FINAL NIPOMO COMMUNITY PARK MASTER PLAN PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

SCH NO. 2009111067







Prepared by:

SWCA ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANTS

1422 Monterey Street, Suite C200 San Luis Obispo, CA 93401 **Prepared for:**

SLO COUNTY PARKS 1087 Santa Rosa Street

San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

AUGUST 2012

Nipomo Community Park Master Plan

Final

Program Environmental Impact Report SCH No. 2009111067

Prepared for:

SLO County Parks 1087 Santa Rosa Street San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 Contact: Shaun Cooper (805) 781-4388

Prepared by:

SWCA Environmental Consultants 1422 Monterey Street, Suite C200 San Luis Obispo, California 93401 Contact: Shawna Scott, Project Manager (805) 543-7095

August 2012

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	ES-1
A. Project Location	ES-1
B. Project Objectives	ES-4
C. Project Description	ES-4
1. Existing Facilities	ES-4
2. Proposed Facilities	ES-5
3. Access and Parking	ES-10
4. Park Programs and Operational Activities	ES-11
D. Proposed Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures	ES-12
E. Description of Project Alternatives	ES-14
1 No Project Alternative	ES-14
2 Alternative Master Plans	ES-15
3. Community Center Alternatives	ES-18
F. Environmentally Superior Alternative	ES-25
CHAPTER 1 Introduction	1-1
1.1 Program Environmental Impact Report	1-1
1.2 Purpose of the EIR	1-2
1.3 Scoping and Notice of Preparation Process	1-2
1.4 EIR Contents	1-2
1.5 Project Sponsors	1-3
1.6 Review of the Draft EIR	1-4
1.7 Commonly Used Acronyms	1-4
1.7.1 Acronyms	1-4
CHAPTER 2 Project Description	2-1
2.1 General Background	2-1
2.1.1 Project Location	2-1
2.1.2 Project Background	2-1
2.1.3 Initial Scoping	2-1
2.1.4 Public Workshops and Scoping Meetings	
2.1.5 Initial Study	2-7 2-8
2 2 Project Objectives	2-8
2 3 Proposed Project	2-9
2 3 1 Existing Facilities	2-9
2.3.2 Proposed Facilities	
2.3.3 Access and Parking	2-10
2.3.4 Park Programs and Operational Activities	2-13
2.4 Master Plan Implementation	2-18
2.4.1 Project Phasing and Funding	2-18
2.4.2 Master Plan Amendment	2-18

CHAPTER 3 Environmental Setting	3-1
3.1 Physical Setting and Existing Land Uses	
3.1.1 Nipomo Community Park	
3.1.2 Mesa Meadows Recreation Area	
3.2 Surrounding Land Uses	
3.3 Consistency with Land Use Plans and Policies	
3.3.1 Overview	
3.3.2 Relevant Land Use Plans	
3.4 Cumulative Study Area	
3.4.1 CEQA Requirements	
3.5 Cumulative Development Scenario	
CHAPTER 4 Environmental Impacts Analysis	
4 1 Aesthetic Resources	4 1 - 1
4.1.1 Evicting Conditions	۲-۱ .+ ۸ 1 1
4.1.1 Existing Conditions	
4.1.2 Thresholds of Significance	
4.1.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology	4 1-6
4.1.5 Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures	
4.1.6 Cumulative Impacts	4.1-35
4.2 Air Quality	4.2-1
4.2.1 Existing Conditions	
4.2.2 Regulatory Setting	
4.2.3 Thresholds of Significance	
4.2.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology	4.2-11
4.2.5 Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.2-11
4.2.6 Cumulative Impacts	4.2-20
4.3 Biological Resources	4.3-1
4.3.1 Existing Conditions	4.3-1
4.3.2 Survey Methods and Results	4.3-6
4.3.3 Regulatory Setting	4.3-25
4.3.4 Thresholds of Significance	
4.3.5 Impact Assessment and Methodology	
4.3.6 Project-specific impacts and Mitigation Measures	
4.5.7 Cumulative impacts	
4.4.1 Existing Conditions	
4.4.2 Regulatory Setting	
4.4.5 Thesholds of Significance	
4.4.5 Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.4-4 4 4-4
4 4 6 Cumulative Impacts	4 4-7
4.5 Geology, Soils, and Drainage	4.5-1
4 5 1 Existing Conditions	4 5-1
4.5.2 Regulatory Setting	4 5-9
4.5.3 Thresholds of Significance	4.5-9
4.5.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology	4.5-10
4.5.5 Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.5-10

4.5.6 Cumulative Impacts	4.5-15
4.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	4.6-1
4.6.1 Existing Conditions	4.6-1
4.6.2 Regulatory Setting	4.6-4
4.6.3 Thresholds of Significance	4.6-6
4.6.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology	4.6-7
4.6.5 Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.6-7
4.6.6 Cumulative Impacts	4.6-10
4.7 Land Use	4.7-1
4.7.1 Existing Conditions	4.7-1
4.7.2 Regulatory Setting	4.7-1
4.7.3 Thresholds of Significance	4.7-3
4.7.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology	
4.7.5 Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures	
	4.7-8
4.8 Noise	4.8-1
4.8.1 Existing Conditions	
4.8.2 Regulatory Setting	
4.8.3 Thresholds of Significance	
4.8.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology	
4.6.5 Project-specific impacts and Miligation Measures	4.0-11
4.0.0 Culturative impacts	4.0-17
4.9.1 Existing Conditions	
4.9.2 Regulatory Setting	
4.9.3 Thresholds of Significance	4.9-0 1 9-7
4.9.5 Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.9-7
4.9.6 Cumulative Impacts	
4 10 Transportation Circualtion and Traffic	4 10-1
4 10 1 Existing Conditions	4 10-1
4 10 2 Baseline Conditions	4 10-8
4.10.3 Regulatory Setting	
4.10.4 Thresholds of Significance	
4.10.5 Impact Assessment and Methodology	4.10-10
4.10.6 Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.10-10
4.10.7 Cumulative Impacts	4.10-17
4.11 Wastewater	4.11-1
4.11.1 Existing Conditions	4.11-1
4.11.2 Regulatory Setting	4.11-3
4.11.3 Thresholds of Significance	4.11-5
4.11.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology	4.11-5
4.11.5 Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.11-6
4.11.6 Cumulative Impacts	4.11-8
4.12 Water Resources	4.12-1
4.12.1 Existing Conditions	4.12-1
4.12.2 Regulatory Setting	4.12-5
4.12.3 Thresholds of Significance	4.12-10
4.12.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology	4.12-10

4.12.5 Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.12-11
4.12.6 Cumulative Impacts	4.12-17
4.13 Climate Change	4.13-1
4.13.1 Existing Conditions	4.13-1
4.13.2 Regulatory Setting	4.13-3
4.13.3 Thresholds of Significance	4.13-8
4.13.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology	4.13-8
4.13.5 Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures	4.13-9
4.13.6 Cumulative Impacts	4.13-9
CHAPTER 5 Alternatives Analysis	5-1
5.1 Introduction	5-1
5.2 Alternatives Selection	
5.2.1 Project Objectives	
5.2.2 Significant Impacts Resulting from the Proposed Project	5-2
5.3 Alternatives Considered	5-3
5.3.1 No Project Alternative	5-3
5.3.2 Alternative Master Plans	5-3
5.3.3 Community Center Alternatives	5-11
5.4 Alternatives Impacts Analysis	5-14
5.4.1 No Project Alternative	5-14
5.4.2 Alternative Master Plan A	5-15
5.4.3 Alternative Master Plan B	
5.4.4 Community Center Alternative A (Sandydale Drive and Frontage Road)	
5.4.5 Community Center Alternative B (West Tefft Street and Branch Street)	
5.4.6 Community Center Alternative C (Orchard Avenue and Division Street)	
5.4.7 Community Center Alternative D (Fill Street and Grande Street)	
CHAPTER 6 Other CEQA Considerations	6-1
6.1 Growth Inducing Impacts	6-1
6.2 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes	6-1
6.2.1 Irreversible Commitment of Resources	6-1
CHAPTER 7 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	
7 1 Statutory Requirements	7_1
7.2 Administration of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	7-1
7.3 Mitigation Measures and Monitoring Program	
CHAPIER 8 References and Report Preparation	8-1
8.1 References	8-1
8.1.1 Aesthetic Resources	
8.1.2 Air Quality	
ö. I.J BIOIOGICAI Kesources	8-1
0.1.4 Cultural Resources	ŏ-2 ຊ_າ
8 1 6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials	 א-2 ג-2
8.1.7 Land Use	
8.1.8 Noise	
8.1.9 Public Services and Utilities	8-5

8.1.10 Transportation, Circualtion, and Traffic	8-5
8.1.11 Wastewater	8-5
8.1.12 Water Resources	8-6
8.1.13 Climate Change	8-7
8.2 List of Preparers	8-8
CHAPTER 9 Response to Comments	9-1
9.1 Agency Comment Letters and Responses	9-1
9.1.1 Response to State Clearinghouse Online Announcement of Filing	9-4
9.1.2 Response to Letter from San Luis Obispo County Department of Public Wo	orks 9-8
9.1.3 Response to Letter from San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control Dist	rict 9-11
9.1.4 Response to Letter from Nipomo Community Services District	9-24
9.2 Non-Agency Organizations Comment Letters and Responses	9-27
9.2.1 Response to Letter from California Native Plant Society	9-31
9.2.2 Response to Letter from Nipomo Off-leash Dog Park, Inc. (Nipomo Dog Pa	rk) 9-34
9.2.3 Response to Comments from South County Advisory Council Parks &	
Recreation Subcommittee	9-36
9.2.4 Response to Comments from South County Advisory Council Officers and	0.50
Members	
9.2.5 Response to Letter from hipotho Parks Conservancy	
9.3 General Public Comment Letters and Responses	
9.3.1 Response to Email from Bill Deneen	
9.3.2 Response to Email from Nora Jenae	
9.3.3 Response to Letter from EL lay Hansson	9-03
9.3.4 Response to Letter from Stephanie Greene	9-07 0_01
9.3.6 Response to Email from Barbara Verlengiere	9-91 9-95
9.3.7 Response to Email from Cherie Dodds	9-97
9.3.8 Response to Comment Card from Bill Deneen	
9.3.9 Response to Letter from Jacqueline Sue Walls	9-110
9.3.10 Response to Email from Cindy Jelinek	9-121
9.3.11 Response to Email from Vincent McCarthy	9-123
9.3.12 Response to Letter from Jane Peterson	9-127
9.3.13 Response to Email from Dan Woodson, PE	9-133
9.3.14 Response to Email from Ed Eby	9-140
9.3.15 Response to Letter from Harry F. Walls	9-144
9.3.16 Response to Comment Card from "BLME"	9-146
9.3.17 Response to Comment Card from "Neighbor"	9-148
9.4 Additional Non-Agency Organizations Comment Letters and Responses	9-149
9.4.1 Response to Additional Comments from South County Advisory Council	
Officers and Members	9-158

LIST OF TABLES

Table ES-1. Master Plan Existing and Proposed Amenities	ES-6
Table ES-2. Master Plan Existing and Proposed Amenities – Alternative Master Plan A	ES-15
Table ES-3. Master Plan Existing and Proposed Amenities – Alternative Master Plan B	ES-16
Table ES-4. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	ES-27
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Table 1-1. Commonly Used Acronyms	1-5
Table 2-1. Master Plan Existing and Proposed Use Types	
Table 2-2. Master Plan Existing and Proposed Amenities	2-15
Table 3-1. Surrounding Land Uses	3-2
Table 3-2. Consistency with Plans and Policies	3-11
Table 3-3. Cumulative Projects List	3-39
Table 4.2-1. San Luis Obispo County Attainment Status	4.2-3
Table 4.2-2. Screening Emission Rates for Construction Operations	4.2-6
Table 4.2-3. Thresholds of Significance for Construction Operations	4.2-6
Table 4.2-4. Thresholds of Significance for Operational Emissions	4.2-8
Table 4.2-5. SLOAPCD Mitigation Threshold Guide	4.2-10
Table 4.2-6. Estimated Construction Emissions – Sports Fields	4.2-12
Table 4.2-7. Estimated Construction Emissions – Master Plan	4.2-12
Table 4.2-8. Estimated Operational + Area Source Emissions	4.2-14
Table 4.3-1. Special-status Plant Species Evaluated for Occurrence on the Project Site	4.3-10
Table 4.3-2. Special-status Wildlife Species Evaluated for Occurrence on the Project Site	4.3-19
Table 4.3-3. Habitat Impacts	4.3-30
Table 4.3-4. Annual Performance Standards and Final Success Criteria	4.3-33
Table 4.5-1. California Geologic Society Listing of Nearby Faults	4.5-6
Table 4.6-1. Offenses Known to Law Enforcement – San Luis Obispo County	4.6-4
Table 4.7-1. Land Use Ordinance Minimum Setback Requirements	4.7-4
Table 4.9.1 Short term Transportation Noise Measurements	192
Table 4.9.2 Short term Noise Measuremente	
Table 4.8-2. Short-term Noise Measurements	
Table 4.8-4. Maximum Allowable Noise Expedure Transportation Noise Sources	
Table 4.0-4. Maximum Anowable Noise Exposure Transportation Noise Sources	
Table 4.9-5. Land Use Compatibility for New Development hear Transportation Sources	
Table 4.9.7. Estimated Traffic Noise Lavel Increase (Evicting Dive Discisst)	
Table 4.0-7. Estimated Traffic Noise Level Increase (Existing Plus Project)	
Table 4.0-0. Estimated Traffic Noise Level increase (Existing Plus Bullo-Out)	
rable 4.0-9. Noise measurements Damon Garcia Sports Complex	

Table 4.8-10. Noise Measurements Templeton Skate Park	4.8-15
Table 4.8-11. Estimated Traffic Noise Level Increase (Build-out Plus Project)	4.8-18
Table 4.9-1. Nipomo School Enrollment Capacities	4.9-3
Table 4.9-2. San Luis Obispo County Solid Waste Disposal Facilities	4.9-4
Table 4.10-1. Signalized Intersection Service Level Criteria	4.10-4
Table 4.10-2. Unsignalized Intersection Service Level Criteria	4.10-6
Table 4.10-3. Existing Intersection Levels of Service	4.10-6
Table 4.10-4. Level of Service Threshold Volumes for Various Roadway Types	4.10-7
Table 4.10-5. Existing Street Roadway Segment Daily Traffic Conditions	4.10-8
Table 4.10-6. Estimated Project Vehicle Trip Generation	4.10-11
Table 4.10-7. Project Vehicle Trip Distribution Percentages	4.10-12
Table 4.10-8. Existing and Existing with Project Intersection Levels of Service	4.10-14
Table 4.10-9. Existing and Existing With Project Street Roadway Segment Daily Traffic	
Conditions	4.10-14
Table 4.10-10. Cumulative Intersection Levels of Service	4.10-18
Table 4.10-11. Cumulative Roadway Segment Daily Traffic Conditions	4.10-21
Table 4.11-1. 2010 Wastewater Volumes	4.11-1
Table 4.11-2. Wastewater Collected and Recycled by the NCSD	4.11-3
Table 4.12-1. Historic Water Delivery – NCP, 1999-2011	4.12-3
Table 4.12-2. Estimated New Water Demand	4.12-10
Table 5-1. Master Plan Existing and Proposed Amenities Alternative Master Plan A	5-4
Table 5-2. Master Plan Existing and Proposed Amenities Alternative Master Plan B	5-5
Table 5-3. Habitat Impacts – Alternative Master Plan A	5-23
Table 5-4. Estimated Traffic Noise Level Increase (Existing Plus Project)	5-28
Table 5-5. Estimated Traffic Noise Level Increase (Existing Plus Build-out)	5-29
Table 5-6. Estimated Project Alternative Vehicle Trip Generation	5-32
Table 5-7. Existing and Existing with Alternative Master Plan A Intersection Levels of Service	5-35
Table 5-8. Existing and Existing with Project Alternative Street Roadway Segment Daily Traffic	
Table 5-9. Cumulative with Master Plan Alternative A Intersection Levels of Service	
Table 5-10. Cumulative Roadway Segment Daily Traffic Conditions	5-37
I able 5-11. Estimated Additional Water Demand	5-39
Table 7-1. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program	7-2

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure ES-1, Regional Location Map	ES-2
Figure ES-2. Project Vicinity Map	ES-3
Figure ES-3. Nipomo Community Park Master Plan	ES-7
Figure ES-4. Community Center Conceptual Schematic	ES-9
Figure ES-5. Alternative Master Plan A	ES-19
Figure ES-6. Alternative Master Plan B	ES-21
Figure ES-7. Community Center Alternatives	ES-23
Figure ES-8. Community Center Alternatives Land Use Category Map	ES-24
Figure 2-1. Regional Location Map	2-2
Figure 2-2. Project Vicinity Map	2-3
Figure 2-3. Assessor's Parcel Map	
Figure 2-4. Assessor's Parcel Map	2-5
Figure 2-5. Nipomo Community Park Master Plan	2-11
Figure 2-6. Existing Uses	2-14
Figure 2-7. Community Center Conceptual Schematic	2-16
Figure 3-1. Land Use Designations	3-3
Figure 3-2. Parcel Map	3-4
Figure 4.1-1. Locations of Key Viewing Areas and Corresponding Photo-simulations	4.1-7
Figure 4.1-2. Examples of Typical Community Pools	4.1-19
Figure 4.1-3. Examples Showing the General Visual Character of Skate Parks	4.1-20
Figure 4.1-4. Conceptual Grading Plan for the Multi-Use Sports Fields and Stormwater Basins	4.1-21
Figure 4.1-5. Examples of Typical Community Park Restrooms	4.1-22
Figure 4.1-6. Examples Showing the Visual Character of Typical Parking Lots	4.1-23
Figure 4.1-7. Examples of Different Types of Park Roads	4.1-23
Figure 4.1-8. Examples of the Typical Appearance of Park Amphitheaters	4.1-24
Figure 4.1-9. Examples of Two Different Styles of Interpretive Centers	4.1-24
Figure 4.1-10. Examples of a Typical Basketball Court (Left) and Handball Court (Right)	4.1-25
Figure 4.1-11. Examples of Different Looks of Playground Equipment	4.1-25
Figure 4.1-12. Examples of Different Styles of Dog Parks	4.1-26
Figure 4.1-13. Examples Showing the General Visual Character of Horseshoe Pits	4.1-26
Figure 4.1-14. Examples of Two Types of Tennis Courts	4.1-27
Figure 4.1-15. Examples of Typical Park Trails	4.1-27
Figure 4.1-16. Examples of Different Types of Stormwater Basins	4.1-28
Figure 4.1-17. Examples of the Typical Visual Character of Equestrian Staging Areas	4.1-29
Figure 4.1-18. Key Viewing Area 1 – from near the Interior Road looking Northwest	4.1-37
Figure 4.1-19. Key Viewing Area 2 – from near the Interior Road looking Southwest	4.1-38
Figure 4.1-20. Key Viewing Area 3 – from West Tefft Street looking Northwest	4.1-39
Figure 4.1-21. Key Viewing Area 4 – from Park Interior looking Southeast	4.1-40
Figure 4.1-22. Key Viewing Area 5 - from the Southern Perimeter of the NCP looking North	4.1-41

Figure 4.1-23. Key Viewing Area 6 – from Pomeroy Road looking South
-igure 4.3-1. Habitat and Special-status Species Map4.3-3
Figure 4.5-1. Soils Map
-igure 4.5-2. Geologic Hazards4.5-8
Figure 4.8-1. Traffic Noise Measurement Locations4.8-3
-igure 4.8-2. Long-term Noise Monitoring Map4.8-6
Figure 4.10-1. Existing Traffic Volumes4.10-8
-igure 4.10-2. Project Traffic Volumes4.10-13
Figure 4.10-3. Buildout Traffic Volumes4.10-20
Figure 4.11-1. NMMA Wastewater Treatment Facilities4.11-2
Figure 4.12-1. Water Resources4.12-6
-igure 5-1. Alternative Master Plan A5-7
-igure 5-2. Alternative Master Plan B5-6
-igure 5-3. Community Center Alternatives5-12
Figure 5-4. Community Center Alternatives Land Use Category Map
Figure 5-5. Alternative Master Plan A, KVA 15-18
Figure 5-6. Alternative Master Plan A, KVA 35-19
Figure 5-7. Alternative Master Plan A Traffic Volumes5-34

LIST OF PHOTOGRAPHS

Photograph 3-1. Current Park Entrance off of Pomeroy Road	3-5
Photograph 3-2. Existing Parking Facility and Lighted Ball Fields	3-5
Photograph 3-3. Existing Park Loop Road and Drainage Basin	3-5
Photograph 3-4. Nipomo Native Botanical Garden	3-5
Photograph 3-5. Open Space Area/Trails	3-6
Photograph 3-6. Open Space Area/Trails	3-6
Photograph 3-7. Northern Boundary of Park/Facing West along Osage Street	3-6
Photograph 3-8. Eastern Boundary of Park/Facing North along Pomeroy Road	3-6
Photograph 4.1-1. Characteristic landscape of Nipomo including skyline trees, open space, and scattered development	4.1-2
Photograph 4.1-2. The commercial center of Nipomo along West Tefft Street, approximately 0.5 mile east of the NCP	4.1-2
Photograph 4.1-3. An existing view of the NCP from westbound Pomeroy Road	4.1-9
Photograph 4.1-4. The existing view from near Orchard Avenue toward the NCP	4.1-10
Photograph 4.1-5. The existing view from Tejas Place toward the north	4.1-11
Photograph 4.1-6. The existing view from Osage Street looking east toward the park	4.1-11
Photograph 4.1-7. The existing view from Pomeroy Road looking southwest toward the park	4.1-12
Photograph 4.1-8. Existing views of some of the more developed areas within the park	4.1-13
Photograph 4.1-9. Existing views of some of the more developed areas within the park	4.1-13
Photograph 4.1-10. View of the existing ball field and sports lighting	4.1-14
Photograph 4.1-11. The existing view of the less developed western, southern, and central portions of the park	4.1-14
Photograph 4.1-12. The existing view from the oak-covered ridge toward the north	4.1-15
Photograph 4.1-13. The existing view looking southeast from Osage Street	4.1-16
Photograph 4.1-14. Existing view of the Nipomo Community Library from West Tefft Street	4.1-22
Photograph 4.1-15. View of the existing open play area within the park	4.1-28
Photograph 5-1. View to the northwest	5-44
Photograph 5-2. View to the north	5-45
Photograph 5-3. View to the northeast	5-48
Photograph 5-4. View to the southwest	5-48
Photograph 5-5. View to the northwest	5-51
Photograph 5-6. View to the southwest	5-51
Photograph 5-7. View from Grande Street to the northeast	5-54
Photograph 5-8. View from Hill Street to the southwest	5-54

LIST OF APPENDICES

**Appendices included on enclosed CD.

Appendix A:	Nipomo Community Park Master Plan
Appendix B:	Notice of Preparation Notice of Preparation for the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report Notice of Preparation Comment Letters
Appendix C:	Air Quality Background Information Air Emissions Screening Analysis Master Plan Operational and Area Source Emissions Alternative Master Plan A Air Emissions Screening Analysis
Appendix D:	Biological Resources Report Background Information Plant and Wildlife Species Observed within Nipomo Community Park Photo Documentation
Appendix E:	Hazards and Hazardous Materials Background Information Results of Site History Research and Exploratory Trenching
Appendix F:	Noise Background Information Noise Study Report
Appendix G:	Transportation and Circulation Background Information Traffic Impact Analysis

This page intentionally left blank.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) assesses the environmental impacts associated with the development of the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan (NCPMP), proposed by San Luis Obispo County Parks (County Parks). This EIR is an informational document that is being used by the general public and governmental agencies to review and evaluate the proposed project

The purpose of the Executive Summary is to provide the reader with a brief overview of the proposed project, the anticipated environmental effects, and the potential mitigation measures that could reduce the severity of the impacts associated with the project. This chapter includes an impact summary table, which summarizes the impacts and mitigation measures. The impacts and mitigation measures are discussed in detail in Chapter 4, Environmental Impact Analysis, of the EIR. This chapter also identifies the various alternatives analyzed as part of the EIR. The details of the alternatives analysis can be found in Chapter 5, Alternatives Analysis, of the EIR. The reader should not rely exclusively on the Executive Summary as the sole basis for judgment of the proposed project and alternatives. The EIR in its entirety should be consulted for information about the project's environmental impacts and associated mitigation measures.

This EIR was prepared in accordance with State and County of San Luis Obispo (County) administrative guidelines established to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). In compliance with the CEQA Guidelines, the County, as the Lead Agency, prepared an Initial Study for the proposed project and solicited comments through distribution of a Notice of Preparation (NOP). The results of the Initial Study and comments received in response to the NOP were used to help direct the scope of the analysis and the technical studies in this EIR. Copies of the Initial Study, NOP, and the comments received in response to the NOP can be found in Appendix

A number of federal, state, and local governmental agencies require an environmental analysis of the proposed project consistent with the requirements of CEQA in order to act on the project. These agencies include the County, the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG), Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection/County Fire (CAL FIRE), and the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD).

A. **PROJECT LOCATION**

The project site is located in the unincorporated community of Nipomo, within San Luis Obispo County, California (refer to Figure ES-1). The proposed project consists of two connected park areas, Nipomo Community Park (NCP), including the Nipomo Native Garden, and Mesa Meadows (refer to Figure ES-2). The project site is located northwest of the Pomeroy Road / West Tefft Street intersection, approximately one mile west of U.S. Highway 101 (US 101).







Figure ES-2. Project Vicinity Map

NCP is an approximately 137-acre angular parcel bounded by Pomeroy Road and West Tefft Street to the east, Osage Street to the west, and the Tejas Street neighborhood to the south. The approximately 22-acre Mesa Meadows open space area is located within two parcels adjacent to, and immediately southwest of, NCP, on the northwest corner of Mesa Road and Osage Road. The total park and open space area is approximately 159 acres, comprised of four parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers [APNs] 091-313-049, 091-313-050, 092-121-085, and 092-121-086).

B. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The primary goal of the NCPMP is to establish the long-range plan for Nipomo Community Park and Mesa Meadows. The objectives of the NCPMP are to:

- provide a range of passive and active facilities and use areas to meet the recreational needs of the community;
- maintain and upgrade existing recreational and community facilities and amenities;
- effectively manage current and projected levels of park uses;
- provide amenities that are aesthetically consistent with the regional character of the area;
- provide a community recreation center within the unincorporated community of Nipomo;
- incorporate infrastructure and circulation improvements to meet existing and estimated future (2025) motor vehicle transportation warrants;
- apply adaptive management strategies, including the use of improved technology, to address new planning and management issues as they arise;
- consider and support active citizen input in the decision-making process; and,
- periodically review and update the NCPMP through a public review process (approximately 15-year intervals), including consideration of the changing needs of the community when evaluating existing and potential new amenities.

C. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The proposed project under consideration in this Program EIR includes the proposed NCPMP (refer to Figure ES-3). The plan includes a variety of recreational opportunities, including the expansion of existing facilities, the addition of new facilities to the park, active recreational uses including multi-use sports fields, passive recreational uses and open space, and improvements to infrastructure (see Table ES-1).

1. Existing Facilities

Existing major amenities in the park include: four sports fields accommodating baseball, soccer, and football (5.3 acres), including one lighted field; four lighted tennis courts (0.6 acre); a 0.7-acre dog park; 6,534-square foot playground; group and individual picnic areas (9,433 square feet); the 12-acre Nipomo Native Garden including trails and planted areas; open play area (9.3 acres); 1.1 acres of paved trails/walkways; and, 4.3 acres of dirt and spur trails. Infrastructure within the park includes: 1.2 acres of drainage improvements including basin<u>s</u>, two acres of roads; 3.1 acres of parking; 3,155 square feet of restrooms and a maintenance

building (consisting of a shop, office and restroom); two host sites (1,284 square feet); and, an air quality monitoring station. In addition, 7,134-square foot Nipomo Library is located within the park, and is accessed from West Tefft Street. An existing, temporary pre-school and fenced outdoor play area occupies approximately 4,050-square feet within the park. The pre-school is proposed to remain until a new pre-school is approved onsite, or elsewhere in the community of Nipomo.

Existing recreation and infrastructure cover approximately 15 acres or approximately 11% of the park. The remaining 130-acre area (including Mesa Meadows) is generally a natural area consisting of oak woodland and coastal scrub, annual and ruderal grassland, and trails. Public recreation at Mesa Meadows includes a roughly one mile Class I bicycle path and contiguous equestrian trail. The site also contains native and non-native vegetation. The trail system at Mesa Meadows connects into the trail system of NCP.

2. Proposed Facilities

The NCPMP proposes approximately 15.96 acres of new recreational uses within the NCP area, 3.96 acres of new open play area (turf), and 7.57 acres of new infrastructure. Approximately 27.5 acres of existing undeveloped area and dirt trails would be converted to accommodate these new uses (refer to Table ES-1). The proposed project includes the expansion of the following existing uses: 4,000-square foot expansion of the library near West Tefft Street; an additional 8,276 square feet of playground, including a play structure and open play area near Osage Street and Camino Caballo; 19,000-square foot expansion of the offleash dog park; an additional 14,400 square feet of tennis courts; and additional three acres of paved and unpaved trails/walkways including a separate equestrian trail; restoration of spur trails; an additional four acres of open play area (turf). In addition, the NCPMP includes an additional 10 acres of multi-use sports fields. The type of sports to be accommodated would be determined at the time the need for added fields arises. The maximum intensity of use would likely be youth soccer. The area could accommodate about six youth soccer fields. The fields are proposed to be lighted.

Proposed new amenities include a skate park or community pool (10,000 square feet) near West Tefft Street. Additional new facilities would be located near the center of the park, including: a 5,227-square foot amphitheater (gazebo/informal stage); basketball courts (10,000 square feet); handball courts (4,000 square feet); horseshoe pits (1,800 square feet); and, 8,400-square foot swimming pool and deck (if not constructed near West Tefft Street). A paved walkway (11,280 square feet) is proposed along Osage Street. The NCPMP includes a 36,000-square foot community center/gymnasium to be located within the park.

The total area for the proposed community center/gymnasium and associated improvements would be approximately two acres. A conceptual schematic of the community center is shown in Figure ES-4.

Facilities	Existing (sf)	Proposed (sf)	Total (sf)
Recreation Area			
Amphitheaters	0	5,227	5,227
Basketball Courts	0	10,000	10,000
Playgrounds	6,534	8,276	14,810
Community Center	0	36,000	36,000
Dog Parks	31,988	19,000	50,988
Group Picnic Areas	9,433	0	9,433
Handball Courts	0	4,000	4,000
Horseshoe Pits	0	1,800	1,800
Skate Park	0	10,000	10,000
Sports Fields (Turf)	231,633	439,520	671,153
Swimming Pool/Deck	0	8,400	8,400
Tennis Courts	26,404	14,400	40,804
Trails/Walkways (paved/unpaved)	50,724	127,373	178,097
Osage Street Walkway (paved)	0	11,280	11,280
Volleyball Court	0	0	0
Subtotal	356,716	695,276	1,051,992
Open Space			
Open Space (undeveloped)	5,689,881	-1,113,510	4,576,371
Open Play Area (Turf)	399,805	172,498	572,303
Trails (dirt)	190,200	-84,276	105,924
Subtotal	<u>6,279,886</u>	-1,025,288	<u>5,254,598</u>
Infrastructure			
Basins	54,900	108,900	163,800
Library Building	7,134	4,000	11,134
Parking	137,166 (325 spaces)	183,388 (422 spaces)	320,554 (747 spaces)
Pre-school	4,050 (temporary)	0	4,050 (permanent)
Two Host Sites	1,284	0	1,284
Restrooms/Maintenance Buildings	3,155	1,490	4,645
Roads	89,036	32,234	121,270
Subtotal	296,725	330,012	<u>626,737</u>

Table ES-1.	Master	Plan	Existing	and	Proposed	Amenities
-------------	--------	------	----------	-----	----------	-----------

Figure ES-3. Nipomo Community Park Master Plan



This page intentionally left blank.





3. Access and Parking

Access

There are two motor vehicle entrances to NCP. One entrance is located on Pomeroy Road, offset and east of Juniper Street. The second motor vehicle entrance is located on West Tefft Street, adjacent to the Nipomo Library, offset and south of Orchard Avenue. Pedestrian, bicyclist, and equestrian trail access into NCP is located off of: Osage Street (near Charro Way), Camino Caballo (near Osage Street), and at the northern terminus of La Serena Way. NCP is accessible from a number of collector and local streets including: Camino Caballo, Mesa Road, Osage Road, and Tejas Place. The trail system within Mesa Meadows is accessible from Charro Way, Tejas Place, and Amigo Place; this trail system connects with the NCP trail system immediately east of the Charro Way and Osage Street intersection (refer to Figure ES-3).

Major road improvements proposed for the NCPMP include: the re-alignment of existing park entrances on West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road; installation of a traffic signal at the realigned Pomeroy Road/Juniper Street intersection; construction of a westbound left turn pocket and an eastbound right turn pocket on Pomeroy Road; and improvements to Osage Road, including road widening for consistency with County road standard A-1(d) (two 11-foot wide travel lanes, with six-foot shoulders on each side, for a total width of 34 feet), and construction of a trail within the road right-of-way. The project includes construction of a sixfoot wide, paved, multi-use trail and parallel equestrian trail creating a loop around the park.

The County General Services Agency will coordinate with the County Public Works Department prior to preparation of construction plans for road improvements in order to confirm that road improvements will meet the standards applicable at the time of actual development. In addition, there may be opportunities to incorporate design features that would avoid or minimize ground disturbance, and associated impacts to mature oak trees, drainage infrastructure, and the community. The NCPMP does not include a specific phasing plan because amenities would be constructed as funds are available. The Public Works Department was consulted to assess the appropriate timing for implementation of road improvements. The Public Works Department determined that major road improvements would be required prior to construction and operation of any high-traffic generating facility, including the permanent pre-school and administration building, sports fields, community center, amphitheater, swimming pool, and skate park (Richard Marshall; March 7, 2006). Proposed uses that would not generate a substantial amount of new trips may be constructed prior to implementation of access and road improvements, such as open turf areas, playgrounds, dog park, handball courts, tennis courts, basketball courts, internal roads, parking areas group picnic areas, trails, restrooms, and stormwater improvements.

Internal Circulation and Parking

Internal vehicular access within the park is provided by a loop road, which connects the West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road park entrances. Additional paved access is provided for the existing ballpark area. An additional paved loop road is proposed to provide access to proposed facilities and parking areas in the center of NCP. The park currently provides 325 parking spaces within several parking lots located within the southeastern portion of the park. The parking area for the Nipomo Native Garden, located adjacent to Osage Street, includes 10 automobile spaces and two bus spaces. The proposed NCPMP includes an additional 386 to 422 spaces, including seven equestrian pull-through spaces (refer to Table ES-1).

4. Park Programs and Operational Activities

In addition to the proposed facilities discussed above, the following activities and facilities are proposed as part of the NCPMP: removal of diseased trees and replacement tree planting program; utility infrastructure additions and maintenance; and a cellular communication repeater station. Tree removal would be required to accommodate access improvements at Pomeroy Road and Juniper Street, and Osage Road widening and pathway improvements.

Utility Infrastructure Additions and Maintenance

Water Supply

Water service is currently supplied to NCP through a contractual Water Service Agreement (WSA) executed between the NCSD and the County (recorded May 29, 1984). The WSA states that the NCSD will provide water to the park for the purposes of irrigation, sanitation, and miscellaneous uses. The County proposes to continue receiving water from the NCSD to serve the park, potentially including the use of recycled water.

<u>Wastewater</u>

Wastewater disposal for the park is currently treated by individual septic systems for four existing restroom facilities. The project includes two additional restroom facilities to serve park visitors. Effluent disposal and treatment could be accomplished by two methods: septic tanks and leachfield systems, or fiberglass holding tanks that are regularly pumped and maintained.

Stormwater Management

The project site currently receives stormwater flow from adjacent developed areas, which is directed into existing onsite stormwater basins (1.2 acres). Existing drainage improvements include earthen drainage channels, v-shaped concrete swales, culverts, and unlined infiltration basins. An engineered drainage system is located within Mesa Meadows, including multiple 24-inch corrugated metal culverts designed to convey stormwater runoff from the residential development into four infiltration basins located adjacent to Mesa Road. The proposed project includes the following drainage improvements to manage stormwater flow during rain events: (1) construct a new basin in the center of the southern half of the park, and (2) install a drainage pipe along Pomeroy Road within the existing drainage swale.

Cellular Communication Repeater Station

One repeater station is currently located at NCP on an existing light pole that illuminates the field. A second repeater station was approved by the County in 2009. The second station is located in the same vicinity as the existing station.

5. Master Plan Implementation

Project Phasing and Funding

The Master Plan does not establish a phasing plan, although the estimated timeframe for completion is 20 years. Once a master park plan is adopted, County Parks staff will go back to the community to determine priorities. The timing, type, and extent of infrastructure extensions, offsite improvements such as traffic signals, and earthwork would depend upon the type, extent, and cost of the first new facilities to be implemented, including associated infrastructure. The overall estimated cost to construct the Master Plan is shown in Appendix A

(Master Plan), which is based on conceptual design characteristics. The cost for any particular element could go up or down once the more detailed design is developed. It is possible that the Nipomo community, a concessionaire, and/or a community organization may be a partner in the development of the community recreation buildings planned for the park.

Master Plan Amendment

The Master Plan is intended to guide development of the park to an envisioned "build out" some undetermined years in the future. While the purpose of a Master Plan is to guide decisions over a number of years, it is recognized that as time passes community needs and priorities may change and the Master Plan may need updating and revising. The Master Plan should be updated at 15-year intervals to ensure that it remains viable and relevant as a guide for meeting the park and recreation needs of the community. The Master Plan may be amended at any point along the way if new ideas or pressing needs warrant a change in the Plan. The process for amending the Plan would involve community workshops, SCAC and County Parks and Recreation Commission input, as well as review and approval by the County Board of Supervisors.

D. PROPOSED PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Impacts of the proposed project and alternatives have been classified using the categories Class I, II, III, and IV as described below:

- Class I Significant, unavoidable, adverse impacts: Significant impacts that cannot be fully and effectively mitigated. No measures could be taken to avoid or reduce these adverse effects to insignificant or negligible levels.
- Class II Significant, but mitigable impacts: These impacts are potentially similar in significance to those of Class I, but can be reduced or avoided by the implementation of mitigation measures.
- Class III Less than significant impacts: Mitigation measures may still be required for these impacts as long as there is rough proportionality between the environmental impacts caused by the project and the mitigation measures imposed on the project.
- Class IV Beneficial impact: Project would have a beneficial environmental impact.

The term "significance" is used throughout the EIR to characterize the magnitude of the projected impact. For the purpose of this EIR, a significant impact is a substantial or potentially substantial change to resources in the local proposed project area or the area adjacent to the proposed project. In the discussions of each issue area, thresholds are identified that are used to distinguish between significant and insignificant impacts. To the extent feasible, distinctions are also made between local and regional significance and short-term versus long-term duration. Where possible, measures have been identified to reduce project impacts to less than significant levels. CEQA requires that public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the environmental effects of such projects (CEQA Statute §21002). Included with each mitigation measure are the plan requirements needed to ensure that the mitigation is included in the plans and construction of the project and the required timing of the action (e.g., prior to development of final construction plans, prior to commencement of construction, prior to operation, etc.).

The impacts and associated mitigation measures are shown in the Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures (refer to Table ES-4). Each issue area section of the impact summary table describes and classifies each impact, lists recommended mitigation, and states the level of impact with mitigation. A brief summary of the key impacts and mitigation measures for each issue area is presented below. The reader should refer to Table ES-4 and Chapter 4, Environmental Impacts Analysis, of the EIR for a more detailed discussion of the impacts and associated mitigation measures.

No significant, unavoidable, adverse (Class I) impacts were identified. The proposed project's identified significant but mitigable impacts include:

- <u>Aesthetic Resources</u>: Identified impacts include compatibility with rural character, and creation of light and glare affecting sensitive land uses and night sky. Mitigation is recommended to protect key scenic views within the park, require additional community input during the design phase, and incorporate architectural elements consistent with community character. Exterior light standards are recommended to reduce offsite light and glare affecting off-site uses and the night sky.
- <u>Air Quality</u>. Construction of the project would generate emissions, which can be mitigated by standard measures (i.e., dust control, equipment idling restrictions, and compliance with asbestos standards). Energy efficiency measures are recommended for inclusion in the final design of park elements to address operational emissions from vehicles and energy consumption.
- <u>Biological Resources</u>. Development of the project would affect to oak woodland, special status species, and wildlife. Mitigation is recommended, including predevelopment surveys to verify the location of special status vegetation, avoidance of special status wildlife, and restoration and conservation of special status plants and coast live oak trees.
- <u>Cultural Resources</u>. Development would occur within the boundary of an identified historic deposit; monitoring is recommended to support the historic record and provide additional information regarding the resource.
- <u>Geology and Soils.</u> Implementation of the project may result in erosion and sedimentation. Standard measures, including Best Management Practices and Low Impact Development strategies, are recommended.
- <u>Hazards and Hazardous Materials.</u> Grading and construction within boundaries of a previous informal dump site could expose the public to hazardous materials. Further testing is recommended during the design of structural elements to identify appropriate remediation actions (if necessary). Standard measures are identified to avoid public exposure to hazardous materials during grading and construction activities.
- Land Use. The County LUO exempts this project from permit requirements and ordinance regulations; however, relevant standards were identified as thresholds of significance or mitigation measures, as applicable. The proposed skate park would not meet setback standards identified in the County LUO; however, mitigation is recommended to meet County Noise standards and address the intent of the setback. The project is consistent with the Clean Air Plan, Strategic Growth policies, Parks and Recreation Element, and Conservation and Open Space Element.

- <u>Noise</u>. Generation of noise during use of proposed facilities (i.e., sports fields, skate park) would affect nearby residential uses. Use of design setbacks and incorporation of noise attenuating features and building elements are recommended to reduce noise within County Noise Element thresholds. Remediation standards are identified to address substantiated noise complaints, in the event additional measures are necessary beyond the presence of the park ranger.
- <u>Public Services and Utilities</u>. Development of additional park amenities and increased use of the NCP may increase the demand for emergency services. Design features are recommended to reduce the potential for criminal activity. The project would have a beneficial impact on recreation, because it would meet community demands for diverse opportunities.
- Wastewater. The project would include additional onsite septic systems. Title 19 of the County Code states that the use of "private on-site sewage disposal systems are allowed only within the rural areas of the county", and that the standard was enacted in part to implement the requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board Basin Plan. The system would accommodate a public use, and would be designed in compliance with Basin Plan standards (i.e., adequate area for leach fields and expansion, engineered system to address percolation and separation from groundwater, avoidance of steep slopes).
- <u>Water Resources</u>. Installation and maintenance of ten acres of sports fields and additional turf areas will require up to 44.3 acre feet per year (afy) of water from the Nipomo Community Services District (NCSD). Mitigation is recommended to reduce current irrigation water demand, and incorporate best available technologies to minimize future water use, including the potential use of recycled water. Standard measures are recommended to protect water quality, including implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, BMPs, and LID strategies.

E. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

CEQA, §15126.6(a), requires an EIR to "describe a reasonable range of alternatives to a project, or to the location of a project, which could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives". Through the scoping process, if an alternative was found to be infeasible, as defined above, then it was dropped from further consideration. In addition, CEQA states that alternatives should "...attain most of the basic objectives of the project..." Please refer to Chapter 5, Alternatives Analysis, of the EIR for a detailed discussion of the alternatives. The following alternatives were selected for more detailed review.

1. No Project Alternative

This alternative is required to be considered by CEQA, and would not include implementation of the Master Plan. Implementation of the no project alternative would not preclude development or improvements within the park. The park amenities would continue to operate, and improvements may occur in dependent of a master development plan.

2. Alternative Master Plans

Alternative Master Plan A

Alternative Master Plan A proposes approximately <u>22.7</u> acres of new facilities and infrastructure and 4 acres of additional open play area (turf) (refer to Figure ES-5 and Table ES-2).

Implementation of Alternative Master Plan A would result in approximately 38 acres of total developed area, or approximately 23% of the 159-acre park. A community center would be located near West Tefft Street, including a community center, pre-school and administration building, and gymnasium. The remaining additional facilities would be located near the center of the park, including an amphitheater, basketball and tennis courts, a pool or skate park, multi-use sports fields, playground, open lawn area, horseshoe pits, off-leash dog park, gazebo/informational stage, and infrastructure improvements. A lawn area and play structure is proposed near Osage Street and Camino Caballo.

Facilities	Existing (sf)	Proposed (sf)	Total (sf)
Recreation Area			
Amphitheaters	0	5,227	5,227
Basketball Courts	0	10,000	10,000
Playgrounds	6,534	8,276	14,810
Community Center	0	14,000	14,000
Dog Parks	31,988	19,000	50,988
Group Picnic Areas	9,433	0	9,433
Handball Courts	0	0	0
Horseshoe Pits	0	1,800	1,800
Skate Park or Swimming Pool	0	10,000	10,000
Sports Fields (Turf)	231,633	439,520	671,153
Tennis Courts	26,404	14,400	40,804
Trails/Walkways (paved/unpaved)	50,724	127,373	178,097
Osage Street Walkway (paved)	0	11,280	11,280
Volleyball Court	0	0	0
Subtotal	356,716	<u>660,876</u>	1,017,592

Table ES-2. Master Plan Existing and Proposed AmenitiesAlternative Master Plan A

Facilities	Existing (sf)	Proposed (sf)	Total (sf)
Open Space			
Open Space (undeveloped)	5,689,881	-1,088,510	4,601,371
Open Play Area (Turf)	399,805	176,498	576,303
Trails (dirt)	190,200	-84,276	105,924
Subtotal	<u>6,279,886</u>	-996,288	<u>5,283,598</u>
Infrastructure			
Basins	54,900	108,900	163,800
Library Building	7,134	4,000	11,134
Parking	137,166 (325 spaces)	183,388 (422 spaces)	320,554 (747 spaces)
Pre-school	4,050 (temporary)	0	4,050 (permanent)
Two Host Sites	1,284	0	1,284
Restrooms/Maintenance Buildings	3,155	1,490	4,645
Roads	89,036	32,234	121,270
Subtotal	<u>296,725</u>	330,012	626,737

Alternative Master Plan B

Alternative Master Plan B was adapted from recommendations by the South County Advisory Council (refer Table ES-3 and Figure ES-6 below).

This alternative expands on existing uses, and does not include major features identified in the proposed project, such as the community center, sports fields, skate park, or swimming pool. This alternative accommodates adult fitness equipment within the paved trail system, a small (10,000-square foot) turf and picnic area near the play area, and equestrian staging within the parking areas (similar to the proposed project). Overall parking is reduced relative to the proposed facilities. Road improvement projects, including widening of Osage Road and realignment of the park entrances would be implemented with this project.

Facilities	Existing (sf)	Proposed (sf)	Total (sf)
Recreation Area			
Amphitheater and Gazebo	0	5,227	5,227
Basketball Courts	0	10,000	10,000
Playgrounds	6,534	8,276	14,810
Community Center	0	0	0
Dog Parks	31,988	0	31,988
Group Picnic Areas	9,433	0	9,433
Handball Courts	0	0	0
Horseshoe Pits	0	1,800	1,800
Skate Park	0	0	0
Sports Fields (Turf)	231,633	0	231,633
Swimming Pool	0	0	0
Tennis Courts	26,404	14,400	40,804
Trails/Walkways (paved/unpaved)	50,724	127,373	178,097
Osage Street Walkway (paved)	0	11,280	11,280
Volleyball Court	0	1,800	1,800
Subtotal	356,716	180,156	536,872
Open Space			
Open Space (undeveloped)	5,689,881	-510,168	5,179,713
Open Play Area (Turf)	399,805	10,000	409,805
Trails (dirt)	190,200	0	190,200
Subtotal	<u>6,279,886</u>	<u>-500,168</u>	<u>5,779,718</u>
Infrastructure			
Basins	54,900	108,900	163,800
Library Building	7,134	4,000	11,134
Parking	137,166	13,200	150,366
Pre-school	4,050	0	4,050

Table ES-3. Master Plan Existing and Proposed AmenitiesAlternative Master Plan B

Facilities	Existing (sf)	Proposed (sf)	Total (sf)
Two Host Sites	1,284	0	1,284
Restrooms/Maintenance Buildings	3,155	1,490	4,645
Roads	89,036	32,234	121,270
Subtotal	<u>296,725</u>	<u>159,824</u>	<u>456,549</u>

3. Community Center Alternatives

Four alternative locations for the proposed community center, including the structure, parking, and associated landscaping, are qualitatively assessed below. The locations and associated land use categories of each alternative location are shown in Figures ES-7 and ES-8 below. The center would be used for recreation and events (up to 300 persons) for all members of the community.

Community Center Alternative A (Sandydale Drive and Frontage Road)

The location of this alternative site is at the northern terminus of the Frontage Road, at the intersection with Sandydale Drive. This parcel is approximately 4.4 acres, and is within the Commercial Service land use category. The site is currently undeveloped. Surrounding land uses include residential development, the Nipomo Dog and Cat Hospital, a fitness center, and a storage facility. Land to the northwest is undeveloped, and US 101 is located to the east.

Community Center Alternative B (West Tefft Street and Branch)

This site is located at the corner of Burton Street and Mallagh Street, west of West Tefft Street. The parcel is approximately 2.6 acres in size, and is within the Office and Professional land use category. The site is currently undeveloped. Surrounding development includes residential development, the Nipomo Men's Club, and commercial/retail development along West Tefft Street.

Community Center Alternative C (Orchard Avenue and Division Street)

This site is located at the intersection of Orchard Avenue and Division Street. The parcel is approximately 2.85 acres in size, and is within the Commercial Retail land use category. The site is undeveloped. Surrounding land uses include a 76® gas station and the La Placita Market and carwash, a strawberry field and fruit stand, and residential development.

Community Center Alternative D (Hill Street and Grande Street)

This site is located between Hill Street and Grande Street, approximately 500 feet west of the Frontage Road. The parcel is approximately 9.6 acres in size, and is within the Residential Multi-family land use category. A planned unit development and retail development are proposed to the east, and the property to the west is vacant. Land uses along Grande Street include residences, greenhouses, and San Luis Bay Apartments. Land uses along Hill Street include multi-family residential development and a truck parking area.

Figure ES-5. Alternative Master Plan A



This page intentionally left blank.
Figure ES-6. Alternative Master Plan B



This page intentionally left blank.



Figure ES-7. Community Center Alternatives

Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report



Figure ES-8. Community Center Alternatives Land Use Category Map

F. Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA requires the alternatives section of an EIR to describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project that avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects identified in the EIR analysis while still attaining most of the basic project objectives. The alternative that most effectively reduces impacts while meeting project objectives should be considered the "environmentally superior alternative." In the event that the No Project Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR is also supposed to identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. In this EIR the No Project Alternative results in the fewest environmental impacts, although it does not meet any of the project objectives.

As proposed, and with the incorporation of mitigation measures, the proposed project would not result in any significant, unavoidable, adverse impacts. Alternative Master Plan A would result in similar impacts as the proposed project. Key changes include the location of larger structures closer to West Tefft Street, as opposed to the interior of the park. Structural development along the road corridor may appear to be more consistent with the visual character of the area, and would maintain a more rural character within the park itself.

Alternative Master Plan B would significantly reduce uses that require water supply exceeding existing demands. This alternative would also not generate traffic trips and air emissions associated with higher demand uses, such as sports fields and open turf. Upon sole consideration of environmental effects, this alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. While this alternative minimizes potentially significant effects related to aesthetics (including the creation of light and glare), air quality, noise, and water supply, it does not fully meet the objectives of the project. Implementation of this alternative would not provide a range of passive and active facilities and use areas to meet the recreational needs of the community, and it would not effectively manage current and projected levels of park uses.

In the event Alternative Master Plan B is selected for approval, the County will need to address current and future public demand for active recreational opportunities and facilities within the community of Nipomo through other means. In addition, Alternative Master Plan B does not include a community center within NCP; therefore, consideration of an alternative location would be necessary to meet the project objective to provide a community recreation center within the community of Nipomo. In the event the Parks and Recreation Commission and County Board of Supervisors do not determine that Alternative Master Plan B sufficiently meets the project objectives, then Alternative Master Plan A or the proposed project would also be consistent with all County LUO standards specific to the community center.

If Alternative Master Plan B is selected as the approved project, consideration of an alternative site for the community center is recommended for consistency with project objectives. Two potential locations for the proposed community center appear to be environmentally superior: Alternative B, West Branch Street, and Alternative C, Orchard Avenue and Division Street. These locations could be developed with the least amount of ground disturbance, and do not appear to be constrained by sensitive environmental resources. Consideration of noise impacts and the surrounding residential communities may necessitate limits on use (i.e., no events past 10:00 p.m.) and amplified sound (interior use only). Further analysis of biological and cultural resources is recommended. The site between Grande and Hill streets may avoid impacting sensitive land uses.

All alternative locations are potentially inconsistent with the County LUO, primarily related to South County Nipomo Urban Area limitations on use. Alternative B, West Branch Street, is within the Office and Professional land use category; full consistency with the LUO would limit indoor amusement and recreation, and public assembly and entertainment. Alternative C, Orchard Avenue and Division Street, is within the Commercial Retail land use category, and limited allowable uses do not include public assembly and entertainment. In the event it is determined that full consistency with County LUO standards is desired, this determination may prevent or limit use of the community center in these alternative locations. Since the County is not required to obtain a discretionary use permit, this standard does not specifically apply to the project; however, the potential land use inconsistency is noted.

Table ES-4. Summary of	Impacts and	I Mitigation	Measures
------------------------	-------------	--------------	----------

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
Aesthetic Resources		
AES Impact 1 The location and size of the community center and gymnasium would block views of the oak-covered ridge as seen from the main existing park road, resulting in a direct long-term impact to the scenic vista within the park.	AES/mm-1 Prior to approval of the final design and development plan, site plans and architectural plans shall be submitted showing the community center and gymnasium a minimum distance of 150 feet from the existing park road.	Less than significant (long-term)
AES Impact 2 Without definitive design concepts for the elements proposed in the Master Plan, the potential exists for the buildings, support structures, fencing, signage, landscaping, site amenities and miscellaneous features to markedly contrast with the surrounding environment due to inappropriate scale, form, location, materials, colors, and other design factors, resulting in a direct long-term impact to the visual character of the site and surroundings.	 AES/mm-2 Prior to implementation of the Master Plan, comprehensive design guidelines shall be developed for the NCP. The design guidelines shall be developed in conjunction with community input and shall support the stated goals that park amenities be aesthetically consistent with the rural regional character of the area. For park improvements located along West Tefft Street, the NCP design guidelines shall be compatible with the West Tefft Corridor Design Plan. The design guidelines shall specifically describe architectural styles and forms, types, layouts, materials, colors, and other relevant details relating to all proposed park elements. The design guidelines shall be based in part on the following goals: a. The guidelines shall establish a consistent design theme for the NCP, addressing the proposed elements as well as existing features which may need replaced or refurbished in the future. b. In keeping with the rural aesthetic goals of the community, the design guidelines shall strive for an honest use of materials rather than faux or artificial applications. c. Site design and layout of structures and recreational elements shall be designed to accommodate substantial landscaping for the purpose of reducing the visual dominance of the built elements and blending with the natural setting. d. Site grading shall be minimized to the greatest extent feasible. The location, size, and orientation of structures, recreational features, parking areas, paths, and walkways shall be laid-out to minimize the need for earthwork. 	Less than significant (long-term)

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	foundations and/or partially buried walls where possible to minimize the need for grading.	
	f. All visible earthwork shall utilize contour grading and slope rounding to achieve a natural appearance.	
	g. The use of visible retaining walls shall be minimized to the greatest extent feasible. Where retaining walls are required, their visibility shall be reduced through the use of materials, color, and planting. Retaining walls may be appropriate in certain circumstances in order to protect existing mature trees.	
	 Paved areas, including parking lots, recreation surfaces, and pedestrian areas shall strive for surface materials and colorings which blend with the natural ground plane to the greatest extent practical considering their intended function. 	
	 The visual prominence of all buildings and structures shall be lessened through the use of architectural form, style, external materials, colors and other appropriate measures. 	
	j. All signage shall have a consistent graphic design theme. Thematic variations would be appropriate considering the desired hierarchy of information to be conveyed, such as informational, directional, safety, etc.	
	k. Lighting of signs shall be kept to the minimum required by safety and functional necessity. If lighting of signs is required, the signs shall not be internally illuminated.	
	 Visibility of proposed and existing wireless communication facilities and equipment shall be reduced by coloring all visible components to blend with the surroundings and by screen planting. 	
	m. All proposed overhead utilities shall be placed underground to the greatest extent feasible. Where undergrounding is not feasible, their noticeability shall be minimized by placement in low visibility areas as much as possible. Required overhead utility poles shall be wood or wood-colored metal.	
	 n. Existing overhead utilities shall be placed underground as future funding allows. A systematic strategy shall be developed for future utility undergrounding based on aesthetic priorities, opportunities created due to other 	

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	 construction work, maintenance benefits, and funding availability. o. Lighting within the NCP shall be based on the lowest level required by safety and functional needs. Light poles and fixtures shall be consistent with the park's established design theme. Where appropriate, low-height bollard style lighting should be used. Motion detectors should be utilized instead of continuous illumination for security lighting where appropriate and feasible. 	
	 All site amenities and furnishings such as benches, tables, shade structures, drinking fountains, bicycle racks, bollards and road delineators shall be consistent with the park's established design theme. 	
	 q. Noticeability of required security fencing as well as general functional-area fencing shall be minimized to the greatest extent possible through placement and the use of materials, color, and screen planting as appropriate. Standard un-coated galvanized chain-link fencing shall not be used. Razor-wire and barbed-wire shall not be used. Fencing and railing related to accessibility and safety shall adhere to Americans with Disabilities Act and other legally required ordinances. 	
	r. Landscaping and other planting shall be used generously throughout the NCP to reduce overall visibility and noticeability of structures, parking lots and parked vehicles, paved surfaces, and to visually blend the built components of the NCP with the natural setting.	
	 s. Landscaping shall primarily use native plant material. t. Oak tree planting areas as described in the Master Plan shall be planted as part of the first phase of new park improvements to the greatest extent possible. 	
AES Impact 3 The monolithic form, architectural style, exterior materials, and colors of the community center and gymnasium would be visually imposing on the site and inconsistent with the rural character goals of the community, resulting in a direct long-term impact to the visual character of the site and surroundings.	 AES/mm-3 Prior to approval of the final design and development plan for the community center and gymnasium, architectural plans of the community center and gymnasium shall be submitted showing the following: a. All facades should emphasize three-dimensional articulation to provide vertical, horizontal, and depth relief. b. The architectural style shall be consistent with the Design 	Less than significant (long-term)

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	 Guidelines described in mitigation measure AES/mm-2. c. Roofs should be varied and lessen the buildings' apparent height and mass. d. Roof materials and colors shall complement the building's architectural style. e. Roof-mounted equipment shall be screened to not be visible from public areas at the ground level and areas at higher elevations. f. Building colors and materials shall be visually compatible with the area. AES/mm-4 Prior to approval of the final design and development plan for the community center and gymnasium, landscape plans shall be submitted for review and approval. The plan shall be developed and signed by a licensed landscape architect and shall include the following: a. Screen planting along the north, south and east sides of the community center and gymnasium buildings. b. Screen planting shall reduce the visual scale of the 	
	 buildings and visually blend the buildings with the natural setting. c. Planting shall visually screen a minimum of 50% of the community center and gymnasium buildings within seven years after construction. 	
AES Impact 4 Mature trees are primary contributors to the view quality and character of the park. Removal of mature trees in order to construct the elements of the Master Plan would have the potential to be inconsistent with the rural character goals of the community, resulting in a direct long-term impact to the visual character of the site and surroundings.	 AES/mm-5 Mature trees shall be saved to the greatest extent possible. Tree protection measures shall be implemented which include at a minimum the following: a. All mature trees in the vicinity of development shall be identified on preliminary site plans and final design plans. b. A tree preservation plan shall be prepared to be used as guidance throughout the life of the project. c. Project elements shall be sited to avoid existing trees to the greatest extent feasible. d. Earthwork shall be minimized in the vicinity of existing trees to the greatest extent feasible. e. Tree wells and slope-warping shall be used where appropriate to avoid impacts to root systems. 	Less than significant (long-term)

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
AES Impact 5 Nighttime visibility of sports field lighting glare and light trespass would result in a direct long-term impact to the nighttime views in the area.	AES/mm-6 Prior to approval of the final design and development plan for the multi-use sports field lighting, a comprehensive multi-use sports field lighting plan shall be submitted for review and approval. The multi-use sports field lighting plan shall be based on a photometric study prepared by a qualified engineer who is an active member of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America. The multi-use sports field lighting plan shall be prepared using guidance and best practices endorsed by the International Dark Sky Association. The multi-use sports field lighting plan shall include the following in conjunction with other measures as determined by the illumination engineer:	Less than significant (long-term)
	 a. The photometric study shall investigate different configurations of pole heights, pole spacing, and other variables which would result in the least amount of light visibility for the neighborhood south of the park. b. The point source of all sports field lighting shall be sported by balance bisleded the sports field sports. 	
	 completely shielded from off-site views. c. Light trespass from sports field lighting shall be minimized by directing light downward and utilizing full cut-off fixtures or shields. 	
	 Lumination from lights shall be the lowest level allowed by public safety standards. 	
	 Any required lighting poles and related fixtures shall have a non-reflective finish. 	
	f. The lighting plan shall consider effects on wildlife in the surrounding area.	
AES Impact 6 Apart from the multi-use sports field lighting, visibility of lighting throughout the NCP would affect nighttime views resulting in a direct long-term	AES/mm-7 Prior to implementation of the Master Plan, lighting plans shall be submitted for review and approval consistent with the following:	Less than significant (long-term)
impact.	 The point source of all recreational and exterior lighting shall be shielded from off-site views. 	
	 All required security lights shall utilize motion detector activation where feasible. 	
	c. Light trespass from recreational and exterior lights shall be minimized by directing light downward and utilizing full cut- off fixtures or shields.	

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
AES Impact 7 Surface erosion and exposed earth would increase noticeability of earthwork and landform alteration resulting in a direct long-term impact.	 AES/mm-8 Prior to approval of the final design and development plan, an erosion control and slope revegetation plan shall be submitted for review and approval consistent with the following: a. At a minimum, vegetative erosion control shall be applied to all areas disturbed by construction. b. The outer fringe areas of the multi-use sports fields cut slopes shall be revegetated with dune chaparral to blend with the adjacent natural landcover. c. After plant establishment and/or establishment of erosion control, no or little supplemental irrigation shall be applied to the multi-use sports fields cut and fill slopes. d. Vegetation on the fringe slopes surrounding the multi-use sports fields and the stormwater basins shall not be mowed other than to comply with California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) safety requirements. 	Less than significant (long-term)
AES Impact 8 The potential exists that the collective visibility of all of the proposed project elements would substantially contrast with the surrounding environment due to inappropriate scale, form, location, materials, colors, and other design factors, resulting in a direct long-term cumulative impact to the visual environment.	Implement AES/mm-1 through AES/mm-8.	Less than significant (long-term)
Air Quality		
AQ Impact 1 Earth moving activities for development of the proposed project components would result in the generation of PM ₁₀ (fugitive dust), resulting in a direct short-term impact.	 AQ/mm-1 Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall ensure that all required PM₁₀ measures are shown on applicable grading or construction plans. In addition, the General Services Agency shall designate personnel to insure compliance and monitor the effectiveness of the required dust control measures (as conditions dictate, monitor duties may be necessary on weekends and holidays to insure compliance); the name and telephone number of the designated monitor(s) shall be provided to the SLOAPCD prior to construction. PM₁₀ measures shall include: a. Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible; 	Less than significant (short-term)

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	 b. Use water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour (mph). Reclaimed (nonpotable) water should be used whenever possible; 	
	c. All dirt stock-pile areas should be sprayed daily as needed;	
	 Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans should be implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities; 	
	 Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading should be sown with a fast-germinating native grass seed and watered until vegetation is established; 	
	 All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the SLOAPCD; 	
	g. All roadways, parking areas, and pathways to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used;	
	 h. Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site; 	
	 All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with California Vehicle Code §23114. 	
	 Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site; 	
	 Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried on to adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water should be used where feasible; 	
	 The General Services Agency shall designate a person or persons to monitor the fugitive dust emission and enhance the implementation of the measures as necessary to 	

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	minimize dust complaints, reduce visible emission below 20% opacity, and to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SLOAPCD Compliance Division prior to the start of any grading, earthwork, or demolition.	
AQ Impact 2 Operational and area source emissions resulting from operation of the project at build-out would exceed the SLOAPCD daily ROG and NOx combined threshold under worst-case conditions, resulting in a potentially significant impact.	AQ/mm-2 Prior to construction of the community center, ranger residence, restrooms, and swimming pool, the following measures (or similar measures meeting the intent of energy efficiency) shall be incorporated into the building and landscaping plans to the maximum extent feasible:	Less than significant (long-term)
	 Plan for a transit stop and associated amenities (i.e., covered turnout, direct pedestrian access, covered bench, smart signage, route information displays, and lighting); 	
	 Incorporate outdoor electrical outlets to encourage the use of electric appliances and tools. 	
	c. Trusses for south-facing portions of roofs shall be designed to handle dead weight loads of standard solar photovoltaic panels. Roof design shall include sufficient south-facing roof surface, based on structures size and use, to accommodate adequate solar panels. For south- facing roof pitches, the closest standard roof pitch to the ideal average solar exposure shall be used.	
	 Increase the building energy rating by 20% above Title 24 (2011) requirements. Measures used to reach the 20% rating cannot be double counted. 	
	e. Plant drought tolerant, native deciduous shade trees along southern exposures of buildings to reduce energy use to cool buildings in summer and allow for solar warming in the winter. Maintain trees for the life of the project.	
	f. Utilize green building materials that are resource efficient, recycled, sustainable, and available locally if feasible.	
	g. Install high efficiency heating and cooling systems.	
	 Orient building to be aligned north/south to reduce energy used to cool buildings in the summer. 	
	 Design building to include roof overhangs that are sufficient to block the high summer sun, but not the lower 	

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	 winter sun, from penetrating south facing windows. j. Utilize high efficiency gas or solar water heaters, and energy efficient appliances. k. Utilize double paned windows. l. Utilize low energy exterior lighting. m. Utilize low energy efficient interior lighting. n. Utilize low energy traffic signals (i.e., light emitting diode). o. Install door sweeps and weather stripping if more efficient doors and windows are not available. p. Install energy-reducing programmable thermostats. q. Use roofing material with a solar reflectance values meeting the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/Department of Energy (DOE) Energy Star® rating to reduce summer cooling needs. r. Use native plants that do not require supplemental watering once established and are low ROG emitting. s. Provide and require the use of battery powered or electric landscape and turf maintenance equipment. t. Use clean engine technologies (e.g., alternative fuel, electrification) engines that are not subject to regulations. u. Provide valet bicycle parking at community event centers, 	
AQ Impact 3 Grading and construction activities for development of the proposed project components would result in the emission of diesel particulate matter, potentially affecting sensitive receptors, and resulting in an indirect short-term impact.	 AQ/mm-3 Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall ensure that all idling restrictions are shown on applicable grading and construction plans: a. Staging and queuing areas shall not be located within 1,000 feet of offsite sensitive receptors; b. Diesel idling within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors is not permitted (i.e., the operators shall turn the equipment off when there is a break in the work that the equipment is accomplishing); c. Use of alternative fueled equipment is recommended whenever possible; and, d. Signs that specify the no idling requirements must be posted and enforced at the construction site. 	Less than significant (short-term)

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
AQ Impact 4 Demolition and remodeling activities associated with construction of proposed project elements may result in the exposure of ACM, resulting in an indirect short-term impact.	AQ/mm-4 Prior to removal or demolition of any buildings or utility pipes, the General Services Agency shall provide evidence they have contacted SLOAPCD to determine: a) what regulatory jurisdictions apply to the proposed demolition, such as the National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP; 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 61, Subpart M – Asbestos); b) District notification requirements; c) the need for an asbestos survey conducted by Certified Asbestos Inspector; and d) applicable removal and disposal requirements of the asbestos-containing material.	Less than significant (short-term)
AQ Impact 5 Earth moving activities for development of the proposed project components would result in grading activities that may expose naturally occurring asbestos, resulting in an indirect short-term impact.	 AQ/mm-5 Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall: a. Conduct a geologic analysis to ensure the presence/absence of serpentine rock onsite. The geologic analysis shall identify if naturally occurring asbestos is contained within the serpentine rock onsite; and, if found, the applicant must comply with all requirements outlined in the Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measures (ATCM). In addition, the applicants shall work with the SLOAPCD to prepare a SLOAPCD-approved Asbestos Health and Safety Program and an Asbestos Dust Control Plan prior to development plan approval. 	Less than significant (short-term)
Biological Resources	*	
BIO Impact 1 Implementation of the proposed project would directly impact natural communities that provide habitat for special-status plant and wildlife species.	 BR/mm-1 Prior to all ground-disturbing activities within sensitive areas, a qualified biologist shall provide pre-construction training to all workers involved in site activities. This training shall consist of instruction on special-status species with potential to occur on the property and their habitats. Workers shall be instructed as to appropriate contacts and how to proceed if special-status species are observed on the project site. BR/mm-2 Prior to site disturbance, the <u>General Services</u> Agency shall prepare a Special-status Plant Mitigation Plan that provides for the propagation, planting, and monitoring of sand mesa manzanita at a 5:1 replacement ratio if it is determined that these specimens cannot be avoided during construction activities. The mitigation plan shall detail methods for transplanting, propagating, planting, and maintaining the special-status plant species that would 	Less than significant (short-term and long-term)

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	be impacted. The replant area should be located at the biological mitigation receptor site (5.6 acres). To ensure the success of any planted or transplanted individuals, the mitigation program will include monitoring and reporting guidelines.	
	BR/mm-3 A biological monitor qualified to capture and move legless lizards and coast horned lizards shall be present during all initial ground-disturbing activities, such as grading, excavation and vegetation removal. Improvements within the existing park infrastructure are not expected to impact these species, however, construction associated with the construction of the proposed field sport, basins, equestrian facilities, trails, picnic, and community center areas shall require a biological monitor. The monitor shall capture and relocate silvery legless lizards and Coast horned lizards disturbed during tree clearance vegetation clearing and initial site grading. In addition, the monitor shall rake loose soil within oak woodlands, coastal scrub and maritime chaparral prior to excavation to find and move legless lizards. Efforts shall focus on relocation of silvery legless lizards to safe habitat outside disturbance areas.	
	BR/mm-4 Prior to all ground-disturbance within Maritime Chaparral and Oak Woodland Habitat for proposed trail work, the following measures shall be implemented to minimize adverse impacts to Monterey dusky-footed woodrat. Removal of the woodrat nest would result in adverse impacts to the individuals occupying the nests. If future site improvements would impact any of the observed woodrat nests, the applicant <u>shall</u> implement the following minimization measures.	
	 A County-approved biologist <u>shall</u> assist in the removal of the nest after September 1 and before February 15. <u>Nest</u> removal shall be avoided during the breeding season, to avoid separation of mothers from their young. Under supervision of the biologist, the operators should remove all vegetation and other woodrat shelter within the area that surround the woodrat nest to be removed. 	
	b. Upon completion of clearing the adjacent woodrat shelter, the operator should gently nudge the intact nest with equipment or long handled tools. The operators should place their equipment within the previously cleared area and not within undisturbed woodrat shelter area. The objective is to alarm the woodrats so that they evacuate	

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	 the nest and scatter away from the equipment and into undisturbed habitat. c. Once the woodrats have evacuated the nest, the operator should gently pick up the structure with a front loader and move it to the nearest undisturbed habitat. The objective of moving the structure is to provide the displaced woodrats with a stockpile of material to scavenge while they build a new nest; consequently, jeopardizing the integrity of the structure is not an issue. 	
BR Impact 2 Construction of proposed trail improvements could potentially result in the loss of approximately 1.22 acres of intact maritime chaparral habitat.	 BR/mm-5 Prior to implementation of trail improvements, the General Services Agency shall develop a Habitat Restoration Plan (HRP) for review and approval by the CDFG and the County Environmental Coordinator. The HRP shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and/or botanist and shall detail the methods for restoring or enhancing any areas of maritime chaparral habitat impacted within the NCP. The goal of the HRP shall be to mitigate any temporary or permanent impacts to maritime chaparral at the biological mitigation receptor site (5.6 acres). At a minimum, the HRP shall allow for the following mitigation ratios, site protection measures, and monitoring requirements: a. 2:1 restoration ratio for permanent and temporary impacts to intact maritime chaparral (for every one acre of intact maritime chaparral at the biological mitigation receptor site (5.6 acres) core of intact maritime chaparral that is temporarily or permanently impacted, the County shall restore or enhance two acres of maritime chaparral at the biological mitigation receptor site (5.6 acres) located within the NCP. b. The HRP shall include a site maintenance schedule, including weed abatement strategies and Best Management Practices. 1. Maintenance shall be conducted bi-monthly for the first three years or until the County Environmental Coordinator determines that further maintenance is not required. The maintenance period will begin immediately upon completion of the mitigation planting, and will continue for a three-year period. At the end of three years, the appropriate regulatory resource agencies will review the monitoring reports, evaluate whether the performance standards have hear meta and 	Less than significant (long-term)

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	determine whether the maintenance period will be ended or extended.	
	 Water will be supplied to planted materials during the initial planting period. Supplemental water will be supplied on an as needed basis until the Environmental Coordinator determines that the plantings are self-sustaining. 	
	3. Weed control will be necessary to minimize competition from exotic plants. Additional weed abatement will be required during the maintenance period. Weeds shall be removed by hand or through herbicide applications. If herbicide applications are necessary, they will be conducted by an individual holding a valid Qualified Applicators License. Weeding activities will be performed bi-monthly or until the County Environmental Coordinator determines that the plantings are self-sustaining.	
	4. Removal of trash and litter will occur on a regular basis during the maintenance period. Non-fruiting organic debris created from hand removal of weeds may be left on-site if it will not significantly impact the establishment of native seedlings. However, noxious weed debris will be disposed of off-site to avoid further invasions of the exotic species.	
	5. Due to the sites proximity to public access, vandalism may be a problem. If vandalism occurs at the site and plants are removed or trampled, the County will replace the vandalized plants and take appropriate actions to prohibit further vandalism.	
	6. The County Environmental Coordinator will adjust specific replanting requirements if needed, including species, quantities, and schedules. Species selection will be consistent with those currently occupying the immediate area and at the direction of the Environmental Coordinator. Any replanted vegetation will be monitored until the County Environmental Coordinator determines that the plantings are self-sustaining.	
	7. At the discretion of the Environmental Coordinator,	

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	 a single application of fertilizer may be included with the initial plant installation. Subsequent applications, while not anticipated, are at the discretion of the Environmental Coordinator. c. The HRP shall include clearly defined restoration goals, annual performance standards and final success criteria. 	
	 In order to accomplish restoration goals and objectives, a monitoring program will provide both quantitative and qualitative data to be used to determine the success of the mitigation and restoration areas. The County Environmental Coordinator will evaluate data indicating the relationship between actual site conditions and the performance criteria. Field monitoring and sampling will be followed by preparation of annual reports that include photo-documentation and evaluation of the success of the mitigation effort based on whether or not the annual performance goals for that year were met. 	
	2. The County's Environmental Coordinator will perform general monitoring site visits bi-monthly during the first three years after planting, and semi-annually for the last two years of the monitoring program (refer to Table 4.3-4). General monitoring visits can be conducted concurrently with maintenance visits. The focus of general monitoring visits is to assess the restoration and mitigation area's need for water or other maintenance related issues.	
	 The County Environmental Coordinator will perform biological monitoring data collection annually throughout the five year monitoring program. The focus of the biological monitoring visits is to collect quantitative data that will provide an assessment of the sites vegetative cover and plant growth 	
	 Annual performance standards have been established to ensure a successful mitigation effort. The performance standards are based on the vegetative structure found on-site prior to construction related disturbances. Table 4.3-4 lists 	

Impacts	М	itigatio	n Meas	ures			Residual Impacts
	the ann survival the mitig d. All restoration a biologist/Enviro years or until th 1. At the e site will criteria l determi Environ appropr site will has pro	ual perfo of plante gation ar activities nmental e final se nd of the be evalu- nave bee ned to be mental C iate cont not be con- vided wr	ormance ed speci nd restor shall be Coordin uccess of e five-ye lated to e n met. e unsuce Coordina tingency onsidere itten ver	standard es that a ation are monitor ator for ator for criteria a ar monit determin If the pro- cessful, f tor will ro- measure ed succe ification	ds for gr are prope eas. ed by a a minimure re attain oring pe he if the ogram is the Court ecomme es. The essful un that the	owth and osed for qualified um of five ed. riod, the success on ty end mitigatic til CDFG final	n
	Performance Standards	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	
	Total Percent of Native Cover	20%	25%	30%	40%	50%	
	Average Vigor Rating (see below)	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2	
	Percent of Non- Native Cover (excluding annual grasses)	<60 %	<60 %	<45 %	<25 %	<25 %	
	Plant Survival	90%	85%	80%	80%	80%	
	Notes: The mitigation site mus artificial irrigation) for a successful. Plant survivorship may plantings, or volunteers Any remedial plantings date of installation or u determines that they ar	include o s. will be m ntil the Er e self-sus	sustaining of two yo riginal pla onitored to ovironmer staining.	g (i.e., no ears to be antings, re for five ye ntal Coord	maintena conside emedial ears from dinator	ance or red	

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	Plant vigor and survival in the restoration and mitigation area will be monitored annually for five- years following plant installation. A plant is considered "surviving" if at least half of the foliage (or stem if deciduous) is green and flexible. Plant vigor will be measured as follows:	
	 1 = excellent – vigorous healthy plant (no necrotic or chlorotic leaves) 	
	 2 = good – plant healthy with limited signs of vigorous growth 	
	 3 = adequate – plant healthy with no signs of vigorous growth and some necrosis or other damage present 	
	 4 = poor – low vitality, or main stem dead but basal sprouts emerging 	
	5 = dead – no evidence of recovery	
	 Plant survival calculations will be based on the number of individual plants installed. Percent survival will be obtained by counting the number of surviving plants and dividing the result by the number of plants installed (initial and remedial installations). 	
	 Percent cover of native species will be obtained annually throughout the five year monitoring program. Percent cover calculations must be determined by a documented and field proven vegetation monitoring method such as Daubenmire, Braun-Blanquet, line-intercept, or similar. 	
	4. Another important monitoring activity is to detect the presence and advance of invasive plant species, such as introduced pioneer species commonly found in disturbed areas. Russian thistle, perennial mustard, or other non-native species can also invade the restoration areas if left unchecked. Monitoring activities will determine the presence of such species and if action is required	

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	 to control their advance. 5. All wildlife observed in and around the restoration will be documented as to species, number, and functional use of habitat (i.e., feeding, nesting, etc.). Observations of the general habitat quality will be documented. 	
	6. Permanent photo points will be established throughout the mitigation site to assist in tracking the success of the mitigation program. Permanent photo points will be established during the preparation of the as-built planting plan, and ground view photos will be taken during each monitoring year from the same vantage point.	
	7. Typically, CDFG requires a mitigation and restoration completion report to be submitted at the end of three years. The applicant is responsible for preparing and submitting the report to CDFG within 30 days of the end of the three year maintenance program. The report must include photo documentation and detail the progression of the revegetation efforts.	
	 The annual reports must quantify growth and progress of the restoration plantings to determine if the performance criteria have been met. All three of the required reports must include photographs that document the revegetation progress over time. 	
	BR/mm-6 Prior to implementation of trail improvements , the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall retain a qualified biologist/botanist to supervise the implementation of the HRP. The qualified biologist/botanist shall supervise site preparation, implementation timing, species utilized, planting installation, maintenance, monitoring, and reporting of the revegetation/restoration efforts. The qualified biologist/botanist shall prepare and submit four annual reports and one final monitoring report to the County for review and approval by the County Environmental Coordinator. The annual and final monitoring reports shall include discussions of the restoration efforts attainment of the success criteria.	

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
BR Impact 3 The proposed project would result in the loss of approximately 1.12 acres of oak woodland habitat and approximately 20 mature (greater than 5 inches diameter at breast height), native, coast live oak trees.	 BR/mm-7 Prior to site disturbance and grading activities, the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall submit an Oak Woodland Protection and Restoration Plan to be reviewed and approved by the County Environmental Coordinator. Oak woodland restoration shall be accomplished through one of three options: 1) replanting of oak trees removed from the oak woodland at the biological mitigation receptor site; 2) providing for the protection of oak woodland habitat in perpetuity through acquisition or donation of a conservation easement that includes at least 2,000 square feet per tree removed; or 3) providing funds to the California Wildlife Conservation Easements If Option 1 is selected, it may account for no more than 50% of the required mitigation receptor site is 5.6 acres. BR/mm-8 The Oak Woodland Protection and Restoration Plan shall include the following: a. For onsite planting and protection purposes, oak trees removed shall be replaced at a 2:1 ratio. b. Replacement oak trees shall be from regionally or locally collected seed stock grown in vertical tubes or deep one-gallon tree pots. Four-foot diameter shelters shall be placed over each oak tree to protect it from deer and other herbivores, and shall consist of 54-inch tall welded wire cattle panels (or equivalent material) and be staked using T-posts. Wire mesh baskets, at least two feet in diameter and two feet deep, shall be use below ground. Planting during the warmest, driest months (June through September) shall be avoided. The plan shall provide a species-specific planting or parmets, and and ther herbivores and shall be role. If planting occurs outside this time period, a landscape and irrigation plan shall be submitted prior to permit issuance and implemented upon approval by the county. 	Less than significant (long-term)
	feasible, replacement trees shall be planted in a natural	

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	setting on the north side of and at the canopy/dripline edge of existing mature native oak trees; and on north-facing slopes. Replanting areas shall be either in native topsoil or areas where native topsoil has been reapplied. A seasonally timed maintenance program, which includes regular weeding (hand removal at a minimum of once early fall and once early spring within at least a 3-foot radius from the tree or installation of a staked "weed mat" or weed-free mulch) and a temporary watering program, shall be developed for all oak tree planting areas. A qualified arborist/botanist shall be retained to monitor the acquisition, installation, and maintenance of all oak trees to be replaced. Replacement trees shall be monitored and maintained by a qualified arborist/botanist for at least seven years or until the trees have successfully established as determined by the County Environmental Coordinator. Annual monitoring reports will be prepared by a qualified arborist/botanist and submitted to the County Environmental Coordinator by October 15 each year.	
	 BR/mm-9 To mitigate the balance of the oak woodland impact, one of the following measures, or a combination thereof shall be used: a. Prior to site disturbance and grading activities, the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall record a conservation easement that protects 2000 square feet of existing oak woodland habitat for each tree removed from the oak woodland in perpetuity. The conservation easement shall be controlled by a qualified conservation organization approved by the County Environmental Coordinator. Potential conservation organizations include but are not limited to: The Nature Conservancy, San Luis Obispo Land Conservancy, or the Cambria Land Trust. This mitigation measure may be used to satisfy the mitigation requirement for oak woodland impacts. b. If the County is not able to establish a conservation easement, the applicant shall provide funding to the California Wildlife Conservation Board or other County-approved entity to be used for the purchase of Oak Woodland Habitat Conservation Easements (currently established at \$970.00 for each tree removed and \$485.00 per impacted tree). This mitigation measure may be used 	

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	 to satisfy the mitigation requirement for the oak woodland impact. c. If the County is not able to establish a conservation easement, or provide funding as noted in (b) above, the County may use a grant awarded pursuant to the Oak Woodlands Conservation Act (Article 3.5 [commencing with §1360] of Chapter 4 of Division 2 of the Fish and Game Code) to prepare an oak conservation element for a general plan, an oak protection ordinance, or an oak woodlands management plan, or amendments thereto, that meets the requirements of Senate Bill 1334. 	
	BR/mm-10Prior to site disturbance and grading activities, the General Services Agency shall prepare an Oak Tree Inventory, Avoidance, and Protection Plan as outlined herein. The plan shall be reviewed by a County-approved biologist and/or arborist, and shall include the following items: a. Comprehensive Oak Tree Inventory. This shall include the	
	 An inventory of all oak trees at least five inches in diameter at breast height within 50 feet of all proposed impact areas. All inventoried trees shall be shown on plans. The species, diameter at breast height, location, and condition of these trees shall be documented in data tables. 	
	 Identification of trees that will be retained, removed, or impacted. This information shall be shown on plans and cross-referenced to data tables described in item a. 	
	 The location of proposed structures, utilities, driveways, grading, retaining walls, outbuildings, water and wastewater facilities, and impervious surfaces shall be shown on maps. The applicant shall clearly delineate the building sites/building control lines containing these features on the project plans. 	
	 b. Oak Tree Avoidance Measures. Grading and development within proposed project shall avoid the removal of oak trees to the maximum extent possible. Such activities shall minimize potential disturbance to oaks and their associated 	

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	root zones to the maximum extent possible.	
	c. Oak Tree Protection Guidelines. Tree protection guidelines and a root protection zone shall be established and implemented for each tree to be retained that occurs within 50 feet of impact areas. The following guidelines shall be included:	
	 A qualified arborist shall determine the critical root zone for each retained tree on a case-by-case basis, based upon tree species, age, and size. This area is generally defined as 1.0 to 1.5 times the distance from the tree base of the average measurement taken from the tree base to the edge of the canopy/dripline. At a minimum, the critical root zone shall be the distance from the trunk to the drip line of the tree. 	
	2. All trees to remain within 50 feet of construction or grading activities shall be marked for protection (e.g., with flagging) and their root zone fenced prior to any grading. Grading, utility trenching, compaction of soil, or placement of fill shall be avoided within these fenced areas. If grading in the root zone cannot be avoided, retaining walls shall be constructed to minimize cut and fill impacts. Care shall be taken to avoid surface roots within the top 18 inches of soil. If any roots must be removed or exposed, they shall be cleanly cut and not left exposed above the ground surface. The project arborist shall approve any work within the root protection zone.	
	 Unless previously approved by the county, the following activities are not allowed within the root zone of existing or newly planted oak trees: year- round irrigation (no summer watering, unless "establishing" new tree or native compatible plants for up to seven years); grading (includes cutting and filling of material); compaction (e.g., regular use of vehicles); placement of impermeable surfaces (e.g., pavement); disturbance of soil that impacts roots (e.g., tilling). 	

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	4. The County shall minimize trimming of oak trees to remain onsite. Removal of larger lower branches should be minimized to: 1) avoid making tree top heavy and more susceptible to "blow-overs," 2) reduce having larger limb cuts that take longer to heal and are much more susceptible to disease and infestation, 3) retain wildlife habitat values associated with the lower branches, 4) retain shade to keep summer temperatures cooler (retains higher soil moisture, greater passive solar potential, provides better conditions for oak seedling volunteers), and 5) retain the natural shape of the tree. The amount of trimming (roots or canopy) done in any one season shall be limited as much as possible to reduce tree stress/shock (10% or less is best, 25% maximum). If trimming is necessary, the applicant shall use a certified arborist when removing limbs. Unless a hazardous or unsafe situation exists, major trimming shall be done only during the summer months.	
BIO Impact 4 Implementation of project activities in or adjacent to natural plant communities has potential to impact birds by disturbing their nesting behavior.	BIO/mm-11 Removal of vegetation and pruning of trees shall be conducted in the fall and winter (between September 1 and February 28), if possible, after fledging and before the initiation of avian breeding activities. If construction activities are scheduled to occur during the typical bird nesting season (from March 1 to August 31) a qualified biologist shall be retained to conduct a pre- construction survey (approximately one week prior to construction) to determine presence/absence for tree and ground nesting birds. If no nesting activities are detected within the proposed work area, noise-producing construction activities may proceed and no further mitigation is required. If nesting activity is confirmed during pre- construction nesting surveys or at any time during the monitoring of construction activities, work activities shall be delayed within 300 feet (500 feet if raptors) of active nests until the young birds have fledged and left the nest. In addition, the results of the surveys shall be passed immediately to the CDFG and the County, possibly with recommendations for buffer zone changes, as needed, around individual nests. Tree removal in riparian zones shall be monitored and documented by the biological monitor regardless of time of year.	Less than significant (short-term)

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	BIO/mm-12 If tree removal occurs between September 1 and March 1, within seven days of ground disturbance or tree removal/trimming activities, a survey for wintering raptors shall be conducted. If surveys do not locate wintering raptors, construction activities may be conducted. If wintering raptors are located, construction activities shall observe a 500-foot buffer for the wintering location(s). A pre-construction survey report shall be submitted to the County Environmental Coordinator immediately upon completion of the survey. The report shall detail appropriate fencing or flagging of the buffer zone and make recommendations on additional monitoring requirements.	
BIO Impact 5 Implementation of project activities and tree removals has the potential to impact roosting bats, including pallid bat.	BR/mm-13 Within two weeks prior to tree removal, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for pallid bat and/or other roosting bats. If bats are not found, tree removal can proceed. If bats are observed, bat exclusion measures shall be instituted prior to disturbance. If maternal bat colonies are found they shall not be disturbed until young bats have left the site. Subsequently bat exclusion measures shall be instituted prior to disturbance.	Less than significant (short-term)
Cultural Resources		
CR Impact 1 Development within the historic site (CA-SLO-2188H), as defined in the Cultural Resources Investigation (Parker 2002), may result in direct disturbance or looting of a known significant historical site, resulting in a potentially significant impact.	 CR/mm-1 Prior to construction, the General Services Agency shall submit a monitoring plan, prepared by a subsurface- qualified historical archaeologist, for the review and approval by the Environmental Coordinator. The monitoring plan shall include at a minimum: a. List of personnel involved in the monitoring activities; b. Description of how the monitoring shall occur; c. Description of frequency of monitoring (e.g. full-time, part time, spot checking); d. Description of what resources are expected to be encountered; e. Description of circumstances that would result in the halting of work at the project site (e.g. What is considered "significant" archaeological resources?); f. Description of procedures for halting work on the site and notification procedures; and, 	Less than significant (short-term and long-term)

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	 g. Description of monitoring reporting procedures. CR/mm-2 During all ground disturbing construction activities, the General Services Agency shall retain a qualified historical archaeologist (approved by the Environmental Coordinator) to monitor earth disturbing activities within the documented historical site, per the approved monitoring plan. If any significant historical resources are found during monitoring, work shall stop within the immediate vicinity (precise area to be determined by the historical archaeologist in the field) of the resource until such time as the resource can be evaluated by the historical archaeologist or any other appropriate individuals. The historical archaeologist shall be allowed the time and funds necessary to document and retrieve any significant cultural materials that are unearthed. CR/mm-3 Upon completion of all monitoring/mitigation activities, and prior to final inspection (whichever occurs first), the consulting historical archaeologist shall submit a report to the Environmental Coordinator summarizing all monitoring/mitigation activities and confirming that all recommended mitigation measures have been met. 	
CR Impact 2 In the unlikely event significant archaeological resources are present, implementation of the project may result the disturbance of unknown resources, resulting in a potentially significant impact.	 CR/mm-4 In the event archeological resources are unearthed or discovered during any construction activities, the following standards apply: a. Construction activities shall cease, and the Department shall be notified so that the extent and location of discovered materials may be recorded by a qualified archaeologist, and disposition of artifacts may be accomplished in accordance with state and federal law. b. In the event archeological resources are found to include human remains, or in any other case when human remains are discovered during construction, the County Coroner shall be notified in addition to the Department so proper disposition may be accomplished. 	Less than significant (short-term and long-term)
Geology, Soils, and Drainage		
GSD Impact 1 Development of the project may expose structures and persons to existing geologic hazards including liquefaction and ground shaking.	GSD/mm-1 Prior to initiation of each phase of development for major amenities requiring structural improvements and/or major grading (i.e., sports fields, parking, amphitheater(s), playgrounds,	Less than significant (long-term)

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	restrooms, pre-school and administration building, gymnasium, recreation center, pool, skate park, and courts), and as required by the County Environmental Coordinator, <u>the General Services</u> <u>Agency</u> shall prepare project-specific geo-technical reports. The reports shall investigate subsurface conditions within areas proposed for structural development and the findings and recommendations shall be incorporated into grading and construction plans, as appropriate.	
GSD Impact 2 Ground disturbance activities may result in erosion and down-gradient sedimentation.	 Implement WAT/mm-1 (incorporate BMPs into drainage plans) and WAT/mm-2 (prepare and implement SWPPP). GSD/mm-2 Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall prepare a site-specific erosion and sedimentation control plan. The plan shall include measures addressing short-term, construction related effects, and long-term soil stabilization. Grading and construction shall be conducted during the dry season (April through September) if possible. In the event grading occurs during the wet season (October through April), the following measures shall be incorporated into applicable grading and construction plans, and implemented prior to ground disturbance: a. Incorporate the use of silt fences, straw bales, perimeter ditches, water bars, temporary culverts and swales, sediment traps, minimal grading concepts, and similar techniques appropriate for the site. b. Erosion and sediment transport control structures shall be in place prior to the onset of seasonal rains. c. Restoration and re-vegetation of graded areas and unprotected slopes shall be completed as soon as possible following site disturbance. 	Less than significant (short-term)
GSD Impact 3 Permanent improvements, including the creation of additional impervious surfaces, would change existing drainage patterns within the site, potentially increasing the potential for localized flooding during rain events.	Implement WAT/mm-3 (BMPs and LID strategies). GSD/mm-3 Prior to implementation of the first phase of the Master Plan, <u>the General Services Agency</u> shall prepare a stormwater drainage plan, for inclusion in the Master Plan. The plan shall include a schedule for regular maintenance checks, and incorporate additional improvements to existing facilities, including the installation of trash gates on drainage pipes, interception and dissipation of stormwater flow from impervious surfaces, and installation of storm drain inlets and engineered drainage courses.	Less than significant (long-term)

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts	
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
HM Impact 1 Use of large equipment in close proximity to the public and sensitive receptors may result in exposure to hazardous materials, including oils and fuel.	 HM/mm-1 Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall ensure that all required BMPs are shown on applicable grading or construction plans. In addition, the General Services Agency shall designate personnel to insure compliance and monitor the effectiveness of the required BMPs, which shall include: a. Prior to construction, staging and refueling areas shall be designated on applicable plans. b. Equipment refueling shall be done in non-sensitive areas at least 100 feet from any residence, school, and library, and such that any spills can be easily and quickly contained and cleaned up. Any necessary remedial work shall be done immediately to avoid surface or ground water contamination. c. Prior to commencement of grading/construction activities, the County shall ensure that a plan is in place for prompt and effective response to any accidental spills. All workers will be informed of the importance of preventing spills and of the appropriate measures to take should a spill occur. 	Less than significant (short-term)	
HM Impact 2 Disturbance of the former (more recent) dump site along West Tefft Street may result in the disturbance or exposure of non-volatile hazardous materials including metals, long-chain hydrocarbons, or asbestos.	 HM/mm-2 Prior to initiation of ground disturbance or construction within 400 feet of the edge of West Tefft Street, within the Nipomo Community Park, the General Services Agency shall ensure compliance with the following measures: a. Upon identification of a structure footprint or area of disturbance, exploratory trenches or borings shall be excavated to determine the presence or absence of dumped materials. Samples of the debris and soil shall be collected for laboratory analysis to evaluate whether the materials present any health or environmental concerns. b. Soil gas testing shall be conducted in and around any proposed building footprint to determine whether landfill gas is present, and whether it could accumulate in the finished building. Depending on the results of the soil gas testing, it may be necessary to incorporate design features that will prevent gas accumulation. Measures may include controlling the gas pressure (i.e., passive or active venting 	Less than significant (short-term and long-term)	

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	 to reduce gas concentrations under the structure, venting around the perimeter of the structure, and crawl- space venting); eliminating available entry pathways or leaks (i.e., improving plumbing and caulking to reduce cracks and gaps will reduce entry pathways, install a low-permeability liner around the underground portion of the structure); and, installation of a landfill gas monitoring system. c. Prior to removal or relocation, soil and debris shall be tested for contaminants of potential concern to identify disposal or placement restrictions. Testing shall include analysis for metals, long-chain (semi-volatile) hydrocarbons, and semi-volatile organic compounds. Additional testing may be required depending on the specific nature of the materials to be removed from the site. 	
Noise		
N Impact 1 The Nipomo Library and proposed expansion of the library would be adversely affected by transportation-related noise exceeding the County Noise Element interior noise threshold of 45 decibels.	 N/mm-1 Prior to expansion of the Nipomo Library, the proposed plans shall include the following or similar acoustical design measures to attenuate interior noise by 7 decibels, resulting in a measured interior noise level of 45 decibels or less: a. Air conditioning or a mechanical ventilation system. b. Windows and sliding doors mounted in low air infiltration rate frames (0.5 cfm or less, per American National Standards Institute (ANSI) specifications). c. Solid core exterior doors with perimeter weather stripping and threshold seals. d. Exterior walls consist of stucco or brick veneer. Wood siding with a 0.5-inch minimum thickness fiberboard (soundboard) underlayer may also be used. e. Use of dual paned or soundproof glass for windows facing West Tefft Street (or similar measure). f. Roof or attic vents facing the south, north, and east shall be baffled. 	Less than significant (long-term)
N Impact 2 Use of the proposed skate park and other activities would generate stationary noise levels exceeding County Noise Element thresholds of	N/mm-2 Prior to construction of the skate park, the design plans shall incorporate the following noise reduction measures. <u>achieving a maximum average hourly noise level of 65 decibels as</u>	Less than significant (long-term)

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
significant for noise-sensitive land uses.	 <u>measured 25 feet from the edge of the skate park</u>: a. In-ground concrete design to minimize noise generation during use. b. Earthen berm between the skate park and the noise sensitive land uses. c. Fence and lock-able gate surrounding the skate park facility. N/mm-3 During operation of the park, events and activities shall only be permitted during operating hours (6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.). Mowing, use of equipment, and other maintenance activities shall be limited to daytime hours, unless an emergency situation exists. Noise generated by loudspeakers and microphones shall be directed towards the interior of the park, away from surrounding residential areas. N/mm-4 In the event substantiated noise complaints are received by the County, and the presence of the onsite ranger and/or park host is not sufficient to address received complaints, County Parks shall develop a park monitor program. The program may include volunteers or paid staff and shall provide for presence during key operations of the skate park to restrict playing of loud music and the use of loud voices. The monitor may be present during operating hours in the summer, and on weekends and afternoons during the winter. To prevent use of the skate park and pool during nighttime hours when the park is closed (10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.), County Parks shall a fence and locked gate around the skate park or community pool 	
Public Services and Utilities		
PSU Impact 1 Development and increased usage of proposed park facilities may result in increased demands on Sheriff's Department services, resulting in a potentially significant impact.	 PSU/mm-1 While in the planning stages for development of any facility proposed in the Park Master Plan, and prior to any site disturbance activities related to development of such facilities, <u>the General Services Agency</u> shall coordinate with the Sheriff's Department for implementation of design strategies and safety measures to prevent and reduce crime, including "Crime Prevention through Environmental Design" standards and "Lighting and Lighting Systems" guidelines, including the following: a. After-hours access points to the park and community center should be protected with adequate security. As 	Less than significant (long-term)

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	admission is necessary for emergency personnel, combinations to locks/lockboxes should be provided to Sheriff's Department Dispatch;	
	 b. Visible signage with hours of operation and any type of regulations should be strategically placed throughout the park, and properly maintained; 	
	c. Proper illumination should be provided inside structures, exterior doors, designated parking areas, entry and walkways to deter property crime and provide increased personal safety. Lights should be on timers, and a manual overrides should be available in case of a greater need for light. Proper care should be taken to ensure exterior lighting is properly shielded to prevent illumination that would affect the ambient level of light in the nighttime sky;	
	 County Parks shall provide the Sheriff's Department with accurate information indicating what park employees have access to which areas of any structures or access points; 	
	 During construction periods of any significant proposed park facility or amenity, the construction site shall be temporarily fenced off, with signage indicating that the area is off limits to the general public; 	
	f. All construction equipment shall be secured at the site after hours, with a complete recorded inventory kept on file;	
	 Adequate lighting of the construction areas shall be implemented; 	
	 Special care should be taken to avoid creating "hiding places" in alcoves or entry areas; 	
	 Facility design should facilitate a clear view of the exterior of structures from the interior, and vice versa, to allow increased observation of any suspicious activity in either location; 	
	Sufficient lighting should be installed on the exterior and interior of any structures; and,	
	 All exterior doors should meet all safety requirements, should be solid core, and have adequate locks. 	

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic		
TR Impact 1 Inadequate transit service is available to serve NCP, which is potentially inconsistent with alternative transportation goals.	TR/mm-1 Upon implementation of the NCP Master Plan, the General Services Agency shall coordinate with the Regional Transportation Authority, and establish a transit stop within Nipomo Community Park, if appropriate.	Less than significant (long-term)
TR Impact 2 Buildout of the NCP Master Plan will potentially have a significant cumulative impact at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange southbound ramps during the p.m. peak hour.	 Implement TR/mm-1. TR/mm-2 Upon development of high-traffic generating uses, including tennis courts, sports fields, amphitheater, and community center, a during periodic review of the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan, the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall re-assess the project's effect on the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. a. In the event the project would have a significant traffic impact, the County shall adopt Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures for implementation, as necessary, during peak times (Monday through Friday, 4:00 – 6:00 pm) including, but not be limited to: requiring reservation for specific uses, staggered scheduling of starting times for the sports fields, and limiting the size of community center events. b. County Parks shall coordinate with County Public Works to determine the appropriate <u>South County Road</u> Improvement Fee Area 1 fees at the time development is proposed. In the event <u>South County Road Improvement Fee Area 1</u> fees are determined to be appropriate by Public Works, in accordance with Title 13.01 of the County Code, the General Services Agency shall provide the fees prior to development of high-traffic generating uses (i.e., tennis courts, sports fields, amphitheater, and community center). 	Less than significant (long-term)
Water Resources		
WAT Impact 1 The project would include construction activities that would require substantial areas of ground disturbance and use of heavy equipment, which may result in the discharge of sediment and other pollutants, indirectly affecting surface and ground water quality.	WAT/mm-1 During any project resulting in ground disturbance, the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall ensure that BMPs are included on all grading and construction plans, and implemented during grading and construction activities as suggested by the County LUO. BMPs shall include, but not be limited to, the following:	Less than significant (short-term)
Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
---	--	--------------------------------------
	 Staking or flagging of grading footprint to minimize the area of disturbance; 	
	 Designation of staging areas, including equipment and materials storage; 	
	 Fueling of major equipment shall not occur on-site due to nearby sensitive receptors; 	
	 Erosion control barriers shall be applied, such as silt fences, hay bales, drain inlet protection, and gravel bags; 	
	 Existing vegetation shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible; 	
	f. Disturbed areas shall be stabilized with vegetation or hard surface treatments upon completion of construction in any specific area.	
	 g. All inactive disturbed soil areas are required to be stabilized with both sediment and temporary erosion control prior to the onset of the rainy season (October 15 to April 15). 	
	WAT/mm-2 Prior to major grading (ground disturbance exceeding one acre), the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall prepare and submit a SWPPP to the RWQCB for review and approval. A copy of the plan shall be on-site during all major grading and construction activities.	
WAT Impact 2 During operation of the project, discharge of sediment, hydrocarbons, and other pollutants into stormwater and drainage infrastructure would indirectly affect water quality.	WAT/mm-3 Prior to construction of drainage infrastructure, the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall prepare drainage plans incorporating BMPs and LID strategies suggested by the County LUO to minimize stormwater flow rates and off-site transport of pollutants, including sediment, hydrocarbons, and equestrian waste. BMPs may include, but not be limited to:	Less than significant (long-term)
	a. Minimize parking area by incorporating striped and painted "compact-vehicle" spaces.	
	 Incorporate grassed swales in lieu of paved curbs and gutters. 	
	c. Incorporate the use of alternative pavers, including gravel, cobbles, wood mulch, brick, grass pavers, turf blocks, natural stone, pervious concrete, and porous asphalt.	
	d. Construct bio-retention areas (or raingardens) near parking areas and access roads.	

1

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	 e. Incorporate the use of swales to convey stormwater into <u>retention</u> basins (i.e., grassed channel, dry swale, wet swale, biofilter, or bioswale). f. Incorporate the use of infiltration basins in lieu of conventional retention basins. g. Install cisterns or rainbarrels near structures (i.e., library, community center, restrooms) to collect and filter stormwater from roofs and gutters and re-use for nearby landscaping. 	
WAT Impact 3 Implementation of the project would create additional areas of impervious surfaces, potentially affecting off-site stormwater flow rates.	Implement WAT/mm-3.	Less than significant (long-term)
WAT Impact 4 Implementation of the project would create additional demand for water services from the NCSD.	 WAT/mm-4 Prior to expansion or addition of irrigated turf and landscaped areas, the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall conduct a water survey of existing irrigated turf and landscaped areas, in consultation with the NCSD, that shall include, but not be limited to, the following: a. Quantify irrigated areas based on vegetation type (i.e., turf, ornamental landscaping, trees). b. Inspect and inventory the irrigation system, including timers, distribution lines, storage, and other infrastructure, and document needed maintenance and repairs. c. Develop irrigation schedule by month, based on precipitation rate and local climate. d. Document irrigation system performance and landscape conditions. e. Review irrigation schedule. f. Summarize water survey evaluation results and identify water savings recommendations, which shall achieve a minimum <u>50</u>% reduction in current water use. WAT/mm-5 Prior to expansion or addition of irrigated turf and landscaped areas, the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall demonstrate compliance with the water survey evaluation shall be applied to existing and additional irrigated turf and landscaped areas, and may 	Less than significant (long-term)

Impacts	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	 include, but not be limited to the following: a. Computerized irrigation controller that can estimate cumulative evapo-transpiration losses to establish the most efficient and effective watering regimes. 	
	 Avoidance of close mowing, overwatering, excessive fertilization, soil compaction and accumulation of thatch. 	
	 Programming watering times for longer and less frequently rather than for short periods and more frequently. 	
	 Installation of tensionmeters at different depths to measure moisture status, which will allow for better estimates on irrigation needs. 	
	<u>e.</u> Linking irrigation of the park to the California Irrigation Management Information System (CIMIS) station located at the Woodlands golf course to maximize irrigation efficiency.	
	e.f. Implementation and maintenance of the most efficient and effective water regime for park irrigation consistent with best management practices, such as measures identified by the California Urban Water Conservation Council and/or similar recognized organizations.	
	g. Incorporation of recycled water from the Southland WWTF. f.h. Consultation with NCSD prior to implementation of major planned replacement, renovation, or construction of water-using facilities	
	WAT/mm-6 Prior to construction of additional restrooms, the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall retrofit existing toilets and sinks with low-flow appliances <u>within the NCP</u> . All new appliances shall be low-flow (1.6 gallons per flush).	

This page intentionally left blank.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

The County of San Luis Obispo (County), serving as the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970 (CEQA), has prepared this Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to assess the impacts that may result from development of the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan (project). The project would result in the phased construction of recreation facilities and related infrastructure over a 20-year timeframe. The project site is located in the unincorporated community of Nipomo, within San Luis Obispo County, California. The proposed project consists of two connected park areas, Nipomo Community Park (NCP), including the Nipomo Native Garden, and Mesa Meadows. The project site is located northwest of the Pomeroy Road/West Tefft Street intersection, approximately 1 mile west of U.S. Highway 101 (US 101).

1.1 PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This document was prepared in accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code [PRC] §21000 et seq.) and the "CEQA Guidelines" (California Code of Regulations [CCR] Title 14, §15000 et seq.). This Program EIR addresses the environmental impacts associated with construction and operation of the project elements, which comprise the proposed project. A Program EIR was determined to be the appropriate level of environmental analysis because the document provides a framework for future, more detailed environmental analyses on a set of related and individual actions that can be characterized as one project. This is often called "tiering" of the environmental analysis and documentation. As described in the CEQA Guidelines (§15168), a program-level document can be incorporated into future project-level documents to:

- Provide a basis for determining whether subsequent phases may have significant environmental effects;
- Help address regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other elements that apply to the program as a whole; and,
- Focus the subsequent evaluation on new effects that had not been considered before.

After the Final Program EIR is certified by the County Board of Supervisors, some minor elements of the Master Plan could be carried out without further environmental review. For other major elements of the Master Plan, this EIR serves as program level (first tier) analysis (CEQA Guidelines §§15152, 15168). Elements addressed at a program level would require further, focused environmental review prior to implementation. Subsequent analysis would build upon the first tier analysis presented in this Program EIR, and will include additional information, such as design and site-specific data, that is not yet available. Program-level mitigation measures would guide the development of more specific mitigation measures at the time of project-specific environmental analysis.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE EIR

The purpose of this EIR is to identify the proposed project's significant impacts on the environment, indicate the manner in which such significant impacts would be mitigated or avoided, and identify alternatives to the proposed project that avoid or reduce these impacts. This EIR is intended to serve as an informational document for use by the County, the other responsible agencies, and the general public in their consideration and evaluation of the environmental consequences associated with the implementation of the proposed project. This document is provided to the public and decision-makers for their review and comment as required by CEQA.

Under the CEQA process, an EIR must serve as a full disclosure document that enables the lead and responsible agencies to fully evaluate potential environmental impacts and the consequences of their decision on a proposed project. This EIR has been written to comply with the requirements of CEQA for the analysis of both the proposed project and alternatives.

1.3 SCOPING AND NOTICE OF PREPARATION PROCESS

In compliance with State CEQA Guidelines, the County has taken steps to provide opportunities to participate in the environmental process. During the environmental determination process, an effort was made to contact various federal, state, regional, and local governmental agencies and other interested parties to solicit comments and inform the public of the proposed project. This included the distribution of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) on November 17, 2009, to various agencies, organizations, and interested persons throughout the community of Nipomo, San Luis Obispo County, and surrounding areas. The proposed project was described, the scope of the environmental review was identified, and agencies and the public were invited to review and comment on the NOP. The close of the NOP review period was December 23, 2009. Agencies, organizations, and interested parties not contacted or who did not respond to the request for comments about the project during the preparation of the Draft EIR had the opportunity to comment during the 45-day public review period for the Draft EIR. In addition, a scoping meeting was held on December 1, 2009, at the Nipomo Community Services District (NCSD) Boardroom. There were approximately 17 attendees and 39 verbal questions and/or comments were received.

1.4 EIR CONTENTS

The scope of the EIR includes issues identified by the lead agency during the preparation of the NOP for the proposed project, as well as environmental issues raised by agencies and the general public in response to the NOP and at the scoping meeting. The EIR is divided into the following major sections:

Executive Summary. Provides a brief summary of the project background, description, impacts and mitigation measures, and alternatives.

Introduction. Provides the purpose of an EIR, as well as scope, content, and the use of the document.

Project Description. Provides the general background of the project, objectives, a detailed description of the project characteristics, and a listing of necessary permits and government approvals.

Environmental Setting. Describes the physical setting and surrounding land uses.

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures. Discusses the environmental setting as it relates to the various issue areas, regulatory settings, thresholds of significance, impact assessment and methodology, project-specific impacts and mitigation measures, cumulative impacts, and secondary impacts. The EIR analyzes the potentially significant impacts to the following resource areas, as identified during the preparation of the NOP:

- Aesthetic Resources
- Agricultural Resources
- Air Quality/Climate Change
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology, Soils and Drainage
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Noise

- Population and Housing
- Public Services/Utilities
- Recreation
- Transportation and Circulation
- Wastewater
- Water
- Land Use

Alternatives. Summarizes the environmental advantages and disadvantages associated with the project and alternatives. As required, the "No Project" alternative is included among the alternatives considered. An "Environmentally Superior Alternative" is identified.

Environmental Analysis. Identifies growth inducing impact and a discussion of long-term/short-term productivity and irreversible environmental changes.

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan. This section contains a matrix of all mitigation measures contained in the EIR, the requirements of the mitigation measures, the applicant's responsibility and timing for implementation of these measures, the party responsible for verification, the method of verification, and verification timing.

1.5 PROJECT SPONSORS

Lead Agency:	County of San Luis Obispo Department of Planning and Building 976 Osos Street, Room 300 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 Mr. Steve McMasters, Environmental Resource Specialist
Project Applicant:	County of San Luis Obispo, General Services Agency 1087 Santa Rosa Street San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 Mr. Shaun Cooper, Parks Planner

Environmental Consultant:	SWCA Environmental Consultants
	San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
	Ms. Shawna Scott, Project Manager

1.6 REVIEW OF THE DRAFT EIR

This Draft EIR <u>was</u> distributed to responsible and trustee agencies, other affected agencies, surrounding cities, interested parties, and all parties requesting a copy of the Draft EIR in accordance with PRC §21092(b)(3). The Notice of Completion of the Draft EIR <u>was</u> also distributed as required by CEQA. The 45-day public review period <u>began</u> on Monday, February 27, 2012 and ended on April 30, 2012. A public meeting to present the Draft EIR, verbally respond to questions from the public, and collect comment note cards was held at the Nipomo High School on March 8, 2012. During this period, the EIR, including technical appendices, <u>was</u> available for review at the following locations:

County of San Luis Obispo Environmental Coordinator's Office County Government Center Room 200 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 San Luis Obispo City/County Library 995 Palm Street San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Comments on the Draft EIR were addressed to:

County of San Luis Obispo Department of Planning and Building Attention: Mr. Steven McMasters Division of Environmental and Resource Management 976 Osos Street, Room 300 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

Written responses to all significant environmental issues raised <u>were</u> prepared and <u>are</u> included as part of the Final EIR and the environmental record for consideration by decisionmakers for the project. <u>All changes to the EIR resulting from the responses to comments are</u> <u>marked by a vertical line in the left margin, and changed text is underlined.</u>

1.7 COMMONLY USED ACRONYMS

1.7.1 Acronyms

The following acronyms are used extensively in the EIR. The acronyms are spelled out the first time they are used in a chapter, but are also provided in Table 1-1 below.

