis Obispo, California 93408

*Contact:*

Kerry Brown, Project Manager  
Rob Fitzroy, Deputy Director, Policies and Programs

#### Project Description

The proposed project is a regulatory document that guides future development within the Los Osos community. It is similar to a General Plan, and includes a policy framework and accompanying maps that provide guidance for development projects in Los Osos. Thus, this EIR is appropriately framed as a Program EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168. The proposed LOCP will also function as the Local Coastal Plan guiding future development within the Los Osos community. The LOCP is part of the Estero Area Plan and located within the Estero Planning Area. The LOCP establishes a vision for the future of Los Osos and defines the nature of future development in the Los Osos planning area, and provides development standards that in many cases are site-specific. The LOCP is facilitated to a large extent by the recently approved communitywide sewer project, which underwent separate environmental review.

The Plan Area (also referred to in this document as the “project area”, or “proposed project area”) encompasses roughly 3,041 net acres, and includes the anticipated 20-year growth boundary (URL). This area also encompasses the proposed Urban Services Line (USL), as well as some additional surrounding properties in order to provide the context for a comprehensive analysis of potential environmental impacts under the Community Plan.

There are no expansion areas planned outside the URL, although as noted above, there will be minor adjustments to the existing URL, largely for administrative purposes so that certain parcels better coincide with existing property lines and ownership. Although no expansion is anticipated, there are areas within the URL where special planning area standards will apply, which are intended to guide and facilitate future growth in these areas.

The key components of the draft LOCP include:

- *Updating data and information from the approved Estero Area Plan with respect to the Los Osos urban area;*
- *Incorporating strategic growth policies;*
- *Incorporating conditions of approval from the Coastal Development Permit for the Los Osos Wastewater Project, including*
  - ✓ *Development of a sustainable buildout target supported by the safe yield of the groundwater basin; and*
  - ✓ *Integration of conservation strategies from the HCP currently under preparation*
- *Considering Coastal Commission issues identified during the 2004 and 2009 Estero Area Plan update; and*
- *Developing a Public Facilities Financing Plan for new development.*

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

## USE OF THIS EIR FOR FUTURE PROJECTS

In practice, this program EIR will be used as a first tier of environmental review for development projects proposed in accordance with the Los Osos Community Plan. This EIR has been developed specifically to comply with CEQA Section 15183 in order to minimize future environmental review of proposed projects. This section of CEQA provides an exemption from environmental review for projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its location.

Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, future development projects in the Community Plan Area would not require subsequent environmental review if it can be shown that:

- The proposed development is consistent with General Plan and zoning designations;
- The proposed development is consistent with Community Plan policies; and
- The proposed development would not result in environmental effects that:
  - are peculiar to the project or parcel;
  - were not analyzed in this EIR; or
  - would be more severe than what was analyzed in this EIR.

## 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 (Buildout of Existing Adopted Estero Area Plan)
- **Alternative 3:** Reduced Development Based on Water Availability
- **Alternative 4:** Mitigated Project

These are summarized below:

### Alternative 1: No Project (No Development)

This alternative considers the consequences of not approving the proposed LOCP, and not allowing further development in the plan area beyond already exists. In some respects, this represents a continuation of the 1988 growth moratorium, but to an even greater degree, in that no further development of any kind would be considered. Notably, the existing Estero Area Plan would remain in place with current zoning, but new development would be limited by the California Coastal Commission's Special Condition 6 (CDP A-3-SLO-09-055/069) for the recently built wastewater treatment plant.

While this alternative does not meet the project objectives as described above, it is a required scenario for consideration under CEQA, and provides a useful benchmark against which to evaluate the potential impacts of development under the proposed project.

### Alternative 2: No Project (Development under the Existing Estero Area Plan)

This alternative considers the consequences of not approving the proposed LOCP, but assumes that development would resume under the existing Estero Area Plan, based on the land use pattern and regulatory framework included in the current plan, subject to the requirements of the California Coastal Commission's Special Condition 6 (CDP A-3-SLO-09-055/069), associated with the community's new wastewater treatment plant. There would be no growth restrictions based on water availability, such as are included in the proposed LOCP, so there would be no certainty that development would proceed commensurate with the availability of water.

Many of the project objectives described under the Estero Area Plan are the same as those proposed under the LOCP, so in many respects, this alternative is somewhat consistent with the intent of the proposed LOCP.

This alternative envisions a somewhat different land use pattern in portions of the community as compared to the proposed LOCP, particularly along the urban fringes near Los Osos Creek and other sensitive resource areas, where considerably more residential development would be allowed.

In general, the Estero Area Plan envisions more land designated for residential and non-residential development, and correspondingly less land designated for Open Space. Other key differences from the proposed LOCP are described below:

- **Substantially More Overall Residential Area.** There would be 15% more land (419 acres) designated for residential land use categories compared to the LOCP. This would result in more residential development potential compared to proposed land use designations under the LOCP.
- **More Overall Non-Residential Area.** There would be 14% more land (21 acres) in non-residential (commercial and office) land use categories. Overall, this would result more non-residential development potential compared to proposed land use designations under the LOCP.
- **Substantially Less Open Space.** The existing Estero Area Plan includes 418 acres less designated Open Space, or about 25% of the amount proposed under the LOCP. Most of the difference is currently designated for a variety of residential uses throughout the community.

Under the existing Estero Area Plan, the existing Urban Reserve Line (URL) would not be modified to reflect more logical boundaries that would follow existing property lines, as would be the case under the proposed LOCP.

### **Alternative 3: Reduced Development Based on Water Availability**

This alternative assumes a development pattern and policy framework similar to that proposed under the LOCP, except that growth would be restricted by water availability. This scenario is based on restrictions set forth in a key proposed LOCP policy related to the 2015 Los Osos Groundwater Basin Plan.

### **Alternative 4: Mitigated Project**

This alternative assumes the same development pattern, buildout potential and policy framework as under the proposed LOCP, except that it includes the policy-related mitigation measures prescribed to address potentially significant impacts previously identified with respect to implementation of the proposed LOCP.

### **Environmentally Superior Alternative**

The No Project/No Development Alternative (Alternative 1) is considered environmentally superior overall, since no development that could result in significant environmental impacts would occur. However, this alternative would not meet project objectives included in the proposed LOCP. Among the other alternatives, the Reduced Development scenario (Alternative 3) would reduce many impacts related to population and growth compared to the LOCP, but would otherwise be similar. Overall, however, the Mitigated Project is considered the Environmentally Superior Alternative, because it achieves all of the project objectives of the LOCP while directly mitigating all identified impacts associated with implementation of the proposed project.

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 County 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 March 20, 2015 and ended April 20, 2015. Several comment letters from the public, and comment letters from public agencies (i.e., California Coastal Commission; San Luis Obispo Council of Governments; San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District; San Luis Obispo County Parks), were received in response to the NOP. The NOP and associated comment letters are included in **Appendix A** of this EIR.

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

- Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area
- Habitat Conservation Plan
- Water Supply in the context of the Basin Plan
- Recycled Water
- Preservation of Groundwater Basin
- Wastewater Service
- Growth Management
- Coastal Access
- Shoreline Development
- Night Sky Preservation
- Oak Tree Protection
- Estuary Habitat Protection
- Global Climate Change
- Park Planning
- Bike Planning
- Public Safety (adequate lighting)
- Jobs/Housing Balance
- Alternative Transportation Modes
- Smart Growth
- Removing Invasive Species
- Aesthetics
- Roadway Safety

## SUMMARY OF PROJECT-SPECIFIC IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

**Tables ES-1** through **ES-4** summarize the potential project-specific 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.

Class IV, Beneficial. An effect that would reduce existing environmental problems or hazards.

### Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

Significant and Unavoidable (Class I) project-specific impacts were identified, within the following area as shown on **Table ES-1**:

- Cultural Resources (tribal cultural resources and cumulative impacts)

### Significant But Mitigable Impacts

Significant but Mitigable (Class II) project-specific impacts were identified within the following issue areas, as described in **Table ES-2**:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Coastal Hazards
- Cultural Resources
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use
- Noise (project and cumulative impacts)
- Transportation and Circulation (project and cumulative impacts)
- Water Supply

### Less Than Significant Impacts

Less than Significant (Class III) project-specific impacts were identified within the following issue areas, as described in **Table ES-3**:

**Executive Summary**

---

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation and Circulation
- Wastewater
- Cumulative impacts (all issues except Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Noise, and Transportation)

**Beneficial Impacts**

Beneficial (Class IV) project-specific impacts were identified within the following issue area, as described in **Table ES-4**:

- Population and Housing



**Table ES-1.  
 Class I, Significant and Unavoidable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>		
<p><b>Impact CR-3.</b> Development under the Community Plan could directly or indirectly impact Native American Tribal Cultural Resources (Class I impact; significant and unavoidable).</p>	<p><b>CR-3(a) Tribal Consultation Policy.</b> The following language shall be added as a subsection to Community Plan Policies Section 2.5.5, Environmental Resources:</p> <p><i>CR-3: Continue County engagement with Native American tribes to ensure effective consultation under AB 52 and SB18.</i></p> <p><i>A. Identify Tribal Cultural Resources prior to any proposed development and develop a plan for their preservation.</i></p> <p><i>B. Encourage acquisition, preservation, and management of Tribal Cultural Resources. Allow passive recreation where compatible with resource protection confidentiality. After acquisition, change the Land Use categories of these areas to Open Space.</i></p> <p><b>CR-3(b) Community Plan Tribal Cultural Resource Guidelines and Standards.</b> The following Planning Area Standards shall be added to Section 7.3 of LOCP, Communitywide Standards:</p> <p><b>Government-to-Government Consultation.</b> Consistent with AB52 and SB18, the County shall continue its government-to-government consultations with local Tribal representatives to ensure that resources of concern to the Tribes are identified and taken into account in future development planning. Traditional cultural, historical, and spiritual properties of concern to the Tribes shall be protected and preserved to the maximum extent feasible. The County shall ensure the confidentiality of information regarding cultural, historical, and spiritual properties shared by the Tribes, and the County, Tribes, and community should work together to ensure appropriate Tribal access to such properties while still respecting the rights and privileges of private property owners.</p> <p>Plan Requirements and Timing. The Planning and Building Department shall add the</p>	<p>With proposed mitigation, impacts would be reduced, but not to a less than significant level because the outcome of tribal consultations on individual projects is not known and cannot be determined at this time.</p>

**Table ES-1.**  
**Class I, Significant and Unavoidable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	recommended policies, guidelines, and standards LOCP prior to Plan adoption.  <u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the LOCP prior to adopting the plan.	

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>AESTHETICS</b>		
<p><b>Impact AES-3.</b> Buildout under the LOCP would not impair views from currently designated scenic corridors. However, the LOCP does not address the evaluation of Pecho Valley Road, which is identified in the COSE as a potentially scenic corridor. In addition, both Los Osos Valley Road and South Bay Boulevard could potentially qualify as critical viewsheds, which should be considered in the LOCP. This is a significant but mitigable (Class II) impact.</p>	<p><b>AES-3(a). Pecho Valley Road Scenic Corridor Policy.</b> The table under Section 2.4.1 of the LOCP shall be modified to include the following under the heading “Conservation and Open Space Element”:</p> <p align="center"><i>Policy VR 4.1 Designation of Scenic Corridors. Designate scenic corridors based on the recommendations for Scenic Corridor Studies, for the candidate roads and highways listed in Table VR-2. Pecho Valley Road from Rodman Drive through Montana de Oro State Park is identified as a candidate scenic corridor.</i></p> <p>In addition, the following language shall be added as a new policy in Section 2.5.5 of the LOCP:</p> <p align="center"><i>Pecho Valley Road from Rodman Drive to the boundary of Montana de Oro State Park shall be designated as a Critical Viewshed. Development along this corridor shall be subject to the Visual Resource standards included in the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance Section 23.04.210.</i></p> <p><b>Plan Requirements and Timing.</b> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended policy to the LOCP prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><b>Monitoring.</b> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the LOCP prior to adopting the plan.</p> <p><b>AES-3(b). Los Osos Valley Road and South Bay Boulevard Policy Modification.</b> The following language shall be added as a new policy in Section 2.5.5 of the LOCP:</p> <p align="center"><i>South Bay Boulevard, and Los Osos Valley Road east of South Bay Boulevard, shall be designated as a Critical Viewshed. Development along these corridors shall be subject to the Visual Resource standards included in the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance Section 23.04.210.</i></p>	<p>Due to the temporary nature of construction activities and implementation of the above mitigation measures, construction air quality impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended policy to the LOCP prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the LOCP prior to adopting the plan.</p>	
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>		
<p><b>Impact AQ-2.</b> Construction activity within the Community Plan area would generate temporary increases in localized air pollutant emissions. These emissions would occur in proximity to existing and future residents within the community. Construction-related impacts would be Class II, significant but mitigable.</p>	<p><b>AQ-2(a). Community Plan Equipment Emission Reductions.</b> The following language shall be added as a subsection to 7.3 Communitywide Standards of the Community Plan:</p> <p><i>Construction Equipment Emissions Reductions. Construction projects shall implement the following emissions control measures so as to reduce diesel particulate matter in accordance with SLOAPCD requirements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Maintain all construction equipment in proper tune according to manufacturer’s specifications;</i></li> <li>• <i>Fuel all off-road and portable diesel powered equipment with a CARB certified motor vehicle diesel fuel (non-taxed version suitable for use off-road);</i></li> <li>• <i>Use diesel construction equipment meeting the CARB’s Tier 2 certified engines or cleaner off-road heavy-duty diesel engines, and comply with the State Off-Road Regulation;</i></li> <li>• <i>Use on-road heavy-duty trucks that meet the CARB’s 2007 or cleaner certification standard for on-road heavy-duty diesel engines, and comply with the State On-Road Regulation;</i></li> <li>• <i>Construction or trucking companies with fleets that do not have engines in their fleet that meet the engine standard identified in the above two measures (e.g., captive or NO<sub>x</sub> exempt area fleets) may be eligible by providing alternative compliance;</i></li> <li>• <i>All on and off-road diesel equipment shall not idle for more than 5</i></li> </ul>	<p>With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.</p>