Acronym	Term
AB	Assembly Bill
ARB	California Air Resources Board
BMP	Best Management Practice
CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection/County Fire
CalEPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
CalRecycle	California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (formerly CIWMB)
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
САР	Clean Air Plan
CAPCOA	California Air Pollution Control Officers Association
CAT	Climate Action Team
CCCP	California Climate Change Portal
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDFG	California Department of Fish and Game
CEC	California Energy Commission
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act of 1970
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CH ₄	Methane
СНР	California Highway Patrol
CHRIS	California Historical Resources Information System
CIWMB	California Integrated Waste Management Board

Acronym	Term
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	Community Noise Exposure Level
CNPS	California Native Plant Society
CO ₂	carbon dioxide
County	County of San Luis Obispo
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
dB	Decibel
dBA	A-weighted decibel
DD	doubling of distance
DHS	California Department of Health Services
DTSC	Department of Toxic Substances Control
DWR	California Department of Water Resources
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Federal Endangered Species Act
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GSA	Geologic Study Area
HFCs	Hydrofluorocarbons
HRP	Habitat Restoration Plan
HSC	Health and Safety Code

Acronym	Term
KVA	Key Viewing Area
LCFS	Low Carbon Fuel Standard
Ldn	Day/Night Sound Level
Leq	average sound level
LID	Low Impact Development
LOS	Level of Severity
LUO	County Land Use Ordinance
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
min/inch	minute per inch
MMtCO ₂ e	million metric tons of CO ₂ equivalent
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
N ₂ O	nitrous oxide
NCP	Nipomo Community Park
NCSD	Nipomo Community Services District
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act of 1966
NMMA	Nipomo Mesa Management Area
NOAA Fisheries	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service
NOP	Notice of Preparation
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
OES	Office of Emergency Services

Acronym	Term
OHP	Office of Historic Preservation
OHWM	Ordinary High Water Mark
OPR	Office of Planning and Research
PFCs	Perfluorocarbons
ppmv	parts per million by volume
PRC	Public Resources Code
Qs	Quaternary sand dune deposits
RCRA	Resources Conservation and Recovery Act of 1986
RPS	Renewable Portfolio Standard
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
RWQCB	Regional Water Quality Control Board
SARA	Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986
SB	Senate Bill
SCWC	Southern California Water Company
SEMS	Standardized Emergency Management System
SF ₆	sulfur hexafluoride
SLOAPCD	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District
SSC	California Species of Special Concern
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
ТСР	Transportation Choices Program

Acronym	Term
UBC	Uniform Building Code
UNIPCC	United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
URL	Urban Reserve Line
US 101	U.S. Highway 101
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USC	United States Code
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
WDR	report of waste discharge
WWTF	Wastewater Treatment Facility
WWTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant

This page intentionally left blank.

CHAPTER 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project under consideration in this Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) includes the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan (NCPMP). San Luis Obispo County Parks (County Parks) proposes to implement the NCPMP (proposed project), which would result in the phased construction of recreation facilities and related infrastructure over a 20-year timeframe. A description of the project location, project history, and project elements are provided within this chapter in the sections below.

2.1 GENERAL BACKGROUND

2.1.1 Project Location

The project site is located in the unincorporated community of Nipomo, within San Luis Obispo County, California (refer to Figure 2-1). The proposed project consists of two connected park areas, Nipomo Community Park (NCP), including the Nipomo Native Garden, and Mesa Meadows (refer to Figure 2-2). The project site is located northwest of the Pomeroy Road / West Tefft Street intersection, approximately 1 mile west of U.S. Highway 101 (US 101).

NCP is an approximately 137-acre angular parcel bounded by Pomeroy Road and West Tefft Street to the east, Osage Street to the west, and the Tejas Street neighborhood to the south. The approximately 22-acre Mesa Meadows open space area is located within two parcels adjacent to, and immediately southwest of, NCP, on the northwest corner of Mesa Road and Osage Road. The total park and open space area is approximately 159 acres, comprised of four parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers [APNs] 091-313-049, 091-313-050, 092-121-085, and 092-121-086) (refer to Figures 2-3 and 2-4).

2.1.2 Project Background

The park was initially developed in the 1970s, and additional improvements were constructed in the 1980s. The Mesa Meadows open space area was accepted by the County of San Luis Obispo (County) on November 7, 2000. The area within Mesa Meadows was donated in fee to the County as open-space, which limits the County use to passive land uses only. The Mesa Meadows Landscape and Amenity Plan (2002) was approved in association with the residents living in the Mesa Meadows subdivision.

2.1.3 Initial Scoping

In 2003, the County commissioned an environmental constraints analysis report (Morro Group 2004). The constraints analysis identified sensitive resources within the NCP and Mesa Meadows. The report included the existing setting; a summary of potentially proposed recreation and infrastructure; and project-specific technical studies and focused surveys for aesthetics, biological resources, noise, and traffic. The report also assessed potential constraints due to cultural resources, geology and soils, drainage, erosion, sedimentation, flooding, public utilities and services, land use, and planning.







Figure 2-2. Project Vicinity Map



Figure 2-3. Assessor's Parcel Map

Source: County of San Luis Obispo





Source: County of San Luis Obispo

Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report In addition to the environmental constraints analysis, the County commissioned a public survey to identify public opinions regarding NCP and what additions or improvements are needed (Kocher 2004). The survey was mailed out in January 2004 to 3,000 randomly selected households in the communities of Nipomo and Oceano; 522 survey responses were returned by mail. In addition to the mail survey, 51 surveys were conducted onsite at NCP, resulting in a total of 573 responses/returned surveys. The two-page survey included questions on existing recreation, proposed recreation, park funding, unmet recreation needs, and demographic characteristics of the survey respondents. The survey found that, for the recreation opportunities currently provided, people wanted more walking trails, park restrooms, playgrounds, picnic areas, parking, and sports fields. When asked what new recreation facilities they wanted, a majority favored a community recreation center, swimming pool, amphitheater, and skateboard park. The County retained a design firm, Firma, to prepare a draft park master plan (Firma 2004). Firma reviewed the project survey results, attended public workshops, and ultimately prepared plans for NCP's master plan.

2.1.4 Public Workshops and Scoping Meetings

To obtain public input, four public workshops were conducted. The workshops were arranged in two sets. The purpose of the first two workshops was to obtain input regarding what people would like to see in the park and obtain input regarding potential concerns. These workshops, held at the Nipomo Community Services District (NCSD) on March 3 and 4, 2004, included an exercise to let groups of participants draw ideas on a park plan. The facilities with the highest degree of consensus included:

- Preserve existing park facilities
- Preserve existing oaks and open space
- Retain existing multi-use trails
- New community center / recreation building
- Additional sports fields
- Multi-use path around park perimeter
- Equestrian staging area and multi use arena
- Enhance safety at both park entrances

The second set of workshops, held on May 5 and 6, 2004, presented three Concept Plans. These plans were developed based on the survey results, public input received at the March 2004 workshops, and data from the constraints analysis. These Concept Plans included a range of park development intensities as well as options for the locations of some key elements. At the May 2004 workshops there was no overall consensus regarding any one of the concept plans or the precise location of recreation elements.

On July 12, 2004, County Parks staff and the Nipomo Community Advisory Council (NCAC) held a noticed public meeting at the Nipomo High School Auditorium to present information from the constraints analysis, the project's public survey, take public testimony, and obtain community and NCAC input on the NCPMP Concept Plans. Over 100 residents attended the meeting, and diverse viewpoints were expressed, including a majority of persons requesting additional development within the park. The NCAC recommended that the County move forward with environmental review on the more intense Concept Plan, based on the fact that it is easier to take items out of a master plan than put them in later. NCAC also requested that the County review a second alternative that moved some of the larger components (such as a

community center) to West Tefft Street versus the park's interior. The NCAC requested that the County return to the community for additional input upon completion of the environmental document. In late 2004, Firma completed two Draft NCPMP drawings based on NCAC input. The drawings included two alternatives as requested by the NCAC.

2.1.5 Initial Study

In January 2005, the County's consultant started preparation of the project's environmental document (i.e., the California Environmental Quality Act initial study), including the submittal of referrals to agencies and advisory groups. The NCAC held a special meeting on March 24, 2005, to respond to the referral. County Parks staff did not attend this meeting, nor was the County's noticing list used. At the March 2005 meeting, the NCAC objected to the designs being analyzed in the project's environmental document and proposed a "rural friendly" design alternative. In 2006, a draft initial study was completed by the County's consultant. County staff coordinated with the South County Advisory Council (SCAC, previously identified as the NCAC) and held public meetings in Nipomo on August 14 and 21, 2006, to obtain input on the draft initial study. A majority of public comments included requests that the park remain rural with new recreation largely located elsewhere. On August 21, 2006, the majority of the SCAC supported the idea that the park should remain largely rural.

On March 22, 2007, County staff presented the project to the County Parks and Recreation Commission for input. Numerous members of the public attended this meeting and expressed various views regarding future park development. Based on County staff's input that it is easier to take items out of the park master plan once environmental review is complete than to add items later, the Parks and Recreation Commission directed staff to complete the environmental review for the two proposed alternatives (as described in the draft initial study) and then bring the item back to the Commission for further discussion. In September 2007, the County issued a draft initial study (#ED05-225) for the NCPMP for public review. The initial study reviewed two alternative projects. The two alternative park master plans were similar, with the exception of the location of major facilities such as the community center. No un-mitigable impacts were identified in the initial study. Public comments received regarding the initial study raised issues regarding:

- aesthetics, including night lighting;
- biological resources, including impacts to oak trees;
- hazardous materials related to the site's previous use;
- noise from proposed facilities;
- adequacy of public services, such as fire and sheriff;
- land use;
- adequacy of public services for proposed facilities;
- traffic and circulation;
- adequacy of wastewater facilities to serve the proposed park development; and,
- water use.

Some of the letters received in response to the draft initial study raised concern whether the initial study was adequate, indicating that an EIR should be completed for the project. On November 13, 2007, County Parks staff met with the County Environmental Coordinator and other Department of Planning and Building staff involved with the NCPMP to discuss the

comments received on the draft initial study. On November 26, 2007, the Environmental Coordinator recommended that an EIR be prepared for the NCPMP.

2.1.6 Project Changes Since 2007

Since the release of the Master Plan, Master Plan Alternative, and 2007 Initial Study document, County Parks has amended the project description as follows:

- All Osage Street improvements, including an adjacent trail, are now included in the Master Plan design.
- Modifications were made to proposed trail locations, including a paved trail adjacent to Osage Street.
- The Alternative Master Plan identified in the 2007 Initial Study (which moved some of the larger recreation facilities such as a community center to West Tefft Street) will be assessed in the Alternatives chapter of the EIR.
- The existing, temporary pre-school is identified as an existing, temporary use.
- Conceptual architectural drawings are provided for the proposed community center.

2.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The primary goal of the NCPMP is to establish the long-range plan for NCP and Mesa Meadows. The objectives of the NCPMP are to:

- provide a range of passive and active facilities and use areas to meet the recreational needs of the community;
- maintain and upgrade existing recreational and community facilities and amenities;
- effectively manage current and projected levels of park uses;
- provide amenities that are aesthetically consistent with the regional character of the area;
- provide a community recreation center within the unincorporated community of Nipomo;
- incorporate infrastructure and circulation improvements to meet existing and estimated future (2025) motor vehicle transportation warrants;
- apply adaptive management strategies, including the use of improved technology, to address new planning and management issues as they arise;
- consider and support active citizen input in the decision-making process; and,
- periodically review and update the NCPMP through a public review process (approximately 15-year intervals), including consideration of the changing needs of the community when evaluating existing and potential new amenities.

2.3 PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project under consideration in this Program EIR includes the proposed NCPMP (refer to Figure 2-5). The plan includes a variety of recreational opportunities, including the expansion of existing facilities, the addition of new facilities to the park, active recreational uses including multi-use sports fields, passive recreational uses and open space, and improvements to infrastructure. Table 2-1 shows the existing and proposed acreage of land use-types within the park, and the percentage of the park area for each identified use. Table 2-2 lists all the proposed NCPMP facilities and their approximate respective land areas, along with the existing facilities and areas to be substantially left undeveloped.

2.3.1 Existing Facilities

Existing major amenities in the park include: four sports fields accommodating baseball, soccer, and football (5.3 acres), including one lighted field; four lighted tennis courts (0.6 acre); a 0.7-acre dog park; 6,534-square foot playground; group and individual picnic areas (9,433 square feet); the 12-acre Nipomo Native Garden, including trails and planted areas; open play area (9.3 acres); 1.1 acres of paved trails/walkways; and 4.3 acres of dirt and spur trails. Infrastructure within the park includes: 1.2 acres of drainage improvements, including basins; 2 acres of roads; 3.1 acres of parking; 3,155 square feet of restrooms and a maintenance building (consisting of a shop, office, and restroom); two host sites (1,284 square feet); and an air quality monitoring station. In addition, the 7,134-square foot Nipomo Library is located within the park and is accessed from West Tefft Street. An existing, temporary pre-school and fenced outdoor play area occupies approximately 4,050 square feet within the park. The pre-school is proposed to remain until a new pre-school is approved onsite, or elsewhere in the community of Nipomo. Existing development can be seen on an aerial photo of the project site (refer to Figure 2-6).

Existing recreation and infrastructure cover approximately 15 acres, or approximately 11%, of the park. The remaining 130-acre area (including Mesa Meadows) is generally a natural area consisting of oak woodland and coastal scrub, annual and ruderal grassland, and trails. Public recreation at Mesa Meadows includes a roughly 1-mile Class I bicycle path and contiguous equestrian trail. The site also contains native and non-native vegetation. The trail system at Mesa Meadows connects into the trail system of NCP.

2.3.2 Proposed Facilities

The NCPMP proposes approximately 15.96 acres of new recreational uses within the NCP area, 3.96 acres of new open play area (turf), and 7.57 acres of new infrastructure. Approximately 27.5 acres of existing undeveloped area and dirt trails would be converted to accommodate these new uses (refer to Table 2-1). The proposed project includes the expansion of the following existing uses: 4,000-square foot expansion of the library near West Tefft Street; an additional 8,276 square feet of playground, including a play structure and open play area near Osage Street and Camino Caballo; 19,000-square foot expansion of the offleash dog park; an additional 14,400 square feet of tennis courts; an additional 3 acres of paved and unpaved trails/walkways including a separate equestrian trail; restoration of spur trails; and an additional 4 acres of open play area (turf). In addition, the NCPMP includes an additional 10 acres of multi-use sports fields. The type of sports to be accommodated would be determined at the time the need for added fields arises. The maximum intensity of use

would likely be youth soccer. The area could accommodate about six youth soccer fields. The fields are proposed to be lighted.

Proposed new amenities include a skate park or community pool (10,000 square feet) near West Tefft Street. Additional new facilities would be located near the center of the park, including: a 5,227-square foot amphitheater (gazebo/informal stage), basketball courts (10,000 square feet), handball courts (4,000 square feet), horseshoe pits (1,800 square feet), and an 8,400-square foot swimming pool and deck (if not constructed near West Tefft Street). A paved walkway (11,280 square feet) is proposed along Osage Street. The NCPMP includes a 36,000-square foot community center/gymnasium to be located within the park.

The total area for the proposed community center/gymnasium and associated improvements would be approximately 2 acres. A conceptual schematic of the community center is shown in Figure 2-7.

Lies Time	Existing		Proposed		Total	
Use Type	Acres	Percentage	Acres	Percentage	Acres	Percentage
Recreation Area <u>&</u> Designated Trails	8.2	5.2	15.96	10.0	24.2	15.2
Open Space <u>&</u> <u>Trails (dirt)</u>	135	84.8	-27.49	-17.3	107.5	67.5
Open <u>Play Area</u> Turf	9.2	5.76	3.96	2.5	13.1	8.2
Infrastructure	6.7	4.2	7.57	4.8	14.3	9.0
TOTAL	159.17	100			159.17	100

Table 2-1. Master Plan Existing and Proposed Use Types

2.3.3 Access and Parking

2.3.3.1 Access

There are two motor vehicle entrances to NCP. One entrance is located on Pomeroy Road, offset and east of Juniper Street. The second motor vehicle entrance is located on West Tefft Street, adjacent to the Nipomo Library, offset and south of Orchard Avenue. The West Tefft Street and Orchard Street intersection is currently signalized, and a pedestrian crosswalk is located across West Tefft Street. Pedestrian, bicyclist, and equestrian trail access into NCP is located off of Osage Street (near Charro Way), Camino Caballo (near Osage Street), and at the northern terminus of La Serena Way. NCP is accessible from a number of collector and local streets including: Camino Caballo, Mesa Road, Osage Road, and Tejas Place. The trail system within Mesa Meadows is accessible from Charro Way, Tejas Place, and Amigo Place; this trail system connects with the NCP trail system immediately east of the Charro Way and Osage Street intersection (refer to Figure 2-5).

Figure 2-5. Nipomo Community Park Master Plan



This page intentionally left blank.

Major road improvements proposed for the NCPMP include: the re-alignment of existing park entrances on West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road; installation of a traffic signal at the realigned Pomeroy Road/Juniper Street intersection; construction of a westbound left turn pocket and eastbound right turn pocket on Pomeroy Road; and improvements to Osage Road, including road widening for consistency with County road standard A-1(d) (two 11-foot wide travel lanes, with 6-foot shoulders on each side, for a total width of 34 feet), and construction of a trail within the road right-of-way. The project includes construction of a 6-foot wide, paved, multi-use trail and parallel equestrian trail creating a loop around the park.

The County General Services Agency will coordinate with the County Public Works Department prior to preparation of construction plans for road improvements in order to confirm that road improvements will meet the standards applicable at the time of actual development. In addition, there may be opportunities to incorporate design features that would avoid or minimize ground disturbance, and associated impacts to mature oak trees, drainage infrastructure, and the community.

The NCPMP does not include a specific phasing plan because amenities would be constructed as funds are available. The Public Works Department was consulted to assess the appropriate timing for implementation of road improvements. The Public Works Department determined that major road improvements would be required prior to construction and operation of any high-traffic generating facility, including the permanent pre-school and administration building, sports fields, community center, amphitheater, swimming pool, and skate park (Richard Marshall; March 7, 2006). Proposed uses that would not generate a substantial amount of new trips may be constructed prior to implementation of access and road improvements, such as open turf areas, playgrounds, dog park, handball courts, tennis courts, basketball courts, internal roads, parking areas group picnic areas, trails, restrooms, and stormwater improvements.

2.3.3.2 Internal Circulation and Parking

Internal vehicular access within the park is provided by a loop road, which connects the West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road park entrances. Additional paved access is provided for the existing ballpark area. An additional paved loop road is proposed to provide access to proposed facilities and parking areas in the center of NCP.

The park currently provides 325 parking spaces within several parking lots located within the southeastern portion of the park. The parking area for the Nipomo Native Garden, located adjacent to Osage Street, includes 10 automobile spaces and two bus spaces. The proposed NCPMP includes an additional 386 to 422 spaces, including seven equestrian pull-through spaces (refer to Table 2-2).

2.3.4 Park Programs and Operational Activities

In addition to the proposed facilities discussed above, the following activities and facilities are proposed as part of the NCPMP: removal of diseased trees and replacement tree planting program; utility infrastructure additions and maintenance; and a cellular communication repeater station. Tree removal would be required to accommodate access improvements at Pomeroy Road and Juniper Street, and Osage Road widening and pathway improvements.



Figure 2-6. Existing Uses

Facilities	Existing (sf)	Proposed (sf)	Total (sf)			
Recreation Area						
Amphitheaters	0	5,227	5,227			
Basketball Courts	0	10,000	10,000			
Playgrounds	6,534	8,276	14,810			
Community Center	0	36,000	36,000			
Dog Parks	31,988	19,000	50,988			
Group Picnic Areas	9,433	0	9,433			
Handball Courts	0	4,000	4,000			
Horseshoe Pits	0	1,800	1,800			
Skate Park	0	10,000	10,000			
Sports Fields (Turf)	231,633	439,520	671,153			
Swimming Pool/Deck	0	8,400	8,400			
Tennis Courts	26,404	14,400	40,804			
Trails/Walkways (paved/unpaved)	50,724	127,373	178,097			
Osage Street Walkway (paved)	0	11,280	11,280			
Volleyball Court	0	0	0			
Subtotal	356,716	695,276	1,051,992			
Open Space						
Open Space (undeveloped)	5,689,881	-1,113,510	4,576,371			
Open Play Area (Turf)	399,805	172,498	572,303			
Trails (dirt)	190,200	-84,276	105,924			
Subtotal	<u>6,279,886</u>	-1,025,288	<u>5,254,598</u>			
Infrastructure						
Basins	54,900	108,900	163,800			
Library Building	7,134	4,000	11,134			
Parking	137,166 (325 spaces)	183,388 (422 spaces)	320,554 (747 spaces)			
Pre-school	4,050 (temporary)	0	4,050 (permanent)			
Two Host Sites	1,284	0	1,284			
Restrooms/Maintenance Buildings	3,155	1,490	4,645			
Roads	89,036	32,234	121,270			
Subtotal	<u>296,725</u>	330,012	<u>626,737</u>			

Table 2-2. Master Plan Existing and Proposed Amenities



Figure 2-7. Community Center Conceptual Schematic

2.3.4.1 Replacement Tree Planting Program

Many of the existing park trees are Monterey pine (*Pinus radiata*); this species is highly susceptible to devastating disease including pine pitch canker. The replacement tree planting program includes regular evaluation of trees, and subsequent maintenance, removal (if the tree is dead and/or a hazard to public safety), and replacement depending on the monitored health of the tree. Pre-emptive replacement of trees prior to removal may be implemented. Proposed replacement trees may include: Coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), California sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*), California pepper (*Schinus molle*), Coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*), and Monterey cypress (*Callitropsis macrocarpa*).

2.3.4.2 Utility Infrastructure Additions and Maintenance

Water Supply

Water service is currently supplied to NCP through a contractual Water Service Agreement (WSA) executed between the NCSD and the County (recorded May 29, 1984). The WSA states that the NCSD will provide water to the park for the purposes of irrigation, sanitation, and miscellaneous uses. In 2004, the NCSD constructed a waterline through the park adjacent to Dana Elementary School, within a 5-foot wide easement executed between the County and the NCSD. The width of this utility easement is approximately 20 feet from the southern edge of the property. Water is delivered to the park via a 3-inch water main that is located within the right-of-way on Pomeroy Road. The County proposes to continue receiving water from the NCSD to serve the park, potentially including the use of recycled water.

The Mesa Meadows subdivision (Tract 2304) is served by the NCSD. Water mains are located along Osage Street, Charro Way, Tejas Place, and Amigo Place.

<u>Wastewater</u>

Wastewater disposal for the park is currently treated by individual septic systems for four existing restroom facilities. The project includes two additional restroom facilities to serve park visitors. Effluent disposal and treatment could be accomplished by two methods: septic tanks and leachfield systems, or fiberglass holding tanks that are regularly pumped and maintained. The Mesa Meadows subdivision (Tract 2304) is served by onsite, individual septic systems.

Stormwater Management

The project site currently receives stormwater flow from adjacent developed areas, which is directed into existing onsite stormwater basins (1.2 acres). Existing drainage improvements in the northeast area of the park include small drainage channels, v-shaped concrete swales, culverts, and unlined infiltration basins. Collected stormwater percolates into the soil within the basins. An earthen drainage channel located along the northern property line accommodates stormwater flows originating from the parking lot along the Pomeroy Road frontage. The earthen drainage channel then flows southwest and empties onto a rock riprap energy dissipater into an unlined retention basin constructed at the West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road intersection. The retention basin also receives storm flows via three 12-inch culverts: one that conveys stormwater from underneath Pomeroy Road from a low-lying area across the street at the intersection of West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road, a storm drain on the park side of West Tefft Street, and a culvert that flows underneath West Tefft Street originating from bordering residential developments to the east of the park.

An engineered drainage system is located within Mesa Meadows, including multiple 24-inch corrugated metal culverts designed to convey stormwater runoff from the residential development into four infiltration basins located adjacent to Mesa Road. The basins discharge stormwater via percolation into the sandy topsoil.

The proposed project includes the following drainage improvements to manage stormwater flow during rain events: (1) construct a new basin in the center of the southern half of the park, and (2) install a drainage pipe along Pomeroy Road within the existing drainage swale.

2.3.4.3 Cellular Communication Repeater Station

A repeater station is a combination of a receiver and a transmitter that receives a weak or lowlevel signal and retransmits it at a higher level or higher power, so that the signal can cover longer distances without degradation. These facilities require a power source for operation. One repeater station is currently located at NCP on an existing light pole that illuminates the field. A second repeater station was approved by the County Department of Planning and Building in 2009 and is located in the same vicinity as the existing station.

2.4 MASTER PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

2.4.1 Project Phasing and Funding

The Master Plan does not establish a phasing plan, although the estimated timeframe for completion is 20 years. Once a master park plan is adopted, County Parks staff will go back to the community to determine priorities. The timing, type, and extent of infrastructure extensions, offsite improvements such as traffic signals, and earthwork would depend upon the type and extent of the first new facilities to be implemented. Conversely, the choice of which facilities to implement first, second, or third may be influenced by the cost of infrastructure and earthwork that must accompany the recreation facilities.

The overall cost to construct the Master Plan is shown in Appendix A (Master Plan). The cost for each element is based on conceptual design characteristics; therefore, the cost for any particular element could go up or down once the more detailed design is developed.

It is possible that the Nipomo community, a concessionaire, and/or a community organization may be a partner in the development of the community recreation buildings planned for the park. The cost to construct these facilities is identified as a separate item on the construction cost breakdown (2003 dollars) in Appendix A (Master Plan).

2.4.2 Master Plan Amendment

The Master Plan is intended to guide development of the park to an envisioned "build out" some undetermined years in the future. While the purpose of a Master Plan is to guide decisions over a number of years, it is recognized that as time passes community needs and priorities may change and the Master Plan may need updating and revising. The Master Plan should be updated at 15-year intervals to ensure that it remains viable and relevant as a guide for meeting the park and recreation needs of the community. The Master Plan may be amended at any point along the way if new ideas or pressing needs warrant a change in the Plan. The process for amending the Master Plan would involve community workshops, SCAC and County Parks and Recreation Commission input, and review and approval by the County Board of Supervisors.

CHAPTER 3 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.1 Physical Setting and Existing Land Uses

The project area consists of two connected park areas located in San Luis Obispo County, California, within the unincorporated community of Nipomo, roughly 1 mile west of the U.S. Highway 101 (US 101)/West Tefft Street intersection and 6 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean (refer to Figure 2-2). The topography of the Nipomo Mesa, lying west of US 101, consists generally of open flat areas, linear valleys, and hilly knolls formed in an area of sand dunes. Of California's 13 original coastal dune systems, only four remain relatively intact. The Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes, an 18-mile-long complex is one of them, and comprises the second largest coastal dune system in the state (Guadalupe-Nipomo Dunes Draft Interpretive Master Plan, March 2004). The regional landscape can be broadly defined as an old marine terrace between the coast and the hills to the east. The sand dune complexes along the beach transition to wide mesas inland. Slopes generally vary between 2% and 10%. The native landscape generally includes coast live oak woodland and coastal sage chaparral with riparian corridors along the drainage ways. Eucalyptus trees were introduced into the area as a forest crop and have since become established over much of the mesa. The Nipomo Mesa area contains only minor waterways, generally having an east-west orientation on their way to the Pacific Ocean.

The approximately 159-acre project area consists of the Nipomo Community Park (NCP) (approximately 137 acres) and the Mesa Meadows passive recreation area (approximately 22 acres) (refer to Figure 3-1). NCP is bounded by Pomeroy Road to the northeast, Osage Street to the west, West Tefft Street to the southeast, a residential development to the south, and Dana Elementary School and the Nipomo Community Library to the southeast. The project area consists of four separate parcels (Assessor's Parcel Numbers [APNs] 092-121-085, 092-121-086, 091-313-049, and 091-313-050) (refer to Figure 3-2).

3.1.1 Nipomo Community Park

NCP is predominantly in the Recreation land use category. Approximately 9.4 acres along the southern boundary is designated Public Facilities, and is currently undeveloped. The park consists of multiple-use open parkland uses, including three little league baseball fields, one regulation-sized baseball field, lighted tennis courts, basketball hoops, children's playgrounds, individual and group day-use picnic sites, dog parks, equestrian trails, bike and pedestrian paths, and locally maintained native plant and community gardens. The park also contains existing infrastructure, including basins, a library building, parking, a temporary pre-school, restrooms, and maintenance buildings.

The northern corner of the NCP encompasses the Nipomo Native Garden. The Garden's approximately 12 acres are in the final stages of being restored to a native botanical garden featuring native plant communities endemic to the Nipomo Mesa and dunes complex. The Garden is a local, community-based federal and state non-profit organization composed of volunteers and members who support the restoration effort, and offers opportunities for education, conservation, restoration, research, and recreation using plants of the Nipomo Mesa Guadalupe Dunes Complex.

3.1.2 Mesa Meadows Recreation Area

Mesa Meadows is within the Residential Suburban land use category. The 22-acre recreational area was deeded to the County of San Luis Obispo (County) in 2001 as part of an Open Space Agreement associated with the residential development. The Mesa Meadows passive recreation area is an open space area located within two parcels adjacent to, and immediately southwest of, the NCP. The area was donated in fee to the County as open space, which limits the use to passive land uses only, and was accepted by the County on November 7, 2000. The Mesa Meadows Landscape and Amenity Plan (2002) was approved in conjunction with residents living in the Mesa Meadows subdivision. Mesa Meadows currently provides passive recreation opportunities, and existing uses include a Class I bike path, nature trail, and undeveloped open space.

3.2 Surrounding Land Uses

The community of Nipomo is located within the South County Inland planning area. The Nipomo Urban Reserve Line (URL) encompasses approximately 3,951 acres (South County Area Plan – Inland, Land Use pp. 4-19). There are no major topographical features affecting the extent and density of development; therefore, the major determining factor of urban development will likely be the availability and feasibility of community services, including water supply, sewage disposal, and transportation improvements. The build-out potential for the Nipomo urban area is 24,032 people. Nipomo has been targeted in the South County Inland Area Plan as being developed as the economic, cultural, and residential center of the South County planning area.

NCP is located within the Nipomo urban area, and is generally surrounded by single-family residential development. Public facility uses surrounding the park include the Nipomo Community Library and Dana Elementary School. The Nipomo Community Library is a public library affiliated with the San Luis Obispo City/County Library. Dana Elementary School enrolls approximately 595 students in grades kindergarten through sixth grade. Also located at the intersection of Pomeroy Road and West Tefft Street is Community Health Centers of the Central Coast, Inc., a non-profit network of health centers that provide primary health care, dental services, health education, preventative care, mental health services, specialized services, and wellness pregnancy programs to Central Coast residents.

NCP and Mesa Meadows are surrounded by the land use categories and associated land uses shown in Table 3-1.

Area	Land Designations	Land Uses
North	Residential Suburban, Residential Single Family	single family residences
South	Public Facilities, Office Professional, Residential Suburban, Residential Single Family	school, library, single family residences, <u>health center</u>
East	Residential Suburban, Residential Single Family	single family residences
West	Residential Suburban	single family residences

Table 3-1. Surrounding Land Uses










Photograph 3-1. Current Park Entrance off of Pomeroy Road



Photograph 3-3. Existing Park Loop Road and Drainage Basin



Photograph 3-2. Existing Parking Facility and Lighted Ball Fields



Photograph 3-4. Nipomo Native Botanical Garden



Photograph 3-5. Open Space Area/Trails



Photograph 3-7. Northern Boundary of Park/ Facing West along Osage Street



Photograph 3-6. Open Space Area/Trails



Photograph 3-8. Eastern Boundary of Park/ Facing North along Pomeroy Road

Land uses are further discussed in the Land Use section (Section 4.7) of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and the consistency of proposed land uses at the project area with applicable County and local plans, policies, and goals is analyzed.

3.3 Consistency with Land Use Plans and Policies

3.3.1 Overview

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §15125(d) states, "the EIR shall discuss any inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable general plans and regional plans." While CEQA requires a discussion of consistency with public plans, inconsistency does not necessarily lead to a significant impact. Inconsistency with public plans creates significant impacts under CEQA only when an adverse physical effect would result from the inconsistency. This section provides general information as to the plans and policies applicable to the proposed project as stated in the following documents. It is the responsibility of the County, the lead CEQA decision maker, to make the final determination regarding consistency issues. The following plans and policies are applicable to the proposed project and are described in the following sections:

- Inland Framework for Planning Land Use Element
- County of San Luis Obispo South County Inland Area Plan
- San Luis Obispo County Land Use Ordinance (LUO) (Title 22), Nipomo Urban Area Planning Standards
- San Luis Obispo County General Plan
 - Parks and Recreation Element
 - o Noise Element
 - o Safety Element
- West Tefft Corridor Design Plan
- Clean Air Plan
- Basin Plan

Table 3-2 presents a summary of potential inconsistencies between the proposed project and the applicable plans and policies listed above. Additional consistency analysis with local plans and policies is provided in the individual environmental analysis sections of the EIR. For example, the Air Quality section (Section 4.1) includes an assessment of the project's consistency with the Clean Air Plan, and the Water Resources section (Section 4.12) includes a discussion regarding the Water Service Agreement between the County and Nipomo Community Services District (NCSD). To the extent that the proposed project may be inconsistent with portions of these documents, remedies such as project revisions, special conditions of approval, variance, or plan amendments may be required. All adverse physical effects resulting from any inconsistency are discussed in the appropriate environmental analysis sections of the EIR (refer to Chapter 4 of this Program EIR).

3.3.2 Relevant Land Use Plans

Pursuant to the LUO (Title 22 of the County Code), §22.06.040 (Exemptions from Land Use Permit Requirements), County projects constructed by the County or its contractors are exempt from the land use permit requirements of Title 22, including compliance with noted planning area standards identified in the South County Area Plan. However, it is the policy of the County to implement actions that are consistent with Title 22 and the County General Plan.

In addition, while the County is not subject to ordinance requirements, the LUO includes standards that are useful as possible thresholds of significance, such as noise standards, and mitigation measures (i.e., preparation of drainage and erosion control plans). Ordinances and standards applicable to the project area are listed and discussed below.

3.3.2.1 Inland Framework for Planning – Land Use Element

The first part of the County Land Use Element is the Framework for Planning. The Framework contains policies and procedures that apply to the unincorporated area outside the coastal zone, and defines how the Land Use Element is used together with the LUO and other adopted plans. The Framework also explains the criteria used in applying land use categories and combining designations to the land, and the operation of the Resource Management System. Combining designations are special map categories that identify areas of unique resources or potential hazards that necessitate more careful project review.

3.3.2.2 County of San Luis Obispo South County Inland Area Plan

The project lies within the unincorporated area of San Luis Obispo County, and outside of the California Coastal Zone, which is under the jurisdiction of the *South County Inland Area Plan*. The plan acts as a guide for the cohesive and comprehensive development of the South County Inland Area, and seeks to guide future development that will balance the social, economic, environmental and governmental resources and activities affecting the quality of life within the area. This plan includes planning area standards for the South County Planning Area, which includes the urban community of Nipomo, and seeks to preserve the character of the communities and rural areas that currently exist in the area.

3.3.2.3 San Luis Obispo County Land Use Ordinance, Nipomo Urban Area Planning Standards

The LUO (Title 22 of the County Code) includes regulations established and adopted to protect and promote public health, safety and welfare. Regulations are also adopted to implement the County General Plan, guide and manage the future growth of the county in accordance with those plans, and regulate land use in a manner that will encourage and support the orderly development and beneficial use of lands within the county. In addition, ordinance regulations are in place to minimize adverse effects on the public resulting from land use and development, as well as to protect and enhance the significant natural, historic, archeological, and scenic resources within the county as identified by the County General Plan. Article 9 of the Land Use Ordinance includes standards for proposed development and new land uses that are specific to each of the planning areas defined by the Land Use Element, including standards specifically applicable to the Nipomo Urban Area. These standards are mandatory requirements, intended to address the local planning issues of each planning area.

3.3.2.4 San Luis Obispo County General Plan

Parks and Recreation Element

The Parks and Recreation Element is an optional component of the County General Plan. The County has had a Recreation Element as part of its General Plan since 1968, showing an early commitment by the County to provide adequate park and recreation opportunities for both residents and visitors. The Parks and Recreation Element establishes goals, policies, and implementation measures for management, renovation, and expansion of existing, and development of new, parks and recreation facilities in order to meet existing and projected needs and to ensure an equitable distribution of parks throughout the county. The purpose of the Parks and Recreation Element is to: (1) provide policy guidance regarding the provision of park and recreation services, (2) document the county's existing park and recreation resources, and (3) facilitate the evaluation of park and recreation needs including those resources that are outside the County's management during the land use decision process.

Conservation and Open Space Element

The County Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE) consists of a policy and program document and a technical appendix. The COSE policy and program document includes separate chapters to address air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, mineral resources, open space, visual resources, and water resources. The technical appendix includes the County's first baseline greenhouse gas emissions inventory. The COSE is based on the principles of smart growth, with the intent to preserve unique or valuable natural resources, to manage development within the sustainable capacity of the county's resources, and to reduce the county's contribution to global climate change.

Noise Element

The County Noise Element provides a policy framework for addressing potential noise impacts in the planning process, and minimizing future noise conflicts. The Noise Element identifies transportation-related, stationary, and potential operational noise generators in the county, provides a list of noise-sensitive land uses, and identifies acceptable and unacceptable thresholds of noise exposure based on land use. The Noise Element also provides mitigation measures that should be applied to projects when noise attenuation is required to meet identified thresholds.

Safety Element

The two primary principles of the County Safety Element are emergency preparedness and managed development to reduce risk. The Safety Element identifies potential emergency situations and natural disasters within the county, and includes goals and policies for response during an emergency or natural disaster, and avoidance of unnecessary risk.

3.3.2.5 West Tefft Corridor Design Plan

The project area is bounded for approximately 980 feet on the eastern boundary (APN 092-121-086) by West Tefft Street. The West Tefft Corridor Design Plan addresses the design of new development and streets near West Tefft Street between US 101 and Dana Elementary School, including the area along West Tefft Street encompassed by the proposed project. The area of West Tefft Street bordering the proposed project was included in the Design Plan solely to extend parkway/sidewalk concepts within the right-of-way. The central concerns of the plan are to avoid the development of suburban shopping centers throughout the designated downtown and to avoid street environments that are dangerous or unattractive to pedestrians. The Design Plan gives guidance for the desired appearance and scale of streets, buildings and open spaces, which are to be achieved through the public review of new projects and their completion.

3.3.2.6 Clean Air Plan

As part of the California Clean Air Act, the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD) is required to develop a plan to achieve and maintain the state ozone standard by the earliest practicable date. The Clean Air Plan (CAP) outlines the SLOAPCD's strategies to reduce ozone precursor emissions from a wide variety of stationary and mobile sources. The 2001 CAP was adopted by the SLOAPCD at their hearing on March 26, 2002.

3.3.2.7 Basin Plan

The Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coast Region (Basin Plan) is the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) master water quality control planning document. It designates beneficial uses and water quality objectives for waters of the State, including surface waters and groundwater. It also includes programs of implementation to achieve water quality objectives. Periodically, the RWQCB considers amendments to the Basin Plan. Each amendment is subject to an extensive public review process. At a public hearing, the RWQCB may act to adopt the amendment. Adopted amendments are subject to approval by State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), the Office of Administrative Law and, in most cases, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
Framework for Planning (Inland) – Land Use Element		
1. F. Planning Principles, Policies, Implementing Strategies. Strategic Growth Policy 2.4. Create complete communities with appropriate areas for housing, commerce, civic uses, schools, recreation and open spaces.	The NCP is currently the only <u>developed</u> public park in Nipomo. <u>Other opportunities for park improvements in the community</u> <u>include the recently approved Jack Ready Park, Jim Miller</u> <u>Memorial Park, and private developments.</u> The proposed project recommends the enhancement and addition of recreational facilities at this existing park facility. The concentration of recreational facilities at this one location may leave more distant areas of Nipomo without convenient park facilities. However, the County has recognized the need for additional neighborhood parks in Nipomo, and the project does not preempt or hinder the development of such additional recreational areas.	Consistent.
1. <i>F. Planning Principles, Policies, Implementing Strategies. Strategic Growth Policy 2.11.</i> Provide adequate community amenities, parks, natural areas and trails in support of new development, which will support a high quality of life and a compact form of community development.	The project proposes the development and/or enhancement of various trails, park areas and natural areas at the NCP, consistent with this policy. While other neighborhood park areas are still needed in Nipomo, the project enhances those resources that are available at the existing park location.	Consistent.
1. <i>F. Planning Principles, Policies, Implementing Strategies. Strategic Growth Policy 4.1.</i> Plan communities with schools, parks, public spaces, transit stops and commercial districts located as focal points within convenient walking distances of neighborhoods.	The proposed project would create and enhance recreational and natural resources and facilities serving surrounding single family residences and incorporates various connective trails and pathways to surrounding neighborhood areas. Though concentration of recreational facilities at this one site may leave other distant areas of Nipomo without recreational facilities, the project does not hinder the development of additional parks in the future to serve more distant neighborhoods.	Consistent.
1. <i>F. Planning Principles, Policies, Implementing Strategies. Strategic Growth Policy</i> 4.4 <i>.</i> Provide parks, natural areas and recreational facilities with new urban development to enhance a community's quality of life and improve public health.	The proposed project incorporates various new and enhanced recreational and natural resource areas and facilities, consistent with this policy.	Consistent.
1. <i>F. Planning Principles, Policies, Implementing Strategies. Strategic Growth Policy 4.5.</i> Create neighborhoods and non-residential areas that minimize fear and crime though environmental and urban design.	The proposed project incorporates "Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design" standards and "Lighting and Lighting Systems" guidelines in coordination with the San Luis Obispo County Sheriff's Office, consistent with this policy.	Consistent.

Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
1. F. Planning Principles, Policies, Implementing Strategies. Strategic Growth Policy 5.5. Make communities more bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly with safe and attractive routes.	The proposed project incorporates various connective trails and pathways to serve surrounding residential areas, consistent with this policy.	Consistent.
4. C. Policies and Implementing Strategies for Public Services. Implementing Strategy 1.a. Avoid the use of public resources, services and facilities beyond their renewable capacities, and monitor new development to ensure that its resource demands will not exceed existing or planned capacities or service levels.	Through implementation of mitigation measures set forth in Section 4.9, Public Services and Utilities, the proposed project is not expected to create a demand on public services beyond their available capacity levels.	Consistent.
5. Circulation Element, C. Goals and Objectives, 10. Encourage policies for new development to finance adequate additional circulation and access as a result of increased traffic it will cause.	The project includes major road improvements, including the re-alignment of existing park entrances on West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road; installation of a traffic signal at the re-aligned Pomeroy Road/Juniper Street intersection; construction of a westbound left turn pocket and an eastbound right turn pocket on Pomeroy Road; and improvements to Osage Road, including road widening for consistency with County road standard A-1(d) and construction of a trail within the road right-of-way. These road improvements and implementation of proposed mitigation measures will mitigate traffic-related impacts to a less than significant level.	Consistent.
5. Circulation Element, I. Bikeways, Implementing Strategy 3. Regional trails that link communities should be provided consistent with the Parks and Recreation Element, to enable more alternative transportation between and through communities.	The proposed project incorporates a series of trails, bike paths, equestrian trails, and pedestrian walkways connecting the Park and Mesa Meadows with surrounding residential areas, consistent with this policy.	Consistent.
County of San Luis Obispo South County Area Plan – Inland		
Nipomo Urban Area Programs, 11. Community Appearance. Work with neighborhoods to improve their appearance and clean up deteriorated residences and vacant properties. Assist in organizing events, workdays, and contests to motivate public participation, focusing on repair and renovation, construction of new fencing, landscaping, paths and a park.	The project proposes development or enhancement of various trails, paths and park facilities, consistent with this policy. Mitigation measures have also been proposed to reduce impacts and create an aesthetically consistent appearance of the park.	Consistent.
Nipomo Urban Area Programs, 13. Pathway Plan. Work with the community to prepare a plan for pedestrian circulation through the urban area. The plan should identify locations of walking and riding	The project proposes a series of trails, paths, and walkways that will increase connectivity between the park, surrounding residences, and urban areas in proximity to the park.	Consistent.

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
paths connecting neighborhoods to shopping areas, parks and schools. Linear parkways should be studied as one method of providing alternate pedestrian routes within public areas.		
Nipomo Urban Area Programs, 14. Neighborhood Parks. The county, Lucia Mar Unified School District and Nipomo Community Services District should jointly develop neighborhood parks adjacent to proposed new school sites and small parks throughout neighborhoods consistent with the County Parks and Recreation Element.	The project consolidates many of Nipomo's recreational opportunities at one park location. However, the project does not inhibit the County, NCSD, or Lucia Mar Unified School District from developing neighborhood parks in other parts of the community.	Consistent.
Nipomo Urban Area Programs, 15. Implementation Program – Nipomo Regional Park. The General Services Department should prepare an implementation program for improvements to the park consistent with the County Parks and Recreation Element.	The purpose of the project is to establish a park Master Plan to guide future development and improvements at the park, consistent with this policy.	Consistent.
Nipomo Urban Area Programs, 16. Improvements – Nipomo Regional Park. The General Services Department should proceed with improvements at Nipomo Regional Park to complete the Nipomo Regional Park Master Plan within a specific schedule.	The purpose of the project is to establish a park Master Plan to guide future development and improvements at the park, consistent with this policy.	Consistent.
<i>Circulation, Goal 1.</i> Transportation should be planned to facilitate the use of all modes to improve traffic service and air quality. Transportation planning should be consistent between the Planning and Public Works Departments.	Implementation of the NCPMP includes improvements to local roadways, and would facilitate alternative transportation	Consistent
<i>Circulation, Objective (a).</i> Utilize transportation system/demand management to develop various means of reducing traffic volume increases and conflicts, and reduce the need for roadway capacity improvements.	Mitigation is recommended to incorporate transportation demand management to reduce trip generation during the PM peak hour.	Consistent
<i>Circulation, Objective (f).</i> Provide an opportunity for public input before decisions are made on road improvement needs.	Public circulation of this EIR will provide an opportunity for public review and comment.	Consistent
Bikeways, Objectives and Policies 5. Recreation. Develop Class I bikeways with multi-use trails through public recreational areas and along public right-of-ways where deemed appropriate due to scenic and/or recreational resources. The protection of natural resources should also be achieved.	The project also proposes a paved walkway along Osage Street, and a multi-use trail around most of the perimeter of the Park. The project also entails the development or enhancement of a series of trails and walkways at the NCP that connect the park to Mesa Meadows, surrounding neighborhoods, and the West Tefft Street downtown core.	Consistent.

Table 3-2. Consistency with Plans and Policies
--

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
<i>Circulation Programs, Nipomo Urban Area, 12. Tefft Street and Thompson Road Improvements.</i> The Public Works and Planning Departments should develop a landscaping and sidewalk improvement plan for Thompson Road and West Tefft Street, including considering landscaped center medians along West Tefft Street, using low water-consuming plantings of ground cover, shrubs and street trees. This project should be implemented with any major street improvement or widening and upon the assumption of maintenance responsibility by the county or another association or agency such as the Nipomo Community Services District.	Implementation of the NCPMP does not preclude these improvements.	Consistent
San Luis Obispo County Code, Title 22, Land Use Ordinance, Nipomo Urban Area Standards		
22.112.080, A. Community Wide Standards, 4. Nipomo Lowland Areas – Drainage Plan Requirements. All land use permit applications for new structures or additions to the ground floor of existing structures shall require drainage plan approval in compliance with Chapter 22.52, unless the County Engineer determines that the individual project site is not subject to or will not create drainage problems.	While the County is not required to obtain a land use permit, a drainage plan will be prepared for review by the County Public Works Department.	Consistent
22.112.080, C. West Tefft Corridor Design Plan, 1. Compliance with the West Tefft Design Plan. The West Tefft Design Plan and any amendments thereto, is hereby incorporated into this Section as though it were fully set forth here. All Zoning Clearances, Minor Use Permit, Conditional Use Permit and land division applications within the West Tefft Design Plan Area shall be in conformity and compliance with the West Tefft Design Plan. In the event of any conflict between the provisions of this Title and the Design Plan, the Design Plan shall control.	The project has been analyzed for consistency with the Tefft Corridor Design Plan, as set forth in this table, below.	Consistent.
San Luis Obispo County General Plan, Parks and Recreation Element		
Parks Goal, Objective, and Policies, Objective A: Maintain and improve as well as provide new and expanded parks and recreation within the County consistent with Chapter 8 Parks and Recreation Project List, and the County's available funding.	The intent of the proposed project is to create new and expand existing park and recreational opportunities at NCP. Various elements of the proposed project are listed on the Chapter 8 Parks and Recreation Project List, including a Nipomo Community Center and community trails.	Consistent.

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
Parks Goal, Objective, and Policies, Policy 2.1: Provide parks which are aesthetic and consistent with community needs.	The project has been designed to be aesthetically consistent with the surrounding setting, and mitigation measures are further proposed to mitigate any visual impacts to less than significant levels.	Consistent.
 Parks Goal, Objective, and Policies, Policy 2.3: When developing parkland: 1. Prepare adequate studies to determine site constraints. 2. Prepare and implement a master plan for the site. 3. Provide reasonable buffers between existing uses and the new park facilities in order to reduce impacts. 4. Use joint use opportunities and adopt-a-park programs as they are available. 	The project proposes implementation of a Master Plan for the NCP, and is based on a 2004 Constraints Analysis, consistent with this policy. Land use buffers are incorporated into the plan to minimize impacts.	Consistent
Parks Goal, Objective, and Policies, Policy 2.4: Preserve County parkland for active and passive recreation. Community facilities, which have little to no recreational component, shall be placed outside of an existing or proposed park.	The new facilities and uses proposed in the project are intended to provide active and passive recreational opportunities in NCP, consistent with this policy. All other proposed uses, i.e. drainage basins, maintenance buildings, etc., are appurtenant to the project's primary recreational components.	Consistent.
Recreation Goal, Objectives and Policies, Objective B: Provide new and expanded recreation within the County consistent with Chapter 8 Parks and Recreation List, and the County's available funding.	The intent of the proposed project is to create new and expand existing park and recreational opportunities at NCP. Various elements of the proposed project are listed on the Chapter 8 Parks and Recreation Project List, including a Nipomo Community Center and community trails.	Consistent.
 Recreation Goal, Objectives and Policies, General Recreation, Policy 3.1: To provide an equitable distribution of recreation throughout the County, County Parks should attempt to provide new or expanded recreation (as a first priority) in those Planning Areas that have: Experienced faster growth rates. Very limited existing park acreage and/or recreation opportunities in relation to population density. When assessing existing park acreage and/or recreation opportunities consider parks and recreation offered by all entities provided that entity offers comparable service to the County's unincorporated population. 	The South County Inland Area Plan of the LUO indicates that the South County Inland Area averages almost twice the annual growth rate of the rest of the County in general, with the Nipomo urban area experiencing the majority of new development. The project proposes new and expanded recreational uses and facilities at the only existing <u>developed</u> park serving the Nipomo community, consistent with this policy. <u>Other opportunities for park improvements in the community</u> include the recently approved Jack Ready Park, Jim Miller <u>Memorial Park, and private developments</u> .	Consistent.

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
Recreation Goal, Objectives and Policies, General Recreation, Policy 3.2: Provide recreation at the County's parks consistent with community needs.	The project entails new and expanded open space and recreational uses at Nipomo's only existing <u>developed</u> park, consistent with this policy.	Consistent.
Recreation Goal, Objectives and Policies, General Recreation, Policy 3.3: Seek joint use agreements, volunteer and other partnership opportunities to augment recreational services and reduce project costs.	Implementation of the NCPMP does not preclude such agreements.	Consistent
Recreation Goal, Objectives and Policies, General Recreation, Policy 3.4: When considering the acceptance or development of capital intensive recreational facilities such as community centers, indoor sports centers, and aquatic centers, attempt to get numerous entities involved to split the cost of acquisition, design, development and maintenance.	Implementation of the NCPMP does not preclude such agreements.	Consistent
Recreation Goal, Objectives and Policies, General Recreation, Policy 3.5: Provide recreation programs at the County's owned or leased facilities which provide adequate cost recovery.	Implementation of the NCPMP does not preclude development of recreation programs. Improvement and development of facilities would provide the opportunity for additional recreational programs at NCP.	Consistent
Recreation Goal, Objectives and Policies, Trails, Objective C: Provide a viable multi-use trail system which is protective of private property interests and public resources, and consistent with Chapter 8 Parks and Recreation List.	The project proposes conversion of approximately 15.96 acres of existing undeveloped area and dirt trails to a variety of new recreational and infrastructure uses. However, these trails are not in areas designated for trail development in the Parks and Recreation List. The project also proposes a paved walkway along Osage Street, and a multi-use trail around most of the perimeter of the Park, consistent with the Chapter 8 List.	Consistent.
 Recreation Goal, Objectives and Policies, Trails, Policy 3.7: County Parks shall consider as the highest priority those trail projects which: Are on land owned or operated by the County, including public rights of way. Connect urban communities or provide access to recreation areas. Complete a trail corridor, where only small portions are remaining. Will be popular due to their length or duration. 	The trails proposed in the project are located on County-owned lands, and provide access to various proposed facilities of the NCP from surrounding neighborhoods.	Consistent

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
 Offer alternative transportation. Solve a safety concern. Include a funding source. Minimize costs of development and maintenance. 		
 Recreation Goal, Objectives and Policies, Trails, Policy 3.8: To protect the interests of adjacent land uses (both public and private) and the environment, trail projects shall: Be consistent with the standards in the General Plan including the County's Agriculture and Open Space Element. Stay as far away as reasonable from production agriculture, commercial activities and residences. Be built to minimize impacts to sensitive resources. Provide signs that identify permitted trail uses; directions to relevant public areas; and provide for safety and protection of trail users and adjacent property. Provide trail fencing where necessary to discourage trespass onto neighboring land and to protect sensitive resources. Impose enforceable limitations on the trail use, as appropriate. Be designed and constructed consistent with the trails standards contained in Appendix B of this document. 	The proposed trail system would be designed to comply with this goal. Mitigation measures have also been recommended to further reduce impacts on sensitive resources.	Consistent
Recreation Goal, Objectives and Policies, Trails, Policy 3.9: County agencies will work together to coordinate the development, maintenance and use of trails.	Implementation of the NCPMP would require coordination with multiple agencies and local advisory groups.	Consistent
 Recreation Goal, Objectives and Policies, Trails, Policy 3.14: Prior to the construction and/or County acceptance of a public trail corridor, the approving authority must make findings that: Sufficient funds are available for the trail's on-going maintenance; and The liability for the trail has been addressed pursuant to Policy 3.15. 	Implementation of the NCPMP would require compliance with this measure. Development of trails would be phased based on available funding for development and maintenance.	Consistent
<i>Funding, Acquisition, Development & Maintenance Goals, Objectives, and Policies, Objective H:</i> Develop a funding mechanism that provides for acquisition, development and maintenance of parks, recreation, natural areas, and coastal	Implementation of the NCPMP would not be inconsistent with this objective; long-range planning and funding is necessary to ensure development and maintenance of proposed facilities.	Consistent

Table 3-2.	Consistency with	Plans and Policies
------------	------------------	--------------------

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
access, taking advantage of collaborative agreements and volunteers.		
<i>Funding, Acquisition, Development & Maintenance Goals, Objectives, and Policies, Policy 6.2:</i> Develop a funding program that balances community need with available revenues. Use an economic consultant to review existing costs and provide recommendations for a viable funding program. This program should consider the formation of a parks district.	Implementation of the NCPMP would not be inconsistent with this objective; long-range planning and funding is necessary to ensure development and maintenance of proposed facilities	Consistent
<i>Funding, Acquisition, Development & Maintenance Goals, Objectives, and Policies, Objective I:</i> Provide new or expanded public facilities consistent with available maintenance funding.	Implementation of the NCPMP would not be inconsistent with this objective; long-range planning and funding is necessary to ensure development and maintenance of proposed facilities	Consistent
<i>Funding, Acquisition, Development & Maintenance Goals, Objectives, and Policies, Policy 6.4:</i> Prior to accepting or developing a new park, County Parks shall determine the long-term maintenance and operating costs associated with the proposed project. The County shall not develop the park until adequate funds are available for maintenance.	Implementation of the NCPMP would not be inconsistent with this objective; long-range planning and funding is necessary to ensure development and maintenance of proposed facilities	Consistent
<i>Funding, Acquisition, Development & Maintenance Goals,</i> <i>Objectives, and Policies, Policy 6.7:</i> Conduct project maintenance consistent with a facility's master plan.	Maintenance of park facilities would be conducted according to the adopted NCPMP.	Consistent
<i>Funding, Acquisition, Development & Maintenance Goals, Objectives, and Policies, Policy 6.8:</i> When maintaining park, recreation and natural area facilities attempt to minimize signs and other structures that may impact the aesthetics of the facility.	Mitigation is recommended to guide design of proposed elements and structures within NCP to maintain rural character.	Consistent
<i>Funding, Acquisition, Development & Maintenance Goals, Objectives, and Policies, Policy 6.11:</i> Use methods within County Parks' facilities that reduce maintenance costs, such as the use of drought tolerant landscaping, solar oriented structures, structures with natural lighting during daylight hours, and stainless steel fixtures which have a longer lifetime and are more resilient to vandalism.	Mitigation is recommended to address water conservation, energy efficiency, and crime prevention. Upon design of project elements, these measures would be applied.	Consistent
Funding, Acquisition, Development & Maintenance Goals, Objectives, and Policies, Policy 6.12: Continue to assess ways	Implementation of the NCPMP would not be inconsistent with this policy; long-range planning and funding is necessary to	Consistent

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
 of providing additional maintenance funding including: 1. The periodic review of user fees. 2. Ways to cut staff time. 3. Additional ways to manage and use volunteers. 4. Assessing options such as the formation of a parks district. 	ensure development and maintenance of proposed facilities.	
San Luis Obispo County General Plan, Conservation and Open S	Space Element	
Policy AQ 1.1 Compact development: Encourage compact land development by concentrating new growth within existing communities and ensuring complete services to meet local needs.	Implementation of the NCPMP would contribute to this policy and implementation strategy by adding additional uses to an existing park within an urban area.	Consistent
 Implementation Strategy AQ 1.1.1 Strategic Growth Principles: Implement Strategic Growth principles and, as needed, amend applicable ordinances and policies to: g. Encourage new residential development to be within walking distance (1/2 mile or less) to public activity centers such as schools, libraries, parks, and community centers. 		
 Policy AQ 1.2 Reduce vehicle miles traveled: Require projects subject to discretionary review to minimize additional vehicle travel. Implementation Strategy AQ 1.2.1 VMT reduction strategies: Strategies to reduce new demand for vehicle travel may include, but are not limited to, minimum densities along transit corridors, Transportation Demand Management, and alternative transportation infrastructure as follows: d. Install adequate and secure bicycle racks and storage facilities at a ratio of 1 per every 10 vehicle spaces in new commercial and public buildings with a corresponding reduction in required automobile parking spaces. Showers and changing facilities should also be encouraged. e. Incorporate design features and infrastructure into new projects that enable access by transit, bicycling, and walking. 	Implementation of the project would contribute to this implementation strategy by providing additional uses, improved pedestrian and bicycle access, and potentially a transit stop within the existing park, and near the core of an urban area.	Consistent
Policy AQ 1.3 Convenient alternative transportation: Require new development to provide safe and convenient access to alternative transportation within the project area and safe access to public transportation as feasible.	Implementation of the project would be consistent with this policy and implementation strategy, because improved paths and access are proposed, which would improve connectivity between residential neighborhoods and commercial centers in	Consistent

Table 3-2.	Consistency	with Plans	and Policies
------------	-------------	------------	--------------

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
Implementation Strategy AQ 1.3.1 Connectivity in new development: Require new development to construct paths that connect land uses and other non-motorized routes, safe road crossings at major intersections and secure, weatherproof bicycle parking and storage facilities, and long-term maintenance of such facilities.	the area.	
Policy AQ 1.4 Alternative transportation improvements: Where new development is required to provide necessary alternative transportation improvements, such improvements should be in place, or otherwise guaranteed, before or concurrent with construction of the new development.	The project includes off-site road improvements, including a signalized crosswalk at park entrances. These improvements would occur prior to development of major facilities (i.e., sports field, community center).	Consistent
Policy AQ 1.7 Bicycle and pedestrian travel: Encourage bicycle and pedestrian use by supporting the policies found in the Regional Transportation Plan, County Bikeways Plan, Land Use and Circulation Element, and County Parks and Recreation Element. In addition, support public and private efforts to facilitate bicycling and walking for transportation and recreation.	Implementation of the project would contribute to this implementation strategy by providing improved pedestrian and bicycle access within the existing park.	Consistent
<i>Implementation Strategy AQ 1.7.1 Bicycle racks at County facilities:</i> Provide, or work with other County agencies to provide, bicycle racks and storage facilities in public areas, such as County buildings and facilities, parks, and community centers.		
Policy AQ 3.2 Attain air quality standards: Attain or exceed federal or state ambient air quality standards (the more stringent if not the same) for measured criteria pollutants.	The EIR includes an analysis of potential short and long-term air emissions, and associated impacts and mitigation measures, based on the APCD's CEQA Handbook (2009).	Consistent
<i>Implementation Strategy AQ 3.2.1 Use of APCD's CEQA Guidelines:</i> The County's CEQA process will use the APCD's CEQA Guidelines to determine significance of impacts and to identify minimum project design and mitigation requirements.		
Policy AQ 3.3 Avoid air pollution increases: Avoid a net increase in criteria air pollutant emissions in planning areas certified as Level of Severity II or III for Air Quality by the County's Resource Management System (RMS).	Mitigation is recommended to reduce potential impacts related to equipment emissions and generation of fugitive dust and particulate matter, which would help to avoid a net increase in criteria air pollutant emissions.	Consistent

Table 3-2. Consistency with Plans and Policies

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
<i>Policy AQ 3.4 Toxic exposure:</i> Minimize public exposure to toxic air contaminants, ozone, particulate matter, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, and lead.	Mitigation is recommended to ensure avoidance of public exposure to toxic air contaminants, including subsurface landfill gasses and diesel particulates, consistent with this policy.	Consistent
Policy AQ 3.5 Equitable decision making: Ensure that land use decisions are equitable and protect all residents from the adverse health effects of air pollution.	Mitigation is recommended to address all potential public exposures to air pollution, including short term (during construction) and long-term (operation).	Consistent
 Policy AQ 3.7 Reduce vehicle idling: Encourage the reduction of heavy-vehicle idling throughout the county, particularly near schools, hospitals, senior care facilities, and areas prone to concentrations of people, including residential areas. Implementation Strategy AQ 3.7.1 Heavy Duty Vehicle Idling: Encourage the reduction of heavy-duty vehicle idling throughout the county using APCD and California Air Resources Board idling reduction policies for schools and other sensitive receptors. 	Mitigation is recommended, pursuant to the APCD's CEQA Handbook (2009) to avoid excessive idling during construction of proposed park facilities, consistent with this policy.	Consistent
Policy AQ 3.8 Reduce dust emissions: Reduce PM10 and PM2.5 emissions from unpaved and paved County roads to the maximum extent feasible.	Mitigation is recommended to address particulate matter emissions, consistent with the APCD CEQA Handbook (2009).	Consistent
 Implementation Strategy AQ 3.8.1 Reduce PM emissions from County roads: 1) Implement all APCD particulate matter (PM) emission controls. 2) Continue efforts to clean paved roads, and 3) Pave or "chip seal" public County dirt roads to minimize fugitive dust. 		
 Policy AQ 4.1 Reduce greenhouse gas emissions: Implement and enforce State legislative or regulatory standards, policies, and programs designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Implementation Strategy AQ 4.3.3 Reduce GHG emissions from County energy use: Reduce greenhouse gas emissions resulting from energy use in the County buildings, facilities, and operations through adoption of energy efficiency and energy conservation measures, use of renewable energy sources, and other strategies 	Based on the location of the existing park and proposed additional facilities and improvements, implementation of the NCPMP would encourage alternative transportation and reduce vehicle miles traveled by providing recreational opportunities within an established community. Additional mitigation is recommended to address energy efficiency and conservation.	Consistent

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
identified in the Climate Action Plan.		
Policy AQ 4.5 Carbon Sequestration: Reduce net carbon emissions through the preservation, protection, and enhancement, as appropriate, of the county's terrestrial and aquatic carbon sequestration resources, including the county's lakes, soils, and native forests, trees, and plants.	Implementation of the project would retain the oak woodland located within the center of the park. While some oak trees would be removed to accommodate access improvements, trees would be replanted and protected under a conservation easement.	Consistent
 Implementation Strategy AQ 4.5.1 Identify carbon sequestration resources: Identify existing and potential opportunities for terrestrial and aquatic sequestration in the county, including but not limited to County lands, reclaimed mining lands, agricultural lands, and other areas or activities as appropriate. Protect sensitive biological resources such as, wetlands, migratory species of the Pacific flyway, and wildlife movement corridors through: 1) environmental review of proposed development applications, including consideration of cumulative impacts, 2) participation in comprehensive habitat management programs with other local and resource agencies, and 3) acquisition and management of open space lands that provide for permanent protection of important natural habitats. 		
Policy BR 1.2 Limit Development Impacts: Regulate and minimize proposed development in areas that contain essential habitat for special-status species, sensitive natural communities, wetlands, coastal and riparian habitats, and wildlife habitat and movement corridors as necessary to ensure the continued health and survival of these species and protection of sensitive areas.	Minimal development would occur within the oak woodland habitat within the NCP, which would continue to provide habitat for a variety of wildlife species.	Consistent
Policy BR 1.3 Environmental Review: Require environmental review of development applications pursuant to CEQA and County procedures to assess the impact of proposed development on native species and habitat diversity, particularly special-status species, sensitive natural communities, wetlands, and important wildlife nursery areas and movement corridors.	The Biological Resources section (Section 4.3) of this EIR was prepared consistent with this policy.	Consistent
Policy BR 1.4 No Net Loss: Require that development projects	Implementation of the project would require the removal of	Consistent

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
are approved with conditions and mitigation measures to ensure the protection of sensitive resources and to achieve "no net loss" of sensitive habitat acreage, values, and function. Give highest priority to avoidance of sensitive habitat. When avoidance is not feasible, require provision of replacement habitat onsite through restoration and/or habitat creation. When onsite mitigation is not feasible, provide for offsite mitigation that reflects no net loss.	some oak trees, and would potentially affect other sensitive vegetation. A biological conservation area would be established within the park, to ensure no net loss of habitat.	
Policy BR 2.6 Development Impacts to Listed Species: Ensure that potential adverse impacts to threatened, rare, and endangered species from development are avoided or minimized through project siting and design. Ensure that proposed development avoids significant disturbance of sensitive natural plant communities that contain special-status plant species or provide critical habitat to special-status animal species. When avoidance is not feasible, require no net loss of sensitive natural plant communities and critical habitat areas.	Preparation of this EIR included a full analysis of biological resources, consistent with this policy and implementation strategies. Mitigation is recommended, including replacement of habitat and species potentially affected by the development. A conservation easement would be established to ensure long term protection.	Consistent
<i>Implementation Strategy BR 2.6.1 Use of biological resource surveys:</i> Require applications for discretionary projects and land divisions to provide a biological resource survey performed by a qualified biologist when needed to address special-status animal and plant species and their associated habitats.		
Implementation Strategy BR 2.6.2 Use of habitat preservation ratio: Where avoidance, restoration, or replacement of habitat of special status species is not feasible, require preservation and/or enhancement of similar habitat at a minimum 2:1 ratio to avoid significant cumulative loss of valuable habitats and to achieve no net loss of habitat value.		
<i>Implementation Strategy BR 2.6.3 Use of easements to protect habitat:</i> Obtain easements or dedications to protect habitat, especially where it is connected to other large areas of unique or sensitive habitat. Natural open space areas in development projects should be contiguous to natural areas adjacent to the site wherever possible.		
Policy BR 2.8 Invasive Plant Species: Promote and support	Proposed landscaping would include native, drought tolerant	Consistent

Table 3-2. Consistency with Plans and Policies	S
--	---

Table 3-2. Consistency with Plans and Policies
--

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
efforts to reduce the effects of noxious weeds on natural habitats. The County will work with local resource and land management agencies to develop a comprehensive approach to controlling the spread of non-native invasive species and reducing their extent on both public and private land.	species, consistent with the County LUO and this policy. Implementation of the project does not preclude removal of non-native species within natural areas. The presence of the Nipomo Native Garden in the northern portion of the park would continue to provide public education regarding the importance of native plants.	
Implementation Strategy BR 2.8.2 Prohibit invasive species in landscaping: Prohibit use of invasive plant species in landscaping of proposed development. Revise the County's invasive plant list by the end of 2010 in cooperation with County Parks and the County Department of Agriculture consistent with Implementation Strategies B.R. 2.8.4 and 2.8.5. Consider including in that list invasive plants listed in the state's Noxious Weed List, the California Invasive Plant Council's Invasive Plant Inventory, and other priority species identified by the San Luis Obispo County Agricultural Commissioner and California Department of Agriculture.		
<i>Implementation Strategy BR 2.8.3 Require removal of invasive</i> <i>exotic plants:</i> Require the removal of invasive exotic plant species, to the extent feasible, when reviewing discretionary development projects, and include monitoring to prevent re- establishment in managed areas. Support educational programs that inform property owners about appropriate vegetation management techniques.		
Policy BR 2.9 Promote Use of Native Plant Species: Landscaping for proposed development will use a variety of native or compatible non-native, non-invasive plant species as part of project landscaping to improve wildlife habitat values.	Proposed landscaping would include native, drought tolerant species, consistent with the County LUO and this policy.	Consistent
Policy BR 3.1 Native Tree Protection: Protect native and biologically valuable trees, oak woodlands, trees with historical significance, and forest habitats to the maximum extent feasible.	Implementation of the project would retain the oak woodland located within the center of the park. The design of the NCPMP avoids native trees to the maximum extent feasible.	Consistent
Policy BR 3.2 Protection of Native Trees in New Development: Require proposed discretionary development and land divisions to avoid damage to native trees (e.g., Monterey Pines, oaks) through setbacks, clustering, or other appropriate measures. When avoidance is not feasible, require mitigation measures.	Implementation of the project would retain the oak woodland located within the center of the park. While some oak trees would be removed to accommodate access improvements, trees would be replanted and protected under a conservation easement.	Consistent

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
Policy BR 3.3 Oak Woodland Preservation: Maintain and improve oak woodland habitat to provide for slope stabilization, soil protection, species diversity, and wildlife habitat.	The Biological Resources section (Section 4.3) of the EIR included a full analysis of impacts to individual oak trees and oak woodland, and includes mitigation measures consistent with the Oak Woodlands Preservation Act.	Consistent
<i>Implementation Strategy BR 3.3.1 Implement Oak Woodlands</i> <i>Preservation Act:</i> Comply with the Oak Woodlands Preservation Act (PRC Section 21083.4) through the review of proposed discretionary development by maintaining the integrity and diversity of oak woodlands, chaparral communities, and other significant vegetation.		
Policy BR 3.5 Non-native Trees: Protect healthy and non-hazardous, non-native trees (e.g., eucalyptus groves) and forests that provide raptor nesting or roosting sites or support colonies of monarch butterflies.	Implementation of the project would retain the oak woodland located within the center of the park. The design of the NCPMP avoids native trees to the maximum extent feasible.	Consistent
Policy BR 4.8 Runoff from County Lands: Reduce and control fertilizer and pollutant runoff from County-owned and managed lands.	Mitigation is recommended to incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) consistent with this policy. Incorporation of integrates pest management is encouraged for existing and future turf areas. Recentacles and net waste stations are	Consistent
Implementation Strategy BR 4.8.1 Non-point source best management practices: Implement RWQCB Best Management Practices, including integrated pest management, to minimize pesticide application and minimize fertilizer runoff from County- owned and managed properties.	currently provided in the NCP.	
<i>Implementation Strategy BR 4.8.2 Pet waste in County facilities:</i> Provide receptacles for disposal and pickup of pet waste in County recreation areas.		
Policy CR 4.4 Development Activities and Archaeological Sites: Protect archaeological and culturally sensitive sites from the effects of development by avoiding disturbance where feasible. Avoid archaeological resources as the primary method of protection.	A cultural resource survey was conducted during environmental review of the proposed project. No significant archaeological resources were identified. Historical resources have been assessed consistent with this policy and associated implementation strategies.	Consistent
Implementation Strategy CR 4.4.1 Native American participation in development review process: In areas likely to contain Native American and cultural resources, include Native Americans in tasks such as Phase I II, and III surveys, resource		

Table 3-2.	Consistency	with Plans	and Policies
------------	-------------	------------	--------------

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
assessment, and impact mitigation. Consult with Native American representatives early in the development review process and in the design of appropriate mitigations. Enable their presence during archaeological excavation and construction in areas likely to contain cultural resources.		
<i>Implementation Strategy CR 4.4.2 Cultural Resource Studies:</i> Require cultural resources studies (i.e., archaeological and historical investigations) by a professional who meets the Interpretation of cultural resources can include monuments, signs, plaques, artwork, publications, etc.		
Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards when development is proposed within an archaeologically or historically sensitive area. These studies will conform to the County's approved guidelines.		
 Policy E 1.3 Renewable energy and County facilities: Seek to use renewable energy to power County facilities. Implementation Strategy E 1.3.1 Use of renewable energy at County facilities: Retrofit existing County facilities with appropriate 	The NCPMP is a conceptual plan, and does include renewable energy facilities; however, the plan does not preclude incorporation of such features in the future. Mitigation is recommended to incorporate energy efficiency measures, which may include renewable energy sources.	Consistent
renewable energy and clean technologies such as L.E.D. lighting, solar, wind, biofuel, cogeneration, and fuel cells.		
 Policy E 2.1 Energy efficiency: Become a model of energy efficiency and conservation in the provision of services and the maintenance of County facilities and equipment to: a. demonstrate to County residents and businesses the benefits of energy efficiency and conservation, b. reduce costs of government, c. reduce dependence on imported fossil fuel energy, and d. improve air quality. 	As noted above, the NCPMP does currently include renewable energy facilities; however, the plan does not preclude incorporation of such features in the future. Mitigation is recommended to incorporate energy efficiency measures, which may include renewable energy sources.	Consistent
<i>Implementation Strategy E 2.1.1 Apply Energy Use Policy to all County facilities:</i> Amend the Energy Use Policy for County buildings and facilities operated, managed, or leased by General Services to apply to all buildings and facilities operated by the County. The amended Energy Use Policy should identify energy		

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
conservation, energy efficiency, demand reduction, distributed generation, and renewable energy strategies consistent with this Element.		
Policy E 3.2 Energy efficient equipment: Require the use of energy-efficient equipment in all new development, including but not limited to Energy Star appliances, high-energy efficiency equipment, heat recovery equipment, and building energy management systems.	Mitigation is recommended to incorporate energy efficiency measures, consistent with this policy.	Consistent
Policy E 4.3 Green County facilities: Incorporate green building practices into the planning, design, construction, management, renovation, operations, and demolition of all County buildings.	The NCPMP is a conceptual plan, and does not include specific architectural design elements; however, the plan does not preclude incorporation of such features in the future. Mitigation is recommended to incorporate energy efficiency measures, which may include incorporation of green building practices.	Consistent
Policy E 4.4 Solar exposure: Orient new buildings to maximize solar resources, shading, ventilation, and lighting.	The NCPMP is a conceptual plan, and does not include specific architectural design elements; however, the plan does not preclude incorporation of such features in the future. Mitigation is recommended to incorporate orientation of buildings to maximize solar resources.	Consistent
Policy E 4.5 Healthy indoor environments: Encourage healthy indoor environmental quality in new and renovated buildings, including publicly funded affordable housing projects and County buildings, using healthy building materials, finishes, paints, and products.	The NCPMP is a conceptual plan, and does not include specific architectural design elements; however, the plan does not preclude incorporation of such features in the future, such as during development of the community center.	Consistent
Policy E 5.2 County operations and waste: Continue efforts to reduce waste from County operations through reduction, reuse, and recycling in all County programs, operations, facilities, and buildings.	The NCP includes receptacles for recycling collection, consistent with this policy.	Consistent
Implementation Strategy E 5.2.2 Ensure recycling at all County facilities: Ensure that recyclable materials are collected at all County facilities, and develop a policy for the salvage and reuse/recycling of County equipment at the end of its useful life in order to ensure that it is responsibly disposed of or recycled.		
Policy E 5.5 Sustainable materials in County buildings: Reuse	The NCPMP is a conceptual plan, and does not include specific	Consistent

Table 3-2.	Consistency	with Plans	and Policies
------------	-------------	------------	--------------

Table 3-2.	Consistency	with Plans	and Policies
------------	-------------	------------	--------------

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
 building materials, use materials with recycled content, or use materials that are derived from sustainable, renewable, and/or local sources to the greatest extent feasible in County buildings. In proposed County projects, encourage construction that: a. Alinimizes building materials with high-embodied energy (e.g., cement, metal) b. Uses fly ash in concrete. Provide incentives and consider regulations requiring new building projects that use a substantial amount of concrete to incorporate at least 25% fly ash to offset some of the energy use and greenhouse gas emissions associated with the manufacturing of cement c. Uses sustainable materials for pipes d. Uses recycled aggregate in concrete f. Uses straw bale construction in exterior walls. 	architectural design elements; however, the plan does not preclude incorporation of such features in the future. Mitigation is recommended to incorporate use of sustainable materials to address greenhouse gas emissions and energy efficiency.	
Policy OS 2.9 Recreational use of publicly owned open space: Continue to establish and implement policies and management strategies to provide recreational use of open space.	The project is consistent with this policy because it includes improvements to an existing park within an urban area.	Consistent
<i>Implementation Strategy OS 2.9.1 Recreation on public lands:</i> Work closely with other agencies to plan and provide recreational use of publicly owned open space.		
<i>Implementation Strategy OS 2.9.2 Minimize recreation conflicts:</i> Manage park sites and recreation areas to protect scenic and environmentally sensitive resources, and to not conflict with agricultural or other rural land uses addressed in the Agriculture Element.		
Policy SL 1.1 Prevent Loss of Topsoil in All Land Uses: Minimize the loss of topsoil by encouraging broad-based cooperation between property owners, agricultural operators, agencies, and organizations that will lead to effective soil conservation practices on all lands, including County-controlled properties.	The Geology and Soils section (Section 4.5) of the EIR includes an assessment of potential impacts related to erosion, drainage, and down-gradient sedimentation. The plan includes improvements to the existing drainage system, which would address current onsite flooding and stormwater management. Mitigation is recommended to minimize the potential for soil erosion, consistent with this policy.	Consistent
Implementation Strategy SL 1.1.2 Soil erosion: public lands:		

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
Assure that roads and drainage systems on County-controlled properties and facilities do not negatively impact other land uses, including agricultural lands, and that the roads and drainage systems are properly maintained.		
Policy SL 1.3 Minimize Erosion associated with New Development: Avoid development, including roads and driveways, on the steeper portions of a site except when necessary to avoid flood hazards, protect prime soils, and protect sensitive biological and other resources. Avoid grading and site disturbance activities on slopes over 30%. Minimize site disturbance and protect existing vegetation as much as possible.	Grading and site disturbance would not occur on slopes exceeding 30%. Mitigation, including implementation of LID strategies, is recommended to reduce stormwater flow.	Consistent
Implementation Strategy SL 1.3.1 Low Impact Development (LID): Implement Low Impact development (LID) for all new public and private projects.		
Policy VR 6.1 Urban Design: Ensure that new multi-family residential, mixed-use, and commercial or other non-residential development in the urban and village areas is consistent with local character, identity, and sense of place.	The Aesthetic Resources section (Section 4.1) of the EIR includes a full assessment of the project's effect on local character, identify, and sense of place. Mitigation is recommended to ensure the project elements are consistent with the character of the area.	Consistent
Policy VR 7.1 Nighttime Light Pollution: Protect the clarity and visibility of the night sky within communities and rural areas, by ensuring that exterior lighting, including streetlight projects, is designed to minimize nighttime light pollution.	Mitigation is recommended to address the effects of nighttime lighting. Lighting would be shielded, directed internal to the park, and would not be used past 10:00 pm.	Consistent
 Policy WR 1.4 Use reclaimed water: The County will be a leader in the use of reclaimed water. Support expanding the use of reclaimed water to make up at least 5% of total water use by 2015 and 10% of total water use by 2020. Implementation Strategy WR 1.4.3 Reclaimed water: identify partners: Identify potential partners and sites for advanced tertiary treatment projects (i.e., agriculture, park fields, etc.) and initiate a long-term public education process for potable water reuse. 	As discussed in the Water and Wastewater sections of the EIR, the County may connect with the Southland Wastewater Treatment Facility recycled water system, which would be implemented by the Nipomo Community Services District. Use of reclaimed water is recommended as mitigation to reduce anticipated water demand.	Consistent
Implementation Strategy WR 1.4.4 Reclaimed water:		

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
groundwater recharge: Explore opportunities for groundwater recharge with reclaimed water. Opportunities include but are not limited to recharge through use of reclaimed water for irrigation, dust control, and fire suppression.		
Policy WR 3.1 Prevent water pollution: Take actions to prevent water pollution, consistent with federal and state water policies and standards, including but not limited to the federal Clean Water Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).	Implementation of the project would require preparation and implementation of a SWPPP, consistent with this policy and associated implementation strategies.	Consistent
<i>Implementation Strategy WR 3.1.2 Employ pollution prevention in County operations:</i> Employ pollution prevention techniques in all County operations and maintenance activities consistent with the Best Management Practices outlined in the County's Stormwater Management Program.		
Implementation Strategy WR 3.1.3 Minimize construction- related impacts to water quality: Minimize construction and post- construction impacts of development through implementation of the County's Stormwater Management Program and Stormwater Pollution Prevention and Discharge Control Ordinance in compliance with Phase II of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).		
 Policy WR 3.2 Protect watersheds: Protect watersheds, groundwater and aquifer recharge areas, and natural drainage systems from potential adverse impacts of development projects. Implementation Strategy WR 3.2.1 Minimize runoff from new development: Ensure that public and private developments subject to discretionary review are designed to minimize runoff from such sources as homes, golf courses, swimming pools, and roadway maintenance. 	Mitigation is recommended to incorporate Low Impact Development (LID) strategies, which would address stormwater runoff and include the use of permeable materials, consistent with this policy and associated implementation strategies.	Consistent
<i>Implementation Strategy WR 3.2.2 Permeable Materials:</i> Encourage the use of permeable materials in areas where hardscape is proposed.		

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
 Policy WR 4.3 Water conservation: The County will be a leader in water conservation efforts. Implementation Strategy WR 4.3.1 Promote water conservation demonstration projects: Invite university and community collaboration on water conservation demonstration projects at County facilities such as the replacement of the lawn at the County Courthouse with a native landscape and expansion of water conservation landscaping at regional park facilities. 	Mitigation is recommended to include water conservation measures applicable to both existing (turf and landscaping) and future (turf, landscaping, interior) uses. Annual water use is monitored by the County and NCSD (water service provider). The NCP could support a water conservation demonstration project, consistent with this policy.	Consistent
Implementation Strategy WR 4.3.2 Assess and monitor County water use: Assess and monitor water use by County operations, buildings, and facilities on annual basis. Implementation Strategy WR 4.3.3 Reduce water use in County operations: Reduce exterior and interior use of water in County- owned, operated, or financed facilities through efficient technologies, design and management practices, and other conservation efforts.		
Policy WR 4.6 Graywater: Encourage the use of graywater systems, rainwater catchments, and other water reuse methods in new development and renovation projects, consistent with state and local water quality regulations.	Water conservation mitigation measures are recommended, which may include the use of water reuse methods.	Consistent
Policy WR 4.7 Low Impact Development: Require Low Impact Development (LID) practices in all discretionary and land division projects and public projects to reduce, treat, infiltrate, and manage urban runoff.	Mitigation is recommended to incorporate Low Impact Development (LID) strategies, consistent with this policy and associated implementation strategies.	Consistent
Policy WR 4.8 Efficient irrigation: Support efforts of the resource conservation districts, California Polytechnic State University (Cal Poly), the University of California Cooperative Extension, and others to research, develop, and implement more efficient irrigation techniques.	As discussed in the Water Resources section (Section 4.12) of the EIR, the NCSD conducted an audit of irrigation water use at NCP. Methods to improve existing irrigation water use are recommended, and additional water conservation measures are included as mitigation to reduce water demand.	Consistent
<i>Implementation Strategy WR 4.8.1 Improve water efficiency</i> <i>conservation in County irrigation systems:</i> Evaluate the efficiency of irrigation systems at County Parks and other County facilities with the assistance of Resource Conservation Districts and		

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
water purveyors. The goals of such evaluations are to reduce water use and improve water efficiencies.		
San Luis Obispo County General Plan, Noise Element		
Chapter 3, Goals and Policies, Transportation Noise Sources, Policy 3.3.1: New development should minimize noise exposure and noise generation.	The proposed project has been designed to minimize noise- related impacts, and mitigation measures have been proposed to reduce impacts to less than significant.	Consistent.
Chapter 3, Goals and Policies, Transportation Noise Sources, Policy 3.3.2: New development of noise-sensitive land uses shall not be permitted in areas exposed to existing or projected future levels of noise from transportation noise sources which exceed 60 dB Ldn or CNEL (70 Ldn or CNEL for outdoor sports and recreation) unless the project design includes effective mitigation measures to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas and interior spaces to or below the levels specified for the given land use.	The Nipomo Library may be subject to transportation-related noise exceeding identified thresholds. Mitigation is recommended to address this impact.	Consistent
Chapter 3, Goals and Policies, Transportation Noise Sources, Policy 3.3.3: Noise created by new transportation noise sources, including roadway improvement projects, shall be mitigated so as not to exceed the levels specified within the outdoor activity areas and interior spaces of existing noise sensitive land uses.	Implementation of the NCPMP would not generate noticeable levels of increased transportation-related noise.	Consistent
Chapter 3, Goals and Policies, Stationary Noise Sources, Policy 3.3.4: New development of noise-sensitive land uses shall not be permitted where the noise level due to existing stationary noise sources will exceed the noise level standards unless noise mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design of the development to reduce noise exposure to or below the levels specified.	No new development is proposed in areas that would be adversely affected by stationary noise.	Consistent
Chapter 3, Goals and Policies, Existing and Cumulative Noise Impacts, Policy 3.3.6: San Luis Obispo County shall consider implementing mitigation measures where existing noise levels produce significant noise impacts to noise-sensitive land uses or where new development may result in cumulative increases of noise upon noise-sensitive land uses.	Operation of park facilities would generate noise exceeding identified thresholds for residential land uses. Design measures are recommended to attenuate noise below significant levels.	Consistent

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
Chapter 4, Implementation Measure 4.1: New public and private development proposals shall be reviewed to determine conformance with the policies of this Noise Element.	This Program EIR analyzes the potential noise impacts, consistent with the Noise Element.	Consistent
 Chapter 4, Implementation Measure 4.2: When mitigation must be applied to satisfy the policies in Chapter 3.3, the following mitigation measures shall be considered and preference shall be given where feasible to the measures in following item a: a) Site layout, including setbacks, open space separation and shielding of noise-sensitive uses with non-noise-sensitive uses. b) Acoustical treatment of buildings. c) Structural measures: construction of earthen berms or wood or concrete barriers. 	The NCPMP incorporates buffers between noise-generating and sensitive uses. Where applicable, additional design measures are proposed to mitigate levels below identified thresholds.	Consistent
Chapter 4, Implementation Measure 4.8: Procedures shall be developed and employed to monitor compliance with the policies of the Noise Element after completion of projects requiring noise mitigation.	A park ranger is present onsite to monitor activities. Mitigation is recommended to ensure presence of a monitor at the skate park, swimming pool, and community center to regulate noise levels.	Consistent
Chapter 4, Implementation Measure 4.9: The State Noise Insulation Standards (California Code of Regulations, Title 24) and Chapter 35 of the Uniform Building Code (UBC) shall be enforced.	Design of structures near West Tefft Street, including the Nipomo Library Expansion, would comply with existing regulations.	Consistent
Chapter 4, Implementation Measure 4.15: The County shall encourage alternative means of transportation such as carpooling, walking, bicycling, and transit in order to reduce traffic and associated noise exposure.	The project entails the development or enhancement of a series of trails and walkways at the NCP that connect the park to Mesa Meadows and surrounding neighborhoods, which may result in reduced traffic use and associated noise impacts.	Consistent.
San Luis Obispo County General Plan, Safety Element		
<i>Fire Safety, Goal S-4:</i> Reduce the threat to life, structures and the environment caused by fire.	The project has been designed to minimize the impacts on CAL FIRE resources, and is not expected to create significant fire-related impacts.	Consistent.
<i>Fire Safety, Policy S-13 Pre-Fire Management:</i> New development should be carefully located, with special attention given to fuel management in higher fire risk areas. Large, undeveloped areas should be preserved so they can be fuel-	The proposed project entails the development or enhancement of recreational facilities within an existing park setting, and is not expected to create significant impacts on fire safety. The project was designed in conjunction with CAL FIRE, though no	Consistent.

Table 3-2. Consistency wit	h Plans and Policies
----------------------------	----------------------

Table 3-2.	Consistency	with Plans	and Policies
------------	-------------	------------	--------------

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
managed. New development in fire hazard areas should be configured to minimize the potential for added danger.	project specific fire-related impacts were identified.	
<i>Fire Safety, Standard S-29:</i> Identify high value and high risk areas, including urban/wildland interface areas, and develop and implement mitigation efforts to reduce the threat of fire.	The combination of open area at NCP and surrounding residential developments present various urban/wildland interface areas in the project vicinity. However, the project is subject to compliance with the 2005 Wildland/Urban Interface Codes, and no project specific impacts were identified as a result of the additional park development within the existing recreational area.	Consistent.
<i>Fire Safety, Standard S-32:</i> Require fire resistant material to be used for building construction in fire hazard areas.	The CDF has identified the project location as having a "high" fire hazard zone rating, lying within the five minute emergency response time zone. However, all building plans at the park will be approved by CAL FIRE and subject to the California Building Code, Public Works' standards, and a Fire Prevention Plan prepared for the project.	Consistent.
<i>Fire Safety, Policy S-14 Facilities, Equipment and Personnel:</i> Ensure that adequate facilities, equipment and personnel are available to meet the demands of fire fighting in San Luis Obispo County based on the level of service set forth in the fire agency's master plan.	The addition of new park facilities would place a small additional service demand on the two CDF stations that serve the area, but new development in the park is not expected to significantly impact area fire response times or service levels.	Consistent.
<i>Fire Safety, Policy S-16 Loss Prevention:</i> Improve structures and other values at risk to reduce the impact of fire. Regulations should be developed to improve the defensible area surrounding habitation.	All building plans at the park will be approved by CAL FIRE and subject to the County Building Code, Public Works' standards, and a Fire Prevention Plan prepared for the project.	Consistent.
<i>Fire Safety, Standard S-43:</i> Require a "defensible space" around structures and values at risk. The area need not be cleared of all vegetation, but be able to provide fire fighters with enough room to defend structures and maneuver. Each situation will differ, so the permit granting authority will need flexibility in reviewing fire safety plans.	All building plans at the park will be approved by CAL FIRE and subject to the County Building Code, Public Works' standards, and a Fire Prevention Plan prepared for the project.	Consistent.
<i>Fire Safety, Standard S-44:</i> Review development plans by fire safety personnel to assure adequacy of access for equipment, water supplies, construction standards, and vegetation clearance.	All building plans at the park will be approved by CAL FIRE and subject to the County Building Code, Public Works' standards, and a Fire Prevention Plan prepared for the project, including standards related to adequate parking, access and clearance.	Consistent.

Table 3-2.	Consistency with Plans and Policies	
------------	-------------------------------------	--

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
<i>Fire Safety, Standard S-45:</i> Continue to insure that sufficient water supplies are available for protection of structures and encourage other built-in fire protection systems such as sprinklers.	All building plans at the park will be approved by CAL FIRE and subject to the County Building Code, Public Works' standards, and a Fire Prevention Plan prepared for the project, including standards related to fire hydrant location and installation of sprinkler systems in all new buildings.	Consistent.
Hazardous Materials/Pesticide Hazards, Policy S-26 Hazardous Materials: Reduce the potential for exposure to humans and the environment by hazardous substances.	Mitigation is recommended to avoid and reduce the potential for public exposure to hazardous materials during both construction and operation of facilities included in the NCPMP	Consistent
West Tefft Corridor Design Plan		
Goal 5: Create a pedestrian-friendly and vital business district by encouraging walking and making the downtown an exciting place to be.	The project entails the development or enhancement of various trails and walkways that will increase connectivity between the project area, surrounding neighborhoods, and the West Tefft Street downtown core. Improvements proposed along West Tefft Street also include walkways and crosswalks to encourage pedestrian uses.	Consistent.
Goal 6: Provide design guidance to ensure attractive and compatible new development that is consistent with the mission statement.	Mitigation is recommended to provide design guidelines, ensuring consistency with the character of the area, and goals of applicable design plans.	Consistent
Objective d: Encourage complementary architectural and streetscape elements and land uses that do not compete with Olde Towne.	Mitigation is recommended to provide design guidelines, ensuring consistency with the character of the area, and goals of applicable design plans.	Consistent
Objective f: Develop a series of sidewalk and pedestrian amenities that encourage a more walkable community.	The project entails the development or enhancement of various trails and walkways that will increase connectivity between the project area, surrounding neighborhoods, and the West Tefft Street downtown core. Improvements proposed along West Tefft Street also include walkways and crosswalks to encourage pedestrian uses.	Consistent.
Objective g: Include walkways and paseos that provide linkages throughout the design plan area and between blocks.	The project entails the development or enhancement of various trails and walkways that will increase connectivity between the project area, surrounding neighborhoods, and the West Tefft Street downtown core, consistent with this policy.	Consistent.

Table 3-2. Consistency with Plans and Policies
--

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
 Circulation, West Tefft Street Standards: The following standards have been developed to facilitate the proper operation of urban arterials such as West Tefft Street. 2. Driveways, access points and curb cuts along existing developed arterials should be consolidated when development or change in intensity occurs or when traffic operation or safety warrants. Driveway consolidation should be encouraged through joint access agreements along arterials where these standards are exceeded. 9. On-street parking should be discouraged along West Tefft Street. 12. Where possible, intersections shall form 4-leg, right-angle intersections; jog, offset and skewed intersections of major streets in near proximity shall be avoided where possible. 13. In order to promote safe and efficient traffic flow, traffic signals shall be spaced no closer than 1,000 feet on West Tefft Street except in unusual circumstances. 	The project proposes major road improvements along West Tefft Street, including re-alignment of the park entrance to align with the signalized West Tefft Street/Orchard Street intersection. The project does not provide for any on-street parking along West Tefft Street, and adds approximately 386- 422 parking spaces within the park. The project also does not propose any additional traffic signals along West Tefft Street.	Consistent.
Design Principles, Basic Design Principle 1. Enhance Community Life: Urban and project design should create a composition of buildings, open spaces and streets that appears pleasing and inviting for a vibrant community life.	Mitigation is recommended to provide design guidelines, ensuring consistency with the character of the area, and goals of applicable design plans.	Consistent
Design Principles, Basic Design Principle 4. Provide Pedestrian Circulation: Provisions for pedestrians should include safe and efficient walking routes, facilities for bicycles and transit, convenient parking lots, and attractive features to relieve the necessity of using a vehicle and to add a sense of community.	The project entails the development or enhancement of various trails and walkways that will increase connectivity between the project area, surrounding neighborhoods, and the West Tefft Street downtown core, consistent with this policy.	Consistent.
Design Principles, Basic Design Principle 5. Attractive and Safe Streetscape Design: Streets and sidewalks should be designed for safe traffic control, smooth traffic flow for all types of travel, pedestrian orientation, and be visually pleasing.	The project entails the development or enhancement of various trails and walkways that will increase connectivity between the project area, surrounding neighborhoods, and the West Tefft Street downtown core, consistent with this policy.	Consistent.
Design Principles, Basic Design Principle 6. Ecological Responsibility: Design with respect to nature, avoid impacts that could damage or disrupt the environment, and incorporate natural features in the area.	The NCP supports native habitat unique to the core of Nipomo. Mitigation is recommended to protect and enhance sensitive habitats within NCP.	Consistent

Goals, Policies, Plans, Programs and Standards	Proposed Action	Determination
Streetscape Policies and Standards, Policy 8.3. Sidewalks: Sidewalks should be designed to greatly enhance the pedestrian experience and provide adequate space for a variety of pedestrian activities.	The project entails the development or enhancement of various trails and walkways that will increase connectivity between the project area, surrounding neighborhoods, and the West Tefft Street downtown core, consistent with this policy.	Consistent.
 Streetscape Policies and Standards, Sidewalk Standards: a. Sidewalk Design. Sidewalks should include a slight meander or curvilinear edge where located next to landscaping and parkways, for interest. b. Sidewalk Materials. Public sidewalks should be constructed in gray cement for a uniform and simple appearance. c. Sidewalk Width. Sidewalks should be constructed at 8 feet on West Tefft Street, and 10 feet on other streets as required by County code. Additional width on West Tefft Street may be obtained by offers of dedication from adjacent owners, where the setback area is to utilized for public access and walking. d. Sidewalk Clearance. Façade features, such as signs, awnings, planters, and sidewalks should be designed in compliance with the American Disabilities Act (ADA) at a minimum. 	The project entails the development or enhancement of various trails and walkways that will increase connectivity between the project area, surrounding neighborhoods, and the West Tefft Street downtown core, consistent with this policy. Further design of street and walkway features would incorporate these standards.	Consistent.

Table 3-2. Consistency with Plans and	I Policies
---------------------------------------	------------

3.4 Cumulative Study Area

3.4.1 CEQA Requirements

Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines defines "cumulative impact" as two or more individual effects that, when considered together, are considerable or will compound other environmental impacts. Cumulative impacts are changes in the environment that result from the incremental impact of development of the proposed project and all other nearby "related" projects. For example, the traffic impacts of two projects in close proximity may be insignificant when analyzed separately, but could have a significant impact when the projects are analyzed together.

CEQA Guidelines §15130 indicates that cumulative impacts shall be discussed when they are significant. The discussion of cumulative impacts shall reflect the severity of the impacts and their likelihood of occurrence, but the discussion need not provide as much detail as is provided for the effects attributable to the project alone. The discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness. The CEQA Guidelines state the following:

"Cumulative impacts include either option:

- 1. A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including those projects outside the control of the agency, or
- 2. A summary of projections contained in an adopted general plan or related planning document or in a prior environmental document which has been adopted or certified, which described or evaluated regional or area wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact. Any such planning document shall be referenced and made available to the public at a location specified by the Lead Agency (§15130 (b)(1))."

The discussion shall also include a summary of the expected environmental effects to be produced by those projects with specific reference to additional information stating where that information is available, and a reasonable analysis of the cumulative impacts of the relevant projects. An EIR shall examine reasonable options for mitigating or avoiding any significant cumulative effects of a proposed project.

3.5 Cumulative Development Scenario

For the purposes of this EIR, past, present, and reasonably anticipated future projects will be used for the cumulative analysis (CEQA Guidelines §15130, Option 1) (refer to Table 3-3).

Cumulative impacts are assessed in Section 4, Environmental Impact Analysis, under each resource issue, where appropriate. The cumulative analysis for each of the appropriate issue areas is based on the list of projects provided by the County Department of Planning and Building. These projects are in various stages of planning and development and are expected to contribute to cumulative impacts in the community of Nipomo. The specific environmental impacts of each individual project are not known at this time. Therefore, based on the level of detail represented in the Cumulative Development Scenario, several assumptions are used for each individual environmental issue area for determining the potential for cumulative impacts.

Project Name	Project Location	Project Description	
Projects Under Construction			
691 West Tefft LLC Vesting Tentative Tract Map and Conditional Use Permit	691 West Tefft Street, 0.25 miles west of US 101	Condominium subdivision of 2.85-acre parcel into six parcels (0.14 to 1.04 acres each), and 20 residential condominium units. Individually-owned residential live/work units will vary in size from 1,018 to 2,644 sf.	
Luis Conditional Use Permit	750 Grande Street	52-unit affordable housing project.	
Community Health Centers of the Central Coast Conditional Use Permit	150 North Tejas Place	15,000-sf addition to existing medical clinic, and conversion of existing clinic to administration offices.	
Recently approved projects			
Shapiro Vesting Tract Map and Conditional Use Permit	170 South Frontage Road, at the southwest corner of Hill Street and South Frontage Road	Mixed-use planned development including the subdivision of an existing 5.2-acre parcel into nine parcels ranging in size from 8,307 sf to 1.32 acres, and development of 12,000 sf of office space, 44,000 sf of retail space, 4,500 sf of restaurant space, and 51 multi-family residential units, resulting in the disturbance of the entire 5.2-acre parcel.	
LanDev LLC Tentative Tract Map and Conditional Use Permit	Southeastern side of Juniper Street, approximately 90 feet west of North Frontage Road	Subdivision of five parcels totaling 19.1 acres into 24 lots ranging in size from 0.2 to 5.0 acres; mixed-use development including a three-story, 112-unit, 97,600-sf assisted living/memory support facility, 16,000-sf themed restaurant and conference facility, 130,000 sf of retail, office, and professional buildings, and improvements to Mary Avenue, Magenta Avenue, and Juniper Street, and construction of 733 parking spaces and two stormwater retention basins (total area of disturbance would be 21 acres).	
Nipomo Center Vesting Tentative Tract Map and Conditional Use Permit	Between Hill Street and Grande Avenue, west of US 101	Subdivision of 10.98-acre parcel into 59 residential parcels ranging in size from 0.03 to 0.12 acres and ten commercial parcels ranging in size from 0.21 to 0.84 acres. Includes 59 duplex, triplex, and fourplex residential units and 75,868 sf of commercial space (two phases). Includes improvements to Hill Street and Grande Avenue, a 0.67-acre drainage basin, 0.43-acre open space parcel, and on-site frontage road (total area of disturbance 10.98 acres).	

Table 3-3. Cumulative Projects List

Table 3-3. Cumulative Projects List

Project Name	Project Location	Project Description	
Gray Trust Planned Development	Northeast corner of Grande Avenue and Blume Street	Subdivision of 3.8-acre parcel into 39 lots ranging in size from 2,600 to 5,280 sf and construction of 38 single family residences, an on-site park, underground detention basin, and three on-site roads (total area of disturbance 3.8 acres).	
Chestnut Villas, LLC Vesting Tentative Tract Map and Conditional Use Permit	186 North Thompson Road and Chestnut Street	Subdivision of 1.14-acre lot into 16 parcels ranging in size from 1,155 to 4,931 sf. Includes commercial lease space on the street level and residential units on the second and third level, and improvements to Thompson Road and Chestnut Street (total area of disturbance 1.14 acres).	
Mariani Conditional Use Permit	549 Hill Street, 300 feet west of South Frontage Road	Three-story 71-unit motel in two buildings totaling 38,500 sf (total area of disturbance 1.2 acres).	
Yettman Tract Map and Conditional Use Permit	365 Butterfly Lane, 200 feet southeast of Grande Avenue	Subdivision of 1.14-acre parcel into planned development of eight 1,500-sf parcels, and construction of eight detached multi-family residences, and one 35,000-sf open space lot.	
Holloway Vesting Tentative Tract Map and Conditional Use Permit	561 Oakglen Avenue, southeast of Amando Road	Cluster subdivision of 20.3-acre parcel into 18 half-acre residential parcels, one 10.4-acre open space parcel, and on-site road (total area of disturbance 20.3 acres).	
Allshouse Vesting Tentative Tract Map and Conditional Use Permit	Southwest corner of the intersection of Avenida de Amigos and Grande Avenue.	Subdivision of 1.19-acre parcel into 15 residential condominium parcels ranging in size from 1,000 to 1,200 sf, one 0.3-acre parcel (existing four-unit apartment building), and one 0.47-acre parcel for recreation, parking, and drainage, and improvements to Avenida de Amigos and Grande Avenue. 15 single family residences will range in size from 1,189 to 1,330 square feet.	
Vista Roble, LLC Vesting Tract Map and Conditional Use Permit	Southwestern corner of West Tefft Street and Thompson Road	Subdivision of four parcels totaling 1.57 acres into three 619-sf residential parcels, 15,516-sf common area parcel for residential development and four commercial/retail parcels. Residential units will be 912-sf each and commercial structures will range from 400 to 5,237 sf each.	
Nipomo Hills Low Income Residential Project	East Knotts Street	900-unit low income housing project.	
Project Name	Project Location	Project Description	
--	--	---	--
Jack's Helping Hand, Inc. Conditional Use Permit	South end of Illinois Way	Community park focusing on universal accessibility, including a universally- accessible playground, three restrooms, shelter and gazebo, parking areas, therapeutic horse riding center with 30,000-sf covered arena, horse stalls and hay storage, 100-sf office, 1,200-sf caretaker's residence, 41,800-sf grass sports field area, sand volleyball court, paved basketball court, community garden, and special events.	
Proposed Projects Pending Approval [Verify and Update]			
Crystahl Oaks Specific Plan	Northwest of Sandydale Drive, west of US 101 and the North Frontage Road, and south of proposed Willow Road extension and interchange.	Urban expansion area for commercial service, commercial retail, and residential uses. Size of area – 288 acres.	
Vista Grande Vesting Tentative Tract Map and Conditional Use Permit	Southeast corner of Avenida de Amigos and Grande Avenue, 200 feet west of South Frontage Road	Subdivision of 1.14-acre parcel into 18 residential parcels (765 to 1,509-sf each) and construction of 18 single family residences (1,348 to 1,635-sf each), and one parcel for recreation, parking, and drainage, and improvements to Avenida de Amigos and Grande Avenue. Total area of disturbance, 1.14-acres.	
Promesa, LLC Tract Map	n/a	Ten five-acre lots.	
South and North Oak Glen Specific Plan	n/a	n/a	
Cypress Ridge II Vesting Tentative Tract Map and Conditional Use Permit		Subdivision of 60-acre site into 21 lots and 37 acres of open space.	
Conoco Phillips – Modification of Conditions of Approval		Allow refinery operations to be conducted at 48,950 barrels/day.	
Laetitia Agricultural Cluster Vesting Tentative Tract Map and Conditional Use Permit	Los Berros Road, east of US 101	Subdivision of 1,910 acres into 102 clustered residential lots (one acre each) and four open space parcels, Ranch Headquarters (HOA facility and private recreation center).	

Table 3-3. Cumulative Projects List

Table 3-3. Cumulative Projects List

Project Name	Project Location	Project Description
Brushpopper's Riding Club Conditional Use Permit	2285 Fowler Lane, east of Highway 1	Riding area, warm-up arena, parking, and attendant facilities
Community Health Centers of the Central Coast Conditional Use Permit	150 North Tejas Place	15,000-sf addition to existing medical clinic, and conversion of existing clinic to administration offices.

CHAPTER 4 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ANALYSIS

The Environmental Impacts Analysis chapter of this Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been divided into sub-sections, as follows:

- Existing Conditions: The description of the physical environmental conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is published (baseline physical conditions).
- Regulatory Setting: The regulations in force at the time the NOP is published. These
 are the applicable regulations governing each environmental topic, such as the Clean
 Air Act and its requirements for maintaining air quality. This is not an exhaustive
 analysis of the regulations, but rather information to assist the reader in understanding
 the potential impacts of the project from a regulatory perspective.
- Thresholds of Significance: The thresholds used to evaluate each environmental topic usually are based on Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, or are standard procedures related to existing regulations or are standards in the industry.
- **Impact Assessment and Methodology**: Methodology used to determine the impacts associated with the project, such as measurements or field investigative processes.
- Project-Specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures: These include the significant environmental effects of the proposed project, as further defined below. The impacts are identified and then are followed by the mitigation measures that can minimize significant impacts; mitigation measures must be enforceable and feasible. Where more than one mitigation measure could be used to reduce significant effect, each should be discussed and rationale given for determining the preferable mitigation measure. In addition, there must be an essential nexus between the mitigation measure and a legitimate governmental interest, and the mitigation measure also must be "roughly proportional" to the impacts of the project.
- **Residual Impacts**: The statement of the level of impact, significant or insignificant, that is residual once mitigation is applied.
- **Cumulative Impacts**: The cumulative effects of the project when the project's effect is cumulatively considerable.
- Secondary Impacts: If a mitigation measures would cause one or more significant effects in addition to those that would be caused by the project as proposed, the effects of the mitigation measure must be discussed but in less detail than the significant effects of the project as proposed. (*Stevens v. City of Glendale* (1981) 125 Cal.App.3d 986).

All residual impacts in the EIR have been classified according to the following criteria (note: CEQA does not recognize a beneficial effect as an impact):

- Class I Significant, unavoidable, adverse impacts: Significant impacts that cannot be fully and effectively mitigated. No measures could be taken to avoid or reduce these adverse effects to insignificant or negligible levels.
- Class II Significant, but mitigable impacts: These impacts are potentially similar in significance to those of Class I, but can be reduced or avoided by the implementation of mitigation measures.
- Class III Less than significant impacts: Mitigation measures may still be required for these impacts as long as there is rough proportionality between the environmental impacts caused by the project and the mitigation measures imposed on the project.
- Class IV Beneficial impact: Project would have a beneficial environmental impact.

The term "significance" is used throughout the EIR to characterize the magnitude of the projected impact. For the purpose of this EIR, a significant impact is a substantial or potentially substantial change to resources in the local proposed project area or the area adjacent to the proposed project. In the discussions of each issue area, thresholds are identified that are used to distinguish between significant and insignificant impacts. To the extent feasible, distinctions are also made between local and regional significance and short-term versus long-term duration. Where possible, measures have been identified to reduce project impacts to less than significant levels. CEQA requires that public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the environmental effects of such projects (CEQA Statute §21002). Included with each mitigation measure are the plan requirements needed to ensure that the mitigation is included in the plans and construction of the project and the required timing of the action (e.g., prior to development of final construction plans, prior to commencement of construction, prior to operation, etc.).

4.1 AESTHETIC RESOURCES

This section of the EIR identifies and evaluates potential visual resource (aesthetics) impacts resulting from implementation of the project. The analysis focuses on the potential for the project to result in impacts to visual resources as seen from within the Nipomo Community Park (NCP) and from other public vantage points in the area. This section provides a photographic and written inventory of existing site conditions, establishes the baseline visual character, and documents the overall extent and quality of project visibility. The aesthetics analysis specifically identifies the visual resources on-site and any related landforms, vegetative groupings, and other features which are of significance from key viewing areas (KVAs). All critical viewing areas are identified, and photographs provided from each of the KVAs are used as the basis for analyzing the potential effects of the project.

Existing on-site and through-site visual resources are compared with project features as proposed and potential impacts to visual character are identified. The evaluation includes all proposed park structures and site amenities, vegetation removal, roads, grading and earthwork, utilities, lighting, revegetation, landscaping, and other improvements for their complete effect on views. The aesthetics analysis evaluates the cumulative effect that each of the individual project components have on the visual character of the surrounding landscape.

Although the project would be implemented over a 20-year timeframe, the specific recreational facilities and infrastructure included in each of the various construction phases has not been determined at this time. As a result, the aesthetics section analyzes the complete build-out of the project and makes recommendations, as necessary, regarding phasing strategies as they might relate to visual resources.

4.1.1 Existing Conditions

The NCP is located in the community of Nipomo, approximately 1 mile west of U.S. Highway 101 (US 101), and approximately 6 miles inland from the Pacific Ocean. The regional landscape can be broadly defined as an ancient marine terrace between the coast and the hills to the east. Sand dune complexes along the beach transition to wide mesas inland. Creeks and drainages in the region generally have an east-west orientation on their way to the ocean. The native landscape generally includes coast live oak woodland and coastal sage chaparral with riparian corridors along the drainage ways. Eucalyptus trees were introduced into the area as a forest crop and have since become established over much of the Nipomo Mesa. The large stature of eucalyptus groves creates a dominant visual element throughout the area landscape and along the skyline.

The Nipomo region has a generally rural visual character, with agriculture, open space, and residences at various densities making up much of the land use. The unincorporated community of Nipomo is located mostly along US 101 and serves as the commercial center of the region. In recent years, the Nipomo area has been recognized as one of the faster growing areas of San Luis Obispo County. Several residential subdivisions have been constructed and others are planned for the area. This increased development has had an incremental effect on the rural appearance of the region. West Tefft Street, just east of the project, is considered part of the central business district of Nipomo. Although the region is becoming somewhat more urbanized, the area still maintains a well-vegetated visual character, due in large part to the mature eucalyptus trees and the native oaks scattered throughout the area.



Photograph 4.1-1. Characteristic landscape of Nipomo including skyline trees, open space, and scattered development.



Photograph 4.1-2. The commercial center of Nipomo along West Tefft Street, approximately 0.5 mile east of the NCP.

The 140-acre NCP is surrounded mostly by residential land use, and is bounded by Pomeroy Road to the north, West Tefft Street to the southeast, Tejas Place to the south, and Osage Street to the west (refer to Figure 4.1-1). The eastern portion of the NCP is developed with sports and play fields, including baseball fields with night lighting, group and individual picnic facilities, children's play areas, lighted tennis courts, basketball courts, restrooms, and parking lots. The maintenance yard and buildings are located in the approximate center of the NCP and include a wooden residential-scale building with scattered maintenance accessory structures and vehicles. The northern, eastern, and southern portions of the NCP appear mostly natural and are developed with trails, interpretive gardens, and open space areas. The Mesa Meadows portion of the site consists of a residential development, a loop trail around the

perimeter, and a portion of open space serving as a stormwater <u>retention</u> area and buffer from the adjacent agricultural field.

The topography of the NCP is generally flat along the eastern side, in the area of the existing play fields. The southern perimeter of the site is slightly elevated along the back yards of residences on Tejas Place. Moving north from Tejas Place toward the interior of the site, the landform drops off then rises again forming a natural depression in the landscape. The landform elevates gently from this area to form an east-west oriented ridge along the northern third of the site, rising noticeably above the surroundings. North of the ridge toward Pomeroy Road, the landform flattens out again to match the terrain of the adjacent neighborhoods. The Mesa Meadows area to the west is mostly level.

Vegetation within the more developed eastern side of the NCP includes mature pines and eucalyptus, reaching heights of up to approximately 80 feet, as well as a variety of non-native shrubs. Turf areas cover most of this developed portion of the NCP. The southern portion of the NCP is more open and has predominantly scattered native shrubs with native and nonnative grasses. The ridge area along the mid-section of the site is mostly covered with wellestablished native oak woodland species. The oak trees in this area form a moderately dense visual canopy, are evergreen, and average approximately 15 to 30 feet in height. The forest understory is comprised of a variety of native shrubs, perennials, and related plants. Scattered oaks and native shrubs are located on the flatter portion of the site north of the ridge, appearing less dense than the forested area along the ridge. Two separate native plant gardens are located in the northern corner of the NCP. Each of these gardens is in the developing stage and the associated plantings are not yet major visual elements in the landscape. Vegetation within the Mesa Meadows area of the NCP includes oaks along the perimeter pathway, large windrows of eucalyptus trees along the northwest and southeast corners, and typical residential plantings associated with the houses and neighborhood streets. The majority of the NCP is bounded by some type of fencing, including post and wire, pipe, wood, and chain-link.

4.1.2 Regulatory Setting

The proposed project is located within the jurisdiction of the County of San Luis Obispo (County). The regulatory setting pertaining to visual resources includes review of the proposed development's consistency with various elements of the County General Plan and Land Use Ordinance (LUO), in addition to the review of findings made in this document per CEQA Guidelines.

4.1.3 Thresholds of Significance

The determinations of significance of project impacts are based on applicable policies, regulations, goals, and guidelines defined by CEQA and the County. In addition to comparing the project to relevant policies and standards, the aesthetic resources assessment identified which specific criteria contribute most to the existing quality of each view and if change would occur to that criteria as a result of the project. If a change in visual criteria was identified, this change was analyzed for its potential effect on the existing scenic character. This analysis was combined with the potential number of viewers, their sensitivities, and viewing duration in order to determine the overall level of impacts. Specifically, the project would be considered to have a significant effect on the environment if the effects exceed the significance criteria described below.

4.1.3.1 County of San Luis Obispo

The significance of potential aesthetic resources impacts are based on thresholds identified by the County in accordance with within Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. Aesthetic impacts would be considered significant if the proposed project would:

Create an Aesthetically Incompatible Site Open to Public View

Visual contrast may be used as a measure of the potential impact that the project may have on the visual quality of the site. If a strong contrast occurred where project features or activities attract attention and dominate the landscape setting, this would be considered a potentially significant impact on visual character or quality of the site. Project components that are not subordinate to the landscape setting could result in a significant change in the composition of the landscape.

Introduce a Use within a Scenic View Open to Public View

A substantial adverse impact would occur if the proposed project would significantly degrade the scenic landscape as viewed from public roads, or from other public areas. The degree of potential impact on scenic views varies with factors such as viewing distance, duration, viewer sensitivity, and the visual context of the surrounding area (such as urban versus rural). The aesthetics section analyzes the extent that the proposed development would alter the visual quality of the project site and its surroundings. The specific characteristics that define important views, or vistas, are identified, and the project's effect on those characteristics is assessed. If the fundamental quality of the vistas are substantially reduced, significant impacts would result.

Change the Visual Character of an Area

Consideration of potential significance includes analysis of visual character elements such as land use and intensity, visual integrity of the landscape type, and other factors. Project related actions would be considered to have a significant impact on the visual character of the site and surroundings if they altered the area in a way that significantly changed, detracted from, or degraded the visual quality of the site and was inconsistent with community policies regarding visual character. The degree to which that change reflects documented community values and meets viewers' aesthetic expectations is the basis for determining levels of significance. County policies as well as community scoping workshops have identified the preservation of rural character as a goal for the NCP site.

Create Glare or Night Lighting Which May Affect Surrounding Areas

The project would result in a significant impact if it subjected viewers from public roads or other public areas to a substantial amount of point-source lighting visibility at night, or if the collective lumination of the project resulted in a noticeable spill-over effect into the nighttime sky, increasing the ambient light over the region. The placement and heights of lighting, source of illumination, and fixture types combined with hours of operation, viewer locations, adjacent reflective elements, and atmospheric conditions can affect the degree of change to nighttime views.

Impact Unique Geological or Physical Features

County planning documents and regulations do not by themselves set a specific threshold regarding the degradation of a unique geological or physical feature, such as hillside resources. However, review of applicable planning document language indicates that among

other features, obstruction of views of unique or character defining landscape elements can be considered significant.

4.1.3.2 Consistency with County of San Luis Obispo Plans and Policies

County planning documents do not contain specific criteria for determining thresholds of significance regarding aesthetic resources. However, in comparing the project to the above thresholds, substantial consideration was given to the project's consistency with public policies, plans, goals, and regulations concerning scenic vistas, scenic roadways, visual character, and night lighting. The following goals, policies, and guidelines provide a basis for determining levels of potential impact as well as an indication of aesthetic values and sensitivity to visual change.

Parks and Recreation Element

In order to support the goal of an equitable and quality public park system, Policy 2.1 states that the County should "*Provide parks which are aesthetic and consistent with community needs.*" Appendix F cites the following mitigation measures identified in the programmatic EIR for the Parks and Recreation Element. A stated intent of these measures is to "*guide future environmental review and to provide consistency as future projects are developed.*"

Aesthetics

Building location. Development, including access roads, shall minimize visibility as viewed from any designated scenic road or highway to the greatest extent practical. Alternative locations or standards may be approved where visual effects are reduced to an insignificant level or where visibility is desired.

- Screening of New Development. When screening is necessary to protect a sensitive visual resource, the following is appropriate. The site design shall use existing topographic features to the extent feasible. Where use of topography is not feasible, existing vegetation, new landscaping plants, berms and fencing may be used. Where feasible, the use of natural vegetation and/or landscaping shall take precedence over berms or fences. In cases where vegetation is used, the design shall provide that at least 80% of the structure(s), as viewed from public rights-of-way, shall be screened by plants at maturity. New landscaping should use native species to the extent feasible.
- **Ridgetop Development.** New structures shall be located so that they are not silhouetted against the sky as viewed from public roads or the ocean.
- Significant rock outcrops. Grading and placement of structures shall occur at least 150 feet from bedrock outcroppings visible from public right of way.

Slope Limitations for Grading and New Structures. No grading or structures shall occur on slopes greater than 20% (except in the case of trails) unless the County finds that there is no feasible alternative or that by allowing such grading or structures, the overall impacts would be better minimized. Grading shall be designed so that landform alterations are minimized to the extent

feasible and blend with the natural topography by following existing contours where feasible.

Building Height and Mass of new buildings as viewed from public rights-ofway shall be minimized to the extent feasible by using low-profile design and other methods. Colors shall not markedly contrast with the surrounding environment but should complement and be similar to colors of surroundings.

Light and Glare. Facilities shall be designed to minimize new light, except for the minimum required for safety. In general, lighting fixtures shall be downcast and hooded. Night lighting for active sports fields shall limit spillover visible at sensitive uses such as residences to the maximum extent practical. Use of glare-producing materials shall be minimized.

<u>West Tefft Corridor Design Plan – Incorporated by reference in the San Luis Obispo</u> <u>County Land Use and Circulation Element – South County Inland Area Plan</u>

Portions of the project would be adjacent to West Tefft Street and are within the boundary of the West Tefft Corridor Design Plan area. The Design Plan "gives guidance for the desired appearance and scale of streets, buildings and open spaces, which are to be achieved through the public review of new projects and their completion." The Plan provides design goals and policies regarding site planning, architecture, landscaping, and streetscapes.

4.1.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology

4.1.4.1 Analysis Methodology

In order to understand the type and extent of physical change expected by project implementation, the sizes and locations of proposed recreational facilities were developed by comparison with the known heights and locations of existing site features as well as placed reference-poles and other markers. These visual scale references were used for estimating structure heights and massing, increasing accuracy of photo-simulations, and for determining overall project visibility. Locations of critical structure elements were identified based on preliminary and conceptual site plan information and architectural elevations (Firma 2010).

The project was viewed from all potential public viewer group locations and local roads in the vicinity of the project. Following this initial investigation, in conjunction with review of the Constraints Analysis (Morro Group 2004), representative viewpoints were determined for further analysis, based on dominance of the site within the view, duration of views, and expected sensitivity of the viewer group. Of those representative viewpoints, KVAs were selected that would best illustrate the visual changes proposed by the project (refer to Figure 4.1-1). Photographs were taken from the KVAs and photo-simulations were prepared illustrating the appearance of the project as proposed by the County (refer to Figures 4.1-18 through 4.1-23 at the end of this section). The completed simulations were used to quantify potential project visibility and to assess related impacts. The project site was then field-reviewed to assist in determining appropriate mitigation measures.



Figure 4.1-1. Locations of Key Viewing Areas and Corresponding Photo-simulations

The analysis considers the existing development as part of the visual baseline. This includes the neighborhoods immediately surrounding the project, the development along West Tefft Street, and other areas of the community that define the overall character of Nipomo. The visual quality of the community has as much to do with the built environment as it does the natural setting. Patterns of development, architecture, scale, massing, and vegetation combine to define how the community is perceived by residents and visitors alike.

In determining levels of impact, this study also compares the proposed project to the specific visual resource goals of the County. When the stated goals demonstrate that a high degree of value is placed on the visual environment, the standards to which the project must be compared are equally high. As a result of the expressed value for the rural park setting, combined with an awareness of visual character as reflected in county planning policy, it is

anticipated that community and viewer sensitivity to visual changes on this prominent site will be moderately high.

Photo-simulations

Photo-simulations were prepared in order to better understand and communicate the potential visual changes associated with the proposed project. Photo-simulation locations were selected to best show critical views, how the project would compare to applicable planning policy, or from viewpoints which would provide a good representation of the overall project character. The photo-simulations show the development at a time period approximately seven to 10 years after construction (see Figures 4.1-18 through 4.1-23).

At this stage in the Master Plan process, preliminary concept images of the community center/gymnasium, and a preliminary grading plan for the multi-use sports field and stormwater basins, have been provided (refer to Figures 2-7 and 4.1-4). Other specific details and architectural styles of proposed project elements have not yet been determined. The particular appearance and architectural style of project elements would be developed based partly on recommendations of this study and with input from the community. The appearance of project elements shown in the photo-simulations are only conceptual representations of the types of recreational features defined in the Master Plan.

Project Visibility

The project is proposed on a highly visible and sensitive site in terms of proximity to the surrounding community. Portions of the NCP can be seen from several public roads and from residential areas on all four sides. The Constraints Analysis (Morro Group 2004) quantified general visibility of the existing park from the surrounding community and from areas within the NCP itself. Building on that report, the following section verifies identified public viewpoints and describes the extent and quality of critical project features.

Views from the Surrounding Community

The NCP is surrounded by development and, as a result, has some degree of visibility from all sides. Views of the NCP from the surrounding area potentially include adjacent and distant neighborhoods, public roadways, and other public facilities such as Dana Elementary School, the Nipomo Community Library, and a local church. Views to the interior of the NCP are limited to some extent by existing vegetation and/or topography. As seen from farther distances, views of the NCP are generally limited to the tops of the existing trees near the sports fields and the oak covered ridge. During evening sporting events, lighting from the existing sports fields can be seen from the surrounding area, although the existing trees filter some of the light and glare.

Views from Surrounding Roadways

Public roadways surround the NCP on all four sides and allow direct visual access to the project site. The greatest degree of visibility to the project from the surrounding community would be from these public roadways. As seen from Osage Street, Camino Caballo, and the western portion of Pomeroy Road, the viewshed is predominantly dense oak woodland on slopes rising up from the perimeter of the property. Project features most visible from these three street segments would include the play structure at the corner of Camino Caballo and Osage Streets, the interpretive center and amphitheater associated with the Nipomo Native Garden, and the perimeter path and multi-use trails.



Photograph 4.1-3. An existing view of the NCP from westbound Pomeroy Road.

The eastern portion of Pomeroy Road fronting the NCP is adjacent to the northern park entrance. Existing views along this section of Pomeroy Road include the developed sports field section of the NCP. The most visible proposed element as seen from this area would be the realigned park road entrance. Visible elements associated with the proposed entry would include a pay station, signage, a traffic signal, grading, and tree removal. The perimeter multiuse trail would also be seen from this location.

From the intersection of Pomeroy Road and West Tefft Street, existing views to the developed portion of the NCP are available, although heading south on West Tefft Street from this point, views to the interior of the site are somewhat blocked by mature landscaping. Further south along West Tefft Street, visual access to the site is generally blocked by the Nipomo Community Library and Dana Elementary School. The eastern entrance road to the NCP is located along this section of West Tefft Street. As viewed from roadways surrounding the NCP, the section of West Tefft Street between Pomeroy Road and Dana Elementary School would see the greatest amount of visual change. The project proposes a community pool or a skate park in this area, along with an expansion of the existing library, an amphitheater, and a realignment of the NCP entrance.

Tejas Place parallels the southern perimeter of the NCP. Existing residences along the north side of this street block the majority of views to the NCP from this public roadway. The existing landform knoll along the southern side of the NCP also precludes views to much of the interior of the NCP as seen from Tejas Place. The existing houses and landform would also block most of the view to the proposed project elements in the center of the NCP such as the community center, parking lots, basketball courts, and playground. Much of the proposed multi-use sports fields would also generally not be seen from this location. The most noticeable project features as seen from Tejas Place would be the proposed lighting for the multi-use sports fields.

Views from Neighborhoods Southeast of the NCP in the Vicinity of West Tefft Street and Orchard Avenue

These residential areas are at a higher viewing elevation, which allows potentially greater visibility of the NCP site. From these areas, however, existing views to the interior of the NCP are largely screened by the masses of tall trees near the eastern perimeter of the NCP. From areas closest to West Tefft Street the proposed community pool or skate park, library expansion, amphitheater, and realigned park entrance would be potentially visible.

From Dana Elementary School, the existing developed portion of the NCP is visible to the north. As with most viewing locations surrounding the NCP, much of the view from the school is somewhat blocked by landform and existing vegetation. The project proposes several changes that would be visible from the school, including the expansion of the existing library, the relocation of the entry road, a pay station, and further to the north a community pool or a skate park. The multi-use sports fields proposed for the southern portion of the NCP would be mostly blocked from view as seen from Dana Elementary School, although the sport field lighting would be seen during nighttime operation.



Photograph 4.1-4. The existing view from near Orchard Avenue toward the NCP.

Views from the Residential Area to the South near Tejas Place

The homes adjacent to the NCP along the north side of Tejas Place have views of the NCP, especially the oak covered ridge and various masses of skyline trees. These homes also substantially restrict views toward the NCP from the remainder of the neighborhood. In addition, the existing landform knoll along the southern side of the NCP precludes views to the interior of the NCP as seen from many of the homes in this neighborhood, including the ones on the north side of Tejas Road.

Intervening houses and landform would also block much of the view to the proposed project elements in the center of the NCP such as the community center, parking lots, basketball courts, and playground. The proposed multi-use sports fields would also generally not be seen from this location. The most noticeable project features as seen from the Tejas Place neighborhood would be the proposed lighting for the multi-use sports fields. Perimeter trail improvements along the south side of the NCP would also be seen from portions of this neighborhood.



Photograph 4.1-5. The existing view from Tejas Place toward the north. A glimpse of the oak-covered park ridge can be seen between the residences in the distance.

Views from the Residential Neighborhoods West of Osage Street

Existing views of the NCP from the residential neighborhoods west of Osage Street are primarily of the wooded slopes and the native garden areas near Camino Caballo. In the vicinity of the Mesa Meadows neighborhood, limited views are available to the interior of the park, along the southern more open portion of the site. As seen from the residential neighborhoods west of Osage Street, the most noticeable project elements would be the native garden, the interpretive center, the play structure near Camino Caballo, and the perimeter trail. From some areas of the neighborhood along the southern portion of Osage Street, the proposed lighting for the multi-use sports fields would be seen.



Photograph 4.1-6. The existing view from Osage Street looking east toward the park.

Views from the Neighborhoods North of Pomeroy Road

The neighborhoods north of Pomeroy Road have existing views of the NCP that mostly consist of either the wooded ridgeline along the western section or the tops of the trees at the developed area to the east. From this residential area the existing sports field lights can be seen above or through the trees. As with most of the neighborhoods surrounding the park, unless a residence is directly across a street from the park, the existing views of the NCP are substantially blocked by structures and/or landscaping.

From the neighborhoods north of Pomeroy Road the most noticeable new project elements would be the realigned park entry road, the native garden and interpretive center, and the perimeter trail. Most of the proposed recreational elements closer to the center and southern portions of the NCP would not be easily seen from this neighborhood because of distance, topography, and/or vegetation.



Photograph 4.1-7. The existing view from Pomeroy Road looking southwest toward the park.

Views from Within the NCP

From inside much of the park, existing close- and mid-range views are generally unobstructed. The open character of the existing sports fields allows visibility across much of the developed eastern area of the park. The undeveloped area along the southern portion of the site also has generally clear visibility of the NCP surroundings. The areas of the NCP near the native and interpretive gardens have views of the adjacent parkland which are somewhat screened by trees and shrubs in the vicinity. From the oak-covered ridge area, dense vegetation limits most views to other parts of the park. Along the perimeter of the woodland, however, the generally elevated position provides several good viewing opportunities to other parts of the park.

Longer-range views within the NCP are often screened by vegetation, topography, or existing site amenities. The oak-covered ridge near the northern section of the NCP substantially limits distant views in that direction. As a result, certain sub-areas of the existing park tend to be somewhat visually isolated from one another. Four such areas include: the developed eastern

portion, less developed southern and western portions, interior oak ridge, and Nipomo Native Garden in the northern triangle.

The Eastern, More Developed Area of the NCP

The most intensely developed area of the NCP is the eastern portion. Existing views in this area of the NCP include the lighted baseball fields, tennis/basketball courts, internal paved roadways, parking lots, and picnic areas. The eastern end of the NCP also contains the existing library, pre-school, and park entrance off West Tefft Street.



Photograph 4.1-8. Existing views of some of the more developed areas within the park.



Photograph 4.1-9. Existing views of some of the more developed areas within the park.

The project proposes few substantial visual changes to the existing recreational features in the northeastern portion of the park. However new park features visible in the southeastern area would include the community pool or skate park, the expanded library, a realigned entrance road, and an amphitheater. Along Pomeroy Road, a realigned park entrance, an off-leash dog park, a new gazebo, and an oak tree restoration area would be seen.



Photograph 4.1-10. View of the existing ball field and sports lighting.

The Less Developed Area throughout the Western and Southern Portions of the NCP

The existing park road generally separates this area from the more intensely developed section to the east. The western and southern sections of the NCP are the most open, and current recreation uses are predominantly the trails along the southern side. Oak trees are scattered throughout some of this area. Existing caretaker's and maintenance facilities are some of the few structures found here.



Photograph 4.1-11. The existing view of the less developed western, southern, and central portions of the park.

The majority of the visible new development proposed by the project would occur in this central and southern portion of the park. The proposed community center, gymnasium, pool, tennis courts, parking lots, equestrian staging area, playground, restrooms, and parking would be visible in the middle area, and the proposed multi-use sports fields would be terraced into the slope along the southern side. A new loop road would serve these proposed recreation facilities.

The Interior of the Oak-Covered Ridge Area of the NCP

The surrounding oak trees and tall scrub vegetation are visual resources as seen from within the oak-covered ridge. This existing vegetation also screens much of the views to the rest of the park; however, because of the elevated position of the ridge, quality views of the surrounding park as well as the distant hills can be seen through gaps in the vegetation.



Photograph 4.1-12. The existing view from the oak-covered ridge toward the north. The surrounding hills north of Nipomo are visible in the distance.

From certain locations on the ridge, the proposed recreational development would be visible to the south. Through gaps in vegetation, the community center, gymnasium, pool, tennis courts, equestrian staging area, equestrian staging, parking lots, playground, restrooms, and parking would be visible in the middle area, and the proposed multi-use sports fields would be seen further to the south.

The Community Gardens Area of the NCP North of the Oak-Covered Ridge

Little development exists in the existing community gardens area north of Camino Caballo. Trails and passive recreation are the main uses of the area. The project would introduce new visual elements in this area, such as a new interpretative center building and an amphitheater. Just south of Camino Caballo, a proposed play structure and lawn area would be seen. The new trail would also be visible around the perimeter of the park.



Photograph 4.1-13. The existing view looking southeast from Osage Street. The Nipomo Native Garden is visible in the foreground and the oak-covered ridge can be seen in the background.

4.1.5 Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The project site is considered sensitive in terms of community aesthetic character. The NCP is surrounded on all sides by neighborhoods and/or public roadways, including Pomeroy Road, West Tefft Street, Osage Street, Tejas Place, and Camino Caballo. In addition, much of the public viewing exposure to the NCP is from within the boundaries of the park itself. Because of its location on West Tefft Street, which serves as a main east-west thoroughfare for the area, and its proximity to residential neighborhoods on all sides, the NCP serves an important role in defining the visual identity of Nipomo.

The analysis considers the existing development as part of the visual baseline. This includes the existing uses of the park, neighborhoods and natural areas surrounding the project, as well as other areas of the community that define the overall character of Nipomo. The visual quality of the community has as much to do with the built environment as with the natural setting. Patterns of development, architecture, scale, massing, and vegetation combine to define how the community is perceived by the public, including residents and visitors.

In determining levels of impact, this study also compares the project to the specific visual resource goals of the County. As a result of the valued small-town rural setting, combined with an awareness of scenic quality as reflected in County planning policy, it is anticipated that community and viewer sensitivity to visual changes on this prominent park site will be moderately high.

Specific architectural styles of structural project elements have not yet been determined at this stage in the Master Plan process. The specific appearance and architectural styles of project features would be developed based partly on recommendations of this study and input from the community. As a result the appearance of the specific project elements shown in the photo-simulations are reasonable representations of the types of recreational features defined in the Master Plan.

For the purpose of this analysis, assumptions are made regarding the physical characteristics of the proposed project features. Preliminary concepts of the community center and the multiuse sports fields have been designed and are included in the study (refer to Figures 2-7 and 4.1-4). All other proposed features are analyzed considering typical examples of those elements as they would likely be implemented in this setting. In addition, since the specific appearance of many of the project features would be based on subsequent decisions, the aesthetics section uses a "reasonable worst-case scenario" to assess potential impacts regarding the appearance of the project.

4.1.5.1 Effect on Scenic View

An important public scenic view within the NCP is the oak-covered ridge extending through the northern part of the park, which contributes the rural character of the undeveloped areas within NCP. The ridge can be seen from many viewpoints within the park, as well as from the surrounding neighborhoods, which helps establish a natural scenic backdrop for much of the area. As seen from most of the surrounding community, the project would have little or no effect on views of the ridge from surrounding streets or neighborhoods. Trail improvements on the ridge itself would cause minimal disturbance, and would not be easily visible from the surrounding area due to trail width and surrounding vegetation. The quality of views to the ridge would remain intact and the ridge would continue to provide a visual backdrop for the community.

As seen from certain areas near the center of the park, views to the ridge would be partially blocked. The proposed community center, gymnasium, and other structures in this area would partially screen views to the north and of the ridge. Proposed landscaping, such as parking lot trees, would also filter surrounding views. Because of the proximity of the community center and gymnasium buildings to the existing park road, views to the oak-covered ridge to the northwest would be substantially blocked, resulting in an adverse effect on the scenic vista. Although other proposed elements, such as parking lot trees, would partially filter views, the community center and gymnasium buildings would cause the greatest degree of view blockage.

The hills north and east of Nipomo are also important vistas. Views of these distant hills are limited, but can be seen from certain locations within the NCP and the surrounding area. From viewpoints within the NCP itself, the project would have little to no effect on views to the distant hills. Most of the existing viewpoints from within the NCP to the surrounding hills are located at the upper elevations of the oak-covered ridge and the trails along the southern perimeter of the park. The largest proposed elements, the community center and gymnasium, would be below these ridgetop viewpoints and would be oriented below the viewshed of the distant hills.

The elevated viewing position of the Tejas Place neighborhood provides somewhat increased views to the north and east, although much of these public views are screened by existing houses and landscaping. The new light poles proposed for the multi-use sports fields would become part of the view to the north and northeast, and from certain locations could be visible directly in front of the distant hills. Where visible, the institutional appearance of the poles and light arrays would somewhat degrade the quality of the views to the hills. Although visible, the poles and lights would occupy a very small percentage of the overall viewshed. As a result, the light poles would have only a minor effect on views to the distant hills as seen from the surrounding neighborhoods.

AES Impact 1 The location and size of the community center and gymnasium would block views of the oak-covered ridge as seen from the main existing park road, resulting in a direct long-term impact to the scenic vista within the park.

AES/mm-1 Prior to approval of the final design and development plan, site plans and architectural plans shall be submitted showing the community center and gymnasium a minimum distance of 150 feet from the existing park road.

Residual Impact

Implementation of this measure would require some adjustment to the proposed parking area in the vicinity of these structures to maintain close parking and access to these facilities, incorporate mitigation related to public safety and crime prevention, and the potential addition of a transit stop; however, the proposed development footprint would remain the same. While views within the park would be modified by the proposed development, implementation of this mitigation measure would require that proposed structures are located to maintain scenic views of the oak-covered ridge, as seen from the main park road. Residual impacts would be less than significant (Class II).

4.1.5.2 Effect on Visual Character and Quality, Visual Compatibility

the NCP occupies one of the more visible locations in the community. The proximity to primary roadways and surrounding neighborhoods greatly increases the potential number of viewers of the proposed project improvements. Because of this large number of viewers and highly visible location, the appearance of the project would have an influence on the visual character of the community. Future development of the site has the potential to substantially alter the existing visual character. The potential effects the project may have on the visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings are discussed below according to the primary project features proposed.

As mentioned previously, *preliminary concept images* of the community center/gymnasium, and a preliminary grading plan for the multi-use sports field and stormwater basins have been provided (refer to Figure 2-7 and 4.1-4). Other specific details and architectural styles regarding the proposed project elements have not yet been determined. The images shown below are provided only as examples of the categories of recreational elements proposed by the project. *The images are shown to give a sense of the potential visual character of the various recreational facilities, and are not intended to convey a specific design or type.*

Community Center/Gymnasium

A 36,000-square foot community center/gymnasium is proposed near the center of the park. The conceptual image of the facility shows a 35-foot tall structure occupying a space approximately 250 feet long by 230 feet wide (refer to Figure 2-7). No specific architectural style has been identified at this time, although the conceptual image illustrates one building with a parapet hipped-roof, and one building with a shallow barrel vaulted roof. Exterior materials and colors are not specifically defined.

The community center/gymnasium would not be visible from locations outside of the NCP itself. However, because of its size, the proposed community center/gymnasium would be the dominant visual element at the park's core and would greatly define the visual character within the park.

The preliminary design of the community center/gymnasium shows generally monolithic structures with little exterior articulation, which would increase the perceived scale of the buildings. If urban or modern-style architecture were used, these dominant buildings would likely not be consistent with the rural aesthetic goals of the community. Exterior details, materials, and color schemes could either support or detract from the desired visual character of the park. As a result, the proposed community center/ gymnasium would have the potential to result in substantial adverse impacts to the visual character of the park.

Community Swimming Pool

An approximately 8,400-square foot swimming pool and deck would be located in the vicinity of the community center/gymnasium. The pool would likely include associated site features such as benches and/or chairs, safety devices, and signage. Required security fencing may be one of the more noticeable elements of the pool facility. The type of fencing selected would greatly affect the visual character of the site. Galvanized chain-link fencing, for example, may introduce an urban, industrial look compared to a more aesthetically treated material. The community pool would have an adverse effect on the visual character if it created an intensely urban appearance. Institutional looking support buildings and structures, extensive use of galvanized chain-link fencing, and minimal use of landscaping would result in a utilitarian appearance, inconsistent with the stated rural character goals for the park.



Figure 4.1-2. Examples of Typical Community Pools

Skate Park

The project includes a 10,000-square foot skate park near West Tefft Street. Skate parks can vary greatly in appearance, layout, and form. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that the skate park would be primarily a hard surface such as concrete, with ramps, rails, bowls, and other features. Associated amenities may include benches and viewing areas. Perimeter security fencing would also likely be required. The skate park on West Tefft Street would have an adverse effect on the visual character if it created an intensely urban appearance. Institutional looking support buildings and structures, extensive use of galvanized chain-link fencing, and minimal use of landscaping would result in a utilitarian appearance, inconsistent with the stated rural character goals for the park.



Figure 4.1-3. Examples Showing the General Visual Character of Skate Parks

Multi-use Sports Fields

The Master Plan includes an additional 10 acres of lighted multi-use sports fields, located toward the southern-central portion of the park. The sports fields themselves would be on a single terrace level, with an irrigated turf surface. Preliminary designs indicate that substantial landform alteration would occur in order to accommodate these level playing fields on the existing sloping terrain (refer to Figure 4.1-4). From many viewpoints the multi-use sports fields would be most noticeable by their associated cut and fill slopes, which would be as much as 25 feet in height.

The generally sandy soil of the area would require somewhat shallow slope-angles, which would reduce the engineered appearance of the earthwork. The preliminary plan also shows contour-type grading which would help the slopes look like natural landforms. In spite of these factors, without appropriate vegetative erosion control measures, the constructed slopes may have increased noticeability due to scarring and exposed earth, which would affect the visual character of the southern section of the park.

A specific lighting plan has not been developed for the sports fields at this time. However, it is presumed that several light poles would be required around the perimeter of the sports fields in order to provide adequate and safe field illumination. Although the final lighting design would depend on numerous factors specific to the site, for comparison purposes it can be noted that similar recreation facilities can be seen with as many as eight to 10 poles with heights of 60 feet or more. The visibility of these light poles would unavoidably contribute to the site's visual alteration from open space to an active recreational facility, both during the day and nighttime hours.

Expanded Community Library Building

The existing community library building located on West Tefft Street is approximately 7,100 square feet in size. The Master Plan proposes to expand the library by adding another 4,000 square feet of space. The existing library building is single-story, with a stucco and shingle exterior. The roof form is hipped with gable-type dormer windows. It is expected that the expanded portion of the library would match the architecture of the existing library. If not designed to be compatible with the existing building, the library facility could lack visual coherence and reduce the visual quality of the area.



Figure 4.1-4. Conceptual Grading Plan for the Multi-Use Sports Fields and Stormwater Basins



Photograph 4.1-14. Existing view of the Nipomo Community Library from West Tefft Street.

Expanded Restrooms/Maintenance Buildings

New and/or expanded restrooms and maintenance buildings would be included in the park. The existing restrooms and maintenance buildings are rectangular structures with wood or stucco siding and concrete block. The roofs are gable style with shingles. The design of the new restrooms and maintenance structures would be important contributors to the visual character of the park. Overly institutional looking restrooms and maintenance buildings would result in a utilitarian appearance, inconsistent with the stated rural character goals for the park.



Figure 4.1-5. Examples of Typical Community Park Restrooms

Increased Parking

Because of the increased intensity of park usage, the amount of required vehicle parking area would more than double. The largest new parking lots would be near the middle portion of the park, between the proposed community center and the multi-use sports fields. The majority of the parking areas would be paved, with trees scattered throughout the lots. The most visible aspect of the parking lots would likely be the expanses of paved area and the vehicles

themselves, both parked and in motion. Additional features would likely include public safety lighting. By their nature, paved parking lots filled with vehicles can be associated with urban or suburban visual environments.



Figure 4.1-6. Examples Showing the Visual Character of Typical Parking Lots

Additional Roads

Internal roadways would connect the new park elements to each other and to the existing facilities. The new roads would be paved and are not expected to include curbs or gutters unless required for accessibility or drainage management. The new access roads would connect to the existing internal road system and would likely be similar in width. New entry road connections are proposed at Pomeroy Road and at West Tefft Street. The Master Plan layout shows the entry roads having median islands and pay stations. Paved roadways and vehicles serving the proposed recreational elements near the middle and western portions of the NCP would contribute to the reduction in rural character, in currently less-developed areas.

Figure 4.1-7. Examples of Different Types of Park Roads



New Amphitheater / Gazebo

A new amphitheater is proposed near the Nipomo Native Garden area, and a new gazebo/stage would be located south of the existing lighted baseball field. The appearance of these features could vary greatly and no specific designs have been identified. Each of these features could include a vertical structure associated with a stage as well as an area for a

potential audience. The design of any new gazebo and amphitheater structures would be important contributors to the visual character of the park. Inappropriate forms, materials, and colors would be inconsistent with the stated rural character goals for the park.



Figure 4.1-8. Examples of the Typical Appearance of Park Amphitheaters

Interpretive Center

The Master Plan includes a proposed interpretive center with parking near the Nipomo Native Garden area. The appearance of the interpretive center has not been defined and interpretive centers designs often respond to specific site conditions and associated resources. As with the other proposed buildings, the ultimate design of the interpretive center would have a direct influence on the visual character of the park. The interpretive center would also be seen from Osage Road and possibly from Camino Caballo. Urban or modern style architecture would likely not be consistent with the rural aesthetic goals of the community. Exterior details, materials, and color schemes could either support or detract from the desired visual character of the park. As a result, the proposed interpretive center would have the potential to result in substantial adverse impacts to the visual character of the park.





Basketball and Handball Courts

The project includes 10,000 square feet of new basketball courts and 4,000 square feet of handball courts. These recreational features would be characterized to a great extent by their hard court playing surfaces. Vertical elements associated with the basketball courts would be the poles and backboards, and the handball courts would include vertical concrete court-walls on one, three, or four sides. Security needs may require perimeter fencing for the basketball and handball courts. The type of fencing selected would greatly affect the visual character of the site. Galvanized chain-link fencing for example may introduce an urban, industrial look compared to a more aesthetically treated fencing material.

Figure 4.1-10. Examples of a Typical Basketball Court (Left) and Handball Court (Right)



Additional Playgrounds

Eight thousand square feet of new playground area would be added to the park. Playgrounds can have a wide variety of appearances. It is assumed that the playgrounds would include one or more play structures, a ground plane of rubberized surface, wood chips, or turf, and benches or other seating. One of the most noticeable characteristics of the playground would be the colors of the new structures. New playground equipment is seen in hues ranging from earth tones to bright primary colors.

Figure 4.1-11. Examples of Different Looks of Playground Equipment



Expanded Dog Parks

An additional 19,000 square feet of off-leash dog park is proposed near the northern entry of the park. Typically, dog parks are characterized by perimeter and cross-fencing, seating, and sometimes an information kiosk. The type of fencing used would affect the visual character of the site.



Figure 4.1-12. Examples of Different Styles of Dog Parks

Horseshoe Pits

New horseshoe pits would be included with implementation of the Master Plan. Because of their relatively small size and general lack of vertical elements, horseshoe pits are often not easily noticeable in the landscape. If safety fencing is required, the fencing may be the most easily visible aspect of the horseshoe pit facility. As with the other fencing proposed throughout the project, the style and material could have an influence on the visual setting.

Figure 4.1-13. Examples Showing the General Visual Character of Horseshoe Pits



Expanded Tennis Courts

Two new tennis courts would be located in the vicinity of the proposed community center. The tennis courts would likely include perimeter fencing, which could be one of its more noticeable elements. Other features associated with the tennis courts may include benches, signage, and an informational kiosk. The type of fencing selected would greatly affect the visual character of the site. Untreated galvanized chain-link fencing may introduce an urban, industrial look compared to a more aesthetically treated material.





Additional Trails/ Walkways

A substantial amount of new trails and walkways are proposed. A multi-use trail would generally parallel Pomeroy Road along the northern side of the park, and along the southern perimeter south of the proposed sports fields. Some of these trails would be partly paved, with adjacent unpaved horse trails. An attached sidewalk-type path would be constructed along Osage Street, at the western edge of the park. The most noticeable aspects of the trails and walkways may be the paved surfaces themselves and any required grading and/or vegetation removal. If grading is required in order to construct the trails and walkways, without appropriate vegetative erosion control measures, the constructed slopes may have increased noticeability due to scarring and exposed earth, which would affect the visual character of the vicinity.

Figure 4.1-15. Examples of Typical Park Trails The trail shown on the right includes a paved and non-paved section.



Additional Open Play Area

In addition to the new sports fields, approximately 4 acres of irrigated turf would be installed for open play area. This turf area would be most noticeable by its brighter green lawn, possibly contrasting with the seasonally golden adjacent natural slopes. The minimal landform alterations associated with the open play areas would help these areas retain a more natural look.



Photograph 4.1-15. View of the existing open play area within the park.

Stormwater Basins

Between the central parking area and the multi-use sports fields to the south, 108,000 square feet of stormwater basins are proposed. The preliminary grading plans show contour-graded basins. If maintenance or engineering needs require the basins to be rectilinear and look like utilitarian facilities, they could affect the natural appearance of the park. Associated security fencing, if required could also influence the visual character of the setting.



Figure 4.1-16. Examples of Different Types of Stormwater Basins

Equestrian Staging Area

An equestrian staging area is proposed along the western side of the community center area. Although no specific design details are identified at this time, the equestrian area would likely be most recognizable by the pull-through parking area and the potential numbers of horse trailers and associated vehicles.



Figure 4.1-17. Examples of the Typical Visual Character of Equestrian Staging Areas

- AES Impact 2 Without definitive design concepts for the elements proposed in the Master Plan, the potential exists for the buildings, support structures, fencing, signage, landscaping, site amenities and miscellaneous features to markedly contrast with the surrounding environment due to inappropriate scale, form, location, materials, colors, and other design factors, resulting in a direct long-term impact to the visual character of the site and surroundings.
- AES/mm-2 Prior to implementation of the Master Plan, comprehensive design guidelines shall be developed for the NCP. The design guidelines shall be developed in conjunction with community input and shall support the stated goals that park amenities be aesthetically consistent with the rural regional character of the area. For park improvements located along West Tefft Street, the NCP design guidelines shall be compatible with the West Tefft Corridor Design Plan. The design guidelines shall specifically describe architectural styles and forms, types, layouts, materials, colors, and other relevant details relating to all proposed park elements. The design guidelines shall be based in part on the following goals:
 - a. The guidelines shall establish a consistent design theme for the NCP, addressing the proposed elements as well as existing features which may need replaced or refurbished in the future.
 - b. In keeping with the rural aesthetic goals of the community, the design guidelines shall strive for an honest use of materials rather than faux or artificial applications.
 - c. Site design and layout of structures and recreational elements shall be designed to accommodate substantial landscaping for the purpose of reducing the visual dominance of the built elements and blending with the natural setting.

- d. Site grading shall be minimized to the greatest extent feasible. The location, size, and orientation of structures, recreational features, parking areas, paths, and walkways shall be laid-out to minimize the need for earthwork.
- e. Buildings and other structures shall use stepped foundations and/or partially buried walls where possible to minimize the need for grading.
- f. All visible earthwork shall utilize contour grading and slope rounding to achieve a natural appearance.
- g. The use of visible retaining walls shall be minimized to the greatest extent feasible. Where retaining walls are required, their visibility shall be reduced through the use of materials, color, and planting. Retaining walls may be appropriate in certain circumstances in order to protect existing mature trees.
- h. Paved areas, including parking lots, recreation surfaces, and pedestrian areas shall strive for surface materials and colorings which blend with the natural ground plane to the greatest extent practical considering their intended function.
- *i.* The visual prominence of all buildings and structures shall be lessened through the use of architectural form, style, external materials, colors and other appropriate measures.
- j. All signage shall have a consistent graphic design theme. Thematic variations would be appropriate considering the desired hierarchy of information to be conveyed, such as informational, directional, safety, etc.
- k. Lighting of signs shall be kept to the minimum required by safety and functional necessity. If lighting of signs is required, the signs shall not be internally illuminated.
- I. Visibility of proposed and existing wireless communication facilities and equipment shall be reduced by coloring all visible components to blend with the surroundings and by screen planting.
- m. All proposed overhead utilities shall be placed underground to the greatest extent feasible. Where undergrounding is not feasible, their noticeability shall be minimized by placement in low visibility areas as much as possible. Required overhead utility poles shall be wood or wood-colored metal.
- n. Existing overhead utilities shall be placed underground as future funding allows. A systematic strategy shall be developed for future utility undergrounding based on aesthetic priorities,

opportunities created due to other construction work, maintenance benefits, and funding availability.

- o. Lighting within the NCP shall be based on the lowest level required by safety and functional needs. Light poles and fixtures shall be consistent with the park's established design theme. Where appropriate, low-height bollard style lighting should be used. Motion detectors should be utilized instead of continuous illumination for security lighting where appropriate and feasible.
- p. All site amenities and furnishings such as benches, tables, shade structures, drinking fountains, bicycle racks, bollards and road delineators shall be consistent with the park's established design theme.
- q. Noticeability of required security fencing as well as general functional-area fencing shall be minimized to the greatest extent possible through placement and the use of materials, color, and screen planting as appropriate. Standard un-coated galvanized chain-link fencing shall not be used. Razor-wire and barbed-wire shall not be used. Fencing and railing related to accessibility and safety shall adhere to Americans with Disabilities Act and other legally required ordinances.
- r. Landscaping and other planting shall be used generously throughout the NCP to reduce overall visibility and noticeability of structures, parking lots and parked vehicles, paved surfaces, and to visually blend the built components of the NCP with the natural setting.
- s. Landscaping shall primarily use native plant material.
- t. Oak tree planting areas as described in the Master Plan shall be planted as part of the first phase of new park improvements to the greatest extent possible.

Residual Impacts

With implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts due to the project's contrast with the surrounding environment due to visual dominance of built structures related to inappropriate scale, form, location, materials, colors, and other design factors would be considered *less than significant* (Class II).

AES Impact 3 The monolithic form, architectural style, exterior materials, and colors of the community center and gymnasium would be visually imposing on the site and inconsistent with the rural character goals of the community, resulting in a direct long-term impact to the visual character of the site and surroundings.

- AES/mm-3 Prior to approval of the final design and development plan for the community center and gymnasium, architectural plans of the community center and gymnasium shall be submitted showing the following:
 - a. All facades should emphasize three-dimensional articulation to provide vertical, horizontal, and depth relief.
 - b. The architectural style shall be consistent with the Design Guidelines described in mitigation measure AES/mm-2.
 - c. Roofs should be varied and lessen the buildings' apparent height and mass.
 - d. Roof materials and colors shall complement the building's architectural style.
 - e. Roof-mounted equipment shall be screened to not be visible from public areas at the ground level and areas at higher elevations.
 - f. Building colors and materials shall be visually compatible with the area.
- AES/mm-4 Prior to approval of the final design and development plan for the community center and gymnasium, landscape plans shall be submitted for review and approval. The plan shall be developed and signed by a licensed landscape architect and shall include the following:
 - a. Screen planting along the north, south and east sides of the community center and gymnasium buildings.
 - b. Screen planting shall reduce the visual scale of the buildings and visually blend the buildings with the natural setting.
 - c. Planting shall visually screen a minimum of 50% of the community center and gymnasium buildings within seven years after construction.

Residual Impacts

With implementation of identified mitigation measures impacts to the visual character of the site and surroundings caused by the appearance and visibility of the community center and gymnasium buildings would be considered *less than significant* (Class II).

AES Impact 4 Mature trees are primary contributors to the view quality and character of the park. Removal of mature trees in order to construct the elements of the Master Plan would have the potential to be inconsistent with the rural character goals of the community, resulting in a direct long-term impact to the visual character of the site and surroundings.
- AES/mm-5 Mature trees shall be saved to the greatest extent possible. Tree protection measures shall be implemented which include at a minimum the following:
 - a. All mature trees in the vicinity of development shall be identified on preliminary site plans and final design plans.
 - b. A tree preservation plan shall be prepared to be used as guidance throughout the life of the project.
 - c. Project elements shall be sited to avoid existing trees to the greatest extent feasible.
 - d. Earthwork shall be minimized in the vicinity of existing trees to the greatest extent feasible.
 - e. Tree wells and slope-warping shall be used where appropriate to avoid impacts to root systems.

Residual Impacts

With implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts to the visual character of the site and surroundings caused by the loss of mature trees would be considered *less than significant* (Class II).

4.1.5.3 Effects of Light and Glare

The multi-use sports fields would include field lighting, generally between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. For the purposes of analysis, it is assumed that the lighting would be elevated on poles, and that the design would be subject to public safety standards for recreational uses. At night, the sports field lighting could be the most noticeable element of the project for the surrounding community. The neighborhood south of the NCP along Tejas Place would have the greatest visibility of the sports field lighting.

Lighting would also likely be required elsewhere as part of the NCP improvements. Safety regulations and guidelines require lighting for parking areas, pedestrian uses, and buildings. Security lighting may be necessary at the community pool, skate park, tennis and basketball courts, and other areas. The proposed lighting has the potential for glare caused by direct visibility of the light sources, light spill-over into areas other than the intended sports field area, and for general atmospheric light pollution. Inappropriate lighting design, including light placement and height, luminaire type, housing, reflectors, lenses and shields could drastically affect the amount of impact within the NCP and to the surrounding community.

AES Impact 5 Nighttime visibility of sports field lighting glare and light trespass would result in a direct long-term impact to the nighttime views in the area.

AES/mm-6 Prior to approval of the final design and development plan for the multi-use sports field lighting, a comprehensive multi-use sports field lighting plan shall be submitted for review and approval. The multi-use sports field lighting plan shall be based on a photometric study prepared by a qualified engineer who is an active member of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America. The multi-use sports field lighting plan shall be prepared

using guidance and best practices endorsed by the International Dark Sky Association. The multi-use sports field lighting plan shall include the following in conjunction with other measures as determined by the illumination engineer:

- a. The photometric study shall investigate different configurations of pole heights, pole spacing, and other variables which would result in the least amount of light visibility for the neighborhood south of the park.
- b. The point source of all sports field lighting shall be completely shielded from off-site views.
- c. Light trespass from sports field lighting shall be minimized by directing light downward and utilizing full cut-off fixtures or shields.
- d. Lumination from lights shall be the lowest level allowed by public safety standards.
- e. Any required lighting poles and related fixtures shall have a non-reflective finish.
- f. The lighting plan shall consider effects on wildlife in the surrounding area.

AES Impact 6 Apart from the multi-use sports field lighting, visibility of lighting throughout the NCP would affect nighttime views resulting in a direct long-term impact.

- AES/mm-7 Prior to implementation of the Master Plan, lighting plans shall be submitted for review and approval consistent with the following:
 - a. The point source of all recreational and exterior lighting shall be shielded from off-site views.
 - b. All required security lights shall utilize motion detector activation where feasible.
 - c. Light trespass from recreational and exterior lights shall be minimized by directing light downward and utilizing full cut-off fixtures or shields.

Residual Impacts

With implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts due to night lighting would be reduced to *less than significant* (Class II); however, the light and glare would still be visible from within the park and adjacent residential areas.

4.1.5.4 Effect on Unique Geological or Physical Features

The topography of the NCP is considered a visual resource. The existing landform offers visual interest as seen from both internal and external viewing locations, and provides viewing

opportunities from the elevated areas and visual enclosure at the lower elevations. The project would alter the topography within the park, mostly in the central and southern portions, near the multi-use sports fields, stormwater basins, and community center/gymnasium areas. The sports fields would require the creation of a large cut slope into the existing landform along the southern and southeastern part of the fields. Creating a large flat plane on the existing slope would be an obvious alteration of the natural landform. The preliminary grading plan for the multi-use sports fields show rounded slopes and contour grading both above and below the sports field, which would help the facility fit the look of the natural terrain. The retention basins also include natural looking forms and side slopes. In spite of the contour grading, without appropriate vegetative erosion control measures, the new slopes may erode, increasing their noticeability due to scarring and exposed earth.

Although the landform of the south-central portion of the NCP would be substantially altered, the topography of the majority of the NCP would not be affected. The wooded ridge through the northern area, and the remainder of the existing improved area would remain intact. In general, the existing topography somewhat limits views from one area of the NCP to another. As a result the proposed grading for the multi-use sports fields would not be readily seen from many parts of the NCP to the north and east.

AES Impact 7 Surface erosion and exposed earth would increase noticeability of earthwork and landform alteration resulting in a direct long-term impact.

- AES/mm-8 Prior to approval of the final design and development plan, an erosion control and slope revegetation plan shall be submitted for review and approval consistent with the following:
 - a. At a minimum, vegetative erosion control shall be applied to all areas disturbed by construction.
 - b. The outer fringe areas of the multi-use sports fields cut slopes shall be revegetated with dune chaparral to blend with the adjacent natural landcover.
 - c. After plant establishment and/or establishment of erosion control, no or little supplemental irrigation shall be applied to the multi-use sports fields cut and fill slopes.
 - d. Vegetation on the fringe slopes surrounding the multi-use sports fields and the stormwater basins shall not be mowed other than to comply with County Fire/California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) safety requirements.

Residual Impacts

Proposed grading activities would change the existing topography of the NCP; however, with implementation of this mitigation measure, impacts due to alterations to the physical features of the site would be considered *less than significant* (Class II).

4.1.6 Cumulative Impacts

The discussion of cumulative impacts relates to the potential for the project to contribute to an aggregate change in visual quality from public viewing areas both within and surrounding the park, taking into consideration existing as well as proposed development. Nipomo has undergone a certain amount of visual change within the last several years due to new and reconstructed residential and commercial development. These changes have resulted in a moderately increased built-character throughout the community and along West Tefft Street. The Master Plan would result in several visual changes as seen from the surrounding community. The proposed community pool/skate park along West Tefft Street would represent the most noticeable change. Without the application of appropriate design principles, these improvements would be in conflict with community goals. However with implementation of the measures outlined in this section, the proposed park features along West Tefft Street would be consistent with the emerging aesthetic of the area and would likely appear as an appropriate use for the site. The other park features visible from the surrounding area such as paths, the interpretive center, and playground would also look like suitable park elements, with incorporation of mitigation measures.

Little new development has occurred within the NCP itself over the last several years, and the visual conditions internal to the NCP and as seen from areas surrounding the NCP are substantially the same as they have been for years. Substantial visual alterations would occur to the central and southern portions of the park. The most intense amount of development is proposed for these areas, including the community center/gymnasium, tennis courts, basketball courts, multi-use sports fields, and the greatest amount of parking. The potential exists for all of these buildings, courts, fields, parking lots and pedestrian areas to collectively visually dominate the NCP and adversely affect the existing rural character. A visual change is inherent with the introduction of these recreational uses into this mostly undeveloped section of the park. It is expected that most viewers will consider additional recreational uses to be a visually appropriate and acceptable condition in this existing park setting if the proposed elements are consistent with the community aesthetic values in terms of rural character and open space. Implementation of the mitigation measures listed in this section would minimize the visual presence of built structures, courts, paving, earthwork, fields, and lighting, and would emphasize the more natural character of the NCP and the region.

AES Impact 8 The potential exists that the collective visibility of all of the proposed project elements would substantially contrast with the surrounding environment due to inappropriate scale, form, location, materials, colors, and other design factors, resulting in a direct long-term cumulative impact to the visual environment.

Implement AES/mm-1 through AES/mm-8.

Residual Impacts

With implementation of these mitigation measures, cumulative impacts to the visual environment would be considered *less than significant* (Class II).



Figure 4.1-18. Key Viewing Area 1 – from near the Interior Road looking Northwest



Figure 4.1-19. Key Viewing Area 2 – from near the Interior Road looking Southwest



Figure 4.1-20. Key Viewing Area 3 – from West Tefft Street looking Northwest



Figure 4.1-21. Key Viewing Area 4 – from Park Interior looking Southeast



Figure 4.1-22. Key Viewing Area 5 – from the Southern Perimeter of the NCP looking North



Figure 4.1-23. Key Viewing Area 6 – from Pomeroy Road looking South

4.2 AIR QUALITY

The following section describes the existing air quality setting in San Luis Obispo County and the potential short-term and long-term impacts associated with development of the proposed project. The air quality analysis is based on information provided by the County, San Luis Obispo County Parks (County Parks), San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD), and Pinnacle Traffic Engineering/Rick Engineering (EIR transportation consultant). Short-term construction emissions would result from grading and construction operational emissions would result from vehicle emissions. Long-term operational emissions would result from vehicle emissions and maintenance of proposed structures and facilities. Modeled air quality emission levels are based upon vehicle data and project trip generation prepared for this project, as well as operational emissions associated with long-term use of the proposed project components. URBEMIS2007 (version 9.2.4) data sheets and other emission calculations are included in Appendix C.

4.2.1 Existing Conditions

San Luis Obispo County constitutes a land area of approximately 3,316 square miles with varied vegetation, topography, and climate. From a geographical and meteorological standpoint, the county can be divided into three general regions: the Coastal Plateau, the Upper Salinas River Valley, and the East County Plain. Air quality in each of these regions is characteristically different, although the physical features that divide them provide only limited barriers to the transport of pollutants between regions.

Motor vehicles are the primary source of air pollutant emissions and greenhouse gases (GHGs) (SLOAPCD 2009). Approximately 75% of the county population and a corresponding portion of the commercial and industrial facilities are located within the Coastal Plateau. Due to higher population density and closer spacing of urban areas, emissions of air pollutants per unit area are generally higher in this region than in other regions of the county. NCP is located within the Coastal Plateau.

4.2.1.1 San Luis Obispo County Air Quality Monitoring

The county's air quality is measured by multiple ambient air quality monitoring stations, including one within NCP. There are four SLOAPCD operated permanent stations, two state-operated permanent stations, two special stations, and one station operated by Tosco Oil Refinery for monitoring Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂) emissions. Air quality monitoring is rigorously controlled by Federal and State quality assurance and control procedures to ensure data validity. Gaseous pollutant levels are measured continuously and averaged each hour, 24 hours a day. Particulate pollutants are generally sampled by filter techniques for averaging periods of three to 24 hours. PM₁₀ (inhalable particulate matter 10 microns or less in size) and PM_{2.5} (inhalable particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in size) are sampled for 24 hours every sixth day on the same schedule nationwide.

4.2.1.2 San Luis Obispo County Existing Air Quality

The significance of a given pollutant can be evaluated by comparing its atmospheric concentration to State and Federal air quality standards. These standards represent allowable atmospheric contaminant concentrations at which the public health and welfare are protected, and include a factor of safety.

In San Luis Obispo County, ozone and fine particulate are the pollutants of main concern, since exceedances of state health-based standards for those are experienced in some areas of the county. Particulate matter is monitored in two ways: PM_{10} and $PM_{2.5.}$ The county is designated as a non-attainment area for the state PM_{10} standard.

In 2008, the state eight-hour ozone standard (0.070 parts per million [ppm]) was exceeded once at the Nipomo monitoring stations. The state 24-hour PM_{10} standard (50 micrograms per cubic meter of air [µg/m3]) was exceeded one day at the NCP monitoring station, and five days at the Nipomo Mesa 2 station. On October 9, 2008, the Nipomo stations recorded an exceedance of the state PM_{10} standard due to smoke from wildfires. In 2009, the state 24-hour PM_{10} standard was exceeded two days at the NCP station, and nine days at the Nipomo Mesa 2 station.

The South County Phase 1 Particulate Matter Study was initiated by the SLOAPCD from April 2004 through March 2005 to better delineate the nature and extent of the particulate problem observed on the Mesa. Comprehensive sampling of both fine ($PM_{2.5}$) and coarse (PM_{10}) particulate matter was conducted across the Mesa. The results of this study are available in the Nipomo Mesa Particulate Study (2007).

The Phase 2 Study was conducted to determine the cause of high levels of airborne particulate matter impacting air quality and public health on the Nipomo Mesa, and whether off-road vehicle activity on the Oceano Dunes is a contributing factor. The results of the study were presented to the SLOAPCD Board and their acceptance of the report and findings on March 24, 2010.

In March 2011, a pilot program was initiated at the Oceano Dunes including small-scale sand flux control measures, whose emission reduction effectiveness can be measured and documented to evaluate their viability as long-term strategies. Following the pilot program, a long-term PM reduction plan will be developed, which will be designed to meet the requirements of the APCD's fugitive dust regulation currently under development.

San Luis Obispo County Attainment Status

The following describes the criteria air pollutants and their 2010 attainment status in the South Central Coast Air Basin based on the California Air Resources Board's (ARB) Area Designations, Activities, and Maps (ARB 2009). Table 4.2-1 summarizes the attainment status in San Luis Obispo County for the major criteria pollutants.

		California Sta	indards*	Federal Standards*		
Pollutant	Time Concentration*		Attainment Status	Concentration	Attainment Status	
Ozone	1 Hour	0.09 ppm (180 µg/m ³)			Unclassified/	
(O ₃)	8 Hour	0.070 ppm (137 µg/m ³)	Non-Attainment	0.075 ppm (147 µg/m³)	Attainment***	
Fine Particulate	24 Hour	No State Standard	Attainmont	35 µg/m³	Unclassified/ Attainment	
Matter (PM _{2.5})	Annual Arithmetic Mean	12 µg/m ³	Audinment	15.0 μg/m ³		
Respirable Particulate	24 Hour	50 µg/m ³	Non Attainment	150 μg/m ³	Unclassified/	
Matter (PM ₁₀)	Annual Arithmetic Mean	20 µg/m ³	Non-Allamment		Attainment	
Carbon	8 Hour	9.0 ppm (10 mg/m ³)		9 ppm (10 mg/m ³)		
Monoxide	1 Hour	20 ppm (23 mg/m ³)	Attainment	35 ppm (40 mg/m ³)	Unclassified	
(00)	8 Hour (Lake Tahoe) 6 ppm (7 mg/m ³)					
Nitrogen Dioxide	Annual Arithmetic Mean	0.030 ppm (57 μg/m ³)	Attainment	0.053 ppm (100 µg/m ³)	Unclassified	
(NO ₂)	1 Hour	0.18 ppm (330 μg/m ³)	, addiminorit			
	Annual Arithmetic Mean			0.030 ppm (80 µg/m ³)	Unclassified	
Sulfur Dioxide	24 Hour	0.04 ppm (105 μg/m ³)	Attainmont	0.14 ppm (365 µg/m ³)		
(SO ₂)	3 Hour		Allainment	0.5 ppm (1300 μg/m ³)**		
	1 Hour	0.25 ppm (655 µg/m ³)				
	30 Day Average	1.5 µg/m ³				
Lead*	Calendar Quarter		Attainment	1.5 µg/m ³	No Attainment Information	
	Rolling 3-month Average*			0.15 μg/m ³		
Visibility Reducing Particles	8 Hour	Extinction coefficient of 0.23 per kilometer – visibility of 10 miles or more (0.07-30 miles or more for Lake Tahoe) due to particles when relative humidity is less than 70%. Method: Beta Attenuation and Transmittance through Filter Tape.	Attainment	No Federal St	andards	
Sulfates	24 Hour	25 μg/m ³	Attainment			
Hydrogen Sulfide	1 Hour	0.03 ppm (42 μg/m ³)	Attainment			
Vinyl Chloride*	24 Hour	0.01 ppm (26 µg/m ³)	No Attainment Information			

Table 4.2-1. San Luis Obispo County Attainment Status

* For more information on standards visit: http://ww.arb.ca.gov.research/aaqs/aaqs2.pdf
 ** Secondary Standard
 *** San Luis Obispo County ozone attainment status is pending EPA action on the new ozone standard.

Source: SLOAPCD 2011

4.2.2 Regulatory Setting

4.2.2.1 Federal Policies and Regulations

Air quality protection at the national level is provided through the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA). The current version was signed into law on November 15, 1990. These amendments represent the fifth major effort by the U.S. Congress to improve air quality. The 1990 CAAA are generally less stringent than the California Clean Air Act (CCAA). However, unlike the California law, the CAAA set statutory deadlines for attaining federal standards. The 1990 CAAA added several new sections to the law, including requirements for the control of toxic air contaminants; reductions in pollutants responsible for acid deposition; development of a national strategy for stratospheric ozone and global climate protection; and requirements for a national permitting system for major pollution sources.

4.2.2.2 State Policies and Regulations

The CCAA was signed into law in September of 1988. It requires all areas of the State to achieve and maintain the California ambient air quality standards by the earliest practicable date. These standards are generally more stringent than the Federal standards; thus, emission controls to comply with the State law are more stringent than necessary for attainment of the Federal standards. The CAAA requires that all APCDs adopt and enforce regulations to achieve and maintain the State ambient air quality standards for the area under its jurisdiction. Pursuant to the requirements of the law, the SLOAPCD adopted a Clean Air Plan (CAP) for their jurisdiction.

4.2.2.3 Local Policies and Regulations

The Final 2001 San Luis Obispo County CAP is used by the SLOAPCD to address attainment of national and State fugitive dust (PM_{10}) and ozone standards for the entire county (SLOAPCD 2003). The CAP is a comprehensive planning document intended to provide guidance to the SLOAPCD and other local agencies, including the County, on how to attain and maintain the State standard for ozone and PM_{10} . The CAP presents a detailed description of the sources and pollutants which impact the jurisdiction, future air quality impacts to be expected under current growth trends, and an appropriate control strategy for reducing ozone precursor emissions, thereby improving air quality.

4.2.3 Thresholds of Significance

The significance of potential air quality impacts are based on thresholds identified by the County of San Luis Obispo in accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and standards established within the SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook (2009). The specifics of these guidelines are defined below.

4.2.3.1 County of San Luis Obispo

The following thresholds are used to determine significance with respect to air quality. Air quality impacts would be considered significant if the proposed project would:

- 1. Violate any state or federal ambient air quality standard, or exceed air quality emission thresholds as established by the County Air Pollution Control District;
- 2. Expose any sensitive receptor to substantial air pollutant concentrations;

- 3. Create or subject individuals to objectionable odors; or,
- 4. Be inconsistent with the District's Clean Air Plan.

4.2.3.2 SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook

According to the December 2009 CEQA Air Quality Handbook, project impacts may also be considered significant if one or more of the following special conditions apply:

- If the project has the ability to emit hazardous or toxic air pollutants in the close proximity of sensitive receptors, such that an increased cancer risk affects the population.
- If the project has the potential to emit diesel particulate matter in an area of human exposure, even if overall emissions are low.
- Remodeling or demolition operations where asbestos-containing materials will be encountered.
- If naturally occurring asbestos has been identified in the project area.
- If project has the ability to emit hazardous or toxic air pollutants in the close proximity of sensitive receptors, such as schools, churches, hospitals, etc.
- If the project results in a nuisance odor problem to sensitive receptors.

Significance of Short-term Construction Emissions

Heavy equipment and earth-moving operations can generate construction dust and combustion emissions. These may have substantial temporary impacts on local air quality. Fugitive dust emissions would result from land clearing, demolition, ground excavation, cut and fill operations, and equipment traffic. Combustion emissions, such as NO_x , and diesel particulate matter, are most significant when using large diesel fueled scrapers, loaders, dozers, haul trucks, compressors, generators, and other types of equipment. Because specific construction equipment information is often not available during the EIR process, the SLOAPCD has developed an alternative method for calculating construction emissions based on the amount of earthwork involved for a particular project. It may be necessary to calculate the project's construction impacts without knowing the exact fleet of construction equipment involved in the project. Table 4.2-2 contains screening construction emission rates based on the volume of soil moved and the area disturbed. This table should only be used when no other project information is available. Table 4.2-5 summarizes the level of emissions requiring mitigation.

Pollutant	Grams/Cubic Yard of Material Moved Material Moved				
Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM)	2.2	0.0049			
Reactive Organic Gases (ROG)	9.2	0.0203			
Oxides of Nitrogen (NOx)	42.4	0.0935			
Fugitive Dust (PM ₁₀)	0.75 tons/acre/month (assuming 22 of op	of construction activity peration per month)			

Table 4.2-2. Screening Emission Rates for Construction Operations

Source: County of San Luis Obispo, APCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 2009

	Threshold						
Pollutant	Daily (Ibs)	Quarterly Tier 1 (tons)	Quarterly Tier 2 (tons)				
ROG and NOx	137	2.5	6.3				
DPM	7	0.32					
Fugitive Particulate Matter	N/A 2.5 N/A						
Greenhouse Gases		Not Yet Established					

Table 4.2-3. Thresholds of Significance for Construction Operations

1. Daily and quarterly emission thresholds are based on the California Health & Safety Code and the CARB Carl Moyer Guidelines.

2. Any project with a grading area greater than 4.0 acres of worked area can exceed the 2.5-ton PM10 quarterly threshold.

Source: County of San Luis Obispo, APCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 2009

Mitigation of construction activities is required when the emission thresholds are equaled or exceeded by fugitive and/or combustion emissions:

ROG and NOx Emissions

- Daily: For construction projects expected to be completed in less than one quarter (90 days), exceedance of the 137 pounds per day (lbs/day) threshold requires Standard Mitigation Measures;
- Quarterly Tier 1: For construction projects lasting more than one quarter, exceedance of the 2.5 tons per quarter (ton/qtr) threshold requires Standard Mitigation Measures and Best Available Control Technology (BACT) for construction equipment. If implementation of the Standard Mitigation and BACT measures cannot bring the project below the threshold, off-site mitigation may be necessary; and,

 Quarterly – Tier 2: For construction projects lasting more than one quarter, exceedance of the 6.3 ton/qtr threshold requires Standard Mitigation Measures, BACT, implementation of a Construction Activity Management Plan (CAMP), and off-site mitigation.

Diesel Particulate Matter Emissions

- **Daily:** For construction projects expected to be completed in less than one quarter, exceedance of the 7 lbs/day threshold requires Standard Mitigation Measures;
- **Quarterly Tier 1:** For construction projects lasting more than one quarter, exceedance of the 0.13 ton/qtr threshold requires Standard Mitigation Measures, BACT for construction equipment; and,
- **Quarterly Tier 2:** For construction projects lasting more than one quarter, exceedance of the 0.32 ton/qtr threshold requires Standard Mitigation Measures, BACT, implementation of a CAMP, and off-site mitigation.

Fugitive Particulate Matter (PM10), Dust Emissions

• **Quarterly:** Exceedance of the 2.5 ton/qtr threshold requires Fugitive PM₁₀ Mitigation Measures and may require the implementation of a CAMP.

Special Conditions for Construction Activity

In addition to the construction air quality thresholds defined above, there are a number of special conditions, local regulations or state and federal rules that apply to construction activities. These conditions must be addressed in proposed construction activity and are summarized below.

Sensitive Receptors

The proximity of sensitive individuals (receptors) to a construction site constitutes a special condition and may require a more comprehensive evaluation of toxic diesel PM impacts and if deemed necessary by the SLOAPCD, more aggressive implementation of mitigation measures than described below in the diesel idling section. Areas were sensitive receptors are most likely to spend time include schools, parks and playgrounds, day care centers, nursing homes, hospitals, and residential dwelling unit(s). The types of construction projects that typically require a more comprehensive evaluation include large-scale, long-term projects that occur within 1,000 feet of a sensitive receptor location(s).

Permits

Portable equipment and engines 50 horsepower (hp) or greater, used during construction activities will require California statewide portable equipment registration (issued by the ARB) or an Air District permit.

Significance of Long-term Operational Emissions

To determine whether or not an analysis of long term operational emissions thresholds was necessary for the proposed project, Table 1-1 of the CEQA Air Quality handbook was consulted. Table 1-1 indicates projects (by type and size) that would typically exceed operational thresholds. Recreational projects identified in that table that most closely resemble the proposed project include "City Park." Based on the Table 1-1 of the handbook, a

City Park of 696 acres would generate operational emissions that would be expected to exceed SLOAPCD ozone precursor significance thresholds (25 lbs/day).

The threshold criteria established by the SLOAPCD to determine the significance and appropriate mitigation level for long-term operational emissions (i.e., vehicular and area source emissions) from a project are presented in Table 4.2-3. Emissions that equal or exceed the designated threshold levels are considered potentially significant and should be mitigated. As shown in the table, the level of analysis and mitigation recommended follows a tiered approach based on the overall amount of emissions generated by the project. For projects requiring air quality mitigation, the SLOAPCD has developed a list of both standard and discretionary mitigation strategies tailored to the type of project being proposed: residential, commercial, or industrial.

Dellutent	Threshold ¹				
Pollulant	Daily	Annual			
Ozone Precursors (ROG+NOx) ²	25 lbs/day	25 tons/year			
Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) ²	1.25 lbs/day	n/a			
Fugitive Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀), Dust	25 lbs/day	25 tons/year			
СО	550 lbs/day	n/a			
Greenhouse Gases (CO ₂ , CH ₄)	Not Yet E	stablished			

Table 4.2-4. Thresholds of Significance for Operational Emissions

1. Daily and annual emission thresholds are based on the California Health & Safety Code Division 26, Part 3, Chapter 10, §40918, and the CARB Carl Moyer Guidelines for DPM.

2. URBEMIS – use winter operational emission data to compare to operational thresholds.

Source: County of San Luis Obispo, APCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 2009

Ozone Precursor Emissions

- If the project's ozone precursor emissions are below the APCD's 25 lbs/day (combined ROG+NOx emissions) no ozone mitigation measures are necessary. The Lead Agency will prepare the appropriate, required environmental document(s).
- Projects that emit 25 lbs/day or more of ozone precursors (ROG+NOx combined) have the potential to cause significant air quality impacts, and should be submitted to the SLOAPCD for review. On-site mitigation measures, following the guidelines in §3.7 of the SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook 2009 (*Operational Emission*), are recommended to reduce air quality impacts to a level of insignificance.

If all feasible mitigation measures are incorporated into the project and emissions can be reduced to less than 25 lbs/day, then the Lead Agency will prepare the appropriate, required environmental document(s).

If all feasible mitigation measures are incorporated into the project and emissions are still greater than 25 lbs/day, then an EIR should be prepared. Additional mitigation

measures, including off-site mitigation, may be required depending on the level and scope of air quality impacts identified in the EIR.

 Projects which emit 25 tons/year or more of ozone precursor (ROG+NOx combined), require the preparation of an EIR. Depending upon the level and scope of air quality impacts identified in the EIR, mitigation measures, including off-site mitigation, may be required to reduce the overall air quality impacts of the project to a level of insignificance.

Diesel Particulate Matter Emissions

Diesel particulate matter (DPM) is seldom emitted from individual projects in quantities, which lead to local or regional air quality attainment violations. DPM is, however, a toxic air contaminant and carcinogen, and exposure DPM may lead to increased cancer risk and respiratory problems. Certain industrial and commercial projects may emit substantial quantities of DPM through the use of stationary and mobile on-site diesel-powered equipment as well diesel trucks and other vehicles that serve the project.

Projects that emit more than **1.25 Ibs/day** of DPM need to implement on-site Best Available Control Technology measures. If sensitive receptors are within 1,000 feet of the project site, a Health Risk Assessment (HRA) may also be required. Sections 3.5.1 and 3.6.4 of the SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook 2009 provide more background on HRAs in conjunction with CEQA review. Guidance on the preparation of a HRA may be found in the CAPCOA report *Health Risk Assessment for Proposed Land Use Projects* which can be downloaded from the CAPCOA website at www.capcoa.org.

Fugitive Particulate Matter (Dust) Emissions

Projects which emit more than **25 lbs/day** or **25 tons/year** of fugitive particulate matter need to implement permanent dust control measures to mitigate the emissions below these thresholds or provide suitable off-site mitigation approved by the APCD. Operational fugitive dust emissions from a proposed project are calculated using the URBEMIS model discussed in §3.6.1 of the SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook 2009. Typical sources of operational emissions included the following:

- **Paved roadways:** Vehicular traffic on paved roads that are used to accesses large residential, commercial, or industrial projects can generate significant dust emissions.
- Off and/or on-site unpaved roads or surfaces: Even at low traffic volume, vehicular traffic on unpaved roads or surfaces that are used to accesses residential, commercial, or industrial operations or that accesses special events, etc. can generate significant dust emissions.
- Industrial and/or commercial operations: Certain industrial operations can generate significant dust emissions associated with vehicular access, commercial or industrial activities.

Any of the above referenced land uses or activities can result in dust emissions that exceed the SLOAPCD significance thresholds, cause violations of an air quality standard, or create a nuisance impact in violation of SLOAPCD Rule 402 *Nuisance*. In all cases where such impacts are predicted, appropriate fugitive dust mitigation measures shall be implemented.

Carbon Monoxide Emissions

Carbon monoxide (CO) is a colorless, odorless, tasteless gas emitted during combustion of carbon-based fuels. While few land use projects result in high emissions of CO, this pollutant is of particular concern when emitted into partially or completely enclosed spaces such as parking structures and garages. Projects that emit more than 550 lbs/day of carbon monoxide (CO) and occur in a confined or semi-confined space (e.g., parking garage or enclosed indoor stadium) must be modeled to determine their significance. In confined or semi-confined spaces where vehicle activity occurs, CO modeling is required. If modeling shows the potential to violate the State CO air quality standard, mitigation or project redesign is required to reduce CO concentrations to a level below the health-based standard.

Guidelines for Applying ROG, NOx and PM10 Mitigation Measures

In general, projects that do not exceed the 25 lbs/day ROG+NOx threshold do not require mitigation. For projects that exceed this threshold, the SLOAPCD has developed a list of mitigation strategies for residential, commercial, and industrial projects. The project proponent may suggest alternate mitigation measures if the APCD suggested measures are not feasible. Project mitigation recommendations are summarized in Table 4.2-4.

	Mitigation Measures Recommended				
Combined ROG+NOx or PM10 Emissions (Ibs/day)	Residential, Commercial or Industrial	Off-Site Mitigation			
< 25	None	None			
25 – 29	8	*			
30 – 34	14	*			
35 – 50	18	*			
≥ 50	All Feasible	*			
≥ 25 ton/yr	All Feasible	Yes			

le
ł

* Will be dependent on the effectiveness of the mitigation measures, location of project and high vehicle dependent development. Examples of projects potentially subject to off-site mitigation include: rural subdivisions, drive-through applications, commercial development located far from urban core.

Source: County of San Luis Obispo, APCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 2009

The recommended standard air quality mitigation measures have been separated according to land use (i.e., residential, commercial and industrial), measure type (i.e., site design, energy efficiency and transportation) and pollutant reduced (i.e., ozone, particulate, diesel PM, and GHGs). Any project generating 25 lbs/day or more of ROG+NO_x or PM₁₀ should select the applicable number of mitigation measure as outlined above from Table 4.2-4 to reduce the air quality impacts from the project below the significance thresholds. Consult Table 3-5 of the SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook (2009) for a list of applicable mitigation measures.

4.2.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology

Through the scoping process, the SLOAPCD has recommended that a quantified air quality assessment be prepared for the proposed project. Long-term operational emissions were calculated by use of the URBEMIS air quality modeling program. Due to the programmatic nature of the project, and lack of grading plans and predicted construction schedule(s) for project actions, short-term construction impacts are qualitatively assessed.

The project components were also reviewed to identify whether or not SLOAPCD regulations regarding issues such as developmental burning and disturbance of naturally-occurring asbestos, among others, are relevant. Finally, the proposed project was evaluated for consistency with the County's CAP.

4.2.5 Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures

4.2.5.1 Violate Air Quality Standard or Exceed Emission Thresholds

Short-term Construction Emissions

During construction, the proposed project will generate air pollutants. The exhaust from construction equipment contains hydrocarbons, oxides of nitrogen, carbon monoxide, suspended particulate matter, and odors. The use of asphalt, concrete, and other chemicals during construction activities would emit organic gases and other potentially harmful compounds. However, the largest percentage of pollutants would be combustion emissions and windblown dust generated during excavation, grading, hauling, and various other activities. The impacts of these activities would vary each day as construction progresses. Dust and odors could potentially cause occasional annoyance and complaints from nearby residences. Total Suspended Particulate matter (TSP) will be the major air pollutant generated. Of particular concern will be PM_{10} , which is about 65% of TSP, and is considered a health hazard that can lead to respiratory ailments, especially in the young and the elderly, who are more prone to respiratory ailments.

Combustion Emissions (ROG and NOx) and Dust (PM10)

Implementation of the Master Plan would require grading and construction activities, which would result in the generation of air emissions. Vegetation removal and ground disturbance generates fugitive dust (PM_{10}). Operation of heavy construction equipment and transfer trucks, and potentially portable energy sources result in the emission of ROG, NOx, and diesel particulate matter.

Master Plan actions that would result in large areas of disturbance include the sports fields (10 acres), parking areas (4 acres), drainage basins (3 acres), trails and walkways (3 acres), and the community center (1 acre).

A screening analysis for the 10 acres of sports fields was conducted to identify if this project component would generate emissions exceeding SLOAPCD thresholds. Construction emissions were calculated using URBEMIS 2007 Version 9.2.4, pursuant to the SLOAPCD CEQA Handbook (2009). Construction emissions (winter) would be as follows (unmitigated):

	ROG	NOx	СО	PM ₁₀	PM₁₀ (Exhaust)	PM _{2.5} (Exhaust)	CO2
Winter (lbs/day)	26.54	67.88	29.92	50.02	3.17 2.91		4,036.64
Threshold (lbs/day)*	nreshold (lbs/day)* 137		n/a	n/a	7		N/a
Mitigation Required	N	0	n/a	n/a	No		n/a

Table 4.2-6. Estimated Construction Emissions – Sports Fields

*Source: County of San Luis Obispo, APCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 2009

As shown in Table 4.2-6, construction of the sports fields alone would not generate emissions exceeding SLOAPCD thresholds. Although implementation of the Master Plan would occur in phases, a screening analysis of the project as a whole was conducted to determine the maximum level of emissions generated during construction (refer to Table 4.2-7).

Table 4.2-7. Estimated Construction Emissions – Master Plan

	ROG	NOx	со	PM ₁₀	PM₁₀ (Exhaust)	PM _{2.5} (Exhaust)	CO ₂
Winter (lbs/day)	13.48	76.96	49.52	120.05	4.92 4.52		6,766.52
Threshold (lbs/day)*	13	37	n/a	n/a	7		N/a
Mitigation Required	N	0	n/a	n/a	Yes		n/a

*Source: County of San Luis Obispo, APCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, 2009

Based on the approximate area of disturbance, for each of these major actions, and consideration of the entire disturbance area (24 acres), grading and construction activities would not exceed SLOAPCD thresholds for ROG or NOx. The SLOAPCD has determined that any grading of 4 acres or more can exceed the 2.5 ton/qtr threshold for PM_{10} . San Luis Obispo County is currently in non-attainment for PM_{10} dust. Construction of the project under worst-case conditions would exceed the identified threshold for diesel exhaust particulates (refer to 4.2.5.3 below). In addition, sensitive receptors are present in the immediate area, including park users, residents, and occupants of the pre-school and library. Therefore, the generation of PM_{10} would result in a *potentially significant impact, which can be mitigated to less than significant* by implementation of standard dust control measures.

AQ Impact 1 Earth moving activities for development of the proposed project components would result in the generation of PM₁₀ (fugitive dust), resulting in a direct short-term impact.

AQ/mm-1 Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall ensure that all required PM₁₀ measures are shown on applicable grading or construction plans. In addition, the General Services Agency shall designate personnel to insure compliance and monitor the effectiveness of the required dust control measures (as conditions dictate, monitor duties may be necessary on weekends and holidays to insure compliance); the name and telephone number of the designated monitor(s) shall be provided to the SLOAPCD prior to construction. PM_{10} measures shall include:

- a. Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible;
- b. Use water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour (mph). Reclaimed (nonpotable) water should be used whenever possible;
- c. All dirt stock-pile areas should be sprayed daily as needed;
- d. Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans should be implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities;
- e. Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading should be sown with a fast-germinating native grass seed and watered until vegetation is established;
- f. All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the SLOAPCD;
- g. All roadways, parking areas, and pathways to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used;
- *h.* Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site;
- i. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with California Vehicle Code §23114.
- *j.* Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site;
- *k.* Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried on to adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water should be used where feasible;
- I. The General Services Agency shall designate a person or persons to monitor the fugitive dust emission and enhance the implementation of the measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints, reduce visible emission below 20% opacity, and to

prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SLOAPCD Compliance Division prior to the start of any grading, earthwork, or demolition.

Residual Impact

Implementation of this measure would reduce impacts associated with PM₁₀ (fugitive dust) to a *less than significant* level (Class II).

Long-term Operational Emissions

The proposed uses identified in the Master Plan would result in both stationary and mobile sources of air pollution, which together constitute project-related operational emissions. The stationary source emissions from these land uses would come from the consumption of natural gas, emissions from landscaping, and electricity. Mobile sources of air pollution are primarily the result of an increase in vehicle trips. Motor vehicles are a primary source of long-term emissions from many recreational land uses such as the proposed project. Recreational land uses often do not emit significant amounts of air pollutants directly, but cause or attract motor vehicle trips that do produce emissions. Such land uses are referred to as indirect sources.

Based on the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared for the EIR (Pinnacle Traffic Engineering 2010), given the project's description and intended use, it is appropriate to manually assign trip generation rates for each proposed use identified in the Master Plan.

Emission Quantification

Operational emissions for the proposed project have been quantified using the URBEMIS version 9.2.4 modeling program per SLOAPCD guidelines. The guidelines state that the thresholds be compared to the winter emission totals for "area" and "operational vehicle emissions" for impact determination; however, summer emissions are applied because the park will experience greater levels of use during the summer months. Table 4.2-8 provides daily and annual emission estimates using the URBEMIS modeling program. The URBEMIS results have been summarized for the various project components; daily and annual emission estimates were then compared to APCD thresholds to determine exceedance of APCD thresholds.

Commonant	Pollutants							
Component	ROG	NOx	со	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	CO ₂	
Ranger's Residence	0.07	0.09	0.80	0.00	0.11	0.02	58.40	
Pre-school	0.54	0.52	4.54	0.00	0.50	0.10	275.43	
Library	2.80	3.09	26.46	0.02	3.28	0.64	1,759.32	
City park (trails, open space, ampth.)	0.18	0.18	1.51	0.00	0.20	0.04	107.07	
Community Recreation Center	3.92	4.26	36.46	0.02	4.61	0.89	2,461.21	

Table 4.2-8. Estimated Operational + Area Source Emissions

Commonweat	Pollutants							
Component	ROG	NOx	со	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}	CO2	
Swimming pool / skate park	0.77	0.82	6.98	0.00	0.88	0.17	470.92	
Multi-use sports fields (soccer)	2.26	3.00	25.24	0.02	3.52	0.68	1,849.31	
Tennis courts	1.08	1.40	11.79	0.01	1.64	0.32	863.86	
Basketball courts	2.09	2.80	23.59	0.02	3.29	0.63	1,728.41	
Handball courts	0.43	0.56	4.72	0.00	0.66	0.13	345.68	
Baseball / softball fields	0.65	0.84	7.08	0.00	0.99	0.19	518.52	
Area Source Emissions	2.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Daily Total Project (Lbs/day)	17.69	17.56	149.17	0.09	19.68	3.81	10,438.13	
APCD Daily Threshold	ROG 25	+NOx: lbs	550 Lbs	NA	25 Lbs	NA	NA	
Exceed Daily Threshold?	Y	ES	NO	NA	NO	NA	NA	
Annual Emissions (tons)	3.41	3.51	29.06	0.00	3.59	0.69	1,872.24	
APCD Annual Threshold	ROG+NOx: 25 tons		NA	NA	25 tons	NA	NA	
Exceed Annual Threshold?	Ν	10	NA	NA	NO	NA	NA	

Since the proposed project would exceed the daily ROG+NOx combined threshold under "worse-case scenario" conditions (i.e., all facilities in operation and generating trips), mitigation measures must be implemented to offset project generated impacts. Based on the SLOAPCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook (December 2009), the amount of onsite standard plus discretionary measures required are based on by how much the project exceeds the identified threshold. Following the guidelines in §3.7 of the Handbook (*Operational Emission Mitigation*), the proposed project would fall within the 35-50 lbs/day range (ROG+NOx), requiring 18 standard onsite mitigation measures to reduce air quality impacts to a level of insignificance. Many of the measures listed in the Handbook are incorporated by nature into the Master Plan, including the following:

- Provide a pedestrian-friendly and interconnected streetscape to make walking more convenient, comfortable, and safe (including appropriate signalization and signage);
- Provide good access to/from the development for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users.
- Provide shade tree planting in parking lots to reduce evaporative emissions from parked vehicles.
- Pave and maintain the roads and parking areas.

- Construct bikeways and pedestrian walkways.
- Encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel to adjacent land uses.
- Provide onsite housing for employees (ranger residence).
- Develop recreational facility within one-quarter mile from site (adjacent residential area, school).
- AQ Impact 2 Operational and area source emissions resulting from operation of the project at build-out would exceed the SLOAPCD daily ROG and NOx combined threshold under worst-case conditions, resulting in a potentially significant impact.
- AQ/mm-2 Prior to construction of the community center, ranger residence, restrooms, and swimming pool, the following measures (or similar measures meeting the intent of energy efficiency) shall be incorporated into the building and landscaping plans to the maximum extent feasible:
 - a. Plan for a transit stop and associated amenities (i.e., covered turnout, direct pedestrian access, covered bench, smart signage, route information displays, and lighting);
 - b. Incorporate outdoor electrical outlets to encourage the use of electric appliances and tools.
 - c. Trusses for south-facing portions of roofs shall be designed to handle dead weight loads of standard solar photovoltaic panels. Roof design shall include sufficient south-facing roof surface, based on structures size and use, to accommodate adequate solar panels. For south-facing roof pitches, the closest standard roof pitch to the ideal average solar exposure shall be used.
 - d. Increase the building energy rating by 20% above Title 24 (2011) requirements. Measures used to reach the 20% rating cannot be double counted.
 - e. Plant drought tolerant, native deciduous shade trees along southern exposures of buildings to reduce energy use to cool buildings in summer and allow for solar warming in the winter. Maintain trees for the life of the project.
 - f. Utilize green building materials that are resource efficient, recycled, sustainable, and available locally if feasible.
 - g. Install high efficiency heating and cooling systems.
 - h. Orient building to be aligned north/south to reduce energy used to cool buildings in the summer.

- *i.* Design building to include roof overhangs that are sufficient to block the high summer sun, but not the lower winter sun, from penetrating south facing windows.
- *j.* Utilize high efficiency gas or solar water heaters, and energy efficient appliances.
- k. Utilize double paned windows.
- I. Utilize low energy exterior lighting.
- m. Utilize low energy efficient interior lighting.
- n. Utilize low energy traffic signals (i.e., light emitting diode).
- o. Install door sweeps and weather stripping if more efficient doors and windows are not available.
- p. Install energy-reducing programmable thermostats.
- q. Use roofing material with a solar reflectance values meeting the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/Department of Energy (DOE) Energy Star® rating to reduce summer cooling needs.
- *r.* Use native plants that do not require supplemental watering once established and are low ROG emitting.
- s. Provide and require the use of battery powered or electric landscape and turf maintenance equipment.
- t. Use clean engine technologies (e.g., alternative fuel, electrification) engines that are not subject to regulations.
- u. Provide valet bicycle parking at community event centers, as feasible.

Residual Impacts

Proposed grading, construction, and operational activities would generate air emissions, potentially exceeding identified thresholds. Implementation of identified mitigation would not eliminate air emissions; however, the concentration of pollutants would be reduced to below identified thresholds. Therefore, residual impacts will be *less than significant* (Class II).

4.2.5.2 Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations

Combustion Emissions Diesel Particulate Matter

During construction activities, idling heavy equipment emits DPM, which the SLOAPCD considers toxic, and a potential public health risk. Due to the estimated area of disturbance for both major actions and the total area, grading and construction activities would not exceed DPM emission thresholds identified by the SLOAPCD. However, several sensitive receptors are present in the immediate vicinity, including visitors within the park itself, the day care center, school, and residences. Therefore, the short-term generation of DPM would result in a

potentially significant impact, which can be mitigated to less than significant by implementation of standard measures. The project would not result in the use, storage, or generation of toxic air pollutants such that an increased cancer risk would affect identified sensitive receptors or the population.

- AQ Impact 3 Grading and construction activities for development of the proposed project components would result in the emission of diesel particulate matter, potentially affecting sensitive receptors, and resulting in an indirect short-term impact.
- AQ/mm-3 Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall ensure that all idling restrictions are shown on applicable grading and construction plans:
 - a. Staging and queuing areas shall not be located within 1,000 feet of offsite sensitive receptors;
 - b. Diesel idling within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors is not permitted (i.e., the operators shall turn the equipment off when there is a break in the work that the equipment is accomplishing);
 - c. Use of alternative fueled equipment is recommended whenever possible; and,
 - d. Signs that specify the no idling requirements must be posted and enforced at the construction site.

Residual Impact

Implementation of identified mitigation would not eliminate diesel particulate emissions; however, direct effects to sensitive receptors would be avoided. Therefore, residual impacts will be *less than significant* (Class II).

Asbestos Containing Material

The EPA considers asbestos to be a hazardous air pollutant. Proper handling of asbestos containing material (ACM) is necessary to avoid or minimize public exposure. Demolition and remodeling activities associated with the proposed project, including removal and relocation of park amenities and infrastructure, may result in the exposure of persons to asbestos containing material, resulting in a *potentially significant impact, which can be mitigated to less than significant* by implementation of standard measures.

- AQ Impact 4 Demolition and remodeling activities associated with construction of proposed project elements may result in the exposure of ACM, resulting in an indirect short-term impact.
- AQ/mm-4 Prior to removal or demolition of any buildings or utility pipes, the General Services Agency shall provide evidence they have contacted SLOAPCD to determine: a) what regulatory jurisdictions apply to the proposed demolition, such as the National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP; 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 61, Subpart M – Asbestos); b) District notification requirements; c) the need for an asbestos

survey conducted by Certified Asbestos Inspector; and d) applicable removal and disposal requirements of the asbestos-containing material.

Residual Impact

Exposure of ACM may occur during project construction. Implementation of identified mitigation would contain and remove hazardous air pollutants, and reduce impacts associated with ACM to a *less than significant* level (Class II).

Naturally-Occurring Asbestos Exposure

The project site has been identified by the SLOAPCD as an area that has the potential to contain naturally occurring asbestos. Construction and development of the project could result in an exposure of naturally occurring asbestos due to earthwork, resulting in a *potentially significant impact, which can be mitigated to less than significant* by implementation of standard measures.

- AQ Impact 5 Earth moving activities for development of the proposed project components would result in grading activities that may expose naturally occurring asbestos, resulting in an indirect short-term impact.
- AQ/mm-5 Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall:
 - a. Conduct a geologic analysis to ensure the presence/absence of serpentine rock onsite. The geologic analysis shall identify if naturally occurring asbestos is contained within the serpentine rock onsite; and, if found, the applicant must comply with all requirements outlined in the Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measures (ATCM). In addition, the applicants shall work with the SLOAPCD to prepare a SLOAPCD-approved Asbestos Health and Safety Program and an Asbestos Dust Control Plan prior to development plan approval.

Residual Impact

Exposure of naturally-occurring asbestos may occur during project construction. Implementation of identified mitigation would contain and remove hazardous air pollutants, and reduce impacts associated with naturally-occurring asbestos to a *less than significant* level (Class II).

4.2.5.3 Create or Subject Individuals to Objectionable Odors

The proposed project does not include any elements what would generate objectionable odors. Use and operation of additional restrooms, standard landscaping and turf management, and use of picnic areas would generate odors typical of existing conditions. This impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III) and no mitigation is required.

4.2.5.4 Consistency with SLOAPCD Clean Air Plan

In the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the SLOAPCD recommends evaluating consistency with the CAP by evaluating the following questions:

Are the population projections used in the plan or project equal to or less than those used in the most recent CAP for the same area?

The proposed project is a recreational facility intended to serve the existing and future populations. The proposed project would not have a direct or indirect effect on local or regional populations. This question is not relevant to the proposed project.

Is the rate of increase in vehicle trips and miles traveled less than or equal to the rate of population growth for the same area?

The proposed project may attract some vehicle trips that would have previously gone to another recreational facility but would also generate additional trips. Trips would not increase at a rate faster than the rate of population growth.

Have all applicable land use and transportation control measures and strategies from the CAP been included in the plan or project to the maximum extent feasible?

The project consists of improvements to an existing park, which would provide recreational opportunities and alternative transportation linkage within an urban area. The project incorporates applicable CAP control measures and strategies by locating improvements within the existing park, in close proximity to residential and commercial areas. The NCP Master Plan promotes walking and bicycling by improving safe access into the park, and providing path linkages to bike paths and sidewalks.

Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Clean Air Plan. The impact would be *less than significant* (Class III).

4.2.6 Cumulative Impacts

The cumulative study area for air quality impacts is the South Central Coast Air Basin (SCCAB). The project would contribute criteria pollutants to the SCCAB during project construction and long-term operational use, including ozone precursors and particulate matter. A number of large development projects are currently under review by the County, including mixed use, residential, and commercial projects in the immediate area. These projects may be under construction simultaneously with certain elements of the project, and in the long-term, would be generating similar air emissions due to increased traffic trips and energy use.

Depending on construction schedules and actual implementation of projects in the area, generation of fugitive dust and pollutant emissions during construction could result in substantial short-term increases in air pollutants. This would be a contribution to short-term cumulative air quality impacts. Analysis conducted specifically for this project concluded that the build-out of the Master Plan would contribute to cumulative long-term operational air quality impacts because it is projected to exceed the daily ROG+NO_x threshold. However, with implementation of mitigation measures, the project's contribution to cumulative air quality impacts would be *less than significant*, and no additional mitigation is necessary.

In addition, the project would provide additional recreational facilities within one to five miles of proposed residential developments within Nipomo, and would be accessible via alternative transportation, including pedestrian walkways and bicycle paths, which may reduce cumulative air emissions in the area.

4.3 **BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

This section of the Program EIR evaluates potential impacts to biological resources within the NCP, which would result in the phased construction of recreation facilities and related infrastructure over a 20-year timeframe. This analysis has taken into consideration sensitive habitats, plant, and animal species that are either known to occur, or have the potential to occur, within the proposed project area. This analysis evaluates potential short- and long-term impacts to biological resources, based on the proposed recreational opportunities, including the expansion of existing facilities, the addition of new facilities to the park, active recreational uses including multi-use sports fields, passive recreational uses and open space, and improvements to infrastructure. For those instances where potential impacts to sensitive biological resources may occur, mitigation measures and best management practices (BMPs) have been proposed with the objective of avoiding or minimizing impacts.

The information presented within this section is based on a compilation of several previous biological studies conducted within the project area by SWCA biologists in 2004, and field verification surveys conducted in 2010. The primary documents used in preparation of this section include the following:

- Constraints Analyses for the Nipomo Regional Park; Morro Group, Inc., 2004.
- California Red-Legged Frog Habitat Assessment for the Nipomo Regional Park; Morro Group, Inc., 2004.

4.3.1 Existing Conditions

The approximately 140-acre NCP consists of recreationally developed areas located primarily within the southern and eastern portion of the site, with undeveloped areas dominated by native plant communities occupying the remaining areas. The 12-acre Nipomo Native Garden includes trails and planted areas with paved trails/walkways and dirt/spur trails. The garden is in the final stages of being restored to a native botanical garden which will feature native plant communities endemic to the Nipomo Mesa and dunes complex. Public recreation within the 22-acre Mesa Meadows open space area includes a Class I bicycle path and contiguous equestrian trail. The trail system travels past non-native and native (planted) vegetation, and connects into the trail system of the NCP.

4.3.1.1 Soils

The NCP contains sandy soils, and elevations range from 337 to 425 feet. The soils map in the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, California, Coastal Part (1984) delineates two soil units as present within the project site: Oceano Sand, 0% to 9% slopes, and Oceano Sand, 9% to 30% slopes.

4.3.1.2 Plant Communities and Habitat Types

Plant communities and habitat types were classified according to the *Preliminary Description* of *Terrestrial Natural Communities of California* (Holland 1986) and the *California Department* of Fish and Game (CDFG) List of California Terrestrial Natural Communities Recognized by the Natural Diversity Data Base (CDFG 2007). Plant species observed were identified based on The Jepson Manual: Higher Plants of California (Hickman 1993) and Vascular Plants of San Luis Obispo County (Hoover 1970).

Five natural plant communities and habitat types were identified within the NCP, including coastal scrub, oak woodland, maritime chaparral, annual grassland, and ruderal/disturbed areas. Ornamental/developed areas (i.e., windrows of pine and eucalyptus trees, turf areas, and ball fields) are also present in the recreationally developed eastern portion of the park and along the Mesa Meadows bike trail. Several drainage basins are present in the developed areas of the site. The location of plant communities within the park property is shown on Figure 4.3-1.

Maritime Chaparral

Maritime chaparral consists of variable, thick-leaved shrubs of moderate to high cover, dominated by chamise (*Adenostoma fasciculatum*) and manzanita (*Arctostaphylos* spp.) and found on well drained sandy soils in areas subject to summer fog (Holland, 1986). This plant community survives at scattered locations in southern San Luis Obispo and northern Santa Barbara Counties.

Maritime chaparral is located predominately along the margins of oak woodland (refer to Appendix D; Photo 1 and Figure 4.3-1) and coastal scrub plant communities in the NCP and; therefore, has plant associates from these two communities. Plants observed within this plant community include chamise, coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), sand mesa manzanita (*Arctostaphylos rudis*), coffeeberry (*Rhamnus californica*), coyote brush (*Baccharis pilularis*), black sage (*Salvia mellifera*), California sage (*Artemisia californica*), poison oak (*Toxicodendron diversilobum*), and bush monkeyflower (*Mimulus aurantiacus*). Sand mesa manzanita (refer to Appendix D; Photo 2) is considered a California Native Plant Society (CNPS) List 1B.2 plant species. The locations of maritime chaparral and sand mesa manzanita specimens within the park are shown on Figure 4.3-1.

Avian and reptile species observed in central maritime chaparral include scrub jay (*Aphelocoma californica*), northern mockingbird (*Mimus polyglottos*), California thrasher (*Toxostoma redivivum*), bushtit (*Psaltriparus minimus*), California towhee (*Pipilo crissalis*), spotted towhee (*Pipilo maculatus*), white-crowned sparrow (*Zonotrichia leucophrys*), western whiptail (*Cnemidophorus tigris*), and western fence lizard (*Sceloporus occidentalis*).

Oak Woodland

Oak woodlands within the NCP and Nipomo Native Garden feature coast live oak as the dominant evergreen tree. This plant community can often be from 30 to 75 feet in height and establish dense canopies (Holland 1986; Holland and Keil 1995). The shrub layer is typically poorly developed, but may include species such as toyon (*Heteromeles arbutifolia*) and poison oak. The herbaceous layer is continuous and dominated by oak leaf litter and often introduced species such as veldt grass (*Ehrharta calycina*) and ripgut brome (*Bromus diandrus*). Oak woodlands typically grow on north-facing slopes and within shaded ravines, intergrading with coastal scrub and chaparral communities on xeric (dry) sites and coast live oak forest or mixed evergreen forest on mesic (moist) sites (Holland 1986).

Plants observed within oak woodland habitat in the NCP include coast live oak, California blackberry (*Rubus ursinus*), hummingbird sage (*Salvia spathacea*), and poison oak. Numerous mature coast live oak trees (>5 inches diameter breast height [dbh]) occur in this plant community as well as within ornamental/developed portions of the park (refer to Appendix D; Photo 3 and Figure 4.3-1).



Figure 4.3-1. Habitat and Special-status Species Map

This page intentionally left blank.

Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report Oak woodland and its understory offers excellent habitat for a variety of wildlife species, including foraging habitat for coyote (*Canis latrans*), gray fox (*Urocyon cinereoargenteus*), mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*), bobcat (*Lynx rufus*), and nesting and foraging habitat for raptors and a variety of song birds. Wildlife observed in oak woodland habitat within the NCP includes scrub jay, Northern flicker (*Colaptes auratus*), acorn woodpecker (*Melanerpes formicivorus*), oak titmouse (*Baeolophus inornatus*), chestnut-backed chickadee (*Poecile rufescens*), Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperi*), red-shouldered hawk (*Buteo lineatus*), western fence lizard, and bobcat. Additional occurrences noted by the public include rabbits and mountain lion. Several Monterey dusky-footed woodrat (*Neotoma fuscipes luciana*) middens were observed in oak woodland habitat within the park. Monterey dusky-footed woodrat and Cooper's hawk are both California Species of Special Concern (SSC).

Coastal Scrub

Coastal scrub communities consist of shrubs approximately 3 to 6 feet high, restricted to areas along the coast and extending inland for a few miles. Along the central coast of California, these communities may be sparsely vegetated to dense, and typically lack grassy openings that are more commonly associated with northern coastal scrub (Holland 1986). While coastal scrub typically grows on exposed, often south-facing slopes with rocky soils (Holland 1986), localized stands of coastal scrub tend to occupy xeric (dry) sites with shallow soils and may occur on a variety of substrates, including sandstone, diatomite, and serpentinite (Holland and Keil 1995). Most growth occurs in late winter and spring, and flowering is concentrated in spring and early summer but may continue throughout the year (Holland 1986). Characteristic species include coyote brush, California sagebrush, bush monkeyflower, and sage (*Salvia* spp.).

Plants observed within this community in the NCP include mock heather (*Ericameria ericoides*), deerweed (*Lotus scoparius*), silver lupine (*Lupinus chamissonis*), coyote brush, veldt grass, California sagebrush, and telegraph weed (*Heterotheca grandiflora*) (refer to Appendix D; Photo 4 and Figure 4.3-1).

Wildlife observed within this plant community includes western fence lizard, California towhee, California thrasher, white-crowned sparrow, black phoebe (*Sayornis nigricans*), and Anna's hummingbird (*Calypte anna*). One white-tailed kite was observed flying over the large coastal scrub area located west of the ball fields, and community members have noted other occurrences within NCP. White-tailed kite is a fully protected (FP) species.

Annual Grassland

Annual grasslands typically include a composition of both non-native and native grasses. Valley and southern coastal grasslands composed of mainly Mediterranean species are common in California and consist of a dense to sparse cover of annual grasses approximately 8 to 20 inches high (Holland 1986; Holland and Keil 1995). Annual grassland communities are often associated with numerous species of wildflowers, especially in years of favorable rainfall. Germination occurs with the onset of late fall rains and growth, flowering, and seed-set occurs from winter through spring. The plants typically die during the summer to fall dry season and persist as seeds until the growing season.

Plants observed within the community include veldt grass, brome (*Bromus* spp.), filaree (*Erodium* spp.), rattail fescue (*Vulpia myuros*), and short-pod mustard (*Hirschfeldia incana*) (refer to Appendix D, Photo 5 and Figure 4.3-1). Wildlife observed in this plant community includes California ground squirrel, pocket gopher, western meadowlark (*Sturnella neglecta*),

and western fence lizard. Several red-tailed hawks were also observed flying over annual grassland habitat located west and south of the existing ball fields.

Annual grasslands provide foraging habitat for small mammals such as the vole (*Microtus* sp.), white-footed mouse (*Peromyscus* spp.), California mouse (*Peromyscus* californicus), Botta's pocket gopher (*Thomomys bottae*), and California ground squirrel (*Spermophilus beecheyi*), as well as predators that feed on them, such as coyote, and raptors, including sharp-shinned hawk (*Accipiter striatus*), red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*), red-shouldered hawk (*Buteo lineatus*), white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*), and great horned owl (*Bubo virginianus*).

Ruderal/Disturbed Areas

Ruderal vegetation is usually found in disturbed areas that have been significantly altered by construction, landscaping, or other types of land-clearing activities. Ruderal habitats often occur along roadsides and fence-lines, near developments, and in other areas experiencing severe ground surface disturbance. Plants found within this habitat are typically introduced Mediterranean species that exhibit clinging seeds, adhesive stems, and rough leaves that assist their invasion and colonization of disturbed lands. Plants observed in the ruderal areas include veldt grass, brome, filaree, rattail fescue, and short-pod mustard (refer to Appendix D; Photo 6 and Figure 4.3-1).

Ruderal areas typically do not support sensitive species habitat, although if soil conditions allow, sensitive plant species can grow in such areas. Sensitive wildlife species may occasionally forage in ruderal habitats. Wildlife found in ruderal areas includes species tolerant of disturbance, such as western fence lizard, and California ground squirrel.

Ornamental/Developed Areas

As previously stated, ornamental/developed areas (i.e., windrows of pine and eucalyptus trees, turf areas, and ball fields) are present in the recreationally developed eastern portion of the park and along the Mesa Meadows bike trail. Windrows consist of trees planted for wind protection and are generally associated with agriculture and urban landscapes. Windrows of Monterey pine (*Pinus* spp.) and eucalyptus trees (*Eucalyptus* spp.) are present in the recreationally developed eastern portions of the park and along the Mesa Meadows bike path. Several ball fields with turf grass are also present in the eastern portions of the park. Several mature coast live oak trees are also present in the landscaped areas of the site.

Windrows and landscaped areas have limited wildlife habitat value other than roosting and nesting habitat for various bat, bird, and raptor species. Birds observed foraging in ornamental/developed areas within the park include killdeer (*Charadrius vociferus*), yellow-rumped warbler (*Dendroica coronata*), dark-eyed junco (*Junco hyemalis*), scrub jay, bushtit, American crow (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*), house sparrow (*Passer domesticus*), and red-tailed hawk.

4.3.2 Survey Methods and Results

The description and analysis of special-status biological resources within the project area is based on the results of a California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) query for records of special-status species that are known to occur within the region. The records search included the following nine 7.5-minute U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) quadrangle maps: Nipomo, Twitchell Dam, Santa Maria, Oceano, Arroyo Grande NE, Guadalupe, Huasna Peak, Caldwell
Mesa, and Tar Springs Ridge. In addition to the CNDDB query, the CNPS *Online Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants of California* (2010) was also reviewed to provide additional information on rare plants that are known to occur in the area. Following the literature review, SWCA Biologist Barrett Holland conducted field verification surveys on March 4 and March 5, 2010. The verification survey focused on mapping the location of sand mesa manzanita specimens and dusky-footed woodrat nests within the NCP. All observed plant and animal species were documented during the survey.

This section addresses all special-status species known to occur in the nine surrounding USGS quadrangles queried in 2010 (CNDDB 2010). Special-status taxa that are known to occur, or have the potential to occur in the project area were also identified through a review of relevant literature (CNPS 2010; Zeiner et al. 1988; 1990a, 1990b), previous biological studies in the area, and surveys conducted by SWCA biologists.

4.3.2.1 Sensitive Communities

Sensitive communities include wetlands and other habitats listed by CDFG, the County, or other resource agencies as meriting protection or further study due to their rarity or value. Of the plant communities and habitat types identified within the NCP, only maritime chaparral is considered sensitive by CDFG (CNDDB 2010). Maritime chaparral survives at scattered locations in southern San Luis Obispo and northern Santa Barbara Counties.

Oak woodland within the NCP falls under standard County mitigation guidelines for tree removal and are protected under Senate Bill (SB) 1334 (Kuehl bill). The Kuehl bill mandates mitigation for impacted oak woodland and is administered by the county. Other sensitive habitats known to occur within the investigated USGS quadrangles include central foredunes, southern vernal pool, coastal and valley freshwater marsh, and central dune scrub. These communities are confined to specific coastal locations and are not present within the NCP.

4.3.2.2 Special-Status Species

Several species known to occur within, or in the vicinity of the project area, are accorded "special-status" designation because of their recognized rarity or vulnerability to various causes of habitat loss or population decline. Some of these receive specific protection defined in federal or State endangered species legislation. Others have been designated as "sensitive" on the basis of adopted policies and expertise of State resource agencies or organizations with acknowledged expertise, or policies adopted by local governmental agencies such as counties, cities, and special districts to meet local conservation objectives. These species are referred to collectively as "special-status species" in this EIR, a collective term indicating some level of local, state or federal concern for populations or habitats.

Special-status Plant Species

The following section describes those special-status plant species which have been documented within an approximate 10-mile radius of the project area. For the purposes of this section, special-status plant species are defined as the following:

 Plants listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) (50 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 17.12 for listed plants and various notices in the Federal Register for proposed species).

- Plants that are candidates for possible future listing as threatened or endangered under the ESA (Federal Register Vol. 73, No. 238, pp. 75175-75244, December 10, 2008).
- Plants that meet the definitions of rare or endangered species under CEQA (State CEQA Guidelines, §15380).
- Plants considered by the CNPS to be "rare, threatened, or endangered" in California (Lists 1B and 2 in California Native Plant Society, 2006).
- Plants listed by CNPS as plants about which we need more information and plants of limited distribution (Lists 3 and 4 in California Native Plant Society, 2006).
- Plants listed or proposed for listing by the State of California as threatened or endangered under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR] 670.5).
- Plants listed under the California Native Plant Protection Act (California Fish and Game Code 1900 et seq.).
- Plants considered sensitive by other Federal agencies (i.e., United States Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management), state and local agencies, or jurisdictions.

Based on the literature review for this project, a total of 35 sensitive plant species have been documented in a 10-mile radius of the project area (refer to Table 4.3-1). Because the plant species list presented in Table 4.3-1 is regional, an analysis of the range and habitat preferences of those species was conducted to identify which special-status plant species have the potential to occur within the project area. This analysis considered existing habitat, elevation, results of previous surveys conducted for other projects, and soils within the project area. The analysis determined that 17 sensitive plant species had potential to occur in NCP based on existing habitat. The remaining 18 plant species were eliminated from consideration based on lack of suitable habitat and/or soils on-site, and previous negative survey results (Morro Group 2004). Survey results determined that sand mesa manzanita was the only special-status plant species present within the NCP. These specimens occur at sporadic locations throughout the park (refer to Table 4.3-1 and Figure 4.3-1). For a complete listing of vascular flora observed within the NCP, Nipomo Native Garden, and Mesa Meadows, please refer to Appendix D.

Special-status Wildlife

For the purposes of this section, special-status animal species are defined as the following:

- Animals listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under the ESA (50 CFR 17.11 for listed animals and various notices in the Federal Register for proposed species).
- Animals that are candidates for possible future listing as threatened or endangered under the ESA (Federal Register Vol. 73, No. 238, pp. 75175-75244, December 10, 2008).
- Animals that meet the definitions of rare or endangered species under the CEQA (State CEQA Guidelines, §15380).

- Animals listed or proposed for listing by the State of California as threatened and endangered under the CESA (14 CCR 670.5).
- Animal species of special concern to the CDFG (Remsen 1978, for birds; Williams 1986, for mammals).
- Animal species that are fully protected in California (California Fish and Game Code, §3511 [birds], §4700 [mammals], and §5050 [reptiles and amphibians]).

Based on a CNDDB query, a review of existing literature and the local experience of SWCA biologists, a total of 32 special-status wildlife species have been documented or have the potential to occur within the reviewed USGS quadrangles (refer to Table 4.3-2). Because this list of species is regional, an analysis of the range and habitat preferences of those species was conducted to identify which sensitive wildlife species have the potential to occur within the project study area given the existing habitat. As a result of the analysis conducted by SWCA it was determined that seven sensitive wildlife species had potential to occur within, or directly adjacent to NCP. The remaining 24 species were eliminated from consideration based on lack of suitable habitat conditions on or adjacent to the site. Numerous woodrat nests are present in the oak woodland and maritime chaparral areas on the project site. Nests are likely those of the common dusky-footed woodrat (*Neotoma fuscipes macrotis*). The project area also has the potential to support migratory nesting birds. For a complete listing of wildlife observed within NCP, Nipomo Native Garden, and Mesa Meadows, please refer to Appendix D.

Table 4.3-1. Special-statu	s Plant Species	Evaluated for	Occurrence on	the Project Site
----------------------------	-----------------	----------------------	---------------	------------------

Species Name	Federal/ State/CNPS Status & Threat Code	General Habitat Description	Blooming Period	Rationale for Expecting Presence or Absence
Hoover's bent grass <i>Agrostis hooveri</i>	/ / 1B.2	Stoloniferous herb. Occurs in chaparral, cismontane woodland, valley and foothill grassland; usually sandy soils. Elevation 6 – 610 meters.	April – July	Habitat Present / Occurrence not expected: Suitable habitat and soils are present on the project site; however, this species was not observed during surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
Santa Lucia manzanita Arctostaphylos luciana	/ / 1B.2	Shrub. Occurs in chaparral and cismontane woodland; usually on shale soils. Elevation 35 – 850 meters.	February – March	Habitat Absent / No Species Occurrence: Chaparral and oak woodland habitat was observed on the project site; however, the appropriate soils are not present on the project site for this species.
Santa Margarita manzanita Arctostaphylos pilosula	/ / 1B.2	Shrub. Occurs in closed coniferous forest, chaparral, and cismontane woodland; usually on shale soils. Elevation 170 – 1100 meters.	December – March	Habitat Absent / No Species Occurrence: Chaparral and oak woodland habitat was observed on the project site; however, the appropriate soils are not present on the project site for this species. This species occurs at higher elevations and was not observed on the project site.
Sand mesa manzanita Arctostaphylos rudis	/-1B.2	Shrub. Occurs in chaparral and coastal scrub in Lompoc and Nipomo area; usually on sandy soils. Elevation 25 – 230 meters.	November – February	Present: Suitable habitat was observed on the project site. Several individuals were observed in the oak woodland and chaparral/coastal scrub areas on the site.
Well's manzanita Arctostaphylos wellsii	/ / 1B.1	Shrub. Occurs in closed cone coniferous forests and chaparral; usually on sandstone. Elevation 30 – 400 meters.	December – May	Habitat Absent / No Species Occurrence: Chaparral habitat was observed on the project site; however, the appropriate soils are not present on the project site for this species.

Species Name	Federal/ State/CNPS Status & Threat Code	General Habitat Description	Blooming Period	Rationale for Expecting Presence or Absence
Marsh sandwort Arenaria paludicola	FE / SE / 1B.1	Perennial herb. Occurs in freshwater marshes; usually with saturated acidic bog soils. Elevation 3 – 170 meters.	May – August	Habitat Absent / No Species Occurrence: Suitable habitat and soils are not present on the project site. This species was not observed during surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
Miles' milk vetch Astragalus didymocarpus var. milesianus	/ / 1B.2	Annual herb. Occurs in coastal scrub habitat. Elevation 20 – 90 meters.	March – June	Habitat Present / Species not observed: Suitable habitat and soils are present on the project site; however, this species was not observed during surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period in 2010 and in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
Davidson's saltscale Atriplex serenana var. davidsonii	/ / 1B.2	Annual herb. Occurs in coastal bluff scrub and coastal scrub. Elevation 10-200 meters	April - October	Habitat Present / Occurrence not expected: Although coastal scrub habitat is present on the project site, this species was not observed during surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
San Luis Obispo mariposa lily <i>Calochortus</i> <i>obispoensis</i>	/ / 1B.2	Perennial herb. Occurs in chaparral, coastal scrub, and grassland communities on serpentine soils. Elevation 75 – 730 meters.	May – July	Habitat Absent/ No Species Occurrence Although chaparral, coastal scrub and grassland habitat was observed on the project site, the appropriate soils were not present. This species was not observed during surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).