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p><i>minutes. Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas and or jobs sites to remind drivers and operators of the 5 minute idling limit;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Diesel idling within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors is not permitted;</i></li> <li>• <i>Staging and queuing areas shall not be located within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors;</i></li> <li>• <i>Electrify equipment when feasible;</i></li> <li>• <i>Substitute gasoline-powered in place of diesel-powered equipment, where feasible; and</i></li> <li>• <i>Use alternatively fueled construction equipment on-site where feasible, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane, or biodiesel.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended language to the Community Plan prior to adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the Community Plan prior to adoption.</p> <p><b>AQ-2(b). Community Plan Fugitive Dust Control Measures.</b> The following language shall be added as a subsection to 7.3 Communitywide Standards of the Community Plan:</p> <p><i>Fugitive Dust Control Measures. Construction projects shall implement the following dust control measures so as to reduce PM<sub>10</sub> emissions in accordance with SLOAPCD requirements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible;</i></li> <li>• <i>Use water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Water shall be applied as soon as possible whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed</i></li> </ul>	

**Table ES-2.**  
**Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p><i>(nonpotable) water should be used whenever possible;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>All dirt-stock-pile areas shall be sprayed daily as needed;</i></li> <li>• <i>Permanent dust control measures shall be identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans and implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities;</i></li> <li>• <i>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 native grass seed and watered until vegetation is established;</i></li> <li>• <i>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;</i></li> <li>• <i>All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc., to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used;</i></li> <li>• <i>Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site;</i></li> <li>• <i>All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil or other loose materials shall 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 CVC Section 23114;</i></li> <li>• <i>Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site; and</i></li> <li>• <i>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.</i></li> <li>• <i>All of these fugitive dust mitigation measures shall be shown on grading and building plans; and</i></li> </ul>	

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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 off-site. 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.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended language to the Community Plan prior to adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the Community Plan prior to adoption.</p>	
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<p><b>Impact BIO-1.</b> Development under the Community Plan could have a substantial adverse effect on candidate, sensitive, or special-status species. This impact would be Class II, <i>Significant but Mitigable</i>.</p>	<p><b>BIO-1(a). LOCP Natural Resource Policies.</b> The following language shall be added as a new policy in the LOCP:</p> <p><i>Special Status Species Habitat Preservation and Enhancement. During the project permitting process, the County, including the entity overseeing LOHCP compliance, shall work with future applicants to encourage preservation or enhancement of habitat for special status species on parcels greater than 20,000 square feet that contain suitable habitat. This would be done in concert with LOHCP requirements to promote habitat preservation and enhancement efforts and regional habitat connectivity by ensuring that preserved or enhanced areas are connected to other preserved or enhanced areas and/or to other suitable habitat occurrences. Preservation of or enhancement of areas that are isolated should be discouraged unless they are determined to provide unique or unusually valuable habitat attributes. Isolated patches of native habitat on smaller lots less than 20,000 square feet are not expected to provide high quality habitat for special status</i></p>	<p>With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.</p>



**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p><i>CEQA species that is sustainable. Impacts to small patches of native habitat that could support low numbers of CEQA special status species such as CRPR plants or species of concern wildlife will be further mitigated through implementation of the LOHCP and payment of the mitigation fee. Habitat set aside outside urban areas will promote sustainable habitat for the range of special status species known to occur in the Plan area.</i></p> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall include recommended policy to the LOCP prior to Plan adoption that states habitat preservation and enhancement opportunities will be evaluated during the initial phases of the building permit review process for lots greater than 20,000 square feet. Lots less than 20,000 square feet shall be adequately mitigated by payment of the mitigation fee associated with LOHCP implementation and no further biology study will be required.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the LOCP prior to adopting the plan. If habitat preservation and enhancement is incorporated as a project permit requirement, the Planning and Building Department shall ensure that the requirement is properly implemented during the normal building inspection and final review process. If subsequent monitoring of restoration areas is required, the County may require Applicants to retain an approved biologist to monitor and document restoration activities until the success criteria are met.</p> <p><b>BIO-1(b). LOCP Natural Resources Implementing Programs.</b> Because of the programmatic structure of the LOCP, and specific impacts for a given private or public project cannot be determined at this time. It is possible that both private and public projects could potentially impact federal and/or state listed species. As such, the following language shall be added as a new program in the LOCP:</p> <p><i>Los Osos Habitat Conservation Plan Compliance. To address the specific requirements for special status species and habitat identification, protection, preservation, enhancement, and mitigation that would apply to a given private or public project subject to the LOHCP, the County shall incorporate the final LOHCP into the LOCP, to ensure those requirements are fully addressed during development under the LOCP.</i></p> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The County shall incorporate the LOHCP into the LOCP</p>	

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p>immediately after the LOHCP is finalized and approved.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall ensure that all applicable LOHCP requirements are properly implemented during the normal building inspection and final review process for all development projects within the LOCP.</p> <p><b>BIO-1(c). Biological Resources Assessment, and Focused or Protocol-level Survey Requirements on Parcels Greater Than 20,000 Square Feet.</b> The following language shall be added as a new policy in the LOCP:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>For all projects on undeveloped lots greater than 20,000 square feet in size that require issuance of a County land use development permit, project applicants shall retain a County-approved biologist to conduct a project-specific biological resources assessment (BRA) to document the existing biological resources within the project footprint on which development is proposed, as well as an appropriate buffer, to determine the potential impacts to those resources as part of the environmental review process. The BRA shall conform to the requirements presented in the County guidance document, Guidelines for Biological Resources Assessments - Guidelines for Biological Consultants.</i></p> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended policy to the LOCP prior to Plan adoption, and ensure that project-specific biological resources are evaluated during the initial phases of the building permit review process.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the LOCP prior to plan adoption. As applicable, Planning and Building shall ensure that the policy requirements are properly implemented during the normal building inspection and final review process.</p> <p><b>BIO-1(d) Special Status Plant Species Avoidance, Minimization, and Mitigation.</b> The following language shall be added as a new policy in the LOCP:</p>	

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p><i>If a BRA pursuant to Mitigation Measure BIO-1(c) conducted on undeveloped lots greater than 20,000 square feet in size identifies potentially suitable habitat for any federal listed, state listed or California Rare Plant Rank 1B species plant species, focused floristic surveys that are seasonally timed to coincide with the blooming period of all species identified as potentially present in the project-specific BRA shall be conducted. Surveys shall follow current USFWS and CDFW protocols. If special status plants are identified on a site, the project shall be re-designed to avoid impacting these plant species, to the maximum extent feasible. Rare plant occurrences that are not within the immediate disturbance footprint, but are located within 50 feet of proposed disturbance limits shall be protected such as having bright orange protective fencing installed at least 30 feet beyond their extent, or other appropriate distance as determined by a County-approved biologist, to protect them from direct and indirect impacts.</i></p> <p><i>If special status plant species cannot be completely avoided, and will be impacted by development, all impacts shall be mitigated at the current County-required ratio for the species (number of acres of habitat/individuals restored to number of acres of habitat/individuals impacted). A habitat restoration plan (also referred to as a mitigation and monitoring plan) shall be prepared and submitted to the County, and to other state or federal agencies as appropriate. The restoration/mitigation plan shall include, at a minimum, the following components:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>• Description of the responsible party(-ies), project site and impact area (by habitat type);</i></li> <li><i>• Goal(s) of the mitigation or restoration project including the types and area 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;</i></li> <li><i>• Description of the proposed mitigation/restoration site (e.g., location, size, ownership status, existing functions and values, etc.);</i></li> <li><i>• Implementation plan for the mitigation/restoration site including rationale for expected success, responsible parties, schedule, site preparation and planting plan;</i></li> <li><i>• Maintenance activities during plan implementation and monitoring, including but not limited to weed abatement and adaptive management;</i></li> </ul>	

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Monitoring plan for the mitigation/restoration site including no less than quarterly monitoring visits for the first year, and preparation of annual monitoring reports;</i></li> <li>• <i>Success criteria based on goals and measurable objectives, target functions and values, target areas to be established, restored, enhanced, and/or preserved; and</i></li> <li>• <i>An adaptive management program and contingency measures to address shortcomings and the overall effort in meeting success criteria.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended policy to the LOCP prior to Plan adoption. In addition, applicants with future projects on parcels greater than 20,000 square feet impacting special status plants or habitats shall submit the mitigation/restoration plan to Planning and Building Department for review and approval prior to issuance of grading permits.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the LOCP prior to plan adoption. As applicable, Planning and Building shall ensure that the policy requirements are properly implemented during the normal building inspection and final review process.</p> <p><b>BIO-1(e). Special Status Wildlife Species Habitat Assessment, Surveys, Avoidance and Minimization.</b> The following language shall be added as a new policy in the LOCP:</p> <p><i>If a BRA pursuant to Mitigation Measure BIO-1(c) identifies potentially suitable habitat for a special status wildlife species on a parcel larger than 20,000 square feet, appropriate levels of surveys to determine the presence or absence of the species shall be conducted. For federal listed species such as the Morro shoulderband snail, protocol level surveys or the appropriate compliance requirements of the future LOHCP shall be conducted.</i></p> <p><i>Specific habitat assessments and protocol surveys have been established for several special status species (i.e., California red-legged frog and Morro shoulderband snail) found within the Plan Area. If the results of the BRA determine that suitable habitat may be present for any such species, protocol habitat assessments or surveys shall be completed in accordance with applicable CDFW, USFWS, and County protocols prior to issuance of any construction permits.</i></p>	

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p><i>If consultation with the CDFW and/or USFWS determines that protocol habitat assessments or surveys are not required, such consultation shall be documented in writing by the agency prior to issuance of any construction permits. The project applicant shall be responsible for retaining a biological consultant that is qualified to conduct any required protocol habitat assessments or surveys.</i></p> <p><i>Other special status wildlife that are not listed under CESA or FESA or covered in the LOHCP, shall have current mitigation requirements included in the developer's statement. For the Monarch butterfly, for instance, and projects located in eucalyptus woodland (including tree removal), a County-approved biologist shall conduct a habitat assessment to determine if suitable habitat for this species is present. If suitable habitat is present, then the biologist shall conduct seasonally-timed surveys to determine if Monarch butterflies currently use the site for overwintering activities. If an overwintering site is located, the County shall work with the applicant to protect the site and provide a sufficient buffer to avoid impacts to the species.</i></p> <p><i>As part of a project's conditions of approval, the County-approved biologist shall conduct pre-construction clearance survey(s) of the site to avoid impacts to special status wildlife. The biologist shall be present during all initial ground disturbing and vegetation clearing activities. Ground disturbance shall be limited to the minimum necessary to complete the project, and the limits of disturbance shall be flagged for identification. Areas of special biological concern within or adjacent to the limits of disturbance shall have highly visible orange construction fencing installed between said area and the limits of disturbance. Once initial ground disturbing and vegetation clearing activities have been completed, the biologist shall conduct additional surveys as appropriate during project construction activities, based on species habits, weather conditions, and LOHCP or protocol survey requirements.</i></p> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended policy to the LOCP prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the LOCP prior to plan adoption. As applicable, Planning and Building shall ensure that the proposed development avoids impacts to special status species and habitats to the greatest</p>	