 Table 4.3-1. Special-status Plant Species Evaluated for Occurrence on the Project Site

Table 4.3-1. Special-status	Plant Species Evaluated for	r Occurrence on the Project Site
-----------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------

Species Name	Federal/ State/CNPS Status & Threat Code	General Habitat Description	Blooming Period	Rationale for Expecting Presence or Absence
Palmer's mariposa lily <i>Calochortus palmeri</i> var. <i>palmeri</i>	/ / 1B.2	Bulbiferous herb. Occurs in broadleafed upland forest, chaparral, and meadows and seeps. Elevation 1,000 – 2,390 meters.	April - July	Habitat Absent/ No Species Occurrence: This species occurs at higher elevations than the project site and was not observed during surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
Cambria morning- glory <i>Calystegia subacaulis</i> ssp. <i>episcopalis</i>	/ / 1B.2	Rhizomatous herb. Occurs in chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal prairie. Elevation 60 – 500 meters.	April – June	Habitat Present / Occurrence not expected: Suitable habitat is present on the project site; however, this species was not observed during surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
San Luis Obispo owl's clover Castilleja densiflora ssp. obispoensis	/ / 1B.2	Annual herb. Occurs in valley and foothill grasslands. Elevation 10 – 400 meters.	March – May	Habitat Present / Species not observed: Grassland habitat is present on the project site; however, this species was not observed during surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period in 2010 and in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
Brewer's spineflower Chorizanthe breweri	/ / 1B.3	Annual herb. Occurs in closed coniferous forest, chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub; usually on gravelly or rocky serpentinite soils. Elevation 45 – 800 meters.	April – August	Habitat Absent / Occurrence not expected: Habitat was observed on the project site; however the appropriate soils were not present. This species was not observed during surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).

Species Name	Federal/ State/CNPS Status & Threat Code	General Habitat Description	Blooming Period	Rationale for Expecting Presence or Absence
Straight-awned spineflower <i>Chorizanthe</i> <i>rectispina</i>	/ / 1B.3	Annual herb. Occurs in chaparral, cismontane woodland, and coastal scrub habitats. Elevation 85 – 1,035 meters.	May – July	Habitat Present / Occurrence not expected: Habitat was observed on the project site; however the appropriate soils were not present. This species was not observed during surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
La Graciosa thistle <i>Cirsium loncholepis</i>	FE / ST / 1B.1	Perennial herb. Occurs in coastal wetlands with dunes. Elevation 4 – 220 meters.	May – August	Habitat Absent / No Species Occurrence: Suitable habitat was not observed on the project site. This species was not observed during surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
Surf thistle Cirsium rhothophilum	/ ST / 1B.2	Perennial herb. Occurs in coastal bluff scrub and coastal dune habitats. Elevation 3 – 60 meters.	April – June	Habitat Absent / No Species Occurrence: Suitable habitat was not observed on the project site. This species occurs at lower elevations than the project site.
California saw-grass Cladium californicum	/ / 2.2	Rhizomatous herb. Occurs in meadows and seeps, and marshes and swamps; usually alkaline or freshwater. Elevation 60 – 600 meters.	June – September	Habitat Absent / No Species Occurrence: Suitable habitat and soils were not observed on the project site.
Pismo clarkia Clarkia speciosa ssp. immaculata	FE / SR / 1B.1	Annual herb. Occurs in sandy soils, openings in chaparral, cismontane woodland, and valley and foothill grassland. On ancient sand dunes not far from the coast. Elevation 25-185 meters.	May – July	Habitat Present / Occurrence not expected: Habitat was observed on the project site; however, this species was not observed during surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).

 Table 4.3-1. Special-status Plant Species Evaluated for Occurrence on the Project Site

Table 4.3-1. Special-status	s Plant Species Ev	aluated for Occurrence	e on the Project Site
-----------------------------	--------------------	------------------------	-----------------------

Species Name	Federal/ State/CNPS Status & Threat Code	General Habitat Description	Blooming Period	Rationale for Expecting Presence or Absence
Leafy tarplant Deinandra increscens ssp. foliosa	/ / 1B.2	Annual herb. Occurs in valley and foothill grasslands. Elevation 300 – 500 meters.	June – September	Habitat Absent / No Species Occurrence: Grassland habitat is present on the project site; however, this species occurs at higher elevations.
Gaviota tarplant Deinandra increscens ssp. villosa	FE/SE/1B.1	Annual herb that occurs in coastal scrub, valley and foothill grassland, and coastal bluff scrub. Elevation 35-430 meters.	May-October	Habitat Present / Occurrence not expected: Habitat was observed on the project site; however, this species was not observed during surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
Dune larkspur Delphinium parryi ssp. blochmaniae	/ / 1B.2	Perennial herb. Occurs in chaparral and coastal dune habitats (maritime). Elevation 0 – 200 meters.	April – May	Habitat Present / Occurrence not expected: Habitat was observed on the project site; however, this species was not observed during surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
Umbrella larkspur Delphinium umbraculorum	/ / 1B.3	Perennial herb. Occurs in cismontane woodland. Elevation 400 – 1600 meters.	April – June	Habitat Absent / No Species Occurrence: Oak woodland habitat was observed on the project site; however, this species occurs at higher elevations than the project site. This species was not observed during surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
Beach spectaclepod <i>Dithyrea maritima</i>	/ ST / 1B.1	Rhizomatous herb. Occurs in coastal dune and coastal scrub habitats with sandy substrate. Elevation 3 – 50 meters.	March – May	Habitat Present / Species not observed: Suitable habitat and soils were observed on the project site; however, this species occurs at lower elevations and was not observed during the appropriate blooming period in 2010 and 2004 (Morro Group 2004).

Species Name	Federal/ State/CNPS Status & Threat Code	General Habitat Description	Blooming Period	Rationale for Expecting Presence or Absence
Mouse grey dudleya Dudleya abramsii ssp. murina	/ / 1B.3	Perennial herb. Occurs in chaparral, cismontane woodland valley, and foothill grassland (serpentinite). Elevation 90 – 440 meters.	May – June	Habitat Absent / No Species Occurrence: Chaparral, grassland and oak woodland habitat was observed on the project site; however, serpentinite soils are not present. This species was not observed during surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
Blochman's leafy daisy <i>Erigeron blochmaniae</i>	/ / 1B.2	Perennial rhizomatous herb. Occurs in coastal dune habitats with sandy substrate. Elevation 3 – 45 meters.	July – August	Habitat Present / Occurrence not expected: Suitable dune habitat was not observed on the project site. This species occurs at lower elevations than the project site. This species was not observed during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
Mesa horkelia Horkelia cuneata ssp. puberula	/ / 1B.1	Perennial herb. Occurs in chaparral, cismontane woodland, coastal scrub on sandy/gravelly soils. Elevation 70 – 810 meters.	February – July	Habitat Present / Species not Observed: Suitable habitat and sandy soils were observed on the project site; however, this species was not observed during the appropriate blooming period in 2010 and 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
Kellogg's horkelia <i>Horkelia cuneata</i> ssp. <i>sericea</i>	/ / 1B.1	Perennial herb. Occurs in closed-cone coniferous forest, chaparral (maritime), and coastal scrub with sandy or gravelly openings. Elevation 10 – 200 meters.	April – September	Habitat Present / Occurrence not expected: Suitable habitat and sandy soils were observed on the project site; however, this species was not observed during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).

 Table 4.3-1. Special-status Plant Species Evaluated for Occurrence on the Project Site

Table 4.3-1. Special-status	Plant Species Evaluated for	r Occurrence on the Project Site
-----------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------------

Species Name	Federal/ State/CNPS Status & Threat Code	General Habitat Description	Blooming Period	Rationale for Expecting Presence or Absence
San Luis Obispo County lupine <i>Lupinus ludovicianus</i>	/ / 1B.2	Perennial herb. Occurs in chaparral and cismontane woodland on sandstone or sandy soils. Elevation 50 – 525 meters.	April – July	Habitat Present / Occurrence not expected: Suitable habitat and sandy soils were observed on the project site; however, this species was not observed during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
Nipomo Mesa lupine <i>Lupinus nipomensis</i>	FE /SE /1B.1	Annual herb. Occurs in coastal dunes. Endemic to San Luis Obispo on dry sandy flats, restricted to back dunes, associated with central dune scrub habitat. Elevation 33 – 165 feet.	December-May	Habitat Absent / No Species Occurrence: Suitable habitat was not present on the project site. The site is out of the species' elevational range and was not observed during surveys conducted during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
Crisp monardella <i>Monardella crispa</i>	/ / 1B.2	Rhizomatous herb. Occurs in coastal dunes and coastal scrub with sandy soils. Elevation 10 – 120 meters.	April – August	Habitat Present / Occurrence not expected: Suitable habitat and sandy soils were observed on the project site; however, this species was not observed during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
San Luis Obispo monardella <i>Monardella frutescens</i>	/ / 1B.2	Rhizomatous herb. Occurs in coastal dunes and coastal scrub with sandy soils. Elevation 10 – 200 meters.	May – September	Habitat Present / Occurrence not expected: Suitable habitat and sandy soils were observed on the project site; however, this species was not observed during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).
Gambel's watercress Nasturtium gambelii	FE / ST / 1B.1	Rhizomatous herb. Occurs in freshwater and brackish marshes, swamps and the borders of lakes. Elevation 5 – 451 meters.	April – September	Habitat Absent / No Species Occurrence: Suitable habitat was not present on the project site. This species was not observed during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).

Species Name	Federal/ State/CNPS Status & Threat Code	General Habitat Description	Blooming Period	Rationale for Expecting Presence or Absence	
Short-lobed broomrape <i>Orobanche parishii</i> ssp. <i>brachyloba</i>	/ / 4.2	Perennial herb parasitic. Occurs in coastal bluff scrub, coastal dunes, and coastal scrub (sandy). Elevation 3 – 305 meters.	April – October	Habitat Present / Occurrence not expected: Suitable habitat and sandy soils were observed on the project site; however, this species was not observed during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).	
Black-flowered figwort Scrophularia atrata	/ / 1B.2	Perennial herb. Occurs in closed cone conifer forest, chaparral, coastal dune, coastal scrub, and riparian scrub habitats. Diatomaceous shales. Elevation 10 – 500 meters.	March – July	Habitat Absent / No Species Occurrence: Chaparral habitat was observed on the project site; however, the appropriate soils were not present. This species was not observed during the appropriate blooming period in 2010 or in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).	
San Bernardino aster Symphyotrichum defoliatum	//1B.2	Rhizomatous herb. Occurs in cismontane woodland, coastal scrub, and foothill grassland near ditches and springs. 2-2,040 meters.	July-November	Habitat Absent / No Species Occurrence: Chaparral, oak woodland and grassland habitat was observed on the project site; however, the appropriate soils were not present. This species was not observed during the appropriate blooming period in 2004 (Morro Group 2004).	
Natural Communities of Concern					
Central dune scrub	A back dune pla develop conside <i>Lupinus chamis</i>	ant community characterized by low growing, drou erable cover. Diagnostic species include <i>Ericame</i> <i>sonis</i> .	Habitat Absent / No Potential for Occurrence: Project site is not located on the coast and does not support any dune habitats.		
Central foredunes	A foredune plan including <i>Abron</i> tidal action.	t community characterized by scattered low grow ia sp. Ambrosia sp. and Cackile sp. Usually occur	ing perennial plants rring in areas exposed to	Habitat Absent / No Potential for Occurrence: Project site is not located on the coast and does not support any dune habitats.	

 Table 4.3-1. Special-status Plant Species Evaluated for Occurrence on the Project Site

Table 4.3-1. Special-status Plant Species Evaluated for Occurrence on the Project Site

Species Name	Federal/ State/CNPS Status & Threat Code	General Habitat Description	Blooming Period	Rationale for Expecting Presence or Absence
Maritime chaparral	A variable scru Arctostaphylos subject to sum	able scrub community of moderate to high cover dominated by various staphylos or Ceanothus species. Found on well drained sandy soils in areas ct to summer fog.		Present: This habitat was observed on the property.
Coastal and valley freshwater marsh	A wetland community that is found in areas of permanently or prolonged freshwater saturation without significant current or flow. Vegetation is dominated by perennial emergent monocots including cattails and rushes.		Habitat Absent / No Potential for Occurrence: This habitat was not observed on the project site.	
Southern vernal pool	A wetland comm brachyantherum Plagiobothrys tra	→ stland community dominated by plant species such as <i>Juncus bufonius, Hordeum</i> shyantherum, Gnaphalium palustre, Eleocharis spp., Crassula aqautica, and giobothrys trachycarpa.		Habitat Absent / No Potential for Occurrence: This habitat was not observed on the project site.

General references: CDFG 2008, Hickman (ed.) 1993, Munz 1974, CNDDB 2008

Status Codes:

Federal:	California Native Plant Society (CNPS):
FE = Federally Endangered	List 1B = rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere.
FT = Federally Threatened	List 2 = rare, threatened, or endangered in California, but more common elsewhere.
FP = Federally Protected	List 4 = A watch list. Species are of limited distribution or infrequent.
State:	Threat Code:
SE = State Endangered	.1 = Seriously endangered in California (over 80% of occurrences threatened / high degree and
ST = State Threatened	immediacy of threat)
SR = State Rare	.2 = Fairly endangered in California (20-80% occurrences threatened)

.3 = Not very endangered in California (<20% of occurrences threatened or no current threats known)

Species Name	Habitat and Distribution	Legal Status Federal/State/CDFG	Rationale for Expecting Presence or Absence	
Amphibians				
California tiger salamander Ambystoma californiense	Vernal pools within grassland or oak woodlands; require seasonal water, ground squirrel burrows, or other underground refuges.	FT//SSC	Species not observed or expected to occur: The project site does not contain suitable vernal pool habitat or underground refuges suitable for California tiger salamanders.	
Arroyo toad Anaxyrus californicus	Semi-arid areas near washes and intermittent streams including desert washes, and valley-foothill riparian and desert riparian areas.	FE//SSC	Species not observed or expected to occur: The project site does not contain suitable wash/riparian habitat for Arroyo toad.	
California red-legged frog Rana draytonii	Aquatic habitats with little or no flow and surface water depths to at least 2.3 feet. Presence of fairly sturdy underwater supports such as cattails.	FT//SSC	Species not observed or expected to occur: The project site does not contain aquatic pool habitat or underground refuges suitable for California red-legged frog.	
Western spadefoot Spea hammondii	Inhabits vernal pools primarily in grassland, but also in valley and foothill hardwood woodlands. Requires seasonal pools for breeding and egg- laying.	//SSC	Species not observed or expected to occur: The project site does not contain vernal pool habitat.	
Coast Range newt Taricha torosa torosa	Coastal drainages from Mendocino County to San Diego County. Resides in terrestrial habitats and migrates up to 1 km to breed in slow moving streams, ponds, and reservoirs. Frequents terrestrial habitats such as oak woodlands.	//SSC	Species not observed or expected to occur: Suitable stream and pond habitat is not present on the project site. Though oak woodland habitat is present, coast range newts are not expected to use the site.	
Birds				
sharp-shinned hawk Accipiter striatus	Occurs in ponderosa pine, black oak, deciduous riparian areas, mixed conifer, and Jeffrey pine habitats. North facing slopes with plucking perches and close proximity to water (within 275 feet).	MBTA//	Potential for Occurrence (Low): Suitable roosting and foraging habitat conditions exists within the oak woodland and coastal scrub areas. Species not observed on the site.	

Table 4.3-2. Special-status Wildlife Species Evaluated for Occurrence on the Project Site

|--|

Species Name	Habitat and Distribution	Legal Status Federal/State/CDFG	Rationale for Expecting Presence or Absence
Tricolored blackbird Agelaius tricolor	(Nesting colony); requires open water, protected nesting substrate, and foraging area with insect prey.	//SSC	Species not observed or expected to occur: Suitable habitat and foraging areas were not observed for tricolored blackbird.
Burrowing owl <i>Athene cunicularia</i>	Open, dry grasslands, deserts, and scrublands. Subterranean nester, dependent upon burrowing mammals.	MBTA/ /SSC	Species not observed or expected to occur: Though grassland habitat is present on the project site, suitable open areas with burrowing mammals was not observed for burrowing owl.
Western snowy plover Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus	Occurs on sandy beaches, salt pond levees, and shores of large alkali lakes. Needs sandy, gravelly, or friable soils for nesting.	MBTA, FT//SSC	Species not observed or expected to occur: Suitable habitat was not observed on the project site.
white-tailed kite <i>Elanus leucurus</i>	Open grasslands, meadows, or marshlands for foraging close to isolated trees for nesting and perching.	MBTA / / FP	Potential for Occurrence (Moderate <u>to</u> <u>High</u>): One white-tailed kite was observed flying over the large coastal scrub area located west of the ball fields. Suitable roosting and foraging habitat was also observed on the project site. <u>Community</u> <u>members have noted observances within</u> <u>NCP.</u>
Prairie falcon <i>Falco mexicanus</i>	Occurs in dry, open terrain that is level or hilly and breeds on cliffs.	MBTA//	Potential for Occurrence (Low): Suitable roosting and foraging habitat was observed on the project site. However, suitable nesting habitat is not present. Species not observed on the site.
California condor Gymnogyps californianus	Occurs in open savannahs, grasslands, and foothill chaparral, in mountain ranges with moderate altitudes. Nest in deep canyons on rock walls with clefts.	FE/SE/	Species not observed or expected to occur: Suitable habitat was not observed on the project site.

Species Name	Habitat and Distribution	Legal Status Federal/State/CDFG	Rationale for Expecting Presence or Absence
California black rail Laterallus jamaicensis coturnniculus	Occurs most commonly in tidal emergent wetlands dominated by pickleweed, or in brackish marshes supporting bulrushes in association with pickleweed. In freshwater, usually found in bulrushes, cattails, and saltgrass. Usually found in immediate vicinity of tidal sloughs.	MBTA/ST/	Species not observed or expected to occur: Suitable habitat was not observed on the project site.
California least tern Sternula antillarum browni	Largely a coastal species that feed on fish and nest on sandy dunes or beaches. Once a common species in California; currently nesting colonies are isolated to Southern California and scattered Bay Area beaches.	FE/SE/	Species not observed or expected to occur: Suitable habitat was not observed on the project site
Class Aves Other migratory bird species (nesting)	Maritime chaparral, windrow and willow riparian forest may provide nesting habitat for migratory birds	MBTA//	Potential for Occurrence (High): Potential nesting habitat occurs throughout the project site. <u>Community members have</u> <u>noted occurrence of several raptors and</u> <u>other bird species within NCP.</u> Pre- disturbance nesting bird surveys are recommended prior to any grading or vegetation removal.
Fish			
Tidewater goby Eucyclogobius newberryi	Occurs in brackish shallow lagoons and lower stream reaches where water is fairly still, but not stagnant.	FE//SSC	No Potential for Occurrence: Suitable aquatic habitat is not present on the project site.
Arroyo chub <i>Gila orcutti</i>	Occurs in slow water streams with mud or sand bottoms and feeds on aquatic vegetation and the associated invertebrates.	//SSC	No Potential for Occurrence: Suitable aquatic habitat is not present on the project site.
South-central California coast steelhead ESU Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus	Clear, cool water with abundant in-stream cover, well-vegetated stream margins, relatively stable water flow, and a 1:1 pool-to-riffle ratio.	FT, PCH / /SSC	No Potential for Occurrence: Suitable aquatic habitat is not present on the project site.

Table 4.3-2. Special-status Wildlife Species Evaluated for Occurrence on the Project Site

Table 4.3-2. Special-status Wildlife Species Evaluated for Occurrence on the Project Site

Species Name	Habitat and Distribution	Legal Status Federal/State/CDFG	Rationale for Expecting Presence or Absence			
Gastropods	Gastropods					
Mimic tyronia Tyronia imitator	Coastal lagoons, estuaries, and salt marshes; found only in permanently submerged areas.	/SA/	No Potential for Occurrence: Suitable aquatic habitat is not present on the project site.			
Insects						
Oso Flaco robber fly Ablautus schlingeri	Occurs in sand dunes.	/SA/	Species not observed or expected to occur: Suitable habitat was not observed on the project site			
Oso Flaco flightless moth Areniscythris brachypteris	Open, coastal sand dune slopes in San Luis Obispo County.	/SA/	Species not observed or expected to occur: Suitable habitat was not observed on the project site			
Oso Flaco patch butterfly Chlosyne leanira elegans	Sand dune habitat around Oso Flaco Lake, San Luis Obispo County. Distribution corresponds to its food plant <i>Castilleja affinis</i> .	/SA/	Species not observed or expected to occur: Suitable habitat was not observed on the project site			
Sandy beach tiger beetle Cicindela hirticollis gravida	Coastal areas adjacent to non-brackish water; clean, dry light-colored sand in the upper zone.	/SA/	Species not observed or expected to occur: Suitable habitat was not observed on the project site			
Monarch butterfly Danaus plexippus	Occurs along the coast from northern Mendocino to Baja California, Mexico. Winter roosts in wind protected tree groves (eucalyptus, Monterey pine and cypress), with nectar and water sources nearby.	/SA/	Species not observed or expected to occur: Suitable habitat was not observed on the project site. Existing Monterey pine and eucalyptus windrows are not dense enough to provide roosting habitat for this species.			
White sand bear scarab beetle <i>Lichnanthe albipilosa</i>	Inhabits coastal dunes of San Luis Obispo County, in the vicinity of dune lakes.	/SA/	Species not observed or expected to occur: Suitable habitat was not observed on the project site			

Species Name	Habitat and Distribution	Legal Status Federal/State/CDFG	Rationale for Expecting Presence or Absence	
Morro Bay blue butterfly Plebejus icarioides moroensis	Found in coastal dunes and adjacent habitat.	/SA/	Species not observed or expected to occur: Suitable habitat was not observed on the project site	
Mammals				
pallid bat Antrozous pallidus	Prefers rocky outcrops, cliffs, and crevices with access to open habitats for foraging. Day roosts are in caves, crevices, mines, and occasionally in hollow trees and buildings. Night roosts may be in more open sites, such as porches and buildings.	//SSC	Potential for Occurrence (Moderate): Suitable roosting habitat was observed on the project site. Species not observed on the site.	
Monterey dusky-footed woodrat <i>Neotoma fuscipes luciana</i>	Occurs in coastal central California in habitats that exhibit a moderate vegetative canopy, with a brushy understory. Builds nests of sticks and leaves at the base of, or within, a tree or shrub, or at the base of a hill. Primarily feeds on woody plants, but also eats fungi, flowers, grasses, and acorns.	//SSC	Potential for Occurrence (High): Suitable Conditions Present – numerous woodrat nest are present in the oak and chaparral areas. Nests are likely those of the common dusky-footed woodrat (<i>Neotoma fuscipes macrotis</i>). <u>Members</u> of the community have noted observances within the park.	
American badger <i>Taxidea taxus</i>	Occurs in open stages of shrub, forest, and herbaceous habitats; needs uncultivated ground with friable soils.	//SSC	Species not observed or expected to occur: Though friable soils, and shrub, forest and herbaceous habitats are present on the project site, burrows capable of supporting this species were not observed.	
Reptiles				
western pond turtle Actinemys marmorata	Quiet waters of ponds, lakes, streams, and marshes. Typically in the deepest parts with an abundance of basking sites.	/ /SSC	No Potential for Occurrence: Suitable aquatic habitat is not present on the project site.	

Table 4.3-2. Special-status V	Vildlife Species Evaluated for	Occurrence on the Project Site
-------------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------

Table 4.3-2. Special-status Wildlife	Species Evaluated for	Occurrence on the Project Sit	e
--------------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------	---

Species Name	Habitat and Distribution	Legal Status Federal/State/CDFG	Rationale for Expecting Presence or Absence
Silvery legless lizard Anniella pulchra pulchra	Sandy or loose loamy soils with high moisture content under sparse vegetation.	/-/SSC	Potential for Occurrence (Moderate): Suitable habitat (sandy soils) is present on the project site. This species was not observed during the field visit; however, community members have noted observances.
two-striped garter snake Thamnophis hammondii	Inhabits perennial and intermittent streams with rocky beds bordered by dense vegetation. May also utilize stock ponds and other artificially-created aquatic habitats	/-/SSC	No Potential for Occurrence: Suitable stream habitat is not present on the project site.
Coast horned lizard Phrynosoma coronatum	Frequents a wide variety of habitats including maritime chaparral. Most commonly occurring in lowlands along sandy washes with scattered low bushes.	/-/SSC	Potential for Occurrence (Moderate): Suitable habitat is present on the project site. This species was not observed during surveys; however, based on personal observations by horseback riders in the NCP <u>and other community members</u> , this species has been observed in the warmer summer months.

Status Codes

--= No status

Federal:

FE = Federal Endangered

- FT = Federal Threatened
- FC = Federal Candidate
- **CH** = Federal Critical Habitat
- **PCH** = Proposed Federal Critical Habitat
- **MBTA** = Protected by Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act

State:

SE = State Endangered

California Department of Fish and Game: SSC = State Species of Concern

FP = Fully Protected Species

SA = Not formally listed but included in CDFG "Special Animal" List.

4.3.3 Regulatory Setting

4.3.3.1 Federal Policies and Regulations

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act of 1977

Pursuant to §404 of the Clean Water Act (33 United States Code [USC] 1344), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is responsible for the issuance of permits for the placement of dredged or fill material into "Waters of the United States." As defined by USACE at 33 CFR 328.3(a)(parts 1-6), the following summarizes Waters of the United States:

"Those waters that are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible to use in interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide; tributaries and impoundments to such waters; all interstate waters including interstate wetlands; and territorial seas."

Waters of the United States are typically identified by the presence of an Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) and connectivity to traditional navigable waters or other jurisdictional features. If a project would result in dredge or fill of USACE jurisdictional waters, the project would be subject to USACE review under §404 of the Clean Water Act. Based on the site characteristics, the proposed construction of recreation facilities would not be subject to §404 of the Clean Water Act.

Section 401 of the Clean Water Act of 1977

Section 401 of the Clean Water Act and its provisions ensure that federally permitted activities comply with the federal Clean Water Act and state water quality laws. Section 401 is implemented through a review process that is conducted by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB), and is triggered by the §404 permitting process. The RWQCB certifies via the §401 process that a proposed project complies with applicable effluent limitations, water quality standards, and other conditions of California law. Evaluating the effects of the proposed project on both water quality and quantity falls under the jurisdiction of the RWQCB. Based on the site characteristics, the proposed construction of recreation facilities would not be subject to §401 of the Clean Water Act.

Federal Endangered Species Act

The ESA of 1973 provides legislation to protect federally-listed plant and animal species. Impacts to listed species resulting from the implementation of a project would require the responsible agency or individual to formally consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries) to determine the extent of impact to a particular species. If USFWS or NOAA Fisheries determine that impacts to a federally-listed species would likely occur, alternatives and measures to avoid or reduce impacts must be identified. USFWS and NOAA Fisheries also regulate activities conducted in federal critical habitat, which are geographic units designated as areas that support primary habitat constituent elements for listed species. The proposed construction of recreation facilities is not expected to affect any species protected by the ESA; therefore, coordination with USFWS or NOAA Fisheries is not necessary.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) protects all migratory birds, including their eggs, nests, and feathers. The MBTA was originally drafted to put an end to the commercial trade in bird feathers, popular in the latter part of the 1800s. The MBTA is enforced by the USFWS, and potential impacts to species protected under the MBTA are evaluated by the USFWS in consultation with other federal agencies. The proposed construction of recreation facilities has potential to impact nesting bird species that are protected by the MBTA. Pre-disturbance nesting bird surveys are recommended to avoid impacts to nesting birds.

4.3.3.2 State Policies and Regulations

California Endangered Species Act

The CESA ensures legal protection for plants listed as rare or endangered, and wildlife species formally listed as endangered or threatened, and also maintains a list of SSC. SSC status is assigned to species that have limited distribution, declining populations, diminishing habitat, or unusual scientific, recreational, or educational value. Under state law, the CDFG is empowered to review projects for their potential to impact special-status species and their habitats. Under CESA, CDFG reserves the right to request the replacement of lost habitat that is considered important to the continued existence of CESA protected species. The project is not anticipated to affect any species listed under the CESA; however, several SSC species could be affected by the project including Monterey dusky-footed woodrat, silvery legless lizard (*Anniella pulchra pulchra*), and Coast horned lizard (*Phrynosoma coronatum*). Avoidance measures are recommended to avoid any adverse effects on SSC species.

California Fish and Game Code

California Fish and Game Code §3511 includes provisions to protect Fully Protected species, such as: (1) prohibiting take or possession "at any time" of the species listed in the statute, with few exceptions; (2) stating that "no provision of this code or any other law shall be construed to authorize the issuance of permits or licenses to "take" the species; and (3) stating that no previously issued permits or licenses for take of the species "shall have any force or effect" for authorizing take or possession. The CDFG is unable to authorize incidental take of "fully protected" species when activities are proposed in areas inhabited by those species. §§3503 and 3503.5 of the Fish and Game Code state that it is unlawful to take, possess, or destroy the nest or eggs of any bird, with occasional exceptions. In addition, §3513 states that it is unlawful to take or possess any migratory bird as designated in the MBTA or any part of such migratory birds except as provided by rules and regulations under provisions of the MBTA.

CDFG also manages the California Native Plant Protection Act of 1977 (Fish and Game Code §1900, et seq.), which was enacted to identify, designate and, protect rare plants. In accordance with CDFG guidelines, CNPS 1B list plants are considered "rare" under the Act, and are evaluated in CEQA documents. Several specimens of sand mesa manzanita, a CNPS list 1B.2 listed plant species, occur throughout the NCP (refer to Figure 4.3-1).

Other Sections of the Fish and Game Code

Fully Protected species may not be taken or possessed without a permit from the Fish and Game Commission and/or CDFG. Information on these species can be found within §3511 (birds), §4700 (mammals), §5050 (reptiles and amphibians), and §5515 (fish) of the Fish and

Game Code. The white-tailed kite is a Fully Protected species that was observed foraging over the NCP.

Senate Bill 1334 Oak Woodlands Conservation

Under SB 1334 county governments are responsible for conserving oak woodlands within their jurisdiction. During the CEQA review process, SB 1334 requires County governments to determine if a proposed project would result in the conversion of oak woodland. If the County determines that the proposed project would result in the conversion of oak woodland, the County is mandated to require implementation of specified mitigation as outlined in an oak woodland management plan. In San Luis Obispo County, oak woodlands are defined as areas containing greater than 10% oak canopy cover. The County oak management plan defines conversion as cutting or removing 10% or more of the oak woodland canopy or removing more than 10 oak trees. The proposed project would result in the conversion of oak woodland; therefore, is subject to mitigation as mandated by SB1334 and the County oak management plan.

4.3.4 Thresholds of Significance

The significance of potential biological impacts is based on County of San Luis Obispo thresholds, in accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. Biological impacts would be considered significant if the proposed project would:

- 1. Result in a loss of unique or special status species or their habitats;
- 2. Reduce the extent, diversity, or quality of native or other important vegetation;
- 3. Impact wetland or riparian habitat;
- 4. Introduce barriers to movement of resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or factors, which could hinder the normal activities of wildlife.

4.3.5 Impact Assessment and Methodology

Impact assessment focused on identifying potential project-related impacts associated with implementation of the project, and was based on details presented within the project description. Identified impacts represent a reasonable worst case scenario based on the provided conceptual project plans and preliminary grading plans for the tract improvements. Potential impacts were expected to occur where proposed construction or development activities would result in temporary or permanent modification of sensitive communities or habitats occupied by special-status species. Impacts to biological resources within the study area were evaluated by determining the sensitivity, significance, or rarity of each resource that would be adversely affected by the proposed project, and thresholds of significance were applied to determine if the impact constituted a significant impact. The significance threshold may be different for each habitat or species and is based on the resource's rarity or sensitivity and the level of impact that would result from the proposed project. Where potential project-related impacts to sensitive resources were identified, measures for avoiding or minimizing adverse effects to these resources were recommended.

4.3.6 Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Potential impacts were identified where proposed project activities would result in temporary or permanent modification of habitats that could be used by special-status species. Potential impacts were also identified for proposed activities could result in direct "take" of special-status species. Where potential project-related impacts to biological resources were identified, mitigation measures for avoiding or minimizing adverse effects to these resources have been recommended in the following sections.

4.3.6.1 Unique or Special Status Species or their Habitats

Construction of the project would result in permanent impacts to plant communities, which provide habitat for special-status plant and animal species, including sand mesa manzanita, silvery legless lizard, coast horned lizard, Monterey dusky-footed woodrat and white-tailed kite. Approximately 1.22 acres of maritime chaparral would be impacted by the construction of the new trails and the widening of Osage Street. Several sand mesa manzanita specimens occur in this plant community and could be impacted as a result of the work. Construction of the new sports fields and the widening of Osage Street would result in the removal of 1.12 acres of oak woodland habitat, and could result in the removal of approximately 20 mature oak trees. Silvery legless lizards and Monterey dusky-footed woodrats/middens could be affected by the work proposed in oak woodland habitat. The new sports field areas would result in a loss of 13.14 acres of coastal scrub within the NCP. Silvery legless lizards and coast horned lizards are known to occur in coastal scrub habitats and could be affected by the removal of this habitat. The construction of equestrian facilities, the proposed community center and picnic areas would result in a loss of 6.7 acres of annual grassland and 2.94 acres of ruderal habitat. Though these habitats provide marginal habitat for coast horned lizard and silvery legless lizards, these species could potentially be found in these areas, and would be directly affected by habitat loss. In addition to the biological mitigation site proposed south of Camino Caballo, the County could coordinate with the Nipomo Native Garden to implement habitat restoration within the garden and other natural areas of the NCP.

- BIO Impact 1 Implementation of the proposed project would directly impact natural communities that provide habitat for special-status plant and wildlife species.
- BR/mm-1 **Prior to all ground-disturbing activities within sensitive areas**, a qualified biologist shall provide pre-construction training to all workers involved in site activities. This training shall consist of instruction on special-status species with potential to occur on the property and their habitats. Workers shall be instructed as to appropriate contacts and how to proceed if special-status species are observed on the project site.

Special-Status Plants

Sand Mesa Manzanita

BR/mm-2 **Prior to site disturbance**, the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall prepare a Special-status Plant Mitigation Plan that provides for the propagation, planting, and monitoring of sand mesa manzanita at a 5:1 replacement ratio if it is determined that these specimens cannot be avoided during construction activities. The mitigation plan shall detail methods for transplanting, propagating, planting, and maintaining the special-status

plant species that would be impacted. The replant area should be located at the biological mitigation receptor site (5.6 acres). To ensure the success of any planted or transplanted individuals, the mitigation program will include monitoring and reporting guidelines.

Special-Status Wildlife Species

Silvery Legless Lizard and Coast Horned Lizard

BR/mm-3 A biological monitor qualified to capture and move legless lizards and coast horned lizards shall be present during all initial ground-disturbing activities, such as grading, excavation and vegetation removal. Improvements within the existing park infrastructure are not expected to impact these species, however, construction associated with the construction of the proposed field sport, basins, equestrian facilities, trails, picnic, and community center areas shall require a biological monitor. The monitor shall capture and relocate silvery legless lizards and Coast horned lizards disturbed during tree clearance vegetation clearing and initial site grading. In addition, the monitor shall rake loose soil within oak woodlands, coastal scrub and maritime chapparal prior to excavation to find and move legless lizards. Efforts shall focus on relocation of silvery legless lizards and Coast horned lizards to safe habitat outside disturbance areas.

Monterey Dusky-Footed Woodrat

- BR/mm-4 **Prior to all ground-disturbance within Maritime Chaparral and Oak Woodland Habitat for proposed trail work,** the following measures shall be implemented to minimize adverse impacts to Monterey dusky-footed woodrat. Removal of the woodrat nest would result in adverse impacts to the individuals occupying the nests. If future site improvements would impact any of the observed woodrat nests, the applicant <u>shall</u> implement the following minimization measures.
 - a. A County-approved biologist <u>shall</u> assist in the removal of the nest after September 1 and before February 15. <u>Nest removal shall be</u> <u>avoided during the breeding season, to avoid separation of mothers</u> <u>from their young.</u> Under supervision of the biologist, the operators should remove all vegetation and other woodrat shelter within the area that surround the woodrat nest to be removed.
 - b. Upon completion of clearing the adjacent woodrat shelter, the operator should gently nudge the intact nest with equipment or long handled tools. The operators should place their equipment within the previously cleared area and not within undisturbed woodrat shelter area. The objective is to alarm the woodrats so that they evacuate the nest and scatter away from the equipment and into undisturbed habitat.
 - c. Once the woodrats have evacuated the nest, the operator should gently pick up the structure with a front loader and move it to the nearest undisturbed habitat. The objective of moving the structure is to provide the displaced woodrats with a stockpile of material to

scavenge while they build a new nest; consequently, jeopardizing the integrity of the structure is not an issue.

Residual Impact

Implementation of preconstruction surveys, construction crew training, and biological monitoring would avoid direct disturbance of special status wildlife to the maximum extent feasible. In the event sand mesa manzanita cannot be avoided, implementation of restoration would occur to mitigate the loss of individual plants. With implementation of the above mitigation measures, indirect impacts associated with potential loss of special-status species would be considered *less than significant with mitigation* (Class II).

4.3.6.2 Native or Other Important Vegetation

Direct and permanent impacts to various habitats are expected to result from the proposed construction of recreation facilities. A discussion of impacts to habitats follows, and anticipated impacts to habitats are shown in Figure 4.3-1 and quantified in Table 4.3-3.

Habitat Type	Total Acres	Acres Affected
Maritime Chaparral	14.60	1.22
Oak Woodland	130.14	1.12
Coastal Scrub	27.37	13.14
Annual Grassland	13.56	6.71
Ruderal	4.13	2.94
Ornamental/Developed	20.76	0.30
Pine	14.06	2.45
Eucalyptus	0.33	0.19
Total	224.95	28.07

Table 4.3-3. Habitat Impacts

Maritime Chaparral

Maritime chaparral is considered a sensitive plant community by CDFG. As shown in Figure 4.3-1, this plant community covers approximately 14.60 acres within the NCP. The proposed trail work has the potential to impact 1.22 acres of intact maritime chaparral. Disturbance and removal of this habitat type would primarily occur during the expansion and improvement of existing sandy trails. Mitigation, including habitat restoration at a 2:1 ratio, is proposed to reduce this impact to less than significant.

BR Impact 2 Construction of proposed trail improvements could potentially result in the loss of approximately 1.22 acres of intact maritime chaparral habitat.

- BR/mm-5 **Prior to implementation of trail improvements,** the <u>General Services</u> <u>Agency</u> shall develop a Habitat Restoration Plan (HRP) for review and approval by the CDFG and the County Environmental Coordinator. The HRP shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and/or botanist and shall detail the methods for restoring or enhancing any areas of maritime chaparral habitat impacted within the NCP. The goal of the HRP shall be to mitigate any temporary or permanent impacts to maritime chaparral at the biological mitigation receptor site (5.6 acres). At a minimum, the HRP shall allow for the following mitigation ratios, site protection measures, and monitoring requirements:
 - a. 2:1 restoration ratio for permanent and temporary impacts to intact maritime chaparral (for every one acre of intact maritime chaparral that is temporarily or permanently impacted, the County shall restore or enhance two acres of maritime chaparral at the biological mitigation receptor site (5.6 acres) located within the NCP.
 - b. The HRP shall include a site maintenance schedule, including weed abatement strategies and BMPs.
 - Maintenance shall be conducted bi-monthly for the first three years or until the County Environmental Coordinator determines that further maintenance is not required. The maintenance period will begin immediately upon completion of the mitigation planting, and will continue for a three-year period. At the end of three years, the appropriate regulatory resource agencies will review the monitoring reports, evaluate whether the performance standards have been met, and determine whether the maintenance period will be ended or extended.
 - 2. Water will be supplied to planted materials during the initial planting period. Supplemental water will be supplied on an as needed basis until the Environmental Coordinator determines that the plantings are self-sustaining.
 - 3. Weed control will be necessary to minimize competition from exotic plants. Additional weed abatement will be required during the maintenance period. Weeds shall be removed by hand or through herbicide applications. If herbicide applications are necessary, they will be conducted by an individual holding a valid Qualified Applicators License. Weeding activities will be performed bi-monthly or until the County Environmental Coordinator determines that the plantings are self-sustaining.
 - 4. Removal of trash and litter will occur on a regular basis during the maintenance period. Non-fruiting organic debris created from hand removal of weeds may be left on-site if it will not significantly impact the establishment of native

seedlings. However, noxious weed debris will be disposed of off-site to avoid further invasions of the exotic species.

- 5. Due to the sites proximity to public access, vandalism may be a problem. If vandalism occurs at the site and plants are removed or trampled, the County will replace the vandalized plants and take appropriate actions to prohibit further vandalism.
- 6. The County Environmental Coordinator will adjust specific replanting requirements if needed, including species, quantities, and schedules. Species selection will be consistent with those currently occupying the immediate area and at the direction of the Environmental Coordinator. Any replanted vegetation will be monitored until the County Environmental Coordinator determines that the plantings are self-sustaining.
- 7. At the discretion of the Environmental Coordinator, a single application of fertilizer may be included with the initial plant installation. Subsequent applications, while not anticipated, are at the discretion of the Environmental Coordinator.
- c. The HRP shall include clearly defined restoration goals, annual performance standards and final success criteria.
 - 1. In order to accomplish restoration goals and objectives, a monitoring program will provide both quantitative and qualitative data to be used to determine the success of the mitigation and restoration areas. The County Environmental Coordinator will evaluate data indicating the relationship between actual site conditions and the performance criteria. Field monitoring and sampling will be followed by preparation of annual reports that include photo-documentation and evaluation of the success of the mitigation effort based on whether or not the annual performance goals for that year were met.
 - 2. The County's Environmental Coordinator will perform general monitoring site visits bi-monthly during the first three years after planting, and semi-annually for the last two years of the monitoring program (refer to Table 4.3-4). General monitoring visits can be conducted concurrently with maintenance visits. The focus of general monitoring visits is to assess the restoration and mitigation area's need for water or other maintenance related issues.
 - 3. The County Environmental Coordinator will perform biological monitoring data collection annually throughout the five year monitoring program. The focus of the biological monitoring visits is to collect quantitative data that will

provide an assessment of the sites vegetative cover and plant growth

- 4. Annual performance standards have been established to ensure a successful mitigation effort. The performance standards are based on the vegetative structure found onsite prior to construction related disturbances. Table 4.3-4 lists the annual performance standards for growth and survival of planted species that are proposed for the mitigation and restoration areas.
- d. All restoration activities shall be monitored by a qualified biologist/Environmental Coordinator for a minimum of five years or until the final success criteria are attained.
 - 1. At the end of the five-year monitoring period, the site will be evaluated to determine if the success criteria have been met. If the program is determined to be unsuccessful, the County Environmental Coordinator will recommend appropriate contingency measures. The mitigation site will not be considered successful until CDFG has provided written verification that the final success criteria have been met.

Performance Standards	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Total Percent of Native Cover	20%	25%	30%	40%	50%
Average Vigor Rating (see below)	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2
Percent of Non-Native Cover (excluding annual grasses)	<60%	<60%	<45%	<25%	<25%
Plant Survival	90%	85%	80%	80%	80%

Table 4.3-4. Annual Performance Standards and Final Success Criteria

Notes:

The mitigation site must be self-sustaining (i.e., no maintenance or artificial irrigation) for a minimum of two years to be considered successful.

Plant survivorship may include original plantings, remedial plantings, or volunteers.

Any remedial plantings will be monitored for five years from the date of installation or until the Environmental Coordinator determines that they are self-sustaining.

Plant vigor and survival in the restoration and mitigation area will be monitored annually for five-years following plant installation. A plant is considered "surviving" if at least half of the foliage (or stem if deciduous) is green and flexible. Plant vigor will be measured as follows:

- 1 = excellent vigorous healthy plant (no necrotic or chlorotic leaves)
- 2 = good plant healthy with limited signs of vigorous growth

- 3 = adequate plant healthy with no signs of vigorous growth and some necrosis or other damage present
- 4 = poor low vitality, or main stem dead but basal sprouts emerging
- 5 = dead no evidence of recovery
- 2. Plant survival calculations will be based on the number of individual plants installed. Percent survival will be obtained by counting the number of surviving plants and dividing the result by the number of plants installed (initial and remedial installations).
- 3. Percent cover of native species will be obtained annually throughout the five year monitoring program. Percent cover calculations must be determined by a documented and field proven vegetation monitoring method such as Daubenmire, Braun-Blanquet, line-intercept, or similar.
- 4. Another important monitoring activity is to detect the presence and advance of invasive plant species, such as introduced pioneer species commonly found in disturbed areas. Russian thistle, perennial mustard, or other non-native species can also invade the restoration areas if left unchecked. Monitoring activities will determine the presence of such species and if action is required to control their advance.
- 5. All wildlife observed in and around the restoration will be documented as to species, number, and functional use of habitat (i.e., feeding, nesting, etc.). Observations of the general habitat quality will be documented.
- 6. Permanent photo points will be established throughout the mitigation site to assist in tracking the success of the mitigation program. Permanent photo points will be established during the preparation of the as-built planting plan, and ground view photos will be taken during each monitoring year from the same vantage point.
- 7. Typically, CDFG requires a mitigation and restoration completion report to be submitted at the end of three years. The applicant is responsible for preparing and submitting the report to CDFG within 30 days of the end of the three year maintenance program. The report must include photo documentation and detail the progression of the revegetation efforts.
- 8. The annual reports must quantify growth and progress of the restoration plantings to determine if the performance criteria have been met. All three of the required reports must include

photographs that document the revegetation progress over time.

BR/mm-6 Prior to implementation of trail improvements, the General Services Agency shall retain a qualified biologist/botanist to supervise the implementation of the HRP. The qualified biologist/botanist shall supervise site preparation, implementation timing, species utilized, planting installation. maintenance. monitorina. and reportina of the The qualified biologist/botanist shall revegetation/restoration efforts. prepare and submit four annual reports and one final monitoring report to the County for review and approval by the County Environmental Coordinator. The annual and final monitoring reports shall include discussions of the restoration activities, project photographs, and an assessment of the restoration efforts attainment of the success criteria.

Residual Impact

Although native habitats would not be avoided, implementation of a Habitat Restoration Plan would mitigate the loss by restoring and creating this habitat within the NCP. With implementation of the above mitigation measures, indirect impacts associated with potential loss of habitat would be considered *less than significant with mitigation* (Class II).

Oak Woodland

As shown in Figure 4.3-1, oak woodland habitat covers approximately 130.14 acres within the NCP. Construction of ball fields, picnic areas and the widening of Osage Street would result in the loss of approximately 1.25 acres of oak woodland habitat within the NCP. Approximately 20 mature coast live oak trees (greater than 5 inches dbh) could be potentially be impacted or be removed by construction activities. Pursuant to SB 1334, the County requires significant impacts to oak trees and oak woodlands to be mitigated. Significant impacts are defined as cutting or removing 10% or more of the oak woodland canopy or removing more than 10 oak trees. County guidelines encourage project modifications to avoid or reduce impacts to oak woodland is unavoidable, the County allows mitigation for oak woodland impacts to be implemented via oak tree replanting and implementation of a conservation easement, or payment of a fee to the Wildlife Conservation Board. Tree replanting can constitute up to 50% of the required mitigation; and all planted trees must be monitored for seven years.

BR Impact 3 The proposed project would result in the loss of approximately 1.12 acres of oak woodland habitat and approximately 20 mature (greater than 5 inches diameter at breast height), native, coast live oak trees.

BR/mm-7 **Prior to site disturbance and grading activities,** the <u>General Services</u> <u>Agency</u> shall submit an Oak Woodland Protection and Restoration Plan to be reviewed and approved by the County Environmental Coordinator. Oak woodland restoration shall be accomplished through one of three options: 1) replanting of oak trees removed from the oak woodland at the biological mitigation receptor site; 2) providing for the protection of oak woodland habitat in perpetuity through acquisition or donation of a conservation easement that includes at least 2,000 square feet per tree removed; or 3) providing funds to the California Wildlife Conservation Board to be used for the purchase of Oak Woodland Conservation Easements If Option 1 is selected, it may account for no more than 50% of the required mitigation required for oak woodland impacts and a conservation easement (or similar measure) shall apply. The biological mitigation receptor site is 5.6 acres.

BR/mm-8 The Oak Woodland Protection and Restoration Plan shall include the following:

- a. For onsite planting and protection purposes, oak trees removed shall be replaced at a minimum 4:1 ratio, and impacted trees shall be replaced at a 2:1 ratio.
- b. Replacement oak trees shall be from regionally or locally collected seed stock grown in vertical tubes or deep one-gallon tree pots. Four-foot diameter shelters shall be placed over each oak tree to protect it from deer and other herbivores, and shall consist of 54-inch tall welded wire cattle panels (or equivalent material) and be staked using T-posts. Wire mesh baskets, at least two feet in diameter and two feet deep, shall be use below ground. Planting during the warmest, driest months (June through September) shall be avoided. The plan shall provide a species-specific planting schedule. If planting occurs outside this time period, a landscape and irrigation plan shall be submitted prior to permit issuance and implemented upon approval by the county.
- c. Replacement oak trees shall be planted no closer than 20 feet on center and shall average no more than four planted per 2,000 square feet. Trees shall be planted in random and clustered patterns to create a natural appearance. As feasible, replacement trees shall be planted in a natural setting on the north side of and at the canopy/dripline edge of existing mature native oak trees; and on north-facing slopes. Replanting areas shall be either in native topsoil or areas where native topsoil has been reapplied. Α seasonally timed maintenance program, which includes regular weeding (hand removal at a minimum of once early fall and once early spring within at least a 3-foot radius from the tree or installation of a staked "weed mat" or weed-free mulch) and a temporary watering program, shall be developed for all oak tree planting areas. A qualified arborist/botanist shall be retained to monitor the acquisition, installation, and maintenance of all oak trees to be replaced. Replacement trees shall be monitored and maintained by a qualified arborist/botanist for at least seven years or until the trees have successfully established as determined by the County Environmental Coordinator. Annual monitoring reports will be prepared by a qualified arborist/botanist and submitted to the County Environmental Coordinator by October 15 each year.
- BR/mm-9 To mitigate the balance of the oak woodland impact, one of the following measures, or a combination thereof shall be used:

- a. **Prior to site disturbance and grading activities**, the <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> shall record a conservation easement that protects 2000 square feet of existing oak woodland habitat for each tree removed from the oak woodland in perpetuity. The conservation easement shall be controlled by a qualified conservation organization approved by the County Environmental Coordinator. Potential conservation organizations include but are not limited to: The Nature Conservancy, San Luis Obispo Land Conservancy, or the Cambria Land Trust. This mitigation measure may be used to satisfy the mitigation requirement for oak woodland impacts.
- b. If the County is not able to establish a conservation easement, the applicant shall provide funding to the California Wildlife Conservation Board or other County-approved entity to be used for the purchase of Oak Woodland Habitat Conservation Easements (currently established at \$970.00 for each tree removed and \$485.00 per impacted tree). This mitigation measure may be used to satisfy the mitigation requirement for the oak woodland impact.
- c. If the County is not able to establish a conservation easement, or provide funding as noted in (b) above, the County may use a grant awarded pursuant to the Oak Woodlands Conservation Act (Article 3.5 [commencing with §1360] of Chapter 4 of Division 2 of the Fish and Game Code) to prepare an oak conservation element for a general plan, an oak protection ordinance, or an oak woodlands management plan, or amendments thereto, that meets the requirements of Senate Bill 1334.
- BR/mm-10 **Prior to site disturbance and grading activities**, the <u>General Services</u> <u>Agency</u> shall prepare an Oak Tree Inventory, Avoidance, and Protection Plan as outlined herein. The plan shall be reviewed by a County-approved biologist and/or arborist, and shall include the following items:
 - a. Comprehensive Oak Tree Inventory. This shall include the following information:
 - 1. An inventory of all oak trees at least five inches in diameter at breast height within 50 feet of all proposed impact areas. All inventoried trees shall be shown on plans. The species, diameter at breast height, location, and condition of these trees shall be documented in data tables.
 - 2. Identification of trees that will be retained, removed, or impacted. This information shall be shown on plans and cross-referenced to data tables described in item a.
 - 3. The location of proposed structures, utilities, driveways, grading, retaining walls, outbuildings, water and wastewater facilities, and impervious surfaces shall be shown on maps. The applicant shall clearly delineate the building

sites/building control lines containing these features on the project plans.

- b. Oak Tree Avoidance Measures. Grading and development within proposed project shall avoid the removal of oak trees to the maximum extent possible. Such activities shall minimize potential disturbance to oaks and their associated root zones to the maximum extent possible.
- c. Oak Tree Protection Guidelines. Tree protection guidelines and a root protection zone shall be established and implemented for each tree to be retained that occurs within 50 feet of impact areas. The following guidelines shall be included:
 - A qualified arborist shall determine the critical root zone for each retained tree on a case-by-case basis, based upon tree species, age, and size. This area is generally defined as 1.0 to 1.5 times the distance from the tree base of the average measurement taken from the tree base to the edge of the canopy/dripline. At a minimum, the critical root zone shall be the distance from the trunk to the drip line of the tree.
 - 2. All trees to remain within 50 feet of construction or grading activities shall be marked for protection (e.g., with flagging) and their root zone fenced prior to any grading. Grading, utility trenching, compaction of soil, or placement of fill shall be avoided within these fenced areas. If grading in the root zone cannot be avoided, retaining walls shall be constructed to minimize cut and fill impacts. Care shall be taken to avoid surface roots within the top 18 inches of soil. If any roots must be removed or exposed, they shall be cleanly cut and not left exposed above the ground surface. The project arborist shall approve any work within the root protection zone.
 - 3. Unless previously approved by the county, the following activities are not allowed within the root zone of existing or newly planted oak trees: year-round irrigation (no summer watering, unless "establishing" new tree or native compatible plants for up to seven years); grading (includes cutting and filling of material); compaction (e.g., regular use of vehicles); placement of impermeable surfaces (e.g., pavement); disturbance of soil that impacts roots (e.g., tilling).
 - 4. The County shall minimize trimming of oak trees to remain onsite. Removal of larger lower branches should be minimized to: 1) avoid making tree top heavy and more susceptible to "blow-overs," 2) reduce having larger limb cuts that take longer to heal and are much more susceptible to disease and infestation, 3) retain wildlife habitat values associated with the lower branches, 4) retain shade to keep

summer temperatures cooler (retains higher soil moisture, greater passive solar potential, provides better conditions for oak seedling volunteers), and 5) retain the natural shape of the tree. The amount of trimming (roots or canopy) done in any one season shall be limited as much as possible to reduce tree stress/shock (10% or less is best, 25% maximum). If trimming is necessary, the applicant shall use a certified arborist when removing limbs. Unless a hazardous or unsafe situation exists, major trimming shall be done only during the summer months.

Residual Impact

As proposed, the project would not avoid individual, mature, native oak trees or oak woodland habitat. Replanting oak trees within NCP, and establishing an onsite conservation easement (or similar mitigation) would minimize potential adverse effects by the creation of oak woodlands onsite and within the native range. With implementation of the above mitigation measures, indirect impacts associated with potential loss of habitat would be considered *less than significant with mitigation* (Class II).

4.3.6.3 Wetland or Riparian Habitat

No wetland or riparian habitat is present within the project site; therefore, there would be no impact.

4.3.6.4 Impacts to Nesting Birds and Roosting Bats

Removal of vegetation in all habitats within the NCP has the potential to affect nesting birds, and roosting bat species such as pallid bat. Maritime chaparral, oak woodlands, coastal scrub, grassland, ruderal, eucalyptus and pine trees, and buildings within the developed areas of the NCP provide suitable roosting, nesting, and foraging habitat for a variety of bird and bat species, including several that are considered sensitive by resource agencies (e.g., Cooper's hawk, sharp-shinned hawk, white-tailed kite). Nesting birds could be directly and/or indirectly impacted by construction activities occurring any time during the typical nesting season (from March 1 to August 30). Removal of trees and buildings also has the potential to effect roosting bats and potentially maternal bat colonies. Tree-nesting birds could have nests directly damaged or destroyed during any tree-removal activities, or their nesting and foraging behaviors could be indirectly affected by noise and other sources of construction related disturbance. Tree removal would be required to accommodate access improvements at Pomeroy Road and Juniper Street, and Osage Road widening and trail/pathway improvements. Ground nesting birds such as Western meadowlark, California towhee, and spotted towhee could have nests directly impacted and behaviors indirectly impacted during any construction activities in maritime chaparral, coastal scrub, and annual grassland within the NCP.

- BIO Impact 4 Implementation of project activities in or adjacent to natural plant communities has potential to impact birds by disturbing their nesting behavior.
- BIO/mm-11 **Removal of vegetation and pruning of trees shall be conducted in the fall and winter (between September 1 and February 28)**, if possible, after fledging and before the initiation of avian breeding activities. If construction

activities are scheduled to occur during the typical bird nesting season (from March 1 to August 31) a qualified biologist shall be retained to conduct a pre-construction survey (approximately one week prior to construction) to determine presence/absence for tree and ground nesting birds. If no nesting activities are detected within the proposed work area, noise-producing construction activities may proceed and no further mitigation is required. If nesting activity is confirmed during pre-construction nesting surveys or at any time during the monitoring of construction activities, work activities shall be delayed within 300 feet (500 feet if raptors) of active nests until the young birds have fledged and left the nest. In addition, the results of the surveys shall be passed immediately to the CDFG and the County, possibly with recommendations for buffer zone changes, as needed, around individual nests. Tree removal in riparian zones shall be monitored and documented by the biological monitor regardless of time of year.

BIO/mm-12 **If tree removal occurs between September 1 and March 1,** within seven days of ground disturbance or tree removal/trimming activities, a survey for wintering raptors shall be conducted. If surveys do not locate wintering raptors, construction activities may be conducted. If wintering raptors are located, construction activities shall observe a 500-foot buffer for the wintering location(s). A pre-construction survey report shall be submitted to the County Environmental Coordinator immediately upon completion of the survey. The report shall detail appropriate fencing or flagging of the buffer zone and make recommendations on additional monitoring requirements.

Residual Impact

Timing of construction activities to avoid nesting birds is recommended; however, in the event other factors require activity during the nesting season, mitigation is recommended to ensure no nests are removed or disturbed. Other, suitable habitat for nests will remain with NCP. With implementation of mitigation, impacts associated with potential impacts to nesting birds would be considered *less than significant with mitigation* (Class II).

- BIO Impact 5 Implementation of project activities and tree removals has the potential to impact roosting bats, including pallid bat.
- BR/mm-13 Within two weeks prior to tree removal, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for pallid bat and/or other roosting bats. If bats are not found, tree removal can proceed. If bats are observed, bat exclusion measures shall be instituted prior to disturbance. If maternal bat colonies are found they shall not be disturbed until young bats have left the site. Subsequently bat exclusion measures shall be instituted prior to disturbance.

Residual Impact

Implementation of the project would include the removal of trees potentially used for bat roosting; however, mitigation is recommended to ensure roosting bats are avoided during grading and construction activities, and suitable habitat would remain within the NCP. With implementation of mitigation, impacts associated with potential impacts to roosting bats would be considered *less than significant with mitigation* (Class II).

4.3.7 Cumulative Impacts

Several projects are proposed within the immediate area, which would result in the conversion of undeveloped pockets to urbanized uses in the vicinity of NCP. In addition to development within the community of Nipomo, residential subdivisions and other development in the South County area contribute to regional habitat loss, including but not limited to oak woodland, coastal scrub, maritime chaparral, central dune scrub, coastal scrub, and grassland. Impacts to habitat, nesting and foraging sites, and special status species may occur in these locations, and mitigation would be required including pre-construction surveys and revegetation of habitat and oak trees. In addition to the direct effects identified above, build-out of the Master Plan would result in an increase in park visitors, which has the potential to affect natural resources and habitats. The specific impacts resulting from the proposed project would be mitigated to a less than significant level, and the project would not contribute to cumulatively significant impacts. Cumulative impacts would be *less than significant* (Class III). No additional mitigation is required.

This page intentionally left blank.
4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This section of the Program EIR summarizes the cultural resources present within the NCP. The EIR analysis evaluates potential impacts to cultural resources, and recommends mitigation measures where appropriate. The information presented below is a compilation of cultural resource information from a previous cultural resource investigation and survey conducted onsite site in 2002, *Cultural Resource Investigation of the Nipomo Community Park* (Parker 2002). This report is on file with the County; however, pursuant to federal, state, and local regulations, the report is confidential and not available for public review.

4.4.1 Existing Conditions

4.4.1.1 Historical Resources

In the mid-1800s, the town of Nipomo was subdivided for the sale and development of lots. By 1887, the town of Nipomo had two hotels, shops, a schoolhouse, stable, real estate offices, saloons, and a newspaper. The Southern Pacific Railroad was established west of Nipomo in the town of Guadalupe in 1895 and also had a depot in Nipomo. By 1942, the Southern Pacific Railroad was put out of commission, disassembled, and sold for scrap. A major economic slump occurred in the town of Nipomo, until US 101 was completed in the 1940s. Past background records searches have revealed the presence of one historic site located at the project site, as well as three prehistoric sites recorded within 1 mile of the project area. The location of the historic site was confirmed during the field surface survey (Parker 2002).

Documented findings at the site included scattered historic material presumed to represent a historic trash deposit or old Nipomo city dump, including glass, ceramics, and metal artifacts dating from 1880 to 1930. Artifacts documented at the project site include both machine-made and hand blown bottle fragments (including some made from magnesium/purple glass historically used in the glass manufacturing process between 1880 and 1914), a stopper for a club sauce bottle, a piece of rose colored pressed glass depression glass, the neck of a cork-sealed whiskey bottle, the neck of a milk bottle, a preserve jar, the base of a champagne bottle, a milk-glass insert for a canning jar lid, several pieces of Euro American stoneware (including one piece with a maker's mark indicating a Buffalo Pottery Company ceramic dating between 1915 and 1930), various colored stencil ware, and a crockery piece. All materials found suggested general household refuse, but it is unknown whether the area was an "official" city dump or a casual dumping area at a time when this location was fairly remote and distant from central Nipomo. Such out-of-town roadside dumping areas were popular places to get rid of household trash in the 1920s.

The age of the materials discovered would place them within the "depressed" period of Nipomo's past, after the demise of the Pacific Coast Railroad and before the US 101 growth period (Parker 2002). Information gathered from the dumpsite could provide valuable insight on how Nipomo coped with the economic downturn brought on by the lack of transportation ties with the surrounding areas. The fact that a casual dump exists at all may evidence a lack of community pride brought on by the poor economy of the time.

Portions of the historic site have been disturbed by previous development, including existing park facilities and surrounding development, paving, and structures.

4.4.1.2 Archaeological Resources

The project is located in an area historically occupied by the Obispeño Chumash. The Obispeño Chumash have occupied San Luis Obispo County for more than 9,000 years. The Obispeño Chumash have adapted to the changing environmental and social conditions and are now a large complex society. Aboriginal society began to disintegrate soon after Spanish contact in 1769 A.D., primarily due to the introduction of epidemic European diseases and the consequent high mortality rate.

The 2002 background records search revealed the presence of three archeological deposit sites located within 1 mile of the proposed project site. The entire parcel was surveyed on foot to identify the presence or absence of archaeological surface deposits. No archaeological surface deposits were observed during the surface survey (Parker 2002). Based on the negative results of the surface survey, it is unlikely that significant archaeological deposits are present onsite.

4.4.1.3 Paleontological Resources

The proposed project is located on sand dune deposits typical of the entire Nipomo Mesa, which are generally too young to contain significant paleontological resources.

4.4.2 Regulatory Setting

4.4.2.1 Federal Policies and Regulations

Authorized under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) is part of a national program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect our historic and archeological resources. Properties listed in the NRHP include districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that are significant in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, or culture. The NRHP is administered by the National Park Service, which is part of the U.S. Department of the Interior.

4.4.2.2 State Policies and Regulations

Office of Historic Preservation

The Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) is the governmental agency primarily responsible for the statewide administration of the historic preservation program in California. The mission of the OHP and the State Historical Resources Commission, in partnership with the people of California and governmental agencies, is to "preserve and enhance California's irreplaceable historic heritage as a matter of public interest so that its vital legacy of cultural, educational, recreational, aesthetic, economic, social, and environmental benefits will be maintained and enriched for present and future generations." The OHP's responsibilities include:

- Identifying, evaluating, and registering historic properties;
- Ensuring compliance with federal and state regulatory obligations;
- Cooperating with traditional preservation partners while building new alliances with other community organizations and public agencies;
- Encouraging the adoption of economic incentives programs designed to benefit property owners; and

• Encouraging economic revitalization by promoting a historic preservation ethic through preservation education and public awareness and, most significantly, by demonstrating leadership and stewardship for historic preservation in California.

The Central Coast Information Center is under contract to the State Office of Historic Preservation and helps implement the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS). It integrates information on new resources and known resources into the CHRIS, supplies information on resources and surveys to the government and supplies lists of consultants qualified to do historic preservation fieldwork within the area. The California Archeological Site Inventory is the collection of Site Records, which has been acquired and managed by the Information Centers and the OHP since 1975.

California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA (Public Resources Code [PRC] §21000 et seq.) requires consideration of a project's impacts on significant historical and archaeological resources. Significant impacts on such resources are to be avoided or mitigated to less than significant levels. Other state laws govern actions affecting cemeteries and human remains. Similarly, County regulations require protection of archaeological and historical resources to the greatest extent feasible.

4.4.2.3 Local Policies and Regulations

Section 22.10.040 of the LUO states that if archaeological resources are unearthed or discovered during any construction activities, construction activities shall halt until the resource can be recorded by a qualified archaeologist, the appropriate authorities can be notified, and disposition of the discovery is completed. If the discovery consists of human remains, the County Coroner must also be notified. While the County is not subject to LUO standards, compliance is recommended as mitigation for future development where applicable to ensure that specific issues identified during preparation of the EIR are addressed during future development.

4.4.3 Thresholds of Significance

CEQA directs lead agencies to protect and preserve resources with cultural, historic, scientific, or educational value. In accordance with §15064.5 (Determining the Significance of Impacts to Archaeological and Historical Resources) and Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, the County identified the following questions to determine a project's impact on cultural resources. Would the project:

- 1. Disturb pre-historic resources;
- 2. Disturb historic resources;
- 3. Disturb paleontological resources.

The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project:

 Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); or,

- b. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristic that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to PRC §5020.1(k) or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of PRC §5024.1(g), unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant; or
- c. Demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its eligibility for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources as determined by a lead agency for the purposes of CEQA.

Generally, intact cultural and historic deposits are considered significant. Severely disturbed or mixed deposits often are not considered significant but may have educational value. Human remains and associated goods are accorded special consideration, even when fragmentary and are considered significant.

4.4.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology

Archaeological surveys are typically phased to maximize the potential for planning and management of archaeological resources. Phase One surveys include a records search and field surface survey. When significant cultural resources are identified and cannot be feasibly avoided, a Phase Two survey is conducted. Phase Two surveys include subsurface investigations to define the boundary, depth, and significance of identified resources. If the site is significant, a Phase Three data recovery program is implemented, which includes excavation and preservation of cultural resources.

A Phase One surface survey was conducted by John Parker, Ph.D, Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA) in 2002. The survey was conducted on the 140-acre NCP area. The survey included a background records search and intensive on-site examination of the project site for evidence of historic and prehistoric cultural materials. A record search was performed at the Regional California Historical Resources Information Center (Department of Anthropology, University of California, Santa Barbara). The field inspection revisited a previously recorded historic site (CA-SLO-2188H) and further defined and analyzed this resource.

4.4.5 Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures

4.4.5.1 Historical Resources

Actions within the known boundary of the historic site include the Juniper Street driveway alignment, pay station, and perimeter trail. Grading and construction activities would disturb both fill material and native soils containing historic materials and fragments. The site is not currently listed on the CRHR or a local register. Four criteria for inclusion are as follows:

1. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.

As noted above, presence of the dump is an indicator of the "depressed" period of Nipomo's past.

2. Associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.

No materials were found to have a connection with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.

3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values.

The site does not include any features meeting this criterion.

4. Has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

As noted above, the presence of the dump is an indicator of the "depressed" period of Nipomo's past. This information has been documented in a report.

Implementation of the project would not materially alter the physical characteristics of the historic landfill that convey its historical significance to the extent that it would ineligible for inclusion in the CRHR. Mitigation is recommended, including onsite monitoring and documentation of findings, to support the historic record and provide additional information about the resource. Implementation of recommended mitigation would mitigate potential impacts to this resource to less than significant.

- CR Impact 1 Development within the historic site (CA-SLO-2188H), as defined in the Cultural Resources Investigation (Parker 2002), may result in direct disturbance or looting of a known significant historical site, resulting in a potentially significant impact.
- CR/mm-1 Prior to construction, the General Services Agency shall submit a monitoring plan, prepared by a subsurface-qualified historical archaeologist, for the review and approval by the Environmental Coordinator. The monitoring plan shall include at a minimum:
 - a. List of personnel involved in the monitoring activities;
 - b. Description of how the monitoring shall occur;
 - c. Description of frequency of monitoring (e.g. full-time, part time, spot checking);
 - d. Description of what resources are expected to be encountered;
 - Description of circumstances that would result in the halting of work at the project site (e.g. What is considered "significant" archaeological resources?);
 - f. Description of procedures for halting work on the site and notification procedures; and,
 - g. Description of monitoring reporting procedures.

CR/mm-2 During all ground disturbing construction activities, the General Services Agency shall retain a qualified historical archaeologist (approved by the Environmental Coordinator) to monitor earth disturbing activities within the documented historical site, per the approved monitoring plan. If any significant historical resources are found during monitoring, work shall stop within the immediate vicinity (precise area to be determined by the historical archaeologist in the field) of the resource until such time as the resource can be evaluated by the historical archaeologist or any other appropriate individuals. The historical archaeologist shall be allowed the time and funds necessary to document and retrieve any significant cultural materials that are unearthed.

CR/mm-3 Upon completion of all monitoring/mitigation activities, and prior to final inspection (whichever occurs first), the consulting historical archaeologist shall submit a report to the Environmental Coordinator summarizing all monitoring/mitigation activities and confirming that all recommended mitigation measures have been met.

Residual Impact

Implementation of the measures listed above would ensure that any significant historical resources uncovered during grading and construction would be protected and documented. These measures would reduce impacts to a *less than significant level* (Class II).

4.4.5.2 Archaeological Resources

Based on the negative results of the archaeological surface survey, it is unlikely that significant archeological deposits are present at the site, and there is no evidence that human remains are located within NCP. If such resources are later discovered during future soil disturbance and/or construction activities, the County will issue a stop work order until the resource can be evaluated. Furthermore, California Health and Safety Code §7050.5 states the following:

- (b) In the event of discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, there shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent remains until the coroner of the county in which the human remains are discovered has determined, in accordance with Chapter 10 (commencing with §27460) of Part 3 of Division 2 of Title 3 of the Government Code, that the remains are not subject to the provisions of §27491 of the Government Code or any other related provisions of law concerning investigation of the circumstances, manner and cause of any death, and the recommendations concerning the treatment and disposition of the human remains have been made to the person responsible for the excavation, or to his or her authorized representative, in the manner provided in §5097.98 of the PRC. The coroner shall make his or her determination within two working days from the time the person responsible for the excavation, or his or her authorized representative, notifies the coroner of the discovery or recognition of the human remains.
- (c) If the coroner determines that the remains are not subject to his or her authority and if the coroner recognizes the human remains to be those of a Native American, or has reason to believe that they are those of a Native American, he or she shall contact, by telephone within 24 hours, the Native American Heritage Commission.

Based on compliance with State Standards, and implementation of identified mitigation, significant adverse impacts to archaeological resources would be avoided.

CR Impact 2 In the unlikely event significant archaeological resources are present, implementation of the project may result the disturbance of unknown resources, resulting in a potentially significant impact.

- CR/mm-4 In the event archeological resources are unearthed or discovered during any construction activities, the following standards apply:
 - a. Construction activities shall cease, and the Department shall be notified so that the extent and location of discovered materials may be recorded by a qualified archaeologist, and disposition of artifacts may be accomplished in accordance with state and federal law.
 - b. In the event archeological resources are found to include human remains, or in any other case when human remains are discovered during construction, the County Coroner shall be notified in addition to the Department so proper disposition may be accomplished.

Residual Impact

Based on the results of field surveys conducted at NCP, significant archaeological discovery is unlikely; however, provisions are recommended in the event of subsurface discovery. Based on the analysis, compliance with State Code, and implementation of recommended mitigation, potential impacts to archaeological resources would be *less than significant* (Class III).

4.4.5.3 Paleontological Resources

Based on the presence of stabilized dune sands on the proposed project site, it is unlikely that significant paleontological resources are present.

4.4.6 Cumulative Impacts

Implementation of the proposed project would potentially contribute to the cumulative degradation of significant cultural resources in the County. The destruction of cultural resources has a significant cumulative impact as they make the study of historic life unavailable for study by scientists. Given the prevalence of cultural resource sites in the Nipomo area, several of the development projects identified in the area likely have an effect on archaeological and historical resources, and require implementation of standard mitigation measures. For the proposed project, impacts to known potential subsurface cultural resources would be avoided or mitigated by implementation of monitoring and documentation, and development would contribute to a significant loss of cultural resources in the area. Based on implementation of mitigation measures recommended in this EIR, potential cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed project are considered *less than significant* (Class III). No additional mitigation is required.

This page intentionally left blank.

4.5 GEOLOGY, SOILS, AND DRAINAGE

This section discusses existing geologic and soils related conditions and the natural and manmade drainage conditions within the NCP. The section is based on existing published geologic and soils data, the *Nipomo Community Park Constraints Analysis* (Morro Group 2004), and the *South County Area Plan Inland Portion Final EIR* (County of San Luis Obispo 1991). This section identifies potential geologic impacts including local geologic conditions. Direct and indirect impacts to the existing drainage system are also included. This section also considers erosion and sedimentation impacts resulting from the proposed project.

4.5.1 Existing Conditions

The topography of the NCP is undulating, with elevations ranging from approximately 300 to 425 feet. Elevation changes are due to small, smoothly eroded hills, and ancient sand dunes with intervening closed depressions. Massive sand dune deposits whose thickness ranges from approximately 70 to 80 feet in depth underlie the park. Surface elevations across the park gently decrease from northeast to southwest, consistent with the coastal plain in the surrounding area.

4.5.1.1 Geologic Setting

Based on USGS maps (California Geological Survey), the proposed project is located on Quaternary sand dune deposits (Qs), which dates to the Holocene time period (approximately 12,000 years ago to present day). The dune shapes are still evident in the surface topography of the park.

Three geologic basins (Pismo, Santa Maria, and Huasna Basins) underlie the South County area. These basins contain thick, mostly marine sedimentary Tertiary deposits that lay on top of a Jurassic-Cretaceous complex.

The triangularly shaped Santa Maria Basin opens toward the west and extends offshore to the Hosgri fault zone. The basin is bounded on the north by the San Rafael Mountains and is in contact with the mountains along the largely concealed system of the Santa Maria River-Foxen Canyon-Little Pine faults. On the south, the basin is bounded by the Santa Ynez Mountains of the Transverse Ranges and is in contact with the mountains along the Santa Ynez River fault.

The Pismo Basin, smaller than the Santa Maria, is flanked by strike-slip faults and trends westnorthwest. The basin is bounded on the northeast by the West Huasna fault zone and on the southwest by the Santa Maria River fault (Hall 1981; Heasler and Surdam 1984; Stanley and Surdam 1984). The basin extends west offshore to the Hosgri fault zone (Heasler and Surdam 1984; Kablanow and Surdam 1984; Clark et al. 1994).

The Huasna Basin lies between the West Huasna fault zone on the west and the East Huasna fault zone on the east (outside the South County study area) (Hall and Corbato 1967; Heasler and Surdam 1984; Kablanow and Surdam 1984). The project site is not within a County-designated Geologic Study Area (GSA). Based on the County's Geographic Information Systems (GIS) database, the nearest potentially active fault is located approximately 0.25 mile to the northeast. Landslide and rockfall conditions do not exist at the project site given the relatively flat topographic conditions of the project area.

<u>Soils</u>

There are two soil types present in the area (refer to Figure 4.5-1) where the proposed project would result in ground disturbance. These soils are described below.

Oceano Sand, 0 – 9 % slopes (Soil Unit 184)

This very deep, excessively drained, nearly level to moderately sloping soil is on stabilized sand dunes. It formed in deposits of windblown sand. Typically, the surface layer is brown sand about 29 inches thick, and the underlying material is stratified pale brown and pink sand to a depth of 60 inches or more. Some areas of this soil have a sandy loam surface layer. The permeability of this soil is rapid, and the available water capacity is low. Surface runoff is slow or medium. The hazard of water erosion is slight or moderate, and the hazard of soil blowing is high. The shrink-swell potential is low. This soil is best suited to drip or sprinkler methods of irrigation.

Oceano Sand, 9 – 30 % slopes (Soil Unit 185)

This soil type has similar characteristics as Oceano sand, 0% to 9% slopes, except this soil type is strongly sloping and moderately steep soil located on old established sand dunes. Surface runoff is medium or rapid, and the hazard of water erosion is moderate or high, and the hazard of soil blowing is high.

Faults

Several faults in the region are considered geologically active or potentially active and are capable of causing significant ground motion in the vicinity of the park. An active fault is defined by the California Division of Mines and Geology as a fault that has "had surface displacement within Holocene time (last 11,000 years). A potentially active fault is a fault with evidence of surface displacement during Quaternary time" (last two million years).

Known active faults or fault zones with surface expression that could potentially affect the park include the San Andreas Fault System, Coast Range-Sierran Block, Hosgri Fault Zone, Los Alamos, Santa Lucia, and the Los Osos faults. Fault zones located near the park that are potentially active include: Wilmar Avenue/Santa Maria River fault, Oceano fault, Pecho fault, Oceanic West Huasna Fault Zone, San Luis Bay fault, and the Casmalia-Orcutt-Little Pine fault. Faults that are in close proximity to the park are shown in Figure 4.5-2.

Although the park is located within the seismically active Central Coast region, it lies outside any fault rupture zones (formerly Special Studies Zones) established by the Alquist-Priolo Act of 1972. Should a major earthquake occur in the area on any of these faults, significant ground shaking is expected to occur. The San Andreas Fault is considered the most likely to generate a major earthquake in the region in the near future. Such an earthquake is expected to produce moderate to strong ground shaking along the entire Nipomo Mesa. The potentially active Wilmar Avenue Fault has been mapped east of US 101 in the vicinity of Nipomo Creek. Table 4.5-1 shows local fault systems and the estimated maximum intensity of a ground shaking event that potentially could cause significant damage to the park area.





Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report

This page intentionally left blank.

Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report



Figure 4.5-2. Geologic Hazards

Fault Name	Activity	Maximum Magnitude
Hosgri-San Simeon	Active	7.3
Casmalia	Potentially Active	6.5
Los Osos	Active	6.8
San Luis Range	Potentially Active	7.0
San Andreas-Carrizo	Active	7.2
San Andreas-Cholame	Active	6.9
San Andreas-Parkfield	Active	6.7
San Andreas (1857 rupture)	Active	7.8
San Andreas (1906)	Active	7.9
East Huasna	Potentially Active	n/a
Edna	Potentially Active	n/a
Oceano	Inactive	6.0
Pecho	Potentially Active	6.25
West Huasna/Oceanic	Potentially Active	7.0

 Table 4.5-1. California Geologic Society Listing of Nearby Faults

Source: CGS (1997), Jennings (1994), and Namson & Davis (1990), as cited in the County Safety Element (1999)

Liquefaction

Liquefaction is the rapid transformation of saturated, loose, fine-grained sediment (such as silt and sand) to a fluid-like state, often caused by an earthquake. During the shaking the soil loses its bearing strength and it may spread laterally, undergo settlement, and/or form fissures. Liquefaction can result in substantial damage to property, roads, and infrastructure. Due to the sandy soil conditions underlying the Nipomo Mesa, the NCP area has been mapped as being susceptible to liquefaction hazards during a ground-shaking event. The area containing the park can be seen as having moderate liquefaction hazard potential.

<u>Drainage</u>

The topography of the site is gently to moderately sloping, with general slope directions towards the interior of the park. The park area is irregularly shaped and has an undulating topographic profile with generally higher elevations being located to the exterior boundaries along the bordering roadways. The ground surface elevations range from between 375 feet near the intersection of West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road, 382 feet at the southwest corner of the property (near the intersection of Osasge Street and Tejas Place), 378 feet near Dana

Elementary School, 390 feet near the Nipomo Community Library, and 382 feet in the northern corner of the Nipomo Native Gardens portion of the park.

The Mesa Meadows area is at an approximate elevation of 400 feet in the northeast corner of the development, 365 feet dropping off to approximately 315 feet in the western portion, and approximately 350 feet along Mesa Road at the southern border of the development near the constructed drainage infiltration basins. Near surface soils observed at the park appear to be very well drained. No evidence of wetlands or springs was observed on site during several site visits.

The project site is not located within a floodplain as determined by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (Flood Insurance Rate Map, County of San Luis Obispo 1996). There are no surface water features observed in the site vicinity that would present a risk of flooding to the park. However, due to the rolling topography and existence of several closed depressions of the park and lack of drainage outlets, there are several areas where stormwater accumulates, causing localized flooding conditions.

The undeveloped areas of the park rely on natural percolation of stormwater for drainage discharge. The park has minimal areas of surface water due to the sandy soil conditions that allow water to penetrate into the ground at a rapid rate. Drainage systems in the more developed northeast areas of the park consist of small drainage channels, v-shaped concrete swales, culverts, and unlined infiltration basins.

Drainage is internal to the park, with no evidence of stormwater flowing out of or through the area. Stormwater generally percolates through the permeable surface soils before it has a chance to accumulate and cause substantial flows. There currently is stormwater run-on flowing into the park from several outside areas including: the northeast corner originating from residential development to the north and east (this water percolates through the <u>retention</u> basin system), the northwest corner of the park due to a topographical low point (natural percolation), and an area in the northeastern portion of the Nipomo Native Gardens. There are also several stormwater infiltration basins that were constructed in the Mesa Meadows area to the southwest, which allow for drainage discharge from a housing development known as McKenzie Tract 2304. There are no jurisdictional areas or drainages that would be considered "waters of the United States" found within the park boundaries.

Along the northern property line, an earthen drainage channel has been constructed to accommodate storm water flows originating from the parking lot along the Pomeroy Road frontage. This channel starts out as nothing more than a small roadside swale, but develops into a 3-foot wide by 2-foot deep erosive channel near Primrose Lane, where it picks up residential runoff from the north via a 12-inch culvert that runs underneath Pomeroy Road. The earthen drainage channel then flows southwest and empties onto a rock riprap energy dissipater into the primary unlined infiltration basin constructed at the West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road intersection. The infiltration basin also receives storm flows via three 12-inch culverts: one that conveys storm water from underneath Pomeroy Road from a low-lying area across the street at the intersection of West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road, a storm drain on the park side of West Tefft Street, and a culvert that flows underneath West Tefft Street originating from bordering residential developments to the east of the park.

A series of three infiltration basins was constructed in the northeast corner of the park (one primary and two secondary basins), due to the increase in storm water runoff that can be attributed to residential development occurring to the north and northeast, which has created

more impermeable surfaces and concentrated storm flows towards the park. The primary infiltration basin is designed to let storm flow percolate into the permeable dune sands underlying the area. Finished bottom elevation of the primary infiltration basin is 345 feet above mean sea level. In the event that larger volumes of stormwater flow into the primary infiltration basin than its maximum design capacity, a secondary unlined infiltration basin is connected via one 24-inch and three 12-inch culverts to the primary basin. The overflow basin is constructed approximately 15 feet to the southwest of the primary basin at a bottom surface elevation of 348 feet. If required, the secondary basin overflows into a smaller third area at a slightly lower finished elevation, which is essentially nothing more than a natural depression located next to the middle softball field.

Drainage from the two parking lots located near the softball fields is conveyed via sheet flow into a series of four 24-inch corrugated metal storm drain standpipes constructed to a depth of approximately 6 feet. The standpipes are located behind the middle softball field to the west, several feet from the edge of the outfield grass in a constructed low-lying drainage swale. This low-lying area is subject to adverse flooding conditions during larger storm events because of the minimal retention capacity of the standpipes and the bowl-shaped topography in the immediate vicinity.

Near Dana Elementary School, stormwater sheet flows down the park entrance where it intercepts sheet flow from the parking lot, slightly concentrates, and then flows alongside the roadway to a low point near the tennis courts. At this point, the flow fans out and presumably percolates on either side of the roadway. This low-lying area is potentially subject to adverse flooding conditions during larger storm events due to the saddle shape topography in the immediate vicinity and lack of any drainage outlet.

Drainage along the southern portion of the park appears to be by percolation only, and no definitive drainage patterns are evident. This portion of the park has an undulating rolling profile characterized with several saddle-shaped areas that are heavily vegetated. Ground surface elevations are generally higher to the southern boundary and slope directions are to the interior of the park. If enough surface saturation were to occur, sheet flow would be directed into the park along the entire southern boundary.

Drainage patterns along the western portion of the park, bounded by Osage Street are also internal to the park. Osage Street is a raised roadway that only allows drainage flow to the east and partially to the north along the park boundary. In the northwestern section of the park, near the intersection of Osage Street and <u>Camino Caballo</u>, there appears to be a small seasonal vegetated drainage swale that runs parallel to the park/roadway interface for approximately 100 feet. This swale does not have a defined bed or bank and fans out and flattens near the northwestern corner of the park.

Drainage along the portion of the park bounded by Camino Caballo is conveyed via several asphalt roadside swales and overside drains cut in the curb. All drainage is directed into the park along this boundary, as Camino Caballo is elevated several feet above park grade.

In the Nipomo Native Gardens section of the park, more distinct drainage patterns are distinguishable. In the northeast portion of the Garden, there is a roadside asphalt drainage swale and a 12-inch culvert, which empty into a small-unlined infiltration basin. The small infiltration basin overflows into an adjacent low-lying area of the Garden. To the south of the low lying area of the Garden, there appears to be a moderately defined non-contiguous drainage swale running in an east-west direction along most of the southern boundary of the

Garden. Once again, due to the raised elevation of Camino Caballo, this swale has no outlet and fans out to the western portion of the Garden where natural percolation occurs.

The Mesa Meadows section of the park, containing the McKenzie Tract 2304 residential development, has an engineered storm drain system. The drainage system consists of multiple 24-inch corrugated metal culverts designed to convey storm runoff from the development into any one of four infiltration basins located adjacent to Mesa Road. The infiltration basins then discharge storm water via percolation into the sandy topsoil.

4.5.2 Regulatory Setting

4.5.2.1 Federal and State Regulations

The Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Hazard Zone Act was developed by the State to regulate development near active faults and mitigate the surface fault rupture and other hazards. The Act identifies active earthquake fault zones and restricts building habitable structures over known active or potentially active faults.

Water quality protection is regulated by the Federal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Program established by the Clean Water Act. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) establishes stormwater permit requirements based on compliance with a NPDES permit. Discharges of stormwater associated with construction activity that results in a disturbance of one acre or more of total land area requires a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Stormwater Associated with Construction Activity. This permit requires developers to implement BMPs to prevent the discharge of sediment-laden or otherwise contaminated water off site. The site-specific plan to implement BMPs is called the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The plan must include a description of soil stabilization and sediment load control methods that would be implemented to minimize erosion and sediment loading during construction of the project. The SWPPP also includes descriptions of post-construction BMPs. The State of California administers stormwater permits through the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and its local RWQCB – Central Coast Region. A SWPPP would be required for the proposed project.

4.5.3 Thresholds of Significance

The County thresholds of significance are based on the criteria set forth in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. According to those criteria, a project would result in a significant geology, soils or drainage-related impact if it would:

- 1. Result in exposure to or production of unstable earth conditions, such as landslides, earthquakes, liquefaction, ground failure, land subsidence or other similar hazards;
- 2. Be within a California Geological Survey "Alquist-Priolo" Earthquake Fault Zone;
- Result in soil erosion, topographic changes, loss of topsoil or unstable soil conditions from project-related improvements, such as vegetation removal, grading, excavation or fill;
- 4. Change rates of soil absorption, or amount or direction of surface runoff;
- 5. Include structures located on expansive soils;

- 6. Change the drainage patterns where substantial on- or off-site sedimentation/erosion or flooding may occur;
- 7. Involve activities within the 100-year flood zone;
- 8. Be inconsistent with the goals and policies of the County's Safety Element relating to Geologic and Seismic Hazards;
- 9. Preclude the future extraction of valuable mineral resources.

4.5.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology

Potential geologic, soils and drainage impacts were evaluated based upon a review of the County's GIS database of local geologic and soils conditions, the 2004 Environmental Constraints Analysis and field review of the project site. The assessment considers compliance with regulations, such as the Uniform Building Code (UBC). In addition, while the County is not subject to ordinance standards, preparation of reports and plans such as drainage and erosion control plans are recommended as mitigation for future development where applicable to ensure that specific issues identified during preparation of the EIR are included in the plans.

4.5.5 **Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

4.5.5.1 Exposure to or Production of Unstable Earth Conditions

Soil Stability

The primary geotechnical concern at the project site is the loose condition of the surficial soil. Re-compaction of the upper zone is recommended to limit any potential settlement, consistent with the California Building Code. As Nipomo/Oceano sands are known to be susceptible to hydro-consolidation, which is the tendency of a soil to collapse upon addition of water, the soil should be compacted at a moisture content slightly above optimum. The R-value of the sand was determined to be 64, which indicates that the soil has a high resistance to the type of loading imposed by roads and traffic. Compliance with the UBC and preparation of site-specific geo-technical reports would address this issue; impacts are considered *less than significant* (Class III).

Earthquake Rupture and Groundshaking

The park area contains two inactive fault zones within its boundaries (refer to Figure 4-5.2). Should a major earthquake occur in the area on any of these faults, significant ground shaking is expected to occur in the immediate vicinity. Active fault hazards are not considered to be a significant impact that would preclude development of the park. Compliance with the UBC and preparation of site-specific geo-technical reports would mitigate these effects; impacts are considered *less than significant* (Class III).

Liquefaction

Due to the sandy soil conditions underlying the park, the area has been mapped as being susceptible to moderate liquefaction hazard during a ground-shaking event. Soils that area particularly susceptible to liquefaction hazards generally consist of unconsolidated loose sandy conditions near the groundwater table. The groundwater table underlying the park is generally

found at depths over 100 feet below ground surface. Liquefaction is not considered to be a major concern that would preclude development of the park.

There are several possibilities to reduce liquefaction hazards when designing and constructing new buildings or other structures: avoid liquefaction susceptible soils, build liquefaction resistant structures, or improve the soil. The first possibility to avoid construction on liquefaction susceptible soils is not practicable in this case. If it is necessary to construct on liquefaction susceptible soil, it may be possible to make the structure liquefaction resistant by designing the foundation elements to resist the effects of liquefaction. The third option involves mitigation of the liquefaction hazards by improving the strength, density, and/or drainage characteristics of the soil. This can be done using a variety of soil improvement techniques. Based on the application of standard UBC requirements, and preparation of site-specific geotechnical reports, impacts resulting from the potential for liquefaction are considered *less than significant* (Class III).

Landslides

The project site is not located in an area that is subject to landslide hazards, due to slope and topography.

GSD Impact 1 Development of the project may expose structures and persons to existing geologic hazards including liquefaction and ground shaking.

GSD/mm-1 Prior to initiation of each phase of development for major amenities requiring structural improvements and/or major grading (i.e., sports fields, parking, amphitheater(s), playgrounds, restrooms, pre-school and administration building, gymnasium, recreation center, pool, skate park, and courts), and as required by the County Environmental Coordinator, <u>the General Services Agency</u> shall prepare project-specific geo-technical reports. The reports shall investigate subsurface conditions within areas proposed for structural development and the findings and recommendations shall be incorporated into grading and construction plans, as appropriate.

Residual Impact

The project site is not located within a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that could potentially result in landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse. The liquefaction potential is moderate, due to underlying sandy soils; however, due to the depth of the groundwater table and lack of surface waters onsite, this risk is not high. Based on the application of standard UBC requirements, and preparation of site-specific geotechnical reports, impacts resulting from standard geologic and soils hazards would be *less than significant* (Class III).

4.5.5.2 Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone

The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone; therefore, there would be no impact. Potential impacts related to earthquake rupture and ground-shaking are discussed in Section 4.5.5.1 above.

4.5.5.3 Result in Substantial Soil Erosion or the Loss of Topsoil

The soils in the park would be easily excavated using conventional equipment; utility trenches would be subject to caving, particularly where loose soil conditions are encountered. Shoring or sloped sidewalls of relatively shallow trenches may be necessary. Where trees are to be removed, deeper earthwork may be necessary to ensure large roots are removed and that any disturbed soils are adequately compacted.

The ground surface of the Park should be prepared for grading by removal of vegetation, large roots, and other materials. Stabilization of soils, particularly those disturbed by construction, is essential to protect fill slopes from erosive damage. Care should be taken to establish and maintain vegetation. Landscaping should be planned and installed to maintain surface drainage. Slopes greater than 10% should be benched prior to fill placement. If fills are to be placed on slopes greater than 20%, the toe shall be keyed. All voids should be backfilled and re-compacted. Footing depths should be excavated in accordance with the applicable load type as shown in the UBC. Foundations should be designed in accordance with the architect and or engineer. Unpaved ground surfaces should be finished graded to drain away from any foundation. If this is not possible because of terrain, swales should be provided to divert drainage away from foundations. Paved surfaces should slope away from foundations.

In addition to proposed and recommended drainage measures described above, grading activities should be conducted during the dry season (April through September). If grading, vegetation removal, and any site disturbance occur during the rainy season, County Parks has agreed to prepare and implement an erosion and sedimentation control plan including the use of silt fences, straw bales, perimeter ditches, water bars, temporary culverts and swales, sediment traps, minimal grading concepts, and similar techniques appropriate for the site. These erosion and sediment transport control structures need to be in place prior to the onset of seasonal rains. Restoration and re-vegetation of graded areas and unprotected slopes shall be completed as soon as possible following site disturbance.

Preparation and implementation of a site-specific short and long-term erosion and sedimentation control plan would mitigate potential impacts. Therefore, the potential for erosion and down-gradient sedimentation would result in a *potentially significant impact, which can be mitigated to less than significant* by implementation of standard measures.

GSD Impact 2 Ground disturbance activities may result in erosion and down-gradient sedimentation.

Implement WAT/mm-1 (incorporate BMPs into drainage plans) and WAT/mm-2 (prepare and implement SWPPP).

GSD/mm-2 Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall prepare a site-specific erosion and sedimentation control plan. The plan shall include measures addressing short-term, construction related effects, and long-term soil stabilization. Grading and construction shall be conducted during the dry season (April through September) if possible. In the event grading occurs during the wet season (October through April), the following measures shall be incorporated into applicable grading and construction plans, and implemented prior to ground disturbance:

- a. Incorporate the use of silt fences, straw bales, perimeter ditches, water bars, temporary culverts and swales, sediment traps, minimal grading concepts, and similar techniques appropriate for the site.
- b. Erosion and sediment transport control structures shall be in place prior to the onset of seasonal rains.
- c. Restoration and re-vegetation of graded areas and unprotected slopes shall be completed as soon as possible following site disturbance.

Residual Impact

During grading and construction activities, some on-site erosion may occur. Implementation of an erosion and sedimentation control plan would reduce impacts associated with erosion and down-gradient sedimentation to *less than significant* (Class II).

4.5.5.4 Rates of Soil Absorption, or Amount or Direction of Surface Runoff

Based on review of the existing drainage system within the park, existing facilities are not adequate to handle existing and future stormwater flows, and localized flooding within the park occurs during storm events. In addition, the existing drainage swale adjacent to Pomeroy Road is subject to erosion, and subsequent sedimentation of the primary retention basin. If this basin becomes inundated with sediment and debris during a major rain event, storm water could back up, flow across the spillway, and discharge into the low-lying areas near the West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road intersection.

Additional flooding occurs within the softball field parking lot, and the park access road west of the existing tennis courts. Stormwater sheet flows from two adjacent parking lots towards the softball field, and the lack of drainage outlets and bowl shaped topography cause flooding in the parking lot. In addition, stormwater flows from the upland areas of the park, and flows west where it ponds on the access road, which is a low point. Implementation of the proposed master plan would create additional impervious surfaces (e.g., roofs, structures, sidewalks, and paved parking) that would increase the amount of stormwater flow directed towards to lower areas of the park. Increased flooding could also occur if subsurface clay layers inhibit percolation of runoff beneath potential development sites, and rising ground water levels surface, resulting in flooding conditions. The proposed Master Plan includes the following drainage improvements to manage stormwater flow during rain events: 1) construct a new basin in the center of the southern half of the park, and 2) install a drainage pipe along Pomeroy Road within the existing drainage swale.

In addition to the drainage improvement measures proposed in the Master Plan, projectspecific geo-technical reports shall be required to investigate subsurface conditions within areas proposed for structural development. Incorporation of improvements to existing facilities, including the installation of trash gates on drainage pipes, interception and dissipation of stormwater flow from impervious surfaces, and installation of storm drain inlets and engineered drainage courses is recommended to address existing drainage and flooding issues. Alternative drainage control incorporating BMPs and Low Impact Development (LID) strategies is recommended, including bio-retention filters, vegetated swales, and landscaping within existing infiltration basins. These measures would serve as filtration systems to reduce contaminants and downstream turbidity and sedimentation. Regular maintenance and repair would be required. Preparation and implementation of a site-specific drainage plan would mitigate potential impacts. Therefore, development of the project would result in a *potentially significant impact, which can be mitigated to less than significant* (Class II).

GSD Impact 3 Permanent improvements, including the creation of additional impervious surfaces, would change existing drainage patterns within the site, potentially increasing the potential for localized flooding during rain events.

Implement WAT/mm-3 (incorporate BMPs and LID strategies).

GSD/mm-3 Prior to implementation of the first phase of the Master Plan, <u>the General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> shall prepare a stormwater drainage plan, for inclusion in the Master Plan. The plan shall include a schedule for regular maintenance checks, and incorporate additional improvements to existing facilities, including the installation of trash gates on drainage pipes, interception and dissipation of stormwater flow from impervious surfaces, and installation of storm drain inlets and engineered drainage courses.

Residual Impact

Implementation of this measure would reduce impacts associated with drainage to a *less than significant* level (Class III).

4.5.5.5 Expansive Soils

Underlying soils are judged to be non-expansive. Therefore, no special measures with respect to expansive soils are necessary, and there would be no impact.

4.5.5.6 Change in Drainage Patterns Resulting in Erosion and Sedimentation

As noted in Sections 4.5.5.4 above, the proposed Master Plan includes drainage improvements, which would address current erosion and sedimentation issues and manage stormwater flow during rain events. In addition, the County has agreed to prepare project-specific geo-technical reports addressing subsurface conditions, and BMPs and LID strategies would be incorporated into grading and construction plans (refer to GS/mm-1, mm-2, mm-3; and WAT/mm-3). Preparation and implementation of a site-specific drainage plan would mitigate potential impacts. Therefore, potential impacts would be mitigated to less than significant (Class II).

4.5.5.7 100-year Flood Zone

The project site is not located within the 100-year flood zone; therefore, no impact would occur. Drainage and localized flooding is discussed under Section 4.5.5.4 above.

4.5.5.8 Consistency with the County Safety Element

As discussed in Chapter 3 Table 3-2 (Environmental Setting, Consistency with Plans and Policies), the project would be consistent with Safety Element standards and policies.

4.5.5.9 Mineral Resources

The project site is not located within an Extractive (EX) combining designation for mineral extraction, and is not known to contain valuable mineral resources. Therefore, no impact would occur.

4.5.6 Cumulative Impacts

Implementation of the pending and approved projects listed in the cumulative development scenario would increase development in the immediate area. Additional development, including the proposed project, would increase the number of people and structures exposed to a variety of geologic and soils hazards within the County, including liquefaction and ground shaking. Potential impacts related to geologic, soils, and seismic hazards are all site-specific, and mitigation measures are applied to each project to minimize the potential for significant geologic impacts. All development projects are required to comply with State and local regulations regarding grading and construction; therefore, no cumulative impacts related to these issues have been identified. Implementation of mitigation measures identified above, and compliance with existing regulations would mitigate impacts to less than significant, and not additional measures are necessary.

This page intentionally left blank.

4.6 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

This section of the Program EIR addresses non-geologic and non-air quality related hazards, such as hazardous material exposure, secondary and emergency access, airport hazards, fire hazards, potential for crime, and risks from road traffic. This section was prepared based on information contained in the *Results of Site History Research and Exploratory Trenching* (Earth Systems Pacific 2011), *Cultural Resource Investigation of the Nipomo Community Park* (Parker & Associates 2002), County planning documents, responses to the NOP of the Program EIR, and discussions with CAL FIRE, the San Luis Obispo Fire Department, and the County Sheriff's Department.

4.6.1 Existing Conditions

4.6.1.1 Hazardous Materials

A hazardous material is defined by the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) as a material that poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or the environment if released because of its quantity, concentration, or physical or chemical characteristics (26 CCR §25501). Worker safety and public health are potentially at risk whenever hazardous materials are used or exposed. It is often helpful to distinguish between the "hazard" associated with these materials and the "risk" they pose to human health or the environment. A hazardous material has the potential to cause damage upon accident or incidental exposure. The risk of an event is determined by a combination of the probability of exposure to hazardous materials and the severity of consequences should exposure occur (California Office of Emergency Services [OES] 1989). The likelihood of exposure to a hazardous material coupled with its inherent hazardous properties determines the degree of risk to public health or the environment. To be of high risk, exposure to a hazardous material must be both likely and have negative consequences.

The project site is located within the Nipomo urban area. Based on the results of a cultural resources field study (Parker 2002), and consultation with County staff and local residents, a historic dump site exists within the park. The dump was found to contain primarily ceramic, glass, and metal dating from the 1880s to the 1930s. Additional historical research and subsurface investigation was conducted to define the boundary and nature of deposits within the park (site history research and exploratory trenching) (Earth Systems Pacific 2011; refer to Appendix E).

The earliest reviewed aerial photo is dated 1939; no evidence of dumping is shown in the photo. Areas of dry-farmed agriculture are visible in the northern and southern portions of the park, and Pomeroy Road and West Tefft Street are present. Based on review of a 1949 aerial photograph, ground disturbance is observed within the southeastern corner of the park, along the northwest edge of a loop road, which may indicate the presence of dumping. In 1956, the loop road remains, and ground disturbance is observed on both sides of the road. The 1969 aerial photograph shows additional development within and adjacent to the park, including two baseball fields, an equestrian area, Dana Elementary School, and scattered residential development. The ground surface appears to still be disturbed in the southeast corner of the park; the loop road is no longer observed and numerous trees have been planted in this area. By 1978, additional park improvements include a third baseball field and tennis courts, and by 1989 a fourth baseball field and a network of footpaths and trails are evident. No indications of dumping are visible.

Based on a review of historic topographic maps, the 1922 and 1952 maps show a closed topographic contour indicating a basin-like depression, just west of the West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road intersection, and similar depressions are shown elsewhere in the area north and southeast of the park. These areas are typical topographic features in a stabilized sand dune environment, and in several locations outside the park have been found to contain buried debris and waste.

State and County records indicate the presence of a landfill site known as the Old Nipomo Dump, reportedly located northeast of the library. The library was constructed in 1996, and soil vapor sampling was conducted by the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB). Low combustible gas concentrations (a maximum of 900 parts per million by volume [ppmv]) were found at several locations in the northeastern part of the library site; the highest concentrations were found in a planter area that had been recently mulched and fertilized. The CIWMB requested the County conduct additional analysis to evaluate soil conditions. Soil gas samples were collected from a depth of eight feet below grade at two locations at the rear of the library, closest to the former disposal area identified by the CIWMB. Field readings for methane ranged from 3 to 6 ppmv. Soil gas samples were collected to test for concentrations of volatile compounds that could present health risks to occupants of the building.

Low levels of several volatile compounds were detected in the vapor samples collected in June 1996; the concentrations were several orders of magnitude below regulatory thresholds established for these compounds and did not present a health risk. As a precautionary measure, the CIWMB recommended that a landfill gas monitoring system be installed for the library to provide ample warning in the event combustible gas levels in the building rise. Based on consultation with the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) (formerly CIWMB), no detections of landfill gas have been logged since 2005. Based on County staff interviews, surficial dumping has occurred at the park, and items are dealt with at that time.

Based on field observation conducted November 18, 2010, small fragments of glass and scattered ceramic and gravel fragments were observed. On February 7, 2011, subsurface exploration consisting of five excavated trenches was conducted to observe the nature of the disposed materials, and to make a preliminary evaluation of their potential to contain volatile compounds that could impact future development of the park. Encountered debris included glass fragments, brick, metal, a metal cooking pot, tea kettle, broken and intact glass bottles, concrete, and wood. Volatile organic vapors were screened in the field, and no measurable organic vapors were detected. No other indications (e.g., odors, discoloration) of organic compound (e.g., hydrocarbon) contamination were noted in the trenches.

Two areas of past dumping were identified in the study and field analysis. The location of the older dump site is not published to prevent excavation and exploration. This site is less than 5 feet in depth, and appears to have not been used after 1939. Observed materials appear to be generally non-organic; therefore, the likelihood of landfill gas is low.

The more recent dump site is on the north side of West Tefft Street, approximately 200 feet west of Pomeroy Road, and extends several hundred feet to the southwest, in the vicinity of the existing dog park, picnic area, and unimproved area between the dog park and the library (refer to Appendix E). This site contains debris to a depth of at least 8 feet, and appears to have been in operation from 1939 to 1969. Observed materials appear to be generally non-organic, and are unlikely to generate significant amounts of landfill gas. The results of soil gas testing and monitoring near the library indicate that the dump is not generating significant amounts of combustible gases.

4.6.1.2 Secondary and Emergency Access and Road Traffic Hazards

The park is currently accessible by vehicles from West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road. Internal roads include a loop through the park, within the developed southeastern corner. The current park entrances do not align with street intersections on the opposite side of the road (Orchard Road and Juniper Street). These intersections are not signalized.

4.6.1.3 Airport Hazards

The project site is not located within an Airport Review Area, or within 2 miles of a private or public airport.

4.6.1.4 Fire Hazards

The project site is located within a high fire hazard zone, and within the State Responsibility Area for wildland fires. CAL FIRE has identified the project location as lying within the fiveminute emergency response time area. The Mesa Meadows area of the project site is further identified as a Wildland Area that may contain substantial forest fire risks and hazards on the County's Wildland Fire Hazard Area Map. The Safety Element of the County General Plan describes the Nipomo area as primarily developed with low-density residential areas with interspersed supporting commercial uses. The Element notes that the fire response needs of Nipomo are increased because of the presence of various wooded and urban area interfaces. The Safety Element uses the term "urban/wildland interface" to describe an area where urban development has been located in proximity to open space, or "wildland" areas. The most common type of urban/wildland interface results when urban development occurs on the fringe of existing urban areas, adjacent to wildland vegetation. The Element specifically identifies Nipomo as an area with intermixed urban/wildland interface areas. This represents a higher risk of fire than other unincorporated communities, and the areas west of Nipomo have historically experienced a high number of smaller fires (50 to 300 acres in size).

The project was referred to CAL FIRE for review, and CAL FIRE did not identify any significant fire hazard concerns. However, the department recommended preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan for the park, including vegetation fuel management, no smoking areas, an evacuation plan, and noted emergency access and fire hydrant locations (personal communication, Robert Lewin, CAL FIRE; September 27, 2005).

Please refer to Section 4.9, Public Services and Utilities, for further discussion of fire hazards and risks within the project area.

4.6.1.5 Potential for Crime

There are 358 total law enforcement employees in the county, including 147 officers and 211 civilians (U.S. Department of Justice [USDOJ], 2011). The County Sheriff's Department currently provides law enforcement services in the unincorporated area of San Luis Obispo County, including the Nipomo area. San Luis Obispo County encompasses 3,615 square miles, of which only 66 miles are incorporated and served by City police departments. The Department's South Patrol Station is located at 1681 Front Street, in Oceano. The South Station opened in October 2002 and serves the communities of Oceano, Nipomo, Huasna, rural Arroyo Grande, New Cuyama, and Lopez Lake. Private companies in Arroyo Grande and Santa Maria also provide ambulance service to the Nipomo area. Currently, the Sheriff's Department is understaffed and, with the cumulative impact of approved development, response times most likely will increase in the project area. In commenting on the proposed project, the County Sheriff's Department reported that current average response times to the

project area generally range between five and 30 minutes, depending upon the nature of the call and the location of patrol vehicles at the time of the call.

Based on the 2010 Crime Rate Index for Nipomo, the index for all crime is lower than the state and federal average crime risk. The index score for an area is compared to the national average (100 index score); the total index score for Nipomo is 13, compared to California, which is 97 (CLRChoice, Inc.; 2010). The number of offenses known to law enforcement, documented within the county in 2010, is presented below.

Type of Offense	Number of Documented Incidents	
Violent Crime	241	
Murder / manslaughter	6	
Rape	18	
Robbery	18	
Assault	199	
Property	1,295	
Burglary	437	
Larceny-Theft	853	
Vehicle-Theft	5	
Arson	5	

 Table 4.6-1. Offenses Known to Law Enforcement – San Luis Obispo County

Source: USDOJ, 2011

The Sheriff's Department recommended implementation of several safety measures in conjunction with development of additional park facilities, including the "Crime Prevention through Environmental Design" and lighting and lighting system guidelines, which have been proven to prevent and reduce crime.

Please refer to Section 4.9, Public Services and Utilities, for further discussion of the potential for additional crime within the project area.

4.6.2 Regulatory Setting

4.6.2.1 Hazardous Materials

Federal Policies and Regulations

The EPA is the Federal agency responsible for enforcement and implementation of Federal laws and regulations pertaining to hazardous materials. In addition, the EPA provides oversight and supervision for some site investigation/remediation projects. For disposal of certain hazardous wastes, the EPA has developed land disposal restrictions and treatment standards. Legislation includes the Resources Conservation and Recovery Act of 1986

(RCRA), the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA), and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA). The Federal regulations are primarily codified in CFR Title 40. These laws and regulations include specific requirements for facilities that handle, generate, use, store, treat, transport, and/or dispose of hazardous materials, as well as for investigation and cleanup of contaminated property.

State Policies and Regulations

California regulations are equal to or more stringent than federal regulations. EPA has granted the State of California primary oversight responsibility to administer and enforce hazardous waste management programs. State regulations require planning and management to ensure that hazardous wastes are handled, stored, and disposed of properly to reduce risks to human health and the environment. In California, the DTSC, a branch of CalEPA, works in conjunction with or in lieu of the EPA to enforce and implement specific hazardous materials laws and regulations. California has enacted its own legislation pertaining to the management of hazardous materials. The California legislation for which the DTSC has primary enforcement authority are the Hazardous Waste Control Act, a statute that primarily regulates the management of hazardous waste, and the Hazardous Substance Account Act, a statute that governs the cleanup of contaminated property and is modeled after CERCLA. CCR Title 22, enacted pursuant to the Hazardous Waste Control Act, establishes criteria for identifying hazardous wastes and presents hazardous waste management requirements. These regulations are reprinted in CCR Title 26, Toxics. The DTSC acts as the Lead Agency for some soil and groundwater cleanup projects. For sites where water quality is potentially endangered, the DTSC consults with the RWQCB on technical and regulatory issues. Several key laws pertaining to hazardous wastes are discussed below.

Under the Emergency Services Act, the state developed an emergency response plan to coordinate emergency services provided by federal, state, and local agencies. Rapid response to incidents involving hazardous materials or hazardous waste is an important part of the plan, which is administered by the California OES. The office coordinates the responses of other agencies, including EPA, the California Highway Patrol (CHP), RWQCBs, air quality management districts, and County disaster response offices.

Local Policies and Regulations

Pursuant to State law and local ordinance, the Environmental Health Services division of the County Health Agency conducts inspections to ensure proper handling, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials and proper remediation of contaminated sites. In addition, information is collected under the Business Plan Act is collected and certified by the County Environmental Health Services for emergency response purposes.

The County OES is an emergency management agency with responsibilities that include coordination of emergency and disaster preparedness planning, response, and recovery with and between local, state, and federal agencies. To address the potential for an uncontrolled hazardous material release in San Luis Obispo County, and to ensure that adequate resources are available to respond to a significant hazardous materials release, the County OES has prepared a Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Plan (updated 2003).

The County OES has also adopted an Emergency Operations Plan (revised 2008), an extension of the State Emergency Plan, which addresses the government's responsibility to preserve life, property, and the environment by anticipating and identifying events that would

require emergency management and response. The plan includes the following potential hazards and threats: earthquakes, hazardous materials, storm damage and flooding, dam or levee failure, nuclear power plant, fire, transportation emergencies, tsunami, aircraft incidents, civil disturbance, and terrorism.

4.6.2.2 Secondary and Emergency Access and Road Traffic Hazards

CAL FIRE Access Road Standards (August 2011) include standards for residential and commercial projects. Standard requirements include, but are not limited to, an all-weather surface, 24-foot width, 13-foot 6-inch vertical clearance, and no parking within the 10-foot wide through lane (each way). In addition to compliance and consistency with the 2010 California Fire Code, these standards are in place to ensure that in the event of a fire, persons can exit and emergency personnel and fire trucks can enter the location. Vegetative fuel modification is required within ten feet of the access road. Dead end road lengths are also established by these published standards.

Road traffic hazards are regulated by the County Department of Public Works, through consistency review with the Road Improvement Standards. These standards include safe sight distance at intersections, road widths, road surfacing requirements, shoulders, striping, and stormwater management.

4.6.2.3 Wildland Fire Hazards

The California PRC defines hazardous fire areas, restrictions on fire use, and minimum fire protection requirements for the state. The Code is administered by CAL FIRE, and sets forth provisions for the reduction of fire hazards and utilization of firebreaks around buildings, removal all flammable vegetation or combustible growth around buildings or electrical transmission poles and towers, and additional provisions under extra-hazardous conditions. Firebreak clearance is also required around electrical transmission poles and towers.

In addition to the PRC, several local ordinances direct fire prevention activities within San Luis Obispo County. Sections 22.50.010 through 22.50.040 of the County LUO is devoted entirely to Fire Safety and includes standards pertaining to the preparation and review of fire safety plans and application of fire safety standards. In addition, the Safety Element of the County General Plan includes goals, policies, implementation measures, and standards for pre-fire management, reduction of the threat of fires, readiness and response to fires, and loss prevention.

4.6.2.4 Crime

The County Sheriff's Department currently provides law enforcement services in the unincorporated area of San Luis Obispo County, including the Nipomo area. Upon review of the project, the Sheriff's Department recommended implementation of several safety measures in conjunction with development of additional park facilities, including the "Crime Prevention through Environmental Design" and lighting and lighting system guidelines, which have been proven to prevent and reduce crime.

4.6.3 Thresholds of Significance

As defined by the County, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, hazards and hazardous materials impacts would be considered significant if the project would:

- 1. Result in a risk of explosion or release of hazardous substances (e.g., oil, pesticides, chemicals, radiation) or exposure of people to hazardous substances;
- 2. Interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan;
- 3. Expose people to safety risk associated with airport flight pattern;
- 4. Increase fire hazard risk or expose people or structures to high fire hazard conditions; or,
- 5. Create any other health hazard or potential hazard.

4.6.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology

The impact analysis focuses on potential health risks associated with the proposed project, particularly from on-site and surrounding land uses where the potential for hazardous material release could be encountered and effect the project site and surrounding areas. Methodology for assessing the proposed project includes a review of existing regulatory plans and policies to determine the proposed project's consistency with these documents, as well as reliance upon the research and exploratory testing conducted by Earth Systems Pacific (2011).

Potential hazards and public safety issues associated with development of the Master Plan include increased risk for fire hazard, adequate secondary and emergency access, potential for crime, risks from road traffic, and exposure due to a known historic dump onsite. These impacts are discussed below.

4.6.5 Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures

4.6.5.1 Risk of Explosion, Release of, or Exposure to Hazardous Substances

Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials

During construction of elements included in the Master Plan, the use of large equipment would require fuels and oils. In the event of a leak or spill, the subsequent discharge would expose persons to these materials. Implementation of standard BMPs would minimize the potential for accidental exposure.

Operation of the project would include the continued use of regulated chemicals, fuels, and oils for the continued operation and maintenance. All materials would be transported, stored, and used according to existing regulations.

HM Impact 1 Use of large equipment in close proximity to the public and sensitive receptors may result in exposure to hazardous materials, including oils and fuel.

HM/mm-1 Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall ensure that all required BMPs are shown on applicable grading or construction plans. In addition, the General Services Agency shall designate personnel to insure compliance and monitor the effectiveness of the required BMPs, which shall include:

- a. Prior to construction, staging and refueling areas shall be designated on applicable plans.
- b. Equipment refueling shall be done in non-sensitive areas at least 100 feet from any residence, school, and library, and such that any spills can be easily and quickly contained and cleaned up. Any necessary remedial work shall be done immediately to avoid surface or ground water contamination.
- c. Prior to commencement of grading/construction activities, the County shall ensure that a plan is in place for prompt and effective response to any accidental spills. All workers will be informed of the importance of preventing spills and of the appropriate measures to take should a spill occur.

Residual Impact

The use of large equipment presents a potential risk related to hazardous material leaks or spills. Implementation of mitigation, including BMPs, would reduce the potential impact to a *less than significant level* (Class II).

Release of Hazardous Materials into the Environment

Field monitoring of the dumps indicate that volatile organic vapors were not present in the trenched areas. Landfill gas monitoring at the site of the existing library did not detect landfill gas. These results and the nature of the encountered debris indicate that volatile organic compounds are not likely to affect proposed development; however, they could contain non-volatile contaminants such as metals, long-chain hydrocarbons, or asbestos that could present a health or disposal concern if they are disturbed. Due to the nature of undocumented dumping, conditions throughout the dump area may not be uniform. Proposed improvements in this area would include the library expansion, skatepark or community pool, access road, and associated parking. Site specific testing would be necessary prior to development of these structures and improvements. Further testing and remediation would be implemented pursuant to existing regulations, and in compliance with CalRecycle and the CCR.

- HM Impact 2 Disturbance of the former (more recent) dump site along West Tefft Street may result in the disturbance or exposure of non-volatile hazardous materials including metals, long-chain hydrocarbons, or asbestos.
- HM/mm-2 Prior to initiation of ground disturbance or construction within 400 feet of the edge of West Tefft Street, within the Nipomo Community Park, the General Services Agency shall ensure compliance with the following measures:
 - a. Upon identification of a structure footprint or area of disturbance, exploratory trenches or borings shall be excavated to determine the presence or absence of dumped materials. Samples of the debris and soil shall be collected for laboratory analysis to evaluate whether the materials present any health or environmental concerns.
 - b. Soil gas testing shall be conducted in and around any proposed building footprint to determine whether landfill gas is present, and

whether it could accumulate in the finished building. Depending on the results of the soil gas testing, it may be necessary to incorporate design features that will prevent gas accumulation. Measures may include controlling the gas pressure (i.e., passive or active venting to reduce gas concentrations under the structure, venting around the perimeter of the structure, and crawl- space venting); eliminating available entry pathways or leaks (i.e., improving plumbing and caulking to reduce cracks and gaps will reduce entry pathways, install a low-permeability liner around the underground portion of the structure); and, installation of a landfill gas monitoring system.

c. Prior to removal or relocation, soil and debris shall be tested for contaminants of potential concern to identify disposal or placement restrictions. Testing shall include analysis for metals, long-chain (semi-volatile) hydrocarbons, and semi-volatile organic compounds. Additional testing may be required depending on the specific nature of the materials to be removed from the site.

Residual Impact

The presence of potentially hazardous materials has been documented during subsurface testing. Compliance with existing state regulations and implementation of this mitigation measure would include additional testing and remediation, which would reduce impacts associated with subsurface hazardous materials exposure to a *less than significant level* (Class II).

Exposure to Hazardous Emissions

The NCP is located <u>immediately adjacent to</u> the Dana Elementary School. As noted above, potential hazards include the use of large equipment, the potential for accidental exposure to construction-related oils and fuels, and the disturbance of soil and debris within a known dump site. The dump site is located to the immediate north of the school property, and as noted above, landfill gas has not been detected in the existing library structure. Based on implementation of BMPs, further soil testing and remediation (if required) pursuant to existing regulations, and long-term monitoring of interior gas levels within structures, the potential impacts to the school site would be less than significant, and no additional mitigation is required.

Hazardous Materials Sites

Section 65962.5(a)(1) requires that DTSC "shall compile and update as appropriate, but at least annually, and shall submit to the Secretary for Environmental Protection, a list of all the following:(1) [a]II hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to §25187.5 of the Health and Safety Code ("HSC")." The hazardous waste facilities identified in HSC §25187.5 are those where DTSC has taken or contracted for corrective action because a facility owner/operator has failed to comply with a date for taking corrective action in an order issued under HSC §25187, or because DTSC determined that immediate corrective action was necessary to abate an imminent or substantial endangerment. This is a very small and specific subgroup of facilities and they are not separately posted on the DTSC or CalEPA's website. No facilities within or in the vicinity of the project site are included on the list.

4.6.5.2 Emergency Response or Emergency Evacuation Plan

Based on review of the County's Emergency Operations Plan (2008), and associated mitigation and response plans, US 101 is an emergency evacuation route. Implementation of the Master Plan would not impair implementation of any response or mitigation plan, and would not interfere with emergency evacuation, because no element would block or emergency responders or the public. No significant impact would occur.

4.6.5.3 Risk Associated with Airport Flight Pattern

The project site is not located with an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public or private airport or airstrip; therefore, no impact would occur.

4.6.5.4 Fire Hazard Risk

The project site is within a high fire hazard zone, and within the State Responsibility Area for wildland fires. While the site is not located adjacent to wildlands, the ridge traversing the park and slope adjacent to Osage Road supports oak woodland. During preliminary scoping, the proposed project was referred to CAL FIRE for review. CAL FIRE did not identify any significant fire hazard concerns; however, the department recommended preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan for the park, including vegetation fuel management, no smoking areas, and evacuation plan, and noted emergency access and fire hydrant locations (personal communication, Robert Lewin, CAL FIRE; September 27, 2005). All vegetative fuel management would comply with current guidelines and regulations (i.e., 100-foot buffer from all structures). Proposed on and off-site transportation and circulation improvements would facilitate access into the park in the event of a fire or similar emergency, and would also facilitate exit from the park. Existing and proposed access points including Camino Caballo, Osage Street, Pomeroy Road, and West Tefft Street would provide numerous options for vehicles, pedestrians, equestrians, and bicyclists. Based on the design of the park, proposed access improvements, and compliance with the California Fire Code, the project would not result in a significant impact related to fire risk.

4.6.6 Cumulative Impacts

Potential hazards in this EIR are location-specific to the extent that they may result in significant impacts on the localized environment, but they are not "cumulative" in the sense normally applied in CEQA documents. Further, the impacts identified in this section are associated with relatively short-term construction activities and the continued monitoring of the known dump site, and anticipated testing and remediation activities at that site will reduce potential exposure to hazards during construction and use of future structures and park facilities. The mitigation measures that have been identified for the proposed project would apply cumulatively as well. Cumulative impacts would be *less than significant* (Class III). No additional mitigation is required.

4.7 LAND USE

This section of the Program EIR addresses potential impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed NCP Master Plan on existing land uses and future land use compatibility.

4.7.1 Existing Conditions

The project site consists of two main locations: the NCP and Mesa Meadows Recreation Area. Land use designations include Recreation, Public Facility, and Residential Suburban (refer to Figure 3-1).

4.7.1.1 Existing Land Uses and Designations

NCP is predominantly in the Recreation land use category, with approximately 9.4 acres along the southern boundary designated Public Facilities and currently being used as open space. The park currently consists of various open parkland uses, including three little league baseball fields, one regulation-sized baseball field, lighted tennis courts, basketball hoops, children's playgrounds, individual and group day-use picnic sites, dog parks, equestrian trails, bike and pedestrian paths, and a locally maintained native plant and community garden. NCP encompasses the Nipomo Native Garden at its northern boundary, an approximately 12-acre native botanical garden featuring plant communities native to the Nipomo Mesa and Nipomo dunes complex.

The Mesa Meadows Recreation Area is within the Residential Suburban land use category, but was deeded to the County in 2001 as part of an Open Space Agreement associated with the residential development to the southwest. The area is currently in passive recreation and open space, and existing uses include a Class I bike path, nature trail, and undeveloped open space area. The Open Space Agreement limits the use of Mesa Meadows to passive land uses only, and no improvements are proposed in this area as part of the project.

The physical setting and existing land uses of the project area are further discussed in Chapter 3, Environmental Setting.

4.7.1.2 Land Use of Adjacent Properties

The majority of lands directly adjacent to the project area are in Residential Suburban or Residential Single Family land use designations. There are also two parcels at the southeast corner of the project area within other designations: a Public Facility parcel at the location of Dana Elementary School and an Office Professional parcel with some general office buildings and <u>a community health center expansion (under construction)</u>.

4.7.2 Regulatory Setting

4.7.2.1 State Policies and Regulations

Aside from CEQA, there are no State policies or regulations applicable to the proposed project, with regard to land use issues.

4.7.2.2 Local Policies and Regulations

Pursuant to the LUO (Title 22 of the County Code), §22.06.040 (Exemptions from Land Use Permit Requirements), County projects constructed by the county or its contractors are exempt from the land use permit requirements of Title 22, including compliance with noted planning

area standards identified in the South County Area Plan. However, it is the policy of the County to implement actions that are consistent with Title 22 and the County General Plan, to the maximum extent feasible.

In addition, while the County is not subject to ordinance requirements, the LUO includes standards that are useful as possible thresholds of significance, such as noise standards, and mitigation measures (i.e., preparation of drainage and erosion control plans). Ordinances and standards applicable to the project area are listed and discussed below.

Framework for Planning (Inland)

The first part of the County Land Use Element is the Framework for Planning. The Framework contains policies and procedures that apply to the unincorporated area outside the coastal zone, and defines how the Land Use Element is used together with the LUO and other adopted plans. The Framework also explains the criteria used in applying land use categories and combining designations to the land, and the operation of the Resource Management System. Combining designations are special map categories that identify areas of unique resources or potential hazards that necessitate more careful project review.

County of San Luis Obispo Land Use Ordinance

The LUO (Title 22 of the County Code) includes regulations established and adopted to protect and promote public health, safety, and welfare. Regulations are also adopted to implement the County General Plan, guide and manage the future growth of the county in accordance with those plans, and regulate land use in a manner that will encourage and support the orderly development and beneficial use of lands within the county. In addition, LUO regulations are in place to minimize adverse effects on the public resulting from land use and development, as well as to protect and enhance the significant natural, historic, archeological, and scenic resources within the county as identified by the County General Plan.

County of San Luis Obispo South County Area Plan

The project lies within the unincorporated area of San Luis Obispo County, and outside of the California Coastal Zone, which is under the jurisdiction of the *South County Inland Area Plan*. The plan acts as a guide for the cohesive and comprehensive development of the South County Inland Area, and seeks to guide future development that will balance the social, economic, environmental and governmental resources and activities affecting the quality of life within the area. This plan includes planning area standards for the South County Planning Area, which includes the urban community of Nipomo, and seeks to preserve the character of the communities and rural areas that currently exist in the area.

San Luis Obispo County Land Use Ordinance, Nipomo Urban Area Planning Standards

Article 9 of the LUO includes standards for proposed development and new land uses that are specific to each of the planning areas defined by the Land Use Element, including standards specifically applicable to the Nipomo Urban Area. These standards are mandatory requirements, intended to address the local planning issues of each planning area. As noted above, County public projects are exempt from the LUO; however, the standards are useful thresholds of significance to identify potential land use impacts.
San Luis Obispo County General Plan

Parks and Recreation Element

The Parks and Recreation Element is an optional component of the County General Plan. The County has had a Recreation Element as part of its General Plan since 1968, showing an early commitment to provide adequate park and recreation opportunities for both residents and visitors. The Recreation Element establishes goals, policies, and implementation measures for management, renovation, and expansion of existing, and development of new, parks and recreation facilities in order to meet existing and projected needs and to ensure an equitable distribution of parks throughout the county. The purpose of the Parks and Recreation Element is to: (1) provide policy guidance regarding the provision of park and recreation services, (2) document the County's existing park and recreation resources, and (3) facilitate the evaluation of park and recreation needs including those resources that are outside the County's management during the land use decision process.

Noise Element

The County Noise Element (adopted May 5, 1992) provides a policy framework for addressing potential noise impacts in the planning process, and minimizing future noise conflicts. The Noise Element identifies transportation-related, stationary, and potential operational noise generators in the county, provides a list of noise-sensitive land uses, and identifies acceptable and unacceptable thresholds of noise exposure based on land use. The document also provides mitigation measures that should be applied to projects when noise attenuation is required to meet identified thresholds.

Safety Element

The two primary principles of the County Safety Element are emergency preparedness and managed development to reduce risk. The Safety Element identifies potential emergency situations and natural disasters within the county, and includes goals and policies for response during an emergency or natural disaster, and avoidance of unnecessary risk.

West Tefft Corridor Design Plan

The project area is bounded for approximately 980 feet on the eastern boundary (APN 092-121-086) by West Tefft Street. The West Tefft Corridor Design Plan addresses the design of new development and streets near West Tefft Street between US 101 and Dana Elementary School, including the area along West Tefft encompassed by the proposed project. The central concerns of the plan are to avoid the development of suburban shopping centers throughout the designated downtown and to avoid street environments that are dangerous or unattractive to pedestrians. However, the area of West Tefft bordering the proposed project was included in the Design Plan solely to extend parkway/sidewalk concepts within the rightof-way. The Design Plan gives guidance for the desired appearance and scale of streets, buildings and open spaces, which are to be achieved through the public review of new projects and their completion.

4.7.3 Thresholds of Significance

The significance of impacts on land use was determined by the County consistent with criteria listed in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. For the purpose of this Program EIR, a project will have a significant effect on the environment if it would:

- 1. Be potentially inconsistent with land use, policy/regulation (e.g., general plan [county land use element and ordinance], local coastal plan, specific plan, Clean Air Plan, etc.) adopted to avoid or mitigate for environmental effects; or,
- 2. Be potentially inconsistent with any habitat or community conservation plan;
- 3. Be potentially inconsistent with adopted agency environmental plans or policies with jurisdiction over the project; or,
- 4. Be potentially incompatible with surrounding land uses.

4.7.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology

The analysis of land use was conducted qualitatively based on existing land use policies and the existing land use setting. The potential impacts resulting from implementation of the proposed Master Plan were analyzed against the ordinance standards and General Plan policies whose purpose it is to remedy the impacts. Chapter 3, Environmental Setting, of this Program EIR describes the applicable land use plans and policies and provides an analysis of the consistency of the proposed actions with these plans and policies.

4.7.5 **Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

4.7.5.1 Consistency with Land Use, Policy/Regulation

The project has been assessed for consistency with the County General Plan and LUO. As noted above, compliance with ordinance regulations is not required; however, these standards provide measurable thresholds of significance when assessing potential land use impacts (i.e., setbacks, structure heights, access requirements). Applicable standards are noted below.

Land Use Setbacks

Section 22.30.340 of the County LUO identifies specific thresholds outdoor sports and recreational facilities. These thresholds, and the project's proposed thresholds, are included in Table 4.7-1 below. As proposed, the proposed project elements would be consistent with all identified setbacks except for the skate park.

Facility	Required Setback (feet)	Proposed Setback (feet)	
Sports Turf Fields (lighting)	100	120	
Group Picnic Areas (lighting)	100	240	
Amphitheater	F: 10 / S: 30 / R: 15	200 (minimum)	
Playgrounds	50	180	
Recreation center	F: 10 / S: 30 / R: 15	720	
Swimming Pool (no lighting)	50	50	
Dog park (no lighting)	50	50	

 Table 4.7-1. Land Use Ordinance Minimum Setback Requirements

Facility	Required Setback (feet)	Proposed Setback (feet)
Skate park (no lighting)	1,000 (from residential)	120
Handball courts (no lighting)	50	920
Horseshoe pits (no lighting)	50	360
Tennis courts (lighting)	100	640
Basketball courts (lighting)	100	840

F = front, S = side, R = rear

Source: San Luis Obispo County LUO

Setbacks are often recommended to encourage land use consistency, including adequate distance for noise attenuation. Noise generated by proposed park uses may affect sensitive uses, including residences, Dana Elementary School, and the Nipomo Library. Section 22.30.340 of the Land Use Ordinance states that amusement parks (including skate parks) are not located closer than 1,000 feet to a residential category. The proposed skate park element to the proposed project would be located approximately 120 feet from residential property boundaries to the east, and therefore does not comply with the ordinance requirement. Section 22.30.020(D) states that the standards of §22.30.340 may be waived or modified through Conditional Use Permit approval provided that the Planning Commission makes the appropriate findings based on specific conditions of the site that make the standard either unnecessary or ineffective.

As discussed further in Section 4.8, Noise, the recommended setback is 400 feet based on average use of the skate park (without other mitigating design elements). As proposed, the skate park would be located within 200 feet of the existing library and proposed library expansion, and approximately 380 feet from Dana Elementary School. A residential development is located approximately 120 feet to the southeast, across West Tefft Street. Based on the noise analysis, which included measurement of traffic noise along West Tefft Street, use of the skate park would add 1 dB to the existing (and future estimated) ambient noise level. Noting that traffic levels fluctuate during the day, there would be periods when noise generated by the skate park would exceed noise generated by traffic on West Tefft Street, which would adversely affect residential land uses. Mitigation is recommended, including measures such as incorporating an in-ground design and a noise barrier or berm between the skate park and noise sensitive uses. Construction of a barrier within 25 feet of the edge of the skate park will reduce the noise level by approximately 5 to 10 dB; which would result in a noise level of approximately 63 to 68 dB at the barrier, and approximately 52 to 57 dB at a distance of 100 feet from the source. Therefore, the project would not generate noise levels significantly exceeding ambient noise levels, and would also mitigate potential related land use impacts.

Based on this analysis, and implementation of recommended mitigation (N/mm-2), it can be found that the standards required by §22.30.340(A) are unnecessary in this instance, and potential land use impacts would be less than significant.

Structure Height

Section 22.10.090.C (Height Limits) establishes a 35-foot height limit for structures in the Recreation land use category. The tallest structure proposed as part of the NCMP is the recreation/community center, which would be 35 feet in height, consistent with the standard.

Light and Glare

The proposed project includes the installation of exterior lighting for use of the sports fields, tennis courts, and basketball courts. As shown in Table 4.7-1 Land Use Ordinance Minimum Setback Requirements, the project would be consistent with recommended setbacks for these lighted uses; however, the generation of additional light may have an adverse effect on residential uses in the closest proximity, to the southwest of the proposed sports fields. County LUO §22.10.060 (Exterior Lighting) includes standards to minimize light intensity, and requires that light sources are shielded. In addition, the County *Parks and Recreation Element* states that "Facilities shall be designed to minimize new light, except for the minimum required for safety. In general, lighting fixtures shall be downcast and hooded. Night lighting for active sports fields shall limit spillover visible at sensitive uses such as residences to the maximum extent practical. Use of glare-producing materials shall be minimized".

As discussed in Section 4.1, Aesthetic Resources, mitigation is recommended to design, implement, and verify exterior lighting that would not create excessive glare adversely affecting nearby residential uses (refer to AES/mm-6 and AES/mm-7), consistent with the LUO and General Plan. Based on implementation of these measures, potential land use impacts would be less than significant.

Title 19 – Building and Construction Ordinance

Section 19.07.022 (Private Sewage Disposal Systems) states that the use of private on-site sewage disposal systems is allowed only within the rural areas of the county and within urban and village areas where no community sewage collection, treatment, and disposal system exists. Section 19.07.022(a) notes that these regulations are enacted in part to implement the requirements of the "Water Quality Control Plan Central Coast Basin" (Basin Plan). Based on consultation with the RWQCB regarding the Basin Plan and Basin Plan Amendment requirements, restroom facilities within the park are not required to connect to the Nipomo Community Services District (NCSD) sewer system unless compliance with the Basin Plan cannot be demonstrated (RWQCB 2010).

The proposed on-site systems would be located on public land, be operated and maintained by a public agency (County), and would serve the public visitors to NCP. As discussed in Section 4.11, Wastewater, the existing onsite systems have served current uses, and based on the size and topography of the project site, construction of an engineered system in compliance with the Basin Plan is feasible. Therefore, potential land use impacts would be less than significant.

Strategic Growth

On April 28, 2009, the County Board of Supervisors adopted Principles of Strategic Growth, including policies and implementing strategies. Principles include the following:

- 1. Preserve open space, scenic natural beauty and sensitive environmental areas.
- 2. Conserve energy resources. Conserve agricultural resources and protect agricultural land.

- 3. Strengthen and direct development towards existing and strategically planned communities.
- 4. Foster distinctive, attractive communities with a strong sense of place.
- 5. Create walkable neighborhoods and towns.
- 6. Provide a variety of transportation choices.
- 7. Create a range of housing opportunities and choices.
- 8. Encourage mixed land uses.
- 9. Take advantage of compact building design.
- 10. Make development decisions predictable, fair and cost-effective.
- 11. Encourage community and stakeholder collaboration.
- 12. Strengthen regional cooperation.

Relative to land use, the proposed NCP Master Plan is consistent with these Principles and associated policies because it would:

- Plan for most future development to be within an existing and strategically planned community (Principle 2, Policy 3).
- Contribute to the creation of a complete community with appropriate areas for housing, commerce, civic uses, schools, recreation, and open spaces (Principle 2, Policy 4).
- Create active and vital urban and village environments that are attractive, compact, and orderly arrangements of structures and open space, appropriate to the size and scale of Nipomo (Principle 2, Policy 5).
- Phase urban development in a compact manner, first using vacant or underutilized infill parcels and lands next to or near existing development (Principle 2, Policy 7).
- Provide adequate community amenities, parks, natural areas, and trails in support of new development, which will support a high quality of life and a compact form of community development (Principle 2, Policy 11).
- Provide parks and public spaces located as focal points within convenient walking distances of neighborhoods (Principle 4, Policy 1).
- Provide connectivity between different land uses through walkways (Principle 4, Policy 2).
- Create attractive street enhancements and public spaces that serve as gathering places on corridors and at connecting locations (Principle 4, Policy 3).
- Provide parks, natural areas, and recreation facilities with new urban development to enhance the community's quality of life and improve public health (Principle 4, Policy 4).
- Create non-residential areas that minimize fear and crime through environmental and urban design (Principle 4, Policy 5).

As discussed above, potential land use impacts include the generation of noise, light, and glare. Upon implementation and operation of the proposed project, adjacent land uses will notice changes in the NCP, including an increase in noise and lighting. While these changes would affect adjacent land uses, based on resource-specific analysis of these issues and implementation of recommended mitigation, potential land use impacts would be *less than significant* (Class III).

4.7.5.2 Consistency with Habitat or Community Conservation Plan

There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans in effect that would conflict with the developments proposed in the NCP Master Plan; therefore, no impact would occur.

4.7.5.3 Consistency with Adopted Agency Environmental Plans

As discussed in Section 4.2, Air Quality, the project is consistent with the SLOAPCD *Clean Air Plan.* As discussed in Section 4.11, Wastewater, compliance with the RWQCB Basin Plan is feasible. The project appears to be consistent with applicable adopted agency environmental plans.

4.7.5.4 Compatibility with Surrounding Land Uses

The proposed NCPMP is intended to enhance existing land uses and strengthen the recreational and open space uses in the central urban core of Nipomo. The proposed NCPMP; however, does present potential conflicts with surrounding residential uses, including changes to the existing visual setting (i.e., potential conflicts with community values regarding the character of NCP), increased light and glare during evening hours, and increased levels of noise within the proposed developed areas of NCP.

These issues are thoroughly analyzed in their relative sections, including Aesthetic Resources (Section 4.1) and Noise (Section 4.8) of this Program EIR. No significant, adverse, unavoidable impacts were identified. All identified impacts can be mitigated to less than significant, which would subsequently address potential land use conflicts as well, and ensure consistency with regulations and policies. No additional mitigation measures are required.

4.7.6 Cumulative Impacts

Potential cumulative land use impacts would be avoided or minimized through implementation of the mitigation measures described in this Program EIR. The proposed uses are generally consistent with the current use of NCP, the surrounding community, and the land use designation and policies applicable to the project site. In addition, prior to development of major features requiring further discretionary review, the public will have an opportunity to provide comments regarding specific elements (i.e., recreation/community center). No additional mitigation measures are necessary.

4.8 Noise

The effects of noise are considered in two ways: how a proposed project may increase existing noise levels and affect surrounding land uses; and how a proposed land use may be affected by noise from existing and surrounding land uses. This section of the Program EIR addresses: the existing noise environment of the project area; federal, state, and local noise guidelines and policies; potential impacts resulting from implementing the proposed Master Plan; and potential noise impacts that would be encountered throughout the area.

4.8.1 Existing Conditions

Noise is generally defined as unwanted sound. Noise meters are instruments that detect small changes in atmospheric pressure. These meters cannot distinguish between that which is wanted (e.g., birds singing, waves on a beach, etc.) and that which is not (e.g., traffic or railroad noise). Thus, measurements of noise are more accurately described as measurements of sound pressure.

Noise sources and sound intensities can vary significantly over an urban area. Motor vehicles are usually the primary noise source in California cities. Variables that affect traffic noise include traffic volumes, proximity to the noise source, time of day, speed, pavement condition. Topography also plays a significant role in the perception of traffic related noise emissions. Road segments that are cut below or significantly elevated above the grade at which noise is measured will generally produce a quieter noise environment.

Sites that have abundant vegetation and an undulating profile (soft sites) will absorb sound pressure waves more fully than an area that is predominantly asphalt or concrete (hard site). Under normal conditions on hard sites, noise will attenuate (drop-off) at an approximate rate of 3.0 dBA (A-weighted decibel [dB]) per doubling of distance (DD) for a line source (i.e., traffic sources) and about 6.0 dBA/DD for a point (stationary) source. An excess ground attenuation value of 1.5 dBA/DD over standard conditions would be assumed for undeveloped areas.

The only way to ascertain the noise level at a given site is to actually measure it. Qualified persons, using laboratory-certified sound meters, conduct noise studies. Often noise studies gather measurements for several days, and this data is used to calculate the Day/Night Sound Level (Ldn) and/or the Community Noise Exposure Level (CNEL). These two metrics penalize night time noise to reflect normal sleep patterns. Having noise exposure information allows better site planning and architectural treatments (e.g., quiet windows) as needed.

4.8.1.1 Identified Sensitive Land Uses

Certain land uses are considered more sensitive to ambient noise levels than others, due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities involved. In general, noise-sensitive land uses include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Residential areas;
- Schools-preschool to secondary, college; specialized education and training;
- Health care services (hospital);
- Nursing and personal care;
- Churches;
- Public assembly and entertainment;
- Libraries and museums;
- Hotels and motels;

- Outdoor sports and recreation; and,
- Offices.

Existing noise sensitive uses within, adjacent to, and in the vicinity of NCP include residences, Dana Elementary School, Little Bits Preschool, Day Springs Preschool, Nipomo Library, <u>Community Health Center (expansion under construction)</u>, and NCP itself.

4.8.1.2 Existing Noise Environment

Transportation Noise Sources

The level of traffic noise depends on the following three factors: (1) the volume of traffic, (2) the speed of the traffic, and (3) the number of trucks in the traffic flow. Generally, heavier traffic volumes, higher speeds, and the greater numbers of trucks increase the loudness of traffic noise. Any condition (such as a steep incline) that causes heavy laboring of motor vehicle engines will also increase the resultant traffic noise levels. Vehicle noise around the NCP is a combination of the noise produced by the engines, exhausts, and tires.

Higher levels of existing noise resulting from automobile and truck traffic characterize the perimeter portions of the NCP, especially adjacent to the West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road corridors. Although higher levels of noise occur along the existing transportation corridors surrounding the NCP, noise levels rapidly attenuate as one moves towards the interior of the park because of the varying topography and in some locations the presence of dense thick wooded vegetation. A field investigation was conducted on November 23, 2010, and noise measurements were documented from approximately 3:30 p.m. to 5:45 p.m. to determine traffic related ambient noise levels around the perimeter and within the NCP (refer to Figure 4.8-1 and Table 4.8-1). Each of the short-term sites was measured for 15 minutes while vehicle volumes were classified. The hourly counts are then normalized from the data generated.

Generally speaking, the loudest traffic noise levels are associated with sites monitored adjacent to West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road, which are the primary noise sources in the general area. There are a variety of commercial and retail areas to the north and east of the NCP (including US 101), which are additional noise generators in the immediate area. Most other areas surrounding the NCP are residential and do not have significant traffic volumes or excessive traffic noise levels.

Looption*	Period of	Noise Levels (dBA)	Traffic Volume		
Location	Measurement	Leq	Number	Vehicles/Hour	
1	3:30 – 4:45 pm	63.8	228	912	
2	4:00 – 4:15 pm	64.5	240	960	
3	4:30 – 4:45 pm	61.0	150	600	
4	5:00 – 5:15 pm	57.1	118	472	
5	5:15 – 5:30 pm	55.6	70	280	
6	5:30 – 5:45 pm	63.0	195	780	

 Table 4.8-1. Short-term Transportation Noise Measurements

*Refer to Figure 4.8-1



Figure 4.8-1. Traffic Noise Measurement Locations

Short and Long-term Ambient Noise

Within the park, noise is generated by park users, including voices, portable radios and music players, use of courts and ball fields, and internal traffic. Short-term noise measurements were conducted on March 16, 2010, at 16 locations within NCP (refer to Figure 4.8-2). At the time of the field study, documented noise sources included traffic, aircraft, human voices, and use of the tennis courts. Table 4.8-2 presents the results of the short-term monitoring. The average noise level ranged from approximately 36 to 51 Leq (average sound level).

Site	Time	Elev (m)	LeqA*	Lmax*	Lmin*	Primary Noise Sources
ST1	2:00 p.m.	115	41.2	44	39.4	Distant traffic, wind, birds, human voices
ST2	2:10 p.m.	109	39.7	50	36.3	Distant traffic, wind, birds, human voices
ST3	2:20 p.m.	109	36.8	49.4	32.5	Distant traffic, wind, birds, human voices
ST4	2:35 p.m.	114	46.8	59	30.2	Traffic
ST5	3:00 p.m.	113	46.7	69.9	33.5	One aircraft, traffic
ST6	3:20 p.m.	115	44.9	54.7	34.2	Traffic
ST7	3:30 p.m.	114	43.9	65.5	34.9	One aircraft, traffic
ST8	3:37 p.m.	109	41.5	52.5	34.3	Gentle wind - sheltered area
ST9	3:45 p.m.	118	45.4	59.9	35.8	One aircraft
ST10	3:52 p.m.	119	53	61.4	40.6	Traffic
ST11	3:59 p.m.	119	51.1	63.8	45.6	Traffic - no baseball on large diamond
ST12	4:05 p.m.	109	50.3	61.5	42.6	Traffic, kids playing, two tennis games
ST13	4:08 p.m.	101	45.9	63.4	37.7	Traffic, kids playing, two tennis games, wind
ST14	4:3: p.m.	111	41.9	56.7	34.4	Wind, traffic
ST15	4:18 p.m.	118	40.7	51.4	34.7	Wind, distant traffic
ST16	4:25 p.m.	110	41.7	47.2	34.7	Wind, distant traffic

|--|

*All measurements A-weighted scale

Long-term noise measurements were conducted in one location within the NCP on March 14 and 15, 2010 (refer to Figure 4.8-2). Noise levels were averaged over hourly increments, and peak hour, daytime, and nighttime averages are presented in Table 4.8-3.

Time	March 14, 2010 dBA		March 15, 2010 dBA	
	a.m.	p.m.	a.m.	p.m.
12:00	40.9	52.7	37.5	40.0
1:00	39.1	64.9	37.4	63.5
2:00	37.4	53.6	36.7	45.7
3:00	36.6	46.7	42.1	49.0
4:00	37.4	55.8	46.0	64.4
5:00	40.8	51.7	52.4	61.5
6:00	43.6	44.4	52.9	46.3
7:00	43.9	46.4	50.3	51.3
8:00	47.0	45.5	47.2	45.1
9:00	50.3	44.0	41.6	42.9
10:00	47.8	41.8	40.1	64.9
11:00	47.5	38.7	45.9	61.4
Leq Measurements				
Morning Peak hour (7:00 a.m10:00 a.m.)	48		48	
Evening Peak Hour (4:00 p.m8:00 p.m.)		52		60
Daytime (7:00 a.m10:00p.m.)	55		57	
Nighttime (10:00 p.m7:00 a.m.)*		40		57

 Table 4.8-3. Long-term Noise Measurements

*not penalized.



Figure 4.8-2. Long-term Noise Monitoring Map

4.8.2 Regulatory Setting

Noise is regulated at the federal, state, and local levels through regulations, policies, and/or local ordinances. Local policies are commonly adaptations of federal and state guidelines based on prevailing local conditions or special requirements.

4.8.1.3 Federal Policies and Regulations

Congressional: The Federal Noise Control Act of 1972

This law states that controlling noise protects the health and welfare of the Nation's population. It recognizes that transportation vehicles, machinery, and appliances are noise sources, and responsibility for controlling these noise sources rests with state and local governments. Moreover, the federal government will coordinate and adopt standards for inter-state commerce projects (e.g., airports).

Federal Highway Administration: 23 CFR 772

Federal code provides uniform procedures to evaluate highway noise and implement abatement measures. Interpretation of what constitutes 'substantial noise' is left to the states.

4.8.1.4 State and Local Policies and Regulations

California Government Code

The State General Plan Guidelines requires that local governments identify major noise sources and areas containing noise-sensitive land uses. Noise must be quantified by preparing generalized noise exposure contours for current and projected conditions. Contours may be prepared in terms of either the CNEL or Ldn.

4.8.1.5 County of San Luis Obispo Noise Element

The Noise Element of the County General Plan provides a policy framework for addressing potential and existing noise impacts during the planning process. Its purpose is to minimize future and existing noise conflicts. Among the most significant polices found in the Noise Element are numerical noise standards that limit noise exposure within noise-sensitive land uses resulting from transportation sources. An increase in the ambient stationary noise level surrounding the project site would result from the addition of the new facility, which could potentially result in a stationary noise impact that would exceed the thresholds defined in the County Noise Element. Specific thresholds are discussed in the section below.

4.8.3 Thresholds of Significance

In accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA *Guidelines*, the County thresholds state that noise impacts would be considered significant if the proposed project would:

- 1. Expose people to noise levels that exceed the County Noise Element thresholds (see Tables 4.8-4, 4.8-5, and 4.8-6 below);
- 2. Generate increases in the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas; or
- 3. Expose people to severe noise or vibration.

Transportation Noise Sources

Policy 3.3.2 of the Noise Element states that "new development of noise-sensitive land uses shall not be permitted in areas exposed to existing or projected future levels of noise from transportation noise sources which exceed 60 dB Ldn or CNEL for outdoor activity areas and 45 Ldn or CNEL for interior spaces unless the project includes effective mitigation measures to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas and interior spaces to or below the levels for the given land use" (refer to Tables 4.8-4 and 4.8-5).

Policy 3.3.3 of the Noise Element states that "noise created by new transportation noise sources, including roadway improvement project, shall be mitigated so as not to exceed the levels specified in [Table 4.8-4] within the outdoor activity areas and interior spaces of existing noise sensitive land uses."

Landline	Outdoor Activity	Interior Spaces		
	Ldn/CNEL, dB	Ldn/CNEL, dB	L_{EQ}, dB^2	
Residential (Except Temporary)	60 ³	45	_	
Bed and Breakfast, Hotels, Motels	60 ³	45	_	
Hospitals, Nursing and Personal Care	60 ³	45	-	
Public Assembly and Entertainment	_	-	35	
Offices	60 ³	-	45	
Churches, Meeting Halls	_	_	45	
Schools, Libraries, Museums	_	_	45	
Outdoor Sports and Recreation	70	-	_	

Table 4.8-4. Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure Transportation Noise Sources

¹ Where the location of outdoor activity areas is unknown, the exterior noise level standard shall be applied to the property line of the receiving land use.

² As determined for a typical worst-case hour during periods of use.

³ For other than residential uses, where an outdoor activity area is not proposed, the standard shall not apply. Where it is not possible to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas to 60 dB Ldn/CNEL or less using a practical application of the best-available noise reduction measures, an exterior noise level of up to 65 dB Ldn/CNEL may be allowed.

Source: Noise Element, County of San Luis Obispo, General Plan

Land Use	Exterior Noise Exposure Threshold Ldn or CNEL, dB				
	55 60 65 70 75 80				
Residential, Public Assembly, Entertainment					
Bed and Breakfast, Hotel, Motel					
Schools Libraries Museums Hospitals					
Schools, Libraries, Museuris, Hospitals					
Outdoor Sports and Recreation					
Offices					
Acceptable, no mitigation required					
Conditionally Acceptable, mitigation re	Conditionally Acceptable, mitigation required				
Unacceptable, mitigation may not be fe	easible				

 Table 4.8-5. Land Use Compatibility for New Development near Transportation Sources

Source: Noise Element, County of San Luis Obispo, General Plan

Stationary Noise Sources

Policy 3.3.4 of the Noise Element states that "new development of noise-sensitive land uses shall not be permitted where the noise level due to existing stationary noise sources would exceed the noise level standards included in the Noise Element unless effective noise mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design of the development to reduce noise exposure to or below the levels specified." The hourly daytime stationary noise standard for a residential development is 50 dBA, while the maximum is 70 dBA. The hourly nighttime stationary noise standard for a residential development is 45 dBA, while the maximum is 60 dBA (refer to Table 4.8-6).

Policy 3.3.5 of the Noise Element states that "new proposed stationary noise sources or existing stationary noise sources that undergo modifications that may increase noise levels shall be mitigated as follows and shall be the responsibility of the developer of the stationary noise source. Policy 3.3.5 can be found in its entirety on page 3-3 of the County Noise Element, applicable standards from Policy 3.3.5 are provided below as follows:

b. Noise levels shall be reduced to or below the noise level standards in [Table 4.8-6] where the stationary noise source will expose an existing noise-sensitive land use (which is listed in the Land Use Element as an allowable use within its existing land use category) to noise levels that exceed the standards in [Table 4.8-6].

c. Noise levels shall be reduced to or below the noise level standards in [Table 4.8-6] where the stationary noise source will expose vacant land in the Agriculture, Rural Lands, Residential Rural, Residential Suburban, Residential Single Family, Residential Multi-Family, Recreation, Office and Professional, and Commercial Retail land use categories to noise levels that exceed the standards in [Table 4.8-6] (note: This policy may be waived when the Director of Planning and Building determines that such vacant land is not likely to be developed with a noise sensitive land-use).

Level	Daytime (7 am – 9 pm)	Nighttime (9 pm – 7 am)
Hourly Leq, dbA ²	50	45
Maximum Level, dbA ²	70	60
Maximum Level, Impulsive Noise, dbA ³	65	60

¹ As determined at the property line of the of the receiving land use.

² Sound level measurements shall be made with slow meter response.

³ Sound level measurements shall be made with fast meter response.

Source: Noise Element, County of San Luis Obispo, General Plan

4.8.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology

The noise investigation was conducted using a Bruel and Kjaer (B & K) Model 2231 precision integrating sound level meter. The meter internally computes a new Leq from the sound pressure level and updates the digital display once each second. The meter was calibrated externally at the beginning of each period of measurement using a B & K Model 4230 acoustic calibrator. In combination, these instruments yield sound level measurements accurate to within 0.1 dB. All models fulfill standards of relevant sections of IEC (International Electrotechnical Commission) 651 and ANSI (American National Standard) S1.4.1971 for Type 1 (precision) integrating sound level meters. All noise readings were conducted in the A-weighted decibel range. The A-weighting correlates well with how humans hear sounds, deemphasizing very high and low frequencies.

4.8.1.6 Transportation Noise Assessment

The procedure for assessing vehicular traffic noise impacts included measuring the peak-hour noise levels at select locations around the NCP while counting the traffic generating the noise during the period of measurement. The measured peak-hour noise levels are then adjusted logarithmically to determine the "future" noise levels by using the estimated traffic volume predictions for various road segments. Logarithms are used because they produce linear correlations, which can then be used to more readily evaluate future noise levels. Generally speaking, doubling the traffic volume will produce a 3-dB increase in the ambient noise environment.

From a practical standpoint, the peak-hour Leq noise level is essentially equivalent to the Ldn noise level (generally yielding results within 1-2 dBA of each other). The Ldn is the standard measure used for evaluating community noise impacts in the County Noise Element. For most

situations involving vehicular traffic noise, the peak-hour Leq can be used as the Ldn level in situations where there is little nighttime traffic or significant heavy truck volumes. Peak hour Leq was the methodology used in evaluation of traffic noise impacts for the proposed project. Noise measurements were taken for 15-minute durations at each location. Further analysis is based on the Leq.

General guidelines for determining community noise impacts typically include:

- A 3-dB change is barely perceptible, and is the minimum most people will notice in most environments.
- A 5-dB change is a readily perceptible increase or decrease in sound level.
- A 10-dB increase in sound level is perceived as an approximate doubling of the loudness of the sound and represents a substantial change in loudness.

4.8.1.7 Stationary Noise Assessment

The procedure used to assess noise resulting from this project focused on measuring noise levels at similar events and facilities such as soccer games at multi-use sports fields and skate parks to estimate noise levels that could be expected by these types of uses at the NCP. Ambient pre-project noise levels were measured at select locations to determine if recreational development would result in a stationary noise impact. The expected noise levels were compared to published threshold values in the County's Noise Element to determine if a significant change in the noise environment would occur and if an exceedance of the threshold value would be expected. The one-hour Leq threshold outlined in the Noise Element is 50 dBA at the property line of the nearest sensitive receptor location, with a maximum noise level of 70 dBA allowed for short periods of time so long as the hourly average is maintained at 50 dBA Leq.

4.8.5 Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures

4.8.1.8 Exposure to Noise Levels Exceeding County Thresholds

Transportation-related Noise Generated by NCP Uses

To determine the traffic noise level increase due to project generated trips, the *Traffic Impact Analysis* (March 2010) was used in order to determine build-out traffic conditions, and build-out conditions including the uses proposed in the Master Plan. Expected transportation-related noise increases resulting from implementation of the NCP Master Plan are presented in Table 4.8-7. All estimated noise increases have been rounded to one decimal place.

Location ¹	Existing ADT	Existing Plus Project ADT	ADT Increase (%)	Estimated Noise Level Increase (dBA) Leq
1 – Pomeroy / Juniper	8,500	8,702	2.4	0.1
2 – West Tefft / Pomeroy	13,100	13,410	2.4	0.1
3 – Orchard	5,900	6,114	3.6	0.1
4 – Mesa	2,900	2,922	0.8	0.0
5 – Osage	1,200	1,222	1.8	0.1
6 – Pomeroy/Camino	6,500	6,664	2.5	0.1

Table 4.8-7. Estimated	I Traffic Noise	Level Increase	(Existing	Plus Project)
------------------------	-----------------	----------------	-----------	----------------------

¹ Refer to Figure 4.8-1 for noise measurement locations.

As seen in Table 4.8-7, due to the relatively low number of expected additional trips (compared to existing conditions), estimated noise level increases due to project generated traffic are expected to be negligible (0.0 to 0.1-dB increase). Under controlled conditions in an acoustics laboratory, the trained healthy human ear is able to discern changes in sound levels of 1 dBA when exposed to steady single-frequency (pure tone) signals in the mid-frequency range. Outside such controlled conditions, the trained ear can detect changes of 2 dBA in normal environmental noise. It is widely accepted that the average healthy ear, however, can barely perceive noise level changes of 3 dBA (Caltrans Technical Noise Supplement 2009). Since the expected noise level increase would be less than 1 dBA, traffic noise impacts are not expected to occur due to traffic generated by proposed NCP uses.

Based on the traffic and noise analysis summarize above, potential noise impacts related to transportation noise generated by the project would be *less than significant (Class III)* and no mitigation is necessary.

Transportation-related Noise Affecting NCP Uses

The NCP is considered a noise sensitive use, including the library and outdoor recreation areas. As shown in Table 4.8-1, Short-term Transportation Noise Measurements, the existing average noise measurements at the perimeter of the NCP ranges from 55.6 dB on Osage Road to 64.5 dB near West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road.

Based on the Traffic Impact Analysis, additional trips would be generated on adjacent roadways under build-out conditions, with the exception of Pomeroy/Juniper (modeling notes a decrease in trips at this location under buildout conditions). As seen in Table 4.8-8, this would result in a minimal increase in noise levels in the area. The location with the highest percentage of average daily trip increase is near West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road. Upon community build-out, traffic noise at this location would increase by 1.9 dB, resulting in an approximately 66.5-dB noise level (including the uses proposed at NCP).

Location ¹	Existing ADT	Baseline Build- out ADT	ADT Increase (%)	Estimated Noise Level Increase (dBA) Leq	Estimated Noise Level (without project)	Estimated Noise Level (Build-out Plus Project)
1 – Pomeroy/Juniper	8,500	8,400	0	0.1	63.8	63.9
2 – West Tefft/Pomeroy	13,100	19,200	47	1.9	66.4	66.5
5 – Osage	1,200	1,300	8.3	0.3	55.9	56
6 - Pomeroy/Camino	6,500	6,700	3.1	0.12	63.1	63.1

Table 4.8-8. Estimated Traffic Noise Level Increase (Existing Plus Build-out)

¹ Refer to Figure 4.8-1 for noise measurement locations.

The Nipomo Library is located approximately 110 feet from the West Tefft Street roadway. The topography between the library and the road is nearly level and hardscaped (existing parking area). Generally, for this use, noise levels ranging from 60 to 70 dB is considered conditionally acceptable. The library faces West Tefft Street, and there are no outdoor use areas (aside from the parking area) between the building and the roadway. The proposed expansion would be located on the western side of the library, opposite the roadway. Standard building practices would attenuate noise by 15 dB, and the existing library building would further attenuate noise. The threshold of significance of interior noise is 45 dB; therefore, noise mitigation is recommended for both the existing building and southern and northern aspects of the proposed expansion, including replacement of windows.

The acceptable noise level for outdoor recreation ranges from 50 to 70 dB; therefore, all other NCP uses would not be adversely affected by transportation-related noise.

Upon implementation of noise mitigation, this impact would be less than significant (Class II).

- N Impact 1 The Nipomo Library and proposed expansion of the library would be adversely affected by transportation-related noise exceeding the County Noise Element interior noise threshold of 45 decibels.
- *N/mm-1* Prior to expansion of the Nipomo Library, the proposed plans shall include the following or similar acoustical design measures to attenuate interior noise by 7 decibels, resulting in a measured interior noise level of 45 decibels or less:
 - a. Air conditioning or a mechanical ventilation system.
 - b. Windows and sliding doors mounted in low air infiltration rate frames (0.5 cfm or less, per American National Standards Institute (ANSI) specifications).
 - c. Solid core exterior doors with perimeter weather stripping and threshold seals.

- d. Exterior walls consist of stucco or brick veneer. Wood siding with a 0.5-inch minimum thickness fiberboard (soundboard) underlayer may also be used.
- e. Use of dual paned or soundproof glass for windows facing West Tefft Street (or similar measure).
- f. Roof or attic vents facing the south, north, and east shall be baffled.

Residual Impacts

Although transportation-related noise would increase over time, incorporation of structural and design features into proposed plans would maintain acceptable noise levels within the library building. Application of current and potentially future technologies and advances in noise attenuation would reduce potential noise impacts to a *less than significant level* (Class II).

Stationary Noise

The primary sources of stationary noise would be use of the multi-use sports fields (soccer) and the skate park. To help assess expected stationary noise levels resulting from development due to the project, similar noise sources and events were monitored. Noise was measured on November 19, 2010, at the Damon Garcia Sports Complex (San Luis Obispo, California), during a youth soccer tournament, and at the Templeton Skate Park (Templeton, California) on November 21, 2010 (refers to Appendix F).

The measurement set conducted at Damon Garcia consisted of a multi-game youth soccer tournament. Three games were being played at the same time; measurement Location 3 was the combination of all three games being played at once. There was no amplified sound at any of the games; most of the noise measured from the games resulted from the crowd cheering during exciting plays. Very little noise is actually generated by participants or action on the field. Table 4.8-9 presents the results of the monitoring conducted during the soccer event.

Location	Distance from	Noise Level (dBA)		
	(feet)	Leq	Мах	
1	25	66.5	76.6	
2	50	59.1	75.1	
3	100	54.0	73.1	
4	10	66.4	79.1	

 Table 4.8-9. Noise Measurements Damon Garcia Sports Complex

The skaters primarily generate the skate park noise when they are actively skating within the confines of the concrete at the facility. The noise environment around the park is subject to multiple impulsive types of episodes when the skaters fall off their boards and the boards bang around on the concrete. When the skaters are on their boards and skating through the facility, the sound of the skate wheels and trucks are quite noticeable in close proximity to the park. Table 4.8-10 presents the results of the monitoring conducted at the skate park.

Location	Distance from	Noise Level (dBA)		
	(feet)	Leq	Мах	
1	25	73.5	82.9	
2	50	68.4	79.6	
3	100	62.2	74.4	

Table 4.8-10.	Noise Meas	urements	Templeton	Skate	Park

The project area is a mix of hardscaped surfaces, undeveloped fields, commercial/retail uses, and residential development. The topography surrounding the NCP is characterized as "hard," which means that it would tend to be more reflective than absorptive of sound pressure waves. Hard sites generally do not have absorptive ground surfaces such as soft dirt, grass, or bushes and trees to attenuate noise levels.

Existing vegetation at the NCP consists of annual grassland, scattered herbaceous vegetation, and small clumps of brush and oak woodland habitat. The existing project site would be characterized as a "soft site," meaning that excess attenuation of sound pressure levels would be observed due to the ground cover and vegetation. After project development, more of the site would be hardscaped, decreasing natural noise attenuation capabilities. When added to the natural geometric spreading of sound pressure waves, this would result in an overall noise drop-off rate of approximately 6.0 dBA/DD for a stationary source.

Assuming a conservative drop-off rate of 6 dBA/DD, a safe-distance offset could be estimated in order to determine the distance between uses to comply with the noise thresholds identified in the Noise Element. For a hypothetical non-amplified multi-game soccer event, the nearest field would need to be no closer than 200 feet from the sensitive receptor (i.e., residence property line) to meet County exterior noise thresholds. The edge of the sports fields would be 200 feet from the property line of adjacent residences; therefore, use of the fields would not exceed daytime noise exterior thresholds (50 dBA).

For a skate park, the active skating area should be no closer than 400 feet from the nearest receptor location to meet County exterior noise thresholds. This evaluation is based on average conditions, with no loud music playing, and assumes only the sounds from voices and skateboards. As proposed, the skate park would be located within 200 feet of the existing library and proposed library expansion, and approximately 380 feet from Dana Elementary School. A residential development is located approximately 120 to the west across West Tefft Street.

Based on traffic noise measurements, the existing transportation noise level is 64.5 dBA, and is expected to increase by 2 dB under build-out conditions (including the project). At a distance of 100 feet, the noise generated by the skate park would be 62.2 dB. The combined noise level is anticipated to increase by 1 dB, for a noise level of approximately 67.5 dB. As noted above, transportation noise mitigation is recommended for the existing library and proposed expansion. Due to existing and expected traffic noise (regardless of the project), noise levels at the property line of residences across West Tefft Street exceed identified noise thresholds. Use of the skate park would add 1 dB to the existing (and future estimated) ambient noise level.

Noting that traffic levels fluctuate during the day, there would be periods when noise generated by the skate park exceeds noise generated by traffic on West Tefft Street, which would adversely affect residential land uses. Mitigation is recommended, including measures such as incorporating an in-ground design and a noise barrier or berm between the skate park and noise sensitive uses. Construction of a barrier within 25 feet of the edge of the skate park will reduce the noise level by approximately 5 to 10 dB; which would result in a noise level of approximately 63 to 68 dB at the barrier, and approximately 52 to 57 dB at a distance of 100 feet from the source. Based on this analysis, the project would not generate noise levels significantly exceeding ambient noise levels.

The park and associated uses are closed between the hours of 10:00 pm and 6:00 am. In addition, a park ranger will be present onsite during daytime hours and a park host will be present onsite during nighttime hours. In the event of excessive noise, the public has the opportunity to contact the ranger, park host, and/or County Parks. Pursuant to County policy, the County would review the complaints and implement remediation. Potential remediation options include implementation of a park monitor program, including the presence of volunteers or paid staff during key operations of the skate park and pool facilities to restrict playing of loud music and use of loud voices. A fence and locked gate, or similar measures, around the skate park and pool will be constructed to prevent nighttime use.

Additional sources of noise within NCP include the use of maintenance equipment, such as turf mowers, and amplified noise (i.e., loud speakers, microphones, and music). Existing policies in place to control and monitor amplified noise would apply to future uses within the park. The County reserves the right to revoke amplified sound permits at any time if the noise level is excessive. In addition, noise generated by loudspeakers and microphones shall be directed towards the interior of the park, away from surrounding residential areas.

Based on implementation of identified mitigation measures, the noise impact would be *less than significant* (Class II).

- N Impact 2 Use of the proposed skate park and other activities would generate stationary noise levels exceeding County Noise Element thresholds of significant for noise-sensitive land uses.
- *N/mm-2* Prior to construction of the skate park, the design plans shall incorporate the following noise reduction measures, achieving a maximum average hourly noise level of 65 decibels as measured 25 feet from the edge of the skate park:
 - a. In-ground concrete design to minimize noise generation during use.
 - b. Earthen berm between the skate park and the noise sensitive land uses.
 - c. Fence and lock-able gate surrounding the skate park facility.
- N/mm-3 During operation of the park, events and activities shall only be permitted during operating hours (6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.). Mowing, use of equipment, and other maintenance activities shall be limited to daytime hours, unless an emergency situation exists. Noise generated by loudspeakers and microphones shall be directed towards the interior of the park, away from surrounding residential areas.

N/mm-4 In the event substantiated noise complaints are received by the County, and the presence of the onsite ranger and/or park host is not sufficient to address received complaints, County Parks shall develop a park monitor program. The program may include volunteers or paid staff and shall provide for presence during key operations of the skate park to restrict playing of loud music and the use of loud voices. The monitor may be present during operating hours in the summer, and on weekends and afternoons during the winter. To prevent use of the skate park and pool during nighttime hours when the park is closed (10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.), County Parks shall install a fence and locked gate around the skate park or community pool.

Residual Impact

Operation of new uses within NCP would increase the noise levels both within and surrounding the park. Implementation of recommended mitigation would reduce anticipated noise levels to a level below identified County thresholds; however, persons within and adjacent to NCP may experience noise levels above current levels during higher levels of use (i.e. sports field tournaments, summertime use of skate park). In the event excessive noise affects adjacent land uses, and complaints are received by the County, remediation may include a monitoring program to further address noise issues. Implementation of these measures would reduce impacts associated with noise generated by the proposed uses to a *less than significant level* (Class II).

4.8.1.9 Increase in Ambient Noise Levels

As noted above, implementation of the project would result in a maximum 2-dB increase in the ambient noise level, due to transportation-related noise and activities within recreational areas, including the sports fields and skate park.

Ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the proposed sports fields ranges from approximately 40 to 64 dB throughout the day (7:00 am to 7:00 pm). During use of the sports fields, the ambient noise level within 100 feet of the fields would be 54 dB; the noise level is estimated to attenuate to 49 dB at 200 feet from the fields, and to 44 dB at 400 feet from the fields. The ridge of oak woodland is approximately 400 to 500 feet from the edge of the proposed fields. Based on ambient noise measurements, the existing ambient noise level ranges from 43 to 46 dB throughout the oak woodland area. While the ambient noise level would increase in this immediate area, other open space areas within the park and offsite residential areas would not experience a substantial increase in ambient noise levels. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant (Class III)*.

4.8.1.10 Exposure to Excessive Noise or Vibration

Construction of the project would include the use of heavy equipment within NCP and on adjacent roadways during construction of road improvements. All construction activity would occur during daytime hours, and no activities are anticipated to result in excessive ground borne vibrations or noise levels.

4.8.6 Cumulative Impacts

There are no proposed or recently approved projects in the immediate area that would generate a significant level of stationary noise (including the proposed Master Plan); therefore, cumulative noise impacts related to stationary noise would be less than significant. To

determine the cumulative traffic noise level increase, the *Traffic Impact Analysis* (March 2010) was used in order to determine build-out traffic conditions. Expected cumulative transportation-related noise increases are presented in Table 4.8-11. All estimated noise increases have been rounded to one decimal place.

Due to the relatively low number of expected additional trips (compared to build-out conditions) estimated noise level increases due to project generated traffic are expected to be negligible (0.0 to 0.1-dB increase). Since the expected noise level increase would be less than 1 dBA, traffic noise impacts are not expected to occur due to traffic generated by traffic buildout and proposed NCP uses.

Location ¹	Baseline Build-out ADT	Build-out Plus Project ADT	ADT Increase (%)	Estimated Noise Level Increase (dBA) Leq	
1 – Pomeroy / Juniper	8,400	8,602	2.4	0.1	
2 – West Tefft / Pomeroy	19,200	19,510	1.6	0.1	
3 – Orchard	9,350	9,564	2.3	0.1	
4 – Mesa	3,100	3,122	0.7	0.0	
5 – Osage	1,300	1,322	1.7	0.1	
6 – Pomeroy/Camino	6,700	6,764	1.0	0.0	

Table 4.8-11. Estimated Traffic Noise Level Increase (Build-out Plus Project)

¹ Refer to Figure 4.8-1 for noise measurement locations

Based on the traffic and noise analysis summarize above, potential cumulative noise impacts related to transportation noise generated by the project would be *less than significant* (Class III) and no mitigation is necessary.

4.9 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

The proposed project site is served by the County Sheriff's Department, CAL FIRE, and is within the Lucia Mar Unified School District. Water is provided by the NCSD. This section of the Program EIR identifies the current status of affected public facilities, and determines the proposed project's effect on these public resources. The adequacy of existing public fee programs and the need for additional public facilities will be also be assessed. Information was gathered from the *Nipomo Regional Park Constraints Analysis* (Morro Group 2004), County planning documents, responses to the NOP of the Program EIR, and consultation with CAL FIRE, San Luis Obispo County Sheriff's Department, and County Department of Public Works. Please refer to Section 4.12, Water Resources, for a more-detailed discussion of area water resources, and Section 4.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, for a discussion of emergency-related hazards.

4.9.1 Existing Conditions

The project site is located in the Nipomo urban area and provides a combination of passive and active recreational and open space uses. Public services and utilities are summarized below.

4.9.1.1 Emergency Responders

Various different local and state agencies provide emergency services to the Nipomo area. CAL FIRE provide fire protection in the Nipomo Mesa Area, and the County Sheriff's Department provides police and patrol services. Private companies in Arroyo Grande and Santa Maria provide additional ambulance service to the Nipomo area, and a County Park Ranger is present onsite. The CHP also services San Luis Obispo County's highways and is available to respond in emergency situations.

4.9.1.2 California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection/County Fire

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and County Fire, as CAL FIRE, work in conjunction to provide rural fire protection to the Nipomo area. The Safety Element of the County General Plan (1999) describes the Nipomo area as primarily developed with low-density residential areas with interspersed supporting commercial uses. The Element notes that the fire response needs of Nipomo are increased because of the presence of various wooded and urban area interfaces. While the community of Nipomo has changed since adoption of the Safety Element, this description is applicable. The NCP is a mixture of developed and natural areas. The Safety Element uses the term "urban/wildland interface" to describe an area where urban development has been located in proximity to open space or "wildland" areas. The most common type of urban/wildland interface results when urban development occurs on the fringe of existing urban areas, adjacent to wildland vegetation. The Element specifically identifies Nipomo as an area with intermixed urban/wildland interface areas. This represents a higher risk of fire than other unincorporated communities, and the areas west of Nipomo have historically experienced a high number of smaller fires (50 to 300 acres in size).

CAL FIRE is responsible for providing fire suppression services to approximately 1.4 million acres of San Luis Obispo County. Two stations service the Nipomo area, Station 22, located on the Mesa off of Highway 1, and Station 20, located in the community of Nipomo. The

stations are staffed to provide 24 hour/seven days a week emergency response and include volunteer programs to increase response capabilities.

The project location has been identified by CAL FIRE as having a "high" fire hazard zone rating, and it is located within the five-minute emergency response time area. The Mesa Meadows area of the project site is further identified as a "Wildland Area That May Contain Substantial Forest Fire Risks and Hazards" on the County's Wildland Fire Hazard Area Map.

4.9.1.3 San Luis Obispo County Sheriff

The County Sheriff's Department currently provides law enforcement services in the unincorporated area of San Luis Obispo County, including the Nipomo area. San Luis Obispo encompasses 3,615 square miles, of which only 66 miles are incorporated and served by City police departments. The Department's South Patrol Station is located at 1681 Front Street, in the community of Oceano. The South Station opened in October 2002 and serves the communities of Oceano, Nipomo, Huasna, rural Arroyo Grande, New Cuyama, and Lopez Lake.

The South Station is currently staffed by approximately 20 sworn officers. The number of officers on duty at any given time varies greatly depending on the day and shift, but generally ranges between two to six officers (personal communication, Sheriff's Department South Station; March 17, 2010). Currently, the Sheriff's Department is understaffed and, with the cumulative impact of approved development, response times most likely will increase. In commenting on the proposed project, the Sheriff's Department reported that current average response times to the project area generally range between five and 30 minutes, depending upon the nature of the call and the location of patrol vehicles at the time of the call. The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) provides a model for determining the need for new law enforcement based on the number of deputies to population unit of 1,000 people. The ratio of deputy to population has not kept pace with population growth for several years. The current ratio of deputies per population unit is one deputy per 1,140 citizens, which is deficient. The acceptable ratio per FBI standards is one deputy per 1,000 citizens, and a ratio of one deputy per 750 citizens would align Sheriff's Department levels of service with those of City police departments within San Luis Obispo County.

4.9.1.4 California Highway Patrol

The CHP services San Luis Obispo's highways, with stations located in San Luis Obispo and Templeton. The CHP is primarily responsible for traffic-related calls along highways and streets in the unincorporated portions of the county. They are available to respond in emergency situations, but typically do not investigate, take action, or respond to domestic calls or crimes in progress in residential, commercial, or industrial areas. CHP may respond to a request for back-up to a Sheriff's Department response, if available; however, they do not normally provide police protection services. Their primary role is traffic enforcement.

4.9.1.5 Schools

The park is located within the Lucia Mar Unified School District. There are four schools located within the Nipomo Mesa area: Dana Elementary, Dorothea Lang Elementary, Nipomo Elementary, and Nipomo High School. Current enrollment and capacity levels of Lucia Mar Unified School District schools are presented in Table 4.9-1 below.

School	Capacity	Enrollment	Enrollment Capacity	Level of Severity*
Elementary	5,191	5,401	104.05%	Ш
Middle	1,810	1,676	92.60%	II
High School	2,775	3,484	125.55%	Ш

Table 4.9-1. Nipomo School Enrollment Capacities

Source: County of San Luis Obispo 2010

* Level of Severity for schools (enrollment versus capacity) is defined as follows:

- Level of Severity II: when enrollment projections will reach school capacity within five years.
- Level of Severity III: When enrollment equals or exceeds school capacity.

4.9.1.6 Solid Waste Disposal

South County Sanitary Service is the private vendor that provides solid waste collection services to the park area. Waste Connections, Inc. is the owner of Cold Canyon Landfill, Coastal Rolloff Service, and South County Sanitary Service. Waste Connections is a regional, integrated, non-hazardous solid waste services company that provides collection, transfer, disposal, and recycling services to commercial, industrial, and residential customers in the Nipomo area.

Solid waste collection and disposal at NCP currently occurs as frequently as twice a week, on Mondays and Fridays. The park has four 3-yard bins, two of which are picked up once a week, and two of which are picked up twice a week. The park has not had to call in for any additional services or extra pickups over the last year, showing that the four bins are providing sufficient capacity for current solid waste disposal needs (personal communication, South County Sanitary Service; March 11, 2010). Additional proposed development at the park will require the placement of additional trash receptacles and potentially result in an increase in the demand on trash pickup and/or onsite ranger station services.

Solid waste is transferred and processed at the Santa Maria Transfer Station and/or disposed of at the Cold Canyon Landfill north of Arroyo Grande. The Santa Maria Transfer Station is located 0.5 mile west of US 101, at 325 Cuyama Lane (Highway 166) in Nipomo and has more than sufficient capacity to meet the increased need resulting from the project. Estimated area landfill capacities are shown in Table 4.9-2, below. The County is currently in the process of expanding of the Cold Canyon Landfill site (an EIR is being prepared to analyze the proposed expansion), anticipating the closure date of 2012. While the landfill is approaching its maximum capacity (within approximately 25% of maximum capacity), both the landfill as it exists and any expanded facility would be able to adequately meet the small increase in solid waste that would be generated by new development at the NCP. County Department of Public Works officials have confirmed that the landfill has existing capacity remaining to accommodate approximately eight years of operation (personal communication, Mary Whittlesey, Solid Waste Coordinator; March 12, 2010).

Name of Facility	Total Estimated Permitted Capacity	Total Estimated Capacity Used	Remaining Estimated Capacity	Percent Capacity Remaining	Estimated Closure Date
Cold Canyon Landfill	10,900,000 cubic yards	8,100,000 cubic yards	2,800,000 cubic yards	25.69%	1/1/2012
Santa Maria Transfer Station	500 tons/day	60-90 tons/day	440-410 tons/day	82-88%	n/a

 Table 4.9-2. San Luis Obispo County Solid Waste Disposal Facilities

Source: California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery, 2010; personal communication Santa Maria Transfer Station, March 4, 2010; personal communication County Public Works (Solid Waste), March 12, 2010.

4.9.1.7 Wastewater and Water Services

NCP is served by onsite septic systems, and the NCPMP does not currently include connection to the NCSD sewer system. For a further discussion of wastewater services, refer to Section 4.11 of the EIR, Wastewater

NCP lies entirely within the boundaries of the NCSD, which provides water to the park for irrigation, sanitation, and miscellaneous purposes. For a further discussion of area water resources, refer to Section 4.12 of the EIR, Water Resources.

4.9.1.8 Energy Services

Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) currently provides electricity to the park via overhead transmission lines that originate from Pomeroy Road and Tefft Street. A combination of overhead lines and underground electrical conduit then carries power from transformers on surrounding roads to developed areas of the park. New facilities within the park would require the addition of new electric lines, underground conduits, transformers, and any appurtenances necessary for operation. PG&E officials have confirmed that they could adequately accommodate the small increase in demand generated by the proposed development that would occur within the park.

The Southern California Gas Company currently supplies gas services to the residential neighborhoods surrounding the park, as well as the adjacent Dana Elementary School and County Library. These areas are supplied with gas service by 0.75- to 1-inch gas laterals, connected to larger gas mains that run parallel to Pomeroy Road and Tefft Street. New gas service laterals would need to be constructed to provide service to proposed facilities such as the Community Center. Gas Company officials have indicated that the types of facilities proposed for development within the park would not impact their ability to provide adequate services.

An "Underground Services Alert" would need to be initiated by the County prior to the commencement of any ground disturbing activities. New development within the park would not affect the delivery of electricity or gas services.

4.9.1.9 Recreational Resources

The park currently provides approximately 159 acres of public passive and active recreational space. The Nipomo Community Park is the only developed public park in Nipomo, and thus meets a variety of needs. The 33-acre Jack Ready Park was approved by the County in 2011; this park will include themed play structures, a sand play area, soccer and baseball fields, basketball courts and a therapeutic riding center. The entire park will be accessible by foot, bike, stroller, wheelchair, and walker.

The County Parks and Recreation Element provides that 5 to 8 acres of community parkland is recommended for every 1,000 residents (based on National Recreation and Parks Association standards). The population of the entire Nipomo Mesa is approximately 15,256 (2010), and is anticipated to grow at a rate of 15% through the year 2020 (County of San Luis Obispo 2010). Based on these standards, the community needs approximately 75 to 120 acres of parkland to meet its population need. The park currently meets this demand and the proposed project is intended to improve and enhance the recreational opportunities at NCP and Mesa Meadows open space area. Implementation of the proposed project will result in a beneficial impact by helping meet projected future increased demands for recreational public services in the area.

Recreation facilities in Nipomo will continue to be primarily oriented to residents rather than tourists. While the NCP provides community facilities for the northwest portion of town, it must also be augmented by additional neighborhood parks to serve east and southwest Nipomo. The County Parks and Recreation Element identifies community needs and suggests financing opportunities. The Element recognized the need for additional neighborhood and regional parks in Nipomo.

4.9.2 Regulatory Setting

4.9.2.1 Police and Emergency Services

FEMA is an independent agency of the federal government, established in 1979 via executive order. FEMA's mission is as follows, "to reduce loss of life and property and protect our nation's critical infrastructure from all types of hazards through a risk-based, emergency management program of preparedness, response and recovery." FEMA provides direction and assistance to state and local governments, but does not regulate approaches to emergency planning or response.

California Government Code §8607(a) authorized establishment of the Standardized Emergency Management System (SEMS). Title 19, Division 2, Chapter 1 of the CCR (§§2400-2540) defines SEMS, including its purpose, scope, structure, and applicability. SEMS is intended to standardize response to emergencies involving multiple jurisdictions or multiple agencies. Local government must use SEMS in order to be eligible for state funding of response-related personnel costs occurring in response to an emergency incident.

The County Sheriff's Office, CHP, and the OES have the opportunity to review and comment on projects through the CEQA process. Police and fire protection are provided to the Nipomo area by the County Sheriff's Department, CHP, and CAL FIRE.

4.9.2.2 Solid Waste Collection

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Chapter 1095, 1989) required each City and County to divert and recycle 50% of its solid waste by the year 2000 (PRC §41780) and maintain the achieved reduction after 2000 (amended Act).

CCR Title 23, Chapter 15 establishes requirements and specifications for waste handling, and CCR Title 14, Division 7 provides the State's standards for the management of facilities that handle or dispose of solid waste. CCR Title 14, Division 7 is administered by the CIWMB and the designated Local Enforcement Agency (LEA). CCR Title 14, Division 7, Chapter 9, Article 9 §§18800-18813 were adopted to implement PRC §41821.5, which requires each solid waste handler, transfer station operator, disposal facility operator, and County to gather information on which jurisdiction the solid waste originated from, their amounts disposed, and amounts of waste exported.

4.9.2.3 Energy Services

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) regulates privately owned electric, telecommunications, natural gas, water, railroad, rail transit, and passenger transportation companies in California. The CPUC is responsible for assuring California utility customers have safe, reliable utility service at reasonable rates, protecting utility customers from fraud, and promoting the health of California's economy. In pursuing these goals, the CPUC establishes service standards and safety rules, and authorizes utility rate changes. The CPUC monitors the safety of utility and transportation operations and overseas markets to inhibit anticompetitive activity. In its efforts to protect consumers, the CPUC prosecutes unlawful utility marketing and billing activities, governs business relationships between utilities and their affiliates, and resolves complaints by customers against utilities. Additional responsibilities include implementation of energy efficiency programs, low-income rates, telecommunications services for disabled customers, and CEQA enforcement for utility construction. The CPUC works with other State and Federal agencies in promoting water quality, environmental protection, and safety.

4.9.3 Thresholds of Significance

As defined in the County Initial Study Checklist and County Energy Element, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, public services and utilities impacts would be considered significant if the project would:

- 1. Have an effect upon, or result in the need for new or altered public services in any of the following areas:
 - a. Fire protection
 - b. Police protection (e.g., Sheriff, CHP)
 - c. Schools
 - d. Roads
 - e. Solid Wastes
 - f. Other public facilities
- 2. Increase the use or demand for parks or other recreation opportunities;
- 3. Affect the access to trails, parks, or other recreation opportunities;

- 4. Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans;
- 5. Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner; or,
- 6. Result in a need for new systems, or substantial alterations to power or natural gas.

4.9.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology

The impacts of the project were evaluated based on an assessment of the impacts that increased public access and the construction of additional park facilities would have on the existing public services, utilities, energy, and associated infrastructure.

4.9.5 Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The increase in passive and active use of the park facilities, amenities, trails, and open space areas will impact public utilities serving the park area through increased utility infrastructure needs and demands on services. Increased visitors and park usage will likely result in a general increase in demand for local public utilities, including solid waste disposal, water supply, energy supply, and road services. Two new restroom facilities are included in the project to serve park visitors, as well as extensions of public utility infrastructure and road improvements. A larger visitor base may also increase the number of responses by the local fire and sheriff's departments, due to the higher traffic and numbers of visitors on site. Increased visitation, especially by tourists, can lead to a number of issues in a rural environment in terms of responding to emergency calls.

4.9.5.1 Effect Upon or Result in New or Altered Public Services

Fire Protection

There is an existing need to expand fire services in South County areas. The proposed additional developments at NCP, and resulting increased usage, have the potential for creating an increase in demand on area fire services. However, the proposed project does not establish a new use, but rather involves the enhancement of park and recreation facilities and areas at an existing park location. CAL FIRE did not identify any specific significant fire hazard concerns associated with the project (personal communication, Fire Captain, CAL FIRE; March 17, 2010). CAL FIRE's main concerns are generally related to suitable access and water. These needs can be met through standard County review procedures required prior to new development at the park, including compliance with the County Building Code, including fire safety and sprinkler requirements in new structures; compliance with County Department of Public Works standards related to adequate parking, access, and clearance; compliance with the 2005 Wildland-Urban Interface Codes; and preparation of a Fire prevention Plan for the park, including vegetation fuel management, no smoking areas, an evacuation plan, and noted emergency access and fire hydrant locations. All building plans at the park will be approved by CAL FIRE.

The addition of new park facilities would place a small additional service demand on the two CAL FIRE stations that serve the area, but new development in the park is not expected to significantly impact area fire response times or service levels.

Thus, impacts on County fire services are considered less than significant (Class III).

Police Protection

There is presently a need to expand police services in the South County area, and this need will increase as the population grows. New park development would place additional service demands on existing South County Sheriff services. Current average response times generally range from five to thirty minutes. The cumulative development and build-out of the Nipomo area, including through implementation of the proposed NCP Master Plan, will likely impact the Sheriff Department's capacity to respond to emergency calls.

The Sheriff's Department recommended implementation of several safety measures in conjunction with development of additional park facilities, including the "Crime Prevention through Environmental Design" and lighting and lighting system guidelines, which have been proven to prevent and reduce crime. Though new park development would place additional service demands on existing South County Sheriff services, through implementation of these measures, it is not anticipated that existing levels of service would significantly degrade as a result of new development at the park.

PSU Impact 1 Development and increased usage of proposed park facilities may result in increased demands on Sheriff's Department services, resulting in a potentially significant impact.

- PSU/mm-1 While in the planning stages for development of any facility proposed in the Park Master Plan, and prior to any site disturbance activities related to development of such facilities, <u>the General Services Agency</u> shall coordinate with the Sheriff's Department for implementation of design strategies and safety measures to prevent and reduce crime, including "Crime Prevention through Environmental Design" standards and "Lighting and Lighting Systems" guidelines, including the following:
 - a. After-hours access points to the park and community center should be protected with adequate security. As admission is necessary for emergency personnel, combinations to locks/lockboxes should be provided to Sheriff's Department Dispatch;
 - b. Visible signage with hours of operation and any type of regulations should be strategically placed throughout the park, and properly maintained;
 - c. Proper illumination should be provided inside structures, exterior doors, designated parking areas, entry and walkways to deter property crime and provide increased personal safety. Lights should be on timers, and a manual overrides should be available in case of a greater need for light. Proper care should be taken to ensure exterior lighting is properly shielded to prevent illumination that would affect the ambient level of light in the nighttime sky;
 - d. County Parks shall provide the Sheriff's Department with accurate information indicating what park employees have access to which areas of any structures or access points;

- e. During construction periods of any significant proposed park facility or amenity, the construction site shall be temporarily fenced off, with signage indicating that the area is off limits to the general public;
- f. All construction equipment shall be secured at the site after hours, with a complete recorded inventory kept on file;
- g. Adequate lighting of the construction areas shall be implemented;
- h. Special care should be taken to avoid creating "hiding places" in alcoves or entry areas;
- *i.* Facility design should facilitate a clear view of the exterior of structures from the interior, and vice versa, to allow increased observation of any suspicious activity in either location;
- *j.* Sufficient lighting should be installed on the exterior and interior of any structures; and,
- *k.* All exterior doors should meet all safety requirements, should be solid core, and have adequate locks.

Residual Impact

While implementation of the project may increase use of the park, the mitigation measures identified above would reduce potential opportunities for crime, and are sufficient to reduce the potential for impacts to police services. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant with mitigation* (Class II).

<u>Schools</u>

Although Nipomo area schools are currently operating at or above their maximum capacities, the proposed project is not expected to result in significant impacts on local schools, because it would serve the existing and projected population.

This impact is considered less than significant (Class III).

<u>Roads</u>

The proposed Master Plan includes traffic improvements including widening and improvement of Osage Road, the construction of a new traffic signal at the intersection of Pomeroy Road and Juniper Street, and the realignment of park entrances on Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road. These measures would address traffic-related impacts, as discussed in Section 4.10, Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic, and no additional road improvements would be required. This impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III).

Solid Wastes

Solid waste collection and disposal, managed by South County Sanitary Service, currently occurs twice a week, on Mondays and Fridays. The park's four bins have sufficient capacity to meet the need of the peak season, as the park has not had to call in for any additional services or extra pickups over the last year. As public access increases, the demand for trash pickup may increase. Additional trash pick-up may need to occur more often, or all four bins

may have to be picked up twice a week, especially during the summer tourist season. All solid waste from the park is transferred and processed at the Santa Maria Transfer Station and/or disposed of at the Cold Canyon Landfill north of Arroyo Grande. The Santa Maria Transfer Station is currently operating at only 12% to 18% of its capacity. While the Cold Canyon Landfill is operating much closer to capacity and has an expected closure date of 2012, plans for expansion are currently being processed. Cold Canyon, either as it currently exists or as expanded, has sufficient capacity to adequately meet the small increase in solid waste that would be generated by new development at the park. This impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III).

<u>Wastewater</u>

The proposed project includes plans for two additional restroom facilities to serve park visitors. However, the current facilities are treated by onsite individual septic systems, and additional septic systems and leachfields are considered suitable for additional proposed facilities. Because the project facilities are not tied into the public wastewater collection and treatment system, no increased demand or resulting impacts on that public system are anticipated. Additionally, any new facilities would be required to comply with Title 19 of the County Code to ensure septic system design and capacities are adequate, further reducing the likelihood of impacts. This impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III).

Water Services

The project site would continue to be served by the NCSD for water supply. Improved on-site use of water and infrastructure, including irrigation systems, and anticipated additional water demand is discussed in detail in Section 4.12, Water Resources. Additional infrastructure may include pipelines to transfer recycled water from the Southland Wastewater Treatment Facility. Otherwise, no additional facilities would be required to serve the project. Please refer to Section 4.12, Water Resources, for addition discussion and analysis. This impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III).

Recreation

Impacts to recreational resources as a result of this project will be beneficial overall. Improvements to existing passive and active recreational opportunities and the creation of a community center would increase the recreational opportunities for both visitors and residents. Mesa Meadows will continue to provide passive open space recreational uses to neighboring residents, and create connectivity with the existing trial network at NCP. The park will provide additional recreational areas, including additional playgrounds, dog parks, sports fields, tennis courts, and walkways, and newly developed basketball and handball courts, horseshoe pits, and possibly an amphitheater, swimming pool, community center, and skate park. NCP is currently the only developed public park in Nipomo, and thus meets a variety of needs. The proposed project will provide additional recreational recreational resources in both the community of Nipomo and the county are considered *beneficial* (Class IV).

4.9.5.2 Energy

Public Energy Utilities

The impacts to public energy utilities at the park as a result of the actions proposed in the Master Plan will be minimal. New facilities within the park would require the addition of new electric lines, underground conduits, transformers, and any appurtenances necessary for

operation. Sources of energy consumption including interior and exterior lighting, interior heating and cooling, use of maintenance equipment, transfer of water supply, and operation of appliances. PG&E officials have confirmed that they could adequately accommodate the small increase in demand generated by the proposed development that would occur within the park. New gas service laterals would need to be constructed to provide service to proposed facilities such as the Community Center. The Southern California Gas Company officials have indicated that the types of facilities proposed for development within the park would not impact their ability to provide adequate services.

As discussed in Section 4.12, Water Resources, and Section 4.13, Climate Change, the project would incorporate energy-efficiency measures to reduce water consumption (and subsequently energy used to transport water to the site) and use of utility-power and energy. There will be opportunities to include alternative and renewable energy sources (i.e., on-site solar panels) on existing and proposed structures within the park. This impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III).

Use of Fossil Fuels

Implementation of the project would result in the generation of additional vehicle trips, which would require the use of fossil fuels. As discussed in Section 4.13, Climate Change, the project provides opportunities to reduce "Vehicle Miles Traveled" by improving access for pedestrians and bicyclists, and includes additional active recreational facilities within the urban core of Nipomo. Therefore, this impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III).

4.9.6 Cumulative Impacts

The impacts of the proposed development within the community of Nipomo would contribute to a cumulative effect on public emergency services and responders. Development is subject to public service fees upon permit issuance, which assists such facilities by providing funds for infrastructure and facilities. However, these fees do not address additional staffing. The demand for public and emergency services staff increases with additional growth within the community of Nipomo, and cumulative effect may be significant. Implementation of standard crime prevention measures and coordination with CAL FIRE, the County Sheriff's Department, and CHP reduce the potential for crime and emergencies, and lessens the demand on services. In addition, the project would contribute to the demand for energy, including electricity, gas, and fossil fuels. Implementation of the project accommodates energy conservation in design and operation, and provides alternative transportation opportunities, including improved pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access. Furthermore, the project includes recreational facilities within an existing urban area adjacent to residential areas, which would reduce vehicle miles traveled (and consumption of fuels for vehicle use) within the community of Nipomo.

Based on the location and design of the project, and implementation measures recommended by the County Sheriff's Department and CAL FIRE, the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable effect on public services, and no additional mitigation measures are necessary. This page intentionally left blank.
4.10 TRANSPORTATION, CIRCULATION, AND TRAFFIC

This section of the EIR was prepared by Pinnacle Traffic Engineering. This section documents the transportation-related impacts associated with the NCP Master Plan project. Technical information is available in Appendix G.

4.10.1 Existing Conditions

4.10.1.1 Road Network

The NCP and Mesa Meadows are located southwest of US 101 within the community of Nipomo in unincorporated San Luis Obispo County. Regional access is provided via the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange, and State Route (SR) 1. Primary access is provided via West Tefft Street, Pomeroy Road, and Orchard Avenue. The existing access road for the NCP intersects West Tefft Street (150 feet south of Orchard Avenue) and Pomeroy Road (150 feet east of Juniper Street). Access to Mesa Meadows is provided via Charro Way, Tejas Place, and Amigo Place.

The impacts of the NCP Master Plan project to the transportation system were evaluated during the weekday evening (p.m.) peak hour for the following study intersections and daily operations on the following roadway segments:

Intersections

- 1. West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road
- 2. West Tefft Street and Orchard Avenue
- 3. West Tefft Street and Existing Park Access Road
- 4. Pomeroy Road and Existing Park Access Road
- 5. Pomeroy Road and Juniper Street
- 6. Pomeroy Road and Camino Caballo

Roadway Segments

- 1. West Tefft Street, east of Pomeroy Road
- 2. West Tefft Street, Pomeroy Road Orchard Avenue
- 3. West Tefft Street, south of Orchard Avenue
- 4. Pomeroy Road, north of West Tefft Street
- 5. Pomeroy Road, Juniper Street Camino Caballo
- 6. Pomeroy Road, north of Camino Caballo
- 7. Camino Caballo, west of Pomeroy Road
- 8. Orchard Avenue, east of West Tefft Street'
- 9. Juniper Street, east of Pomeroy Road
- 10. Osage Street, south of Camino Caballo
- 11. Mesa Road, west of West Tefft Street

At the request of County staff, the analysis also includes a qualitative evaluation of the potential project impacts at the US 101 and West Tefft Street interchange.

<u>U.S. Highway 101</u>

US 101 is a four-lane north-south divided freeway through the Nipomo area of unincorporated San Luis Obispo County. US 101 provides regional access between northern and southern California. In the vicinity of the community of Nipomo, there are grade separated interchanges at SR 166 (Cuyama Highway), West Tefft Street, and Los Berros Road/North Thompson Avenue. The new Willow Road "grade separated" interchange is currently under construction and will connect to the Willow Road extension (planned for completion in late 2012/early 2013). The north and southbound ramps at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange are signalized.

West Tefft Street

West Tefft Street extends west from Thompson Avenue to North Las Flores Drive. West Tefft Street in the vicinity of the NCP is posted with a 45 mph speed limit. West Tefft Street also has a "school zone" speed limit (25 mph) posted for the Dana Elementary School. The "school zone" speed limit signs are supplemented with "your speed" read-out signs. West of US 101, West Tefft Street has two travel lanes in each direction with a raised median. West of Mary Avenue, this four-lane arterial has a two-way left turn lane that provides access for various commercial driveways and collector streets. West Tefft Street continues along a horizontal curve to the south adjacent to Pomeroy Road. South of Pomeroy Road, West Tefft Street has a single lane in each direction with a two-way left turn lane. West Tefft Street is signalized at Thompson Avenue, Oakglen Avenue, US 101 ramps, Mary Avenue, Pomeroy Road, and Orchard Avenue. In the vicinity of the NCP, West Tefft Street also provides access for the Nipomo Public Library, Dana Elementary School and, the Nipomo Community Health Center.

Pomeroy Road

Pomeroy Road extends north of West Tefft Street to Los Berros Road. Pomeroy Road has a single lane in each direction with a posted speed limit of 45 mph (adjacent to the NCP). The 45 mph speed limit signs are supplemented with "your speed" read-out signs. There are 35 mph "curve advisory" signs for the horizontal curve near the NCP access road and Juniper Street intersections. Left turn lanes are provided for access at Primrose Lane, the NCP park access road, Juniper Street, and Camino Caballo.

Orchard Avenue

Orchard Avenue extends east of West Tefft Street to Joshua Road. Orchard Avenue has a single lane in each direction with a posted 45 mph speed limit. Left turn lanes are provided for access at Grande Street, Division Street, Soares Drive, and Story Street. The Orchard Avenue and Division Street intersection is signalized.

Park Access Road

The NCP access road extends between West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road. The existing access road has a single lane in each direction with a width of approximately 18 to 20 feet. There is a posted speed limit of 15 mph and speed humps within the park. The existing park access road also provides access for the northerly parking lot at the Dana Elementary School (23 stalls used by staff and faculty).

The network of local collector streets serving the NCP and Mesa Meadows includes Primrose Lane, Bernita Place, Juniper Street, Camino Caballo, Osage Street, Tejas Place, and Mesa Road. Each local collector streets has a single lane in each direction.

4.10.1.2 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

West Tefft Street, Pomeroy Road, and Orchard Avenue have Class II bike lanes. The Class II bike lanes include no parking signs, bike lane signs, and striping. In the vicinity of the NCP, there are pedestrian sidewalks on the east side of West Tefft Street (north of Orchard Avenue), west side of West Tefft Street (south of Orchard Avenue), north side of Pomeroy Road (between West Tefft Street and Camino Caballo), and north side of Orchard Avenue. Access to various trails within the NCP and Mesa Meadows is provided via connections to Pomeroy Road, Camino Caballo, Osage Street, Tejas Place, and La Serena Way.

4.10.1.3 Transit Facilities

South County Area Transit (Regional Transit Authority, RTA) currently provides limited service to the community of Nipomo (Route 10). Local transit stops are provided at the Nipomo High School and on West Tefft Street near Carillo Street. The RTA also provides a "dial a ride" service for Nipomo.

4.10.1.4 Existing Traffic Volumes and Intersection Configurations

The evaluation of project impacts includes an analysis of average weekday evening peak hour operations at the selected study intersections. Traffic associated with the Dana Elementary School (approx. 600 students) does create congestion along West Tefft Street on a daily basis (before classes start @ 9:00AM and after classes end @ 3:15). Schools typically generate sharp peaks in traffic demand prior to the beginning of classes and when classes end (15-30 minutes). Traffic during an average weekday afternoon commuter peak hour (highest hour between 4:00 and 6:00 PM) is generally higher and spread out over the entire peak hour. Traffic count data on the County's website demonstrates that the evening peak hour on West Tefft Street (west of Mary Avenue) typically starts between 4:00 and 5:00 PM. Therefore, traffic demands along West Tefft Street adjacent to the project site are higher during an average weekday evening commuter peak period than when classes end at the Dana Elementary School.

New turning movement traffic count data was collected at the study intersections during a weekday afternoon commuter period (4:00-6:00 p.m.). New 24-hour traffic count data was also collected on West Tefft Street (south of Pomeroy Road), Pomeroy Road (west of West Tefft Street), and Osage Street (south of Camino Caballo). Existing traffic volume data contained in the *South County Traffic Model Update (Final Report)* (County of San Luis Obispo 2008) and published on the County's website was also referenced. Traffic count data for the US 101/West Street interchange was provided by County staff. The new traffic count data is provided in Appendix G The existing turning movement volumes, roadway segment, and traffic control at each of the study intersections are shown on Figure 4.10-1.

4.10.1.5 Existing Levels of Service

The operation of intersections and roadway segments is measured in terms of Level of Service (LOS). LOS is a qualitative measure of traffic conditions ranging from LOS A (representing free-flowing conditions with little or no delay) to LOS F (representing congested conditions with long delays and lengthy vehicle queues). LOS E represents at-capacity conditions. The

County has established LOS C as the general threshold for acceptable operations on rural facilities and LOS D as the general threshold for acceptable operations on urban facilities.

The South County Inland Area Plan considers the area within the Nipomo Urban Reserve Line (URL) as the only "urban" area within the South County planning area. The South County Traffic Model Update (Final Report) utilizes the LOS C threshold for acceptable operations on the study area street system (intersections and roadways). Therefore, operations within the LOS D, E, and F range are considered unacceptable. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) strives to maintain a target level of service at the transition between LOS C/D on State operated facilities. Operational analysis of the study intersections is based on the methods and procedures described in the 2000 Highway Capacity Manual (HCM 2000), published by the Transportation Research Board.

Existing Intersection Operations

Signalized intersection operations were analyzed using the SYNCHRO software program. This program is a comprehensive analysis tool that produces a variety of output data for intersection and arterial roadway operating performance. Table 4.10-1 presents the service level criteria used for signalized intersections based on average control delay per vehicle as described in Chapter 16 of the *HCM 2000*, where control delay includes initial deceleration delay, queue move-up time, stopped delay, and final acceleration.

-		
Level of Service	Description	Average Control Delay Per Vehicle (Seconds)
A	Operations with very low delay occurring with favorable progression and/or short cycle length.	<u><</u> 10
В	Operations with low delay occurring with good progression and/or short cycle lengths.	> 10 and <u><</u> 20
С	Operations with average delays resulting from fair progression and/or longer cycle lengths. Individual cycle failures begin to appear.	> 20 and <u><</u> 35
D	Operations with longer delays due to a combination of unfavorable progression, long cycle lengths, or high V/C ratios. Many vehicles stop and individual cycle failures are noticeable.	> 35 and <u><</u> 55
E	Operations with high delay values indicating poor progression, long cycle lengths, and high V/C ratios. Individual cycle failures are frequent occurrences. This is considered to be the limit of acceptable delay.	> 55 and <u><</u> 80
F	Operations with delays unacceptable to most drivers occurring due to over saturation, poor progression, or very long cycle lengths.	> 80

Table 4.10-1. Signalized Intersection Service Level Criteria

Source: Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board, 2000





Source: Pinnacle Transportation Engineering 2010

Unsignalized intersections were analyzed using the methodology described in Chapter 17 of the *HCM 2000*. This methodology calculates the overall intersection control delay for intersections controlled by stop signs. At two-way or side street-controlled intersections, the control delay is calculated for each movement, not for the intersection as a whole. For approaches composed of a single lane, the control delay is computed as the average of all movements in that lane. Table 4.10-2 shows the ranges of control delay and corresponding levels of service for unsignalized intersections.

Level of Service	Description	Average Total Delay Per Vehicle (Seconds)
А	Little or no delay	<u><</u> 10
В	Short delays	> 10 and <u><</u> 15
С	Average delays	> 15 and <u><</u> 25
D	Moderate delays	> 25 and <u><</u> 35
E	Lengthy delays.	> 35 and <u><</u> 50
F	Intolerable delays.	> 50

Table 4.10-2. Unsignalized Intersection Service Level Criteria

Source: Highway Capacity Manual, Transportation Research Board, 2000.

The existing peak hour volumes, peak hour factors, and lane configurations were input into the SYNCHRO program to calculate the LOS at each of the study locations. A global peak hour factor (PHF) of 0.85 was applied to all intersections in the p.m. peak hour analysis to ensure consistency with the results from the *South County Traffic Model Update (Final Report)*. Table 4.10-3 summarizes the existing intersection p.m. peak hour Levels of Service. The level of service calculations are contained in Appendix G

 Table 4.10-3. Existing Intersection Levels of Service

Study Intersection	Vehicle Delay (Sec./Vehicle) – LOS Value
Study intersection	May 2009
W. Tefft Street/Pomeroy Road*	14.6 - B
W. Tefft Street/Orchard Avenue*	20.8 - C
W. Tefft Street/Park Access Road	1.5 - A
EB Stop Sign Approach	(22.0 - C)
Pomeroy Road/Park Access Road	0.9 - A
EB Stop Sign Approach	(14.2 - B)
Pomeroy Road/Juniper Street	1.8 - A
WB Stop Sign Approach	(14.6 - B)
Pomeroy Road/Camino Caballo	2.7 - A
Stop Sign Approach	(22.8 - C)

*Intersection controlled with traffic signal.

Vehicle delays at the West Tefft Street/Orchard Avenue intersection are within the LOS C range, while delays at the West Tefft Street/Pomeroy Road intersection are within the LOS B range. Delays at the stop sign controlled study intersections are within the LOS A range. Information in the *South County Traffic Model Update (Final Report)* indicates that delays at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange northbound ramps are in the LOS C range during the p.m. peak hour. The study also indicates that delays at the southbound ramps intersection (opposite the Frontage Road) are within the LOS E range during the p.m. peak hour. The primary reason for the excessive delays is the current intersection configuration. The US 101 southbound ramps-Frontage Road intersection essentially has five legs, with a two-stage left turn signal phase for the westbound left turn movements at the US 101 southbound on-ramp and at the Frontage Road.

As previously discussed, the US 101/Willow Road "grade separated" interchange is currently under construction and will connect to the Willow Road extension (planned for completion in late 2012/early 2013). The US101/Willow Road Interchange Project - Final Traffic Operations Report included an evaluation of the potential benefits to the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. The Willow Road Extension Final Supplemental EIR analyzed the benefits associated with the "preferred" alternative. The analysis of 2030 traffic conditions demonstrated that the US 101/Willow Road interchange would reduce vehicle delays at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange ramp intersections by about 40% during the PM peak hour (sum of critical movements).

Existing Roadway Segment Operations

The operations of roadway segments are generally evaluated by comparing the measured (counted) volume to the threshold volumes. Table 4.10-4 presents threshold volumes from the *South County Traffic Model Update (Final Report) and HCM 2000*, based on the roadway facility type and number of lanes, for various types of roadways. These threshold volumes include adjustments for divided or undivided facilities and for roadways with left turn lanes. The threshold volumes are approximate in nature and serve primarily as a general guide as to whether the roadway is over or under capacity. In urban environments, where intersections become the constraint points along roadway segments, intersection level of service is typically used to determine the roadway's level of service.

Beedwey Type	Maximum Daily Volume (both directions)					
Roadway Type	LOS A	LOS B	LOS C	LOS D	LOS E	
4-Lane Divided Highway	28,000	43,200	61,600	74,400	80,000	
4-Lane Divided Arterial (with left turn lanes)	22,000	25,000	29,000	32,500	36,000	
3-Lane Undivided Arterial (with left turn lanes)	14,400	16,800	19,200	21,600	24,000	
2-Lane Arterial (with left turn lanes)	11,000	12,500	14,500	16,000	18,000	
2-Lane Arterial (with no left turn lanes)	8,000	9,500	10,500	12,000	13,500	
2-Lane Collector/Local Street ¹	6,000	7,500	9,000	10,500	12,000	

Table 4.10-4.	Level of Service	Threshold	Volumes for	Various	Roadwav	Tvpes

¹ Threshold volumes obtained by taking the average value of the range presented in the South County Traffic Model Update, derived from the Highway Capacity Manual 2000. This accounts for the nonstandard design features of collector roads in the study area, such as narrow lane widths and dirt shoulders.

Table 4.10-5 shows the existing roadway segment levels of service for the study segments. Based on the volume thresholds from the *South County Traffic Model Update (Final Report)* and *HCM 2000,* daily traffic volumes along Pomeroy Road are within the LOS B range. The remaining study roadway segments operate at LOS A.

Roadway Segment	Туре	ADT* May 2009	Level of Service
W. Tefft Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	4-Lane Divided Arterial**	17,000	А
W. Tefft Street, Pomeroy Rd Orchard Ave.	3-Lane Undivided Arterial**	13,100	А
W. Tefft Street, s/o Orchard Avenue	2-Lane Arterial**	9,800	А
Pomeroy Road, n/o W. Tefft Street	2-Lane Arterial	8,900	В
Pomeroy Road, Juniper St Camino Ca.	2-Lane Arterial	8,500	В
Pomeroy Road, n/o Camino Caballo	2-Lane Collector	6,500	В
Camino Caballo, w/o Pomeroy Road	2-Lane Collector	2,300	A
Orchard Avenue, e/o W. Tefft Street	2-Lane Arterial	5,900	А
Juniper Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	2-Lane Collector	1,600	A
Osage Street, s/o Camino Caballo	2-Lane Collector	1,200	А
Mesa Road, w/o Tefft Street	2-Lane Collector	2,900	А

Table 4.10-5. Existing Street Roadway Segment Daily Traffic Conditions

* ADT = Average Daily Traffic

** With left turn lanes

4.10.2 Baseline Conditions

Baseline conditions typically reflect the sum of the existing volumes, as identified in the Existing Conditions, plus traffic from approved but not yet constructed developments in the vicinity of the proposed project. Since there are no approved but not yet constructed projects in the study area, the Existing Conditions scenario will be used to establish the baseline for evaluating project impacts.

4.10.3 Regulatory Setting

Transportation system requirements for the unincorporated areas of the county are subject to the policies and plans of the County. The County outlines policies and standards regarding use of public roads in the *South County Inland Area Plan* and *South County Traffic Model Update (Final Report)*. The County is responsible for the review and approval of proposed projects and traffic study reports. All new developments are required to meet the parking space and access improvement standards specified by the County.

Caltrans has jurisdiction over all state-maintained facilities, including US 101. Caltrans strives to maintain operations at the LOS C/D threshold on all of its facilities but acknowledges that

numerous roadway segments under its control in urban areas will operate at LOS D or worse. Any modifications to facilities within Caltrans right-of-way must be approved by the State.

4.10.4 Thresholds of Significance

The significance of potential transportation and circulation impacts are based on thresholds identified by the County of San Luis Obispo, in accordance with Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. Transportation impacts are considered significant if the proposed project would:

- Increase vehicle trips to local or areawide circulation system;
- Reduce existing "Levels of Service" on public roadways (refer to LOS standards below);
- Create unsafe conditions on public roadways (e.g., limited access, design features, sight distance, slow vehicles);
- Provide for adequate emergency access;
- Result in inadequate parking capacity;
- Result in inadequate internal traffic circulation;
- Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation; or,
- Result in a change in air traffic patterns that may result in substantial safety risks.

"Level of Service" Thresholds

The County has established the LOS C threshold for acceptable operations on rural facilities maintained by the County. Caltrans strives to maintain a target level of service at the transition between LOS C/D on State operated facilities.

Transportation impacts at signalized intersections are considered significant when:

- The addition of project traffic causes the intersection's level of service to degrade from LOS C or better to LOS D, E, or F.
- Project traffic is added to an intersection operating at LOS D, E, or F.

Transportation impacts at unsignalized intersections are considered significant when:

- The addition of project traffic to an unsignalized intersection degrades the level of service to an unacceptable level and satisfies the peak-hour signal warrant from the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).
- The project's access to a major street causes a potentially unsafe situation or requires a new traffic signal.

Evaluation of arterial roadway segments reflects planning-level conditions along a street, whereas analysis of the intersections reflects detailed conditions of the arterial. Typically, poor operating conditions on an arterial are due to constraints at the intersections, and can be mitigated at the intersection. Therefore, if an arterial roadway segment analysis shows poor operating conditions, but individual intersections operate within acceptable standards, the mitigation measures defer to the intersection.

For US 101 ramps, US 101 mainline segments, or a County roadway segment already operating at LOS D, E, or F without the project, the addition of any project traffic to that location is considered a significant impact.

Alternative Transportation

An impact to pedestrians and bicyclists would be considered significant if implementation of the proposed project would conflict with existing or planned bicycle facilities or would generate pedestrian and bicycle demand without providing adequate and appropriate facilities for safe non-motorized mobility. Impacts to transit would be considered significant if the proposed project would conflict with existing or planned transit facilities or will generate potential transit trips and would not provide adequate facilities for pedestrians and bicyclists to access transit routes and stops.

4.10.5 Impact Assessment and Methodology

Impacts were assessed by comparing roadway operations with the addition of projectgenerated traffic to those under Existing Conditions and applying the appropriate criteria from thresholds of significance described above. Potential impacts to bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities and services were also identified by comparing project conditions to Existing Conditions.

In addition to project-specific impacts, the EIR analysis identifies long-term impacts under a cumulative conditions scenario, representing future conditions in Year 2025. This scenario includes 20 years of growth in the study area in addition to background traffic growth.

4.10.6 **Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

4.10.6.1 Increase in Traffic and Level of Service

Proposed Intersection and Roadway Improvements

As part of the NCP Master Plan project, various on- and off-site circulation infrastructure improvements will be constructed prior to construction and operation of any high-traffic generating facility, including the permanent pre-school and administration building, sports fields, community center, amphitheater, swimming pool, and skate park. The existing park access road connection to West Tefft Street will be realigned to the north side of the public library opposite Orchard Avenue (signalized). Modifications at the West Tefft Street/Orchard Avenue intersection will include two approach lanes for traffic exiting the NCP (i.e., a shared left-through lane and a right turn lane). The existing split signal phasing for Orchard Avenue should be eliminated. An exclusive left turn signal phase should be provided on the northbound approach of West Tefft Street. The existing park access road connection to Pomeroy Road will be realigned opposite Juniper Street and a traffic signal will be installed. A northbound left turn and southbound right turn lane will be installed on Pomeroy Road at the Juniper Street intersection. The following impact analysis assumes the implementation of the infrastructure improvements included in the NCPMP.

Intersection and Roadway Impacts

Project Trip Generation, Distribution, and Assignment

The amount of traffic added to the roadway system by a proposed development project is estimated using a three-step process: (1) trip generation, (2) trip distribution, and (3) trip

assignment. The first step estimates the amount of added traffic to the roadway network. The second step estimates the direction of travel to and from the project site. The trips are assigned to specific street segments and intersection turning movements during the third step. These steps are described below.

Currently the NCP includes a variety of recreational facilities (e.g., park and playground area, tennis courts, restrooms, trails, Little Bits Preschool, etc.). The existing park access road provides access for existing recreational facilities, an existing preschool, and the northerly parking lot for the Dana Elementary School. The preschool and access to the elementary school parking lot are included in the NCP Master Plan. The number of p.m. peak hour trips associated with the existing park uses was quantified using the new traffic count data. Daily traffic volumes associated with the existing uses at the NCP were estimated using the appropriate trip generation rates contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual (8th Edition) (2008) and other sources. The project trip generation estimates associated with the proposed uses were also derived using data contained in the ITE Trip Generation Manual and other sources. Table 4.10-6 summarizes the estimated trip generation of the proposed project (new increase equals proposed minus existing).

	Number of Vehicle Trips				
Land Use Component	a.m. Peak Hour		p.m. Peak Hour		Deily
	In	Out	In	Out	Daily
Existing NCP Uses (159.167 acres)	-	-	154	99	1,800
Proposed NCP Master Plan Uses					
Various Park Uses - 6.12 acres*	0	0	1	1	28
Community Center - 36,000 sf**	36	22	19	33	824
Four Baseball/Softball Fields	0	0	20	10	120
Two Basketball Courts	0	0	65	35	400
Two Handball Courts	0	0	13	7	80
Six Tennis Courts	5	5	11	11	200
Six Multi-Purpose Sporting Fields (Soccer)	4	4	86	38	428
Skate Park or Comm. Pool - 10,000 sf	0	0	15	9	158
Amphitheater - 5,227 sf (50-75 Seats)	0	0	15	4	50
Library - 11,134 sf	8	3	39	42	626
Preschool - 4,050 sf (30 Students)	13	11	12	13	134
Ranger Residence	0	1	1	0	10
Total	66	46	297	203	3,058
Net Change	n/a	n/a	+143	+104	+1,258

Table 4.10-6.	Estimated	Project	Vehicle	Trip	Generation

* Uses include playgrounds, dog park area, picnic areas, horseshoe pits & trails/walkways

** Uses include gymnasium and pool (8,400 sf)

Buildout of the NCP Master Plan will generate 3,058 daily trips (two-way trip ends), 112 trips during the a.m. peak hour (66 inbound and 46 outbound), and 500 trips during the p.m. peak hour (297 inbound and 203 outbound). The additional facilities included in the NCP Master Plan will generate a "net" increase of 1,258 daily trips (+70%) and 247 trips during the p.m. peak hour (+98%). Information contained in the various trip rate sources indicates that a small portion of the trips attracted to the NCP and Mesa Meadows will come from traffic already on the local street system (5% to 10%). It is anticipated that there will also be "multiple-use" type trips associated with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan. To present a "worst case" analysis the evaluation of potential impacts was conducted without any reductions applied to the project trip generation estimates.

The trips associated with the NCP Master Plan were distributed on the local street system based on a review of current travel patterns and traffic demands included in the *South County Traffic Model Update (Final Report)*. The project vehicle trip distribution percentages are presented in Table 4.10-7.

Trip Route and Roadway	Distribution Percentage
To and from Northwest via Pomeroy Road	12-17%
To and from Northeast Via West Tefft Street	35-25%
To and from South via West Tefft Street	28-30%
To and from East via Orchard	15-18%
To and from Local Collector Street*	10%

 Table 4.10-7. Project Vehicle Trip Distribution Percentages

* Local Streets include Juniper Street, Camino Caballo, Primrose Lane and Bernita Place

A small portion of the trips are anticipated to use Osage Street, Mesa Road, Tejas Place, and Charro Way (less than 5%), and US 101 (5% to 10%). The trips associated with the individual uses were assigned to the local street system using the distribution percentages in Table 4.10-7, assuming that the Master Plan infrastructure improvements are in place. The traffic volumes associated with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan are illustrated on Figure 4.10-2.

Existing Plus Project Intersection Operations

Intersection operations were re-calculated with the total traffic volumes associated with the NCP Master Plan buildout (refer to Table 4.10-8). Detailed LOS calculation sheets are presented in Appendix G. Table 4.10-8 shows the levels of service under Existing and Existing with Project Conditions. The study intersections will operate within acceptable limits (LOS C or better) with buildout of the NCP Master Plan. The project analysis assumes that the NCP Master Plan infrastructure improvements will be in place at the West Tefft Street/Orchard Avenue and Pomeroy Road/Juniper Street intersections.



Figure 4.10-2. Project Traffic Volumes

Source: Pinnacle Transportation Engineering 2010

Study Interception	Vehicle Delay/LOS			
Study intersection	Existing	With Project		
W. Tefft Street/Pomeroy Road*	14.6/B	15.4/B		
W. Tefft Street/Orchard Avenue*	20.8/C	19.9/B		
Pomeroy Road/Juniper Street *	n/a	5.4/A		
Pomeroy Road/Camino Caballo Stop Sign Approach	2.7/A (22.8/C)	2.7/A (24.5/C)		

Table 4.10-8. Existing and Existing with Project Intersection Levels of Service

* Intersection controlled with traffic signal.

As documented under existing conditions, delays at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange southbound ramps intersection are in the LOS E range during the p.m. peak hour. However, completion of the US 101/Willow Road interchange is anticipated to reduce delays at the US 101 West Tefft Street interchange by about 40% during the PM peak hour. It is anticipated that buildout of uses included in the NCP Master Plan could add 10 to 15 trips to the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. Buildout of the NCPMP would not significantly impact existing operations during the p.m. peak hour; therefore, no mitigation measures are warranted.

Existing With Project Roadway Segment Operations

Table 4.10-9 shows the roadway levels of service for the study street segments under Existing and Existing with Project Conditions. The study roadway segments will operate at LOS C or better with the addition of project traffic. The project will potentially add daily trips to West Tefft Street through the US 101 interchange. Project specific impacts associated with the "existing with project" scenario are presented under the intersection levels of service analysis. Thus, no project impacts to roadway segments are anticipated, so no mitigation measures are warranted.

			ADT/LOS		
Roadway Segment	Туре	Capacity	Existing	With Project	
W. Tefft Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	4-Lane Arterial*	36,000	17,000/A	17,426/A	
W. Tefft Street, Pomeroy Rd Orchard Ave.	3-Lane Arterial*	24,000	13,100/A	13,410/A	
W. Tefft Street, s/o Orchard Avenue	2-Lane Arterial*	18,000	9,800/A	10,144/A	
Pomeroy Road, n/o W. Tefft Street	2-Lane Arterial	13,500	8,900/B	9,122/B	
Pomeroy Road, Juniper St Camino Ca.	2-Lane Arterial	13,500	8,500/B	8,702/B	
Pomeroy Road, n/o Camino Caballo	2-Lane Collector	12,000	6,500/B	6,664/B	

Table 4.10-9. Existing and Existing With Project Street Roadway Segment Daily Traffic Conditions

			ADT/LOS		
Roadway Segment	Roadway Segment Type		Existing	With Project	
Camino Caballo, w/o Pomeroy Road	2-Lane Collector	12,000	2,300/A	2,338/A	
Orchard Avenue, e/o W. Tefft Street	2-Lane Arterial	13,500	5,900/A	6,114/A	
Juniper Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	2-Lane Collector	12,000	1,600/A	1,634/A	
Osage Street, s/o Camino Caballo	2-Lane Collector	12,000	1,200/A	1,222/A	
Mesa Road, w/o Tefft Street	2-Lane Collector	12,000	2,900/A	2,922/A	

* With left turn lanes.

Neighborhood Impacts

Buildout of uses included in the NCP Master Plan will not significantly increase vehicular traffic demands on local neighborhood streets. No significant neighborhood impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are warranted.