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p>extent feasible and that the policy requirements are properly implemented during the normal building inspection and final review process.</p> <p><b>BIO-1(f). Preconstruction Surveys for Nesting Birds.</b> The following language shall be added as a new policy in the LOCP:</p> <p><i>For construction activities occurring during the nesting season (generally February 1 to September 15), where tree, grassland or shrub removal or disturbance would be considered, focused surveys for nesting birds covered by the California Fish and Game Code and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act shall be conducted by a County-approved biologist no more than 14 days prior to vegetation removal. Vegetation is defined as trees, shrubs, or grasslands. Dependent on the size of the parcel and proposed development footprint, the surveys shall include the entire disturbance footprint plus observation of any large trees within a 300-foot buffer around the lot with binoculars. 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 up to 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 County-approved biologist shall confirm that breeding/nesting is completed and young have fledged the nest prior to removal of the buffer. The results of the pre-construction survey shall be submitted to the County and construction shall not commence without authorization from the County.</i></p> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended policy to the LOCP prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the LOCP prior to plan adoption. As applicable, the Planning and Building Department shall ensure that the policy is properly implemented during the normal building inspection and final review process.</p>	

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p><b>Impact BIO-2.</b> Development under the Community Plan could have a substantial adverse effect on sensitive habitats, including riparian areas and wetlands not subject to Clean Water Act Section 404 jurisdiction. This is a Class II, <i>Significant but Mitigable</i>, impact.</p>	<p>The following mitigation measures shall be included in the LOCP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>BIO-1(a).</b> Special Status Species Habitat Preservation and Enhancement (see Impact BIO-1)</li> <li>• <b>BIO-1(b).</b> Los Osos Community Habitat Conservation Plan Compliance (see Impact BIO-1)</li> </ul> <p>In addition, mitigation measures identified below would also further reduce impacts to special status vegetation communities including those meeting the definition as ESHA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>BIO-3(a).</b> Jurisdictional Waters Identification, Avoidance, Permitting, and Mitigation (see Impact BIO-3)</li> <li>• <b>BIO-3(b).</b> Construction Best Management Practices (see Impact BIO-3)</li> <li>• <b>BIO-4(a).</b> Lighting Design (See Impact BIO-4)</li> </ul>	<p>With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<p><b>Impact BIO-3.</b> Development under the Community Plan 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, <i>significant but mitigable</i>.</p>	<p><b>BIO-3(a). Jurisdictional Waters Identification, Avoidance, Permitting, and Mitigation.</b> The following language shall be added as a new policy in the LOCP:</p> <p><i>If future development in the Plan Area is proposed within or adjacent to wetlands, marshes, drainages, riparian habitats, Los Osos Creek, unnamed tributary drainages, the Morro Bay estuary, or other areas that may fall under the jurisdiction of the Corps, CDFW, RWQCB, and California Coastal Commission, a County-approved biologist shall complete a jurisdictional delineation using the most current state and federal methodologies. The jurisdictional delineation shall determine the extent of wetlands or non-wetland waters subject to each of these agencies and shall be conducted in accordance with the requirements set forth by each agency. The result shall be a preliminary jurisdictional delineation report that shall be submitted to the County, Corps, RWQCB, CDFW, and CCC as appropriate, for review and approval. If jurisdictional areas are identified on a site, the project shall be designed to avoid impacting those areas. All unavoidable impacts to Corps jurisdictional waters and wetlands shall be mitigated at the ratio (area restored / created / enhanced to area lost), approved in the final Section 404 permit for the project. Additional mitigation at different ratios may be required to meet CDFW, RWQCB, or California Coastal Commission regulations. Mitigation shall occur on-site or as close to the impacted habitat as possible. A mitigation and</i></p>	<p>With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.</p>



**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p align="center"><i>monitoring plan consistent with current state and federal requirements shall be developed by a County-approved biologist.</i></p> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended policy to the LOCP prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the LOCP prior to plan adoption. As applicable, the Planning and Building Department shall ensure that the policy is properly implemented during the normal building inspection and final review process.</p> <p><b>BIO-3(b). Construction Best Management Practices.</b> The following language shall be added as a new policy in the LOCP:</p> <p align="center"><i>All development in the Plan Area proposed within or adjacent to wetlands, marshes, drainages, riparian habitats, the Morro Bay estuary, Los Osos Creek and unnamed tributaries, or other jurisdictional areas must implement standard practices and measures to control and prevent erosion, sedimentation, or contamination of these areas. Best management practices shall follow current County requirements, and must include the following measures:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Access routes, staging, and construction areas shall be limited to the minimum area necessary to achieve the project goal and minimize impacts to other waters including locating access routes and construction areas outside of jurisdictional areas to the maximum extent feasible.</i></li> <li>• <i>To control sedimentation during and after project implementation, appropriate erosion control materials shall be deployed to minimize adverse effects on jurisdictional areas in the vicinity of the project.</i></li> <li>• <i>Project activities within the jurisdictional areas should occur during the dry season (typically between June 1 and November 1) in any given year to the extent practicable, or as otherwise directed by the regulatory agencies.</i></li> <li>• <i>During construction, no litter or construction debris shall be placed within jurisdictional areas. All such debris and waste shall be picked up daily and properly disposed of at an appropriate site.</i></li> </ul>	

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>All project-generated debris, building materials, and rubbish shall be removed from jurisdictional areas and from areas where such materials could be washed into them.</i></li> <li>• <i>Raw cement, concrete or washings thereof, asphalt, paint or other coating material, oil or other petroleum products, or any other substances which could be hazardous to aquatic species resulting from project-related activities, shall be prevented from contaminating the soil and/or entering jurisdictional areas.</i></li> <li>• <i>All refueling, maintenance, and staging of equipment and vehicles shall occur at least 50 feet from bodies of water where possible, 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). Reduced distances shall be approved by the County. 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.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended policy to the LOCP prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the LOCP prior to plan adoption. As applicable, the Planning and Building Department shall ensure that the policy is properly implemented during the normal building inspection and final review process.</p>	
<p><b>Impact BIO-4.</b> Development under the Community Plan would not interfere substantially with the movement of resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites. Still, indirect impacts could potentially</p>	<p><b>BIO-4(a). Lighting Design.</b> The following Policy shall be added to the LOCP.</p> <p><i>Outdoor lighting installed as part of any project shall be designed to be minimally disruptive to wildlife. This may be accomplished through the use of hoods to direct light away from natural habitat areas within or adjacent to the Plan Area, using low intensity lighting and as few lights as possible to achieve the goals of a project.</i></p> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the</p>	<p>With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.</p>

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>occur with proposed buildout of the LOCP area. Impacts would be Class II, <i>significant but mitigable</i>.</p>	<p>recommended policy to the LOCP prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the LOCP prior to adopting the plan. As applicable, the Planning and Building Department shall ensure that the policy is properly implemented during the normal building inspection and final review process.</p>	
<b>COASTAL HAZARDS</b>		
<p><b>Impact CH-1.</b> Development under the Los Osos Community Plan would potentially conflict with the Coastal Act and applicable plans, policies, regulations and guidance approved by the California Coastal Commission for the purpose of protecting coastal resources and reducing the impacts of sea level rise (i.e. coastal hazards). Therefore, projected impacts of coastal hazards represent a Class II significant but mitigable impact.</p>	<p><b>CH-1(a). Additional Plan Framework Text.</b> The following text shall be incorporated within the updated LOCP to address Coastal Act requirements and ensure that impacts would be reduced to the extent possible (proposed new language is <i>italicized</i>):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add the following sentence at the end of the second paragraph of section 2.2.3 (Environmental Resources, p. 2-4) that addresses Coastal Act sections 30230 and 30231 requirement to maintain, enhance and where feasible restore marine, wetland and estuary resources: <i>“Planning and development decisions, and new programs, should be implemented to assure the protection and maintenance of the Morro Bay estuary as sea level rises.”</i></li> <li>2. Add Coastal Plan Hazards 1-7, 11 and 12; and ESH Policies 7-10, 13 and 16 to policy summaries in section 2.4.</li> <li>3. On page 2-16, add new subsection (B) to PS-3 to require consideration of future vulnerability in public services planning and development: <i>“PS-3(B): Address future vulnerability to sea level rise in planning and development of new public services and adaptive redevelopment of existing services.”</i></li> <li>4. Amend LU-1, to maintain hard <i>inland</i> edge and a soft <i>bayside</i> edge to protect future wetland and estuary function in light of sea level rise, and add a requirement to monitor sea level rise. Add a new program (LU-1.2 and reiterate as EN 1.7), to provide for no net loss of wetland acreage or biological and recreational function in Morro Bay Estuary in light of projected sea level rise:</li> </ol> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">LU-1. Maintain a hard inland urban edge around the community of Los Osos, surrounded by a well-managed community greenbelt, <i>and a soft bayside edge to protect future wetland and estuary function in light of sea level rise.</i></p>	<p>With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.</p>

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p><i>A. Prevent the net loss of wetland acreage or biological and recreational function of Morro Bay Estuary in Los Osos due to sea level rise by providing for natural inland migration of wetlands and protection and restoration of wetlands.</i></p> <p><i>B. Monitor the trends in sea level rise at the Port San Luis tide gauge (NOAA ID #9412110, <a href="https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/sltrends_station.shtml?stnid=9412110">https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/sltrends/sltrends_station.shtml?stnid=9412110</a> )</i></p> <p>Program LU-1.1: Los Osos Greenbelt. ....</p> <p><i>Program LU-1.2: Morro Bay Estuary Protection. The County should support the protection of wetland resources, which may become increasingly vulnerable to hard shoreline coastal hazard protection measures in light of sea level rise, by developing and implementing a strategy for achieving no net loss of wetland acreage or biological and recreational function along the Los Osos shoreline. The County should support efforts of public agencies, conservation organizations, and others to acquire easements and properties in fee along the shoreline, as well as the use of redevelopment/planned retreat strategies, and adaptive public access and recreation management plans to achieve wetland protection and hazard mitigation goals.</i></p> <p>5. Add the Morro Bay Estuary to LU-2 as resource protection reason for concentrating and clustering development as follows:</p> <p><i>LU-2. Concentrate or cluster development to protect contiguous environmentally sensitive areas and the Morro Bay Estuary, including the habitat of rare, endangered and other sensitive species, and other biologically important communities.</i></p> <p>6. Add new program/language to assess and plan for vulnerability of public access</p>	

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p>resources in light of sea level rise (add new program 1.5 to follow policy CIR-1):</p> <p><i>Program CIR-1.5. Sea Level Rise and Public Access. The County should protect public access resources by assessing their vulnerability to sea level rise and planning for their protection, including through planned retreat as necessary.</i></p> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended policies and language to the LOCP prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above changes are included in the LOCP prior to adopting the plan.</p> <p><b>CH-1(b). New Text and Combining Designations to address Sea Level Rise.</b> The following changes to Chapter 4 of the updated LOCP should be made to address Coastal Act requirements and ensure that impacts would be reduced to the extent possible:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Add mapped projected sea level rise zone to 4.5.3 FH designation:</li> </ol> <p>4.5.3 Flood Hazard (FH)</p> <p>Los Osos Creek. The flood-prone natural drainage course should be maintained in its natural state to protect native vegetation and wildlife habitats.</p> <p><i>Sea Level Rise Flooding and Inundation Zone. This zone may be subject to increased flooding and inundation due to future sea level rise. New development and redevelopment within this zone should carefully assess and minimize potential hazards for the life of the development through siting, design consistent with CLZUO 23.07.060-066, and where necessary or appropriate, relocation of development. Intensification of development should be avoided.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Add text to 4.5.6(A) discussion of Morro Bay Estuary and Shoreline to recognize</li> </ol>	

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p>future vulnerability of wetland resources to rising sea levels.:</p> <p>4.5.6. Sensitive Resource Area (SRA)</p> <p>The following SRAs ...</p> <p>Morro Bay Estuary and Shoreline</p> <p>The purpose of the SRA standards for the following SRAs is to protect wetlands, riparian, and other sensitive habitat, and to provide required public access. <i>This SRA protection is even more important given projected sea level rise and the associated potential vulnerability of these resources.</i> The estuary and shoreline support...</p> <p>3. Add SLR flooding and inundation projection map to Chapter 4.</p> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended policies, language and maps to the LOCP prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above changes are included in the LOCP prior to adopting the plan.</p> <p><b>CH-1(c). New Text to Address Circulation Vulnerability.</b> Add New Section 5.4 to Chapter 5 and new Program CIR-5 to Chapter 2 to address vulnerability of circulation network to sea level rise:</p> <p><i>5.4 Sea Level Rise and Circulation.</i></p> <p><i>The circulation system of Los Osos, including roads, bicycle facilities, and pedestrian and public accessways may be increasingly vulnerable as sea level rises. The County should pursue the assessment of the vulnerability of the circulation system to support the development of new strategies and public works investments to minimize impacts to circulation due to projected sea level rise (see Program CIR-5).</i></p>	

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p><i>Program CIR-5. Assess the vulnerability of the Los Osos circulation system to sea level rise, including potential impacts to public access resources under CIR-1.5, to assure the maintenance of adequate community circulation and protection of public access to and along the shoreline through future planning and development decisions. Update the Community Plan to provide for continued public access, taking into account projected sea level rise for 100 years. Coordinate with transportation agencies to plan for and phase implementation of new road projects.</i></p> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended policies and language to the LOCP prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above changes are included in the LOCP prior to adopting the plan.</p> <p><b>CH-1(d). Sea Level Rise Standards.</b> Amend LOCP Planning Area Standards to address future sea level rise.</p> <p>1. Amend Communitywide Standard 7.3 E(1) as follows:</p> <p>Applicability. In the following locations or circumstances, development shall be clustered, <del>or</del> concentrated <i>or setback</i> as described below ...</p> <p>2. Add language to Communitywide Standard 7.3E(2)(a) requiring an evaluation of projected sea level rise and impacts on a site for areas located within the Sea Level Rise Flooding and Inundation Zone FH overlay (Ch-1(b), based on the best available science, for the life of a project:</p> <p>a. Application Content. In addition to the application requirements of the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance or other sections of this Chapter, <i>the applicant shall submit an evaluation of projected sea level rise and impacts on a site for areas located within the Sea Level Rise Flooding and Inundation Zone FH overlay, based on the best available science, for the life of a project. In addition, the</i></p>	



**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p>applicant shall submit, ...</p> <p>3. Add language to Communitywide Standard 7.3E(2)(c) requiring development to be setback from wetland vegetation as required by CZLUO or other sections of the LCP, plus an additional distance to provide for inland migration of wetland resources based on a professional assessment of projected sea level rise:</p> <p>c. Setbacks. In order to comply with Subsection 5.b above, structures may need to be set back a distance greater than the applicable minimum setbacks required by the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance or other sections of this Chapter. <i>In addition, development should meet all required wetland vegetation setbacks, plus an additional distance to provide for inland migration of wetland resources based on a professional assessment of projected sea level rise, using best available science.</i></p> <p>4. Add language to Standard 7.3E(2) to prohibit creation of new parcels that could not be developed consistent with required wetland setbacks taking into account projected sea level rise for 100 years:</p> <p><b><i>Extent and Intensity of Development.</i></b> <i>If required by the Review Authority, the number of dwelling units, intensity of development and site coverage shall be reduced to protection of identified sensitive features on or adjacent to the site. Creation of new lots that would be undevelopable with applicable wetland setbacks, taking into account 100 years of projected sea level rise, are prohibited unless the purpose is to put them into open space.</i></p> <p>5. Add language to Standard 7.3E(2) required finding that development shall not diminish the long-term sustainability of the biological resources, including taking into account projected sea level rise and related wetland retreat for the life of the project:</p> <p><b><i>Required Finding.</i></b> <i>The land division or discretionary land use permit shall not be approved unless the Review Authority first finds, in addition to other required findings, that development shall not significantly disrupt or cause significant adverse environmental impacts to the preceding sensitive features, and shall not diminish</i></p>	

**Table ES-2.**  
**Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p><i>the long - term sustainability of the biological resources, including taking into account projected sea level rise and related wetland retreat for the life of the project.</i></p> <p>6. Add additional criteria to Communitywide Standard 7.3F to require that the maintenance, design and provision of public accessways consider projected sea level rise for at least 50 years:</p> <p><b>F. Coastal Access and Recreation.</b> Opportunities for public access to and along the coast shall be maximized as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. New development shall be required to provide public access and improvements to and along the coast, and shall not interfere with the public’s right of access to the sea where acquired through use or legislative authorization.</li> <li>2. Public access and improvements to and along the coast shall be consistent with the Circulation Element, Chapter 5 (and corresponding policies in Chapter 2) of this plan, and the coastal access policies in Chapter 2, Section 2.5.4 of this plan.</li> <li>3. Public access shall be consistent with protection of sensitive habitat and agriculture.</li> <li>4. Any existing free public access to recreational areas shall be maintained.</li> <li>5. New publicly-developed coastal access and recreation shall include requirements for resource monitoring and management, and provision of interpretive facilities at points of attraction, consistent with Chapter 23.04 of the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance.</li> <li>6. <i>The design, provision and maintenance of public accessways shall take into account projected sea level rise for at least 50 years.</i></li> <li>7. <i>Existing accessways vulnerable to coastal hazards shall be maintained through planned retreat or other appropriate measures.</i></li> </ol> <p>7. Amend Standard 7.3(H) as follows:</p> <p><b>H. Shoreline Development.</b> New development or expansion of existing uses proposed to be located on or adjacent to a <u>shoreline</u>, beach or coastal bluff are subject to the following standards:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Application Content. In addition to the application requirements of the Coastal</li> </ol>	

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p>Zone Land Use Ordinance and other Estero Urban Area Plan Standards, applications for new development or expansion of existing uses proposed to be located on or adjacent to a <u>shoreline</u>, beach or coastal bluff, or in the Sea Level Rise Flooding and Inundation Zone FH as applicable, shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. An analysis of beach erosion, wave run-up, inundation and flood hazards prepared by a licensed civil engineer with expertise in coastal engineering and a slope stability analysis, prepared by a licensed Certified Engineering Geologist and/or Geotechnical Engineer or Registered Civil Engineer with expertise in soils, in accordance with the procedures detailed by Appendix G of the Estero Area Plan. <i>In addition, the report shall assess the impact of projected sea level rise on these hazards, for the life of the project, based on the best available science.</i> The report shall include an alternatives analysis to avoid or minimize impacts to public access.</li> <li>b. On lots with a legally established shoreline protective device, the analysis shall describe the condition of the existing seawall; identify any impacts it may be having on public access and recreation, scenic views, sand supplies, and other coastal resources; and evaluate opportunities to modify or replace the existing armoring device in a manner that would eliminate or reduce these impacts. The analysis shall also evaluate whether the development, as proposed or modified, could be safely established on the property for a one hundred year period without a shoreline protective device, <i>taking into account projected sea level rise.</i></li> <li>d. Surveyed location of all property lines and the mean high tide line, <i>and projected MHT based on projected sea level rise for the life of the project</i>, by a licensed surveyor <i>familiar with coastal processes and tidal boundaries</i> along with written evidence of full consent of any underlying land owner, including, but not limited to the County, State Parks, and State Lands. If application materials indicate that development may impact or encroach on tidelands or public trust lands, the County shall consult with Coastal</li> </ul>	

**Table ES-2.**  
**Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p>Commission staff regarding the potential need for a Coastal Development Permit from the Coastal Commission. <i>Upon encroachment, developments shall be required to be removed from public tidelands unless otherwise allowed to remain by an amendment to the original coastal permit and authorization by the California State Lands Commission.</i></p> <p>2. <b>Bluff Setbacks.</b> The bluff setback is to be determined by the engineering geology analysis required in Subsection I.1.a. above and shall be adequate to withstand bluff erosion and wave action for a period of 100 years, <i>taking into account projected sea level rise.</i> In no case shall bluff setbacks be less than 25 feet. Alteration or additions to existing development that is nonconforming with respect to bluff setbacks that equals or exceeds 50 percent of the size of the existing structure, on a cumulative basis beginning July 10, 2008, shall not be authorized unless the entire structure is brought into conformance with this setback requirement and all other policies and standards of the LCP. On parcels with legally established shoreline protective devices, the setback distance may account for the additional stability provided by the permitted seawall, based on its existing design, condition, and routine repair and maintenance that maintain the seawall's approved design life. Expansion and/or other alteration to the seawall shall not be factored into setback calculations.</p> <p>3. <b>Seawall Prohibition.</b> Shoreline and bluff protection structures shall not be permitted to protect new development. All permits for development on blufftop or shoreline lots that do not have a legally established shoreline protection structure shall be conditioned to require that prior to issuance of any grading or construction permits, the property owner record a deed restriction against the property that ensures that no shoreline protection structure shall be proposed or constructed to protect the development, and which expressly waives any future right to construct such devices that may exist pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 30235 and the San Luis Obispo County certified LCP. <i>The restriction shall also provide for the removal of the development if it is deemed uninhabitable by a public official due to coastal hazard risks, or if the development is otherwise in imminent danger. These restrictions shall be specifically disclosed in all real estate transactions.</i></p>	

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p>4. <b>Liability.</b> As a condition of approval of development on a beach or shoreline which is subject to wave action, erosion, flooding, landslides, or other hazards associated with development on a <i>shoreline</i>, beach or bluff, <i>taking into account projected sea level rise</i>, the property owner shall be required to execute and record a deed restriction which acknowledges and assumes these risks and waives any future claims of damage or liability against the permitting agency and agrees to indemnify the permitting agency against any liability, claims, damages or expenses arising from any injury or damage due to such hazards.</p> <p><b>CH-1(e). Saltwater Intrusion Policies.</b> Include policies that are outlined in the 2015 Updated Basin Plan for The Los Osos Groundwater Basin that establish a long-term strategy for addressing saltwater intrusion into aquifers, including limiting development or groundwater extraction that would use sensitive aquifers, as applicable.</p> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall evaluate and include Basin Plan policies as appropriate to the LOCP prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above changes are included in the LOCP prior to adopting the plan.</p>	
<p><b>Impact CH-2.</b> Development under the Los Osos Community Plan would create a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment, including an adverse change in exposure of people by a proposed project to a substantial, existing or reasonably foreseeable, natural</p>	<p><b>CH-2(a). Parcels 4, 5 and 9 Development Limitations.</b> Development of Community Parcels #4, 5 and 9 should follow appropriate setback and building standards to avoid future coastal hazards for the life of the proposed development without the use of shoreline protection devices.</p> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> Prior to occupancy clearance, future applicants for the development of parcels 5 and 9, in consultation with the Planning and Building Department, shall plan and design recreation and public facilities to be coastal-dependent, per the definition contained in the CCA. This can take the form of development restrictions placed</p>	<p>With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.</p>