4.10.6.2 Create Unsafe Conditions

The NCPMP includes various infrastructure improvements, which will address existing potential hazards related to site access for vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians. The existing park access road connection to West Tefft Street will be realigned to the north side of the public library opposite Orchard Avenue. The existing park access road connection to Pomeroy Road will be realigned opposite Juniper Street and a traffic signal will be installed. A northbound left turn and southbound right turn lane will be installed on Pomeroy Road at the Juniper Street intersection. Osage Road will be widened to meet County road standards, allowing for adequate room for two vehicles to pass in alternate directions. These improvements would have a beneficial impact related to safety and road hazards by remediating sub-standard existing conditions. No significant project access impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are warranted.

4.10.6.3 **Provide for Adequate Emergency Access**

As noted above, on and off-site road improvements would have a beneficial effect on access, which would in turn improve access for emergency vehicles. Internal roads, shoulders, and parking areas would support emergency vehicles. No impact would occur.

4.10.6.4 Parking Capacity and Internal Circulation

Buildout of the NCPMP will include the construction of numerous internal circulation improvements. New parking lots will be constructed to accommodate parking demands adjacent to the existing and proposed facilities. No significant internal circulation or parking impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are warranted.

4.10.6.5 Alternative Transportation

Pedestrian Impacts

Buildout of uses included in the NCP Master Plan has a potential to increase local pedestrian traffic. The NCP Master Plan includes various multi-purpose trails and walkways. The project trails and walkways will connect to existing pedestrian facilities along West Tefft Street, Pomeroy Road, Camino Caballo, and Osage Street. Thus, no project impacts to pedestrian facilities are anticipated, so no mitigation measures are warranted.

Bicycle Impacts

Buildout of uses included in the NCP Master Plan has a potential to increase local bicycle traffic. The NCP Master Plan includes various multi-purpose trails. The project trails will connect to existing bicycle facilities along West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road. Thus, no project impacts to bicycle facilities are anticipated, so no mitigation measures are warranted.

Transit Impacts

Buildout of the uses included in the NCP Master Plan has a potential to increase local demands for transit service. As discussed under existing conditions, South County Area Transit (RTA) currently provides limited service to Nipomo. The nearest transit stop is located on West Tefft Street near Carillo Street, approximately 1 mile from the NCP. Currently, there are not adequate paved pedestrian facilities to access the transit stops on West Tefft Street. Therefore, existing transit services are not adequate to serve NCP.

TR Impact 1 Inadequate transit service is available to serve NCP, which is potentially inconsistent with alternative transportation goals.

TR/mm-1 Upon implementation of the NCP Master Plan, <u>the General Services</u> <u>Agency</u> shall coordinate with the Regional Transportation Authority, and establish a transit stop within Nipomo Community Park, if appropriate.

Residual Impact

The project would generate increased trips in the area, but would not exceed identified thresholds based on existing and forecasted conditions. Improved pedestrian and bicycling access and connections, and incorporation of transit service to and from NCP would reduce potential vehicle trips contributing to the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange, and would be consistent with alternative transportation goals; therefore, potential transportation impacts would be considered *less than significant* (Class II).

4.10.6.6 Air Traffic

The project site is not located in close proximity to a public or private airstrip or airport. No features are proposed that would interfere with air traffic. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant.

4.10.7 Cumulative Impacts

4.10.7.1 Year 2025 Cumulative Impacts

The impacts of the proposed project were evaluated under Cumulative Conditions (Year 2025) with and without the proposed project. This scenario includes 20 years of growth in the study area in addition to background traffic growth on the area's through corridors.

4.10.7.2 Cumulative Planned Road Improvements

The 2005 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) published by the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG) and the South County Traffic Model Update (Final Report) provides an overview of the planned region-wide improvements in the South County area. The RTP also notes the status of funding for expected improvements. In the study area, the South County Traffic Model Update (Final Report) identifies various projects that would affect local traffic operations in Nipomo. The cumulative transportation network includes the following roadway improvements:

- Willow Road extension to Thompson Avenue (under construction)
- US 101/Willow Road Interchange (under construction)
- North Frontage Road Connection to Willow Road Extension
- State Route 1 connections to Dawn Road, Mesa Road and Eucalyptus Road

The Cumulative analysis presented in the *South County Traffic Model Update (Final Report)* designates the segment of West Tefft Street between Pomeroy Road and Orchard Avenue as a four-lane arterial with left turn lanes. Therefore, the buildout analysis assumes that future improvements in this portion of Nipomo will include providing two through travel lanes in each direction along this segment of West Tefft Street. The County Public Works Department is currently evaluating various operational improvements for the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. However, these improvements are not designed or funded at this time, and therefore, are not assumed to be completed under the baseline cumulative scenario. The following is a brief description of the three alternatives under consideration:

Alternative 1 – This alternative would include closing the existing US 101 southbound on ramp and constructing a new southbound "hook" on ramp on the frontage road opposite Hill Street. The northbound left turn movement on the frontage road would be prohibited at West Tefft Street. Southbound traffic exiting the US 101 with a destination to West Tefft Street (west of US 101) would utilize the Hill Road and Mary Avenue. This alternative would also eliminate the existing two-stage left turn signal phase for westbound traffic on West Tefft Street at the existing the southbound on ramp.

Alternative 2 – This alternative would include moving the existing US 101 southbound off ramp to the previous location opposite the southbound on ramp. This alternative would also eliminate the existing two-stage left turn signal phase for westbound traffic on West Tefft Street at the existing US 101 southbound ramps intersection.

Alternative 3 – This alternative would include restriping the eastbound approach on West Tefft Street at the US 101 northbound ramps intersection. The eastbound approach would be striped for dual left turn lanes and one through lane. This alternative would not include any traffic signal modifications at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange.

County staff prefers Alternative 1 at this time. A preliminary analysis associated with the potential benefits of this alternative indicates that levels of service in the LOS C-D range could be achieved under buildout conditions.

4.10.7.3 Cumulative Intersection and Roadway Impacts

Cumulative Traffic Volumes

Buildout daily and peak hour traffic volumes for the local street system serving were obtained from the South County Traffic Model Update (Final Report). The relation between daily and peak hour traffic volumes in the traffic model were used to derive roadway segment and intersection turning movement volumes not included in the final report. Minor adjustments were applied to the p.m. peak hour traffic volumes at the West Tefft Street and Orchard Avenue intersection to reflect for the actual amount of traffic utilizing the library driveway. Data contained in the ITE Trip Generation Manual was referenced to perform the adjustments for p.m. peak hour traffic on the adjacent street system between 4:00 and 6:00 PM. The cumulative buildout volumes for the local street system are illustrated on Figure 4.10-3. It should be mentioned that the cumulative traffic volumes only reflect the current uses at the NCP and not buildout of all the proposed uses in the NCP Master Plan.

Cumulative Intersection Operations

Table 4.10-10 shows the levels of service under Cumulative and Cumulative with Project Conditions. Detailed LOS calculation sheets are included in Appendix G.

Study Interception	Vehicle Delay/LOS			
Study intersection	Cumulative	With Project		
W. Tefft Street/Pomeroy Road*	27.2/C	34.0/C		
W. Tefft Street/Orchard Avenue*	34.4/C	20.6/C		
Pomeroy Road/Juniper Street*	n/a	6.1/A		
Pomeroy Road/Camino Caballo Stop Sign Approach	3.4/A (43.4/E)	4.0/A (>50/F)		

 Table 4.10-10. Cumulative Intersection Levels of Service

* Intersection controlled with traffic signal.

Average vehicle delays will be within acceptable limits at the study intersections with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan. Delays on the westbound approach at the Pomeroy Road and Camino Caballo intersection will be within unacceptable limits (LOS E-F). Cumulative traffic demands will satisfy the minimum "peak hour volume" signal warrant criteria (California MUTCD 70% factor) at this intersection. However, the construction of capacity improvements at this intersection would not reduce delays on the westbound approach to an acceptable level (LOS C or better). Additional signal warrants should be satisfied before considering the installation of traffic signal control and, therefore, the installation of signal control at this intersection is not recommended. As documented under existing conditions delays at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange southbound ramps are within unacceptable levels (LOS E).

Completion of the US 101/Willow Road interchange is anticipated to reduce traffic demands and vehicle delays at the US101/West Tefft Street interchange by about 40% during the PM peak hour. PM peak hour traffic demands will also be reduced on Pomeroy Road and at the Pomeroy Road/Camino Caballo intersection. However, the Willow Road Extension EIR analysis indicates that the benefits associated with the project will not eliminate the adverse LOS at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange during the PM peak hour period.

The NCPMP is a 20-year plan; therefore, periodic re-assessment of traffic conditions is recommended prior to development and during operation of high-traffic generating uses to ensure traffic impacts are mitigated to the extent feasible. The re-assessment would include consultation with Public Works to identify impact fees appropriate for the project, based on the most recent South County Traffic Model Update. The associated capital improvement program provides a mechanism for the funding of future long range infrastructure improvements, which would improve traffic and circulation. Proposed facilities and amenities that may trigger the South County Road Improvement Fee (Area 1) include the permanent preschool and administration building, sports fields, community center, amphitheater, swimming pool, skate park, open turf, playgrounds, dog park, handball courts, horseshoe pits, tennis courts, and basketball courts.

TR Impact 2 Buildout of the NCP Master Plan will potentially have a significant cumulative impact at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange southbound ramps during the p.m. peak hour.

Implement TR/mm-1.

- TR/mm-2 Upon development of high-traffic generating uses, including tennis courts, sports fields, amphitheater, and community center, a during periodic review of the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan, the General Services Agency shall re-assess the project's effect on the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange.
 - a. In the event the project would have a significant traffic impact, the County shall adopt Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures for implementation, as necessary, during peak times (Monday through Friday, 4:00 – 6:00 pm) including, but not be limited to: requiring reservation for specific uses, staggered scheduling of starting times for the sports fields, and limiting the size of community center events.
 - b. County Parks shall coordinate with County Public Works to determine the appropriate <u>South County Road Improvement Fee Area 1</u> fees at the time development is proposed. In the event <u>South County Road</u> <u>Improvement Fee Area 1</u> fees are determined to be appropriate by Public Works in accordance with Title 13.01 of the County Code, the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall provide the fees prior to development of high-traffic generating uses (i.e., tennis courts, sports fields, amphitheater, and community center).

Residual Impact

The NCPMP is a long-term, 20-year plan. The South County Circulation Model is periodically updated by County Public Works and, over time, will likely show changes in traffic flow and

delays within the community of Nipomo, and specifically at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. While the project would add trips to this interchange, periodic re-assessment of the project's effect on traffic flow and delay is recommended to ensure the best application of mitigation prior to development and during operation of major improvements. Recommended mitigation, including implementation of Transportation Demand Management measures, payment of "in lieu fees", and incorporation of a transit stop within NCP (if requested by RTA), would reduce potential cumulative effects related to trip generation to *less than significant* (Class II).

Cumulative Roadway Segment Operations

Table 4.10-11 presents the cumulative roadway segment levels of service for the study segments.

			ADT/LOS		
Roadway Segment Type		Capacity	Cumulative	With Project	
W. Tefft Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	4-Lane Arterial*	36,000	25,550/C	25,976/C	
W. Tefft Street, Pomeroy Rd Orchard Ave.	4-Lane Arterial*	36,000	19,200/B	19,510/B	
W. Tefft Street, s/o Orchard Avenue	2-Lane Arterial*	18,000	10,600/A	10,944/A	
Pomeroy Road, n/o W. Tefft Street	2-Lane Arterial	13,500	7,150/B	7,372/B	
Pomeroy Road, Juniper St Camino Ca.	2-Lane Arterial	13,500	8,400/B	8,602/B	
Pomeroy Road, n/o Camino Caballo	2-Lane Collector	12,000	6,700/B	6,764/B	
Camino Caballo, w/o Pomeroy Road	2-Lane Collector	12,000	2,900/A	2,938/A	
Orchard Avenue, e/o W. Tefft Street	2-Lane Arterial	13,500	9,350/B	9,564/C	
Juniper Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	2-Lane Collector	12,000	2,800/A	2,834/A	
Osage Street, s/o Camino Caballo	2-Lane Collector	12,000	1,300/A	1,222/A	
Mesa Road, w/o Tefft Street	2-Lane Collector	12,000	3,100/A	3,122/A	

 Table 4.10-11. Cumulative Roadway Segment Daily Traffic Conditions

* With left turn lanes.

Cumulative daily traffic volumes on a majority of the study area roadway segments will remain within acceptable limits with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan (LOS C or better). Cumulative daily traffic along West Tefft Street near the US 101 interchange is projected to be within the LOS E range (with or without the project).

Completion of the US 101/Willow Road interchange is anticipated to reduce daily traffic on West Tefft Street (west of US 101) by about 20-25%. The Willow Road Extension EIR analysis indicates that the benefits associated with the project are estimated to improve the buildout LOS E to an acceptable LOS C (27,200 ADT) on West Tefft Street (near US 101 interchange). Thus, no project impacts to roadway segments are anticipated, so no mitigation measures are warranted.





Source: Pinnacle Transportation Engineering 2010

This page intentionally left blank.

4.11 WASTEWATER

This section describes and analyzes the proposed collection, treatment, and disposal of the project's wastewater demands.

4.11.1 Existing Conditions

Wastewater disposal for the park is currently treated by individual septic systems for the four existing restroom facilities. The park is also within the Nipomo Urban Services Line, and surrounding areas are serviced by the NCSD. The NCSD, which serves approximately 12,000 people over an area of about 4,650 acres provides water and wastewater service to approximately 25% of the Nipomo Mesa area's population (Urban Water Management Plan 2005 Update, SAIC Engineering).

The NCSD currently operates two wastewater treatment facilities. The Blacklake Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) collects and treats water from the Blacklake water system. The Southland Wastewater Treatment Facility (WWTF) collects and treats water from the rest of the NCSD as well as some properties outside of the NCSD boundary (2010 Urban Water Management Plan, Water Systems Consulting, Inc., June 29, 2011). According to the NCSD, the Southland WWTF currently operates at approximately 63% of capacity (County of San Luis Obispo 2009). The Southland WWTF has a permitted capacity of 900,000 gallons per day (gpd) based on its maximum monthly flow. Average annual flow is approximately 570,000 gpd with a maximum recorded monthly flow rate of approximately 613,000 gpd. Proposed phased improvements to the WWTF will improve effluent quality, biosolids management, and increase the ultimate treatment capacity to a maximum flow of 1.8 million gpd from its current capacity of 0.9 million gpd. Other properties within the Nipomo Urban Services Line utilize individual septic systems where centralized sewer service is not provided. Previously identified operational issues include occasional BOD (biochemical oxygen demand) limit violations during settling pond maintenance.

Two additional WWTPs discharge treated effluent within the Nipomo Mesa Management Area (refer to Figure 4.11-1): the Rural Water Company's Cypress Ridge Wastewater Facility and the Woodlands Mutual Water Company Wastewater Reclamation Facility. The total WWTP effluent was 640 acre feet per year (afy). Table 4.11-1 shows estimated wastewater volumes for all WWTPs in the NMMA in 2010.

Facility	Influent (afy)	Estimated Effluent (afy)	Re-Use
Blacklake WWTP	82	70	Irrigation
Southland WWTF	534	474	Infiltration
Cypress Ridge Wastewater Facility	Not reported	47	Irrigation
Woodlands Wastewater Reclamation Facility	Not reported	39	Irrigation
La Serena	Not reported	6	Infiltration
Total		640	

Table 4.11-1. 2010 Wastewater Volumes

Source: NMMA 3rd Annual Report, 2010 Calendar Year (NMMA Technical Group 2011)



Figure 4.11-1. NMMA Wastewater Treatment Facilities

The Blacklake, Cypress Ridge, and Woodlands WWTPs utilize secondary treatment and recycled water for golf course irrigation. The amount of recycled water used in 2010 for irrigation at Blacklake, Cypress Ridge, and Woodlands are 70 acre feet (af), 47 af, and 39 af, respectively (*NMMA* [*Nipomo Mesa Management Area*] 3rd *Annual Report, 2010 Calendar Year*, NMMA Technical Group 2011). The Blacklake WWTP is the only place in the NCSD facility where wastewater is recycled, as shown in Table 4.11-2, below. The Southland WWTF utilizes secondary treatment and treated water is disposed of in percolation ponds on-site, although the NCSD is considering treating this water to recycled water standards (*2010 Urban Water Management Plan*, Water Systems Consulting, Inc. 2011).

Wastewater Collection and Treatment System	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Southland WWTP Average Annual Flow (afy)	661	818	1,086	1,344	1,613	1,870
Blacklake WWTP Average Annual Flow (afy)	71	71	71	71	71	71
Quantity that meets recycled water standard*	71	71	71	71	71	71

Table 4.11-2. Wastewater Collected and Recycled by the NCSD

* All water processed through the Blacklake WWTP meets reclaimed water permit conditions.

Source: 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, (NCSD 2011)

4.11.2 Regulatory Setting

4.11.2.1 Federal Policies and Regulations

Federal standards for the quality of treated wastewater effluent would apply to this project. However, no other Federal policies or permits relating to wastewater services or utilities would be applicable. The project would not affect potential impacts to "waters of the U.S." and no actions would be subject to §§ 404 and 401 of the Clean Water Act and the NPDES.

4.11.2.2 State Policies and Regulations

The Central Coast RWQCB's Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coast Region (Basin Plan) includes various guidelines, criteria, and prohibitions for on-site wastewater treatment and disposal. On-site wastewater systems may be used to treat and dispose of wastewater, provided the daily flow rate is less than 2,500 gallons.

Based on consultation with County Environmental Health Services (personal communication, Leslie Terry; December 17, 2008), the Central Coast RWQCB is proposing to amend the Basin Plan regarding the on-site wastewater system implementation program. The RWQCB has entered into a multi-agency memorandum of understanding (MOU) governing regulation of on-site systems, and local permitting agencies (i.e., County) implemented criteria for on-site systems through their own permits. Draft Basin Plan Amendments are proposed, which would make the existing program more stringent and provide greater environmental protection. The Amendments also require the preparation and implementation of on-site wastewater management plans in urbanizing areas to investigate and mitigate long-term cumulative impacts resulting from continued use of individual, alternative, and community on-site wastewater systems (RWQCB 2008).

Standards for the quality of treated effluent are established by federal and state water quality laws. Effluent is required to be treated in accordance with the applicable standards set forth in CCR Title 22 (Environmental Health) as well as standards set by the SWRCB, which sets specific effluent discharge requirements for wastewater facilities in the county. Standards for quality of treated effluent are set to protect present and potential beneficial uses of surface and/or groundwater that receive the treated effluent, including recreation, agriculture, and wildlife. Use of treated effluent as recycled water is also regulated by Title 22 (Chapter 3, Recycling Criteria). In the event recycled water is used within the park for irrigation, requirements would likely include:

- 100-foot buffer between irrigated area and domestic water supply wells;
- Irrigation runoff shall be confined to the recycled water use area, unless the runoff does
 not pose a public health threat and is authorized by the regulatory agency;
- Spray, mist, or runoff shall not enter dwellings, designated outdoor eating areas, or food handling facilities;
- Drinking water fountains shall be protected against contact with recycled water spray, mist, or runoff; and,
- All use areas where recycled water is used that are accessible to the public shall be posted with signs stating "recycled water, do not drink."

4.11.2.3 Local Regulations

The County Environmental Health Services and the Central Coast RWQCB are the local agencies responsible for effluent treatment standards and siting of wastewater treatment and disposal facilities. These agencies ensure that proposed projects conform to all applicable local standards, including the Basin Plan. Implementation of the NCPMP would be a County project; therefore, compliance with the County Ordinance is not required; however, standards are useful as thresholds of significance when assessing potential impacts resulting from the project.

Title 19 – Building and Construction Ordinance

Section 19.07.022 (Private Sewage Disposal Systems) states that the use of private on-site sewage disposal systems are allowed only within the rural areas of the county and within urban and village areas where no community sewage collection, treatment, and disposal system exists. Section 19.07.022(a) notes that these regulations are enacted in part to implement the requirements of the "Water Quality Control Plan Central Coast Basin" (Basin Plan). Based on consultation with the RWQCB regarding the Basin Plan and Basin Plan Amendment requirements, restroom facilities within the park are not required to connect to the NCSD sewer system unless compliance with the Basin Plan cannot be demonstrated (RWQCB 2010).

Since the proposed project includes on-site wastewater treatment and disposal, requirements that would be imposed on this project potentially affecting water resources include:

 Depth to groundwater (minimum vertical separation of 5 feet from the bottom of the disposal field for soils having percolation rates slower than 30 minutes per inch. Greater separation distances are required for faster percolation rates).

- Setbacks (minimum setback of 100 feet between disposal area and any water supply well, spring, or water course).
- Surface and Subsurface Irrigation Water Recycling (subject to CCR Title 22 for water reuse criteria).

The following policies are contained in the Central Coast RWQCB Basin Plan:

- Groundwater recharge with high quality water shall be encouraged.
- In all groundwater basins known to have an adverse salt balance, total salt content of the discharge shall not exceed that which normally results from domestic use, and control of salinity shall be required by local ordinances, which effectively limit municipal and industrial contributions to the sewerage system.
- Wastewaters percolated into the groundwaters shall be of such quality at the point where they enter the ground so as to assure the continued usability of all groundwaters of the basin.

4.11.3 Thresholds of Significance

Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, the County states that a significant wastewater resource impact would occur if the project would:

- 1. Violate waste discharge requirements or Central Coast Basin Plan criteria for wastewater systems;
- 2. Change the quality of surface or ground water (e.g., nitrogen-loading, daylighting); or
- 3. Adversely affect community wastewater service provider.

4.11.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology

Wastewater disposal for the park is currently treated by individual septic systems for the four existing restroom facilities. NCP is located within the Nipomo urban area, and surrounding uses are served by the NCSD. Effluent disposal for NCP could be accomplished by three methods: connection to an existing NCSD system, septic tanks and leachfield systems, or fiberglass holding tanks that are regularly pumped and maintained. Septic system disposal is considered the preferred method because of the open space areas within NCP. Additionally, there are multiple level to relatively level areas that would be suitable for leachfield siting, and depth to bedrock and/or groundwater are not expected to be significant issues for standard septic system design. Percolation tests performed on the adjacent Mesa Meadows property indicate that soil conditions are adequate for on-site septic systems (*Constraints Analysis*, Morro Group 2004). Site specific testing pursuant to current (or amended) Basin Plan regulations would be implemented.

4.11.5 **Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

4.11.5.1 Violate Waste Discharge Requirements or Central Coast Basin Plan Criteria

The proposed on-site systems would be located on public land, be operated and maintained by a public agency (County), and would serve the public visitors to NCP. Prior to development of the Mesa Meadows residential area, percolation tests were performed by Earth Systems Consultants (1994) to assess the Mesa Meadows area for suitability of on-site effluent disposal via septic system, and to determine the ability for on-site stormwater retention via percolation. Percolation tests occurred approximately 1,300 to 2,000 feet from the proposed additional park restrooms and associated on-site wastewater treatment and disposal systems. Observed percolation rates ranged from a low of <1 minute per inch (min/inch) up to 8 min/inch. Because no groundwater was encountered at bore depths ranging from 10 to 21 feet below the surface, soil conditions were judged to be adequate for on-site septic systems for the Mesa Meadows residential project.

Per the Basin Plan, if the percolation rate is less than 4 min/inch, depth to groundwater must not be less than 20 feet. Proposed Basin Plan Amendments require additional treatment of wastewater if the rate is less than 1 min/inch. The Master Plan does not include the construction of restrooms in the Mesa Meadows area; however, the existing soils and percolation data can be generally be applied to the park area. Because Mesa Meadows is located immediately adjacent to the park, contains the same soil profile mapped by the NRCS (Oceano sand), and standard septic systems were constructed for that development, conditions appear to meet Basin Plan, and Basin Plan Amendment, requirements. Some standard requirements, which were reviewed to assess the feasibility of new on-site wastewater treatment and disposal, include the following key standards:

- Natural ground slope of the disposal area should not exceed 20%.
- Setback distance from a cut, embankment, or steep slope (greater than 30%) should be determined by projecting a line 20% down gradient from the sidewall at the highest perforation of the discharge pipe. The leachfields shall be set back far enough to prevent this projected line from intersecting the cut within 100 feet, measured horizontally, from the sidewall. If restrictive layers intersect cuts, embankments or steep slopes, and geologic conditions permit surfacing, the setback shall be at least 100 feet measured from the top of the cut.
- On-site discharge in soils with percolation rates faster than one minute per inch is prohibited without additional treatment consistent with an on-site management plan.
- On-site discharge is prohibited in fill unless specifically engineered as a disposal area.
- Dual disposal fields (200% of original calculated disposal area).

Based on site conditions, it appears that the site is suitable for additional on-site wastewater treatment and disposal. Applying a sewer flow duty factor of 0.62 afy/acre (NCSD 2007), and applying this rate to approximately 25 acres of active recreation land, the estimated sewer flow would be approximately 14,000 gpd. Dividing this among the six proposed restrooms would result in a flow less than 2,500 gpd per restroom.

Implementation of on-site wastewater disposal is subject to updated regulations regarding wastewater disposal and water quality, including specific requirements for site specific subsurface investigation and testing. In the event the County cannot demonstrate compliance with the Basin Plan, connection to the NCSD sewer system would be necessary. Based on consultation with the NCSD (personal communication, Bruce Buel; December 17, 2008), the NCSD notes that a connection is possible, based on further review of additional information at the time connection is proposed. There is an existing sewer line along West Tefft Street, adjacent to the park site.

Based on review of the Basin Plan, the project appears to be consistent with noted requirements; therefore, this impact would be *less than significant* (Class III) and no mitigation is necessary.

4.11.5.2 Change the Quality of Surface or Groundwater

This threshold of significance consider any adverse change to existing water quality as a result of wastewater treatment and disposal, including nitrogen-loading, day-lighting, violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and substantial degradation of water quality.

The site demonstrates characteristics (slope, percolation rate, depth to groundwater) suitable for disposal, while avoiding adverse effects to surface or groundwater. In addition, the County is required to comply with the Basin Plan prior to siting and development of the restrooms and associated on-site systems. Therefore, this impact is *less than significant* (Class III) and no mitigation is necessary.

4.11.5.3 Adversely Affect Community Wastewater Service Provider

As proposed, the project would not require connection to the NCSD sewer system and Southland WWTF. In the event that site specific testing and analysis shows that the project would not comply with the Basin Plan, connection to the community system may be necessary. The project would adversely affect the NCSD in the event implementation would:

- Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; or,
- Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.

Based on review of the Southland WWTF EIR (2011), and consultation with the NCSD, the facility has the capacity to serve the park, if necessary. The project could feasibly connect to the existing sewer system, provided on and offsite infrastructure is provided. Based on review of available information, the project would not result in an adverse effect to the NCSD, regardless of the treatment and disposal method. Information available in this Program EIR could be used to avoid or mitigate impacts associated with additional infrastructure, including avoidance of oak trees and special status species, minimization of soil erosion, avoidance or remediation of potentially hazardous subsurface materials). This impact would be *less than significant* (Class III) and no mitigation is necessary.

4.11.6 Cumulative Impacts

As proposed, the project would include the development of additional on-site wastewater treatment and disposal systems. The siting and operation of the systems would comply with the Basin Plan, and would therefore have no adverse effect on surface or groundwater, or the NCSD community system. Therefore, the project would not contribute to the cumulative impacts related to wastewater.

4.12 WATER RESOURCES

This section provides general background information on the state of existing project site water usage, supply and demand estimates, the ongoing water basin litigation, water quality, and identification of potential impacts that would result from the proposed project. This section references a number of recent groundwater studies and/or reports conducted in the area by private consultants and by State and/or regional resource agencies, which are referenced where applicable. Information contained within each of the reports was used in assessing the potential impacts of the proposed project. These reports were peer reviewed by the EIR consultant, and information is incorporated by reference. These reports are on-file with the County Department of Planning and Building, Environmental Resources and Management Division, and include the following:

- Nipomo Mesa Management Area (NMMA) Annual Report; NMMA Technical Group:
 - o___1st Annual Report, Calendar Year 2008, April 2009
 - o 2nd Annual Report, Calendar Year 2009, June 2010
 - o 3rd Annual Report, Calendar Year 2010, June 2011
 - o <u>4th Annual Report, Calendar Year 2011, April 2012</u>
- San Luis Obispo County Master Water Plan, Draft January 2012; County of San Luis Obispo, 2012
- Resource Management System, 2008 Annual Summary Report; County of San Luis Obispo, 2008
- Waterline Intertie Project Preliminary Engineering Memorandum; Nipomo Community Services District, May 2008
- Resource Capacity Study Water Supply in the Nipomo Mesa Area; San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning and Building, November 2004
- Constraints Analysis Nipomo Regional Park; Morro Group, Inc., June 14, 2004
- Nipomo Mesa Groundwater Resource Capacity Study San Luis Obispo County, California; S.S. Papadopulos & Associates, Inc., March 2004
- California's Groundwater, Bulletin 118 Central Coast Hydrologic Region, Santa Maria River Valley Groundwater Basin; California Department of Water Resources, February 2004
- Water Resources of the Arroyo Grande Nipomo Mesa Area in 2002; California Department of Water Resources, October 25, 2002

4.12.1 Existing Conditions

The park is served by the NCSD, which has wells within the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin. The Basin is located within southern San Luis Obispo and northern Santa Barbara Counties, including the Santa Maria, Nipomo, and Arroyo Grande areas. The NCSD and the Southern California Water Company (SCWC) are the primary municipal water purveyors in the Nipomo Area. In addition, there are approximately 25 private water purveyors and hundreds of private domestic wells within the Nipomo area.

Increase in the population and development in southern San Luis Obispo County has created concern about limitations of groundwater supplies in the Nipomo Mesa area. A 1979 study by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), *Ground Water in the Arroyo Grande Area*, reported that groundwater levels were declining in all parts of the study area as a consequence of groundwater pumping. DWR began work on a renewed and expanded study of water resources in the area in 1993, which culminated in a comprehensive 2002 report entitled *Water Resources of the Arroyo Grande – Nipomo Mesa Area* (hereinafter referred to as the "2002 DWR report"). The 2002 DWR report took 10 years to complete, reviewed hundreds of previously published technical reports (including the 1996a, 1997, 1998 Cleath reports), and was based on continual revision and input from hydrologists, geologists, engineers, and planning experts. The 2002 DWR report consolidates information concerning groundwater resources within the study area.

The 2002 DWR report conflicted with some of the findings made by independent consulting firms analyzing the groundwater basin at the same time, and the basis for some of the conclusions and implications regarding sustainable groundwater pumping beneath the Nipomo Mesa remained unclear. Therefore, the County commissioned an additional study by S.S. Papadopulos & Associates (SSPA) to analyze the 2002 DWR report and provide clarification of water issues on the Nipomo Mesa. The SSPA study, *Nipomo Mesa Groundwater Resource Capacity Study*, was completed in March 2004 (hereinafter referred to as the "2004 SSPA report") and concluded that a major decline in groundwater levels occurred over a 25-year period where the area experienced 2 inches less than average annual rainfall (1945-1970), and that water budget deficits for the Nipomo Mesa area during the period ranging from 1975 to 1995 were likely even greater.

A third comprehensive report was prepared more recently as a result of over a decade of litigation regarding the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin. The litigation has resulted in a Stipulated Judgment, which, in part, mandates the preparation of an annual report on the hydrologic conditions for three sub-areas of the basin. The first annual report for the Nipomo Mesa Management Area (NMMA) was submitted to the court in April 2009, with data covering the 2008 calendar year (hereinafter the "2008 NMMA report"). The report was prepared by the NMMA Technical Group, consisting of the NCSD, Golden State Water Company, ConocoPhillips, Woodlands Mutual Water Company, and various management area engineers appointed by these parties as well as an agricultural representative. <u>Since the 1st Annual Report (April 2009) three annual reports have been prepared and submitted by the NMMA Technical Group (June 2010, June 2011, and April 2012).</u>

The NCSD serves approximately 12,000 people over an area of approximately 4,650 acres (NCSD 2008). The service area <u>consists of one distribution system</u>, which is currently served by groundwater from the NMMA, which is at the northwestern part of the basin and encompasses approximately 27.5 square miles.

Based on the 2009 Resource Management System Annual Summary Report, the Nipomo Mesa area is currently in a Level of Severity (LOS) III for water supply (County of San Luis Obispo 2009). A level III designation means that the resource is being used at or beyond its estimated dependable supply or will deplete dependable supply before new supplies can be developed. The LOS III was first established in 2005, after the County's 2004 Resource Capacity Study (Water Supply in the Nipomo Mesa Area) was prepared. The area will need additional water supplies to bring the groundwater basin back into balance. The County has directed the preparation of water conservation ordinances for the Nipomo Mesa Water Conservation Area, and the NCSD is looking into options for bringing new water resources into

the area, including a waterline intertie from Santa Maria to the Nipomo Mesa, which would bring approximately 3,000 to 6,300 afy of new water to the area.

From 1984 to 1992, water was supplied to Nipomo Park through a contractual Water Service Agreement (WSA) between the NCSD and the County (recorded May 29, 1984). The agreement stated that the NCSD will provide water to the park for irrigation, sanitation, and other miscellaneous purposes. The maximum annual rate agreed upon in the agreement was set at 43 afy, and the County <u>could not</u> exceed this amount unless it <u>was</u> demonstrated to the mutual satisfaction of both the County and the NCSD that any increases will be without detriment to the water resources and delivery system of the NCSD (Morro Group, Inc. 2004). In 1992, the park was annexed into the NCSD service area, and became a standard customer, which eliminated the WSA and associated limitation on use. Table 4.12-1 provides data for total water deliveries to the park from 1999 to <u>2011</u>.

Fiscal Year	Acre Feet Delivered	
1999	41.68	
2000	45.25	
2001	36.84	
2002	47.50	
2003	45.31	
2004	<u>56.3</u>	
2005	49.40	
2006	50.18	
2007	60.99	
2008	<u>59.38</u>	
<u>2009</u>	44.85*	
2010	47.95	
<u>2011</u>	43.93	

Table 4.12-1. Historic Water Delivery – NCP, 1999-2011

* Noted meter failure in November – January

Source: NCSD 2004, 2009, 2012

Regarding existing water use, the NCSD conducted a water audit of the NCP in September 2007. Based on the results of the audit, the park's irrigation system operates at 57% efficiency, indicating that the park may be using twice as much water as needed for irrigation. The audit notes that the County could apply water conservation measures to existing irrigation systems, which would result in a savings of \$26,445 annually. The NCSD requests that the County implement recommended water conservation measures within existing facility areas and incorporate the use of recycled water to minimize the anticipated demand for new uses (NCSD 2009). The NCSD has no existing infrastructure within the NCP boundaries. Water is

delivered to the park via a 3-inch water main that is located within the right-of-way on Pomeroy Road. An executed agreement between the County and NCSD grants the NCSD a water line utility easement along the southern border of the park boundary. The width of this utility easement is approximately 20 feet from the southern edge of the property (NCSD 2004).

Potential Future Supply

Future water supply would be provided at the discretion of the NCSD. As noted above, NMMA Technical Group and DWR water budget estimates and projections indicate that groundwater pumping in the Nipomo Mesa area exceeds inflow, and that the Nipomo Mesa portion of the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin is currently in overdraft. The NCSD is addressing this issue by obtaining water from Santa Maria (Supplemental Water Project, Waterline Intertie), and planning phased improvements at the Southland Wastewater Treatment Facility to allow for distribution and use of recycled water. The NCSD initially proposed an assessment district to provide funding for the Supplemental Water Project, Waterline Intertie, which required approval by vote. In June 2012, a majority of property owners voted against the assessment district proposed) to provide the supplemental water could not be funded by existing funds. The NCSD issued a moratorium on the issuance of new will serve letters while considering other options for supplemental water, which may include other funding sources and/or a scaled-down project.

Water Conservation

The NCSD is required to reduce its per capita water use by 20% from the baseline year (average between 1996 and 2005) by December 31, 2020, with an interim target of 10% reduction by December 31, 2015. As noted in the NCSD's Urban Water Management Plan (2011), NCSD has reduced water use by 27.5% from the baseline, and has exceeded required goals. Current water use (2010) is 173.9 gallons/capita/day; targeted water use for 2020 is 204 gallons/capita/day (adjusted for anticipated growth). In order to attain this goal while accommodating anticipated additional growth, the NCSD has implemented water conservation measures, including a <u>4-tier residential "water conservation" rate (November 1, 2011) and California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC)-approved BMPs. Additional measures include development standards and target reducing consumption for high-use customers (such as the NCP) (NCSD 2011).</u>

4.12.1.1 Surface Water Resources and Watersheds

Most of the Santa Maria Groundwater Basin lies within the Santa Maria River Watershed, which extends eastward into the coastal range region and covers nearly 1.2 million acres (SSPA 2004). The watershed is divided into two sub-basins: the Cuyama sub-basin, which is the upper portion of the watershed, and the Santa Maria sub-basin, which is the lower portion of the watershed. The Cuyama sub-basin covers approximately 732,147 acres, and average precipitation is 16.3 inches per year. The Santa Maria sub-basin covers an area of approximately 453,777 acres. Average annual rainfall is 19.7 inches (SSPA 2004).

The Santa Maria River is the major surface water drainage of the watershed, and a major source of recharge to the underlying aquifers. The Santa Maria River channel extends westward approximately 20 miles to the Pacific Ocean. Flow of water is intermittent, occurring only during periods of high seasonal runoff. The Sisquoc and Cuyama Rivers also extend through the watershed, though the Cuyama River, which drains a portion of the Sierra Madre Mountains, has been controlled by Twitchell Dam since 1959. Twitchell Dam is located on the Cuyama River approximately 6 miles upstream from its junction with the Sisquoc River, and

has a capacity of 224,300 acre feet (SSPA 2004). After construction, operation of the Dam was transferred to the Santa Barbara County Water Agency, and currently the Santa Maria River Valley Water Conservation District physically operates the reservoir.

Other watercourses in proximity to the proposed project, and analyzed in the 2002 DWR report, include Nipomo Creek, Pismo Creek, Arroyo Grande Creek, Lopez Creek, Tar Spring Creek, Los Berros Creek, Temettate Creek, and numerous other small tributaries (refer to Figure 4.12-1).

4.12.2 Regulatory Setting

4.12.2.1 Federal Policies and Regulations

Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974

The Safe Drinking Water Act, implemented by the EPA, is the primary federal regulation controlling drinking water quality. The Safe Drinking Water Act grants the EPA the authority to establish and enforce guidelines for the achievement of minimum national water quality standards for every public water supply system serving 25 people or more.

This act was originally implemented in 1974 and significant revisions were made in 1986 and 1996. The Act originally set standards for 83 individual constituents, including pesticides, trihalomethanes, arsenic, selenium, radionuclides, nitrates, toxic metals, bacteria, viruses, and pathogens. The 1986 amendments required more contaminants to be regulated, granted more enforcement powers, and created regulations on the use of lead in solder and plumbing, well head protection, and disinfection of certain groundwater systems. The 1996 amendments to the Act made additional changes, most of which resulted in more stringent application of control technology. The amended regulations also adopted a more rigorous schedule for amending the Disinfectants/Disinfection By-Products Rule and the Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule, both of which took effect in 1998.

No federal permits relating to water utilities or infrastructure are anticipated for any potential component of the proposed project, unless USACE involvement or ESA issues concerning the construction of new infrastructure (such as pipelines, utility lines, etc., in sensitive habitat areas) is required.

Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act controls the discharge of toxic material into surface water bodies. Under this act, states are required to identify water segments impaired by pollutants and develop control strategy/management plans to reduce pollution and meet certain water quality standards.




Waters of the U.S: Sections 404 and 401 of the Clean Water Act of 1977.

Regulatory protection for water resources throughout the United States is under the jurisdiction of the USACE. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act prohibits the discharge of dredged or fill material into "waters of the United States" without formal consent from the USACE. Waters of the U.S. include marine waters, tidal areas, stream channels, and associated wetlands. Wetlands include freshwater marshes, vernal pools, freshwater seeps, and riparian areas. Under §404, activities in Waters of the U.S. may be subject to either an individual permit or a general permit, or may be exempt from regulatory requirements. Some activities have been given blanket authorization under the provisions of a general permit through the Nationwide Permit system. Individual Permits require the applicant to prepare and submit an alternatives analysis of the project.

Section 401 of the Clean Water Act and its provisions ensure that federally permitted activities comply with the federal Clean Water Act and state water quality laws. Section 401 is implemented through a review process conducted by the RWQCB, and is usually triggered by the §404 permitting process. Specifically, the RWQCB certifies via §401 that the proposed project complies with applicable effluent limitations, water quality standards, and other conditions of California law. If the RWQCB denies certification, the lead federal agency must deny the federal permit application.

4.12.2.2 State Policies and Regulations

The establishment and enforcement of water quality standards for the discharge into and maintenance of water throughout California is managed by the SWRCB and its RWQCBs. The SWRCB enforces the federal Clean Water Act on behalf of the EPA. Most of the quantitative objectives are based on the CCR, Title 22 – State Drinking Water Standards. Other considerations include the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, and the RWQCB's Non-degradation Policy. San Luis Obispo County lies entirely within Region 3 – Central Coast RWQCB. The RWQCB is the primary State agency ensuring that the quality of potable water supplies is protected from harmful effects by man.

The California Department of Health Services (DHS) is responsible for overseeing the quality of water once it is in storage and distribution systems. DHS oversees the self-monitoring and reporting program implemented by all water purveyors, performs inspections, and assists with financing water system improvements for the purpose of providing safer and more reliable service.

State Water Code

Section 10910 of the California Water Code (CWC) requires the County to identify the agency or entity responsible for providing water service to the area and to request that the agency determine whether the project was included within the current Urban Water Management Plan maintained by that water agency.

Section 13260(a) of the CWC requires that any person discharging waste or proposing to discharge waste within any region, other than to a community sewer system, that could affect the quality of the waters of the State, file a report of waste discharge (WDR). All WDR's must implement the applicable water quality control plan (Basin Plan) for the Region affected by the discharge. Therefore, WDRs require the project to comply with all applicable Basin Plan provisions, including any prohibitions and water quality objectives, governing the discharge. The siting, design, construction, operation, maintenance, and monitoring of all small domestic systems must comply with all of the applicable provisions of the RWQCB's Basin Plan. The

project shall not discharge waste in excess of the maximum design and disposal capacity of the small domestic system. The discharger must comply with any more stringent standards in the Basin Plan. In the event of a conflict between the provisions of RWQCB Order No. 97-10-DWQ and the Basin Plan, the more stringent provision prevails.

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act of 1987

The Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act provides the authority and method for the State of California to implement its water management program. The act establishes waste discharge requirements for both point and non-point source discharges affecting surface water and groundwater.

Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986

The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act prohibits the discharge or release of any significant amount of chemical known to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity into the drinking water supply, by any person in the course of doing business.

The Groundwater Management Act of 1992 (AB 3030)

The Groundwater Management Act was designed to provide local public agencies with increased management authority over groundwater resources in addition to existing groundwater management capabilities. A key element of this law is the development and implementation of groundwater management plans.

California Department of Fish and Game

CDFG is responsible for conserving, protecting, and managing California's fish, wildlife, and native plant resources. California law requires any person, agency, or public utility proposing a project that may impact a river, stream, or lake to notify the CDFG before beginning the project. If the CDFG determines that the project may adversely affect existing fish and wildlife resources, a Lake or Streambed Alteration Agreement is required. This Agreement lists the CDFG conditions of approval for the proposed project, and serves as an agreement between applicants and the CDFG.

Water Conservation Act of 2009 (SB 7)

SBx7-7 (SB 7) was enacted in November 2009, requiring all water suppliers to increase water use efficiency (DWR 2011). The bill also requires, among other things, that the DWR, in consultation with other state agencies, develop a single standardized water use reporting form, which would be used by both urban and agricultural water agencies. The legislation sets an overall goal of reducing per capita urban water use by 20% by December 31, 2020. The state shall make incremental progress towards this goal by reducing per capita water use by at least 10% by December 31, 2015.

- Each urban retail water supplier shall develop water use targets and an interim water use target by July 1, 2011.
- An urban retail water supplier shall include in its water management plan due July 2011 the baseline daily per capita water use, water use target, interim water use target, and compliance daily per capita water use. DWR, through a public process and in consultation with the California Urban Water Conservation Council, shall develop technical methodologies and criteria for the consistent implementation of this part

- DWR shall adopt regulations for implementation of the provisions relating to process water.
- A Commercial, Institutional, Industrial (CII) task force is to be established that will develop and implement urban best management practices for statewide water savings.
- Effective 2016, urban retail water suppliers who do not meet the water conservation requirements established by this bill are not eligible for state water grants or loans.

4.12.2.3 Local Policies and Regulations

Chapter 52 of the County's LUO (Title 22 of the County Code) contains site development standards for the county, including drainage, grading, erosion, and sedimentation control. While the proposed project would not require issuance of a land use permit or compliance with the LUO, County policy recommends consistency with the code. Furthermore, mitigation consistent with ordinance requirements will be recommended to ensure implementation. Sections that are applicable to drainage, grading, erosion, and sedimentation are outlined below.

Section 22.52.020 states that the County's standards for grading and excavation are intended to minimize hazards to life and property, protect against erosion and the sedimentation of water courses, and to protect the safety, use, and stability of public rights of way and drainage channels. Grading must follow the standards provided in the UBC (§3309) and the following standards:

- Areas of cut and fill are to be limited to the minimal amount necessary.
- Grading for a building site is prohibited on slopes of 30% or greater.
- Contours are to be blended with the natural terrain.
- Grading may not alter watercourses except as permitted through the CDFG and various watercourse protection methods shall be followed.
- Areas where natural vegetation has been removed must be replanted by various approved methods.

Section 22.52.080 of the LUO states that standards for the control of drainage and drainage facilities are designed to minimize harmful effects of stormwater runoff and resulting inundation and erosion on proposed projects, and to protect neighboring and downstream properties from drainage problems resulting from new development. Erosion and sedimentation control to protect damaging effects on-site and on adjoining properties is discussed in §22.52.090 of the LUO. A sedimentation and erosion control plan would be required for future developments, and shall include temporary and final measures including:

- Slope surface stabilization including temporary mulching or other stabilization measures to protect exposed areas of high erosion potential during construction and interceptors and diversions at the top of slopes to redirect runoff;
- Erosion and sedimentation control devices such as absorbing structures or devices to reduce the velocity of runoff;
- Final erosion control measures including mechanical or vegetative measures.

4.12.3 Thresholds of Significance

Consistent with CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, the County states that a significant water resource impact would occur if the project would:

- 1. Violate any water quality standards;
- 2. Discharge into surface waters or otherwise alter surface water quality (e.g., turbidity, temperature, dissolved oxygen, etc.);
- 3. Change the quality of groundwater (e.g., saltwater intrusion, nitrogen-loading, etc.);
- 4. Change the quantity or movement of available surface or ground water; or,
- 5. Adversely affect community water service provider.

4.12.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology

For the purpose of the project specific-evaluation in this EIR, significant water supply and infrastructure impacts would occur if the demands placed on the area from this development exceeded the available water supply, or if the well capacity of adjoining parcels was diminished so as to create unsustainable yields or disruption of existing localized water supply. The conclusions regarding significance are influenced more by the adequacy of current and future supplies rather than by the magnitude of potential increased demands.

4.12.4.1 Water Supply and Infrastructure

The impacts of any proposed development project are evaluated based on an assessment of project-related impacts on existing water supply, utilities, and service systems, as well as an assessment of site activities based on the intended land uses. The impact analysis determines if the community water provider (NCSD) has adequate supply to serve the project. Water demand was estimated through the use of water duty factors derived from several sources including the County of Santa Barbara and Monterey County. Water demand for irrigated turf ranges from 1.6 to 2.7 afy. The 2.7 afy rate identified by the County of Santa Barbara for the community of Orcutt was applied to this project, due to similar annual average rainfall (approximately 16 inches/year). The total additional water demand would be approximately 44.3 afy.

Facilities	Unit	Water Duty Factor (afy)	Estimated Water Demand (afy)
Community Center/Gymnasium ¹	36,000 square feet	.00007	2.52
Sports Fields (Turf) ²	10.0 acres	2.7	27
Swimming Pool/Deck ¹	8,400 square feet	0.00046	3.86
Open Play Area (Turf) ²	3.96 acres	2.7	10.7
Restrooms ¹	4 toilets	.058	0.232
Total			44.3

Table 4.12-2. Estimated New Water Demand

² County of Santa Barbara

¹ Monterey Peninsula Water Management District

4.12.4.2 Surface Water Quality and Quantity

An impact would occur if the proposed project results in development in areas with existing drainage concerns, including flooding, or results in off-site runoff exceeding existing rates. Potential impacts are assessed based on site topography, the proposed layout and elevations of potential project components, the erodibility of soils, and the regulatory framework applicable to the project.

With respect to water quality, determining significance is more indirect because there are no specific discharge requirements or standards for storm water runoff that can be compared at this time. For the purposes of this EIR, the determination of significance is based on a review of typical construction site pollutants usually found on job sites that might contribute to disproportionate amounts of polluting materials in runoff. The SWRCB has not attempted to identify numerical limits to be achieved in runoff from construction sites. Instead, the General Order contains narrative restrictions referencing best available technology economically achievable and the best conventional pollution control technology. The significance of water quality impacts will be judged in terms of conformance with these requirements and regulations.

4.12.5 **Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

4.12.5.1 Violation of Water Quality Standards

The Clean Water Act has established a regulatory system for the management of storm water discharges from construction, industrial and municipal sources. The SWRCB has adopted an NPDES Storm Water General Permit, which requires the implementation of a SWPPP for discharges regulated under the SWRCB program. Currently, construction sites of 1 acre and greater may need to prepare and implement a SWPPP that focuses on controlling storm water runoff. The RWQCB is the local extension of the SWRCB, who currently monitors these SWPPPs. Pursuant to Clean Water Act regulations, County Parks is required to prepare and implement a SWPPP during construction to minimize off-site sedimentation and erosion impacts. Implementation of major grading, such as site preparation for the sports fields, would necessitate preparation of a SWPPP.

Due to the location of the project, implementation of the project would not result in direct effects to surface or groundwater. Future grading activities would disturb soil, and potentially result in off-site sedimentation and/or clogging within existing and proposed retention basins. Standard erosion and sedimentation control measures would be required, including staking or flagging the development footprint; use of fiber rolls and silt fencing to retain soil on-site; covering soil stockpiles; and restoration and revegetation of disturbed soils. In addition to the SWPPP described above, implementation of these measures would ensure avoidance of adverse effects to water quality.

During operation of the project, discharge of sediment, hydrocarbons, and other pollutants into stormwater and drainage infrastructure (which eventually discharge into surface waters) would indirectly affect water quality. Implementation of BMPs consistent with LUO §§22.10.155.G.7 and 22.10.155.G.8., incorporation of LID consistent with LUO §22.10.155.G.1 would avoid or minimize the project's contribution to water quality issues affecting surface water bodies in Nipomo and the South County area.

WAT Impact 1 The project would include construction activities that would require substantial areas of ground disturbance and use of heavy equipment, which may result in the discharge of sediment and other pollutants, indirectly affecting surface and ground water quality.

WAT/mm-1 During any project resulting in ground disturbance, the <u>General Services</u> <u>Agency</u> shall ensure that BMPs are included on all grading and construction plans, and implemented during grading and construction activities as suggested by the County LUO. BMPs shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- a. Staking or flagging of grading footprint to minimize the area of disturbance;
- b. Designation of staging areas, including equipment and materials storage;
- c. Fueling of major equipment shall not occur on-site due to nearby sensitive receptors;
- d. Erosion control barriers shall be applied, such as silt fences, hay bales, drain inlet protection, and gravel bags;
- e. Existing vegetation shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible;
- f. Disturbed areas shall be stabilized with vegetation or hard surface treatments upon completion of construction in any specific area.
- g. All inactive disturbed soil areas are required to be stabilized with both sediment and temporary erosion control prior to the onset of the rainy season (October 15 to April 15).
- WAT/mm-2 Prior to major grading (ground disturbance exceeding one acre), the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall prepare and submit a SWPPP to the RWQCB for review and approval. A copy of the plan shall be on-site during all major grading and construction activities.

Residual Impact

Vegetation removal and ground disturbance prior to or during a rain event creates the potential for erosion and down-gradient sedimentation. Proper planning and implementation of BMPs and a SWPPP reduces the potential for off-site transport of sediments and other pollutants that may affect surface and ground water quality, either directly or indirectly. Based on implementation of mitigation measures, potential construction-related impacts to water quality would be *less than significant* (Class II).

WAT Impact 2 During operation of the project, discharge of sediment, hydrocarbons, and other pollutants into stormwater and drainage infrastructure would indirectly affect water quality.

- WAT/mm-3 Prior to construction of drainage infrastructure, the <u>General Services</u> <u>Agency</u> shall prepare drainage plans incorporating BMPs and LID strategies suggested by the County LUO to minimize stormwater flow rates and offsite transport of pollutants, including sediment, hydrocarbons, and equestrian waste. BMPs may include, but not be limited to:
 - a. Minimize parking area by incorporating striped and painted "compact-vehicle" spaces.
 - b. Incorporate grassed swales in lieu of paved curbs and gutters.
 - c. Incorporate the use of alternative pavers, including gravel, cobbles, wood mulch, brick, grass pavers, turf blocks, natural stone, pervious concrete, and porous asphalt.
 - d. Construct bio-retention areas (or raingardens) near parking areas and access roads.
 - e. Incorporate the use of swales to convey stormwater into <u>retention</u> basins (i.e., grassed channel, dry swale, wet swale, biofilter, or bioswale).
 - f. Incorporate the use of infiltration basins in lieu of conventional retention basins.
 - g. Install cisterns or rainbarrels near structures (i.e., library, community center, restrooms) to collect and filter stormwater from roofs and gutters and re-use for nearby landscaping.

Residual Impact

Increased vehicle use and parking onsite and the creation of additional impervious surfaces creates the potential for pollutant transport and increased stormwater flow rates. Proper planning and implementation of BMPs and LID strategies reduces the potential for off-site transport of pollutants that may affect surface and ground water quality, either directly or indirectly. Based on implementation of mitigation measures, potential operation-related impacts to water quality would be *less than significant* (Class II).

4.12.5.2 Discharge into Surface Waters or Alter Surface Water Quality

The NCP is not located in close proximity to surface waters. As discussed above, grading and construction activities may result in sediment and pollutant transport and discharge offsite, which may eventually affect offsite surface waters. Mitigation is recommended to address these effects (WAT/mm-1, WAT/mm-2, and WAT/mm-3).

4.12.5.3 Change the Quality of Groundwater

As discussed in Section 4.11, Wastewater, the project would continue to manage wastewater via on-site septic systems and leach fields, consistent with existing regulations and Basin Plan requirements. Based on compliance with these existing regulations, the project would not adversely affect groundwater quality. This impact is considered *less than significant* (Class III).

4.12.5.4 Change the Quantity or Movement of Surface or Groundwater

The project would continue to use water supplied by the NCSD (refer to analysis below). The proposed project would result in approximately 7.5 acres of additional impervious surfaces, including approximately 2.5 acres of facilities and 5 acres for infrastructure. The remaining additional acreage would include pervious surfaces, such as trails and sports fields. On-site stormwater management is proposed to avoid adverse effects both within the NCP and offsite. While these elements do not represent a significant percentage of area compared to permeable surfaces within the park, incorporation of LID strategies is recommended to avoid potential effects to stormwater flow and off-site effects related to flood control and stormwater management.

WAT Impact 3 Implementation of the project would create additional areas of impervious surfaces, potentially affecting off-site stormwater flow rates.

Implement WAT/mm-3.

Residual Impact

The creation of additional impervious surfaces creates the potential for increased stormwater flow rates. Proper planning and implementation of BMPs and LID strategies reduces the potential uncontrolled drainage and increased flow resulting in erosion, flooding, and other adverse drainage impacts. Based on implementation of mitigation measures, potential impacts to stormwater flow would be *less than significant* (Class II).

4.12.5.5 Adversely Affect Community Water Service Provider

Implementation of the Master Plan would result in an increase of irrigated areas and facilities, and would require additional water supplied from the NCSD. The proposed NCP Master Plan would be constructed in phases, and supplemental water would need to be secured prior to construction of the new sports fields and open public turf areas. Based on consultation with the NCSD (Bruce Buell, pers. comm.; December 17, 2008), no project can be given more than 20% of the annual water allocation per year. Total water consumption within NCSD and outside service boundaries averaged 2,646 afy between fiscal year 2005 to 2009. Twenty percent of this amount is approximately 530 afy. Estimated demand (based on build-out) within the existing service area is 4,139 afy (NCSD 2011), including implementation of the NCP Master Plan.

Based on implementation of the Urban Water Management Plan (NCSD 2011), including water conservation measures and site-specific retrofits, maintenance, and monitoring of water use, the NCSD has demonstrated adequate water supply to serve the future needs of the park. As noted by the NCSD, this additional service is contingent on the implementation of improvements to the existing irrigation system to reduce current water supply, consistent with measures to target reducing consumption for high-use customers. Based on consultation with the NCSD (2008) and as stated in the Urban Water Management Plan (NCSD 2011), the following measures are applicable to NCP:

 Compliance with District Ordinance No. 2009-114, which will require submittal of an irrigation plan, landscape plan, plant material list, and hardscape plan for water features prior to issuance of a will-serve letter.

- Implementation of landscape irrigation retrofits and improvements.
- Implement or comply with site-specific landscape water surveys, including checking irrigation system and timers for maintenance or repairs; quantify landscaped area; develop irrigation schedule based on precipitation rate, climate, system performance, and conditions; provide/prepare evaluation results and water savings recommendations.
- Retrofit existing toilets and install low-flow toilets in new restrooms.

In addition, the NCSD is analyzing alternatives for recycling or discharging the treated water from the Southland WWTF (AECOM 2009; Boyle Engineering Corporation 2007). If implemented, a pipeline would extend from the Southland WWTF, up Orchard Avenue and Pomeroy Road, and would provide recycled water for NCP irrigation (approximately 100,000 to 245,000 gpd).

Based on implementation of water conservation measures identified by the NCSD, impacts to water supply and the community water provider would be *less than significant (Class II)*.

WAT Impact 4 Implementation of the project would create additional demand for water services from the NCSD.

- WAT/mm-4 Prior to expansion or addition of irrigated turf and landscaped areas, the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall conduct a water survey of existing irrigated turf and landscaped areas, in consultation with the NCSD, that shall include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - a. Quantify irrigated areas based on vegetation type (i.e., turf, ornamental landscaping, trees).
 - b. Inspect and inventory the irrigation system, including timers, distribution lines, storage, and other infrastructure, and document needed maintenance and repairs.
 - c. Develop irrigation schedule by month, based on precipitation rate and local climate.
 - d. Document irrigation system performance and landscape conditions.
 - e. Review irrigation schedule.
 - f. Summarize water survey evaluation results and identify water savings recommendations, which shall achieve a minimum <u>50%</u> reduction in current water use.
- WAT/mm-5 Prior to expansion or addition of irrigated turf and landscaped areas, the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall demonstrate compliance with the water survey evaluation water savings recommendations, and shall submit documentation to the NCSD for verification. Water savings recommendations shall be applied to <u>existing and additional irrigated turf</u> and landscaped areas, and may include, but not be limited to the following:

- a. Computerized irrigation controller that can estimate cumulative evapo-transpiration losses to establish the most efficient and effective watering regimes.
- b. Avoidance of close mowing, overwatering, excessive fertilization, soil compaction and accumulation of thatch.
- c. Programming watering times for longer and less frequently rather than for short periods and more frequently.
- d. Installation of tensionmeters at different depths to measure moisture status, which will allow for better estimates on irrigation needs.
- <u>e.</u> Linking irrigation of the park to the California Irrigation Management Information System (CIMIS) station located at the Woodlands golf course to maximize irrigation efficiency.
- e.f. Implementation and maintenance of the most efficient and effective water regime for park irrigation consistent with best management practices, such as measures identified by the California Urban Water Conservation Council and/or similar recognized organizations.
- g. Incorporation of recycled water from the Southland WWTF.
- <u>h.</u> Consultation with NCSD prior to implementation of major planned replacement, renovation, or construction of water-using facilities.
- WAT/mm-6 Prior to construction of additional restrooms, the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall retrofit existing toilets and sinks with low-flow appliances <u>within the</u> <u>NCP</u>. All new appliances shall be low-flow (1.6 gallons per flush).

Residual Impact

Implementation of the project would create additional demand for water supply from the NCSD. The highest water demand would consist of additional turf; however, this use would be public, and annual consumption is monitored by the County and NCSD. Water conservation measures are identified for both current and future uses and advancements in conservation technology and recycled water infrastructure can be accommodated to further reduce water consumption. Water conservation measures identified by the NCSD and incorporated into the mitigation measures above would reduce existing water demand by 50 percent. As noted in Table 4.12 1. Historic Water Delivery – NCP 1999-2011, the average annual water demand over the past 12 years is approximately 48 afy (excluding year 2009 when a meter failed). Application of these mitigation measures would result in a 24 afy reduction in water use for existing uses, and a 22 afy reduction in future anticipated water demand. Based on implementation of identified water conservation measures, the total anticipated demand would be approximately 46 afy (no net demand for additional water). Based on implementation of mitigation measures to water supply, including the NCSD water provider, would be *less than significant* (Class II).

4.12.6 Cumulative Impacts

The NCP is currently one of the largest single customers of the NCSD. Water demand for existing and proposed uses would represent a measurable quantity of annual distribution. As previously discussed, the NCSD has available water to serve this project, in addition to others within the service area. In addition, further development of supplemental water, and increased use of recycled water, within the service area will be implemented in the future to reduce demands from NCSD wells. Based on implementation of identified mitigation measures, implementation of the NCP Master Plan, potential cumulative impacts would be *less than significant* (Class II) and no additional mitigation measures are necessary.

This page intentionally left blank.

4.13 CLIMATE CHANGE

This section defines climate change and greenhouse gases (GHGs) and presents the current legislation and programs addressing climate change in California. The section quantifies existing and potential future greenhouse gas emissions associated with the proposed project. It also recommends mitigation measures that could be implemented to reduce those emissions.

4.13.1 Existing Conditions

Climate change refers to any significant change in measures of climate such as temperature, precipitation, or wind, lasting for decades or longer (EPA 2007). Climate change may result from:

- Natural factors, such as changes in the sun's intensity or slow changes in the Earth's orbit around the sun;
- Natural processes within the climate system (e.g., changes in ocean circulation); or,
- Human activities that change the atmosphere's composition (e.g., through burning fossil fuels) and the land surface (e.g., deforestation, reforestation, urbanization, desertification, etc.)

Human activities, such as fossil fuel combustion and land use changes release carbon dioxide and other compounds, cumulatively termed GHGs. GHGs are effective in trapping infra-red radiation which otherwise would have escaped the atmosphere, thereby warming the atmosphere, the oceans, and earth's surface (EPA 2007).

4.13.1.1 Greenhouse Gases

GHGs are any gas that absorbs infrared radiation in the atmosphere (EPA 2007). GHGs, as defined in Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), include the following gases: carbon dioxide (CO_2), methane (CH_4), nitrous oxide (N_2O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCs), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF_6). A brief summary of each GHG is summarized below (EPA 2007).

Carbon Dioxide

 CO_2 is a naturally occurring gas and also a byproduct of burning fossil fuels and biomass, as well as land-use changes and other industrial processes (EPA 2007). Anthropogenic CO_2 is about 80% to 90% of the principal GHG that currently affects the Earth's radiative balance. Atmospheric CO_2 has a lifetime of about 50 to 200 years (Environmental Monitor, Spring 2007).

<u>Methane</u>

 CH_4 is a hydrocarbon that is a GHG with a global warming potential most recently estimated at 23 times that of CO_2 . Methane is produced through anaerobic decomposition of waste in landfills, animal digestion, decomposition of animal wastes, production and distribution of natural gas and petroleum, coal production, and incomplete fossil fuel combustion. Atmospheric CH_4 has a lifetime of about 12 years (Environmental Monitor, Spring 2007).

Nitrous Oxide

 N_2O is a powerful GHG with a global warming potential of 296 to 310 times that of CO_2 . Major sources of nitrous oxide include soil cultivation practices, especially the use of commercial and organic fertilizers, fossil fuel combustion, nitric acid production, and biomass burning. Atmospheric N_2O has a lifetime of about 120 years (Environmental Monitor, Spring 2007).

Hydrofluorocarbons

HFCs are compounds introduced as alternatives to ozone depleting substances (commonly refrigerants). In serving many industrial, commercial, and personal needs, HFCs are emitted as byproducts of industrial processes and are also released during manufacturing. They do not significantly deplete the stratospheric ozone layer, but they are powerful GHGs with global warming potential ranging from 140 to 11,700 times that of CO₂. Depending on the HFC species, atmospheric HFCs have a lifetime of about one to 15 years (US EPA, 2008; Environmental Monitor, Spring 2007).

Perfluorocarbons

PFCs were introduced as alternatives, along with hydrofluorocarbons, to ozone-depleting substances. PFCs are also emitted as byproducts of industrial processes and are used in manufacturing. PFCs do not harm the stratospheric ozone layer, but they are powerful GHGs with global warming potential ranging from 6,500 to 9,200 times that of CO₂. Atmospheric PFCs have a lifetime of about 10,000 to 50,000 years (Environmental Monitor, Spring 2007).

Sulfur Hexafluoride

 SF_6 is a colorless gas soluble in alcohol and ether, slightly soluble in water, with a global warming potential 23,900 times that of CO₂. SF_6 is a very powerful GHG used primarily in electrical transmission and distribution systems and as a dielectric in electronics. Atmospheric SF_6 has a lifetime of about 3,200 years (Environmental Monitor, Spring 2007).

4.13.1.2 Global Climate Change

A series of reports issued by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (UNIPCC) have synthesized recent scientific studies of climate change (UNIPCC 2007a, 2007b, 2000c). Key findings of these reports include the following:

- Global atmospheric concentrations of CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O have increased markedly as a result of human activities since 1750, and now are at about double pre-industrial levels. Global increases in CO₂ concentration are due primarily to fossil fuel use and land use change, and global increases in CH₄ and N₂O are due primarily to agriculture.
- Warming of the global climate due to GHGs is unequivocal, as evidenced by increases in air and water temperatures, widespread melting of snow and ice, and rising global average sea level. Most of the increase in global average temperatures since the mid-20th century is very likely due to increases in GHGs from human activities. GHG emissions increased 70% between 1970 and 2004.
- Numerous long-term climate changes observed have included changes in arctic temperatures and ice, precipitation, ocean salinity, wind pattern, and the frequency of extreme weather events such as droughts, heavy precipitation, heat waves, and tropical cyclone intensity.

- Continued GHG emissions at current rates would cause further warming and climate change during the 21st century that would very likely be larger than that observed in the 20th century.
- Climate change is expected to have adverse impacts on water resources, ecosystems, food and forest products, coastal systems and low-lying areas, urban areas, and public health. These impacts will vary regionally, and may be very expensive for agriculture and human activities. In some areas sea level rise may completely inundate now inhabited areas (e.g., river deltas, Pacific Islands).

4.13.1.3 California GHG Emissions and Climate Change

In California, the main sources of GHG emissions are from the transportation and energy sectors. According to the ARB draft GHG emission inventory for the year 2004, 39% of GHG emissions result from transportation and 25% of GHG emissions result from electricity generation. California produced 497 million metric tons of CO_2 equivalent (MMtCO₂e) in 2004 (ARB, 2007). California produces about 2% of the world's GHG emissions, with about 0.55% of the population.

The potential effects of future climate change on California resources include:

- Air temperature: Increases of 3 to 10.4 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) by the end of the century, depending on the aggressiveness of GHG emissions mitigation.
- Sea level rise: 6 to 30 inches by the end of the century, depending on the aggressiveness of GHG emissions mitigation.
- Water resources: Reduced Sierra snowpack, reduced water supplies, increased water demands, changed flood hydrology.
- Forests: Changed forest composition, geographic range, and forest health and productivity; increased destructive wild fires.
- Ecosystems: Changed habitats, increased threats to certain endangered species.
- Agriculture: Changed crop yields, increased irrigation demands, increased impacts from tropospheric ozone.
- Public health: Increased smog and commensurate respiratory illness and weatherrelated mortality (California Climate Change Portal [CCCP] 2007).

4.13.2 Regulatory Setting

4.13.2.1 California Climate Change Legislation and Programs

Vehicle Climate Change Standards

AB 1493 (Chapter 200, Statutes of 2002), requires the state to develop and adopt regulations that achieve the maximum feasible and cost-effective reduction of climate change emissions emitted by passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks. Regulations were adopted by the ARB in September 2004. The ARB analysis of this regulation indicates emissions savings of 1 MMtCO₂e by 2010 and 30 MMtCO₂e by 2020. For these standards to go into effect, EPA

must approve a waiver of Clean Air Act requirements to allow California (and other states) motor vehicle standards to exceed federal standards.

Assembly Bill 32

The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32, Health and Safety Code §§38500 et seq.) requires the ARB to design and implement emission limits, regulations, and other measures. These will reduce, by 2020, statewide GHG emissions in a technologically feasible and cost-effective manner to 1990 levels (representing a 25% reduction). The following summarizes the process and schedule for implementing AB 32:

- June 30, 2007 ARB publishes a list of discrete early action GHG emission reduction measures that can be implemented prior to the measures and limits to be adopted to meet the 2020 limit.
- On September 7, 2007, the ARB released a list of additional early action measures and discrete early actions:
- January 1, 2008 ARB determines what the statewide GHG emissions level was in 1990 and approves a statewide GHG limit that is equivalent to that level.
- January 1, 2008 ARB adopts regulations requiring the reporting and verification of statewide GHG emissions.
- January 1, 2009 ARB adopts a scoping plan for achieving the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective reductions in GHG emissions from sources or categories of sources of GHGs by 2020.
- January 1, 2010 ARB adopts and enforces regulations to implement the GHG emission reduction measures identified on the early action list in 2007.
- January 1, 2011 ARB adopts regulations to achieve the required reduction of GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020.
- January 1, 2012 GHG emission limits and emission reduction measures adopted by January 1, 2011, become enforceable.

Senate Bill 1368

SB 1368 (Public Utilities Code §8340 et seq.) is an AB 32 companion bill that was signed into law in 2006. It requires the CPUC to establish a GHG performance standard for base load generation from investor-owned utilities, and the California Energy Commission (CEC) to establish a similar standard for publicly-owned utilities. These standards may not exceed the GHG emission rate from a base load combined-cycle natural gas fired plant. The bill also requires all imported electricity provided to California to be generated from plants meeting CPUC and CEC standards.

Renewable Portfolio Standard Program

The CPUC and CEC coordinate the Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), which calls for more energy to come from clean, renewable sources such as wind and sun. In 2003, the Governor called for an acceleration of the RPS to 20% by 2010 rather than 2017; this goal was codified

by SB 107 (Chapter 464, Statutes of 2006). In 2005, the Governor called for an acceleration of the RPS to 33% by 2020.

Senate Bill 97

By enacting Senate Bill (SB) 97 in 2007, California's lawmakers expressly recognized the need to analyze greenhouse gas emissions as a part of the CEQA process. SB 97 required the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop, and the Natural Resources Agency to adopt, amendments to the CEQA Guidelines addressing the analysis and mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions. Those CEQA Guidelines amendments clarified several points, including the following:

- Lead agencies must analyze the greenhouse gas emissions of proposed projects, and must reach a conclusion regarding the significance of those emissions. (See CEQA Guidelines §15064.4.)
- When a project's greenhouse gas emissions may be significant, lead agencies must consider a range of potential mitigation measures to reduce those emissions. (See CEQA Guidelines §15126.4(c).)
- Lead agencies must analyze potentially significant impacts associated with placing projects in hazardous locations, including locations potentially affected by climate change. (See CEQA Guidelines §15126.2(a).)
- Lead agencies may significantly streamline the analysis of greenhouse gases on a project level by using a programmatic greenhouse gas emissions reduction plan meeting certain criteria. (See CEQA Guidelines §15183.5(b).)
- CEQA mandates analysis of a proposed project's potential energy use (including transportation-related energy), sources of energy supply, and ways to reduce energy demand, including through the use of efficient transportation alternatives. (See CEQA Guidelines, Appendix F.)

As part of the administrative rulemaking process, the Natural Resources Agency developed a Final Statement of Reasons explaining the legal and factual bases, intent, and purpose of the CEQA Guidelines amendments. Other rulemaking documents can be accessed on the Natural Resources Agency's rulemaking website (http://ceres.ca.gov/ceqa/guidelines/). The amendments to the CEQA Guidelines implementing SB 97 became effective on March 18, 2010 (State of California, 2011).

Governor's Executive Orders

Executive Order S-3-05 was signed in 2005, and calls for a reduction of GHG emissions to 2000 levels by 2010, a reduction of GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and a reduction of GHG emissions to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. The order directs the CalEPA secretary to coordinate development and implementation of strategies to achieve the GHG reduction targets in conjunction with the secretary of Business, the Transportation and Housing Agency, the secretary of the Department of Food and Agriculture, the secretary of the Resources Agency, the chairperson of the ARB, the chairperson of the CEC, and the president of the CPUC.

CalEPA developed the Climate Action Team (CAT), made up of representatives from the agencies listed above, to implement the strategies to reduce GHG emissions. The order also includes a reporting requirement for CalEPA to the governor and legislature. The first report was released in March 2006 (CalEPA, 2006), and a report will be issued bi-annually in the future. CAT has also issued a report on proposed early actions to mitigate climate change in California (CAT 2007).

Executive Order S-1-07, the Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS) (issued on January 18, 2007), calls for a reduction of at least 10% in the carbon intensity of California's transportation fuels by 2020. The executive order instructed CalEPA to coordinate activities between the University of California, the CEC, and other state agencies to develop and propose a draft compliance schedule to meet the 2020 target. Furthermore, the order directed the ARB to consider initiating regulatory proceedings to establish and implement the LCFS. The LCFS regulation was approved and went into effect on April 15, 2010.

4.13.2.2 San Luis Obispo County GHG Emission Reduction Program

San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District

Local efforts to quantify and reduce GHG emissions have primarily been undertaken by the SLOAPCD. Many of the programs currently implemented by SLOAPCD to reduce emissions and exposure to criteria and toxic air pollutants may also reduce GHG emissions. The following is a brief summary of these programs:

- Rules and Regulations: Numerous rules adopted by the County Board of Supervisors and implemented by SLOAPCD to address criteria pollutant emissions also have the side benefit of reducing GHGs. For instance, several SLOAPCD rules address conventional emissions from combustion sources such as boilers, heaters, and engines that often result in equipment modifications or replacement that improves the energy efficiency of those units and reduces fossil fuel use. Similarly, rules that regulate or prohibit open burning activities reduce CO₂ emissions from that activity. SLOAPCD Rule 426 regulates landfill emissions of methane.
- Clean Fuels: SLOAPCD is actively involved in and supports the efforts of the Central Coast Clean Cities Coalition (C5), a local nonprofit coalition which promotes the use of cleaner alternative fuel technologies. With over 40% of the GHG emissions coming from mobile sources, these efforts are an essential tool in reducing fossil fuel use and associated CO₂ emissions.
- Development Review: Through the CEQA review process, SLOAPCD evaluates impacts from land use development projects and recommends measures to reduce emissions. Mitigation measures focus on reducing emissions from motor vehicles and improving energy efficiency, both of which directly reduce criteria pollutants and GHGs. Such strategies include incorporation of energy efficiency measures (increased insulation, high efficiency appliances and lighting, passive and active solar systems, etc.) that go beyond current building standards, and including Smart Growth principles into the project design to reduce vehicle trips and increase the viability of alternative transportation.
- Grant Programs: Many emission reduction projects funded through the various grant programs administered by SLOAPCD result in replacement or retrofit of older, high emission engines with cleaner and more efficient engines that simultaneously reduce

fuel use, thus reducing CO_2 emissions. Conversion of stationary and mobile diesel engines to natural gas or electric motors also serves to reduce CO_2 emissions.

- Transportation Choices Program: In partnership with San Luis Obispo Regional Rideshare, Ride-On, and SLOAPCD, the Transportation Choices Program (TCP) is a free program offered to businesses and organizations throughout San Luis Obispo County to reduce employee and student commute trips and promote the use of alternative transportation.
- Pollution Prevention: The Pollution Prevention Program promotes the use of, and publicly recognizes small businesses which successfully employ, pollution prevention and emission reduction techniques as part of routine operating procedures. Many of the businesses so recognized have incorporated operational changes that reduce their emissions through efficiency improvements that also reduce fuel and product use and save energy.
- Public Outreach: SLOAPCD implements a number of outreach campaigns to promote a variety of clean air programs, including backyard burning reduction programs, clean car awareness, pollution prevention, energy efficiency, and transportation alternatives, all of which promote community consciousness and lifestyle choices that can help reduce our impacts on climate change."

San Luis Obispo County EnergyWise Plan (Climate Action Plan)

The County has prepared a Draft EnergyWise Plan (Climate Action Plan) – Designing Energy and Climate Solutions for the Future. This plan identifies strategies to reduce the county's GHG emissions by 15% below the baseline year of 2006 by the year 2020. This goal is consistent with AB 32. The plan includes the following:

- Scientific and regulatory framework for addressing climate change and GHGs at the local level.
- Identifies sources of GHG emissions from sources within the unincorporated county and estimates how these emissions may change over time.
- Forecasts emissions to reflect the County's desired growth projections without regulatory or technical intervention to reduce GHG emissions and provides an emissions reduction target consistent with AB 32 and the County's General Plan.
- Provides energy use, transportation, land use, water use, and solid waste strategies to reduce San Luis Obispo County's GHG emissions and quantifies the potential emissions reductions that will be achieved by implementing each strategy.
- Identifies existing and proposed strategies to reduce emissions from County operations and facilities.
- Addresses adaptation to climate change climate adaptation is an adjustment in natural or human systems in response to actual or expected climatic change and its effects.
- Presents an implementation program to assist with monitoring and prioritization of the reduction strategies through 2020.

4.13.3 Thresholds of Significance

No formal statewide or local guidance currently exists for determining climate change thresholds of significance for large projects such as the one proposed. There is no legally adopted threshold for what emission levels constitute a significant amount. Information is being evaluated at the state and local level in response to the serious threat of climate change effects and subsequent legislation. There is some developing guidance, and this is discussed below.

According to draft California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) guidance (CEQA & Climate Change Evaluating and Addressing Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Projects Subject to the California Environmental Quality Act, January 2008), a reasonable significance threshold could be a 900 tons per year emissions increase compared to "business as usual" levels. The project's climate impact would be significant if this goal is not met. This 900 ton level would capture approximately 90% or more of expected new projects and require mitigation. This allows small projects to go forward without onerous conditions.

The ARB has surveyed large industrial sources such as oil refineries, cement plants, and electricity generating facilities and found that a reporting threshold of 25,000 tons per year would capture 90% or more of them. The control measures aimed at these sources would have the greatest impact while not being onerous to small operations. Alternatively, a 10,000 metric tons (11,000 tons) threshold has been proposed by the Market Advisory Committee for a Cap and Trade program.

AB 32 requires state agencies to take actions that will reduce 2020 GHG emissions to those of 1990, and then substantially further reduce emissions by 2050. To achieve the intermediate goal of 2020, it seems reasonable for existing projects that may result in substantial GHG emissions, such as at the level of a landfill, to be held to a net increase of zero new emissions.

4.13.3.1 California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines

Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines provides the following thresholds for determining significance with respect to greenhouse gas emissions. Impacts would be considered significant if the proposed project would:

- 1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?
- 2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

4.13.4 Impact Assessment and Methodology

Long-term operational emissions of CO_2 were calculated by use of the URBEMIS air quality modeling program. Due to the programmatic nature of the project, and lack of grading plans and predicted construction schedule(s) for project actions, short-term construction impacts are qualitatively assessed. The proposed project was evaluated for consistency with measures identified by the SLOAPCD to address GHG emissions.

4.13.5 **Project-specific Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

4.13.5.1 Generation of GHG Emissions

GHG emissions directly generated during construction of the project will be a short-term increase. As noted in Section 4.2, Air Quality, operation of the project would exceed combined ROG and NOx thresholds. Estimated CO_2 emissions would be 6,766.52 lbs/day during construction, and 14,118.65 lbs/day (or 34.91 tons per year) during operation. Mitigation is identified to reduce operational emissions for these precursors to ozone, including energy efficiency measures, use of landscaping to minimize energy use for heating and cooling, use of green building materials, and incorporation of engineering and design (i.e., insulation, windows, lighting) to minimize energy demand (AQ/mm-2).

In addition, the project includes several actions that would reduce regional generation of GHG emissions, including improved safe alternative access to the park, including safer pedestrian and bicycle crossings, and improvements to existing public facilities within an urban area. Based on the size and location of the proposed project, this impact would be *less than significant* (Class III).

4.13.5.2 Conflict with Plans and Policies

The project will not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted to reduce GHG emissions. Air quality, energy efficiency, and water conservation measures are identified to mitigate identified impacts; implementation of these measures would also reduce operational GHG emissions. In addition, the project would be consistent with goals to reduce vehicle miles traveled by providing recreational opportunities and alternative transportation linkage within an urban area, and in close proximity to residential areas, and by promoting walking and bicycling by improving safe access into the park and providing path linkages to bike paths and sidewalks.

4.13.6 Cumulative Impacts

No single project is considered large enough to individually affect climate change. GHG impacts, including those described above, all contribute cumulatively with those produced worldwide, to affect climate change. Compliance with identified air quality, energy efficiency, and water conservation mitigation measures would reduce the project's contribution to cumulative GHG emissions, and subsequent climate change. Cumulative effects would be *less than significant* (Class III).

This page intentionally left blank.

CHAPTER 5 ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), §15126.6(a), requires an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to "describe a reasonable range of alternatives to a project, or to the location of a project, which could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives". This chapter discusses a range of alternatives to the proposed project, including alternative locations, alternative designs, and a No Project Alternative. The CEQA Guidelines provide direction for the discussion of alternatives to the proposed project. This section requires:

- Description of "...a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of a project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives." [§15126.6(a)]
- A setting forth of alternatives that "...shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only the ones that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project". [§15126.6(f)]
- Discussion of the "No Project" alternative, and "...If the environmentally superior alternative is the "no project" alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives". [§15126.6(e)(2)]
- Discussion and analysis of alternative locations "...that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project"; only these need to be considered for inclusion in the EIR. [§15126.6(f)(2)(A)]
- "Prior to approval of the proposed subsequent project, the lead agency shall incorporate all feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives appropriate to the project as set forth in the Master EIR and provide notice in the manner required by §15087. [§15177 (d)]

Given the CEQA mandates listed above, this section: (1) describes the range of reasonable alternatives to the project; (2) examines and evaluates resource issue areas where significant adverse environmental effects have been identified and compares the impacts of the alternatives to those of the proposed project; and (3) identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative.

5.2 ALTERNATIVES SELECTION

In defining feasibility of alternatives the CEQA Guidelines state: "Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context), and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control or otherwise have access to the alternative site." Through the scoping process, if an alternative was found to be infeasible, as defined above, then it was dropped from further consideration. In addition, CEQA states that alternatives should "...attain most of the basic objectives of the project..."

5.2.1 Project Objectives

The basic objectives of the proposed project that were used in the screening of project alternatives are taken from Chapter 2 and include the following:

- provide a range of passive and active facilities and use areas to meet the recreational needs of the community;
- maintain and upgrade existing recreational and community facilities and amenities;
- effectively manage current and projected levels of park uses;
- provide amenities that are aesthetically consistent with the regional character of the area;
- provide a community recreation center within the unincorporated community of Nipomo;
- incorporate infrastructure and circulation improvements to meet existing and estimated future (2025) motor vehicle transportation warrants;
- apply adaptive management strategies, including the use of improved technology, to address new planning and management issues as they arise;
- consider and support active citizen input in the decision-making process; and,
- periodically review and update the Nipomo Community Park (NCP) Master Plan through a public review process (approximately 15-year intervals), including consideration of the changing needs of the community when evaluating existing and potential new amenities.

5.2.2 Significant Impacts Resulting from the Proposed Project

The alternatives evaluated include those that would avoid or reduce, to the maximum extent feasible, the identified unavoidable impacts that cannot be mitigated to insignificance, and avoid or reduce other significant impacts. A complete list of impacts is included in the Executive Summary.

5.2.2.1 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

No significant and unavoidable impacts were identified.

5.2.2.2 Significant but Mitigable Impacts

The proposed project's most intensive significant but mitigable impacts and/or those with intensive mitigation requirements include:

• <u>Aesthetic Resources</u>: Compatibility with rural character; creation of light and glare affecting sensitive land uses and night sky.

- Biological Resources. Impacts to oak woodland, special status species, and wildlife.
- <u>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</u>: Grading and construction within boundaries of previous informal dump site could expose public to hazardous materials.
- <u>Noise</u>. Generation of noise during use of proposed facilities (i.e., sports fields) affecting nearby residential uses.
- <u>Water Resources</u>. Installation and maintenance of ten acres of sports fields and additional turf areas will require up to 44.3 acre feet per year (afy) of water from the Nipomo Community Services District (NCSD).

5.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The project objectives include providing a dynamic master plan for an existing park. Alternatives to the project include modifications in the type and intensity of recreational use to avoid or minimize identified impacts. Certain project elements, including the community center, could feasibly be located either within the existing park or in other locations in the community of Nipomo. Four alternative locations for the community center are considered in the alternatives analysis. A total of seven potential alternatives to the proposed project are described below.

There are a number of potential alternatives to the proposed project that are feasible and can be examined in this Program EIR. One alternative is included in the Master Plan, and is identified as "Alternative Master Plan A" in this document. In addition, during public circulation of the proposed Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration, the South County Advisory Council (SCAC) recommended a "rural character" alternative, which has been included in the analysis as "Alternative Master Plan B". Each alternative will consider changes to the existing park entrances at the West Tefft Street/Orchard Avenue and Pomeroy Road/Juniper Street intersections and expansion of the Nipomo library.

Further modification of the Master Plan may be considered by decision makers; however, removal or incorporation of major elements have the most significant effect on the level of impacts and extent of recommended mitigation (i.e., water demand, ground disturbance, trip generation, aesthetic compatibility of larger structures and features).

In addition to alternatives within the boundaries of NCP, four alternative locations for the proposed community center within the community of Nipomo are assessed below.

5.3.1 No Project Alternative

This alternative is required to be considered by CEQA, and would not include implementation of the Master Plan. Implementation of the no project alternative would not preclude development or improvements within the park. The park amenities would continue to operate, and improvements may occur in dependent of a master development plan.

5.3.2 Alternative Master Plans

5.3.2.1 Alternative Master Plan A

Alternative Master Plan A proposes approximately <u>22.7</u> acres of new facilities and infrastructure and 4 acres of additional open play area (turf) (refer to Table 5-1 and Figure 5-1).

Implementation of Alternative Master Plan A would result in approximately 38 acres of total developed area, or approximately 23% of the 159-acre park. A community center would be located near West Tefft Street, including a community center, pre-school and administration building, and gymnasium. The remaining additional facilities would be located near the center of the park, including an amphitheater, basketball and tennis courts, a pool or skate park, multi-use sports fields, playground, open lawn area, horseshoe pits, off-leash dog park, gazebo/informational stage, and infrastructure improvements. A lawn area and play structure is proposed near Osage Street and Camino Caballo.

Facilities	Existing (sf)	Proposed (sf)	Total (sf)
Recreation Area			
Amphitheaters	0	5,227	5,227
Basketball Courts	0	10,000	10,000
Playgrounds	6,534	8,276	14,810
Community Center	0	14,000	14,000
Dog Parks	31,988	19,000	50,988
Group Picnic Areas	9,433	0	9,433
Handball Courts	0	0	0
Horseshoe Pits	0	1,800	1,800
Skate Park or Swimming Pool	0	10,000	10,000
Sports Fields (Turf)	231,633	439,520	671,153
Tennis Courts	26,404	14,400	40,804
Trails/Walkways (paved/unpaved)	50,724	127,373	178,097
Osage Street Walkway (paved)	0	11,280	11,280
Volleyball Court	0	0	0
Subtotal	356,716	<u>660,876</u>	<u>1,017,592</u>
Open Space			
Open Space (undeveloped)	5,689,881	-1,088,510	4,601,371
Open Play Area (Turf)	399,805	176,498	<u>576,303</u>
Trails (dirt)	190,200	-84,276	105,924
Subtotal	<u>6,279,886</u>	-996,288	<u>5,283,598</u>

Table 5-1. Master Plan Existing and Proposed AmenitiesAlternative Master Plan A

Facilities	Existing (sf)	Proposed (sf)	Total (sf)
Infrastructure			
Basins	54,900	108,900	163,800
Library Building	7,134	4,000	11,134
Parking	137,166 (325 spaces)	183,388 (422 spaces)	320,554 (747 spaces)
Pre-school	4,050 (temporary)	0	4,050 (permanent)
Two Host Sites	1,284	0	1,284
Restrooms/Maintenance Buildings	3,155	1,490	4,645
Roads	89,036	32,234	121,270
Subtotal	296,725	330,012	<u>626,737</u>

5.3.2.2 Alternative Master Plan B

Alternative Master Plan B was adapted from recommendations by the SCAC (refer Table 5-2 and Figure 5-2 below).

This alternative expands on existing uses, and does not include major features identified in the proposed project, such as the community center, sports fields, skate park, or swimming pool. This alternative accommodates adult fitness equipment within the paved trail system, a small (10,000-square foot) turf and picnic areas near the play area, and equestrian staging within the parking areas (similar to the proposed project). Overall parking is reduced relative to the proposed facilities. Road improvement projects, including widening of Osage Road and realignment of the park entrances would be implemented with this project.

Facilities	Existing (sf)	Proposed (sf)	Total (sf)
Recreation Area			
Amphitheater and Gazebo	0	5,227	5,227
Basketball Courts	0	10,000	10,000
Playgrounds	6,534	8,276	14,810
Community Center	0	0	0
Dog Parks	31,988	0	31,988

Table 5-2. Master Plan Existing and Proposed AmenitiesAlternative Master Plan B

Facilities	Existing (sf)	Proposed (sf)	Total (sf)
Group Picnic Areas	9,433	0	9,433
Handball Courts	0	0	0
Horseshoe Pits	0	1,800	1,800
Skate Park	0	0	0
Sports Fields (Turf)	231,633	0	231,633
Swimming Pool	0	0	0
Tennis Courts	26,404	14,400	40,804
Trails/Walkways (paved/unpaved)	50,724	127,373	178,097
Osage Street Walkway (paved)	0	11,280	11,280
Volleyball Court	0	1,800	1,800
Subtotal	356,716	180,156	536,872
Open Space			
Open Space (undeveloped)	5,689,881	-510,168	5,179,713
Open Play Area (Turf)	399,805	10,000	409,805
Trails (dirt)	190,200	0	190,200
Subtotal	<u>6,279,886</u>	<u>-500,168</u>	<u>5,779,718</u>
Infrastructure			
Basins	54,900	108,900	163,800
Library Building	7,134	4,000	11,134
Parking	137,166	13,200	150,366
Pre-school	<u>4,050</u>	0	4,050
Two Host Sites	1,284	0	1,284
Restrooms/Maintenance Buildings	3,155	1,490	4,645
Roads	89,036	32,234	121,270
Subtotal	<u>296,725</u>	159,824	456,549

I

Figure 5-1. Alternative Master Plan A



Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Final Program Environmental Impact Report This page intentionally left blank.

Figure 5-2. Alternative Master Plan B



This page intentionally left blank.

5.3.3 Community Center Alternatives

Four alternative locations for the proposed community center, including the structure, parking, and associated landscaping, are qualitatively assessed below. The locations and associated land use categories of each alternative location are shown in Figures 5-3 and 5-4 below. The community center would be used for recreation and events (up to 300 persons).

5.3.3.1 Community Center Alternative A (Sandydale Drive and Frontage Road)

The location of this alternative site is at the northern terminus of the Frontage Road, at the intersection with Sandydale Drive. This parcel is approximately 4.4 acres, and is within the Commercial Service land use category. The site is currently undeveloped. Surrounding land uses include residential development, the Nipomo Dog and Cat Hospital, a fitness center, and a storage facility. Land to the northwest is undeveloped, and U.S. Highway (US 101) is located to the east.

5.3.3.2 Community Center Alternative B (West Tefft Street and Branch Street)

This site is located at the corner of Burton Street and Mallagh Street, west of West Tefft Street. The parcel is approximately 2.6 acres in size, and is within the Office and Professional land use category. The site is currently undeveloped. Surrounding development includes residential development, the Nipomo Men's Club, and commercial/retail development along West Tefft Street.

5.3.3.3 Community Center Alternative C (Orchard Avenue and Division Street)

This site is located at the intersection of Orchard Avenue and Division Street. The parcel is approximately 2.85 acres in size, and is within the Commercial Retail land use category. The site is undeveloped. Surrounding land uses include a 76® gas station and the La Placita Market and carwash, a strawberry field and fruit stand, and residential development.

5.3.3.4 Community Center Alternative D (Hill and Grande)

This site is located between Grande Street and Hill Street, approximately 500 feet west of the Frontage Road. The parcel is approximately 9.6 acres in size, and is within the Residential Multi-family land use category. A planned unit development and retail development are proposed to the east, and the property to the west is vacant. Land uses along Grande Street include residences, greenhouses, and San Luis Bay Apartments. Land uses along Hill Street include multi-family residential development and a truck parking area.



Figure 5-3. Community Center Alternatives





5.4 ALTERNATIVES IMPACTS ANALYSIS

The level of analysis for each of the alternatives varies due to the amount of information available for each. Alternative Master Plan A has been analyzed at a project specific level as opposed to the qualitative analysis required by CEQA. The No Project Alternative, Alternative Project B, and the four alternative community center sites are analyzed qualitatively below.

5.4.1 No Project Alternative

No improvements to the NCP would be implemented.

5.4.1.1 Aesthetic Resources

No improvements would be made; therefore the No Project Alternative would not impact aesthetic resources. It avoids any impacts to aesthetic resource impacts resulting from the proposed project.

5.4.1.2 Air Quality

This alternative would not require earthwork or generate additional vehicle trips. It would not result in construction or operational air quality impacts.

5.4.1.3 Biological Resources

Biological resources would not be directly impacted by the No Project Alternative. No impacts to oak woodland, sand mesa manzanita, or wildlife would occur.

5.4.1.4 Cultural Resources

Because this alternative would not include any ground disturbance, this alternative would not result in direct impacts cultural resources.

5.4.1.5 Geology, Soils and Drainage

This alternative would not change the existing geologic, soils, or drainage conditions. Localized flooding would continue to occur within the park.

5.4.1.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The No Project Alternative would not require ground disturbance of any kind and therefore would not result in any exposure to subsurface materials.

5.4.1.7 Land Use

Land use would remain the same at the project site, and no potential conflicts would occur.

5.4.1.8 Noise

Under the No Project Alternative, no additional facilities would be developed; therefore, no additional sources of transportation, stationary, or operational related noise would be generated. The ambient noise level would remain the same; aside from area-wide transportation-related noise due to population growth.
5.4.1.9 Public Services and Utilities

No additional facilities are proposed; therefore average use of NCP would remain the same. The No Project Alternative is not expected to result in an increased demand for emergency services and energy. This alternative would have an adverse effect on recreational resources, because it would not provide additional recreational facilities for the community of Nipomo and surrounding area.

5.4.1.10 Transportation and Circulation

No additional traffic trips would be generated by the proposed project; however, improvements to Osage Road, and park entrances at Pomeroy Road and West Tefft Street would not be implemented. The No Action Alternative would not include beneficial effects of these improvements, including safer access for vehicles, bicyclists, and pedestrians.

5.4.1.11 Wastewater

Under the No Project Alternative, existing restrooms and associated on-site septic and leachfield systems would continue to serve the public.

5.4.1.12 Water Resources

The No Project Alternative would not result in an increase demand for water resources, and would not create additional impervious surfaces or stormwater runoff. This alternative does not preclude implementation of water conservation measures and irrigation system maintenance and upgrades to increase water efficiency, as recommended by the NCSD.

5.4.1.13 Consistency with Project Objectives

This alternative does not meet the project objectives.

5.4.2 Alternative Master Plan A

This alternative would consist of alternative arrangement of major features, and some alternative uses within the proposed development footprint within NCP (refer to Figure 5-1). It would generally have the same impacts when compared to the proposed project; however, slightly deceased level of intensity due to fewer traffic trips and air emissions. Impacts would be significant and mitigable, or less than significant.

5.4.2.1 Aesthetic Resources

In general, Alternative Master Plan A would result in additional structural development near West Tefft Street, including a community center. Facilities within the center of the park would be limited to outdoor recreational uses, such as courts, sports fields, and a swimming pool or skate park. This alternative would have a greater effect on the viewshed as seen from major perimeter roads; however, structural development would be consistent with existing uses along the West Tefft Street corridor. Similar to the proposed project, incorporation of rural design elements will be important to maintain the visual character of NCP and surrounding area. All impacts would be mitigated to *less than significant* (Class II).

Effect on Scenic View

An important public scenic view within the NCP is the oak-covered ridge extending through the northern part of the park. Under this alternative, the quality of views to the ridge would remain

intact and the ridge would continue to provide a visual backdrop for the community. No large structures are proposed within the interior of the park that would block views of the ridge, although parking area landscaping and active recreational areas may filter views in certain locations. Implementation of this alternative would avoid adverse effects related to internal views within the park, and effects on the scenic vista.

Effect on Visual Character and Quality, Visual Compatibility

The NCP occupies one of the more visible locations in the community. The proximity to primary roadways and surrounding neighborhoods greatly increases the potential number of viewers of the proposed project improvements. Because of this large number of viewers and highly visible location, the appearance of the project would have an influence on the visual character of the community. Future development of the site has the potential to substantially alter the existing visual character.

Structural elements including buildings and fencing may appear urban in nature, which is inconsistent with the rural character of the park. Locating larger structures, such as the community center, closer to major roadways would minimize adverse effects to visual character as seen from within the park. The development of structures adjacent to West Tefft Street would not likely be as noticeable in the long-term, due to existing development in the area and the presence of a large shopping center and other retail and commercial development in the immediate vicinity. Similar to the proposed project, incorporation of design standards, as identified in AES/mm-2 through AES/mm-5, would be necessary to mitigate potentially significant impacts to visual character. The potential effects the project may have on the visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings are summarized below.

Community Center, Pre-school, and Expanded Library

A 14,000-square foot community center is proposed near the intersection of West Tefft Street and Orchard Avenue. Similar to the project, the community center could accommodate a variety of uses (i.e., teen center, gymnasium, senior services). A 4,000-square foot expansion of the existing library would be located to the northwest of these proposed structures. The temporary pre-school would be removed, and a <u>4,050</u>-square foot permanent pre-school and administration building would be constructed near the community center and library. As shown in Figure 5-5, these structures would be predominantly visible from West Tefft Street and Orchard Avenue. The conceptual design of these structures is generally monolithic and does not include much exterior articulation. This design type may increase the perceived scale of the buildings (i.e., they may appear larger in size relative to the landscape). If urban or modern-style architecture were used, these dominant buildings would likely not be consistent with the rural aesthetic goals of the community. Exterior details, materials, and color schemes could either support or detract from the desired visual character of the park. As a result, the proposed structures would have the potential to result in substantial adverse impacts to the visual character of the area and associated park.

Community Swimming Pool/Skate Park

An approximately 10,000-square foot swimming pool or skate park would be located in the center of the park. Required security fencing may be one of the more noticeable elements of the pool facility. Institutional looking support buildings and structures, extensive use of galvanized chain-link fencing, and minimal use of landscaping would result in a utilitarian appearance, inconsistent with the stated rural character goals for the park (refer to Figure 5-6).

Multi-use Sports Fields

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative includes an additional ten acres of lighted multi-use sports fields, located toward the southern-central portion of the park. Construction of the fields would require substantial alteration of the existing landform; without appropriate vegetative erosion control measures, the constructed slopes may have increased noticeability due to scarring and exposed earth, which would affect the visual character of the southern section of the park. The visibility of these light poles would unavoidably contribute to the site's visual alteration from open space to an active recreational facility, both during the day and nighttime hours.

Expanded Restrooms/Maintenance Buildings

New and/or expanded restrooms and maintenance buildings would be included in the park. Overly institutional looking restrooms and maintenance buildings would result in a utilitarian appearance, inconsistent with the stated rural character goals for the park.

Increased Parking and Internal Roads

Similar to the proposed project, the amount of required vehicle parking area would more than double. The most visible aspect of the parking lots would likely be the expanses of paved area and the vehicles themselves, both parked and in motion. By their nature, paved parking lots filled with vehicles, and paved roadways, can be associated with urban or suburban visual environments.

New Amphitheater/Gazebo

A new amphitheater is proposed near the Nipomo Native Garden area, and a new gazebo/stage would be located near the internal access road. The design of these structures would be important contributors to the visual character of the park. Inappropriate forms, materials, and colors would be inconsistent with the stated rural character goals for the park.

Interpretive Center

Similar to the proposed project, an interpretive center is proposed within the Nipomo Native Garden area. The interpretive center would be seen from within the Nipomo Native Garden, and from Osage Road and possibly from Camino Caballo. Urban or modern style architecture would likely not be consistent with the rural aesthetic goals of the community. Exterior details, materials, and color schemes could either support or detract from the desired visual character of the park. As a result, the proposed interpretive center would have the potential to result in substantial adverse impacts to the visual character of the park.

Basketball and Handball Courts

The project includes 10,000 square feet of new basketball courts. Security features may include perimeter fencing. The type of fencing selected would greatly affect the visual character of the site. Galvanized chain-link fencing for example may introduce an urban, industrial look compared to a more aesthetically treated fencing material.



Figure 5-5. Alternative Master Plan A, KVA 1

ALTERNATIVE PROJECT KEY VIEWING AREA 1 - FROM NEAR THE INTERIOR ROAD LOOKING NORTHWEST

Figure 5-6. Alternative Master Plan A, KVA 3





ALTERNATIVE PROJECT KEY VIEWING AREA 3 - FROM WEST TEFFT STREET LOOKING NORTHWEST

Additional Playgrounds

Similar to the proposed project, approximately 8,000 square feet of additional playground area would be installed. Playgrounds can have a wide variety of appearances. One of the most noticeable characteristics of the playground would be the colors of the new structures, which can range from wood-appearing to bright primary colors.

Expanded Dog Parks

An additional 19,000 square feet of off-leash dog park is proposed near the northern entry of the park. Typically, dog parks are characterized by perimeter and cross-fencing, seating, and sometimes an information kiosk. The type of fencing used would affect the visual character of the site.

Horseshoe Pits

New horseshoe pits would be included with implementation of the Master Plan. Because of their relatively small size and general lack of vertical elements, horseshoe pits are often not easily noticeable in the landscape. If safety fencing is required, the fencing may be the most easily visible aspect of the horseshoe pit facility. As with the other fencing proposed throughout the project, the style and material could have an influence on the visual setting.

Expanded Tennis Courts

Two new tennis courts would be located adjacent to the swimming pool or skate park. The tennis courts would likely include perimeter fencing, which could be one of its more noticeable elements. The type of fencing selected would greatly affect the visual character of the site. Untreated galvanized chain-link fencing may introduce an urban, industrial look compared to a more aesthetically treated material.

Additional Trails/ Walkways

The proposed trail system would be similar to the proposed project, including a multi-use perimeter trail. An attached sidewalk-type path would be constructed along Osage Street, at the western edge of the park. The most noticeable aspects of the trails and walkways may be the paved surfaces themselves and any required grading and/or vegetation removal. If grading is required in order to construct the trails and walkways, without appropriate vegetative erosion control measures, the constructed slopes may have increased noticeability due to scarring and exposed earth, which would affect the visual character of the vicinity.

Additional Open Play Area

In addition to the new sports fields, approximately four acres of irrigated turf would be installed for open play area. This turf area would be most noticeable by its brighter green lawn, possibly contrasting with the seasonally golden adjacent natural slopes. The minimal landform alterations associated with the open play areas would help these areas retain a more natural look.

Stormwater Basins

Approximately 2.5 acres of stormwater basins are proposed. The preliminary grading plans show contour-graded basins. If maintenance or engineering needs require the basins to be rectilinear and look like utilitarian facilities, they could affect the natural appearance of the park. Associated security fencing, if required could also influence the visual character of the

setting. Incorporation of Limited Impact Development (LID) strategies (i.e., vegetation, bioswales) would soften the appearance these basins and associated drainage features.

Equestrian Staging Area

An equestrian staging area is proposed along the western side of the community center area. The equestrian area would likely be most recognizable by the pull-through parking area and the potential numbers of horse trailers and associated vehicles.

Effects of Light and Glare

Similar to the proposed project, the multi-use sports fields would include field lighting, which would have the greatest effect on the residential neighborhood along Tejas Place, along the southwest boundary of NCP. In addition to the sports field lighting, security lighting would be installed throughout parking areas and new features. This additional lighting would create glare, potentially affecting off-site area. Implementation of mitigation measure AES/mm-6 and AES/mm-7 would be required to mitigate this effect.

Effect on Unique Geological or Physical Features

The topography of the NCP is considered a visual resource. The existing landform offers visual interest as seen from both internal and external viewing locations, and provides viewing opportunities from the elevated areas and visual enclosure at the lower elevations. The project would alter the topography within the park, mostly in the central and southern portions, near the multi-use sports fields, stormwater basins, and additional active facilities. Although the landform of the south-central portion of the NCP would be substantially altered, the topography of the majority of the NCP would not be affected. The wooded ridge through the northern area, and the remainder of the existing improved area would remain intact. In general, the existing topography somewhat limits views from one area of the NCP to another. As a result the proposed grading for the multi-use sports fields would not be readily seen from many parts of the NCP to the north and east. Mitigation measures AES/mm-8 would be required to ensure adequate revegetation and visual softening of graded areas and landform alteration.

5.4.2.2 Air Quality

Implementation of Alternative Master Plan A would generate fewer emissions than the proposed project, due to the reduced development footprint and reduction in estimated traffic trips. With the exception of fugitive dust (PM_{10}) both the proposed project and Alternative Master Plan A would not exceed identified thresholds for construction-related emissions. Operational emission thresholds for ROG and NOx would be exceeded, and mitigation would be required. All impacts would be *less than significant* (Class III) or mitigated to *less than significant* (Class II).

Violate Air Quality Standard or Exceed Emission Thresholds

Short-term Construction Emissions

Alternative Master Plan A would result in a similar area of grading and development as the proposed project; therefore, construction and operation of this alternative would result in similar emissions. Based on the approximate area of disturbance, grading and construction activities would not exceed APCD thresholds for ROG or NOx. The San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD) has determined that any grading of 4 acres or more can exceed the 2.5 ton quarterly threshold for PM₁₀. San Luis Obispo County is currently in non-

attainment for PM_{10} dust. Implementation of AQ/mm-1 would be required to mitigation potential impacts to less than significant.

Long-term Operational Emissions

The proposed uses identified in Alternative Master Plan A would result in both stationary and mobile sources of air pollution, similar to the proposed project, and would exceed the daily threshold for combined ROG and NOx. Implementation of AQ/mm-2 would be required to mitigate this impact to less than significant.

Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations

Construction Emissions Diesel Particulate Matter

Similar to the proposed project, construction under worst-case conditions would exceed the identified threshold for diesel exhaust particulates. In addition, sensitive receptors are present in the immediate area, including park users, residents, and occupants of the pre-school and library. Therefore, implementation of AQ/mm-3 would be required to mitigate this impact to less than significant.

Asbestos Containing Material / Naturally Occurring Asbestos

Demolition and remodeling activities associated with the proposed project, including removal and relocation of park amenities and infrastructure may result in the exposure of persons to asbestos containing material. The project site is within an area that has the potential to contain naturally-occurring asbestos. Implementation of mitigation measures AQ/mm-4 and AQ/mm-5 would be required to ensure compliance with the National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants and avoid public exposure to asbestos.

Create or Subject Individuals to Objectionable Odors

The proposed project does not include any elements what would generate objectionable odors. This impact is considered less than significant and no mitigation is required.

Consistency with SLOAPCD Clean Air Plan

The proposed project is a recreational facility intended to serve the existing and future populations. Proposed improvements may attract some vehicle trips that would have previously gone to another recreational facility, but would also generate additional trips. Trips would not increase at a rate faster than the rate of population growth. The project would provide recreational opportunities and alternative transportation linkage within an urban area. The project incorporates applicable CAP control measures and strategies by locating improvements within the existing park, in close proximity to residential and commercial areas. The NCP Master Plan promotes walking and bicycling by improving safe access into the park, and providing path linkages to bike paths and sidewalks. Therefore, the project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the Clean Air Plan.

5.4.2.3 Biological Resources

Alternative Master Plan A would have a similar development footprint as the proposed project. Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would directly affect approximately 0.25 acre less annual grassland, due to locating the community center and associated park within a developed area near West Tefft Street. Overall, impacts to biological resources would be similar to the proposed project, as discussed below.

Unique or Special-Status Species or their Habitats

Construction of the project would result in permanent impacts to plant communities, which provide habitat for special-status plant and animal species, including sand mesa manzanita, silvery legless lizard, coast horned lizard, Monterey dusky-footed woodrat and white-tailed kite. Implementation of mitigation measures BR/mm-1 through BR/mm-4 would be required to mitigation potential adverse effects to special-status species.

Native or Other Important Vegetation

Implementation of Alternative Master Plan A would result in similar impacts to biological resources as the proposed project, due to the similar areas of disturbance (refer to Table 5-3). Open space within the center of NCP would be developed into active recreational facilities, parking areas, and drainage improvements. The sports fields and improved trails would affect the same areas as identified in the proposed project analysis.

Direct and permanent impacts to various habitats are expected to result from the proposed construction of recreation facilities and widening of Osage Road.

Habitat Type	Total Acres	Acres Affected
Maritime Chaparral	14.60	1.22
Oak Woodland	130.14	1.12
Coastal Scrub	27.37	13.14
Annual Grassland	13.56	6.46
Ruderal	4.13	2.94
Ornamental/Developed	20.76	0.55
Pine	14.06	2.45
Eucalyptus	0.33	0.19
Total	224.95	28.07

Table 5-3. Habitat Impacts – Alternative Master Plan A

Maritime Chaparral

Maritime chaparral is considered a sensitive plant community by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). This plant community covers approximately 14.60 acres within the NCP. The proposed trail work has the potential to impact 1.22 acres of intact maritime chaparral. Disturbance and removal of this habitat type would primarily occur during the expansion and improvement of existing sandy trails. Mitigation, including habitat restoration at a 2:1 ratio, is proposed to reduce this impact to less than significant (mitigation measures BR/mm-5 and BR/mm-6).

Oak Woodland

Oak woodland habitat covers approximately 130.14 acres within the NCP. Construction of ball fields, picnic areas and the widening of Osage Street would result in the loss of approximately 1.25 acres of oak woodland habitat within the NCP. Approximately 20 mature coast live oak trees (greater than 5 inches diameter breast height [dbh]) could be potentially be impacted or be removed by construction activities. Implementation of BR/mm-7, BR/mm-8, BR/mm-9, and BR/mm-10 is required to mitigate impacts to individual oak trees and oak woodland.

Wetland or Riparian Habitat

No wetland or riparian habitat is present within the project site; therefore, there would be no impact.

Impacts to Nesting Birds and Roosting Bats

Removal of vegetation in all habitats within the NCP has the potential to affect nesting birds, and roosting bat species such as pallid bat. Maritime chaparral, oak woodlands, coastal scrub, grassland, ruderal, eucalyptus and pine trees, and buildings within the developed areas of the NCP provide suitable roosting, nesting, and foraging habitat for a variety of bird and bat species, including several that are considered sensitive by resource agencies (e.g., Cooper's hawk, sharp-shinned hawk and white-tailed kite). Implementation of BR/mm-11 through BR/mm-13 would be necessary to mitigate potential impacts to ground, structure, and treenesting birds and roosting bats.

5.4.2.4 Cultural Resources

Alternative Master Plan A would have a similar development footprint as the proposed project. Impacts to cultural resources would be the same as the proposed project, as discussed below. All impacts would be *less than significant* (Class III) or mitigated to *less than significant* (Class II).

Historical Resources

Similar to the proposed project, actions within the known boundary of a historic site include the Juniper Street driveway alignment, pay station, and perimeter trail. Grading and construction activities would disturb both fill material and native soils containing historic materials and fragments. Implementation of the project would not materially alter the physical characteristics of the historic landfill that convey its historical significance to the extent that it would be ineligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). Implementation of mitigation measures CR/mm-1, CR/mm-2, and CR/mm-3 are recommended, including onsite monitoring and documentation of findings, to support the historic record and provide additional information about the resource.

Archaeological Resources

Based on the negative results of the archaeological surface survey, it is unlikely that significant archeological deposits are present at the site, and there is no evidence that human remains are located within NCP. If such resources are later discovered during future soil disturbance and/or construction activities, the County will issue a stop work order until the resource can be evaluated (refer to CR/mm-4).

Paleontological Resources

Based on the presence of stabilized dune sands on the proposed project site, it is unlikely that significant paleontological resources are present.

5.4.2.5 Geology, Soils and Drainage

Alternative Master Plan A would have a similar development footprint as the proposed project. Overall, geology, soils, and drainage impacts would be similar to the proposed project, as discussed below. All impacts would be *less than significant* (Class III) or mitigated to *less than significant* (Class II).

Exposure to or Production of Unstable Earth Conditions

Soil Stability

The primary geotechnical concern at the project site is the loose condition of the surficial soil. Similar to the proposed project, compliance with the UBC and preparation of site-specific geotechnical reports would address this issue.

Earthquake Rupture, Groundshaking, and Liquefaction

Similar to the proposed project, Alternative Master Plan A would be affected by geologic hazards including ground shaking and moderate liquefaction. Based on compliance with Uniform Building Code and preparation of site-specific geo-technical reports would mitigate these effects (refer to GS/mm-1); impacts are considered less than significant.

Landslides

The project site is not located in an area that is subject to landslide hazards, due to slope and topography.

Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone

The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone; therefore, there would be no impact.