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
hazard or adverse physical environmental condition. Therefore, coastal hazard locations represent a Class II impact, as the impact is significant but mitigable.	on these two parcels via the implementing regulations.	
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Impact CR-1.</b> Development under the Community Plan could directly or indirectly impact significant prehistoric or historic archaeological sites (Class II impact; less than significant with mitigation).	<p><b>CR-1(a). Cultural Resource Management Policy.</b> The following language shall be added as a subsection to Community Plan Policies Section 2.5.5, Environmental Resources:</p> <p><i>CR-1: Effectively manage significant archaeological and historical resources in and around the community of Los Osos.</i></p> <p><i>A. Identify the locations of sensitive archaeological and historical sites prior to any proposed development, and preserve them in place and avoid damaging impacts whenever feasible.</i></p> <p><i>B. Evaluate site significance and mitigate unavoidable impacts on archaeological sites using current professional standards and best management practices, in consultation with Native American tribal representatives and other affected communities of interest.</i></p> <p><i>C. Encourage acquisition, preservation, and management of sensitive archaeological and historical sites. Allow passive recreation where compatible with resource protection. After acquisition, change the Land Use categories of these areas to Open Space.</i></p> <p><b>CR-1(b). Archaeologically Sensitive Area Combining Designation.</b> The County shall refine its current Archaeologically Sensitive (AS) Area combining designation so it shall apply only to the areas of high and moderate sensitivity within the Plan area, per <b>Figure 4.5-4</b>. Individual project applicants shall consult with the County to determine whether their projects fall within the AS zone. If so, the County shall require a field inspection by a</p>	With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p>Registered Professional Archaeologist to determine the locations of archaeological resources vis-à-vis the proposed development.</p> <p><b>CR-1(c). Community Plan Archaeological Resource Guidelines and Standards.</b> The following Planning Area Standards shall be added to Section 7.3 of LOCP, Communitywide Standards:</p> <p><i><b>Archaeological and Historical Resource Surveys.</b> For any proposed development in areas of high and moderate archaeological sensitivity within the Plan area, per <b>Figure 4.5-4</b>, the County shall require a field inspection by a Registered Professional Archaeologist to determine the locations of archaeological resources vis-à-vis the proposed development. If archaeological resources are present, the County shall assist the applicant in designing a project that allows the archaeological resource to be preserved in place if feasible. Project applicants shall demonstrate that methods proposed for construction with the AS Area can successfully avoid impacts to known or suspected archaeological resources.</i></p> <p><i>For development outside of the AS area, or if archaeological resources are not identified during a survey, the County may require archaeological surveys or monitoring during construction to ensure that unidentified resources are not inadvertently damaged by development. If archaeological or historical sites are discovered outside of the AS area, the standards and guidelines described below shall apply.</i></p> <p><i><b>Siting of Public Amenities and New Development.</b> New residential and commercial development shall be sited to avoid archaeological and historical resources to the greatest extent feasible. Avoidance means that ground disturbance for new development does not overlap the boundaries of identified archaeological and historical sites. In circumstances where complete avoidance is not feasible, applicants shall demonstrate that construction methods will not create direct or indirect impacts on archaeological remains.</i></p>	

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p><i>Recreational sites such as public trails and trail corridors, parks, and related developments also shall be sited and designed to avoid or minimize impacts to archaeological or historical resources. Trails should follow existing road and trail alignments and use existing bridges to the greatest extent feasible. Where this is not possible, prior to final trail alignment, proposed trail routes shall be surveyed for archaeological and historical sites and re-routed where necessary to avoid sensitive resources. Trailhead parking shall be sited and designed to avoid archaeological and historical sites.</i></p> <p><i>Careful selection and planning of coastal access points must be a priority since they are all within the zone of highest archaeological sensitivity. These shall be sited and designed to avoid or minimize impacts to archaeological or historical resources to the greatest extent feasible.</i></p> <p><b>Previously Evaluated Resources.</b> <i>As discussed above, a small number of archaeological sites in the Plan area have been evaluated formally for significance, and others may be evaluated in the future pursuant to these Guidelines and Standards. If archaeological and historical surveys identify previously evaluated sites within a proposed development area, Project applicants shall consult with the County and the Tribes to identify methods to avoid impacts to the resource. Applicants shall demonstrate that methods proposed for construction can successfully avoid impacts. If complete avoidance is not feasible, a Registered Professional Archaeologist shall assess the integrity of remains within the specific project area and the nature of proposed development to determine whether significant impacts will occur as a result of development. Such assessment may require subsurface archaeological testing, which shall be carried out according to the standards and procedures in the following section.</i></p> <p><b>Archaeological Testing and Impact Mitigation.</b> <i>If previously unevaluated archaeological remains are identified and cannot be avoided through project redesign or otherwise preserved in place, or if previously evaluated sites must be sampled to assess integrity and potential impacts per the section above, the proponent shall fund a</i></p>	



**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p><i>Phase 2 study to determine the significance of the resource and the extent of the impacts prior to issuance of any permit for development. The following requirements shall apply:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Phase 2 testing shall include mapping of surface artifacts, collection of functionally or temporally diagnostic tools and debris, and excavation of samples from within the site.</i></li> <li>• <i>Cultural materials collected from the site shall be processed and analyzed in the laboratory according to standard archaeological procedures.</i></li> <li>• <i>The age of the remains shall be determined using radiocarbon dating and other appropriate procedures; lithic artifacts, faunal remains, and other cultural materials shall be identified and analyzed according to current professional standards; any prior archaeological collections from the site shall be included in the comparative analysis.</i></li> <li>• <i>The significance of the site and the extent of impacts shall be evaluated according to the criteria of the CRHR, and the cultural resource record shall be updated to reflect the results of the investigation; such results also shall be presented in a technical report following the standards of the California Office of Historic Preservation publication Archaeological Resource Management Reports: Recommended Content and Format (<a href="http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1054/files/armr.pdf">http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1054/files/armr.pdf</a>).</i></li> <li>• <i>Upon completion of the work, all artifacts, other cultural remains, records, photographs, and other documentation shall be curated at the San Luis Obispo County Archaeological Society or another facility approved by the County.</i></li> <li>• <i>All work shall be completed by a County-approved Registered Professional Archaeologist; a Chumash tribal representative shall monitor all excavation in Native American sites.</i></li> <li>• <i>All fieldwork, analysis, report production, and curation shall be fully funded by the applicant.</i></li> <li>• <i>For archaeological sites that are judged to be significant historical resources, the Phase 2 report shall offer mitigation recommendations as necessary and</i></li> </ul>	

**Table ES-2.**  
**Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p><i>appropriate. All feasible mitigation recommendations shall be incorporated into any permit issued for development.</i></p> <p><b>Archaeological Site Capping.</b> <i>If complete avoidance of archaeological sites cannot be accomplished, a site may be buried under a layer of clean, culturally sterile, chemically neutral fill. Site capping is not a preferred alternative and should only be employed after the Applicant has demonstrated to the County that no other preservation options are feasible. In that case, fill shall be placed on the site beginning at the edge and working in toward the center, so that equipment used to deposit the fill drives across the site only on the fill material and not on the exposed cultural deposit. It is important to note here that capping may effect preservation in place but does not constitute avoidance of impacts to the site. To mitigate the residual impacts of capping, the following requirements shall apply:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>a data collection program shall be implemented prior to placement of the fill cap, including mapping of surface artifacts, collection of functionally or temporally diagnostic tools and debris, and excavation of samples from within the area to be filled as well as adjacent site areas for comparative purposes.</i></li> <li>• <i>Cultural materials collected from the site shall be processed and analyzed in an archaeological laboratory according to standard procedures.</i></li> <li>• <i>The age of the remains shall be determined using radiocarbon dating and other appropriate procedures; lithic artifacts, faunal remains, and other cultural materials shall be identified and analyzed according to current professional standards; any prior archaeological collections from the site shall be included in the comparative analysis.</i></li> <li>• <i>The significance of the site shall be evaluated according to the criteria of the CRHR [CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(3)], and the cultural resource record shall be updated to reflect the results of the investigation; such results also shall be presented in a technical report following the standards of the California Office of Historic Preservation publication Archaeological Resource</i></li> </ul>	

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p><i>Management Reports: Recommended Content and Format</i> (<a href="http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1054/files/armr.pdf">http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/pages/1054/files/armr.pdf</a>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Upon completion of the work, all artifacts, other cultural remains, records, photographs, and other documentation shall be curated at the San Luis Obispo County Archaeological Society or another facility approved by the County.</i></li> <li>• <i>All work shall be conducted by a County-approved Registered Professional Archaeologist; a Chumash tribal representative shall monitor all excavation in Native American sites.</i></li> <li>• <i>All fieldwork, analysis, report production, and curation shall be fully funded by the applicant.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended policies, guidelines, and standards LOCP prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the LOCP prior to adopting the plan.</p>	
<p><b>Impact CR-2.</b> Development under the Community Plan could directly or indirectly impact significant historic buildings, structures, or districts (Class II impact; less than significant with mitigation).</p>	<p><b>CR-2(a).</b> The following language shall be added as a subsection to Community Plan Policies Section 2.5.5, Environmental Resources:</p> <p><i>CR-2: Effectively manage significant historical buildings, structures, and districts in and around the community of Los Osos.</i></p> <p><i>A. Identify significant historical buildings and structures prior to any proposed development.</i></p> <p><i>B. Identify and evaluate potential historic districts and develop a plan for their preservation and enhancement.</i></p> <p><i>C. Encourage adaptive reuse that is compatible with resource protection.</i></p>	<p>With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.</p>

**Table ES-2.**  
**Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p><i>Follow the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines to ensure preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and/or reconstruction of significant buildings and structures.</i></p> <p><i><b>Program CR-2.1: Historic Resource Inventory.</b> The County should conduct an inventory of historical resources within the Baywood Park neighborhood to determine whether the core area qualifies as a historic district, define the boundaries of any such district, and determine which resources contribute to its significance.</i></p> <p><i><b>Program CR-2.2: Protection and Management of Historical Resources.</b> The County should work closely with property owners, other public agencies, and conservation organizations to protect and manage historical buildings, structures, and districts.</i></p> <p><b>CR-2(b). Community Plan Historical Resource Guidelines and Standards.</b> The following Planning Area Standards shall be added to Section 7.3 of LOCP, Communitywide Standards:</p> <p><i><b>Historical Resource Evaluation.</b> Prior to issuance of permits for demolition or development, the County shall ensure that buildings or structures erected prior to 1970 on the subject parcel or any adjoining parcel are documented according to professional standards and their historical significance is evaluated. No permits shall be issued for any demolition, development, or other activity that would adversely affect the integrity of an officially designated Historic Landmark, historical buildings or structures eligible for the CRHR, or identified historical districts.</i></p> <p><i><b>Historical Resource Survey.</b> The County should work with the History Center of San Luis Obispo County, property owners, and other local stakeholders to conduct an inventory of historical resources within the Baywood Park neighborhood to document the historical significance of buildings and structures in the</i></p>	

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p><i>neighborhood, determine whether the core area qualifies as a historic district, define the boundaries of any such district, and determine which resources contribute to its significance. Such an inventory should be initiated within five years of adoption of the LOCP.</i></p> <p><b>Secretary of Interior’ Standards and Guidelines.</b> <i>Projects that that would adversely affect the integrity of an officially designated Historic Landmark, historical buildings or structures eligible for the CRHR, or identified historical district shall be designed to comply with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings. The applicant shall retain a qualified professional architectural historian to conduct design review and ensure compliance with the Standards and Guidelines.</i></p> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended policies, guidelines, and standards LOCP prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the LOCP prior to adopting the plan.</p>	
<p><b>Impact CR-4.</b> Development under the Community Plan could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature (Class II impact; less than significant with mitigation).</p>	<p><b>CR-4(a). Community Plan Paleontological Resource Guidelines and Standards.</b> The following Planning Area Standards shall be added to Section 7.3 of LOCP, Communitywide Standards:</p> <p><b>Paleontological Surveys.</b> <i>If individual projects in areas of high paleontological sensitivity (i.e., the Pismo Formation; Figure 4.5-5) require grading, excavation, or trenching that would result in ground disturbance within previously undisturbed sediments, the following measures shall apply:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>the applicant shall retain a qualified professional paleontologist to perform a pre-construction paleontological survey to visually inspect the</i></li> </ul>	<p>With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.</p>

**Table ES-2.**  
**Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p><i>ground surface for exposed fossils or traces thereof and to further evaluate geologic exposures for their potential to contain preserved fossil material at the subsurface.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The qualified Paleontologist shall have a Master's Degree or equivalent work experience in paleontology, shall have knowledge of the local geology and paleontology, and shall be familiar with paleontological procedures and techniques.</i></li> <li>• <i>All fossil occurrences observed during the course of fieldwork shall be adequately documented and recorded during the survey. The data collected for each fossil occurrence shall include, at minimum, the following information: Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) coordinates, approximate elevation, description of taxa, lithologic description, and stratigraphic context (if known). In addition, each locality shall be photographically documented with a digital camera.</i></li> <li>• <i>The paleontologist shall assess the significance of any identified fossil resources, and all significant or potentially significant fossils shall be collected at the time they are observed in the field.</i></li> <li>• <i>If the fossil discovery is too large to collect during the survey (e.g., a whale skeleton or bone bed) and requires a large-scale salvage effort, then it shall be documented immediately and the paleontologist shall consult with the County regarding a strategy for preservation or recovery.</i></li> </ul> <p><b><i>Paleontological Monitoring.</i></b> <i>If a pre-construction survey identifies significant fossil resources, or if a qualified paleontologist determines the need for monitoring during construction, the following measures shall apply:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>a qualified paleontologist shall observe excavation, grading, and/or trenching.</i></li> <li>• <i>If a paleontological resource is discovered during monitoring, the paleontologist shall have the authority to temporarily divert the</i></li> </ul>	

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p><i>construction equipment around the find until it is assessed for scientific significance and collected if appropriate. The paleontologist shall notify the County within 24 hours of any such discovery, and the location shall be protected from further impact until the significance evaluation and any necessary recovery is completed. Work may not resume without approval of the paleontologist and County.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>All significant fossils collected shall be prepared for curation in a properly equipped paleontology laboratory. Preparation shall include the careful removal of excess matrix from fossil materials and stabilizing and repairing specimens, as necessary.</i></li> <li>• <i>Following laboratory work, all fossils specimens shall be identified to the lowest taxonomic level, cataloged, analyzed, and delivered to an accredited museum repository for permanent curation and storage.</i></li> <li>• <i>The paleontologist shall prepare a technical report describing the results of the paleontological mitigation efforts, including a summary of the field and laboratory methods, an overview of the project area geology and paleontology, a list of taxa recovered, an analysis of fossils recovered and their scientific significance, and recommendations. A copy of the report shall be submitted to the County and the designated museum repository. The cost of fossil recovery, analysis, and curation shall be the responsibility of the individual Project proponent.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended policies, guidelines, and standards LOCP prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the LOCP prior to adopting the plan.</p>	
<b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>		
<p><b>Impact HYD-2.</b> Buildout under the LOCP could expose structures and</p>	<p><b>HYD-2(a). Communitywide Drainage Improvements.</b> Proposed LOCP Program EN-2.2 shall be followed with a new program as follows to more directly link the proposed watershed</p>	<p>With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.</p>

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>people to flood hazards. While the existing regulatory framework to address these issues generally provides sufficient protection, drainage improvement recommendations from the County's 1998 Engineering Evaluation for community drainage improvements should be included in the proposed LOCP policy framework, but are not. This is considered a significant but mitigable (Class II) impact.</p>	<p>management study in Program EN-2.2 with future drainage improvements and new development:</p> <p align="center"><i>New LOCP Program EN-2.3. Community Drainage Improvements. Based on the outcome of the Urban Watershed Management study identified in Program EN-2.2, the County shall implement its recommendations, as well as those included in the 1998 Preliminary Engineering Evaluation. These may include drainage improvements at various locations in the community, as well as other related measures. These improvements shall be completed prior to, or as conditions of, new development in the community that may be impacted by flooding or drainage impacts identified in either the 1998 study of the Urban Watershed Management Program EN-2.2.</i></p> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended policy to the LOCP prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the LOCP prior to adopting the plan.</p>	
<b>LAND USE</b>		
<p><b>Impact LU-1.</b> The proposed land use pattern under the LOCP would not divide any established communities. It would also generally avoid potential land use conflicts, except in a few specific cases. Impacts in these areas are potentially significant but mitigable (Class II).</p>	<p><b>LU-1(a). Standards to Minimize Land Use Conflicts.</b> The LOCP shall be modified to include design and/or planning area standards for the Tri-W/Midtown and Fairchild/Los Olivos parcels (Areas 26 and 27), in order to address and minimize potential land use conflicts with neighboring uses. Standards should address the specific types of allowed uses, and address design considerations such as setbacks, building heights, lighting, landscaping, and architecture. These standards shall be implemented in project design, when development applications in these areas are considered.</p> <p>The following restrictions on future land uses in these areas would ensure compatibility with neighboring uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Tri-W/Midtown (Area 26).</u> Consistent with LOCP Mixed Use Policy 3.4.2, the</li> </ul>	<p>With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.</p>



**Table ES-2.**  
**Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p>County’s intent is to allow for additional park and community facilities in this area, compatible with the adjacent library and park. Expanding this policy to address appropriate design standards that relate to lighting and noise would ensure compatibility with nearby residential uses. New policy language shall be added as follows: <i>“Future park and community facilities at this location must include appropriately-scaled lighting that does not adversely affect nearby residents. The site shall be primarily for daytime use.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Los Olivos and Fairchild (Area 27)</u>. The CS designation as included in the LOCP is relatively open-ended, noting only that “the size, scale, and design of such facilities must be consistent with the existing small-town character of Los Osos and compatible with adjacent residential and retail development.” While this standard would apply to this area, it may not be sufficiently restrictive to ensure compatibility with nearby residences. This standard shall be expanded to address issues related to noise, lighting, air quality and traffic, and shall read as follows: <i>“...the size, scale, and design of such facilities must be consistent with the existing small-town character of Los Osos and compatible with adjacent residential and retail development. Land use compatibility shall be based on Planning Commission review of a commercial project’s impacts to nearby residences related to noise, lighting, air quality, and traffic, based on technical studies associated with such projects, as determined to be appropriate by the Department and Planning and Building.”</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing</u>. The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended policy to the LOCP prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring</u>. Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the LOCP prior to adopting the plan.</p>	
<p><b>Impact LU-2.</b> The proposed policy framework under the LOCP is generally consistent with the policy</p>	<p><b>LU-2(a). Combining Designation Consistency.</b> The LOCP shall be modified either to include additional standards for identified Combining Designations for which no standards have been included in the plan, or references to existing applicable standards in the CZLUO shall</p>	<p>With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.</p>

**Table ES-2.  
Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>framework and intent of the Estero Area Plan, and therefore with all other regulatory documents from which the Estero Area Plan is derived. However, certain policies in the Estero Area Plan do not have a corresponding implementation framework in the LOCP. This is considered a significant but mitigable (Class II) impact.</p>	<p>be included where appropriate, as shown on Table 4.8-3 of the EIR. In addition, some existing Combining Designations in the Estero Area Plan as they apply to Los Osos are not included or described in the proposed LOCP. These potential inconsistencies must be resolved in both documents, based on direction provided in Table 4.8-3.</p> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended language to the LOCP prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the LOCP prior to adopting the plan.</p>	
<b>NOISE</b>		
<p><b>Impact NOS-1.</b> Construction of individual projects that could be facilitated under the proposed Community Plan Update would generate noise and groundborne vibration that could exceed County of San Luis Obispo standards at existing residential uses. Future residential uses and other sensitive receptors may also be exposed to noise and vibration levels that exceed County standards. This is a Class II, <i>significant but mitigable</i>, impact.</p>	<p><b>NOS-1(a). Planning Area Standards.</b> The following language shall be added to Section 7.3: Communitywide Standards of the Community Plan:</p> <p align="center"><i><b>Noise and Vibration Reduction Plan.</b> Projects that involve grading, demolition, and/or construction on lots adjacent to occupied residential structures shall implement the following applicable performance standards to ensure that sensitive receptors are not adversely impacted by construction related noise:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a) Notify existing residences within 1,000 feet of the site boundary concerning the construction schedule;</i></li> <li><i>b) Shield especially loud pieces of stationary construction equipment;</i></li> <li><i>c) Locate portable generators, air compressors, etc. away from sensitive noise receptors;</i></li> <li><i>d) Limit grouping major pieces of equipment operating in one area to the greatest extent feasible; and</i></li> <li><i>e) Use newer equipment that is quieter and ensure that all equipment items have the manufacturers' recommended noise abatement measures, such as mufflers, engine covers, and engine vibration</i></li> </ul>	<p>With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.</p>

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact																														
	<p align="center"><i>isolators intact and operational. Internal combustion engines used for any purpose on or related to the job shall be equipped with a muffler or baffle of a type recommended by the manufacturer.</i></p> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended language to the Community Plan prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the Community Plan prior to Plan adoption.</p>																															
<p><b>Impact NOS-3.</b> The Community Plan would place future sensitive receptors in areas that would be exposed to future transportation noise levels that exceed General Plan noise standards. This would be a Class II, <i>significant but mitigable</i>, impact.</p>	<p><b>NOS-3(a). Planning Area Standards.</b> The following language shall be added to Section 7.3: Communitywide Standards of the Community Plan:</p> <p align="center"><b>Noise Compatibility:</b> <i>Where noise sensitive development such as residential uses is proposed within the projected 60 CNEL noise contours distances for Los Osos Valley Road and South Bay Boulevard, a site-specific noise study shall be conducted to demonstrate compliance with the County’s noise and land use compatibility standards (60 CNEL). This study shall be completed for noise sensitive uses located within the following distances of the identified segments of Los Osos Valley Road and South Bay Boulevard:</i></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Roadway</th> <th>Segment</th> <th>Distance to (feet) 60 CNEL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Los Osos Valley Road</i></td> <td><i>east of Los Osos Creek</i></td> <td><i>175</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Los Osos Valley Road</i></td> <td><i>east of South Bay Boulevard</i></td> <td><i>127</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Los Osos Valley Road</i></td> <td><i>west of South Bay Boulevard</i></td> <td><i>83</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Los Osos Valley Road</i></td> <td><i>east of 9th Street</i></td> <td><i>77</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Los Osos Valley Road</i></td> <td><i>west of Bush Drive</i></td> <td><i>69</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Los Osos Valley Road</i></td> <td><i>west of Palisades Avenue</i></td> <td><i>66</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Los Osos Valley Road</i></td> <td><i>east of Doris Avenue</i></td> <td><i>63</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Los Osos Valley Road</i></td> <td><i>east of Pecho Drive</i></td> <td><i>62</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>South Bay Boulevard</i></td> <td><i>north of Los Osos Valley Road</i></td> <td><i>171</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Roadway	Segment	Distance to (feet) 60 CNEL	<i>Los Osos Valley Road</i>	<i>east of Los Osos Creek</i>	<i>175</i>	<i>Los Osos Valley Road</i>	<i>east of South Bay Boulevard</i>	<i>127</i>	<i>Los Osos Valley Road</i>	<i>west of South Bay Boulevard</i>	<i>83</i>	<i>Los Osos Valley Road</i>	<i>east of 9th Street</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>Los Osos Valley Road</i>	<i>west of Bush Drive</i>	<i>69</i>	<i>Los Osos Valley Road</i>	<i>west of Palisades Avenue</i>	<i>66</i>	<i>Los Osos Valley Road</i>	<i>east of Doris Avenue</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>Los Osos Valley Road</i>	<i>east of Pecho Drive</i>	<i>62</i>	<i>South Bay Boulevard</i>	<i>north of Los Osos Valley Road</i>	<i>171</i>	<p>With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.</p>
Roadway	Segment	Distance to (feet) 60 CNEL																														
<i>Los Osos Valley Road</i>	<i>east of Los Osos Creek</i>	<i>175</i>																														
<i>Los Osos Valley Road</i>	<i>east of South Bay Boulevard</i>	<i>127</i>																														
<i>Los Osos Valley Road</i>	<i>west of South Bay Boulevard</i>	<i>83</i>																														
<i>Los Osos Valley Road</i>	<i>east of 9th Street</i>	<i>77</i>																														
<i>Los Osos Valley Road</i>	<i>west of Bush Drive</i>	<i>69</i>																														
<i>Los Osos Valley Road</i>	<i>west of Palisades Avenue</i>	<i>66</i>																														
<i>Los Osos Valley Road</i>	<i>east of Doris Avenue</i>	<i>63</i>																														
<i>Los Osos Valley Road</i>	<i>east of Pecho Drive</i>	<i>62</i>																														
<i>South Bay Boulevard</i>	<i>north of Los Osos Valley Road</i>	<i>171</i>																														

**Table ES-2.**  
**Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact						
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><i>South Bay Boulevard</i></td> <td><i>south of Santa Ysabel Avenue</i></td> <td><i>149</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>South Bay Boulevard</i></td> <td><i>north of Santa Ysabel Avenue</i></td> <td><i>156</i></td> </tr> </table> <p><i>This study shall contain recommendations to mitigate any noise levels that exceed the County's standard of 60 CNEL. At the program level, the specific attenuation methods cannot be definitively determined. Noise reduction measure could include, but are not limited to, the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Construction of a berm or wall;</i></li> <li>• <i>Design of individual homes such that structures block the line-of-sight from useable backyards to the noise source;</i></li> <li>• <i>For homes with backyards not blocked by intervening structures, backyard fencing of sufficient height to block line-of sight to the noise source; or</i></li> <li>• <i>Placement of exterior use areas and balconies away from the noise source, as applicable.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended language to the Community Plan prior to adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the Community Plan prior to adoption.</p>	<i>South Bay Boulevard</i>	<i>south of Santa Ysabel Avenue</i>	<i>149</i>	<i>South Bay Boulevard</i>	<i>north of Santa Ysabel Avenue</i>	<i>156</i>	
<i>South Bay Boulevard</i>	<i>south of Santa Ysabel Avenue</i>	<i>149</i>						
<i>South Bay Boulevard</i>	<i>north of Santa Ysabel Avenue</i>	<i>156</i>						
<p><b>Impact NOS-4.</b> Future on-site generated noise sources have the potential to exceed to property line noise levels limits established in the County's Code. This would be a Class II, <i>significant but mitigable</i>, impact.</p>	<p><b>NOS-4(a). Community Plan Safety/Health Guidelines and Standards.</b> The following language shall be added as a subsection to 7.3 Communitywide Standards of the Community Plan:</p> <p><b>Noise Study.</b> Where new commercial and industrial development would be located adjacent to residential uses, a site-specific noise study should be conducted to demonstrate compliance with the County noise standards in the Land Use Ordinance (Section 22.10.120).For the purpose of this measure,</p>	<p>With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.</p>						