Result in Substantial Soil Erosion or the Loss of Topsoil

The primary geotechnical concern is the loose condition of the surficial soil. Preparation and implementation of a site-specific short and long-term erosion and sedimentation control plan, and incorporation of Best Management Practices (BMPs), and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would mitigate potential impacts (refer to GEO/mm-2, WAT/mm-1, and WAT/mm-2).

Rates of Soil Absorption, or Amount or Direction of Surface Runoff

In addition to proposed drainage improvement measures, project-specific geo-technical reports would be required to investigate subsurface conditions within areas proposed for structural development. In addition to standard improvements, alternative drainage control incorporating BMPs and LID strategies is recommended (refer to WAT/mm-3 and GS/mm-3). Impacts would be less than significant.

Expansive Soils

Underlying soils are judged to be non-expansive. Therefore, no special measures with respect to expansive soils are necessary, and there would be no impact.

Change in Drainage Patterns Resulting in Erosion and Sedimentation

Alternative Master Plan A includes drainage improvements, which would address current erosion and sedimentation issues and manage stormwater flow during rain events. In addition, the County has agreed to prepare project-specific geo-technical reports addressing subsurface conditions, and BMPs and LID strategies would be incorporated into grading and construction plans (refer to GS/mm-1, GS/mm-2, GS/mm-3; and WAT/mm-3). Preparation and implementation of a site-specific drainage plan would mitigate potential impacts.

100-year Flood Zone

The project site is not located within the 100-year flood zone; therefore, no impact would occur.

Consistency with the County Safety Element

As discussed in Chapter 3 Table 3-2 (Environmental Setting, Consistency with Plans and Policies), the project would be consistent with Safety Element standards and policies.

Mineral Resources

The project site is not located within an Extractive (EX) combining designation for mineral extraction, and is not known to contain valuable mineral resources. Therefore, no impact would occur.

5.4.2.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Alternative Master Plan A would include the construction of the community center within an area previously identified as an informal dump site. Site specific soil testing, potential remediation, and long-term monitoring would be required, similar to the proposed project. All impacts would be *less than significant* (Class II) or mitigated to *less than significant* (Class II).

Risk of Explosion, Release of, or Exposure to Hazardous Substances

Transport, Use or Disposal of Hazardous Materials

Similar to the proposed project, construction activities would require the use of large equipment, and fuels and oils. In the event of a leak or spill, the subsequent discharge would expose persons to these materials. Implementation of standard BMPs would minimize the potential for accidental exposure (refer to mitigation measure HM/mm-1). Operation of the project would include the continued use of regulated chemicals, fuels, and oils, which would be transported, stored, and used according to existing regulations.

Release of Hazardous Materials Into the Environment

Proposed improvements within the approximate boundary of the informal dump site would include the library expansion, community center, pre-school and administration building, access road, and associated parking. Site specific testing would be necessary prior to development of these structures and improvements. Further testing and remediation would be implemented pursuant to existing regulations, and in compliance with California Department of

Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) (formerly CIWMB) and the California Code of Regulations (refer to mitigation measure HM/mm-2).

Exposure to Hazardous Emissions

The NCP is located within 0.25 mile of the Dana Elementary School. Potential hazards include accidental exposure to construction-related oils and fuels, and the disturbance of soil and debris within a known dump site. The dump site is located to the immediate north of the school property, and as noted above, landfill gas has not been detected in the existing library structure. Based on implementation of BMPs, further soil testing and remediation (if required) pursuant to existing regulations, and long-term monitoring of interior gas levels within structures, the potential impacts to the school site would be less than significant, and no additional mitigation is required.

Hazardous Materials Site

No hazardous waste facilities identified by Health and Safety Code §25187.5 are located within or in the vicinity of the project site.

Emergency Response or Emergency Evacuation Plan

Based on review of the County's Emergency Operations Plan (2008), and associated mitigation and response plans, US 101 is an emergency evacuation route. Implementation of this alternative would not impair implementation of any response or mitigation plan, and would not interfere with emergency evacuation, because no element would block or emergency responders or the public.

Risk Associated with Airport Flight Pattern

The project site is not located with an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public or private airport or airstrip.

Fire Hazard Risk

The project site is within a high fire hazard zone, and within the State Responsibility Area for wildland fires. While the site is not located adjacent to wildlands, the ridge traversing the park and slope adjacent to Osage Road supports oak woodland. Upon review of the project, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection/County Fire (CAL FIRE) did not identify any significant fire hazard concerns; however, a Fire Prevention Plan will be required.

5.4.2.7 Noise

Implementation of Alternative Master Plan A would result in approximately 48% fewer traffic trips as compared to the proposed project. Locating active recreational facilities in the center of NCP would avoid or reduce potential effects to off-site sensitive land uses. Use of the community center would generate noise potentially affecting residential areas east of West Tefft Street. All impacts would be *less than significant* (Class III) or mitigated to *less than significant* (Class II).

Exposure to Noise Levels Exceeding County Thresholds

Transportation-related Noise Generated by NCP Uses

The Traffic Impact Analysis (March 2010), including assessment of Alternative Master Plan A, was used in order to quantify increased traffic trips. Expected transportation-related noise

increase resulting from implementation of this alternative is presented in Table 5-4. All estimated noise increases have been rounded to one decimal place.

Location	Existing ADT**	Existing Plus Project ADT	ADT Increase (%)	Estimated Noise Level Increase (dBA***) Leq
1 – Pomeroy Road/Juniper Street	8,500	8,598	1.0	0.1
2 - West Tefft Street/Pomeroy Road	13,100	13,304	1.5	0.1
3 – Orchard Avenue	5,900	6,004	1.7	0.1
4 – Mesa Road	2,900	2,914	0.5	0.0
5 – Osage Street	1,200	1,214	1.2	0.1
6 – Pomeroy Road/Camino Caballo	6,500	6,582	1.2	0.1

Table 5-4. Estimated Traffic Noise Level Increase (Existing Plus Project)

* Refer to Figure 4.8-1 for noise measurement locations.

** ADT = Average Daily Traffic

***A-weighted decibel [dB]

As noted above, implementation of Alternative Master Plan A would generate fewer daily trips, resulting in a slight reduction in noise levels, compared to the proposed project. Similar to the proposed project, due to the relatively low number of expected additional trips (compared to existing conditions), estimated noise level increases due to project generated traffic are expected to be negligible (0.0- to 0.1-dB increase), and not perceptible to the human ear.

Transportation-related Noise Affecting NCP Uses

The NCP is considered a noise sensitive use, including the library and outdoor recreation areas. The existing average noise measurements at the perimeter of the NCP ranges from 55.6 dB on Osage Road to 64.5 dB near West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road (refer to EIR Section 4.8, Noise). Additional trips would be generated on adjacent roadways under build-out conditions. As seen in Table 5-5, this would result in a minimal increase in noise levels in the area. The location with the highest percentage of average daily trip increase is near West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road. The County's South County Traffic Model shows a decrease in trips at Pomeroy Road/Juniper Street. Upon community build-out, traffic noise at this location would increase by 1.9 dB, resulting in an approximately 66.5 dB noise level (including the uses proposed at NCP).

Location ¹	Existing ADT	Baseline Build- out ADT	ADT Increase (%)	Estimated Noise Level Increase (dBA) Leq	Estimated Noise Level (without project)	Estimated Noise Level (Build-out Plus Project)
1 – Pomeroy/Juniper	8,500	8,400	0	0.1	63.8	63.9
2 – West Tefft/Pomeroy	13,100	19,200	47	1.9	66.4	66.5
5 – Osage	1,200	1,300	8.3	0.3	55.9	56.0
6 – Pomeroy/Camino	6,500	6,700	3.1	0.12	63.1	63.1

Table 5-5. Estimated	Traffic Noise I	Level Increase	(Existing Pl	us Build-out)

¹ Refer to Figure 4.8-1 for noise measurement locations

Similar to the proposed project, the Nipomo Library is located approximately 110 feet from the West Tefft Street roadway. In addition, under this alternative, the temporary pre-school would be removed, and a permanent pre-school would be constructed approximately 50 feet from the edge of West Tefft Street, near the Nipomo Library. Generally, for these uses, noise levels ranging from 60 to 70 dB is considered conditionally acceptable. Standard building practices would attenuate noise by 15dB, and the existing library building would further attenuate noise. The threshold of significance for interior noise is 45 dB; therefore, noise mitigation is also recommended for the library building, and the southern and northern aspects of the proposed library expansion (including replacement of windows) (refer to mitigation measure N/mm-1). The acceptable noise level for outdoor recreation ranges from 50 to 70 dB; therefore, all other NCP uses would not be adversely affected by transportation-related noise.

Stationary Noise

An assessment of noise generated by proposed uses is provided in Section 4.8, Noise, of this EIR. As noted, a 200-foot buffer between the sports fields and the residential property line is recommended to ensure consistency with daytime noise exterior thresholds (50 dBA). For a skate park, the active skating area should be no closer than 400 feet from the nearest receptor location to meet County exterior noise thresholds. Under this alternative, the skate park would be located in the center of the NCP, and would not be located within 400 feet of sensitive land uses, including residential uses, Nipomo Library, and Dana Elementary School.

The proposed community center would be located on West Tefft Street, within 200 feet of residential areas to the east. Noise levels would vary substantially, depending on the uses allowed within these facilities. Unmonitored amplified sound could exceed noise thresholds for sensitive land uses. Existing policies in place to control and monitor amplified noise would apply to future uses within the park, including the community center. The County reserves the right to revoke amplified sound permits at any time if the noise level is excessive. Implementation of mitigation measures N/mm-2, N/mm-3, and N/mm-4 are recommended to reduce anticipated noise levels.

Increase in Ambient Noise Levels

Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Alternative Master Plan A would result in a maximum 2 dB increase in the ambient noise level, due to transportation-related noise and activities within recreational areas. Noise-generating uses, such as the sports fields, skate park, and swimming pool, would be located in the interior of the park, a minimum of 400 feet from the oak woodland trail system. While the ambient noise level would increase within the developed area of NCP, other open space areas within the park and offsite residential areas would not experience a substantial increase in ambient noise levels. Implementation of identified mitigation measures would further reduce adverse noise impacts.

Exposure to Excessive Noise or Vibration

Construction of the project would include the use of heavy equipment within NCP and on adjacent roadways during construction of road improvements. All construction activity would occur during daytime hours, and no activities are anticipated to result in excessive ground borne vibrations or noise levels.

5.4.2.8 Public Services and Utilities

Regarding public services and utilities, Alternative Master Plan A would have similar impacts as the proposed project, as discussed below. All impacts would be *less than significant* (Class III) or mitigated to *less than significant* (Class II).

Effect Upon or Result in New or Altered Public Services

Fire Protection

The addition of new park facilities would place a small additional service demand on the two CAL FIRE stations that serve the area, but new development in the park is not expected to significantly impact area fire response times or service levels.

Police Protection

New park development would place additional service demands on existing South County Sheriff services. The Sheriff's Department recommended implementation of several safety measures in conjunction with development of additional park facilities, including the "Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design" and lighting and lighting system guidelines, which have been proven to prevent and reduce crime, and would be applicable to the Alternative Master Plan A. Though new park development would place additional service demands on existing South County Sheriff services, through implementation of these measures, it is not anticipated that existing levels of service would significantly degrade as a result of new development at the park. Implementation of PSU/mm-1 is recommended, which would incorporate crime prevention and safety measures into the final design of each park element.

Schools

Although Nipomo area schools are currently operating at or above their maximum capacities, this alternative is not expected to result in significant impacts on local schools, because it would serve the existing and projected population.

Roads

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative includes traffic improvements including widening and improvement of Osage Road, the construction of a new traffic signal at the

intersection of Pomeroy Road and Juniper Street, and the realignment of park entrances on West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road. These measures would address traffic-related impacts, and no additional road improvements would be required.

Solid Wastes

All solid waste from the park is transferred and processed at the Santa Maria Transfer Station and/or disposed of at the Cold Canyon Landfill north of Arroyo Grande. The Santa Maria Transfer Station is currently operating at only 12% to 18% of its capacity. While the Cold Canyon Landfill is operating much closer to capacity and has an expected closure date of 2012, plans for expansion are currently being processed. Cold Canyon, either as it currently exists or as expanded, has sufficient capacity to adequately meet the small increase in solid waste that would be generated by new development at the park.

Wastewater

Alternative Master Plan A includes two additional restroom facilities to serve park visitors. Current facilities are treated by onsite individual septic systems, and additional septic systems and leachfields are considered suitable for additional proposed facilities. Because the project facilities are not tied into the public wastewater collection and treatment system, no increased demand or resulting impacts on that public system are anticipated. Additionally, any new facilities would be required to comply with Title 19 of the County Code to ensure septic system design and capacities are adequate, further reducing the likelihood of impacts.

Water Services

The project site would continue to be served by the NCSD for water supply. Improved on-site use of water and infrastructure, including irrigation systems, and anticipated additional water demand is discussed in detail in Section 4.12, Water Resources, of this EIR. Additional infrastructure may include pipelines to transfer recycled water from the Southland Wastewater Treatment Facility. Otherwise, no additional facilities would be required to serve the project.

Recreation

Impacts to recreational resources as a result of this alternative would be beneficial overall. Improvements to existing passive and active recreational opportunities and the creation of a community center would increase the recreational opportunities for both visitors and residents.

<u>Energy</u>

New facilities within the park would require the addition of new electric lines, underground conduits, transformers, and any appurtenances necessary for operation. This alternative would incorporate energy-efficiency measures to reduce water consumption (and subsequently energy used to transport water to the site) and use of utility-power and energy. There will be opportunities to include alternative and renewable energy sources (i.e., on-site solar panels) on existing and proposed structures within the park.

This alternative provides opportunities to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled by improving access for pedestrians and bicyclists, and including additional active recreational facilities within the urban core of Nipomo.

5.4.2.9 Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic

Implementation of Alternative Master Plan A would result in approximately 48% fewer daily trips as compared to the proposed project. On and off-site road improvements would be the same as the proposed project. A quantified analysis of transportation and circulation impacts is provided below. All impacts would be mitigated to *less than significant* (Class II).

Increase in Traffic and Level of Service

Proposed Intersection and Roadway Improvements

Alternative Master Plan A incorporates the same off-site road improvements, and similar onsite circulation infrastructure as the proposed project. The existing park access road connection to West Tefft Street will be realigned to the north side of the public library opposite Orchard Avenue (signalized). Modifications at the West Tefft Street/Orchard Avenue intersection will include two approach lanes for traffic exiting the NCP (i.e., a shared leftthrough lane and a right turn lane). The existing split signal phasing for Orchard Avenue should be eliminated. An exclusive left turn signal phase should be provided on the northbound approach of West Tefft Street. The existing park access road connection to Pomeroy Road will be realigned opposite Juniper Street and a traffic signal will be installed. A northbound left turn and southbound right turn lane will be installed on Pomeroy Road at the Juniper Street intersection. The following analysis assumes the implementation of these improvements.

Intersection and Roadway Impacts

Project Trip Generation, Distribution, and Assignment

Trip generation estimates associated with the proposed uses were derived using data contained in the ITE Trip Generation Manual (8th Edition) and other sources (refer to Figure 5-7). Table 5-6 summarizes the trip generation estimates associated with Alternative Master Plan A (new increase equals proposed minus existing).

	Number of Vehicle Trips				
Land Use Component	a.m. Peak Hour		p.m. Peak Hour		Della
	In	Out	In	Out	Daily
Existing NCP Uses (159.167 acres)	-	-	154	99	1,800
Proposed NCP Master Plan Uses					
Various Park Uses - 6.12 Ac.*	0	0	1	1	28
Community Center- 14,000 SF	14	9	8	13	320
Four Baseball/Softball Fields	0	0	20	10	120
Two Basketball Courts	0	0	65	35	400
Four Tennis Courts	3	3	7	7	134
Six Multi-Purpose Sporting Fields (Soccer)	4	4	86	38	428

Table 5-6. Estimated Project Alternative Vehicle Trip Generation

	Number of Vehicle Trips				
Land Use Component	a.m. Pe	a.m. Peak Hour		p.m. Peak Hour	
	In	Out	In	Out	Daily
Skate Park or Community Pool - 10,000 SF	0	0	15	9	158
Amphitheater - 5,227 SF (50-75 Seats)	0	0	15	4	50
Library - 11,134 SF	8	3	39	42	626
Preschool – 5,450 SF (40 Students)	17	15	16	17	180
Ranger Residence	0	1	1	0	10
Total	46	35	273	176	2,454
Net Change	n/a	n/a	+119	+77	+654

* Uses include playgrounds, dog park area, picnic areas, horseshoe pits & trails/walkways

Build-out of Alternative Master Plan A will generate 2,454 daily trips (two-way trip ends), 81 trips during the AM peak hour (46 inbound and 35 outbound) and 449 trips during the PM peak hour (273 inbound and 176 outbound). The additional facilities will generate a "net" increase of 654 daily trips (additional 36%) and 196 trips during the PM peak hour (additional 77%). The impact analysis was performed assuming no discounts for "pass-by" or "multiple-use" type trips. The traffic volumes associated with Alternative Master Plan A are illustrated on Figure 5-7.

Build-out of uses included in this alternative would not significantly increase vehicular traffic demands on local neighborhood streets. No significant neighborhood impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are warranted.

Existing Plus Project Intersection Operations

Intersection operations were calculated with the total traffic volumes associated with build-out of this alternative (refer to Table 5-6). Detailed LOS calculation sheets are presented in Appendix F. Table 5-7 shows the levels of service under Existing and Existing with Alternative Master Plan A Conditions. The study intersections will operate within acceptable limits (LOS C or better) at build-out. The project analysis assumes that infrastructure improvements will be in place at the West Tefft Street/Orchard Avenue and Pomeroy Road/Juniper Street intersections.



Figure 5-7. Alternative Master Plan A Traffic Volumes

Source: Pinnacle Transportation Engineering 2010

Study Interception	Vehicle Delay/LOS			
Study Intersection	Existing	With Project		
W. Tefft Street/Pomeroy Road*	14.6/B	15.3/B		
W. Tefft Street/Orchard Avenue*	20.8/C	16.2/B		
Pomeroy Road/Juniper Street*	n/a	5.6/A		
Pomeroy Road/Camino Caballo Stop Sign Approach	2.7/A (22.8/C)	2.7/A (24.4/C)		

Table 5-7. Existing and Existing with Alternative Master Plan A Intersection Levels of Service

* Intersection controlled with traffic signal.

As documented under existing conditions, delays at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange southbound ramps intersection are in the LOS E range during the p.m. peak hour. However, completion of the US 101/Willow Road interchange is anticipated to reduce delays at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange by about 40% during the PM peak hour. It is anticipated that buildout of uses included in the NCP Master Plan could add 10 to 15 trips to the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. Buildout of the NCPMP would not significantly impact existing operations during the p.m. peak hour; therefore, no mitigation measures are warranted.

Existing With Project Roadway Segment Operations

Table 5-8 shows the roadway levels of service for the study street segments under Existing and Existing with Alternative Master Plan A Conditions. The study roadway segments will operate at LOS C or better with the addition of project traffic. This alternative will potentially add daily trips to West Tefft Street through the US 101 interchange. Project specific impacts associated with the "existing with project alternative" scenario are presented under the intersection levels of service analysis. Thus, no project impacts to roadway segments are anticipated, so no mitigation measures are warranted.

Cumulative Intersection Impacts

Table 5-9 shows the levels of service under Cumulative and Cumulative with Alternative Master Plan A Conditions. Detailed LOS calculation sheets are included in Appendix F. Average vehicle delays will be within acceptable limits at the study intersections with the build-out of this alternative. Delays on the westbound approach at the Pomeroy Road and Camino Caballo intersection will be within unacceptable limits (LOS E to F). Cumulative traffic demands will satisfy the minimum "peak hour volume" signal warrant criteria (California MUTCD 70% factor) at this intersection. However, the construction of capacity improvements at this intersection would not reduce delays on the westbound approach to an acceptable level (LOS C or better). Additional signal warrants should be satisfied before considering the installation of traffic signal control, and therefore, the installation of signal control at this intersection is not recommended. As documented under existing conditions delays at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange southbound ramps are within unacceptable levels (LOS E).

			ADT/LOS	
Roadway Segment	Туре	Capacity	Existing	With Project
W. Tefft Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	4-Lane Arterial*	36,000	17,000/A	17,232/A
W. Tefft Street, Pomeroy Rd Orchard Ave.	3-Lane Arterial*	24,000	13,100/A	13,304/A
W. Tefft Street, s/o Orchard Avenue	2-Lane Arterial*	18,000	9,800/A	10,144/A
Pomeroy Road, n/o W. Tefft Street	2-Lane Arterial	13,500	8,900/B	9,008/B
Pomeroy Road, Juniper St Camino Ca.	2-Lane Arterial	13,500	8,500/B	8,598/B
Pomeroy Road, n/o Camino Caballo	2-Lane Collector	12,000	6,500/B	6,582/B
Camino Caballo, w/o Pomeroy Road	2-Lane Collector	12,000	2,300/A	2,316/A
Orchard Avenue, e/o W. Tefft Street	2-Lane Arterial	13,500	5,900/A	6,004/A
Juniper Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	2-Lane Collector	12,000	1,600/A	1,620/A
Osage Street, s/o Camino Caballo	2-Lane Collector	12,000	1,200/A	1,214/A
Mesa Road, w/o W. Tefft Street	2-Lane Collector	12,000	2,900/A	2,914/A

Table 5-8. Existing and Existing with Project AlternativeStreet Roadway Segment Daily Traffic Conditions

* With left turn lanes.

Table 5-9. Cumulative with Master Plan Alternative A
Intersection Levels of Service

Study Intersection	Vehicle Delay/LOS			
Study Intersection	Cumulative	With Project		
W. Tefft Street/Pomeroy Road*	27.2/C	32.5/C		
W. Tefft Street/Orchard Avenue*	34.4/C	17.4/B		
Pomeroy Road/Juniper Street*	n/a	6.0/A		
Pomeroy Road/Camino Caballo Stop Sign Approach	3.4/A (43.4/E)	3.9/A (>50/F)		

* Intersection controlled with traffic signal.

Completion of the US 101/Willow Road interchange is anticipated to reduce traffic demands and vehicle delays at the US101/West Tefft Street interchange by about 40% during the PM peak hour. PM peak hour traffic demands will also be reduced on Pomeroy Road and at the Pomeroy Road/Camino Caballo intersection. However, the Willow Road Extension EIR analysis indicates that the benefits associated with the project will not eliminate the adverse LOS at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange during the PM peak hour period. The NCPMP is a 20-year plan; therefore, periodic re-assessment of traffic conditions is recommended prior to development and during operation of high-traffic generating uses to ensure traffic impacts are mitigated to the extent feasible. The re-assessment would include consultation with Public Works to identify impact fees appropriate for the project, based on the most recent South County Traffic Model Update. The associated capital improvement program provides a mechanism for the funding of future long range infrastructure improvements, which would improve traffic and circulation. Implementation of TR/mm-1, TR/mm-2, and TR/mm-3 are recommended to address potentially significant cumulative traffic impacts.

Cumulative Intersection and Roadway Impacts

Cumulative daily traffic volumes on a majority of the study area roadway segments will remain within acceptable limits with the build-out of the Master Plan Alternative A (LOS C or better). Cumulative daily traffic along West Tefft Street near the US 101 interchange is projected to be within the LOS E range (with or without the project). Table 5-10 presents the cumulative roadway segment levels of service for the study segments.

			ADT/LOS	
Roadway Segment	Туре	Capacity	Cumulative	With Project
W. Tefft Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	4-Lane Arterial*	36,000	25,550/D	25,782/D
W. Tefft Street, Pomeroy Rd Orchard Ave.	4-Lane Arterial*	36,000	19,200/B	19,404/B
W. Tefft Street, s/o Orchard Avenue	2-Lane Arterial*	18,000	10,600/A	10,776/A
Pomeroy Road, n/o W. Tefft Street	2-Lane Arterial	13,500	7,150/B	7,258/A
Pomeroy Road, Juniper St Camino Ca.	2-Lane Arterial	13,500	8,400/B	8,498/B
Pomeroy Road, n/o Camino Caballo	2-Lane Collector	12,000	6,700/B	6,782/B
Camino Caballo, w/o Pomeroy Road	2-Lane Collector	12,000	2,900/A	2,916/A
Orchard Avenue, e/o W. Tefft Street	2-Lane Arterial	13,500	9,350/B	9,454/C
Juniper Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	2-Lane Collector	12,000	2,800/A	2,820/A
Osage Street, s/o Camino Caballo	2-Lane Collector	12,000	1,300/A	1,314/A
Mesa Road, w/o W. Tefft Street	2-Lane Collector	12,000	3,100/A	3,114/A

Table 5-10. Cumulative Roadway Segment Daily Traffic Conditions

* With left turn lanes.

Completion of the US 101/Willow Road interchange is anticipated to reduce daily traffic on West Tefft Street (west of US 101) by about 20-25%. The Willow Road Extension EIR analysis indicates that the benefits associated with the project are estimated to improve the buildout LOS E to an acceptable LOS C (27,200 ADT) on West Tefft Street (near US 101)

interchange). Thus, no project impacts to roadway segments are anticipated, so no mitigation measures are warranted.

Neighborhood Impacts

Buildout of uses included in Alternative Master Plan A will not significantly increase vehicular traffic demands on local neighborhood streets. No significant neighborhood impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are warranted.

Create Unsafe Conditions / Emergency Access

The NCP Master Plan includes various infrastructure improvements (refer to EIR Section 4.10, Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic). Infrastructure improvements associated with the NCP Master Plan are also included as part of the Alternative Master Plan A. No significant project access impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are warranted.

Parking Capacity and Internal Circulation

Build-out of Alternative Master Plan A will include numerous internal circulation improvements. New parking lots will be constructed to accommodate parking demands adjacent to the existing and proposed facilities. No significant internal circulation or parking impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are warranted.

Alternative Transportation

Build-out of uses included in this alternative have a potential to increase local pedestrian and bicycle traffic. The project trails will connect to existing pedestrian and bicycle facilities along West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road. Thus, no project impacts to pedestrian or bicycle facilities are anticipated, so no mitigation measures are warranted. Additional facilities may increase the demand for transit services. The nearest transit stop is located on West Tefft Street near Carrillo Street, approximately 1 mile from the NCP. Currently there are not adequate paved pedestrian facilities to access the transit stops on West Tefft Street. Therefore, the project alternative has a potential to significantly impact transit service to the Nipomo community. Implementation of TR/mm-1 is recommended to mitigate this impact.

5.4.2.10 Wastewater

Implementation of Alternative Master Plan A would require the addition of two restrooms and associated on-site septic systems and leachfields. Based on consultation with the Regional Water Quality Control Board, review of available data, and project site conditions, NCP remains suitable for on-site wastewater treatment. Development of this alternative would not preclude connection to the NCSD community sewer system. All impacts would be *less than significant* (Class III).

Violate Waste Discharge Requirements or Central Coast Basin Plan Criteria

Based on consultation with the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) regarding the Basin Plan and Basin Plan Amendment requirements, restroom facilities within the park are not required to connect to the NCSD sewer system unless compliance with the Basin Plan cannot be demonstrated (RWQCB 2010). Based on site conditions, it appears that the site is suitable for additional onsite wastewater treatment and disposal. Implementation of on-site wastewater disposal is subject to updated regulations regarding wastewater disposal and water quality, including specific requirements for site specific sub-surface investigation and testing. In the event the County cannot demonstrate compliance with the Basin Plan,

connection to the NCSD sewer system would be necessary. Based on consultation with the NCSD (personal communication, Bruce Buel, NCSD; December 17, 2008), the NCSD notes that a connection is possible, based on further review of additional information at the time connection is proposed. There is an existing sewer line along West Tefft Street, adjacent to the park site.

Change the Quality of Surface or Groundwater

The site demonstrates characteristics (slope, percolation rate, depth to groundwater) suitable for disposal, while avoiding adverse effects to surface or groundwater. In addition, the County is required to comply with the Basin Plan prior to siting and development of the restrooms and associated onsite systems.

Adversely Affect Community Wastewater Service Provider

As proposed, the project would not require connection to the NCSD sewer system and Southland Wastewater Treatment Facility. In the event site specific testing and analysis shows that the project would not comply with the Basin Plan, connection to the community system may be necessary. Based on review of the Southland Wastewater Treatment Facility Draft EIR, and consultation with the NCSD, the facility has the capacity to serve the park if necessary. The project could feasibly connect to the existing sewer system, provided on and offsite infrastructure is provided.

5.4.2.11 Water Resources

Master Plan Alternative A would result in a slight reduction in additional estimated water use (1.3% reduction) due to the smaller community center. There would be a slight increase in open turf area, and the size of the swimming pool, which would increase the water demand for these uses. As shown in Table 5-11, the total additional water demand would be approximately 43.7 afy.

Facilities	Unit	Water Duty Factor (afy)	Estimated Water Demand (afy)
Community Center ¹	14,000 square feet	0.00007	0.98
Sports Fields (Turf) ²	10.0 acres	2.7	27
Swimming Pool ¹	10,000 square feet	0.00046	4.6
Open Play Area (Turf) ²	4.05 acres	2.7	10.9
Restrooms ¹	4 toilets	0.058	0.232
Total			43.7

¹ Monterey Peninsula Water Management District

² County of Santa Barbara

The area proposed for development, and associated drainage improvements, would be the same as the proposed project. Overall, the effects to water resources would be similar to the proposed project. All impacts would be mitigated to *less than significant* (Class II).

Violation of Water Quality Standards

Similar to the proposed project, implementation of major grading, such as site preparation for the sports fields, would necessitate preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Due to the location of the project, implementation of the project would not result in direct effects to surface or groundwater. Future grading activities would disturb soil, and potentially result in off-site sedimentation and/or clogging within existing and proposed retention basins. Standard erosion and sedimentation control measures and preparation and implementation of a SWPPP would ensure avoidance of adverse effects to water quality.

During operation of the project, discharge of sediment, hydrocarbons, and other pollutants into stormwater and drainage infrastructure (which eventually discharge into surface waters) would indirectly affect water quality. Implementation of BMPs consistent with LUO §§22.10.155.G.7 and 22.10.155.G.8., incorporation of LID consistent with LUO §22.10.155.G.1 would avoid or minimize the project's contribution to water quality issues affecting surface water bodies in Nipomo and the South County area (refer to mitigation measures WAT/mm-1 through WAT/mm-3).

Discharge into Surface Waters or Alter Surface Water Quality

The NCP is not located in close proximity to surface waters. As discussed above, grading and construction activities may result in sediment and pollutant transport and discharge offsite, which may eventually affect offsite surface waters. Mitigation is recommended to address these effects (WAT/mm-1, WAT/mm-2, and WAT/mm-3).

Change the Quality of Groundwater

The project would continue to manage wastewater via onsite septic systems and leach fields, consistent with existing regulations and Basin Plan requirements. Based on compliance with these existing regulations, this alternative would not adversely affect groundwater quality.

Change the Quantity or Movement of Surface or Groundwater

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would continue to use water supplied by the NCSD (refer to analysis in following section). The proposed project would result in approximately 12.2 acres of additional impervious surfaces, including approximately 4.6 acres of facilities and paved trails and 7.5 acres for infrastructure. The remaining additional acreage would include pervious surfaces, such as sports fields. Onsite stormwater management is proposed to avoid adverse effects both within the park and offsite. Incorporation of LID strategies is recommended to avoid potential effects to stormwater flow and offsite effects related to flood control and stormwater management (refer to WAT/mm-3).

Adversely Affect Community Water Service Provider

Implementation of Alternative Master Plan A would result in an increase of irrigated areas and facilities, and would require additional water supplied from the NCSD. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would be constructed in phases, and supplemental water would need to be secured prior to construction of the new sports fields and open turf areas. As described in EIR Section 4.12, Water Resources, the NCSD has demonstrated adequate water supply to

serve the future needs of the park. This additional service is contingent on the implementation of improvements to the existing irrigation system to reduce current water supply, consistent with measures to target reducing consumption for high-use customers. In addition, future irrigation needs may be met by applying recycled water from the Southland Wastewater Treatment Facility (approximately 100,000 to 245,000 gallons/day). Implementation of water conservation measures would be required for this alternative (refer to WAT/mm-4, WAT/mm-5, and WAT/mm-6).

5.4.2.12 Climate Change

Implementation of Alternative Master Plan A would result in similar greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions as the proposed project. Overall, this alternative would have similar effects related to GHG emission and climate change as the proposed project. All impacts would be *less than significant* (Class III).

Generation of GHG Emissions

GHG emissions directly generated during construction of the project will be a short-term increase. As noted in EIR Section 4.2, Air Quality, operation of the project would exceed combined ROG and NO_x thresholds. Estimated CO₂ emissions would be 6,766.52 lbs/day during construction and 3,190 lbs/day during operation. Mitigation is identified to reduce operational emissions for these precursors to ozone, including energy efficiency measures, use of landscaping to minimize energy use for heating and cooling, use of green building materials, and incorporation of engineering and design (i.e., insulation, windows, lighting) to minimize energy demand (AQ/mm-2). In addition, the project includes several actions that would reduce regional generation of GHG emissions, including improved safe alternative access to the park, including safer pedestrian and bicycle crossings, and improvements to existing public facilities within an urban area.

Conflict with Plans and Policies

This alternative will not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted to reduce GHG emissions. Air quality, energy efficiency, and water conservation measures are identified to mitigate identified impacts; implementation of these measures would also reduce operational GHG emissions. In addition, the project would be consistent with goals to reduce vehicle miles traveled by providing recreational opportunities and alternative transportation linkage within an urban area, and in close proximity to residential areas, and by promoting walking and bicycling by improving safe access into the park and providing path linkages to bike paths and sidewalks.

5.4.2.13 Consistency with Project Objectives

This alternative would meet all the project objectives.

5.4.3 Alternative Master Plan B

Alternative Master Plan B would have a smaller footprint than the proposed project and Master Plan Alternative A. This alternative does not include sports fields, expanded open turf areas, or a community center. The total additional area would be approximately <u>8</u> acres. This alternative assumes similar drainage, access, and parking infrastructure; however, these features would likely be reduced in size based on further calculations. This alternative would further reduce identified impacts by design. Mitigation would be required as indicated, to reduce potential impacts to less than significant.

5.4.3.1 Aesthetic Resources

Additional development would be limited to two amphitheater/gazebo structures, basketball, tennis, and volleyball courts, expanded tennis courts, horseshoe pits, trails, restrooms, and expansion of the library. These features would be aesthetically compatible with the park setting. Consideration of fencing and architectural features would be necessary at the design phase.

5.4.3.2 Air Quality

This alternative would likely generate insignificant levels of additional traffic and associated operational emissions. During construction, potential impacts would include the generation of fugitive dust (PM_{10}) and diesel particulate matter (DPM). There is also a potential for asbestos exposure (natural and material). Implementation of standard mitigation would be required due to the close proximity of sensitive land uses, including the park itself.

5.4.3.3 Biological Resources

Under this alternative, proposed additional features would be located in close proximity to the developed area of the park. Improved trails would be located within sensitive habitats, including oak woodland and maritime chaparral. Mitigation will be required to avoid adverse effects to special status species and loss of native habitat.

5.4.3.4 Cultural Resources

This alternative includes access improvements similar to the proposed project; therefore construction monitoring is recommended to avoid potential impacts to cultural resources.

5.4.3.5 Geology, Soils and Drainage

Alternative Master Plan B would result in an approximately <u>65</u>% reduction in developed area, compared to the proposed project. This would reduce potential impacts due to erosion and drainage. Preparation and implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, erosion and sedimentation control plan, BMPs, and LID strategies are recommended.

5.4.3.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

New development proposed within the informal dump area would be limited to expansion of the library. Additional testing and monitoring of landfill gasses would likely be required. During construction, standard measures would be required to avoid public exposure to accidental leaks or spills from equipment.

5.4.3.7 Land Use

Proposed facilities would be located adjacent to the existing developed area within the park, and would meet County LUO setbacks and height limitations. Potential land use conflicts related to light, glare, and noise would be avoided due to elimination of the sports fields and associated lighting. Expanded restroom facilities, including onsite septic systems, would be constructed consistent with Basin Plan requirements, similar to the proposed project.

Alternative Master Plan B does not include a community center; therefore consideration of an alternative location within Nipomo is recommended for consistency with *Parks and Recreation Element* Table E2, Nipomo South County PA Proposed County Parks, Recreation & Natural Areas, which requires the County to *"provide a community center for recreational activities and*"

programming for all ages. This facility may include a new structure, an existing school, or other similar facility available through a joint use agreement."

5.4.3.8 Noise

Recreational facilities that would generate noise during use would be located within the interior of the park, and would not affect adjacent sensitive land uses. This alternative would not generate traffic trips that would raise the ambient noise level, and proposed uses would not be adversely affected by transportation noise. No mitigation would be necessary.

5.4.3.9 Public Services and Utilities

Implementation of this alternative would expand existing uses within the park, but would not include any new uses likely to require additional public services or utilities beyond current levels. Incorporation of crime prevention design elements is recommended to further discourage activities that may require emergency response. This alternative may not address current and future recreational needs within the community of Nipomo, including additional multi-use sports fields and other active recreation facilities.

5.4.3.10 Transportation and Circulation

Alternative Master Plan B would not include any elements that generate high levels of traffic, as compared to the proposed project. There would be some increase in traffic trips due to the availability of additional courts and playground facilities. Incorporation of proposed road improvements, including realignment and signalization of park entrances, is recommended to provide safe access for pedestrians and bicyclists. Incorporation of a transit stop is recommended to accommodate existing and future park visitors, and reduce potential trips on area roadways.

5.4.3.11 Wastewater

This alternative would include the construction of two additional restroom facilities. Based on consultation with the RWQCB, review of Basin Plan requirements, and qualitative assessment of the project site, conditions are suitable to accommodate additional onsite systems.

5.4.3.12 Water Resources

This alternative would result in a substantial reduction in additional water demand. Elimination of additional turf, swimming pool, and community center would reduce water demand by approximately 44 afy. Upon implementation of recommended water conservation and irrigation efficiency measures, it is likely this alternative would not result in an increase in water demand for the proposed restrooms. Incorporation of BMPs and LID strategies is recommended to further reduce potential adverse effects to water quality during construction of additional elements and park operation.

5.4.3.13 Consistency with Project Objectives

This alternative is not consistent with all project objectives. This alternative does not fully meet the following objectives:

- provide a range of passive and active facilities and use areas to meet the recreational needs of the community, and
- effectively manage current and projected levels of park uses.

The range of recreational opportunities included in this alternative is limited, and may not meet existing and future public demand for more intensive uses (i.e., sports fields, skate park). Current demand and continued population growth within Nipomo and southern San Luis Obispo County creates additional need for active, public recreational facilities. In the event these facilities are not included in the Master Plan, this issue would need to be addressed by the County in the near future, including identification of a site suitable for sports fields and other active recreational opportunities.

Alternative Master Plan A does not include a community center within the park; therefore, consideration of an alternative location would be necessary to meet the project objective to provide a community recreation center within the community of Nipomo.

5.4.4 Community Center Alternative A (Sandydale Drive and Frontage Road)

The location of this alternative site is at the northern terminus of the Frontage Road, at the intersection with Sandydale Drive. This parcel is approximately 4.4 acres, and is within the Commercial Service land use category. The site is currently undeveloped. Surrounding land uses include residential development, the Nipomo Dog and Cat Hospital, a fitness center, and a storage facility. Land to the northwest is undeveloped, and US 101 is located to the east.



Photograph 5-1. View to the northwest.



Photograph 5-2. View to the north.

5.4.4.1 Aesthetic Resources

This location is readily visible from US 101, predominantly from the southbound lanes. Highway frontage to the north is generally undeveloped, and is dominated by rural residential and agricultural land uses. The facility would be located within the northern gateway to Nipomo; consideration of character and visual compatibility would be necessary to avoid adverse impacts to visual resources, including rural design elements, shielded and/or landscaped parking areas, use of natural exterior colors, and shielded exterior lighting.

5.4.4.2 Air Quality

Construction and operation of the community center would result in short and long-term emissions. By itself, this element would not generate emissions exceeding identified thresholds. Standard mitigation measures to minimize the generation of fugitive dust (PM_{10}) are recommended.

Due to the close proximity of US 101, preparation of a risk assessment may be required by SLOAPCD to evaluate exposure to toxic air and soil emissions due to diesel particulates and heavy metals. Outdoor recreational use would likely be limited (or eliminated) from the community center design to avoid public exposure.

5.4.4.3 Biological Resources

This site is undeveloped, and supports grassland and coastal scrub habitat. Mature stands of trees are located immediately offsite. No sources of surface water were observed onsite or in the vicinity. Seasonal botanical surveys are recommended to verify presence or absence of special-status plant species Potentially affected species may include nesting birds, foraging

raptors, and special-status avian and terrestrial species including white-tailed kite, burrowing owl, Monterey dusky-footed woodrat, American badger, and coast horned lizard. Implementation of standard mitigation is recommended to avoid adverse effects to these species, including pre-construction surveys.

5.4.4.4 Cultural Resources

This site is located in an area generally considered culturally sensitive. A Phase One Cultural Resources Survey is recommended to determine if significant cultural materials are present within or adjacent to the site.

5.4.4.5 Geology, Soils and Drainage

This site is nearly level, and evidence of geologic hazards, flooding, or adverse drainage conditions was not observed. Standard mitigation measures, including preparation and implementation of a SWPPP, BMPs, and LID strategies are recommended to address erosion and stormwater management.

5.4.4.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

No known hazardous sites are present in this location. US 101 is a common route for the transfer of goods and materials, including hazardous liquid, gas, and solids, although the potential for an accidental spill or off-road crash is unlikely. Implementation of BMPs to avoid public exposure to accidental spills or leaks during construction is recommended, due to the presence of residences and businesses to the west and south.

5.4.4.7 Land Use

Land use impacts may include operational noise associated with the center, including trafficrelated noise and amplified sound and voices during the attendance of large events. Due to the presence of US 101, the increase may not be significant; however this new use may require implementation of mitigation to avoid conflicts with adjacent residential uses.

County LUO §22.112.080 (South County – Nipomo Urban Area) standards for the Commercial Service land use category lists a limitation on allowable uses. Excluded allowable uses include public assembly and entertainment and sports assembly. Indoor amusement and recreation facilities would be allowed; however, consistency with this standard may limit use of the community center in this location in the event it is determined that full consistency is desired. Since the County is not required to obtain a discretionary use permit, this standard does not specifically apply to the project; however, the potential land use inconsistency is noted.

5.4.4.8 Noise

Operation of a community center in this location would generate traffic and other associated noise (i.e., voices, amplified sound), which may affect residential uses in the immediate area. Generally, the ambient noise level in this location exceeds thresholds for residential uses, due to the presence of US 101; therefore, the resulting increase in noise levels may not be significant. Incorporation of noise mitigation would likely be necessary to meet thresholds for interior noise. Outdoor use areas, if proposed, could be located on the western side of the structure to attenuate traffic noise from US 101.

5.4.4.9 Public Services and Utilities

Implementation of this alternative would require connection to the NCSD water and sewer system. Operation of the facility would not likely generate an increased demand for emergency responders; however, incorporation of fire prevention and crime prevention design elements are recommended to further discourage activities that may require emergency response.

5.4.4.10 Transportation and Circulation

This site would be accessed from West Tefft Street, Mary Avenue, Juniper Street, and the North Frontage Road. The facility would generate approximately 824 trips per day, and would contribute to deficient conditions at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. Implementation of this alternative would require an assessment of existing roads to determine if road improvements, signalization, striping, or signage are necessary.

5.4.4.11 Water Resources

Operation of the community center would require the use of approximately 2.52 afy of water. It is likely the NCSD can accommodate the facility. Incorporation of water meters and water conservation measures for both indoor and outdoor use is recommended to minimize demand. Development of the site may require disturbance of up to 4.4 acres, not including any potential offsite road improvements. Incorporation of BMPs and LID strategies is recommended to further reduce potential adverse effects to water quality during construction, and to avoid an increase in offsite stormwater flow.

5.4.4.12 Consistency with Project Objectives

This alternative is consistent with project objectives specific to the community center.

5.4.5 Community Center Alternative B (West Tefft Street and Branch Street)

This site is located at the corner of Burton Street and Mallagh Street, west of West Tefft Street. The parcel is approximately 2.6 acres in size, and is within the Office and Professional land use category. The site is currently undeveloped. Surrounding development includes residential development, the Nipomo Men's Club, and commercial/retail development along West Tefft Street.

5.4.5.1 Aesthetic Resources

This location is visible from West Tefft Street, South Mallagh Street, and West Branch Street. The area is urbanized and developed with a mix of uses. Consideration of character and visual compatibility would be necessary to avoid adverse impacts to visual resources, including rural design elements, shielded and/or landscaped parking areas, use of natural exterior colors, and shielded exterior lighting.

5.4.5.2 Air Quality

Construction and operation of the community center would result in short and long-term emissions. By itself, this element would not generate emissions exceeding identified thresholds. Standard mitigation measures to minimize the generation of fugitive dust (PM_{10}) are recommended.



Photograph 5-3. View to the northeast.



Photograph 5-4. View to the southwest.

5.4.5.3 Biological Resources

This site is undeveloped, and supports grassland and coastal scrub habitat. A deeply incised creek channel crosses under South Mallagh Street near the southern boundary of the parcel. Seasonal botanical surveys are recommended to verify presence or absence of special-status plant species. The site is surrounded by development, and is unlikely to support preferred habitat for special status species, although the nearby creek channel provides an opportunity for migration, and large trees in the area could provide habitat for nesting birds. Implementation of standard mitigation is recommended to avoid adverse effects to the creek, and associated species, including on-site protection measures, BMPs, and pre-construction surveys.

5.4.5.4 Cultural Resources

This site is located in an area generally considered culturally sensitive. A Phase One Cultural Resources Survey is recommended to determine if significant cultural materials are present within or adjacent to the site.

5.4.5.5 Geology, Soils and Drainage

This site is nearly level, and evidence of geologic hazards, flooding, or adverse drainage conditions was not observed. Due to the presence of sandy soils and a nearby creek channel, there may be a potential for liquefaction. Standard mitigation measures, including preparation and implementation of a SWPPP, BMPs, and LID strategies are recommended to address erosion and stormwater management.

5.4.5.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

No known hazardous sites are present in this location. Implementation of BMPs to avoid public exposure to accidental spills or leaks during construction is recommended, due to the presence of residences and businesses.

5.4.5.7 Land Use

Land use impacts may include operational noise associated with the center, including trafficrelated noise and amplified sound and voices during the attendance of large events. This new use may require implementation of mitigation to avoid conflicts with adjacent residential uses.

County LUO §22.30.240 (Indoor Amusement and Recreation Facilities) standards for the Office and Professional land use category lists a limitation on allowable uses. The list of allowable uses includes gymnasiums, racquetball, handball, and other similar indoor sports activities. County LUO §22.112.080 (South County – Nipomo Urban Area) standards for the Office and Professional land use category include a limitation on use. Excluded uses include indoor amusements and recreation and public assembly and entertainment. Since the County is not required to obtain a discretionary use permit, this standard does not specifically apply to the project; however, the potential land use inconsistency is noted.

5.4.5.8 Noise

Operation of a community center in this location would generate traffic and other associated noise (i.e., voices, amplified sound), which may affect residential uses in the immediate area. Transportation noise generated by traffic on US 101 and West Tefft Street contribute to elevated ambient noise levels in the area. Incorporation of noise mitigation may be necessary to meet thresholds for interior noise.

5.4.5.9 Public Services and Utilities

Implementation of this alternative would require connection to the NCSD water and sewer system. Operation of the facility would not likely generate an increased demand for emergency responders; however, incorporation of fire prevention and crime prevention design elements are recommended to further discourage activities that may require emergency response.

5.4.5.10 Transportation and Circulation

This site would be accessed from West Tefft Street and South Mallagh Street. The facility would generate approximately 824 trips per day, and would contribute to deficient conditions at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. Implementation of this alternative would require an assessment of existing roads to determine if road improvements, signalization, striping, or signage are necessary.

5.4.5.11 Water Resources

Operation of the community center would require the use of approximately 2.52 afy of water. It is likely the NCSD can accommodate the facility. Incorporation of water meters and water conservation measures for both indoor and outdoor use is recommended to minimize demand. Development of the site may require disturbance of up to 2.6 acres, not including any potential offsite road improvements. Incorporation of BMPs and LID strategies is recommended to further reduce potential adverse effects to water quality during construction, and to avoid an increase in offsite stormwater flow.

5.4.5.12 Consistency with Project Objectives

This alternative is consistent with project objectives specific to the community center.

5.4.6 Community Center Alternative C (Orchard Avenue and Division Street)

This site is located at the intersection of Orchard Avenue and Division Street. The parcel is approximately 2.85 acres in size, and is within the Commercial Retail land use category. The site is undeveloped. Surrounding land uses include a 76® gas station and the La Placita Market and carwash, a strawberry field and fruit stand, and residential development.

5.4.6.1 Aesthetic Resources

The project site is visible from Orchard Avenue and Division Street. The character of the surrounding area is mixed, and includes a variety of land uses. Consideration of character and visual compatibility would be necessary to avoid adverse impacts to visual resources, including rural design elements, shielded and/or landscaped parking areas, use of natural exterior colors, and shielded exterior lighting.

5.4.6.2 Air Quality

Construction and operation of the community center would result in short and long-term emissions. By itself, this element would not generate emissions exceeding identified thresholds. Standard mitigation measures to minimize the generation of fugitive dust (PM_{10}) are recommended.


Photograph 5-5. View to the northwest.



Photograph 5-6. View to the southwest.

5.4.6.3 Biological Resources

This site is undeveloped, and supports disturbed grassland and coastal scrub habitat. Seasonal botanical surveys are recommended to verify presence or absence of special-status plant species. No evidence of surface water was observed onsite or in the immediate vicinity. The site does not appear to support preferred habitat for special-status species; although potentially affected species may include nesting birds, foraging raptors, and special-status avian and terrestrial species including white-tailed kite, burrowing owl, Monterey dusky-footed woodrat, American badger, and coast horned lizard. Implementation of standard mitigation is recommended to avoid adverse effects to these species, including pre-construction surveys.

5.4.6.4 Cultural Resources

This site is located in an area generally considered culturally sensitive. A Phase One Cultural Resources Survey is recommended to determine if significant cultural materials are present within or adjacent to the site.

5.4.6.5 Geology, Soils and Drainage

This site is gently sloping, and evidence of geologic hazards, flooding, or adverse drainage conditions was not observed. Standard mitigation measures, including preparation and implementation of a SWPPP, BMPs, and LID strategies are recommended to address erosion and stormwater management.

5.4.6.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

No known hazardous sites are present in this location. A gas station and convenience store is located across Division Street to the southeast. Implementation of BMPs to avoid public exposure to accidental spills or leaks during construction is recommended, due to the presence of a strawberry field, businesses, and residences to the west, south, and southeast.

5.4.6.7 Land Use

Land use impacts may include operational noise associated with the center, including trafficrelated noise and amplified sound and voices during the attendance of large events. This new use may require implementation of mitigation to avoid conflicts with adjacent residential uses.

County LUO §22.112.080 (South County – Nipomo Urban Area) standards for the Commercial Retail land use category include standards for delineated "Neighborhood commercial centers", including a limitation on use. Limited allowable uses include indoor amusements and recreation, but do not include public assembly and entertainment. Consistency with this standard may limit use of the community center in this location in the event it is determined that full consistency is desired. Since the County is not required to obtain a discretionary use permit, this standard does not specifically apply to the project; however, the potential land use inconsistency is noted.

5.4.6.8 Noise

Operation of a community center in this location would generate traffic and other associated noise (i.e., voices, amplified sound), which may affect residential uses in the immediate area. Noise sources in the area include vehicles and agricultural transport trucks, and operation of a car wash at the corner of Division Street and Orchard Avenue. Incorporation of noise mitigation may be necessary to meet thresholds for interior noise.

5.4.6.9 Public Services and Utilities

Implementation of this alternative would require connection to the NCSD water and sewer system. Operation of the facility would not likely generate an increased demand for emergency responders; however, incorporation of fire prevention and crime prevention design elements are recommended to further discourage activities that may require emergency response.

5.4.6.10 Transportation and Circulation

This site would be accessed from Division Street and Orchard Avenue. This intersection is signalized and striped. The facility would generate approximately 824 trips per day, and may contribute to deficient conditions at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. It is likely that no additional road improvements would be required for development of this location, aside from construction of a driveway consistent with County Public Works road standards.

5.4.6.11 Water Resources

Operation of the community center would require the use of approximately 2.52 afy of water. It is likely the NCSD can accommodate the facility. Incorporation of water meters and water conservation measures for both indoor and outdoor use is recommended to minimize demand. Development of the site may require disturbance of up to 2.85 acres, not including any potential offsite road improvements. Incorporation of BMPs and LID strategies is recommended to further reduce potential adverse effects to water quality during construction, and to avoid an increase in offsite stormwater flow.

5.4.6.12 Consistency with Project Objectives

This alternative is consistent with project objectives specific to the community center.

5.4.7 Community Center Alternative D (Hill Street and Grande Street)

This site is located between Grande Street and Hill Street, approximately 500 feet west of the Frontage Road. The parcel is approximately 9.6 acres in size, and is within the Residential Multi-family land use category. A planned unit development and retail development are proposed to the east, and the property to the west is vacant. Land uses along Grande Street include residences, greenhouses, and San Luis Bay Apartments. Land uses along Hill Street include multi-family residential development and a truck parking area.

5.4.7.1 Aesthetic Resources

This location is visible from US 101, predominantly from the southbound lanes. Highway frontage on the west side of the highway is urbanized and developed, including multi-family, condominium, and townhome residential uses, and the Vons shopping center to the north. Construction of a community center in this location would be visually compatible with surrounding uses; consideration of character and visual compatibility would be necessary to avoid adverse impacts to visual resources, including rural design elements, shielded and/or landscaped parking areas, use of natural exterior colors, and shielded exterior lighting.



Photograph 5-7. View from Grande Street to the northeast



Photograph 5-8. View from Hill Street to the southwest.

5.4.7.2 Air Quality

Construction and operation of the community center would result in short and long-term emissions. By itself, this element would not generate emissions exceeding identified thresholds. Standard mitigation measures to minimize the generation of fugitive dust (PM_{10}) are recommended.

5.4.7.3 Biological Resources

This site is undeveloped, and supports grassland and coastal scrub habitat. Mature stands of eucalyptus trees are located immediately offsite. No sources of surface water were observed onsite or in the vicinity. Seasonal botanical surveys are recommended to verify presence or absence of special-status plant species. Potentially affected species may include nesting birds, foraging raptors, and special-status avian and terrestrial species including white-tailed kite, burrowing owl, Monterey dusky-footed woodrat, American badger, and coast horned lizard. Implementation of standard mitigation is recommended to avoid adverse effects to these species, including pre-construction surveys.

5.4.7.4 Cultural Resources

This site is located in an area generally considered culturally sensitive. A Phase One Cultural Resources Survey is recommended to determine if significant cultural materials are present within or adjacent to the site.

5.4.7.5 Geology, Soils and Drainage

This topography of the project site is gently to moderately sloping. No evidence of geologic hazards, flooding, or adverse drainage conditions was observed. Standard mitigation measures, including preparation and implementation of a SWPPP, BMPs, and LID strategies are recommended to address erosion and stormwater management.

5.4.7.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

No known hazardous sites are present in this location. Implementation of BMPs to avoid public exposure to accidental spills or leaks during construction is recommended, due to the presence of residences in the vicinity.

5.4.7.7 Land Use

Land use impacts may include operational noise associated with the center, including trafficrelated noise and amplified sound and voices during the attendance of large events. This new use may require implementation of mitigation to avoid conflicts with adjacent residential uses.

Pursuant to County LUO Table 2-2 (Allowable Land Uses and Permit Requirements), indoor amusement and recreation facilities and public assembly and entertainment facilities are not listed as allowable uses within the Residential Multi-family land use category. Since the County is not required to obtain a discretionary use permit, this standard does not specifically apply to the project; however, the potential land use inconsistency is noted.

5.4.7.8 Noise

Operation of a community center in this location would generate traffic and other associated noise (i.e., voices, amplified sound), which may affect residential uses in the immediate area. Generally, the ambient noise level in this location is elevated, due to the presence of US 101;

therefore, the resulting increase in noise levels may not be significant. Incorporation of noise mitigation may be necessary to meet thresholds for interior noise. Outdoor use areas, if proposed, could be located on the western side of the structure to attenuate traffic noise from US 101.

5.4.7.9 Public Services and Utilities

Implementation of this alternative would require connection to the NCSD water and sewer system. Operation of the facility would not likely generate an increased demand for emergency responders; however, incorporation of fire prevention and crime prevention design elements are recommended to further discourage activities that may require emergency response.

5.4.7.10 Transportation and Circulation

This site would be accessed from Grande Street or Hill Street. The facility would generate approximately 824 trips per day, and would contribute to deficient conditions at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. Implementation of this alternative would require an assessment of existing roads to determine if road improvements, signalization, striping, or signage are necessary.

5.4.7.11 Water Resources

Operation of the community center would require the use of approximately 2.52 afy of water. It is likely the NCSD can accommodate the facility. Incorporation of water meters and water conservation measures for both indoor and outdoor use is recommended to minimize demand. Development of the site would not likely require disturbance of the entire 9.6 acres; however, substantial cut and fill may be necessary to accommodate a building pad. Incorporation of BMPs and LID strategies is recommended to further reduce potential adverse effects to water quality during construction, and to avoid an increase in offsite stormwater flow.

5.4.7.12 Consistency with Project Objectives

This alternative is consistent with project objectives specific to the community center.

5.5 Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA requires the alternatives section of an EIR to describe a reasonable range of alternatives to the project that avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects identified in the EIR analysis while still attaining most of the basic project objectives. The alternative that most effectively reduces impacts while meeting project objectives should be considered the "environmentally superior alternative." In the event that the No Project Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR is also supposed to identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. In this EIR the No Project Alternative results in the fewest environmental impacts, although it does not meet any of the project objectives.

As proposed, and with the incorporation of mitigation measures, the proposed project would not result in any significant, unavoidable, adverse impacts. Alternative Master Plan A would result in similar impacts as the proposed project. Key changes include the location of larger structures closer to West Tefft Street, as opposed to the interior of the park. Structural development along the road corridor may appear to be more consistent with the visual character of the area, and would maintain a more rural character within the park itself. Alternative Master Plan B would significantly reduce uses that require water supply exceeding existing demands. This alternative would also not generate traffic trips and air emissions associated with higher demand uses, such as sports fields and open turf. Upon sole consideration of environmental effects, this alternative is the Environmentally Superior Alternative. While this alternative minimizes potentially significant effects related to aesthetics (including the creation of light and glare), air quality, noise, and water supply, it does not fully meet the objectives of the project. Implementation of this alternative would not provide a range of passive and active facilities and use areas to meet the recreational needs of the community, and it would not effectively manage current and projected levels of park uses.

In the event Alternative Master Plan B is selected for approval, the County will need to address current and future public demand for active recreational opportunities and facilities within the community of Nipomo through other means. In addition, Alternative Master Plan B does not include a community center within NCP; therefore, consideration of an alternative location would be necessary to meet the project objective to provide a community recreation center within the community of Nipomo.

In the event the Parks and Recreation Commission and County Board of Supervisors do not determine that Alternative Master Plan B sufficiently meets the project objectives, then Alternative Master Plan A or the proposed project would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative. Implementation of Alternative Master Plan A or the proposed project would also be consistent with all County LUO standards specific to the community center.

If Alternative Master Plan B is selected as the approved project, consideration of an alternative site for the community center is recommended for consistency with project objectives. Two potential locations for the proposed community center appear to be environmentally superior: Alternative B, West Branch Street, and Alternative C, Orchard Avenue and Division Street. These locations could be developed with the least amount of ground disturbance, and do not appear to be constrained by sensitive environmental resources. Consideration of noise impacts and the surrounding residential communities may necessitate limits on use (i.e., no events past 10:00 pm) and amplified sound (interior use only). Further analysis of biological and cultural resources is recommended. The site between Grande Street and Hill Street may avoid impacting sensitive land uses.

All alternative locations are potentially inconsistent with the County LUO, primarily related to South County Nipomo Urban Area limitations on use. Alternative B West Branch Street is within the Office and Professional land use category; full consistency with the LUO would limit indoor amusement and recreation, and public assembly and entertainment. Alternative C, Orchard Avenue and Division Street, is within the Commercial Retail land use category, and limited allowable uses do not include public assembly and entertainment. In the event it is determined that full consistency with County LUO standards is desired, this determination may prevent or limit use of the community center in these alternative locations. Since the County is not required to obtain a discretionary use permit, this standard does not specifically apply to the project; however, the potential land use inconsistency is noted.

This page intentionally left blank.

CHAPTER 6 OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 GROWTH INDUCING IMPACTS

The growth inducing impacts section of this Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) addresses the effects the proposed project may have on surrounding facilities and activities by assessing the ways in which a project could encourage population or economic growth, increase employment opportunities or employment growth in support of an industry, or the construction of new housing or service facilities, either directly or indirectly.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines state that in the preparation of an EIR, growth inducing impacts that need to be addressed are such that "...foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing...remove obstacles to population growth...encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment either individually or cumulatively" (§15126.2 (d)). An example given is the expansion of a wastewater treatment plant allowing for increased construction in service areas.

The proposed project is identified in local government planning documents. It is proposed to address an existing demand for passive and active recreational uses and parkland within the County, and the community of Nipomo. The project would not create new jobs or require additional housing. Given its relatively small scale and limited function, the proposed project would not be considered growth-inducing. Impacts would be *less than significant*.

6.2 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines states that use of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of a proposed project may be irreversible if a large commitment of these resources makes their removal, indirect removal, or use thereafter unlikely. This section of the EIR evaluates whether the project would result in the irretrievable commitment of resources, or would cause irreversible changes in the environment.

As discussed in the Biological Resources section, Section 4.3, the proposed project would result in the conversion of <u>coastal scrub and</u> annual grassland to sports fields. While this use is intended to be long-term, the turf could be removed and the area restored to <u>coastal scrub</u> <u>habitat with focused effort</u>; therefore this change is not considered significant or irreversible. Construction of additional features and structures within NCP would result in an aesthetic change noticeable to the community; however, design standards are recommended to encourage visual compatibility with the rural character.

6.2.1 Irreversible Commitment of Resources

Non-renewable resources, such as natural gas, petroleum products, asphalt, steel, copper and other metals, and sand and gravel are considered to be commodities which are available in a finite supply. As discussed in Section 4.9, Public Services and Utilities, sources of energy consumption applicable to the project include interior and exterior lighting, interior heating and cooling, use of maintenance equipment, transfer of water supply, and operation of appliances. The overall demand for non-renewable resources is expected to increase regardless of whether or not the project is developed. Increases in population will directly result in the need for such resources, and they would likely be committed to other projects in the region intended to meet this anticipated growth. The project is of limited scale and therefore its contribution to this loss is limited.

As discussed in Section 4.12, Water Resources, and Section 4.13, Climate Change, the project would incorporate energy-efficiency measures to reduce water consumption (and subsequently energy used to transport water to the site) and use of utility-power and energy. In addition, there will be opportunities to include alternative and renewable energy sources (i.e., on-site solar panels) on existing and proposed structures within the park. The project also provides opportunities to reduce "Vehicle Miles Traveled", and subsequently fuel used for vehicles, by improving access for pedestrians and bicyclists, and providing additional active recreational facilities within the urban core of Nipomo.

CHAPTER 7 MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

7.1 STATUTORY REQUIREMENT

When a Lead Agency makes findings on significant environmental effects identified in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), the agency must also adopt a "reporting or monitoring program for the changes to the project which it has adopted or made a condition of approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment" (Public Resources Code §21081.6(a) and California Environmental Quality Act [CEQA] Guidelines §15091(d) and §15097). The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) is implemented to ensure that the mitigation measures and project revisions identified in the EIR are implemented. Therefore, the MMRP must include all changes in the proposed project either adopted by the project proponent or made conditions of approval by the Lead or Responsible Agency.

7.2 ADMINISTRATION OF THE MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

San Luis Obispo County Parks (County Parks) is the Lead Agency responsible for the adoption of the MMRP. As the applicant, County Parks is also responsible for implementation of the MMRP, in coordination with other County departments and government agencies. The County Land Use Ordinance (LUO) exempts the project from permit requirements; therefore, alternative milestones are identified to ensure proper timing of mitigation and verification that the measure was implemented.

According to CEQA Guidelines §15097(a), a public agency may delegate reporting or monitoring responsibilities to another public agency or to a private entity that accepts the delegation. However, until mitigation measures have been completed, the Lead Agency remains responsible for ensuring that the implementation of the measure occurs in accordance with the program.

7.3 MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING PROGRAM

Table 7-1 is structured to enable quick reference to mitigation measures and the associated monitoring program based on the environmental resource. The numbering of mitigation measures correlates with numbering of measures found in the Environmental Impact Analysis chapter of this EIR (refer to Chapter 4).

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
Aesthetic Reso	burces			
AES/mm-1	Prior to approval of the final design and development plan, site plans and architectural plans shall be submitted showing the community center and gymnasium a minimum distance of 150 feet from the existing park road.	Review and approval of plans	Prior to final design of community center/ gymnasium	County <u>General</u> Services Agency
AES/mm-2	 Prior to implementation of the Master Plan, comprehensive design guidelines shall be developed for the NCP. The design guidelines shall be developed in conjunction with community input and shall support the stated goals that park amenities be aesthetically consistent with the rural regional character of the area. For park improvements located along West Tefft Street, the NCP design guidelines shall be compatible with the West Tefft Corridor Design Plan. The design guidelines shall specifically describe architectural styles and forms, types, layouts, materials, colors, and other relevant details relating to all proposed park elements. The design guidelines shall be based in part on the following goals: a. The guidelines shall establish a consistent design theme for the NCP, addressing the proposed elements as well as existing features which may need replaced or refurbished in the future. b. In keeping with the rural aesthetic goals of the community, the design guidelines shall strive for an honest use of materials rather than faux or artificial applications. c. Site design and layout of structures and recreational elements shall be designed to accommodate substantial landscaping for the purpose of reducing the visual dominance of the built elements and blending with the natural setting. d. Site grading shall be minimized to the greatest extent feasible. The location, size, and orientation of structures, recreational features, parking areas, paths, and walkways shall be laid-out to minimize the need for earthwork. 	Review and approval of plans	Prior to implementation of the Master Plan	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>

Table 7-1. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	 Buildings and other structures shall use stepped foundations and/or partially buried walls where possible to minimize the need for grading. 			
	f. All visible earthwork shall utilize contour grading and slope rounding to achieve a natural appearance.			
	g. The use of visible retaining walls shall be minimized to the greatest extent feasible. Where retaining walls are required, their visibility shall be reduced through the use of materials, color, and planting. Retaining walls may be appropriate in certain circumstances in order to protect existing mature trees.			
	 Paved areas, including parking lots, recreation surfaces, and pedestrian areas shall strive for surface materials and colorings which blend with the natural ground plane to the greatest extent practical considering their intended function. 			
	 The visual prominence of all buildings and structures shall be lessened through the use of architectural form, style, external materials, colors and other appropriate measures. 			
	j. All signage shall have a consistent graphic design theme. Thematic variations would be appropriate considering the desired hierarchy of information to be conveyed, such as informational, directional, safety, etc.			
	 Lighting of signs shall be kept to the minimum required by safety and functional necessity. If lighting of signs is required, the signs shall not be internally illuminated. 			
	 Visibility of proposed and existing wireless communication facilities and equipment shall be reduced by coloring all visible components to blend with the surroundings and by screen planting. 			
	m. All proposed overhead utilities shall be placed underground to the greatest extent feasible. Where undergrounding is not feasible, their noticeability shall be minimized by placement in low visibility areas as much as possible. Required overhead utility poles shall be wood or wood-colored metal.			

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	 n. Existing overhead utilities shall be placed underground as future funding allows. A systematic strategy shall be developed for future utility undergrounding based on aesthetic priorities, opportunities created due to other construction work, maintenance benefits, and funding availability. 			
	o. Lighting within the NCP shall be based on the lowest level required by safety and functional needs. Light poles and fixtures shall be consistent with the park's established design theme. Where appropriate, low- height bollard style lighting should be used. Motion detectors should be utilized instead of continuous illumination for security lighting where appropriate and feasible.			
	p. All site amenities and furnishings such as benches, tables, shade structures, drinking fountains, bicycle racks, bollards and road delineators shall be consistent with the park's established design theme.			
	q. Noticeability of required security fencing as well as general functional-area fencing shall be minimized to the greatest extent possible through placement and the use of materials, color, and screen planting as appropriate. Standard un-coated galvanized chain-link fencing shall not be used. Razor-wire and barbed-wire shall not be used. Fencing and railing related to accessibility and safety shall adhere to Americans with Disabilities Act and other legally required ordinances.			
	r. Landscaping and other planting shall be used generously throughout the NCP to reduce overall visibility and noticeability of structures, parking lots and parked vehicles, paved surfaces, and to visually blend the built components of the NCP with the natural setting.			
	 s. Landscaping shall primarily use native plant material. t. Oak tree planting areas as described in the Master Plan shall be planted as part of the first phase of new park improvements to the greatest extent possible. 			

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
AES/mm-3	 Prior to approval of the final design and development plan for the community center and gymnasium, architectural plans of the community center and gymnasium shall be submitted showing the following: a. All facades should emphasize three-dimensional articulation to provide vertical, horizontal, and depth relief. b. The architectural style shall be consistent with the Design Guidelines described in mitigation measure AES/mm-2. c. Roofs should be varied and lessen the buildings' apparent height and mass. d. Roof materials and colors shall complement the building's architectural style. e. Roof-mounted equipment shall be screened to not be visible from public areas at the ground level and areas at higher elevations. f. Building colors and materials shall be visually compatible with the area. 	Review and approval of plans	Prior to final design of community center/ gymnasium	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>
AES/mm-4	 Prior to approval of the final design and development plan for the community center and gymnasium, landscape plans shall be submitted for review and approval. The plan shall be developed and signed by a licensed landscape architect and shall include the following: a. Screen planting along the north, south and east sides of the community center and gymnasium buildings. b. Screen planting shall reduce the visual scale of the buildings and visually blend the buildings with the natural setting. c. Planting shall visually screen a minimum of 50% of the community center and gymnasium buildings within seven years after construction. 	Review and approval of plans	Prior to final design of community center/ gymnasium	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>
AES/mm-5	Mature trees shall be saved to the greatest extent possible. Tree protection measures shall be implemented which include at a minimum the following:	Review and approval of plans; field inspection	Prior to final design of grading and construction plans;	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	 a. All mature trees in the vicinity of development shall be identified on preliminary site plans and final design plans. b. A tree preservation plan shall be prepared to be used as guidance throughout the life of the project. c. Project elements shall be sited to avoid existing trees to the greatest extent feasible. d. Earthwork shall be minimized in the vicinity of existing trees to the greatest extent feasible. e. Tree wells and slope-warping shall be used where appropriate to avoid impacts to root systems. 		during grading and construction activities	
AES/mm-6	 Prior to approval of the final design and development plan for the multi-use sports field lighting, a comprehensive multi-use sports field lighting plan shall be submitted for review and approval. The multi-use sports field lighting plan shall be based on a photometric study prepared by a qualified engineer who is an active member of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America. The multi-use sports field lighting plan shall be prepared using guidance and best practices endorsed by the International Dark Sky Association. The multi-use sports field lighting plan shall be prepared using guidance the following in conjunction with other measures as determined by the illumination engineer: a. The photometric study shall investigate different configurations of pole heights, pole spacing, and other variables which would result in the least amount of light visibility for the neighborhood south of the park. b. The point source of all sports field lighting shall be minimized by directing light downward and utilizing full cut-off fixtures or shields. d. Lumination from lights shall be the lowest level allowed by public safety standards. e. Any required lighting poles and related fixtures shall have a non-reflective finish. 	Review and approval of lighting plan; field inspection	Prior to final design of multi-use sports fields; upon installation of field lighting	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	the surrounding area.			
AES/mm-7	 Prior to implementation of the Master Plan, lighting plans shall be submitted for review and approval consistent with the following: a. The point source of all recreational and exterior lighting shall be shielded from off-site views. b. All required security lights shall utilize motion detector activation where feasible. c. Light trespass from recreational and exterior lights shall be minimized by directing light downward and utilizing full cut-off fixtures or shields. 	Review and approval of lighting plan; field inspection	Prior to final design of exterior lighting; upon installation of exterior lighting	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>
AES/mm-8	 Prior to approval of the final design and development plan, an erosion control and slope revegetation plan shall be submitted for review and approval consistent with the following: a. At a minimum, vegetative erosion control shall be applied to all areas disturbed by construction. b. The outer fringe areas of the multi-use sports fields cut slopes shall be revegetated with dune chaparral to blend with the adjacent natural landcover. c. After plant establishment and/or establishment of erosion control, no or little supplemental irrigation shall be applied to the multi-use sports fields cut and fill slopes. d. Vegetation on the fringe slopes surrounding the multi-use sports fields and the stormwater basins shall not be mowed other than to comply with California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) safety requirements. 	Review and approval of plans; field inspection	Prior to final design of the multi-use sports fields; upon implementation of plan	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>
Air Quality				
AQ/mm-1	Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall ensure that all required PM ₁₀ measures are shown on applicable grading or construction plans. In addition, the General Services Agency shall designate personnel to insure compliance and monitor the effectiveness of the required dust	Review and approval of plans; field inspection	Prior to ground disturbance; during grading activities	County <u>General:</u> <u>Services Agency</u> , San Luis Obispo APCD

Mitigation Measure		Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	control measures (as conditions dictate, monitor duties may be necessary on weekends and holidays to insure compliance); the name and telephone number of the designated monitor(s) shall be provided to the SLOAPCD prior to construction. PM10 measures shall include:				
	a.	Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible;			
	b.	Use water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour (mph). Reclaimed (nonpotable) water should be used whenever possible;			
	C.	All dirt stock-pile areas should be sprayed daily as needed;			
	d.	Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans should be implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities;			
	e.	Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading should be sown with a fast-germinating native grass seed and watered until vegetation is established;			
	f.	All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the SLOAPCD;			
	g.	All roadways, parking areas, and pathways to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used;			
	h.	Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site;			
	i.	All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance			

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	 between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with California Vehicle Code Section 23114. j. Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site; k. Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried on to adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water should be used where feasible; l. The General Services Agency shall designate a person or persons to monitor the fugitive dust emission and enhance the implementation of the measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints, reduce visible emission below 20% opacity, and to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the SLOAPCD Compliance Division prior to the start of any grading, earthwork, or demolition. 			
AQ/mm-2	 Prior to construction of the community center, ranger residence, restrooms, and swimming pool, the following measures (or similar measures meeting the intent of energy efficiency) shall be incorporated into the building and landscaping plans to the maximum extent feasible: a. Plan for a transit stop and associated amenities (i.e., covered turnout, direct pedestrian access, covered bench, smart signage, route information displays, and lighting); b. Incorporate outdoor electrical outlets to encourage the use of electric appliances and tools. c. Trusses for south-facing portions of roofs shall be designed to handle dead weight loads of standard solar photovoltaic panels. Roof design shall include sufficient south-facing roof surface, based on structures size and use, to accommodate adequate solar panels. For south-facing roof pitches, the closest standard roof pitch to the ideal average solar exposure 	Review and approval of plans; field inspection	Prior to construction of community center, ranger residence, restrooms, and swimming pool	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>

Mitigation Measure		Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
		shall be used.			
	d.	Increase the building energy rating by 20% above Title 24 (2011) requirements. Measures used to reach the 20% rating cannot be double counted.			
	e.	Plant drought tolerant, native deciduous shade trees along southern exposures of buildings to reduce energy use to cool buildings in summer and allow for solar warming in the winter. Maintain trees for the life of the project.			
	f.	Utilize green building materials that are resource efficient, recycled, sustainable, and available locally if feasible.			
	g.	Install high efficiency heating and cooling systems.			
	h.	Orient building to be aligned north/south to reduce energy used to cool buildings in the summer.			
	i.	Design building to include roof overhangs that are sufficient to block the high summer sun, but not the lower winter sun, from penetrating south facing windows.			
	j.	Utilize high efficiency gas or solar water heaters, and energy efficient appliances.			
	k.	Utilize double paned windows.			
	١.	Utilize low energy exterior lighting.			
	m.	Utilize low energy efficient interior lighting.			
	n.	Utilize low energy traffic signals (i.e., light emitting diode).			
	0.	Install door sweeps and weather stripping if more efficient doors and windows are not available.			
	p.	Install energy-reducing programmable thermostats.			
	q.	Use roofing material with a solar reflectance values meeting the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)/Department of Energy (DOE) Energy Star® rating to reduce summer cooling needs.			
	r.	Use native plants that do not require supplemental watering once established and are low ROG emitting.			
	S.	Provide and require the use of battery powered or			

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	 electric landscape and turf maintenance equipment. t. Use clean engine technologies (e.g., alternative fuel, electrification) engines that are not subject to regulations. u. Provide valet bicycle parking at community event centers, as feasible. 			
AQ/mm-3	 Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall ensure that all idling restrictions are shown on applicable grading and construction plans: a. Staging and queuing areas shall not be located within 1,000 feet of offsite sensitive receptors; b. Diesel idling within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors is not permitted (i.e., the operators shall turn the equipment off when there is a break in the work that the equipment is accomplishing); c. Use of alternative fueled equipment is recommended whenever possible; and, d. Signs that specify the no idling requirements must be posted and enforced at the construction site. 	Review and approval of plans; field inspection	Prior to ground disturbance; during grading and construction activities	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> , San Luis Obispo APCD
AQ/mm-4	Prior to removal or demolition of any buildings or utility pipes, the General Services Agency shall provide evidence they have contacted SLOAPCD to determine: a) what regulatory jurisdictions apply to the proposed demolition, such as the National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP; 40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 61, Subpart M – Asbestos); b) District notification requirements; c) the need for an asbestos survey conducted by Certified Asbestos Inspector; and d) applicable removal and disposal requirements of the asbestos-containing material.	Submit documentation to San Luis Obispo APCD	Prior to removal or demolition activities	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> , San Luis Obispo APCD
AQ/mm-5	 Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall: a. Conduct a geologic analysis to ensure the presence/absence of serpentine rock onsite. The geologic analysis shall identify if naturally occurring asbestos is contained within the serpentine rock 	Submit documentation to San Luis Obispo APCD	Prior to grading and construction	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> , San Luis Obispo APCD

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	onsite; and, if found, the applicant must comply with all requirements outlined in the Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measures (ATCM). In addition, the applicants shall work with the SLOAPCD to prepare a SLOAPCD- approved Asbestos Health and Safety Program and an Asbestos Dust Control Plan prior to development plan approval.			
Biological Reso	ources			
BR/mm-1	Prior to all ground-disturbing activities within sensitive areas, a qualified biologist shall provide pre-construction training to all workers involved in site activities. This training shall consist of instruction on special-status species with potential to occur on the property and their habitats. Workers shall be instructed as to appropriate contacts and how to proceed if special-status species are observed on the project site.	Provide documentation of training materials and sign-in sheet	Prior to ground disturbance within sensitive areas	Biological monitor, County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>
BR/mm-2	Prior to site disturbance, the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall prepare a Special-status Plant Mitigation Plan that provides for the propagation, planting, and monitoring of sand mesa manzanita at a 5:1 replacement ratio if it is determined that these specimens cannot be avoided during construction activities. The mitigation plan shall detail methods for transplanting, propagating, planting, and maintaining the special-status plant species that would be impacted. The replant area should be located at the biological mitigation receptor site (5.6 acres). To ensure the success of any planted or transplanted individuals, the mitigation program will include monitoring and reporting guidelines.	Review and approval of plan, field inspection	Prior to ground disturbance within sensitive areas, during implementation of mitigation program	Biological monitor, County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> , County Environmental Coordinator
BR/mm-3	A biological monitor qualified to capture and move legless lizards and coast horned lizards shall be present during all initial ground-disturbing activities, such as grading, excavation and vegetation removal. Improvements within the existing park infrastructure are not expected to impact these species, however, construction associated with the construction of the proposed field sport, basins, equestrian facilities, trails, picnic, and community center areas shall require a biological monitor. The monitor shall capture and relocate silvery legless lizards	Provide verification of biological monitor, provide documentation of monitoring activities	Prior to ground disturbance	Biological monitor, County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	and Coast horned lizards disturbed during tree clearance vegetation clearing and initial site grading. In addition, the monitor shall rake loose soil within oak woodlands, coastal scrub and maritime chaparral prior to excavation to find and move legless lizards. Efforts shall focus on relocation of silvery legless lizards and Coast horned lizards to safe habitat outside disturbance areas.			
BR/mm-4	 Prior to all ground-disturbance within Maritime Chaparral and Oak Woodland Habitat for proposed trail work, the following measures shall be implemented to minimize adverse impacts to Monterey dusky-footed woodrat. Removal of the woodrat nest would result in adverse impacts to the individuals occupying the nests. If future site improvements would impact any of the observed woodrat nests, the applicant <u>shall</u> implement the following minimization measures. a. A County-approved biologist <u>shall</u> assist in the removal of the nest after September 1 and before February 15. <u>Nest removal shall be avoided during the breeding season, to avoid separation of mothers from their young.</u> Under supervision of the biologist, the operators should remove all vegetation and other woodrat nest to be removed. b. Upon completion of clearing the adjacent woodrat shelter, the operator should gently nudge the intact nest with equipment or long handled tools. The operators should place their equipment within the previously cleared area and not within undisturbed woodrat shelter area. The objective is to alarm the woodrats so that they evacuate the nest and scatter away from the equipment and into undisturbed habitat. Once the woodrats have evacuated the nest, the operator should gently pick up the structure with a front loader and move it to the nearest undisturbed habitat. The objective of moving the structure is to provide the displaced woodrats with a stockpile of material to scavenge while they build a new nest; consequently, jeopardizing the integrity of the structure is not an issue. 	Provide verification of biological monitor, field inspection	Prior to ground disturbance within maritime chaparral and oak woodland	Biological monitor, County <u>General</u> Services Agency

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
BR/mm-5	 Prior to implementation of trail improvements, the <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> shall develop a Habitat Restoration Plan (HRP) for review and approval by the CDFG and the County Environmental Coordinator. The HRP shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and/or botanist and shall detail the methods for restoring or enhancing any areas of maritime chaparral habitat impacted within the NCP. The goal of the HRP shall be to mitigate any temporary or permanent impacts to maritime chaparral at the biological mitigation receptor site (5.6 acres). At a minimum, the HRP shall allow for the following mitigation ratios, site protection measures, and monitoring requirements: a. 2:1 restoration ratio for permanent and temporary impacts to intact maritime chaparral (for every one acre of intact maritime chaparral (for every one acre of intact maritime chaparral (for every one acre of intact maritime chaparral at the biological mitigation receptor site (5.6 acres) located within the NCP. b. The HRP shall include a site maintenance schedule, including weed abatement strategies and Best Management Practices. 1. Maintenance shall be conducted bi-monthly for the first three years or until the County Environmental Coordinator determines that further maintenance is not required. The maintenance period will begin immediately upon completion of the mitigation planting, and will continue for a three-year period. At the end of three years, the appropriate regulatory resource agencies will review the monitoring reports, evaluate whether the performance standards have been met, and determine whether the maintenance period will be ended or extended. 2. Water will be supplied to planted materials during the initial planting period. Supplemental water will be supplied on an as needed basis until the Environmental Coordinator determines that the plantings are self-sustaining. 	Review and approval of plan; field inspection	Prior to implementation of trail improvements, during implementation of mitigation program	Biological monitor, County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> , County Environmental Coordinator

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	3. Weed control will be necessary to mini- competition from exotic plants. Additio weed abatement will be required during maintenance period. Weeds shall be r by hand or through herbicide application herbicide applications are necessary, the be conducted by an individual holding a Qualified Applicators License. Weedin activities will be performed bi-monthly of the County Environmental Coordinator determines that the plantings are self- sustaining.	mize nal g the emoved ns. If hey will a valid g pr until		
	 Removal of trash and litter will occur or regular basis during the maintenance p Non-fruiting organic debris created fror removal of weeds may be left on-site if not significantly impact the establishme native seedlings. However, noxious we debris will be disposed of off-site to ave further invasions of the exotic species. 	n a veriod. n hand it will ent of eed bid		
	 Due to the sites proximity to public acc vandalism may be a problem. If vanda occurs at the site and plants are remov trampled, the County will replace the vandalized plants and take appropriate to prohibit further vandalism. 	ess, lism ed or actions		
	 The County Environmental Coordinato adjust specific replanting requirements needed, including species, quantities, a schedules. Species selection will be or with those currently occupying the imm area and at the direction of the Environ Coordinator. Any replanted vegetation monitored until the County Environmen Coordinator determines that the plantin self-sustaining. 	r will if and onsistent ediate mental will be tal ngs are		
	 At the discretion of the Environmental Coordinator, a single application of fert may be included with the initial plant 	ilizer		

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
Mitigation Measure	 Requirements of Measure installation. Subsequent applications, while not anticipated, are at the discretion of the Environmental Coordinator. The HRP shall include clearly defined restoration goals, annual performance standards and final success criteria. In order to accomplish restoration goals and objectives, a monitoring program will provide both quantitative and qualitative data to be used to determine the success of the mitigation and restoration areas. The County Environmental Coordinator will evaluate data indicating the relationship between actual site conditions and the performance criteria. Field monitoring and sampling will be followed by preparation of annual reports that include photo-documentation and evaluation of the success of the mitigation effort based on whether or not the annual performance goals for that year were met. The County's Environmental Coordinator will perform general monitoring site visits bimonthly during the first three years after planting, and semi-annually for the last two years of the monitoring program (refer to Table 4.3-4). General monitoring visits can be conducted concurrently with maintenance visits. The focus of general monitoring visits is to assess the restoration and mitigation area's need for water or other maintenance related issues. The County Environmental Coordinator will perform biological monitoring data collection annually throughout the five year monitoring visits is to assess the restoration and mitigation area's need for water or other maintenance related issues. The County Environmental Coordinator will perform biological monitoring data collection annually throughout the five year monitoring program. The focus of the biological 	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	 monitoring visits is to collect quantitative data that will provide an assessment of the sites vegetative cover and plant growth Annual performance standards have been 			

Mitigation Measure	Red	Requirements of Measure					Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	 effort. The performance standards are based on the vegetative structure found on-site prior to construction related disturbances. Table 4.3-4 lists the annual performance standards for growth and survival of planted species that are proposed for the mitigation and restoration areas. d. All restoration activities shall be monitored by a qualified biologist/Environmental Coordinator for a minimum of five years or until the final success criteria are attained. 1. At the end of the five-year monitoring period, the site will be evaluated to determine if the success criteria have been met. If the program is determined to be unsuccessful, the County Environmental Coordinator will recommend appropriate contingency measures. The mitigation site will not be considered successful until CDFG has provided written verification that the final success criteria have been met. 				hitigation re based site prior Table andards ecies that estoration y a r for a ess criteria g period, e if the le prograr e County nmend The successfu fication een met.				
	Performance Standards	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5			
	Total Percent of Native Cover	20%	25%	30%	40%	50%			
	Average Vigor Rating (see below)	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2	1,2			
	Percent of Non- Native Cover (excluding annual grasses)	<60%	<60%	<45%	<25%	<25%			
	Plant Survival	90%	85%	80%	80%	80%			
	Notes: The mitigation site m artificial irrigation) for	ust be self- a minimum	sustaining of two ye	(i.e., no m ars to be c	aintenance	e or			

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	successful. Plant survivorship may include original plantings, remedial plantings, or volunteers. Any remedial plantings will be monitored for five years from the date of installation or until the Environmental Coordinator determines that they are self-sustaining.			
	 Plant vigor and survival in the restoration and mitigation area will be monitored annually for five-years following plant installation. A plant is considered "surviving" if at least half of the foliage (or stem if deciduous) is green and flexible. Plant vigor will be measured as follows: 1 = excellent – vigorous healthy plant (no necrotic or chlorotic leaves) 2 = good – plant healthy with limited signs of vigorous growth 3 = adequate – plant healthy with no signs of vigorous growth and some necrosis or other damage present 			
	 4 = pool - low vitality, or main stem dead but basal sprouts emerging 5 = dead - no evidence of recovery Plant survival calculations will be based on the number of individual plants installed. Percent survival will be obtained by counting the number of surviving plants and dividing the result by the number of plants installed (initial and remedial installations). 			
	 Percent cover of native species will be obtained annually throughout the five year monitoring program. Percent cover calculations must be determined by a documented and field proven vegetation monitoring method such as Daubenmire, Braun-Blanquet, line-intercept, or similar. Another important monitoring activity is to 			

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	detect the presence and advance of invasive plant species, such as introduced pioneer species commonly found in disturbed areas. Russian thistle, perennial mustard, or other non-native species can also invade the restoration areas if left unchecked. Monitoring activities will determine the presence of such species and if action is required to control their advance.			
	 All wildlife observed in and around the restoration will be documented as to species, number, and functional use of habitat (i.e., feeding, nesting, etc.). Observations of the general habitat quality will be documented. 			
	 Permanent photo points will be established throughout the mitigation site to assist in tracking the success of the mitigation program. Permanent photo points will be established during the preparation of the as-built planting plan, and ground view photos will be taken during each monitoring year from the same vantage point. 			
	7. Typically, CDFG requires a mitigation and restoration completion report to be submitted at the end of three years. The applicant is responsible for preparing and submitting the report to CDFG within 30 days of the end of the three year maintenance program. The report must include photo documentation and detail the progression of the revegetation efforts.			
	 The annual reports must quantify growth and progress of the restoration plantings to determine if the performance criteria have been met. All three of the required reports must include photographs that document the revegetation progress over time. 			

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
BR/mm-6	Prior to implementation of trail improvements, the <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> shall retain a qualified biologist/botanist to supervise the implementation of the HRP. The qualified biologist/botanist shall supervise site preparation, implementation timing, species utilized, planting installation, maintenance, monitoring, and reporting of the revegetation/restoration efforts. The qualified biologist/botanist shall prepare and submit four annual reports and one final monitoring report to the County for review and approval by the County Environmental Coordinator. The annual and final monitoring reports shall include discussions of the restoration activities, project photographs, and an assessment of the restoration efforts attainment of the success criteria.	Submit annual reports and final monitoring report	Annual during implementation of monitoring program	Biological monitor, County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency,</u> County Environmental Coordinator
BR/mm-7	Prior to site disturbance and grading activities, the <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> shall submit an Oak Woodland Protection and Restoration Plan to be reviewed and approved by the County Environmental Coordinator. Oak woodland restoration shall be accomplished through one of three options: 1) replanting of oak trees removed from the oak woodland at the biological mitigation receptor site; 2) providing for the protection of oak woodland habitat in perpetuity through acquisition or donation of a conservation easement that includes at least 2,000 square feet per tree removed; or 3) providing funds to the California Wildlife Conservation Board to be used for the purchase of Oak Woodland Conservation Easements If Option 1 is selected, it may account for no more than 50% of the required mitigation required for oak woodland impacts and a conservation easement (or similar measure) shall apply. The biological mitigation receptor site is 5.6 acres.	Review and approval of plan	Prior to ground disturbance	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> , County Environmental Coordinator
BR/mm-8	 The Oak Woodland Protection and Restoration Plan shall include the following: a. For onsite planting and protection purposes, oak trees removed shall be replaced at a minimum 4:1 ratio, and impacted trees shall be replaced at a 2:1 ratio. b. Replacement oak trees shall be from regionally or locally collected seed stock grown in vertical tubes or deep one-gallon tree pots. Four-foot diameter shelters 	Review and approval of plan; field inspection	Prior to ground disturbance, during implementation of protection and restoration plan	Biological monitor, County <u>ParksGeneral</u> <u>Services Agency</u> , County Environmental Coordinator

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	shall be placed over each oak tree to protect it from deer and other herbivores, and shall consist of 54-inch tall welded wire cattle panels (or equivalent material) and be staked using T-posts. Wire mesh baskets, at least two feet in diameter and two feet deep, shall be use below ground. Planting during the warmest, driest months (June through September) shall be avoided. The plan shall provide a species-specific planting schedule. If planting occurs outside this time period, a landscape and irrigation plan shall be submitted prior to permit issuance and implemented upon approval by the county.			
	c. Replacement oak trees shall be planted no closer than 20 feet on center and shall average no more than four planted per 2,000 square feet. Trees shall be planted in random and clustered patterns to create a natural appearance. As feasible, replacement trees shall be planted in a natural setting on the north side of and at the canopy/dripline edge of existing mature native oak trees; and on north-facing slopes. Replanting areas shall be either in native topsoil or areas where native topsoil has been reapplied. A seasonally timed maintenance program, which includes regular weeding (hand removal at a minimum of once early fall and once early spring within at least a 3-foot radius from the tree or installation of a staked "weed mat" or weedfree mulch) and a temporary watering program, shall be developed for all oak tree planting areas. A qualified arborist/botanist shall be retained to monitor the acquisition, installation, and maintenance of all oak trees to be replaced. Replacement trees shall be monitored and maintained by a qualified arborist/botanist for at least seven years or until the trees have successfully established as determined by the County Environmental Coordinator. Annual monitoring reports will be prepared by a qualified arborist/botanist and submitted to the County Environmental Coordinator by October 15 each year.			

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
BR/mm-9	 To mitigate the balance of the oak woodland impact, one of the following measures, or a combination thereof shall be used: a. Prior to site disturbance and grading activities, the General Services Agency shall record a conservation easement that protects 2000 square feet of existing oak woodland habitat for each tree removed from the oak woodland in perpetuity. The conservation easement shall be controlled by a qualified conservation organization approved by the County Environmental Coordinator. Potential conservation organizations include but are not limited to: The Nature Conservancy, San Luis Obispo Land Conservancy, or the Cambria Land Trust. This mitigation measure may be used to satisfy the mitigation requirement for oak woodland impacts. b. If the County is not able to establish a conservation easement, the applicant shall provide funding to the California Wildlife Conservation Easements (currently approved entity to be used for the purchase of Oak Woodland Habitat Conservation Easements (currently established at \$970.00 for each tree removed and \$485.00 per impacted tree). This mitigation measure may be used to satisfy the mitigation requirement for the oak woodland impact. If the County is not able to establish a conservation easement, to part to be used for the purchase of Oak Woodland Habitat Conservation Easements (currently established at \$970.00 for each tree removed and \$485.00 per impacted tree). This mitigation measure may be used to satisfy the mitigation requirement for the oak woodland impact. 	Provide documentation of easement, provision of funding	Prior to ground disturbance	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> , County Environmental Coordinator
BR/mm-10	Prior to site disturbance and grading activities, the <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> shall prepare an Oak Tree Inventory, Avoidance, and Protection Plan as outlined herein. The plan shall be reviewed by a County-approved biologist and/or arborist, and shall include the following items:	Review and approval of plan; field inspection	Prior to ground disturbance within sensitive areas, during implementation of mitigation program	Biological monitor, County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency,</u> County Environmental Coordinator

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	 a. Comprehensive Oak Tree Inventory. This shall include the following information: An inventory of all oak trees at least five inches in diameter at breast height within 50 feet of all proposed impact areas. All inventoried trees shall be shown on plans. The species, diameter at breast height, location, and condition of these trees shall be documented in data tables. Identification of trees that will be retained, removed, or impacted. This information shall be shown on plans and cross-referenced to the shown on plans. 			
	 data tables described in item a. 3. The location of proposed structures, utilities, driveways, grading, retaining walls, outbuildings, water and wastewater facilities, and impervious surfaces shall be shown on maps. The applicant shall clearly delineate the building sites/building control lines containing these features on the project plans. 			
	 b. Oak Tree Avoidance Measures. Grading and development within proposed project shall avoid the removal of oak trees to the maximum extent possible. Such activities shall minimize potential disturbance to oaks and their associated root zones to the maximum extent possible. 			
	c. Oak Tree Protection Guidelines. Tree protection guidelines and a root protection zone shall be established and implemented for each tree to be retained that occurs within 50 feet of impact areas. The following guidelines shall be included:			
	 A qualified arborist shall determine the critical root zone for each retained tree on a case-by- case basis, based upon tree species, age, and size. This area is generally defined as 1.0 to 1.5 times the distance from the tree base of the average measurement taken from the tree base to the edge of the canopy/dripline. At a 			

Mitigation Measure	Requiremen	ts of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	minimum, the distance from tree.	critical root zone shall be the the trunk to the drip line of the			
	2. All trees to ren construction of marked for pro- their root zone Grading, utility placement of f fenced areas. cannot be avo constructed to Care shall be t within the top must be removing cleanly cut and ground surface approve any w zone.	nain within 50 feet of r grading activities shall be tection (e.g., with flagging) and fenced prior to any grading. trenching, compaction of soil, or II shall be avoided within these If grading in the root zone ded, retaining walls shall be minimize cut and fill impacts. aken to avoid surface roots I8 inches of soil. If any roots ved or exposed, they shall be a not left exposed above the e. The project arborist shall ork within the root protection			
	 Unless previou following activi root zone of ex trees: year-rou watering, unles native compati grading (includ compaction (e placement of in pavement); dis roots (e.g., tilli 	Isly approved by the county, the ties are not allowed within the tisting or newly planted oak nd irrigation (no summer ss "establishing" new tree or ble plants for up to seven years); les cutting and filling of material); g., regular use of vehicles); mpermeable surfaces (e.g., turbance of soil that impacts ng).			
	 The County sh trees to remain lower branches avoid making to susceptible to larger limb cut much more su infestation, 3) associated witt 	all minimize trimming of oak o onsite. Removal of larger s should be minimized to: 1) ree top heavy and more "blow-overs," 2) reduce having s that take longer to heal and are sceptible to disease and retain wildlife habitat values on the lower branches, 4) retain			

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	shade to keep summer temperatures cooler (retains higher soil moisture, greater passive solar potential, provides better conditions for oak seedling volunteers), and 5) retain the natural shape of the tree. The amount of trimming (roots or canopy) done in any one season shall be limited as much as possible to reduce tree stress/shock (10% or less is best, 25% maximum). If trimming is necessary, the applicant shall use a certified arborist when removing limbs. Unless a hazardous or unsafe situation exists, major trimming shall be done only during the summer months.			
BR/mm-11	Removal of vegetation and pruning of trees shall be conducted in the fall and winter (between September 1 and February 28), if possible, after fledging and before the initiation of avian breeding activities. If construction activities are scheduled to occur during the typical bird nesting season (from March 1 to August 31) a qualified biologist shall be retained to conduct a pre-construction survey (approximately one week prior to construction) to determine presence/absence for tree and ground nesting birds. If no nesting activities are detected within the proposed work area, noise-producing construction activities may proceed and no further mitigation is required. If nesting activity is confirmed during pre-construction nesting surveys or at any time during the monitoring of construction activities, work activities shall be delayed within 300 feet (500 feet if raptors) of active nests until the young birds have fledged and left the nest. In addition, the results of the surveys shall be passed immediately to the CDFG and the County, possibly with recommendations for buffer zone changes, as needed, around individual nests. Tree removal in riparian zones shall be monitored and documented by the biological monitor regardless of time of year.	Field verification	Prior to vegetation removal, tree removal, or tree trimming	Biological monitor, County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> , County Environmental Coordinator, California Department of Fish and Game (if required)
BR/mm-12	If tree removal occurs between September 1 and March 1, within seven days of ground disturbance or tree removal/trimming activities, a survey for wintering raptors shall be conducted. If surveys do not locate wintering raptors,	Field verification	Prior to tree removal or tree trimming	Biological monitor, County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> , County Environmental

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	construction activities may be conducted. If wintering raptors are located, construction activities shall observe a 500-foot buffer for the wintering location(s). A pre-construction survey report shall be submitted to the County Environmental Coordinator immediately upon completion of the survey. The report shall detail appropriate fencing or flagging of the buffer zone and make recommendations on additional monitoring requirements.			Coordinator, California Department of Fish and Game (if required)
BR/mm-13	Within two weeks prior to tree removal, a qualified biologist shall conduct a pre-construction survey for pallid bat and/or other roosting bats. If bats are not found, tree removal can proceed. If bats are observed, bat exclusion measures shall be instituted prior to disturbance. If maternal bat colonies are found they shall not be disturbed until young bats have left the site. Subsequently bat exclusion measures shall be instituted prior to disturbance.	Field verification	Prior to tree removal or tree trimming	Biological monitor, County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> , County Environmental Coordinator, California Department of Fish and Game (if required)
Cultural Resources				
CR/mm-1	 Prior to construction, the General Services Agency shall submit a monitoring plan, prepared by a subsurface-qualified historical archaeologist, for the review and approval by the Environmental Coordinator. The monitoring plan shall include at a minimum: a. List of personnel involved in the monitoring activities; b. Description of how the monitoring shall occur; c. Description of frequency of monitoring (e.g. full-time, part time, spot checking); d. Description of of vhat resources are expected to be encountered; e. Description of circumstances that would result in the halting of work at the project site (e.g. What is considered "significant" archaeological resources?); f. Description of procedures for halting work on the site and notification procedures; and, g. Description of monitoring reporting procedures. 	Review and approval of monitoring plan	Prior to ground disturbance within sensitive area	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> , County Environmental Coordinator
Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
-----------------------	---	--	---	--
CR/mm-2	During all ground disturbing construction activities, the General Services Agency shall retain a qualified historical archaeologist (approved by the Environmental Coordinator) to monitor earth disturbing activities within the documented historical site, per the approved monitoring plan. If any significant historical resources are found during monitoring, work shall stop within the immediate vicinity (precise area to be determined by the historical archaeologist in the field) of the resource until such time as the resource can be evaluated by the historical archaeologist or any other appropriate individuals. The historical archaeologist shall be allowed the time and funds necessary to document and retrieve any significant cultural materials that are unearthed.	Field inspection, documentation of monitoring activities	During ground disturbance within sensitive site	Archaeological Monitor, County <u>General Services</u> <u>Agency</u> , County Environmental Coordinator
CR/mm-3	Upon completion of all monitoring/mitigation activities, and prior to final inspection (whichever occurs first), the consulting historical archaeologist shall submit a report to the Environmental Coordinator summarizing all monitoring/mitigation activities and confirming that all recommended mitigation measures have been met.	Submit monitoring report	Upon completion of monitoring activities	Archaeological Monitor, County <u>General Services</u> <u>Agency</u> , County Environmental Coordinator
CR/mm-4	 In the event archeological resources are unearthed or discovered during any construction activities, the following standards apply: a. Construction activities shall cease, and the Department shall be notified so that the extent and location of discovered materials may be recorded by a qualified archaeologist, and disposition of artifacts may be accomplished in accordance with state and federal law. b. In the event archeological resources are found to include human remains, or in any other case when human remains are discovered during construction, the County Coroner shall be notified in addition to the Department so proper disposition may be accomplished. 	Include measure on grading plans, field inspection	During ground disturbance	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency,</u> Environmental Coordinator

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
Geology, Soils	s, and Drainage			
GSD/mm-1	Prior to initiation of each phase of development for major amenities requiring structural improvements and/or major grading (i.e., sports fields, parking, amphitheater(s), playgrounds, restrooms, pre-school and administration building, gymnasium, recreation center, pool, skate park, and courts), and as required by the County Environmental Coordinator, <u>the General Services Agency</u> shall prepare project-specific geo- technical reports. The reports shall investigate subsurface conditions within areas proposed for structural development and the findings and recommendations shall be incorporated into grading and construction plans, as appropriate.	Submit report, review and approve plans, field inspection	Prior to grading and construction of major amenities, during construction	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>
GSD/mm-2	 Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall prepare a site-specific erosion and sedimentation control plan. The plan shall include measures addressing short-term, construction related effects, and long-term soil stabilization. Grading and construction shall be conducted during the dry season (April through September) if possible. In the event grading occurs during the wet season (October through April), the following measures shall be incorporated into applicable grading and construction plans, and implemented prior to ground disturbance: a. Incorporate the use of silt fences, straw bales, perimeter ditches, water bars, temporary culverts and swales, sediment traps, minimal grading concepts, and similar techniques appropriate for the site. b. Erosion and sediment transport control structures shall be in place prior to the onset of seasonal rains. c. Restoration and re-vegetation of graded areas and unprotected slopes shall be completed as soon as possible following site disturbance. 	Review and approve plans, field inspection	Prior to ground disturbance, during construction	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>
GSD/mm-3	Prior to implementation of the first phase of the Master Plan, <u>the</u> <u>General Services Agency</u> shall prepare a stormwater drainage plan <u>in consultation with Public Works</u> , for inclusion in the Master Plan. The plan shall include a schedule for regular maintenance checks, and incorporate additional improvements	Review and approve plans, field inspection	Prior to ground disturbance, during construction	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	to existing facilities, including the installation of trash gates on drainage pipes, interception and dissipation of stormwater flow from impervious surfaces, and installation of storm drain inlets and engineered drainage courses.			
Hazards and Ha	azardous Materials			
HM/mm-1	 Prior to initiation of construction, the General Services Agency shall ensure that all required BMPs are shown on applicable grading or construction plans. In addition, the General Services Agency shall designate personnel to insure compliance and monitor the effectiveness of the required BMPs, which shall include: a. Prior to construction, staging and refueling areas shall be designated on applicable plans. b. Equipment refueling shall be done in non-sensitive areas at least 100 feet from any residence, school, and library, and such that any spills can be easily and quickly contained and cleaned up. Any necessary remedial work shall be done immediately to avoid surface or ground water contamination. c. Prior to commencement of grading/construction activities, the County shall ensure that a plan is in place for prompt and effective response to any accidental spills. All workers will be informed of the importance of preventing spills and of the appropriate measures to take should a spill occur. 	Review and approve plans, field inspection	Prior to ground disturbance, during construction	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>
HM/mm-2	 Prior to initiation of ground disturbance or construction within 400 feet of the edge of West Tefft Street, within the Nipomo Community Park, the General Services Agency shall ensure compliance with the following measures: a. Upon identification of a structure footprint or area of disturbance, exploratory trenches or borings shall be excavated to determine the presence or absence of dumped materials. Samples of the debris and soil shall be collected for laboratory analysis to evaluate whether the materials present any health or environmental concerns. 	Prepare report documenting testing, results, and remediation actions (if necessary)	Prior to ground disturbance within identified site	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	 b. Soil gas testing shall be conducted in and around any proposed building footprint to determine whether landfill gas is present, and whether it could accumulate in the finished building. Depending on the results of the soil gas testing, it may be necessary to incorporate design features that will prevent gas accumulation. Measures may include controlling the gas pressure (i.e., passive or active venting to reduce gas concentrations under the structure, venting around the perimeter of the structure, and crawl- space venting); eliminating available entry pathways or leaks (i.e., improving plumbing and caulking to reduce cracks and gaps will reduce entry pathways, install a low-permeability liner around the underground portion of the structure); and, installation of a landfill gas monitoring system. c. Prior to removal or relocation, soil and debris shall be tested for contaminants of potential concern to identify disposal or placement restrictions. Testing shall include analysis for metals, long-chain (semi-volatile) hydrocarbons, and semi-volatile organic compounds. Additional testing may be required depending on the specific nature of the materials to be removed from the site. 			
Noise				
N/mm-1	 Prior to expansion of the Nipomo Library, the proposed plans shall include the following or similar acoustical design measures to attenuate interior noise by 7 decibels, resulting in a measured interior noise level of 45 decibels or less: a. Air conditioning or a mechanical ventilation system. b. Windows and sliding doors mounted in low air infiltration rate frames (0.5 cfm or less, per American National Standards Institute (ANSI) specifications). c. Solid core exterior doors with perimeter weather stripping and threshold seals. d. Exterior walls consist of stucco or brick veneer. Wood 	Review and approval of plans, field inspection	Prior to expansion of Nipomo Library, test noise level prior to operation	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	 siding with a 0.5-inch minimum thickness fiberboard (soundboard) underlayer may also be used. e. Use of dual paned or soundproof glass for windows facing West Tefft Street (or similar measure). f. Roof or attic vents facing the south, north, and east shall be baffled. 			
N/mm-2	 Prior to construction of the skate park, the design plans shall incorporate the following noise reduction measures, <u>achieving a maximum average hourly noise level of 65 decibels as measured 25 feet from the edge of the skate park:</u> a. In-ground concrete design to minimize noise generation during use. b. Earthen berm between the skate park and the noise sensitive land uses. c. Fence and lock-able gate surrounding the skate park facility. 	Review and approval of plans	Prior to construction of skate park	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>
N/mm-3	During operation of the park, events and activities shall only be permitted during operating hours (6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.). Mowing, use of equipment, and other maintenance activities shall be limited to daytime hours, unless an emergency situation exists. Noise generated by loudspeakers and microphones shall be directed towards the interior of the park, away from surrounding residential areas.	Document in Master Plan, memorandum to park ranger, and include on event permits/rental agreements	During operation, upon hiring of new NCP employees, upon issuance of event permits/rental agreements	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>
N/mm-4	In the event substantiated noise complaints are received by the County, and the presence of the onsite ranger and/or park host is not sufficient to address received complaints, County Parks shall develop a park monitor program. The program may include volunteers or paid staff and shall provide for presence during key operations of the skate park to restrict playing of loud music and the use of loud voices. The monitor may be present during operating hours in the summer, and on weekends and afternoons during the winter. To prevent use of the skate park and pool during nighttime hours when the park is closed (10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.), County Parks shall install a fence and locked gate around the skate park or community pool.	Retain copies of substantiated complaints, document response to complaints	Upon receipt of substantiated complaint	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
Public Service	and Utilities			
PSU/mm-1	 While in the planning stages for development of any facility proposed in the Park Master Plan, and prior to any site disturbance activities related to development of such facilities, the General Services Agency shall coordinate with the Sheriff's Department for implementation of design strategies and safety measures to prevent and reduce crime, including "Crime Prevention through Environmental Design" standards and "Lighting and Lighting Systems" guidelines, including the following: a. After-hours access points to the park and community center should be protected with adequate security. As admission is necessary for emergency personnel, combinations to locks/lockboxes should be provided to Sheriff's Department Dispatch; b. Visible signage with hours of operation and any type of regulations should be strategically placed throughout the park, and properly maintained; c. Proper illumination should be provided inside structures, exterior doors, designated parking areas, entry and walkways to deter property crime and provide increased personal safety. Lights should be on timers, and a manual overrides should be available in case of a greater need for light. Proper care should be taken to ensure exterior lighting is properly shielded to prevent illumination that would affect the ambient level of light in the nighttime sky; d. County Parks shall provide the Sheriff's Department with accurate information indicating what park employees have access to which areas of any structures or access points; e. During construction periods of any significant proposed park facility or amenity, the construction site shall be temporarily forced off, with signage indicating that the area is off limits to the general public; 	Review and approve plans, field inspection	Prior to final design of park facility	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency,</u> County Sherriff
	f. All construction equipment shall be secured at the site after hours, with a complete recorded inventory kept			

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	 on file; g. Adequate lighting of the construction areas shall be implemented; h. Special care should be taken to avoid creating "hiding places" in alcoves or entry areas; i. Facility design should facilitate a clear view of the exterior of structures from the interior, and vice versa, to allow increased observation of any suspicious activity in either location; j. Sufficient lighting should be installed on the exterior and interior of any structures; and, k. All exterior doors should meet all safety requirements, should be solid core, and have adequate locks. 			
Transportation	, Circulation, and Traffic			
TR/mm-1	Upon implementation of the NCP Master Plan, the <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> shall coordinate with the Regional Transportation Authority, and establish a transit stop within Nipomo Community Park, if appropriate.	Document coordination efforts	Upon implementation of Master Plan	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>
TR/mm-2	 Upon development of high-traffic generating uses, including tennis courts, sports fields, amphitheater, and community center, a during periodic review of the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan, the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall re-assess the project's effect on the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. a. In the event the project would have a significant traffic impact, the County shall adopt Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures for implementation, as necessary, during peak times (Monday through Friday, 4:00 – 6:00 pm) including, but not be limited to: requiring reservation for specific uses, staggered scheduling of starting times for the sports fields, and limiting the size of community center events. b. County Parks shall coordinate with County Public Works to determine the appropriate <u>South County Road Improvement Fee Area 1</u> fees at the time development is proposed. In the event <u>South County</u> 	Prepare traffic study update	Prior to final design of high-traffic generating uses (i.e., tennis courts, sports fields, amphitheater, community center)	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	<u>Road Improvement Fee Area 1</u> fees are determined to be appropriate by Public Works <u>in accordance with</u> <u>Title 13.01 of the County Code, the General Services</u> <u>Agency</u> shall provide the fees prior to development of high-traffic generating uses (i.e., tennis courts, sports fields, amphitheater, and community center).			
Water Resourc	es			
WAT/mm-1	During any project resulting in ground disturbance, the <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> shall ensure that BMPs are included on all grading and construction plans, and implemented during grading and construction activities as suggested by the County LUO. BMPs shall include, but not be limited to, the following:	Review and approve plans, field inspection	Prior to ground disturbance, during construction	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u>
	a. Staking of hagging of grading footprint to minimize the area of disturbance;			
	 Designation of staging areas, including equipment and materials storage; 			
	c. Fueling of major equipment shall not occur on-site due to nearby sensitive receptors;			
	 Erosion control barriers shall be applied, such as silt fences, hay bales, drain inlet protection, and gravel bags; 			
	 Existing vegetation shall be preserved to the maximum extent feasible; 			
	 f. Disturbed areas shall be stabilized with vegetation or hard surface treatments upon completion of construction in any specific area. 			
	g. All inactive disturbed soil areas are required to be stabilized with both sediment and temporary erosion control prior to the onset of the rainy season (October 15 to April 15).			
WAT/mm-2	Prior to major grading (ground disturbance exceeding one acre), the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall prepare and submit a SWPPP to the RWQCB for review and approval. A copy of the plan shall be on-site during all major grading and construction activities.	Review and approve plans, field inspection	Prior to major grading (area exceeding one acre)	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency,</u> Regional Water Quality Control Board

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
WAT/mm-3	Prior to construction of drainage infrastructure, the <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> , in consultation with <u>Public Works</u> , shall prepare drainage plans incorporating BMPs and LID strategies suggested by the County LUO to minimize stormwater flow rates and off-site transport of pollutants, including sediment, hydrocarbons, and equestrian waste. BMPs may include, but not be limited to:	Review and approve plans, field inspection	Prior to construction of drainage infrastructure, upon construction of drainage improvements	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency,</u> County Public Works
	 Minimize parking area by incorporating striped and painted "compact-vehicle" spaces. 			
	 Incorporate grassed swales in lieu of paved curbs and gutters. 			
	c. Incorporate the use of alternative pavers, including gravel, cobbles, wood mulch, brick, grass pavers, turf blocks, natural stone, pervious concrete, and porous asphalt.			
	 Construct bio-retention areas (or raingardens) near parking areas and access roads. 			
	 Incorporate the use of swales to convey stormwater into <u>retention</u> basins (i.e., grassed channel, dry swale, wet swale, biofilter, or bioswale). 			
	f. Incorporate the use of infiltration basins in lieu of conventional detention or retention basins.			
	g. Install cisterns or rainbarrels near structures (i.e., library, community center, restrooms) to collect and filter stormwater from roofs and gutters and re-use for nearby landscaping.			
WAT/mm-4	Prior to expansion or addition of irrigated turf and landscaped areas, the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall conduct a water survey of existing irrigated turf and landscaped areas, in consultation with the NCSD, that shall include, but not be limited to, the following:	Review and approve water survey evaluation	Prior to expansion of irrigated areas	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency,</u> Nipomo Community Services District
	 Quantify irrigated areas based on vegetation type (i.e., turf, ornamental landscaping, trees). 			
	 Inspect and inventory the irrigation system, including timers, distribution lines, storage, and other infrastructure, and document needed maintenance and 			

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	 repairs. c. Develop irrigation schedule by month, based on precipitation rate and local climate. d. Document irrigation system performance and landscape conditions. e. Review irrigation schedule. f. Summarize water survey evaluation results and identify water savings recommendations, which shall achieve a minimum <u>50</u>% reduction in current water use. 			
WAT/mm-5	 Prior to expansion or addition of irrigated turf and landscaped areas, the <u>General Services Agency</u> shall demonstrate compliance with the water survey evaluation water savings recommendations, and shall submit documentation to the NCSD for verification. Water savings recommendations shall be applied to <u>existing and additional irrigated turf</u> and landscaped areas, and may include, but not be limited to the following: a. Computerized irrigation controller that can estimate cumulative evapo-transpiration losses to establish the most efficient and effective watering regimes. b. Avoidance of close mowing, overwatering, excessive fertilization, soil compaction and accumulation of thatch. c. Programming watering times for longer and less frequently rather than for short periods and more frequently. d. Installation of tensionmeters at different depths to measure moisture status, which will allow for better estimates on irrigation needs. e. Linking irrigation of the park to the California Irrigation Management Information System (CIMIS) station located at the Woodlands golf course to maximize irrigation efficiency. f. Implementation and maintenance of the most efficient and effective water regime for park irrigation consistent with best management practices, such as measures 	Review and approve water savings evaluation, field inspection	Prior to expansion of irrigated areas, upon implementation of water savings measures	County <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> , Nipomo Community Services District

Mitigation Measure	Requirements of Measure	Compliance Method	Verification Timing	Responsible Party
	identified by the California Urban Water Conservation Council and/or similar recognized organizations. g. Incorporation of recycled water from the Southland WWTF. e.h. Consultation with NCSD prior to implementation of major planned replacement, renovation, or construction of water-using facilities.			
WAT/mm-6	Prior to construction of additional restrooms, the <u>General</u> <u>Services Agency</u> shall retrofit existing toilets and sinks with low- flow appliances within the NCP. All new appliances shall be low-flow (1.6 gallons per flush).	Review and approve plans, field inspection	Prior to construction of new restroom facilities	County <u>General</u> Services Agency

This page intentionally left blank.