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
	<p>“adjacent” is assumed to include properties immediately bordering the existing use where the existing structures are within 50 feet of the project site. This study shall determine the area of impact and present appropriate mitigation measures. The mitigation measures required as a result of the noise study may include, but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For new commercial uses, require the placement of loading and unloading areas so that buildings shield nearby residential land uses from noise generated by loading dock and delivery activities or such that there is an open space separation large enough to attenuate noise levels below the threshold.</li> <li>• Require the placement of all commercial HVAC machinery to be placed within mechanical equipment rooms wherever feasible. If such mechanical equipment is to be outdoors and would expose adjacent residences to equipment noise, provide a noise study to confirm that standards applicable to stationary noise sources in the County Noise Element and Land Use Ordinance will be met.</li> </ul> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended language to the Community Plan prior to adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the Community Plan prior to adoption.</p>	
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</b>		
<p><b>Impact TC-1.</b> The proposed Circulation Plan would result in potential impacts, without additional mitigation, to the transportation network, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-</p>	<p><b>TC-1(a). Intersection 8 - Los Osos Valley Road at Sunset Drive.</b> This intersection is projected to operate at LOS F during AM and PM peak hours under Cumulative No Project conditions, and at LOS E and LOS F during AM and PM peak hours under Cumulative Plus Project conditions, respectively. The following proposed improvement will yield acceptable operations: Restrict left turns out from the side streets with traffic control devices as approved by Public Works.</p>	<p>With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.</p>

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit. <i>(Class II, Significant but Mitigable).</i></p>	<p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the required improvement to the Community Plan prior to adoption. The improvement will be programmed into the County’s Estero Area Plan, and ultimately constructed when funding is available, either through development fees or other outside sources.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the Community Plan prior to adoption.</p> <p><b>TC-1(b). Intersection 16 – South Bay Boulevard at Pismo Avenue.</b> This intersection is projected to operate at LOS F during AM and PM peak hours under Cumulative No Project conditions and Cumulative Plus Project conditions. The following proposed improvement will yield acceptable operations: Restrict left turns out from the side streets with traffic control devices as approved by Public Works.</p> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the required improvement to the Community Plan prior to adoption. The improvement will be programmed into the County’s Estero Area Plan, and ultimately constructed when funding is available, either through development fees or other outside sources.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the Community Plan prior to adoption.</p>	
<b>WATER SUPPLY</b>		
<p><b>Impact W-1.</b> Development under the Community Plan is limited to the sustainable capacity of the Groundwater Basin through the Growth Management Ordinance and additional review standards tied to the Basin Plan. Project</p>	<p><b>W-1(a). Modifications to LOCP Growth Management Provisions.</b> The first paragraph of Standard D.3, Growth limitation standards, shall be modified to include biannual review of Title 26 and the Basin Plan Reports by Planning and Building Department to help ensure consistency with findings from the Basin Plan, as follows:</p> <p align="center"><i>Development of new residential units that use water from the Los Osos Groundwater Basin shall be limited to be consistent with the findings of the Los</i></p>	<p>With proposed mitigation, impacts would be less than significant.</p>

**Table ES-2.  
 Class II, Significant but Mitigable Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>standards and policies require close coordination with the Basin Plan and the standards are in line with the Basin Plan. However, the Basin Plan contains a level of uncertainty. Planned development will need to work continuously with the Basin Management Committee as additional information becomes available to help ensure sustainable water supplies are available for existing populations and potential new development. Therefore, water use for the project is considered a <i>Class II, significant but mitigable impact</i>.</p>	<p><i>Osos Groundwater Basin Plan and annual reports. After successful implementation of all programs identified in Subsection D.1, Section 26.01.070.k of the Growth Management Ordinance may be modified to allow development of new residential units as described in the following sections. The Growth Management Ordinance, status of development, and availability of water supply shall be reviewed on a biannual basis by the San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning and Building through the Resource Management System. The Growth Management Ordinance shall be modified as required to be consistent with the findings of the Los Osos Groundwater Basin Plan and Annual Reports.</i></p> <p><u>Plan Requirements and Timing.</u> The Planning and Building Department shall add the recommended policy to the LOCP prior to Plan adoption.</p> <p><u>Monitoring.</u> Planning and Building shall ensure that the above language is included in the LOCP prior to adopting the plan.</p>	

**Table ES-3.  
 Class III, Less Than Significant Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>AESTHETICS</b>		
<p><b>Impact AES-1.</b> Development under the Community Plan would not result in aesthetically incompatible site open to public views. Development would be required to comply with Community Plan design standards, which would reduce impacts to a Class III, less than significant, level.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<p><b>Impact AES-2.</b> The Community Plan would introduce development within a scenic public view. However, design guidelines and standards included in the Community Plan that address the appearance of future development projects in these areas would ensure that impacts would be less than significant (Class III).</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<p><b>Impact AES-4.</b> Buildout under the LOCP would not degrade the visual character of the Community Plan area and its surroundings, because the proposed LOCP provides adequate protection of these resources in its policy framework. This is a less than significant (Class III) impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>



**Table ES-3.  
 Class III, Less Than Significant Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Residual Impact</b>
<p><b>Impact AES-5.</b> Buildout under the LOCP could introduce new sources of light and glare, but potential impacts would be generally addressed by the proposed policy framework set forth in the LOCP. This is considered a less than significant (Class III) impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<p><b>Impact AES-6.</b> Buildout under the LOCP would not damage any identified unique geologic or physical feature. Potential impacts would be adequately addressed by the proposed policy framework set forth in the LOCP. This is considered a less than significant (Class III) impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>		
<p><b>Impact AQ-1.</b> The Community Plan would generally be consistent with the transportation control measures and land use and circulation management programs in the 2001 CAP. Consistency with the Clean Air Plan ensures that long-term operational impacts associated with future buildout under the Community Plan are adequately addressed. This impact would be Class III, less than</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>

**Table ES-3.  
 Class III, Less Than Significant Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
significant.		
<b>Impact AQ-3.</b> Sensitive receptors sited next to roadways in the Community Plan area would not be exposed to a significant source of diesel particulate matter. Additionally, no CO hot spots would occur as a result of the Community Plan. Implementation of the Community Plan would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Impacts would be Class III, <i>less than significant</i> .	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts would be less than significant.
<b>Impact AQ-4.</b> Implementation of the Community Plan would not create operational-related objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. Impacts would be Class III, <i>less than significant</i> .	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts would be less than significant.
<b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
<b>Impact BIO-5.</b> Development under the Community Plan would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. There would be no impact.	No mitigation measures are required.	There would be no impact.

**Table ES-3.  
 Class III, Less Than Significant Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Residual Impact</b>
<p><b>Impact BIO-6.</b> Development under the Community Plan would not conflict with any provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Impacts would be <i>Less than Significant</i> (Class III).</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<b>GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS</b>		
<p><b>Impact GHG-1.</b> The Community Plan would generate GHG emissions from construction and operation. GHG emissions would be less than the emission threshold of 4.9 MT CO<sub>2</sub>E per service population. The Community Plan’s contribution of GHGs to cumulative statewide emissions would be less than cumulatively considerable. Therefore, impacts related to GHG emissions from development under the Community Plan are Class III, <i>less than significant</i>.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<p><b>Impact GHG-2.</b> The Community Plan would not conflict with any local or state plan, policy, or regulation aimed at reducing GHG emissions from land use and development. Thus, impacts would</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>

**Table ES-3.  
 Class III, Less Than Significant Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
be Class III, <i>less than significant</i> .		
<b>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</b>		
<b>Impact HYD-1.</b> Construction and operational activities associated with future development under the proposed project has the potential to degrade water quality. However, because the existing regulatory framework to address these issues provides sufficient protection, this is considered a less than significant (Class III) impact	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts would be less than significant.
<b>NOISE</b>		
<b>Impact NOS-2.</b> Traffic generated by the Community Plan is not anticipated to result in a significant ambient noise level increase at existing sensitive receivers. The increase in ambient noise would be a Class III, <i>less than significant</i> , impact.	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts would be less than significant.
<b>POPULATION AND HOUSING</b>		
<b>Impact PH-1.</b> Residential development and associated population growth resulting from future development under the LOCP would not exceed the community's capacity to handle that growth, nor would it induce	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts would be less than significant.

**Table ES-3.  
 Class III, Less Than Significant Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Residual Impact</b>
unanticipated growth because of the extension of public infrastructure or roadways. This is a Less than Significant (Class III) impact.		
<b>Impact PH-3.</b> The project will likely exacerbate an existing jobs-housing imbalance that exists in the Los Osos community. While potentially adverse, this is not considered a significant impact (Class III) because the community is not intended to function as a jobs center in the County, based on goals included in the Housing Element, Estero Area Plan and proposed LOCP.	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts would be less than significant.
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES</b>		
<b>Impact PS-1.</b> Residential development and associated population growth resulting from future development under the LOCP would increase the demand for fire protection services. Required public facilities fees that would be paid in conjunction with new development are considered to ensure that impacts are <i>Less Than Significant</i> (Class III).	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts would be less than significant.
<b>Impact PS-2.</b> Residential development and associated	No mitigation measures are required.	Impacts would be less than significant.

**Table ES-3.  
 Class III, Less Than Significant Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Residual Impact</b>
<p>population growth resulting from future development under the LOCP would increase the demand for law enforcement services. Required public facilities fees that would be paid in conjunction with new development are considered to ensure that impacts are <i>Less Than Significant</i> (Class III).</p>		
<p><b>Impact PS-3.</b> Residential development and associated population growth resulting from future development under the LOCP would increase the demand for public school facilities. However, in accordance with Section 65995(h) of the California Government Code (Senate Bill 50, chaptered August 27, 1998), the payment of statutory fees is considered to be full and complete mitigation of potential school-related impacts. For this reason, impacts are considered <i>Less than Significant</i> (Class III).</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<p><b>Impact PS-4.</b> Residential development and associated population growth resulting from future development under the LOCP would increase the demand</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>

**Table ES-3.  
Class III, Less Than Significant Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<p>for solid waste disposal services. However, existing regional landfills that serve Los Osos have sufficient long-term capacity to accommodate buildout under the LOCP, so impacts are considered Less than Significant (Class III).</p>		
<b>RECREATION</b>		
<p><b>Impact REC-1.</b> Residential development and associated population growth resulting from future development under the LOCP would increase the demand for parks and recreational facilities. However, existing parks, in combination with planned recreational facilities and supporting policies in the LOCP, would ensure that programmatic impacts are <i>Less than Significant (Class III)</i>.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<b>TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</b>		
<p><b>Impact TC-2.</b> The proposed Circulation Plan would not result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks (<i>Class III, Less than Significant</i>).</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>

**Table ES-3.  
 Class III, Less Than Significant Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Residual Impact</b>
<p><b>Impact TC-3.</b> The proposed Circulation Plan would not increase risks due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) (<i>Class III, Less Than Significant</i>).</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<p><b>Impact TC-4.</b> The proposed Circulation Plan would not result in inadequate emergency access (<i>Class III, Less Than Significant</i>).</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<p><b>Impact TC-5.</b> The proposed Circulation Plan would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities (<i>Class III, Less Than Significant</i>).</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>
<b>WASTEWATER</b>		
<p><b>Impact WW-1.</b> Because the LOWRF has sufficient capacity to accommodate the projected buildout population of 18,000 under the LOCP and onsite systems outside the sewer service area will be regulated through the SCRWCB OWTS Policy, program-level impacts related to wastewater</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>



**Table ES-3.  
Class III, Less Than Significant Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

<b>Impact</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Residual Impact</b>
production are consider to be <i>Class III, less than significant.</i>		

**Table ES-4.  
 Class IV, Beneficial Project-Specific Environmental Impacts**

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impact
<b>POPULATION AND HOUSING</b>		
<p><b>Impact PH-2.</b> Future development under the LOCP would provide substantial opportunities for affordable housing, which will be necessary in order to meet Countywide Housing Element goals related to this issue. This is a Class IV, beneficial impact.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are required, because impacts are beneficial.</p>	<p>Impacts would be beneficial.</p>

## Cumulative Impacts

**Aesthetics.** The evaluation of the LOCP in this EIR accounts for all of the expected and foreseeable growth in the Los Osos area. Regional growth in the project vicinity, including in the City of Morro Bay and nearby rural areas between Los Osos and the City of San Luis Obispo, while expected to be relatively minor over the life of the proposed LOCP, may impact regional aesthetics and visual resources. However, buildout of the proposed LOCP would not contribute to these cumulative impacts, and prescribed project-specific mitigation to address potential impacts within the LOCP would ensure that cumulative impacts would be ***less than significant (Class III)***.

**Air Quality.** A project that does not exceed the SLOAPCD thresholds and is consistent with the CAP would have a less than significant cumulative impact. Conversely, a project that exceeds the SLOAPCD significance thresholds or is found to be inconsistent with the CAP would result in significant cumulative impacts. As discussed, the Community Plan would be consistent with the SLOCOG growth projections. Additionally, the Community Plan would decrease the development potential when compared to the adopted Estero Area Plan. Because the Community Plan would be consistent with the growth assumed in the CAP and would incorporate TCMs and land use strategies from the CAP, the Community Plan is considered consistent with the CAP. The evaluation of the Community Plan in this EIR accounts for expected population growth and associated development in the Community Plan area. Therefore, cumulative air quality impacts from buildout of the Community Plan have been addressed in this impact analysis. Cumulative impacts on air quality would be ***less than significant (Class III)***.

**Biological Resources.** Full implementation of the proposed LOCP would include build out of areas within existing development boundaries and additional development in the Plan Area. This overall increase in developed area is the basis for the biological resource impacts identified in this section. The development identified under the LOCP would further reduce natural habitat acreages within the Los Osos area, and convert adjacent sparsely developed or undeveloped areas to more intensive uses, thereby altering the fundamental ability of the Plan Area to support natural habitats and species. In general, implementation could result in the removal of natural habitat, a decrease in native plant and wildlife occurrences, and increase the urban/wildland interface resulting in an increase of disturbed habitat adjacent to the URL.

This assessment of the significance of cumulative impacts to biological resources is based upon:

- *The cumulative contribution of the impacts from other approved and proposed development to biological resources in general in the Plan Area vicinity;*
- *The loss of special status habitats and species;*
- *Contribution of the Plan to urban and suburban expansion into natural areas; and,*
- *Fragmentation and isolation of natural habitats and plant and animal populations within the Plan Area by future projects in the vicinity.*

The identified impacts to biological resources resulting from LOCP implementation have been addressed individually in the discussion above. When combined, these impacts reflect the cumulative impact of the

proposed LOCP. As noted in the individual impact discussions, implementation of both the existing General Plan policies and those proposed under the LOCP, as well as compliance with state and federal regulations, will ensure that the biological impacts associated with the LOCP are cumulatively less than significant.

**Coastal Hazards.** The evaluation of the LOCP in this EIR, which includes buildout of the Los Osos community, accounts for all of the expected and foreseeable growth in the Los Osos area. For that reason, project-specific impacts are considered the same as cumulative impacts. This includes significant but mitigation impacts related to coastal hazards and sea level rise. Impacts related to coastal hazards are expected to be less than significant through the implementation of proposed policies, including those included in the proposed LOCP. Cumulative impacts were evaluated comprehensively in this EIR at a programmatic level based on available information. As future applications for individual projects are submitted at a project level of detail, the precise evaluation of future project cumulative impacts would be coordinated through individual project-level environmental review as appropriate.

**Cultural Resources.** Cumulative impacts on archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources would result from the increases in population, increased recreational use, and increased development and construction (including in-fill development) throughout the Plan area. For these resources, the geographic extent of cumulative impacts encompasses a relatively broad area because the importance of any individual resource can only be judged in terms of its regional context and relationship to other resources. Thus, the significance of impacts on any given resource or group of resources must be examined in light of the integrity of the regional resource base. Because the number of cultural resources is finite, limited, and non-renewable, any assessment of cumulative impacts must take into consideration the impacts of the proposed project on resources within the project area; the extent to which those impacts degrade the integrity of the regional resource base; and impacts other projects may have on the regional resource base. If these effects, taken together, result in a collective degradation of the resource base, then those impacts are considered cumulatively considerable.

The regional resource base is defined geographically, ethnographically, and with reference to the specific relevant administrative and management units. The geographic scope of the cumulative impact analysis takes in a broad region encompassing the entire Estero Bay coastal zone, which is generally bounded by Point Buchon and Montaña de Oro State Park to the south, the Pacific Ocean to the west, the crest of the coast range to the east, and Point Estero to the north. The analysis also takes into consideration the cultural geography of the Obispeño Chumash people who occupied the region prehistorically, considering the integrity of the entire suite of resources that make up the cultural patrimony of this group. Finally, the cumulative impact analysis takes into account the resource base under the direct management and care of San Luis Obispo County.

The classes of resources found within the project area reflect the types of sites expected to be found within the broader geographic, cultural, and administrative region considered for the cumulative

analysis. Trends that have led to degradation of the regional cultural resource base, and are expected to continue in the future, include continuing population growth and the concomitant demand for new housing and infrastructure; continuing and increasing recreational use of the regional landscape; continued ranching, agricultural, and industrial activities; and on-going transportation development and improvement.

Based on the current analysis, several prehistoric and historical sites in the Plan area may be adversely affected by the proposed project. Several of these sites are presumed to be significant resources, though most have not been evaluated formally. Although the extent of impacts to these sites may be minor relative to the nature and extent of the individual sites, and most impacts to individual sites can be mitigated to less than significant through application of the proposed mitigation measures, certain of these sites are not typical for the region and are unusually important scientifically and to the local Chumash tribes. When combined with other past, present, and future projects, particularly the Los Osos Wastewater Project, the overall loss of cultural resources and cumulative degradation of the regional resource base is significant and would not be mitigated to less than significant by application of the proposed mitigation measures. Preparation of regional cultural resources overviews and research designs, synthetic analysis and interpretation of cultural resources in regional perspective, and expanded public interpretation of resources would lessen the proposed project's contribution to cumulative degradation of the regional resource base. However, there is no feasible additional mitigation to reduce the project's contribution to cumulative effects on Native American Tribal Cultural Resources. As a result, cumulative impacts on archaeological and historical sites would be **Class I, significant and unavoidable**.

Based on the overall low paleontological potential of the Los Osos Community Plan area, the Project would have a low potential to combine with the paleontological impacts of other projects. Adverse impacts to paleontological resources as the result of development under the Los Osos Community Plan would be less than significant with mitigation. With the implementation of resource protection measures described herein, cumulative impacts on paleontological resources can be reduced or avoided. Therefore, the Project has a negligible potential for contribution to cumulative impacts to paleontological resources and the cumulative impacts of the Project on paleontological resources would be *less than significant*.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** GHG impacts are recognized as exclusively cumulative impacts; there are no non-cumulative GHG emission impacts from a climate change perspective. It is generally the case that an individual project is not of sufficient magnitude by itself to influence climate change or result in a substantial contribution to the global GHG inventory. As the Community Plan would comply with the SLOAPCD thresholds, the additive effect of the Community Plan's GHG emissions would not result in a reasonably foreseeable cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change. In addition, the Community Plan as well as other cumulative related projects would also be subject to all applicable regulatory requirements, which would also reduce the statewide GHG emissions. Therefore,

the Community Plan's cumulative GHG emissions would have a **Class III, less than significant**, impact on the environment.

**Hydrology and Water Quality.** The evaluation of the LOCP in this EIR, which includes buildout of the Los Osos community, accounts for all of the expected and foreseeable growth in the Los Osos area. For that reason, project-specific impacts are considered the same as cumulative impacts. As described in the project-specific analysis, this includes impacts related to flooding and drainage. Impacts related to water quality are expected to be **Class III, less than significant**, through the implementation of existing and proposed policies, including those included in the proposed LOCP. Cumulative impacts were evaluated comprehensively in this EIR at a programmatic level based on available information. As future applications for individual projects are submitted at a project level of detail, the precise evaluation of future project cumulative impacts would be coordinated through individual project-level environmental review as appropriate.

**Land Use.** The project-specific analysis evaluated potential communitywide impacts under the LOCP. For land use and policy issues, project-specific impacts are considered the same as cumulative impacts. This includes impacts related to land use and policy consistency. With prescribed policy-level mitigation to be included in the proposed LOCP, cumulative impacts would be considered **Class III, less than significant**. As future applications for individual projects are submitted at a project level of detail, the precise evaluation of future project-related impacts would be coordinated through individual project-level environmental review as appropriate.

**Noise.** Cumulative development in the Community Plan area would gradually increase population over the existing conditions and would therefore increase noise. The current residential population of the Community Plan area is 13,906. Buildout of the Community Plan would accommodate an additional 4,094 residents for a total of 18,000 residents. The analysis of the increase in noise levels in the Community Plan area is based on the transportation impact analysis, which accounts for future growth at buildout of the Community Plan. Therefore, cumulative noise impacts associated with buildout of the Community Plan were addressed in the project-specific impact analysis. As discussed, impacts to existing uses due to the increase in vehicle traffic in the Community Plan area would be **Class III, less than significant**, while impacts to future development located within the 60 CNEL contours for Los Osos Valley Road and South Bay Boulevard would be **Class II, significant but mitigable**.

Due to the temporary nature of construction activities and the implementation of project-specific mitigation measure **NOS-1(a)**, cumulative impacts associated with construction noise would be **Class III, less than significant**. Additionally, County policies in the General Plan and regulations in the County Code are in place to control noise and reduce on-site generated noise impacts between various land uses. With implementation of project-specific mitigation, cumulative impacts associated with stationary noise sources would be **Class III, less than significant**.

**Population and Housing.** The project-specific analysis evaluated potential communitywide impacts under the LOCP. For this issue, project-specific impacts are considered the same as cumulative impacts. Cumulative impacts would be **Class III, less than significant**.

**Public Services.** Impacts to police protection, fire protection, and public schools would be less than significant upon payment of impact mitigation fees, while impacts related to solid waste would be less than significant due to adequate capacity of an area landfill. Regional growth in the project vicinity, while expected to be relatively minor over the life of the proposed LOCP, may also increase demand for public services. Thus, the public services impacts from buildout of the proposed LOCP would incrementally contribute to these cumulative impacts. Cumulative impacts were evaluated comprehensively in this EIR at a programmatic level based on available information. Cumulative impacts would be **Class III, less than significant**. As future applications for individual projects are submitted at a project level of detail, the precise evaluation of future project-related impacts would be coordinated through individual project-level environmental review as appropriate.

**Recreation.** The project-specific analysis evaluated potential communitywide impacts under the LOCP. For this issue, project-specific impacts are considered the same as cumulative impacts. Cumulative impacts would be **Class III, less than significant**.

**Transportation and Circulation.** The project-specific analysis evaluated potential communitywide impacts under the LOCP. For this issue, project-specific impacts are considered the same as cumulative impacts. Cumulative impacts are considered **Class II, significant but mitigable**. Prescribed project-specific mitigation would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

**Wastewater.** The LOCP accounts for all of the expected growth in the Los Osos area, as it functions as a General Plan and Local Coastal Plan. Therefore, cumulative wastewater impacts are addressed in the project-specific evaluation. As future applications for individual Community Plan projects are submitted at a project level of detail, the precise evaluation of future project cumulative impacts would be coordinated through individual project-level development and environmental review. Cumulative impacts would be **Class III, less than significant**.

**Water Supply.** The LOCP accounts for all of the expected growth in the Los Osos area, as it functions as a General Plan and Local Coastal Plan. Therefore, cumulative water impacts are addressed in the project-specific evaluation. As future applications for individual Community Plan projects are submitted at a project level of detail, the precise evaluation of future project cumulative impacts would be coordinated through individual project-level development and environmental review. With the proposed LOCP policy framework as modified through project-specific mitigation, cumulative impacts would be **Class III, less than significant**.