CHAPTER 8 REFERENCES AND REPORT PREPARATION

8.1 REFERENCES

8.1.1 Aesthetic Resources

- County of San Luis Obispo. 1998. *Design Guidelines*. County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building. November 1998.
- ———. 2006. South County Inland Area Plan. Amended November 2006. County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building.
- ———. 2009. *Title 21: Real Property Division Ordinance*. Revised February 2009. County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building.
- ———. 2010. *Agriculture Element*. County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building. Revised May 11, 2010.
- ——. 2010. *Conservation and Open Space Element*. County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building. Revised May 11, 2010.
- ———. 2011. *Title 22: Land Use Ordinance*. Revised September 2011. County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building.

8.1.2 Air Quality

- California Air Resources Board (CARB). 2009. Area Designations, Activities, and Maps. Available at: http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm. Accessed June 14, 2011.
- County of San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD). 2001. Clean Air Plan. Available at: http://www.slocleanair.org/business/regulations.php. December 2001. Accessed June 14, 2011.
- ——. 2007. Nipomo Mesa Particulate Study.
- ———. 2009. CEQA Air Quality Handbook, A Guide for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts for Projects Subject to CEQA Review. December 2009.
- . 2010. South County Phase 2 Particulate Study. February 2010.
 - —. 2011. San Luis Obispo County Attainment Status. Available at: http://www.slocleanair.org/air/pdf/2011/AttainmentStatus6Jan2011.pdf. Revised January 6, 2011. Accessed June 14, 2011.

8.1.3 Biological Resources

California Native Plant Society (CNPS). 2010. Electronic Inventory of Endangered and Rare Plants. Available at: http://cnps.site.aplus.net/cgi-bin/inv/inventory.cgi. Accessed July 2010.

- California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). 2010. Special Animals List. California Department of Fish and Game, Wildlife and Habitat Data Analysis Branch. Available at: www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/pdfs/spanimals.pdf. Accessed July 2010.
- 2010. Special Plants List. California Department of Fish and Game, Wildlife and Habitat Data Analysis Branch. Available at: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/pdfs/SPPlants.pdf. Accessed July 2010.
- ———. 2010. California Natural Diversity Data Base (CNDDB) Rarefind data output for the USGS 7.5-minute quadrangles: Nipomo, Twitchell Dam, Santa Maria, Oceano, Arroyo Grande NE, Guadalupe, Huasna Peak, Caldwell Mesa, and Tar Springs Ridge.
- Hickman, J. (ed.). 1993. *The Jepson Manual: Higher Plants of California*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Holland, R.F. 1986. *Preliminary Description of Terrestrial Natural Communities of California*. Sacramento, California: The Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game.
- Holland, V.L. and D.J. Keil. 1995. California Vegetation. Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing.
- Morro Group, Inc. 2004. *Nipomo Regional Park California Red-Legged Frog Habitat Assessment*. Prepared for County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building. June 4, 2004.

——. 2004. Nipomo Regional Park Constraints Analysis. Prepared for County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building. June 14, 2004.

- Remsen, J.V., Jr. 1978. Bird Species of Special Concern in California. Sacramento, California: California Department of Fish and Game. Wildlife Management Branch Administrative Report No. 78-1. 54pp. June 1978.
- Sibley, D.A. 2003. *The Sibley Field Guide to Birds of Western North America*. New York, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. April 29, 2003.
- Zeiner, D.C., W.F. Laudenslayer, Jr., K.E. Mayer, and M. White (eds.). 1990. California's Wildlife. Vol. I (amphibians and reptiles), Vol. II (birds), and Vol. III (mammals). Sacramento, California: California Department of Fish and Game, The Resources Agency, California Statewide Wildlife Habitat Relationships System. November 1990.

8.1.4 Cultural Resources

- County of San Luis Obispo. 2011. *Title 22: Land Use Ordinance*. Revised September 2011. County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building.
- Parker, J. 2002. *Cultural Resource Investigation of the Nipomo Community Park*. Prepared for San Luis Obispo County Parks. June 21, 2002.

8.1.5 Geology and Soils

Asquith, D.O. 1997. *Review of Potentially Problematic Faults in San Luis Obispo County*. Prepared for Fugro West, Inc. and the County of San Luis Obispo. January 28, 1997.

- California Geological Survey. 2002. *Guidelines for Evaluating the Hazard of Surface Fault Rupture*. Sacramento, California: California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey. Revised May 2002.
- County of San Luis Obispo. 1981. South County Area Plan Inland Portion Final EIR.
- Diblee, T.W. 2006. Geologic Map of the Oceano and Nipomo Quadrangles San Luis Obispo County, California.
- Earth Systems Pacific. 1994. Soils Engineering Report Proposed Tract 1924. April 26, 1994.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 1996. Flood Insurance Rate Map, County of San Luis Obispo.
- Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2008. Soil Survey Geographic (SSURGO) database for San Luis Obispo County, California, Coastal Part. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service.

8.1.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. 2001. Chapter 5 Landfill Gas Control Measures. Available at: http://www.atsdr.cdc.gov/hac/landfill/html/ch5.html. November 2001. Accessed September 24, 2011.
- ———. 2011. San Luis Obispo County Fire Department Access Road Standards. August 2011.
- California Department of Justice. 2011. Criminal Justice Full-Time Personnel by Type of Agency and Personnel Classification San Luis Obispo County. Available at: http://stats.doj.ca.gov/cjsc_stats/prof09/40/9.htm. Accessed November 10, 2011.
- California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA). 2011. Cortese List Data Resources. Available at: http://www.calepa.ca.gov/SiteCleanup/CorteseList/default.htm. Updated October 21, 2008. Accessed November 2011.
- CLRChoice, Inc. 2010. Nipomo, California Demographics Crime Rate Indexes. Available at: http://www.clrsearch.com/Nipomo_Demographics/CA/Crime-Rate. Accessed September 24, 2011.
- County of San Luis Obispo. 1999. *Safety Element*. County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building. December 14, 1999.
 - ——. 2003. Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Plan. County of San Luis Obispo, Office of Emergency Services. Updated February 2003.
- ———. 2008. San Luis Obispo County Emergency Operations Plan. County of San Luis Obispo, Office of Emergency Services. Revised December 2008.
- ———. 2011. *Title 22: Land Use Ordinance*. Revised September 2011. County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building.

- Earth Systems Pacific. 2011. Results of Site History Research and Exploratory Trenching. March 8, 2011.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). 2011. Crime in the United States, Table 10. U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Available at: http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2010/crime-in-the-u.s.-2010/tables/table-10/10tbl10ca.xls. Accessed September 24, 2011.
- 2011. Crime in the United States, Table 80. U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Available at: http://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-theu.s/2010/crime-in-the-u.s.-2010/tables/table-80/10tbl80ca.xls. Accessed September 24, 2011.
- Lewin, R. 2005. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection / County Fire (CAL FIRE). Personal communication, September 27, 2005.
- Fire Captain. 2010. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection / County Fire. Personal communication, March 17, 2010.

8.1.7 Land Use

- County of San Luis Obispo. 2007. *West Tefft Corridor Design Plan*. County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building. May 15, 2007.
 - ——. 2011. *Title 22: Land Use Ordinance*. Revised September 2011. County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building.

8.1.8 Noise

- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). 1998. *Technical Noise Supplement*. California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program. October 1998.
 - ——. 1998. Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol. California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program. October 1998.
- County of San Luis Obispo. 1992. *Noise Element, Part I Policy Document*. County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building. May 5, 1992.
- -----.1992. *Noise Element Technical Reference Document*. County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building.
- KM Acoustics. 2010. *Nipomo Community Park Master Plan EIR Noise Study Report.* November 25, 2010.
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). 1995. *Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance*. U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. June 1995.

8.1.9 Public Services and Utilities

- California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle). 2010. Facility/Site Summary Details: Cold Canyon Landfill Solid Waste DS (40-AA-0004). Available at www.calrecycle.ca.gov/SWFacilities/Directory/40-AA-0004/Detail. Accessed March 4, 2010.
- County of San Luis Obispo. 1999. *Safety Element*. County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building. December 14, 1999.
 - ——. 2006. Parks and Recreation Element. County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building. December 19, 2006.
- ———. 2010. 2009-2010 Annual Resources Summary Report. County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building.
- 2010. County of San Luis Obispo, Sherriff Department, South Station. Personal communications, March 17, 2010.
- 2010. South County Sanitary Service. Personal communications, March 11, 2010.
- Whittlesey, M. 2010. Solid Waste Coordinator, County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Public Works. Personal communications, March 12, 2010.

8.1.10 Transportation, Circulation and Traffic

Pinnacle Traffic Engineering. 2010. Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Environmental Impact Report Traffic Impact Analysis. April 26, 2010.

8.1.11 Wastewater

- Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). 2011. *Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coast Basin*. California Environmental Protection Agency, State Water Resources Control Board, Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Coast Region. June 2011.
- Douglas Wood & Associates, Inc. 2009. *Nipomo Community Services District Waterline Intertie Final Environmental Impact Report*. Prepared for Nipomo Community Services District. March 2009

Earth Systems Consultants. 1994. Soils Engineering Report: Mesa Meadows.

- LaCaro, D. 2010. Environmental Scientist II, Regional Water Quality Control Board. Personal communication, December 3, 2010.
- Morro Group, Inc. 2004. *Nipomo Regional Park Constraints Analysis*. Prepared for County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building. June 14, 2004.
- Nipomo Community Services District (NCSD). 2008. Waterline Intertie Project Preliminary Engineering Memorandum. May 2008.

- Nipomo Mesa Management Area (NMMA) Technical Group. 2009. *Nipomo Mesa Management Area 1st Annual Report, Calendar Year 2008*. Submitted April 2009.
- ———. 2011. *Nipomo Mesa Management Area 3rd Annual Report, Calendar Year 2010.* Submitted June 2011.
- Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). 2008. *Resolution R3-2008-0005 Amending the Water Quality Control Plan Revising Onsite Wastewater System Criteria.* Forwarded to State Water Resources Control Board and Office of Administrative Law for Final Adoption. June 2008.
- SAIC Engineering. 2006. Urban Water Management Plan 2005 Update. Prepared for Nipomo Community Services District. Adopted January 25, 2006.
- Terry, L. 2008. [Title], County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building. Personal communication, December 17, 2008
- Water Systems Consulting, Inc. 2011. 2010 Urban Water Management Plan. Prepare for Nipomo Community Services District. June 29, 2011.

8.1.12 Water Resources

- AECOM. 2009. Nipomo Waterline Intertie Project Concept Design Report. Prepared for Nipomo Community Services District. April 2009.
- Boyle Engineering Corporation. 2002. *Water and Sewer Master Plan 2001 Update*. Prepared for Nipomo Community Services District. March 2002.
- Boyle | AECOM. 2008. Nipomo Waterline Intertie Project Preliminary Engineering Memorandum. Prepared for Nipomo Community Services District. May 2008.
- California Department of Water Resources (DWR). 2002. Water Resources of the Arroyo Grande Nipomo Mesa Area, Southern District Report 2002. State of California, Department of Water Resources, Southern District. October 2002.
- ———. 2004. California's Groundwater, Bulletin 118 Santa Maria River Valley Groundwater Basin. State of California, Department of Water Resources, Central Coast Hydrologic Region. February 27, 2004.
- -----. 2009. Water Conservation Act of 2009. Available at: http://www.water.ca.gov/wateruseefficiency/sb7/. Accessed October 30, 2011.
- Cannon Associates. 2007. *Water and Sewer Master Plan Update*. Prepared for Nipomo Community Services District. December 2007.
- County of San Luis Obispo. 2004. *Resource Capacity Study Water Supply in the Nipomo Mesa Area.* County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building. November 2004.
 - <u>——. 2012. San Luis Obispo County Master Water Plan, Draft. January 2012.</u>

- Morro Group, Inc. 2004. *Nipomo Regional Park Constraints Analysis*. Prepared for County of San Luis Obispo, Department of Planning and Building. June 14, 2004.
- Nipomo Community Services District (NCSD). 2007. RE: Nipomo Regional Park Water Audit. September 26, 2007.
- ———. 2009. RE: Notice of Preparation Draft Environmental Impact Report, Nipomo Community Park Master Plan. December 22, 2009.
- Nipomo Mesa Management Area (NMMA) Technical Group. 2009. Nipomo Mesa Management Area 1st Annual Report, Calendar Year 2008. Submitted April 2009.
- <u>———. 2010. Nipomo Mesa Management Area 2nd Annual Report, Calendar Year 2009.</u> <u>Submitted June 2010.</u>
- ———. 2011. *Nipomo Mesa Management Area 3rd Annual Report, Calendar Year 2010.* Submitted June 2011.
- <u>———. 2012. Nipomo Mesa Management Area 4th Annual Report, Calendar Year 2011.</u> Submitted April 2012.
- Raines, Melton & Carella, Inc. (RMC). 2004. *Nipomo Drainage and Flood Control Study*. Prepared for the San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. February 2004.
- SAIC Engineering. 2006. Urban Water Management Plan 2005 Update. Prepared for Nipomo Community Services District. Adopted January 25, 2006.
- S.S. Papadopulos & Associates, Inc. 2004. *Nipomo Mesa Groundwater Resource Capacity Study, San Luis Obispo County, California*. Prepared for County of San Luis Obispo. March 2004.
- Water Systems Consulting, Inc. 2011. 2010 Urban Water Management Plan. Prepare for Nipomo Community Services District. June 29, 2011.
- WRAC. 2001. San Luis Obispo County Master Water Plan Rural Water Needs Current and Projected. Prepared for County of San Luis Obispo. March 30, 2001.
- ———. 2001. San Luis Obispo County Master Water Plan Update. Prepared for County of San Luis Obispo. March 30, 2001.

8.1.13 Climate Change

- Hendrix, M., and C. Wilson. 2007. White Paper on Global Climate Change Recommendations by the Association of Environmental Professionals (AEP) on How to Analyze Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Global Climate Change in CEQA Documents. Prepared for Association of Environmental Professionals. March 5, 2007.
- Office of Planning and Research (OPR). 2011. CEQA and Climate Change. State of California, Office of Planning and Research. Available at: http://opr.ca.gov/s_ceqaandclimatechange.php. Accessed January 2012.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2007. Climate Change – Health and Environmental Effects. Available at: http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/effects/health.html. Accessed April 2007.

8.2 LIST OF PREPARERS

This Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared by SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA), in association with the County of San Luis Obispo. SWCA Project Manager for the EIR was Shawna Scott, Senior Planner, and Project Director was Bill Henry, Office Director. The following is a list of individuals responsible for preparation of the EIR.

Responsibilities	EIR Preparer
Executive Summary Project Description Air Quality Climate Change Other CEQA Considerations Water Resources	Shawna Scott, Project Manager/Senior Planner, SWCA
Environmental Setting Cultural Resources Geology, Soils, and Drainage Hazards and Hazardous Materials Land Use Public Services and Utilities Wastewater Alternatives	Emily Creel, Environmental Planner, SWCA
Aesthetic Resources	Robert Carr, Landscape Architect
Biological Resources	Robert Sloan, Senior Biologist, SWCA
Noise	Dave Morrow, Air Quality Specialist, SWCA Karl Mikel, Environmental Engineer, KM Acoustics
Transportation and Circulation	Larry Hail, Pinnacle Transportation Engineering
Mitigation Monitoring Program Document Editing and Compilation	Jaimie Jones, Technical Editor, SWCA

CHAPTER 9 RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

The Response to Comments chapter of the EIR presents responses to comment letters that were received on the Draft EIR for the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan (NCPMP). These comment letters were received from multiple entities including federal, state, and local agencies, non-agency organizations, and the general public. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15132(d), this Final EIR presents the County of San Luis Obispo's response to comments submitted during the Draft EIR review and consultation process.

The letters of comment are in chronological order with the responses following the individual letters. Letters of comment are reproduced in total, and numerical annotation has been added as appropriate to delineate and reference the responses to those comments.

9.1 AGENCY COMMENT LETTERS AND RESPONSES

Respondent	Code	Contact Information	Page
State of California Office of Planning and Research State Clearinghouse and Planning Unit Letter dated: May 1, 2012	SCH	1400 10th Street Sacramento, CA 95812 www.ceqanet.ca.gov	9-2
San Luis Obispo County Department of Public Works Letter dated: March 7, 2012	PW	County Government Center, Room 207 San Luis Obispo CA 93408 Contact: Glenn Marshall, Development Services Engineer	9-5
San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Letter dated: April 30, 2012	APCD	3433 Roberto Court San Luis Obispo, CA 93401 <i>Contact: Gary Arcemont, Air Quality</i> <i>Specialist</i>	9-9
Nipomo Community Services District Letter dated: May 1, 2012	NCSD	148 South Wilson Street Post Office Box 326 Nipomo, CA 93444-0326 <i>Contact: Michael S. LeBrun, General</i> <i>Manager</i>	9-12

The following agencies have submitted comments on the Draft EIR.



EDMUND G. BROWN JR.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR'S OFFICE *of* PLANNING AND RESEARCH STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT



Governor May 1, 2012

> Steve McMasters San Luis Obispo County County Government Center 976 Osos Street, Rm 300 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040

Subject: Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR SCH#: 2009111067

Dear Steve McMasters:

The State Clearinghouse submitted the above named Draft EIR to selected state agencies for review. The review period closed on April 30, 2012, and no state agencies submitted comments by that date. This letter acknowledges that you have complied with the State Clearinghouse review requirements for draft environmental documents, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.

Please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613 if you have any questions regarding the environmental review process. If you have a question about the above-named project, please refer to the ten-digit State Clearinghouse number when contacting this office.

Sincerely,

Scott Morgan

Director, State Clearinghouse

1400 10th Street P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613 FAX (916) 323-3018 www.opr.ca.gov SCH-1

Do	cument	Details	Repo	ort
State	Clearing	house	Data	Base

ø	State cleaninghouse Data Dase
SCU#	20001111057
Broiget Title	2009 FF1067 Ninome Community Park Master Plan Brogram EIP
Lead Agency	San Luis Obisno County
Туре	EIR Draft EIR
Description	Note: Extended Review
	The proposed project consists of two connected park areas, Nipomo Community Park (137 acres), including the Nipomo Native Garden, and Mesa Meadows (22 acres), within the Recreation and Residential Suburban land use categories. The project site is located northwest of the Pomeroy Road
	/ Tefft Street intersection, approximately one mile west of Hwy 101, in the community of Nipomo.
Lead Agenc	cv Contact
Name	Steve McMasters
Agency	San Luis Obispo County
Phone	805-781-5096 Fax
email	1 da
Address	County Government Center
, ,	976 Osos Street Rm 300
City	San Luis Obispo State CA Zin 93408-2040
Project Loc	ation
County	San Luis Obispo
City	Nipomo
Region	
Lat / Long	35° 1' 53.76" N / 120° 30' 10.08" W
Cross Streets	Pomeroy Road and Tefft Street, Osage Street and Tejas Street
Parcel No.	091-313-047, -048, -049, and -050; 09
Township	Range Section Base
Proximity to):
Highways	Hwy 101
Airports	
Railways	
Waterways	
Schools	Lucia Mar USD
Land Use	Recreation/Residential Suburban
Project Issues	Aesthetic/Visual: Air Quality: Archaeologic-Historic: Biological Resources: Drainage/Absorption: Noise
	Public Services: Recreation/Parks: Sentic System: Soil Frasion/Compaction/Grading:
	Toxic/Hazardous: Traffic/Circulation: Vegatation: Water Quality: Water Supply: Wildlife: Leadure
	romornazaroous, francoorculation, vegetation, water Quality; water Supply; wildlife; Landuse
Reviewing	Resources Agency; Department of Fish and Game, Region 4; Office of Historic Preservation;
Agencies	Department of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; California Highway Patrol;
	Caltrans, District 5; Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 3; Department of Toxic Substances
	Control; Native American Heritage Commission
Date Received	02/27/2012 Start of Review 02/28/2012 End of Review 04/30/2012

Note: Blanks in data fields result from insufficient information provided by lead agency.

9.1.1 Response to State Clearinghouse Online Announcement of Filing

Comment No.	Response
SCH-1	Standard response letter noting filing. No changes to the EIR are necessary.



SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Paavo Ogren, Director

County Government Center, Room 207 • San Luis Obispo CA 93408 • (805) 781-5252 Fax (805) 781-1229 email address: pwd@co.slo.ca.us

MEMORANDUM

 Date:
 March 7, 2012

 To:
 Steve McMasters, Project Manager

 From:
 Glenn Marshall, Development Services Engineer Communication

Subject: Public Works Comments on the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject report. It has been reviewed by several divisions of Public Works, and this represents our consolidated response.

PW-1

County Public Works is responsible for reviewing public improvements including streets and utilities, as well as drainage and flood hazard, under the provisions of the Real Property Division Ordinance and the Land Use Ordinance. We are also responsible for reviewing encroachments within the public right-of-way under County Municipal Codes (Title 13) and the Streets and Highway Code. The Nipomo Community Park Master Plan DEIR appears to adequately identify anticipated build-out impacts and their associated mitigations with respect to traffic and circulation, drainage and flood hazard.

General Comments:

1.	Throughout the document where "County" is identified for implementing a specific mitigation then provide clarification as to which Department within the "County" has that responsibility. (For example, mitigation TR/mm-1 requires "County" to coordinate with RTA, replace "County" with either "County Parks" or "County General Services").	PW-2
2.	It is anticipated that County Parks will initiate early coordination of all future master plan development permits with County Public Works to ensure the appropriate traffic and drainage mitigations are in place prior to the specific facility opening to the public.	PW-3
3.	The EIR for the Nipomo Park Master Plan does not identify the drainage facilities that were constructed in the Native Gardens area that receives drainage from the east side of Pomeroy Road and the adjacent subdivision. Future park improvements must not negativity impact historic drainage patterns or basin capacity without the appropriate mitigation as approved by Public Works.	PW-4

PW-5 4. Circulation mitigations should include the widening Osage Street fronting the Park land to minimum County road standard. This is needed as the project proposes improvements to the Nipomo Native Garden including a parking lot, interpretive center and amphitheater. These improvements and the proposed path (trail) may impact removal of existing oak trees along Osage Street. PW-6 5. The plan indicates adding a midblock crosswalk on Camino Caballo between Osage Street and Pomeroy Road. The midblock location does not have appropriate sight distance given traffic speeds in that area. Public Works will not issue an encroachment permit for that improvement and recommend the trail crossing be relocated to the intersection of Camino Caballo and Osage Street. We already have a raised intersection feature at this intersection for slowing traffic. **PW-7** At the proposed entrance location on Pomeroy shows realignment to Juniper Street. This may 6. be problematic as the vertical curve south of the new entrance may not allow this intersection to meet County sight distance requirements. Moreover, the DEIR indicates the possible requirement for a Traffic Signal. Signal warrants must be addressed as part of the project mitigation and, from a pedestrian crossing consideration and not from a capacity point of view;

willigation comments	Mitic	ation	Comments
----------------------	-------	-------	----------

we believe that it would be necessary.

No.	Mitigation No.	Comments/Recommendations
7.	BR/mm-2	see General Comment No. 1, above
8.	BR/mm-4a	see General Comment No. 1, above
9.	BR/mm-5	see General Comment No. 1, above
10.	BR/mm-5a	see General Comment No. 1, above
11.	BR/mm-5b5	see General Comment No. 1, above
12.	BR/mm-6	see General Comment No. 1, above
13.	BR/mm-7	see General Comment No. 1, above
14.	BR/mm-9a	see General Comment No. 1, above
15.	BR/mm-10	see General Comment No. 1, above
16.	TR/mm-1	replace "County" with "County Parks"
17.	TR/mm-2	replace "County" with "County Parks"
18.	TR/mm-2a	replace "County" with "County Parks"
19.	TR/mm-2b	replace "in-lieu fees" with "South County Road Improvement Fee Area 1". Payment will be in accordance with Title 13.01 of the County Code.
20.	WAT/mm-2	see General Comment No. 1, above
21.	WAT/mm-3	see General Comment No. 1, above
22.	WAT/mm-4	see General Comment No. 1, above
23.	WAT/mm-5	see General Comment No. 1, above
24.	WAT/mm-6	see General Comment No. 1, above

Page 2 of 3

PW-8

Specific Comments:

No.	Page	Comments/Recommendations	
25.	4.1-21	Drainage basins designed to have a water depth greater than 2-feet with side slopes greater than 5:1 will require fencing per County Standards. The LUO specifies retention (not detention) basins on the Nipomo Mesa.	PW-9
26.	4.5-8		PW-10

Please contact me at 781-1596 or at the above address if we can be of further assistance.

\\Svr2900fs\divisions\Development_DEVSERV Referrals\Agency-SLO Co\Nipomo Community Park Master Plan\DEIR\NCP DEIR Comments.doc

Page 3 of 3

9.1.2 Response to Letter from San Luis Obispo County Department of Public Works

Comment No.	Response
PW-1	Comment noted. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
PW-2	The EIR has been clarified to identify that the County General Services Agency is responsible for implementation of identified mitigation measures. Please refer to clarified mitigation measures: TR/mm-1 and -2; GSD/mm-3; BR/mm-2, -5, -6, -7, -9, and -10; and WAT/mm-1 through -6. This clarification does not affect the impact determinations identified in the EIR.
PW-3	County Public Works is correct; The County General Services Agency will initiate early coordination with County Public Works, and no changes to the EIR are necessary.
PW-4	Please refer to EIR Section 4.5.1.1 (Geology, Soils, and Drainage, Geologic Setting, Drainage), which identifies a small-unlined infiltration basin within the Nipomo Native Garden Area. This basin is located to the north of an existing trail, which would be improved as part of the NCPMP. As noted in EIR Section 4.5.5.4 of the EIR (Geology, Soils, and Drainage, Rates of Soil Absorption, or Amount or Direction of Surface Runoff), and as required by mitigation measures GSD/mm-3 and WAT/mm-3, the project would not result in adverse impacts to historic drainage patterns or basin capacity, and County Public Works would review proposed drainage improvements prior to construction.
PW-5	As noted in EIR Section 2.3.3.1 of the EIR (Project Description, Access), implementation of the project will include widening of Osage Street and installation of a multi-use path. These improvements would result in the removal of oak trees and oak woodland habitat, which is addressed in EIR Section 4.3.6.2 of the EIR (Biological Resources, Native or Other Important Vegetation). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
PW-6	The proposed modification to the NCPMP can be accommodated to address County Public Works' concerns regarding the crosswalk as proposed the Draft EIR. The existing raised crosswalk and entrance to the Nipomo Native Garden would remain in place. This change to the Master Plan does not affect the impact determinations identified in the EIR.
PW-7	Please refer to EIR Section 2.3.3.1 of the EIR (Project Description, Access), which identifies installation of a traffic signal at the re-aligned Pomeroy Road/Juniper Street intersection as a part of the proposed NCPMP. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
PW-8	These recommendations have been incorporated into the EIR where appropriate, and as indicated in response to comment PW-2 above.
PW-9	EIR Figure 4.1-4, Conceptual Grading Plan for the Multi-Use Sports Fields and Stormwater Basins, is a conceptual plan intended to aid understanding and visualization of proposed improvements. All structures and stormwater management features would be constructed and maintained consistent with County Public Works standards and State Codes. As noted in EIR Section 4.1.5.2, Stormwater of the EIR (Aesthetic Resources, Effect on Visual Character and Quality, Visual Compatibility), fencing may be required around the proposed basins (also see representative photograph in Figure 4.1-16, Examples of Different Types of Stormwater Basins). This clarification does not change the impact determinations identified in the EIR.
PW-10	The EIR has been clarified to specify that the existing and proposed stormwater basins would be "retention" basins (refer to Section 4-1 Aesthetic Resources, Section 4-5 Geology, Soils, and Drainage, and Section 4-12 Water Resources, and mitigation measure WAT/mm-3). This clarification does not change the impact determinations identified in the EIR.

100% Post Consumer Recycled Paper



Air Pollution Control District San Luis Obispo County

April 30, 2012

Steve McMasters San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning and Building County Government Center San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

SUBJECT: APCD Comments Regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan (NCPMP)

Dear Mr. McMasters,

Thank you for including the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) in the environmental review process. We have completed our review of the DEIR for the proposed project located in the unincorporated community of Nipomo, northwest of the Pomeroy Road and Tefft Street intersection, approximately one mile west of Highway 101. San Luis Obispo County Parks proposes to implement the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan which would result in the phased construction of the recreation facilities and related infrastructure over a 20-year timeframe. The proposed project consists of connected park and open space areas, approximately 159 acres in size, called Nipomo Community Park (NCP), which includes the Nipomo Native Garden and roughly 22 acres known as the Mesa Meadows Open Space.

APCD staff would like to commend the project proponents for this project's promotion of land use development that provides an air quality benefit, such as the paved and unpaved trails. When people can walk or ride bicycles to nearby stores, parks and work, traffic is reduced. This is consistent with several of the District's land use goals and policies in the Clean Air Plan.

The following are APCD comments that are pertinent to this project.

As a commenting agency in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process for a project, the APCD assesses air pollution impacts from both the construction and operational phases of a project, with separate significant thresholds for each. <u>Please</u> address the action items contained in this letter, with special attention to items that are highlighted by bold and underlined text.

 APCD-2

DEIR for the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan April 30, 2012 Page 2 of 2

Mitigation Measures

Table 4.2-8 indicates ROG + NOx for Operational & Area Source is slightly greater than 35 lbs per day (35.25 lbs/day). Table 4.2-5 indicates 18 mitigation measures are recommended for combined ROG+NOx emissions of 35 to 50 lbs/day. A description of the selected measures should be included in the EIR.

Developmental Burning Effective February 25, 2000, <u>the APCD prohibited developmental burning of vegetative material</u> within San Luis Obispo County.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. If you have any questions or comments, feel free to contact me at 781-5912.

Sincerely,

Gary Arcemont Air Quality Specialist

GJA/arr

cc: Tim Fuhs, Enforcement Division, APCD Karen Brooks, Enforcement Division, APCD

h:\plan\ceqa\project_review\3000\3000\3002-3\3002-3.doc

APCD-3

APCD-4

PCD-5

9.1.3 Response to Letter from San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District

Comment No.	Response
APCD-1	Comment noted. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
APCD-2	Comment noted; please refer to responses below.
APCD-3	Please refer to AQ/mm-2, which includes 21 measures that would mitigate the potentially significant impact related to operational ROG and NO _x emissions. The intention of the list is to provide options for various proposed uses (i.e. energy efficiency, use of transit, clean engine technologies) as the NCPMP is implemented. In addition to these 21 measures, the project as proposed incorporates eight measures that would address this impact. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
APCD-4	Comment noted; the County General Services Agency intends to comply with APCD rules. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
APCD-5	Comment noted. No changes to the EIR are necessary.

NIPOMO COMMUNITY

BOARD MEMBERS JAMES HARRISON, PRESIDENT LARRY VIERHEILIG, VICE PRESIDENT MICHAEL WINN , DIRECTOR ED EBY, DIRECTOR DAN A. GADDIS, DIRECTOR



SERVICES DISTRICT

STAFF MICHAEL S. LEBRUN, GENERAL MANAGER LISA BOGNUDA, ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER PETER SEVCIK, P.E., DISTRICT ENGINEER TINA GRIETENS, UTILITY SUPERINTENDENT JON SEITZ, GENERAL COUNSEL

Serving the Community Since 1965 148 SOUTH WILSON STREET POST OFFICE BOX 326 NIPOMO, CA 93444 - 0326 (805) 929-1133 FAX (805) 929-1932 Website address: ncsd.ca.gov May 1, 2012 San Luis Obispo County Parks 1087 Santa Rosa Street San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 Attention: Shaun Cooper Via email to secooper@co.slo.ca.us Dear Mr. Cooper: NIPOMO COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT COMMENTS TO PROGRAM Re: ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT NIPOMO COMMUNITY PARK MASTER PLAN, LEAD AGENCY: SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY (COUNTY PARKS). Please accept this letter as providing comments of the Nipomo Community Services District NCSD-1 ("District") to the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) associated with the development of the Nipomo Community Park (Park) Master Plan. This letter was authorized by the District Board of Directors at its regular meeting of April 25, 2012. By way of background, the Nipomo Community Services District is a California Community Service District organized pursuant to Government Code Sections 61000 et seq. The District formed in 1965 and currently provides primarily water, wastewater, and solid waste disposal services to approximately 12,000 residents of the Nipomo area. The District boundary lies within the Nipomo Mesa Water Conservation Area (NMWCA) established by the County Board of Supervisors on May 23, 2006 (see Exhibit "A"). On June 26, 2007, the County certified a Severity Level III for water resources within the Nipomo Mesa Water Conservation Area. The County's Resource Management System indicates that a "Level of Severity III exists when water demand equals the available resource; the amount of consumption has reached the dependable supply of the resource. A Level III may also exist if the time required to correct the problem is longer than the time available before the dependable supply is reached." Further, the Nipomo Mesa Management Area Technical Group commencing with the first annual report (2009) has designated the groundwater basin under lying Nipomo Mesa Management Area (similar boundaries to the NMWCA) as a "potentially severe water shortage condition". A depiction of the Key Wells Index through Spring 2011 is attached as Exhibit "B". The Nipomo Community Park is located within the boundaries the NMWCA and the District. NCSD-2 The District currently provides the Park with potable water for irrigation purposes and amenities. Although available to the Park, the District does not currently provide wastewater treatment for Park facilities.

Nipomo Com Master Plan I	munity Park PEIR	May 1, 2012		
The District i proposed de	s implementing two key resource enhancement projects that dire velopment of the Nipomo Community Park as follows:	ectly impact the NCSD-3		
1.	The District is implementing a Wastewater Project that involve improved treatment facilities (Biolac) to upgrade the wastewat capabilities of the existing Southland Wastewater Treatment F immediately west of US 101 in the southern portion of the Cou Southland Wastewater Treatment Facility provides wastewate areas within the Nipomo Community Services District that are adjacent to the Nipomo Community Park. The Biolac system substantially the same) wastewater treatment process that is the by the County as part of the Los Osos Wastewater Treatment District is keenly interested in the recycled water component of Wastewater Project and the application of recycled water to in school district fields, and public parks.	s the installation of er treatment facility, located inty. The r treatment to immediately is the same (or being implemented Project. The f the Los Osos rigate golf courses,		
2.	The District is also implementing the construction of a waterlin Santa Maria to the Nipomo Community Services District to pro Water to various water companies located within the NMWCA aware, the County, as a property owner, is participating in the District to finance certain capital facilities related to this projec Supplemental Water Project will assist in remedying the water deficiencies/constraints within the NMWCA as certified by the Severity Level III).	e from the City of ovide Supplemental . As you are likely Assessment t. The County (Level of		
The propose a valuable co to demonstra	d improvements and additional facilities addressed in the PEIR v ommunity asset. From a resource constraint analysis, the project ate:	will clearly improve thas the potential		
1.	The value of a well designed and maintained irrigation system	<u>k</u>		
2.	The value of recycled water for approved irrigation uses.			
3.	A model of cooperation between the County and a Community to improve community assets while addressing resource cons	y Services District traints.		
The District supports the project and looks forward to working with the County to advance the project while addressing resource constraints as part and parcel of the Project Mitigation and Monitoring Program. The following are the District's specific comments to the PEIR's Wastewater Treatment and Water Use Analysis.				
WASTEWATER TREATMENT				
The District's new treatment process (Biolac) is superior to the use of septic tanks to treat wastewater influent generated by Park facilities. Further, the use of treated effluent (recycled water) to irrigate provides an optimal model for maximizing water resources through re-use.				
The connection of Park facilities to a community sewage treatment and collection system is consistent with Title 19 (19.07.022) of the County's Building Codes.				
2				

Nipomo Community Park May 1, 2012 Master Plan PEIR					
The Dis in the v	The District therefore strongly believes that the following Mitigation measure should be included in the wastewater portion of the PEIR.				
		"All P The N	Park facilities capable of generating wastewater shall be connected to Nipomo Community Services District Wastewater System."		
WATE	R USI	E			
In orde water d	r to p Iemar	rovide th nd (curre	he public and other affected agencies with an accurate description of Park ent and as proposed), the District suggests the following:	NCSD-7	
	1.	Modify water conse	y Table 2-2 to include two additional columns. One column for existing use for each facility and another column for proposed water use with ervation for each facility.		
	2.	Upda	ate Section 4.12 to include:		
		a)	Calendar 2009, 2010 and 2011 NMMA Annual Reports; and	NCSD-8	
		b)	The 2011 Update of the County's Master Water Plan.	NCSD-9	
	3.	Updat in esta	te Table 4.12-1 to include fiscal years 2009, 2010 and 2011. This will assist ablishing the base line for Park water use.	NCSD-10	
The Dis	strict	eports t	the following inaccuracies in the PEIR related to water use:		
4.12-2	Cor the Pai	rection: y are no ty.	Rural Water Company is one of the many signatories to the Stipulation, but of represented on the NMMA Technical Group other than as a Stipulating	NCSD-11	
4.12-2	Co peo Bla	rection: ple ove cklake \	: The paragraph beginning, "The NCSD serves approximately 12,000 er" is dated. The service area for water is no longer two systems; Village has been incorporated into a single distribution system by the NCSD.	NCSD-12	
4.12-4	Th pur der per on BM	e NCSD nping do nand or capita Novemb Ps in re	D conservation effort are focused on addressing LOS III for water and the lepressions near the ocean, the District's conservation goal is to reduce in the groundwater basin in our region by continued reduction in long-term use. The District implemented a 4- tier residential 'water conservation' rate ber 1, 2011. And has implemented a number of other CUWCC approved ecent years.	NCSD-13	
4.12-4	Cor the and	rection: propos Tar Sp	In the last paragraph on the page, the list of watercourses in proximity to sed project, consider omit Pismo Creek, Arroyo Grande Creek, Lopez Creek, orings Creek since these water bodies are not in the immediate area.	NCSD-14	
The project should maximize:				NCSD-15	
	1.	The u	use of water efficient irrigation systems.		
	2.	The u	use of recycled water to irrigate where appropriate.		
			3		

	Nipomo Com Master Plan F	munity Park May 1, 2012 PEIR			
The District strongly rec		District strongly recommends the following Mitigation measures:	NCS	NCSD-16	
	1.	All existing and future irrigation systems shall be designed and constructed to us recycled water with stub-outs for recycled water located at points designated by the District.	3e		
	2.	Provided that the District can provide recycled water to the Park that meets Title 22 requirements for Park irrigation at costs equal or less than existing water rates, the Park shall use recycled water for irrigation purposes.	NCS	5D-1	
	Specifically, t redline):	the District recommends the following changes to WAT/MM-4 and MM-5 (shown i	n		
	WAT services from	WAT Impact 4—Implementation of the project would create additional demand for water services from the NCSD.		NCSD-1	
	WAT/mm-4—Prior to expansion or addition of integrated turf and landscaped areas, the County shall conduct a water survey of the existing irrigated turf and landscaped areas in consultation with the NCSD, that shall include, but not be limited to, the following:				
	A. Iandscaping,	Quantify irrigated areas based on vegetation type, (i.e. turf ornamental trees).			
	B. storage, and	Inspect and inventory the irrigation system, including timers, distribution lines, other infrastructure, and document needed maintenance and repairs.			
	C. climate.	Develop irrigation schedule by month, based on precipitation rate and local			
	D.	Document irrigation system performance and landscape conditions.			
	E.	Review irrigation schedule.			
1	F. recommenda	Summarize water survey evaluation results and identify water savings ations, which shall achieve a minimum 50% 40% reduction in current water use.			
	WAT/mm-5—Prior to expansion or addition of irrigated turf and landscaped areas, the County shall demonstrate compliance with the water survey evaluation water savings recommendations, and shall submit documentation to the NCSD for verification. Water savings recommendations shall be applied to <u>existing and</u> additional irrigated turf and landscaped areas, <u>which shall and may</u> include, but not limited to the following:		5D-1		
	A. transpiration	Computerized irrigation controller that can estimate cumulative evapo- losses to establish the most efficient and effective watering regimes.			
	B. compaction,	Avoidance of close mowing, overwatering, excessive fertilization, soil and accumulation of thatch.			
	C. periods and	Programming watering times for longer and less frequently rather than shorter more frequently.			
		4			

Nipomo Community Park May 1, 2012 Master Plan PEIR D. Installation of tension meters at different depths to measure moisture status, NCSD-19 which will allow for better estimates on irrigation needs. (continued) E. Linking irrigation of the Park to the California Irrigation Management Information System (CIMIS) station located at the Woodlands golf course to maximize irrigation efficiency. Implement and maintain the most efficient and effective water regime for Park F. irrigation consistent with California Urban Water Conservation Council best management practices. Incorporation of recycled water from the Southland WWTF. G.F. We are encouraged by the County's forward looking plan for the Nipomo Community Park. We NCSD-20 see many opportunities for working together with the County to achieve a great enhancement to an already valuable community asset. Public open space, play fields and facilities, when correctly planned and built serve as a great example of water use efficiency and management. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project. Very truly yours, NIPOMO COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT Michael S. LeBrun Michael S. LeBrun General Manager Enclosure(s): Exhibits: A - Depiction of Nipomo Mesa Water Conservation Area B - Key Wells Index/Spring 2011

5




REPORT.: RUN: Run By.:	05/01/12 05/01/12 T Kathy	IME: 13:43		Т	Nig ransactic Custor	pomo CSD on History P: mer PAR0004	cint				PAGE: 001 ID #: MQCM CTL.: NIP	NCSD-23
Customer Location Rte/Servi Serv. Add Serv. Add City/St/Z	Id.: PAR000 Id.: 005023 .ce.: 005/48 ir: 136 PO ir: PARK Zip.: NIPOMO	4 20 MEROY RD , CA. 9344	4	Name Status Mailine Mailine Mailine City/S	g Addr.: g Addr.: g Addr.: t/Zip:	SLO COUNTY) Owner, Acti DEPT OF GENI 1087 SANTA) SAN LUIS OB	REGIONAL PA ve Customer SRAL SERVIC ROSA ST ISPO, CA. 9	RK, ES 3408	Last Billed Last Service. Current Due Late Due Total Due	: 03/08 : 02/29 : :	/12 /12 0.00 0.00 0.00	
Date	Water Serv	Water Use	Payment	Billed								
03/10/07	200.60	2924.94										
03/21/07 05/10/07	200.60	6813.84	-3125.54	3125.54								
05/21/07	200.60	10408.68	-7014.44	7014.44								
07/19/07	200.60	9662 22	-10609.28	10609.28								
09/17/07	200 60	8677 38	-9862.82	9862.82								
11/20/07	200.60	7730 52	-8877.98	8877.98								
01/18/08	200,00	029.52	-7940.12	7940.12								
03/19/08	217.87	928.26	-1146.13	1146.13								
05/10/08	217.87	8425.01	-8642.88	8642.88								
07/10/08	217.87	11032.16	-11250.03	11250.03								
09/10/08 09/23/08	217.87	11811.44	-12029.31	12029.31								
11/10/08 11/25/08	217.87	194.82	-412.69	412.69								
01/10/09 01/23/09	217.87		-217.87	217.87								
03/10/09 03/17/09	233.07	6235.62	-6468.69	6468.69								
05/10/09	233.07	9162.88	-9395.95	9395.95								
07/10/09	233.07	11830.58	-12063 65	12063 65								
09/09/09	233.07	10794.40	-11027 47	11027 47								
11/09/09	233.07	8398.62	-11027,47	11027.47								
01/10/10	233.07	5982.24	-0031.09	6031,69								
03/10/10	233.07	1322.52	-6215.31	6215.31								
03/23/10	233.07	4698.86	-1555.59	1555.59								
05/18/10 07/10/10	233.07	9719.08	-4931.93	4931.93								
07/16/10 09/09/10	233.07	12131.34	-9952.15	9952.15								
09/21/10 11/09/10	233.07	8001.04	-12364.41	12364.41								
11/23/10 01/10/11	233.07	2014.68	-8234.11	8234.11								
01/19/11 03/10/11	233.07	2492.60	-2247.75	2247.75								
03/18/11 05/10/11	233.07	5059.36	-2725.67	2725.67								
05/20/11 07/10/11	233.07	10021.90	-5292.43	5292.43								
07/15/11	233.07	10907.70	-10254.97	10254.97								
09/23/11	233.07	6655.86	-11140.77	11140.77								
11/18/11	252.56	3316.90	-6888.93	6888,93								
01/20/12	252.56	2410 80	-3569.46	3569.46								
03/20/12			-2663.36	2663.36								
Totals.:	6978.13	209775.25	-216753.38	216753.38								
						CACE UISTOR						
FIRC		UCHET CEDT	MBER OCT	PED NOVEMBED	DECEMBE		FEDDUNDY	MARCH	NDDII	MAN	UNE	
2005	6419 A			0 2078		0 1560		400	APKIL	2210	JONE	
2005	4675	0	6539	0 4966		0 2706	0	2102	0	413	0	
2008	5982	0	5553	0 + 4987		0 4448	0	486	0	4411	000	
2009	5743	0	5240	0 4077	-	0 2904	> 0	642	0	2281	0	
2012	4718	0	5295	0 3884		0 978	0	1210	0	2456	0	
AVERAGE	: 1754.91			/								
				/								
				/	r) . I . I						
				(mete	r to	uled						
				×								

	REPORT.: (RUN: (Run By.:)	07/12/05 07/12/05 : Kathy	FIME: 09:44			Ni Transacti Custo	pomo CSD on History Pr mer PAR0004	rint				PAGE: 001 ID #: MQCM CTL.: NIP	NCSD-23
İ	Customer 2 Location 2 Rte/Servic Serv. Add Serv. Add City/St/2	Id.: PAR00 Id.: 00502 ce.: 005/4 r: 136 P(r: 136 P(r: 136 P(ip.: NIPOM(D4 36 320 DMEROY RD DMEROY RD D, CA. 9344	4	Name Stat Mai Mai Mai City	us ling Addr.: ling Addr.: ling Addr.: //St/Zip:	SLO COUNTY I Owner, Activ DEPT OF GENI 1087 SANTA I SAN LUIS OB:	REGIONAL PAF ve Customer ERAL SERVICE ROSA ST ISPO, CA. 93	8K, 25 3408	Last Billed Last Service. Current Due Late Due Total Due	: 07/10 : 06/30 : :	/05 /05 0.00 0.00 0.00	(continued)
	Date	Water Srv	Water Use	Adjustment	Payment	Billed							1
1	01/10/02 01/23/02	64.50	423.36		-487.86	487.86							
	03/25/02	73.50	3321.10	i i	-3385.60	3385.60							
	05/22/02 07/10/02	73.50	6526.40		-4064.92	4064.92							
	07/22/02 09/09/02	73.50	8299.29		-6599.90	6599.90							
	11/09/02 12/02/02	73.50	5389.25		-5462.75	5462.75							
I	01/10/03 01/24/03	73.50	1467.08		-1540.58	1540.58							
-	03/18/03 05/10/03	77.20	3365.06		-1390.29	1390.29							
	05/23/03 07/10/03 07/24/03	77.20	7612.28		-3442.26	3442.26							
	09/09/03 09/23/03	77.20	7376.56		-7453.76	7453.76							
1	11/21/03 01/10/04	77.20	3122.24		-7502.04	7502.04							
	01/23/04 03/10/04	84.92	3484.71		-3199.44	3199.44							
	05/10/04 05/18/04	84.92	6276.70		-6361.62	6361.62							
	07/10/04 07/22/04	84.92	9671.18	-17898 20	-9756.10	9756.10							
	09/10/04 11/09/04	84.92	5986.78	8880.49		0.00							
	01/10/05 03/10/05 05/10/05	84.92 93.42 93.42	2338.62 669.28 3601.60	-2423.54 -762.70 -3695.02		0.00							
	07/10/05	93.42	7644.20	-7737.62		0.00							
	Totals.;	1/45./8	108241.53	-29708.29	-802/9.02	80279.02							
						WATER U	USAGE HISTORY	!					
2	FISC	JULY P	UGUST SEPT	EMBER OCT	OBER NOVEME	ER DECEMBI	ER JANUARY	FEBRUARY	MARCH	APRIL	YAM	JUNE	
+	2002 2003 2004 2005	6606 4920 5374 6418	00000	4454 6253 5208 5929	0 37 0 40 0 52 0 39	53 65 42 78	0 354 0 1116 0 2212 0 1562	0000	2510 1003 2321 422	0000	3014 2383 4170 2210	0000	
	AVERAGE:	1502.53	U	U	U	U	0 0	0	0	U	0	U	

.

RUN: Run By.:	08/13/04 Kathy	TIME: 09:04	•	T	ransaction Custome	History P Par PAR0004	rint ,				ID #: NOCM CTL.: NIP	NCSD
Customer Location Rte/Servi Serv. Add Serv. Add Serv. Add	Id.: PAR00 Id.: 00502 ce.: 005/4 r: 136 F	04 36 820 OMEROY RD OMEROY RD		Name Status Mailin Mailin Citu/S	g Addr.: 1 g Addr.: 1 g Addr.: 2 g Addr.: 3	BLO COUNTY I Wher, Acti DEPT OF GEN 1087 SANTA I	REGIONAL PARM Ve Customer ERAL SERVICES ROSA ST	<, 3	Last Billed Last Servic Current Due Late Due Total Due	: 07/10/ e.: 06/30/ :	04 0.00 0.00 0.00	(contin
Date	Water Srv	Water Use	Payment	Billed	c/arp c	DU13 00.	1310, GR. 334					
01/01/00	2523.00											
01/21/00	829.05		-2523.00	2523.00								2
03/23/00	3362 50		-829.05	829.05								
05/19/00	5767 15		~3362.50	3362.50								
07/24/00	5010 05		-5767.15	5767.15								
09/26/00	5010.05	8307 05	-5810.85	5810.85								
1/28/00	64.50	3307.03	-5371.55	5371.55								
01/24/01	64.50	3184.15	-3248.65	3248.65								
3/28/01	64.50	567.20	-631.70	631.70								
5/10/01	64.50	3907.76	-3972.26	3972.26								
7/24/01	64.50	8175.84	-8240.34	8240.34								
9/09/01 9/24/01	64.50	5507.36	-5571.86	5571.86								
1/09/01	64.50	4638.12	-4702.62	4702.62					я.			
01/10/02	64.50	423.36	-487.86	487.86								
3/10/02	64.50	3321.10	-3385.60	3385.60				5	979			
5/10/02	73.50	3991.42	-4064.92	4064.92					1~ .			
7/10/02	73.50	6526.40	-6599.90	6599.90					# a	017	71	
9/09/02	73.50	8299.29	-8372.79	8372.79					40 1	UT		
1/09/02	73.50	5389.25	~5462 75	5462.75								
1/10/03	73.50	1467.08	-1540 58	1540 59								
3/10/03	73.50	1316.79	-1390 29	1300.20								
5/10/03	77.20	3365.06	-1390.29	2442 26								
7/10/03	77.20	7612.28	-3442.20	3442.20								
9/09/03	77.20	7376.56	-7003.40	7463.30								
1/09/03	77.20	7424.84	-7455.76	7455.76								
1/10/04	77.20	3122.24	-7502.04	7302.04								
3/10/04	84.92	3484.71	-3199.44	3199.44								
5/10/04	84.92	6276.70	-3569.63	3369.63								
7/10/04	. 84.92	9671.18	-0301.02	0301.02								
//22/04			-9/56.10	9756.10								
otais.:	19954.81	110355.74 -	-130310.55	130310.55								
					WATER US	AGE HISTORY						
1SC	JULY P	UGUST SEPTEN	BER OCTO	BER NOVEMBER	DECEMBER	JANUARY	FEBRUARY	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	
002	4920	0	5253	0 4065	0	1116	0	1003	0	2383	0	
004	6418	0 5	0	0 5242	0	2212	0	2321	0	4170	0	
VERAGE	1583.91											
												*
		× .										



								•			4				•	ж. с			•	•	1	•	•	×.		•	3
rk water Use	led CF	6400	0300	0 <i>0L</i>	1400	32.66	0000 meter met works ag we	3700) tix it and part it back in	1600	6400	1600	0061	k water Use	1995	00764	2200	16700	2000	169900	108000	3(9300	3Isya	242,000	377000	006071		
12 2ª	Hun	1-25-93	2-24-93	3-26-93 5	H-28-93 16	5-25-93 18	6-25-93 11	7-26-43	8-30-93 6	2 -5-93 2	11-8-93 14	12-6-93 9	Par		1-6-45	2-6-95	3-6-95	4-6-95	·5-5-95	P-2:95	7-545	8-4-42		JF-1-95	1-2-45	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	12
water use 19.	44900	47600	88,200	2 48900	355800	330900	393400	317700	493500	. 51400	115400	00429		Park use	6621		×1- ×0	0,0001	01500	00151	297300	315100	292400	298000	228600	005291	8100
Park	26-22-1	22592	3-1592	50-CC-H-	5-26-92	16559-	69-16-1 -	C6-42-8	C28-82-6	26-92-01	26-52-11	26-82-21		•	ent () - -		カクリート		55-1-S	16-2-2	10-8-1	10-1-L	8-10-94	9-6-94	hb-9.01	- 49-7-11	Begu

NCSD-23 (continued)

9.1.4	Response to	Letter from	Nipomo	Community	Services	District
-------	-------------	-------------	--------	-----------	----------	----------

Comment No.	Response
NCSD-1	Comment noted. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCSD-2	Comment noted. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCSD-3	Comment noted. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCSD-4	Comment noted. The EIR has been clarified to summarize recent events affecting the Supplemental Water Project, Water Intertie (please refer to EIR Section 4.12.1 Existing Conditions, Potential Future Water Supply). This clarification and summary of new information does not affect the impact determinations identified in the EIR.
NCSD-5	Comment noted. Please refer to responses to specific comments below.
NCSD-6	As noted in the EIR (refer to Section 4.11.5.1 Violate Waste Discharge Requirements or Central Coast Basin Plan Criteria), in the event the County cannot demonstrate compliance with the Basin Plan, connection with the NCSD would be necessary. At this time, and upon review of current regulations, the proposed additional septic systems would be consistent with the Basin Plan and County Title 19 (Private Sewage Disposal Systems) design criteria. Therefore, while County General Services Agency is not required to connect to the NCSD sewer collection system, the project allows for future connection in the event it is either required based on applicable regulations or if County General Services Agency seeks this method of sewage collection and treatment (refer to EIR Section 4.11.5.3 Adversely Affect Community Wastewater Service Provider for a discussion of this option). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCSD-7	As provided in Table 4.12-1, Historic Water Delivery – NCP, 1999-2011, existing water demand has generally been consistent (with a few noted exceptions) over the past 12 years. The primary demand for water consists of irrigation of approximately 9.2 acres of open turf area and 5.3 acres of sports fields (approximately 46 acre-feet over the past three years). Table 4.12-2 presents the estimated additional water demand "worst case scenario", which represents the demand prior to implementation of conservation measures. EIR Section 4.12.5.5 Adversely Affect Community Water Service Provider, has been clarified to show how recommended water conservation measures would affect overall water use. The following summary has been added to the discussion, to further clarify why the residual impact would be less than significant: "Water conservation measures identified by the NCSD and incorporated into the mitigation measures above would reduce existing water demand by 50 percent. As noted in Table 4.12 1, Historic Water Delivery – NCP 1999-2011, the average annual water demand over the past 12 years is approximately 48 afy (excluding year 2009 when a meter failed). Application of these mitigation measures would result in a 24 afy reduction in water use for existing uses, and a 22 afy reduction in future anticipated water demand. Based on implementation of identified water conservation measures, the total anticipated demand would be approximately 46 afy (no net demand for additional water)."
NCSD-8	Section 4.12 (introductory paragraph) of the EIR has been updated to include the 2 nd through 4 th NMMA Technical Group Annual Reports. EIR Section 4.12.1 Existing Conditions has been updated to note the preparation and submittal of these annual reports. Please note the most current Annual Report (3 rd) at the time was reviewed during preparation of the EIR, and is cited in Chapter 8, References.
NCSD-9	Section 4.12 (introductory paragraph) of the EIR has been clarified to include the San Luis Obispo County Master Water Plan (January 2012).

Comment No.	Response
NCSD-10	Table 4.12-1, Historic Water Delivery – NCP, 1999-2011, has been retitled and updated to include additional information regarding water use during the years 2009, 2010, 2011. This additional information shows that water use has been generally consistent over the past 12 years, with some exceptions noted in the table. These clarifications do not change the analysis or impact determinations presented in the EIR.
NCSD-11	EIR Section 4.12.1 Existing Conditions has been corrected by removing "Rural Water Company" from noted NMMA Technical Group representatives. This is a minor clarification.
NCSD-12	EIR Section 4.12.1 Existing Conditions has been corrected as follows: "The service area consists of <i>one distribution system</i> " (as noted in italics). This is a minor clarification.
NCSD-13	EIR Section 4.12.1 Existing Conditions, Water Conservation has been clarified to note that the NCSD "has implemented water conservation measures, including a 4-tier residential "water conservation" rate (November 1, 2011) and California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC)-approved BMPs. Additional measures include development standards and target reducing consumption for high-use customers (such as the NCP)." Changes to the EIR are noted in italics. This is a minor clarification.
NCSD-14	Pismo Creek, Arroyo Grande Creek, Lopez Creek, and Tar Springs Creek are identified in EIR Section 4.12.1.1 Surface Water Resources and Watersheds because they are located within the Main Groundwater Basin. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCSD-15	Please refer to mitigation measures WAT/mm-4 and WAT/mm-5, which include measures for water efficient irrigation systems and incorporation of recycled water. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCSD-16	Due to the long-term nature of the NCPMP, the intent of the mitigation measures (WAT/mm-4 and WAT/mm-5) are to allow for a range of options (including use of recycled water) that would result in a reduction in water use for both existing uses and future anticipated demands. The General Services Agency will coordinate with the NCSD to incorporate the use of recycled water to the maximum extent feasible. The following language has been added to WAT/mm-5 to clarify this process: " <i>h. Consultation with NCSD prior to implementation of major planned replacement, renovation, or construction of water-using facilities.</i> " This additional clarification does not change the impact determination identified in the EIR.
NCSD-17	As noted in response to comment NCSD-16 above, the County General Services Agency intends to incorporate water conservation measures, including the use of recycled water, to minimize existing and future water demands. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCSD-18	Mitigation measure WAT/mm-4 has been modified to require <i>50%</i> reduction in current water use. This modification is agreeable to The County General Services Agency, and does not affect the impact determination identified in the EIR because it proposes a greater level of water conservation, further achieving the intent of the mitigation to reduce overall water demand.
NCSD-19	Mitigation measure WAT/mm-5 has been modified to state (refer to italicized text for modifications): "Prior to expansion or addition of irrigated turf and landscaped areas, the <i>General Services Agency</i> shall demonstrate compliance with the water survey evaluation water savings recommendations, and shall submit documentation to the NCSD <i>for verification</i> . Water savings recommendations shall be applied to <i>existing and</i> additional irrigated turf and landscaped areas, and may include, but not be limited to the following" and the addition of the following: ".f. <i>Implement and maintain the most efficient and effective water regime for park irrigation consistent with best management practices, such as measured identified by the California Urban Water Conservation Council and similar recognized organizations</i> ". This modification is agreeable to The County General Services Agency, and does not affect the impact determination identified in the EIR because it proposes an additional water conservation measure, further achieving the intent of the mitigation to reduce overall water demand.

Comment No.	Response
NCSD-20	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCSD-21	Exhibit A Depiction of Nipomo Mesa Water Conservation Area has been reviewed. This exhibit was previously reviewed during preparation of the EIR, and does not include new information for inclusion in the EIR analysis. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCSD-22	Exhibit B Key Wells Index was reviewed, and the figure does not include new information for inclusion in the EIR analysis. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCSD-23	Additional water supply information for years 2004, 2009, 2010, and 2011 has been incorporated into EIR Section 4.12, Table 12-1, Historic Water Delivery – NCP, 1999-2011. This additional information does not affect the impact determinations presented in the EIR.

9.2 NON-AGENCY ORGANIZATIONS COMMENT LETTERS AND RESPONSES

Respondent	Code	Contact Information	Page
California Native Plant Society Letter dated: March 28, 2012	CNPS	1530 Bayview Heights Drive Los Osos, CA 93402 Contact: David Chipping, CNPS-SLO Conservation Chair	9-27
Nipomo Off-leash Recreational Area, Inc. (Nipomo Dog Park) Email dated: March 30, 2012	NDP	jetspirit@gmail.com Contact: Linda Walden, Founder and President	9-31
South County Advisory Council Parks & Recreation Subcommittee Comments dated: April 8, 2012	PRS	PO Box 1165 Nipomo, CA 93444	9-33
South County Advisory Council Attached report and individual comments	SCAC	Council Officers and Members	9-35
Nipomo Parks Conservancy Letter dated: April 30, 2012	NPC	P.O. Box 2042 Nipomo, CA 93444-2042 Contact: Harry F. Walls, President	9-66

The following non-agency organizations have submitted comments on the Draft EIR.

California Native Plant Society

To: Steven McMasters, Project Manager County Planning & Bldg. Department 976 Osos St.. Room 300 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040

Wednesday, March 28, 2012

Comments by the San Luis Obispo Chapter of the California Native Plant Society on the Draft PEIR, Nipomo Community Park Master Plan

SCH. NO. 2009111067

The California Native Plant Society is a statewide non-profit organization of some 10,000 scientists, educators, and laypeople dedicated to the conservation and understanding of the California native flora.	CNPS-1
The San Luis Obispo Chapter of the California Native Plant Society is concerned with the losses of plant communities that are dependent on substrates of older dune sand, such as those covering the Nipomo Mesa. Nearly all of this habitat has been destroyed or severely degraded, and very little is in public hands where it can be protected. Destruction through development, eucalyptus plantations and agricultural conversion is found everywhere in the Mesa.	CNPS-2
We believe that the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan (NCPMP) fails to address or recognize this issue, and furthermore, the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DPEIR) fails to accurately describe vegetation types.	CNPS-3
The DPEIR identifies two alternatives (A and B), the essential difference between them being in the reductions of open space. Alternative A removes 1,088,510 square feet of the remaining 5,698,981 square feet of open space, which CNPS considers an intolerably high loss in a "Park". Alternative B removes 510,168 square feet, which is preferable to Alternative A but is still a loss of over 11 acres. CNPS considers these losses to still be extremely high and show a strong bias toward the constructed landscape and against the natural landscape.	CNPS-4
The principle areas of planned development and loss of existing habitat are in the center of the existing park, which is more intensively developed in Alternative A, and in the midsection of the southern edge of the park, in which sports fields are proposed in Alternative A but not in Alternative B. CNPS has less concern about development in the "annual grassland" in the center of the park than it does in the "coastal scrub" along the southern margin of the park.	CNPS-5
The DPEIR's description of plant communities is inadequate, using the simplistic WHR Classification rather than the Manual of California Vegetation 2 nd edition. The DPEIR	CNPS-6
Dedicated to the preservation of California native flora	۲

charactarizes NDDB's/Holland Central Dune Scrub (21320) as the more generalistic coastal scrub, thus failing to recognize it as being limited in distribution by the nature of	CNPS-6 (continued)
the soils. Just as old stabilized back dunes are a highly limited in distribution, so are the vegetation types that live on that substrate. While the DPEIR recognizes the rareity of the Maritime Chaparral and describes mitigation against loss of that community, there is no similar consideration given to the Central Dune Scrub, half of which would be lost in Alternative A to playing fields at the south end of the park. There is no mitigation described for losses to the Central Dune Scrub.	CNPS-7
The central area of the park where most of the development is planned is mapped as "Annual Grassland" in the DPEIR. As this consists essentially of non-native weedy species, including lots of perennial veldt grass, it should be pointed out that this has resulted from disturbance and removal of Central Dune Scrub. This area could be	CNPS-8
scrub in the vegetation, but with greater difficulty that in the areas described as scrub in the vegetation map. The degree of misunderstanding about the 'value' of this 'annual grassland' is manifested in Chapter 6.2 of the DPEIR which states that losses of the grassland to sports fields are not irreversible and that they could be restored. This is absurd, due to the changes in soil profile and chemistry that would be generated from irrigated turf and also to the restoration to the current condition has no value. It is true that they could return to 'ruderal', but not without great difficulty to an original native plant community.	CNPS-9
Vegetation Management	1
Vegetation management is not sufficiently addressed in the NCPMP or DPEIR. The NCPMP appears to recognize the value of certain vegetation types through planned avoidance, but does not contain any program for maintaining the natural plant communities. The Nipomo Mesa sand habitats are under severe attack from invasive veldt grass (<i>Ehrharta calycina</i>) and any long-term planning for NCP should involve plant community restoration, primarily though veldt grass control on a continuing basis. This could be funded through part of the mitigation, but the DPEIR fails to consider this as a issue. CNPS recommends that some funds currently dedicated to development and it's immediate mitigation be diverted to long term vegetation management.	CNPS-10
Water Supply	
Conversion of native flora to irrigated landscape and development is a poor choice in an area with severe water deficits. The current water use at NCP is between 40-60 afy (p. 4.12-3) and the projected added demand is 44.4 afy (p.4-12.10). Most agencies with water supply issues recommend using native drought-tolerant flora in parks or their equivalent, and thus the direction of the NCP runs counter to logic by essentially doubling water demand.	CNPS-11
Climate Change	
The section of the DPEIR on climate change does not include the word 'tree' or 'vegetation' while describing the project. The project replaces vegetation with hardscape, uses energy to both pump water, mow lawns and supply other functions of a developed	CNPS-12

park. Thus the park transitions from a carbon-absorber to a carbon emmitter over an increased area of the park. Regarding the cumulative impacts of all County actions, this is clearly going in the wrong direction.

CNPS thanks the County for this opportunity to comment.

Jairo & Chi

Please address any communication to:

David Chipping: Conservation Chair, CNPS-SLO 1530 Bayview Heights Drive Los Osos, CA 93402 (ph: 805 528-0914 email: <u>dchippin@calpoly.edu</u>)



CNPS-12

(continued)

Comment No.	Response
CNPS-1	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
CNPS-2	Comment noted. EIR Section 4.3.7 Biological Resources, Cumulative Impacts, has been expanded to further clarify cumulative habitat loss in the South County area. This clarification does not affect the impact determination presented in the EIR.
CNPS-3	Please refer to response to specific comment CNPS-6 below.
CNPS-4	The intent of the EIR is to assess the project as proposed, identify potentially significant effects, and present mitigation measures and alternatives to avoid or minimize identified significant impacts. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
CNPS-5	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
CNPS-6	The EIR applies an adopted and accepted method for vegetative classification (Holland 1986) (refer to Section 4.3.1.2 Biological Resources, Plant Communities and Habitat Types). While the underlying soils consist of older dune sand, the vegetation is dominated by coyote brush and California sagebrush, which are not typically dominant species identified in the central dune scrub vegetative classification. Therefore, the coastal scrub vegetative classification is appropriate for the project site. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
CNPS-7	As noted above, based on vegetative classification (Holland 1986) the habitat type was identified as coastal scrub, which is not a sensitive plant community. Therefore, no mitigation was identified. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
CNPS-8	The EIR documents existing conditions as noted upon initiation of the environmental review process. Also, as noted in response to comment CNPS-6, the dominant plant cover indicates a coastal scrub classification. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
CNPS-9	EIR Section 6.2 Other CEQA Considerations, Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes has been clarified for consistency with Section 4.3 Biological Resources, and to further state that focused effort would be necessary for restoration efforts if ever proposed (note clarifications in italics): "As discussed in the Biological Resources section, Section 4.3, the proposed project would result in the conversion of <i>coastal scrub and</i> annual grassland to sports fields. While this use is intended to be long-term, the turf could be removed and the area restored to <i>coastal scrub habitat with focused effort</i> , therefore this change is not considered significant or irreversible."
CNPS-10	The EIR evaluates the potential impacts of the project on the environment, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines. Mitigation measure BR/mm-5 (Habitat Restoration Plan), item b (weed abatement strategies) and item d.4 (invasive plant species) include measures requiring monitoring, identification, and management of weeds and invasive plant species. While this measure only applies to the proposed restoration area (as a mitigation requirement for the loss of sensitive habitat), it does not preclude application of invasive plant identification and eradication within other areas of NCP. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
CNPS-11	As stated on the comment, the EIR notes the additional water demand for development of additional sports fields. While the turf is not considered native, several measures are identified to reduce water demand for both existing and proposed turf areas (refer to WAT/mm-4 and WAT/mm-5). Also, please note mitigation measures WAT/mm-4 and WAT/mm-5 require a <i>50%</i> reduction in current water use, and similar water conservation measures for proposed uses, with the intention of achieving a "no net" increase in water demand beyond current conditions. The use of turf areas is, and will continue to be, shared by the public. Other landscaping would consist of native and drought-tolerant species (refer to mitigation measures AES/mm-2, item s; AQ/mm-1, item e; AQ/mm-2, items e and r). No changes to the EIR are necessary.

9.2.1 Response to Letter from California Native Plant Society

Comment No.	Response
CNPS-12	The County agrees that the project would require the use of water and energy to construct and operate, and the creation of additional parking areas and structures would reduce currently vegetated areas. However, as noted in Chapter 4.13 Climate Change, the development of these additional facilities would result in a decrease in vehicle miles traveled (VMTs), which is a key contributor to greenhouse gas emissions, and the primary source of emissions in San Luis Obispo County. In addition, the NCPMP includes additional native restoration within NCP, including an expansion of the existing oak woodland. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
CNPS-13	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.

Shawna Scott

From:	smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us
Sent:	Monday, April 02, 2012 10:54 AM
To:	Linda Walden
Cc:	Shawna Scott; secooper@co.slo.ca.us
Subject:	Re: Nipomo Dog Park

Linda,

I have included your comment to the EIR consultant to be responded to in the Final EIR, and I am copying this response to County Parks. Your concerns regarding the issues areas as a "Hazards/Safety" impact will be considered. In addition, your comments will also be considered in terms of the Master Plan (and the appropriate location of uses) itself.

Sincerely,

Steven McMasters Senior Planner, Environmental Division Department of Planning & Building County of San Luis Obispo (805) 781-5096 FAX (805) 788-2413

 From:
 Linda Walden <ietspirit@gmail.com>

 To:
 smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us

 Date:
 03/30/2012 10:08 AM

 Subject:
 Nipomo Dog Park

Steve:

I am Linda Walden, founder and President of the Nipomo Off-leash Recreational Area, Inc., i.e. Nipomo Dog Park. I have studied the map for the proposed build out.	NDP-1
As far as I have ascertained, this location was not brought up during any meetings nor was I as President contacted regarding any discussion of the proposed location.	
I am not a great meeting person as I am hard of hearing and have injuries which make it hard to be there, however Jackie stated that she NEVER heard it being discussed at meetings where objections could be made.	
I and others believe that this will be a danger to "jumping escaping" dogs and their owners in hot persuit on the very busy Pomeroy. This location would be difficult and more expensive to mitigate.	NDP-2
This location for the dog park has a safety issue that would be an impact.	
Would this come under the chapter of Hazards/safety as an overlooked impact?	

l'd appreciate any input. Linda Walden

1

9.2.2 Response to Letter from Nipomo Off-leash Dog Park, Inc. (Nipomo Dog Park)

Comment No.	Response
NDP-1	The County General Services Agency, County Parks facilitated several scoping meetings during development of the NCPMP in 2004, 2006, 2007, and 2009, including design workshops and opportunities for public comment (refer to Chapter 1 Introduction, Section 1.3 Scoping and Notice of Preparation Process, and Chapter 2 Project Description, Section 2.1.3 Initial Scoping, Section 2.1.4 Public Workshops and Scoping Meetings, and Section 2.1.5 Initial Study). The currently proposed location of the dog park was presented in the Notice of Preparation and associated scoping meeting.
NDP-2	Based on further review of potential hazards related to dogs escaping from the proposed dog park, the County finds that no significant impact would occur. The County Park Ranger has not documented any instances of escaped dogs associated with the existing dog park. The proposed dog park near the Pomeroy/Juniper park entrance will be enclosed by fencing and a double-gated entry similar to the existing dog park near the intersection of West Tefft and Pomeroy. Prior to development of the additional dog park, the County would coordinate with Nipomo Off-leash Recreational Area, Inc. (Nipomo Dog Park) regarding specific amenities including fencing. No changes to the EIR are necessary.

4/8/12	Comments on Nipomo Community Park Draft EIR Parks & Recreation Subcommittee South County Advisory Council	
The Parks and R Environmental I has consisted of meeting held fo preparing a list comments to th	Recreation Committee received copies of the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Draft Impact Report (DEIR) on March 2, 2012. Subsequent committee examination of the DEIR f individual and committee review as well as the gathering of community comments at a or that purpose on March 28, 2012. The DEIR review has been conducted with the goal of of observations that may assist the SCAC should they choose to petition for addition of the DEIR.	PRS-1
In compiling a li details of the m directed at vario involving the M included in this	st, the committee has attempted to avoid inclusion of comments concerning the aster plan, and to focus on the DEIR. A great many of the community comments were ous details of the Master Plan and could be used in future discussions and recommendations aster Plan implementation. Also there were many DEIR comments by individuals that are not list but are attached for SCAC benefit.	
The list of obser of the DEIR exec	rvations has been sorted by the impact classes listed on pages ES-12 to ES-14 cutive summary.	
Aesthetic Resou	urces	
1. The DEIR stat which "could may not han	tes that multi-use sports fields "could" accommodate 6 lighted soccer fields (ES-5) d" make the area a major complex for night games. Mitigation proposed in the DEIR ndle the intrusion of this many lights for 1.5 to 2hrs a game.	PRS-2
 Mitigation for and their pr 	or tree removal (4.1-33) does not seem to protect the oldest (100 years?) oak trees rotection seems to be a community goal.	PRS-3
Biological Reso	urces	
1. Mitigation fo	or tree removal (4.3-37) same as 2. above.	PRS-4
Hazards & Haza	ardous Materials	
 The DEIR doe evaluating the at events, or 	es not seem to take the location of the community center into consideration when he impact of crime in the park, nor does it consider types of events, use of alcohol r security required at events.	PRS-5
2. The mention to reduce cr	n of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPED) as having been proven ime is not relevant as the ordinance requiring it does not exist in SLO County.	PRS-6
Noise		
 Soccer fields sound may b the number 	normally do not use amplified sound, but if other sports are planned amplified be an issue for residents on Tejas St. depending on how many fields are used and of games played daily on those fields.	PRS-7
Public Services	& Utilities	PRS-8
See Attached R	eport	
Traffic		(L. L.
See Attached R	eport	

9.2.3 Response to Comments from South County Advisory Council Parks & Recreation Subcommittee

Comment No.	Response
PRS-1	Please refer to responses to specific comments below.
PRS-2	The EIR's analysis of aesthetic resource impacts, including the effects of lighting and impacts on the night sky, was conducted based on a worst-case scenario, including use of the multi-use sports fields between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. (refer to EIR Section 4.1.5.3 Effects of Light and Glare). Mitigation measure AES/mm-6 addresses potentially significant impacts resulting from use of lighted multi-use sports fields, based on this worst case scenario. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
PRS-3	Referenced mitigation measure AES/mm-5 is included to require the protection of all mature trees, regardless of age or species type, to the maximum extent feasible. The intent of this measure is to preserve the aesthetic benefit provided by established trees and vegetation within NCP. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
PRS-4	The intention of the NCPMP is to avoid removal of oak trees to the maximum extent feasible. Existing and future conditions related to circulation and traffic safety necessitate improvements, which would require the removal or impacts to mature oak trees. All oak trees with a diameter greater than 5 inches (as measured at breast height) are considered sensitive, regardless of age. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
PRS-5	As discussed in EIR Section 4.9.5.1 Public Services and Utilities, Effect Upon or Result in New or Altered Public Services, the development of additional facilities within NCP, including a community center, may create an additional demand for police response. Mitigation is recommended to reduce the potential need for police response (refer to mitigation measure PSU/mm-1), and an alternative (Alternative A) is assessed, which locates the community center adjacent to West Tefft Street (refer to EIR Section 5.3.2.1 Alternatives, Alternative Master Plan A). While specific event types and other details (i.e. alcohol, security) are not included in the NCPMP at this time, the EIR considers a worst-case scenario, within the bounds of existing laws and regulations, such as park closure (10:00 pm) and the County General Services Agency permitting system, which currently includes restrictions and requirements related to noise, alcohol, and security. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
PRS-6	Please refer to mitigation measure PSU/mm-1, which incorporates relevant standards and guidelines identified in the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPED) document. Compliance with adopted mitigation measures is required regardless of the status of the ordinance. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
PRS-7	As noted in EIR Section 4.8.5.1 Exposure to Noise Levels Exceeding County Thresholds, Stationary Noise, additional sources of noise within NCP includes amplified sound. Use of amplified sound is allowed at the discretion of the Count General Services Agency, and as required by mitigation measure N/mm-3, the use of microphones or loudspeakers shall be directed towards the interior of the park. In addition to the presence of the park ranger (daytime) and park host (nighttime), mitigation measure N/mm-4 includes a requirement for a park monitor program if necessary. These measures were proposed to address identified potentially significant impacts to sensitive noise receptors, including the residents along Tejas Street. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
PRS-8	Please refer to responses to specific comments below.

R.W. WRIGHT

Nipomo Community Park DEIR issues

1. Public Safety Concerns:

к. ¹. 7 К. ¹. К.

The DEIR states that, "Currently, the Sheriff's Department is understaffed and with the cumulative impact of approved development, response times most likely will increase the current average response times to the project area range between five and 30 minutes, depending upon the nature of the call and the location of patrol vehicles at the time of the call." (4.9.1.3) PSU Impact 1 (4.9.5.1) indicated that the development of the proposed park facilities may result in increased demands on Sheriff's Department services, resulting in a "potentially significant impact".	SCAC-1
PSU/mm-1 The Sheriff's Department recommended several safety measures in conjunction with development of additional park facilities, including "Crime Prevention through Environment Design" (CPTED) and lighting system guidelines. (4.9.5.1)	
CPTED requires an ordinance that mandates specific standards and design features for all development projects. The provisions of a CPTED ordinance would require that projects be reviewed by a trained crime prevention specialist. San Luis Obispo County does not currently have such an ordinance in place.	
Additionally, any mitigation of the significant public safety impact of this park development needs to be based upon issues that the DEIR has not addressed. Specifically, those issues include:	SCAC-2
 Regulations involving the use of facilities within the park; including the hours of operation, the types of events permitted, whether the Community Center would have events permitting alcoholic beverages and the requirement of security guards. 	
2. The final location of the community recreation center; whether it is within the park, on the edge of the park or at one of the alternative locations would require different levels of mitigation.	SCAC-3
 Comparable crime statistics for similar parks, with and without community recreation centers, including "called for services" and the number of emergency medical requests. 	SCAC-4

۴. ۲		
	4.10 Traffic and Circulation Impacts	
	General	
	All the traffic tables are from 2009 or earlier. There is a need for more current data.	SCAC-5
	<u>TR/mm-1</u> – Asking the RTA to approve a local fixed route transit expansion <u>does not mitigate</u> the traffic impacts created by this proposal. It is well known that Nipomo does not have sufficient population density to justify transit expansion and this request to RTA would be denied. The traffic impacts will continue to be unresolved.	SCAC-6
	TR/mm-1 – Merely paying into the Road Impact Fee account <u>does not mitigate</u> the traffic impacts created by this proposal. The Area 1 Road Impact Fee account is nearly exhausted and is in debt to the Area 2 account. It will take a considerable amount of development to create sufficient RIF funds for any Tefft/101 improvements. This development cannot occur until there is sufficient water to cancel the building moratorium. The current waterline intertie project will not provide this water and there is no additional water acquisition projects scheduled for the future. The traffic impacts will continue to be unresolved.	SCAC-7
	4.10.6.1 Increase in Traffic and Level of Service	
	Proposed Intersection and Roadway Improvements	
	The DEIR indicates that a realignment of Orchard Road and Juniper Street will occur to provide appropriate entrances to the Park. However, the DEIR does not mention when during this 20 year plan this proposed new traffic related construction will occur or whether the traffic improvements must be completed prior to any major development in the park.	SCAC-8
	Traffic signal at Juniper and Pomeroy – This is a decision that must be made by the County Traffic Engineer and submitted to the BOS for approval. A traffic signal should only be placed in accordance with the Manual of Uniform Traffic control Devices.	SCAC-9
	Neighborhood Impacts	
	Impacts are to be expected. When the Park charges admission people will park on public streets in the adjacent neighborhoods causing friction between residents and park users.	SCAC-10
	4.10.6.2 Create Unsafe Conditions	
	Traffic signal at Juniper and Pomeroy – This is a decision that must be made by the County Traffic Engineer and submitted to the BOS for approval. A traffic signal should only be placed in accordance with the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices or other, accepted prevailing standards.	SCAC-11
	Osage Road widening – Based on the statement, Osage road will be widened to meet County road standards, allowing for adequate room for two vehicles to pass in alternate directions. These improvements would have a beneficial impact related to safety and road hazards by remediating substandard existing conditions. No significant project access impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are warranted, then, why is the Osage Street widening is even included in this DEIR for the	SCAC-12

4.10 Traffic and Circulation Impacts

e

.

park, particularly since Osage St. is rated Level of Service "A" and the existing ADT is the same as the anticipated ADT with the project.	SCAC-12 (continued)
This not wanted by the adjacent landowners. It has never appeared on any of the South County Traffic Model updates, a report published by Public Works documenting the transportation and circulation needs for the South County Planning Area. Furthermore, the topography does not lend itself to easy road construction. Construction will require the taking of property or the placement of extensive and expensive retaining walls to accommodate the necessary cut and fill slopes. Filling on the park side will destroy some stately, old oaks.	SCAC-13
4.10.6.5 Alternative Transportation	
Pedestrian Impacts	
Path along Osage – There is insufficient roadway width along part of Osage (see above) to allow a path. Path construction along that segment must be within the park boundary.	SCAC-14
Bicycle Impacts	
Although the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan 1" to 150' scale plan sheet shows separate paved/equestrian trails, this must be reemphasized in the final EIR.	SCAC-15
Transit Impacts	
TR/mm-1*	
County does <u>not</u> need to coordinate with RTA. Public Works is capable designing and siting a transit stop. Such stop should be located on Tefft Street and serve the Library, the School and the Park. A transit stop may encourage transit service in the future. This should be completed before any interior improvements. There will be no transit service in Nipomo until there is a significant increase in	SCAC-16
population density and this cannot be considered a mitigating factor for many years. With the addition of the park amenities traffic generation will increase starting from the first day of operations. * TR/mm-1 will not be mitigated for many years.	SCAC-17
Residual impacts	
Improved pedestrian and bicycling access will not reduce potential vehicle trips contributing to the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. Those that choose to bicycle or walk to the park will come from local neighborhoods. These people would not contribute to decreasing potential vehicle trips at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange.	SCAC-18
Even with a transit stop there will be no transit service in Nipomo until there is a significant increase in population density.	SCAC-19
4.10.7.1 Year 2025 Cumulative Impacts	

.

4.10 Traffic and Circulation Impacts

Now that the Central Coast Community Health Center is under construction has the traffic generated from that project been considered as a cumulative impact.	SCAC-20
4.10.7.2 Cumulative Planned Road Improvements	
General	
The monies that would fund those projects listed in the latest edition of the South County Traffic Model are depleted. Funds can only be generated from future development. Development will not occur unless developers can provide a water source separate from the existing purveyors.	SCAC-21
North Frontage Road Connection to Willow Road Extension	
This will not be achieved until buildout of the area between Hettrick and Highway 101 in the vicinity of Willow. This development will not occur unless they can provide a water source separate from the existing purveyors. These improvements should not be assumed to be completed under the baseline cumulative scenario.	SCAC-22
State Route 1 connections to Dawn Road, Mesa Road and Eucalyptus Road	
Mesa Road and Eucalyptus Road traverse Woodlands with slow circuitous alignment. Dawn road is not scheduled to be a through road. Of the three roads only Mesa is a designated truck route. These improvements should not be assumed to be completed under the baseline cumulative scenario.	SCAC-23
Alternatives 1, 2, and 3	
Action on all three alternatives are dependent on the results of a Highway Corridor Study. Alternative 3 is a separate consideration. It is not influenced by Alternatives 1 and 2. CalTrans indicates that implementation of Alternative 3 would require additional deck widening. This would be a very extensive project.	SCAC-24
TR Impact 2 Buildout of the NCP Master Plan will potentially have a significant cumulative impact at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange southbound ramps during the p.m. peak hour.	SCAC-25
TR/mm-2*	
Transportation Demand Management measures – Who will monitor this? How will we know it's being done given Parks and Recreation minimal budget?	
- <u>in lieu fees</u>	
To mitigate problems caused by park activities these fees will need to be supplemented by other road impact fees. These fees will not be generated without future development This development will not occur unless developers can provide a water source separate from the existing purveyors.	SCAC-26
- and incorporation of a transit stop within NCP (if requested by RTA)	SCAC-27

4.10 Traffic and Circulation Impacts

County does <u>not</u> need a request from RTA. In fact RTA will not request a transit stop. Public Works is capable designing and siting a transit stop. Such stop should be located on Tefft Street and serve the Library, the School and the Park. A transit stop may encourage transit service in the future. This should be completed before any interior improvements. There will be no transit service in Nipomo until there is a significant increase in population density and this cannot be considered a mitigating factor for many years. With the addition of the park amenities traffic generation will increase starting from the first day of operations.

Does a transit stop rectify both TR/mm-1 and 2?

It does not appear that TR/mm-2 can be mitigated until there is development. Development can only commence when there is water available from sources other than the purveyors.

SCAC-28 SCAC-29 2

Nunutes of Comm. Meating held at NASD

Nipomo Community Park DEIR Community Meeting Responses March 28,2012 22 community members attended the meeting Aesthetic Resources-See attached exhibit 1 from Jackie Walls Jane Peterson-

Concerned about the lighting, To many lights when you include the parking lots and fields. Must be shielded down to prevent the loss of the night sky and Milky Way not seen as much in Nipomo any more.

Air Quality-

Jackie- There are 18 mitigations just for emissions. It states that the emissions are low, but some areas were not factored in.	SCAC-33
Green - Oil slicks caused by cars leaking oil was not talked about	SCAC-34
Cultural Resources -	
Cherie D - There used to be charros in the park. Could there be findings in the sand?	SCAC-35

SCAC-30

SCAC-31

Biological Resources-

1 X .

Bill- Native plants need to be promoted. All new plantings should be native to the area. Increase incidences of native and reduce the amount of exotics, such as the eucalyptus.	SCAC-36
Ed- Removal of 100 year old oak trees should be a Class 1 mitigation.	SCAC-37
Julie Steiner - The old oak trees take my breath away There must be a way to preserve these oaks by some clear and creative thinking.	SCAC-38
Jackie- Report states that there would be a tree monitor, but where would the	SCAC-39
tree removal, perhaps we could re-route paths and trails around the old oaks to lessen the removal.	SCAC-40
Animal-	
After a show of hands about the species listed in the report, it is clear that the horse riders and park walkers have seen more sightings than the one or two observations by the county. It is suggested that further review should be given to these animals.	SCAC-41
Harry- Coyotes were glossed over and need to be reviewed as well.	SCAC-42
Hazards and Hazardous Materials-	
Harry- the report doesn't state any mitigation when the old preschool septic tank is removed.	SCAC-43
Linda- the report doesn't sate any mitigation about the old dump site that is now a dog park and all types of bottles and can can be found.	SCAC-44

Geology and Soils-

No Comments

Land Use-Jackie- Skate Board Park sections says that a 25 foot berm will be needed to SCAC-46 mitigate noise, but such a berm would block the view. Jackie- The buildings section doesn't reflect the planning area standards. (???) SCAC-47 Jane P- When the High School was built, the north end of parking lot which is an SCAC-48 ag buffer was to be used for soccer fields. What happen to that idea? It would be easier to use the existing lights and parking lot instead of starting over. Harry- It is illegal to have a pre-school in the park, so what is the impact to the SCAC-49 park when moving out the pre-school. Noise Jane- concerned about noise when you have the library, the school, CHC and the SCAC-50 new development in the park. Jackie- Levels are stated as being low, but they state that they did not add the SCAC-51 extra noise created by radios. **Public Serviced & Utilities** Dick- see exhibit b attached SCAC-52 Wastewater SCAC-53 Fred- Not sure about the impact of the pool and water usage. SCAC-54 Ed- There is no recycled water to be used as stated in the report

SCAC-45

SCAC-55

: Commentificono Netur Garden

Comments by the San Luis Obispo Chapter of the California Native Plant Society and Nipomo Native Garden on the Draft PEIR, Nipomo Community Park Master Plan

SCH. NO. 2009111067

The California Native Plant Society is a statewide non-profit organization of some 10,000 scientists, educators, and laypeople dedicated to the conservation and understanding of the California native flora.

The San Luis Obispo Chapter of the California Native Plant Society is concerned with the losses of plant communities that are dependent on substrates of older dune sand, such as those covering the Nipomo Mesa. Nearly all of this habitat has been destroyed or severely degraded, and very little is in public hands where it can be protected. Destruction through development, eucalyptus plantations and agricultural conversion is found everywhere in the Mesa.

We believe that the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan (NCPMP) fails to address or recognize this issue, and furthermore, the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report (DPEIR) fails to accurately describe vegetation types.

The DPEIR identifies two alternatives (A and B), the essential difference between them being in the reductions of open space. Alternative A removes 1,088,510 square feet of the remaining 5,698,981 square feet of open space, which CNPS considers an intolerably high loss in a "Park". Alternative B removes 510,168 square feet, which is preferable to Alternative A but is still a loss of over 11 acres. CNPS considers these losses to still be extremely high and show a strong bias toward the constructed landscape and against the natural landscape.

The principle areas of planned development and loss of existing habitat are in the center of the existing park, which is more intensively developed in Alternative A, and in the midsection of the southern edge of the park, in which sports fields are proposed in Alternative A but not in Alternative B. CNPS has less concern about development in the "annual grassland" in the center of the park than it does in the "coastal scrub" along the southern margin of the park.

The DPEIR's description of plant communities is inadequate, using the simplistic WHR Classification rather than the Manual of California Vegetation 2nd edition. The DPEIR charactarizes NDDB's/Holland Central Dune Scrub (21320) as the more generalistic coastal scrub, thus failing to recognize it as being limited in distribution by the nature of the soils. Just as old stabilized back dunes are a highly limited in distribution, so are the vegetation types that live on that substrate. While the DPEIR recognizes the rareity of the Maritime Chaparral and describes mitigation against loss of that community, there is no similar consideration given to the Central Dune Scrub, half of which would be lost in Alternative A to playing fields at the south end of the park. There is no mitigation described for losses to the Central Dune Scrub.

The central area of the park where most of the development is planned is mapped as "Annual Grassland" in the DPEIR. As this consists essentially of non-native weedy species, including lots of perennial veldt grass, it should be pointed out that this has resulted from disturbance and removal of Central Dune Scrub. This area could be restored as original vegetation, but with greater difficulty that in the areas described as scrub in the vegetation map. The degree of misunderstanding about the 'value' of this 'annual grassland' is manifested in Chapter 6.2 of the DPEIR which states that losses of the grassland to sports fields are not irreversible and that they could be restored. This is absurd, due to the changes in soil profile and chemistry that would be generated from irrigated turf and also to the restoration to the current condition has no value. It is true that they could return to 'ruderal', but not without great difficulty to an original native plant community.

Vegetation Management

Vegetation management is not sufficiently addressed in the NCPMP or DPEIR. The NCPMP appears to recognize the value of certain vegetation types through planned avoidance, but does not contain any program for maintaining the natural plant communities. The Nipomo Mesa sand habitats are under severe attack from invasive veldt grass (*Ehrharta calycina*) and any long-term planning for NCP should involve plant community restoration, primarily though veldt grass control on a continuing basis. This could be funded through part of the mitigation, but the DPEIR fails to consider this as a issue. CNPS recommends that some funds currently dedicated to development and it's immediate mitigation be diverted to long term vegetation management.

Water Supply

Conversion of native flora to irrigated landscape and development is a poor choice in an area with severe water deficits. The current water use at NCP is between 40-60 afy (p. 4.12-3) and the projected added demand is 44.4 afy (p.4-12.10). Most agencies with water supply issues recommend using native drought-tolerant flora in parks or their equivalent, and thus the direction of the NCP runs counter to logic by essentially doubling water demand.

Climate Change

The section of the DPEIR on climate change does not include the word 'tree' or 'vegetation' while describing the project. The project replaces vegetation with hardscape, uses energy to both pump water, mow lawns and supply other functions of a developed park. Thus the park transitions from a carbon-absorber to a carbon emmitter over an increased area of the park. Regarding the cumulative impacts of all County actions, this is clearly going in the wrong direction. SCAC-55 (continued)

SCAC-56

Jachie Dello

Executive Summary

- ES6 table ES1 lists Open Space (undeveloped) and Open Play Area (turf) in the same category. This is misleading as to the actual loss of Open Space because it is added back in under Open Play Area. Open Play Area (4 acres) should more accurately be placed under Recreation Area. The stats need to be changed accordingly. Total recreation area now including turf would be approx 24 acres of the 123 total available acres putting the existing portion at 20%.
- ES6 Preschool is listed at Infrastructure. It is a temporary contracted non-recreational business and should not be considered as Infrastructure. It is in the park via a temporary use permit.

Chapter 3 Environmental Setting

- 3-1 3.1.1 the temporary Lil Bits preschool as listed at infrastructure. It is a contractually permitted non recreational temporary business. Its current location is in the area designated by LUO as Recreation and should be in the Public Facilities designated LUO area.
- 3-2 table 3-1 needs to include under land uses Dana Elementary School and CHCC medical clinic and its expansion currently in progress (add'I 15,000 sq ft).
- 3-11 table3-2/1.F states NCP is the only public park in Nipomo. The Jack Reddy Park has been approved and will include a volleyball court, a basketball court, and approximately one acre of grassy fields. The Jim Miller Memorial Park on Tefft is approx 1 acre and is available for development. The Kaminaka project on Pomeroy includes 29 acre sports complex with ball fields in their plans. These should be referenced in the table and considered for recreation.
- 3-15 table 3-2, policy 3.1: as mentioned earlier, EIR claims NCP is only park in Nipomo. Jack Reddy, Jim Miller Memorial Park and the Kaminaka sports complex development need to be mentioned and considered.
- 3-16 table 3-2, policy3.2: see above, NCP listed as the only existing park in Nipomo.
- 3-39 table 3-3, Cumulative Projects List: There is a project currently under construction that is not listed. It is located at 239 Tefft. It is a mixed used development that will include commercial and 3 residential units to be completed in 2012. Once occupied this would add to the traffic on Tefft and should be considered as a cumulative traffic and circulation impact.

Chapter 4 Environmental Impacts Analysis

AESTHETICS

4.1-18 AES impact 1: sites the recreation center as the only visual block to existing rural view. In terms of aesthetic character, the NCP serves an important role in defining the visual identity of Nipomo. As development continues around the community, NCP remains one of the last

surviving native areas tying it to its rural roots. There is a cumulative block from the combination facilities including the fenced pool and deck, the 36,000 sq. ft. recreation center (250'Lx230'Wx36'H) covering 2 acres plus a defensible space fire break, fenced basketball courts with pole lighting, 2 fenced tennis courts with wind screening and pole lighting, fenced skate board park, a hand ball court, a transit stop, and parking lot with cars. Further, native chaparral would be stripped away and replaced with 10 acres of ball fields with 8-10 pole lights. The view from the interior of the park (KVA1, KVA-2, &KVA-5) would be irreparably altered from a rural view to an urban utilitarian view not in character with our rural goals. Mitigation of shrubbery would not diminish the size of the view obstruction, only decorate it. Setting structures back 150' from the road is equally ineffective. Ineffective mitigations.

- 4.1-20 multi use sports fields: It estimates 8-10 pole lights for 10 acres of playing fields. That ratio does not seem right, only one light per acre? The 25' high cut and fill slopes needed to accommodate the 10 acres of fields in combination with lights and its mere size would noticeably affect the visual view to the South (KVA-2). With the adjacent added facilities the rural ambiance would be transformed into an active sports center with a definite urban feel. The park would change from a calm, peaceful, rural setting to a bustling, noisy, and urban one. Class I impact.
- 4.1-25 Basketball courts and handball courts: no mention of lights
- 4.1-27 Tennis courts: no mention of lights
- 4.1-29 AES Impact 2: Basically defers impacts because there is no definite design plan. Mitigations are to use rural designs. That is an ineffective mitigation because design does not diminish size. It is the cumulative number and mass of the additions that detract from the visual view not the architectural design. 24 acres of illumination and all the required fencing detracts from the rural ambiance and adds to the harsh, urban, industrial look. Inadequate mitigations. Class I impact.
- 4.1-31 AES Impact 3: community center would be visually imposing

AES/mm-3: mitigation by architectural design is ineffective. The size not style is the imposing factor creating a significant impact on the rural character. Class I impact .

AES/mm-4: mitigation by landscaping is ineffective. Landscaping reduces the visual scale of the building but not the actual size. Class I impact

4.1-32 AES Impact 4 : Impact on character of park by removal of 1.12 acres/20 mature trees. Planting smaller trees at a biological mitigation receptor site on the other side of the park or at a

purchased easement elsewhere does not mitigate the loss of trees, rural character, and view shed from the area where they were taken. It would take 50 plus years to see the benefit of the replanting and the area where they were removed would be significantly and permanently altered. This is not an immediate mitigation; it would take 50+ yrs. Ineffective mitigation. Class I impact.

AIR QUALITY

4.2-14 table 4.2-8 emissions chart: where are pollutants listed for horseshoe pits, dog park, picnic/BBQ area, horse staging area, turf, playgrounds, and rapid transit vehicles/stops? Have emissions been factored in from the 2 main thoroughfares that border the park (Tefft and Pomeroy)? Idling automobiles on Tefft while dropping off and picking up students at the adjacent Dana School adds to the cumulative emissions. Have the emissions from the newly constructed 15,000sq ft Medical center adjacent to the park been factored in? Chart figures need updating.

Emissions Quantification: EIR states proposed project would exceed the daily ROG+NOx combined threshold. It currently requires 18 on site mitigation measures. That threshold may be inaccurately low if the items mentioned in above emissions chart notation have not been factored in. The mitigations are not effective or feasible. Internal paths would not diminish the trips to the park. The auto traffic is not generated from trips within the park. Planting trees in the parking lot to reduce evaporative emissions will not offset the loss of the 20 mature trees removed. Has the removal of those trees been factored in the equation as a cumulative effect? On site housing already exists for the ranger so that is not a feasible mitigation. A recreational facility cannot be moved to the area adjacent to the school and residences. The topography would limit development, the height of the property would interfere with the view shed and aesthetics, and it would be adjacent to the newly developed 16,000 sq ft medical center on Tejas Place with its accompanying emissions. Not a feasible mitigation. There would be a significant air quality impact on the park visitors and day care children in the park as well as to the sensitive receptors adjacent to the park (Dana school, the medical center, the Library, and the church with its additional day care.) Class I mitigation.

- 4.2-16 AQ Impact 2, AQ/mm-2 AQ emissions exceed daily thresholds: see chart corrections above that would increase daily emissions and threshold totals. Mitigation of valet bicycle parking at community events centers is not feasible given the rural nature of our community and how spread out the residents are. Residual impacts: EIR states even with implementation of mitigations the emissions would not be reduced. With additional contributing factors (noted above re chart) and mitigations not feasible (moving rec. facility, building ranger residence, & bicycle valet) this becomes a Class I Impact.
- 4.2-19 4.2.5.3, Create or subject individuals to Objectionable Odors: When Lil Bits temporary day care was placed in the park turf was dug up and a septic system was installed. If they are removed or moved to the new site on the project map, what happens to that system? Will it be dug up?

In the 3/24/05 letter to Shawna Scott at Morro Group Inc. from Melissa A, Guise, Air Quality specialist from SLO Air Pollution Control District she states, "District staff supports Alternative 2, which provides for less development that Alternative 1 and does not increase parking. District staff commends the applicant on the multi-use trail system proposed throughout the park and recommends the pathways be linked to bus stops, pedestrian trails and bike paths outside the park to encourage the use of alternative transportation".

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

SCAC-56 (continued)

- 4.3-20 Special status wildlife: white Tailed Kite. My husband has sited these frequently in the rural section of the park as has Bill Deneen a noted naturalist in Nipomo. With the frequency of citings, the limited habitats in the coastal area and the MBTA/FP status their potential for occurrence should be elevated to "High" and elevation to Class I Impact.
- 4.3-23 Special status wildlife: Pallid Bat. My husband has observed bats in the park species unk. May or may not be Pallid. Do other species of bats live there?

Monterey Dusky-Footed Woodrat: My husband and I have both observed them in the rural section.

Silvery Legless lizard: My husband and I have both observed them in the rural section.

Coastal Horned Lizard: My husband, grandchildren and I have all observed them in the rural section.

Class Aves: My husband and I have observed Red Tailed Hawks, American Crows, Scrub Jays, Great horned owls and numerous quail in the rural section.

It further serves as habitat for rabbits and coyotes. Mountain Lions, Bob Cats, and Fox have also been observed in the park.

4.3.28 Project would disturb natural habitat for special status plant and wildlife species. 4.3-29BR/mm-3 Legless and Horned Lizard: 27.5 acres of special status wildlife species habitat would be eliminated, substantially affecting their ability to survive. Monitor's soil raking has limited protection against loss of wildlife during the removal/relocation efforts during the ground disturbing activities. Not an effective mitigation

BR/mm-4, Monterey Dusky-footed Woodrat: Special specsies Woodrats would be displaced with their destroyed nests to serve as a stockpile of materials to scavenger and rebuild their nests. They would have permanently diminished habitat by the removal of Oak Woodland and Maritime Chaparral, affecting their normal activities. These animals are nocturnal so they won't be sited by day time monitors. What time will their nests be moved to not disturb their natural way of life? Unknown numbers of the species would be without nests until they could be rebuilt leaving them subject to natural predators which could substantially affect their numbers. Ineffective mitigation.

4.3-35 BR Impact 3, Loss of 1.12 acres of oak woodland, approx 20 trees, BR/mm7, BR/mm-8,BR/mm-9,BR/mm-10:The mitigation only allows for 50% mitigation via replanting. That is not an immediate mitigation; that will take 50+ years. An additional feasible mitigation would be to alter path/trail plans to route around established trees. Trails do not need to be straight lines. Trails curving around established trees would add to the rural character Nipomo is attempting to maintain and habitat would be preserved.

SCAC-56 (continued)

SCAC-56

(continued)

4.4-40 4.3.7 cumulative impacts: If all the biological impacts in this chapter have been considered class II with mitigation, how does the cumulative impact result in Class III? Shouldn't that be Class II as well?

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- 4.6-4 3rd paragraph, The Sheriff's Department recommends implementation of several safety measures in conjunction with development of additional park facilities, including "Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design" and "light and lighting system guidelines", which have been proven to prevent and reduce crime. This creates a Class I impact on the recreation center. Per the CPTED guidelines, youth facilities should be on main roads in plain view to allow effective policing and natural public surveillance. The lighting in lighting and lighting systems guidelines needs to be factored in when determining the aesthetic impacts of cumulative lighting. The cumulative lighting from both of these safety measures plus the activity lighting would be a Class I impact on lighting.
- 4.6-7 4.6.3, Thresholds of Significance: Need to include 6th category of Potential for Crime as discussed on pg 4.6-3. Building the youth recreation center in the center of the park would be out of compliance with recommended safety measure to use Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design principles. This would create a class I Hazard Impact.
- 4.6-9 Exposure to Hazardous Emissions: 1st sentence would be more accurately stated as, "The NCP is located directly adjacent to the Dana Elementary School. The closer proximity would also change the concern for emissions at the school which is an air quality sensitive receptor.
- 4.6-10 4.6.5.2 Emergency Response or Emergency Evacuation Plan: states implementation of the Master Plan would not interfere with emergency evacuations because no element blocks the public. Evacuation plans must include adequacy of escape routes for the population functioning at full capacity. There is no information regarding the maximum capacities of all the activity areas and the ability to safely and efficiently evacuate them. Class I Impact.

LAND USE

4.7-4 4.7.5.1 Consistency with Land Use, Policy/Regulations: County Gen Plan guides future growth to enhance scenic resources. So County Inland Area balances social, economic, environmental a governmental resources and activities affecting quality of life in an area. The So County Planning Area preserves the character of communities and rural areas that currently exist in the area. The Recreation Element insures the development of new parks and equitable distribution of parks throughout the county. Principles of Strategic Growth attempts to preserve open space, scenic natural beauty, and sensitive

4 N

5 1		environmental uses (like our sensitive an protected species in the park) and foster a distinctive, attractive community with a strong sense of place.1988 Master Plan included a plan for acquisition of new parklands which was never done. The massive build out of the park impacts all of these land use policies to preserve Nipomo's rural equestrian character, provide equitable distribution of parks, preservation of open space, scenic natural beauty, and sensitive environmental uses and to acquire additional parkland. As Nipomo has grown there has been considerable loss to riding trails and the county has failed to dedicate new trails as requested creating a net loss of recreation to equestrians. The impact needs to address the cumulative loss of recreation to our equestrians and the unnecessary duplication of amenities for organized sports already existing in Nipomo violating our land use guidelines. Suggested mitigations would be 1. Acquisition of new parkland while real estate prices are low. 2. Enter into joint use agreements with our schools to share and save tax dollars during tight county budgets. There are funds for building but not maintenance. 3. Enter into joint use agreement with schools to pay for the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design changes to campuses so that they will feel safe to open them to the public on off school hours. 4. Place some smaller developments in Jim Miller Park instead of in NCP (horse shoes, Bocce Ball, gazebo, skateboard park) 5. Partner with Jack Reddy Park to get it up and running.	SCA (cont
	4.7-5	2 nd paragraph, skate board park mitigation: Cannot state that using mitigations N/mm-2 will reduce the noise to a specific level when the dimensions of the berm used in that mitigation are not given. Facts are not supplied to support that conclusion.	
	NOISE		
	4.8-1	4.8.1.1 Identified Sensitive Land Uses: Final sentence needs to include the CHC medical center and its 15,000 sq ft expansion.	
	4.8-12	Last paragraph: States Pomeroy/Juniper would experience decreased traffic under build out conditions. What is the basis for this? This street will be realigned, signalized, and have turn lanes added. A pay booth will be added to this entrance and will serve as one of two entrances joined by a circular interior road. It will generate more traffic than currently and as much as Tefft upon completion. With that entrance signalized, it is reasonable to assume an increase in the people who cut thru the park now in order to avoid that signal and the ones at Pomeroy/Tefft and Tefft/Orchard.	
	4.8-14	Stationary Noise, 2 nd paragraph: Noise measurements were taken at Damon Garcia Sports Complex during 3 games without amplified sound. Our proposed build is 10 acres or 6 youth soccer fields/games that could be played on simultaneously with amplification, whistles, and crowd roars. Also practice games would include whistles and loud coaching instructions. The comparison is not equal. The measurement needs to be more accurately calibrated based on 6 fields.	

SCAC-56 (continued)
I

4.8-15	receptor, Dana Elementary and the new 15,000 sq ft CHC expansion.	SCAC-56 (continued)
4.8-16	2 nd paragraph: no description of the skate board park barrier other than earthen and 25' from the edge. What are the dimensions?	,
	3 rd paragraph: Potential remediation options for noise abatement are not mitigations and are not acceptable or reliable measures to reduce noises. Noise impact would be Class I.	
	N/mm-2: What are the dimensions of the berm? It cannot be offered as an adequate mitigation if no dimensions are given to calculate its effects. Will its size be a conflict with the Aesthetics requirement not to block view of the park from the street? What is the style and height of the fence? In order to block noise it would have to be solid which would conflict if safety and aesthetic mitigations and the West Tefft Corridor Design elements. Ineffective conflicting mitigation, not feasible.	
	N/mm-3: Directing loud speakers inward would not mitigate sound from effecting sensitive receptors within 200 ft. The loud speakers currently at the football field on Pomeroy can be very clearly heard across the park to the homes on Tejas Place, well over 200 ft.	
	N/mm-4: These are not mitigations. They are POSSIBLE afterthought solutions of questionable value. The ranger and/or park host do not have police powers. The County has no money for a Park Monitor. They are cutting park personnel. There is no guarantee a volunteer could be secured and that position would not have police powers either. What design and height would the fence be to effectively keep people out? If it is solid as needed to mitigate noise it would be in conflict with mitigating safety measures to use Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design. CPTED requires no blind spots and all recreational activities remain visually open for effective policing and naturally occurring public surveillance. If it is open for safe viewing it won't mitigate the sound. Conflicting and ineffective mitigations. Class I Impact.	
4.8-18	4.8.6: 1 st sentence is incorrect. The CHC 15,000 sq ft expansion on Tejas Place adjacent to the park will generate a significant level of stationary noise.	

3rd paragraph: The multi game soccer event would be closer that 200 ft from a sensitive

2nd paragraph: Need to recalculate the increased number of visits to the park upon build out. With an additional 27.5 acres of new recreation (more than doubling its current size) the additional trips would be substantially higher. The new amenities would draw high numbers of people each both on a casual use and tournament basis. (recreation center, ball fields, skateboard park, swimming pool, tennis courts, basketball courts). Facts do not support this assumption.

4.8-15

¢

۰.

Concerns re: EIR

Since I'm new and haven't read all the EIR recommendations I will give a few of my concerns based on the meetings I have attended:	SCAC-57
From what I have heard we do not have the man power for emergency responders (police, fire etc.) to patrol the area and the response times are becoming longer.	SCAC-58
The set-backs recommended in the in the EIR do not appear to be acceptable to the emergency responders.	SCAC-59
Someone recommended putting a brim around the skate park to cut down on noise which the emergency responders would not be able to see over.	SCAC-60
It is suggested using reclaimed water on the landscaping but does not say where the reclaimed water will come from since there is not a facility or pipe line. Therefore all watering would come from existing water supply which we are already hearing of shortages.	SCAC-61
The existing plan removes quite a bit of existing horse trails with no future plans of adding more.	SCAC-62
The existing plan talks of removing old growth oak trees and replacing with other trees but how do you replace trees that are 50 to 100 years old.	SCAC-63

Sincerely,

lea 7 Susan Cholakian 1055 Ridgecrest Place

Nipomo, CA 93444

805-473-0883

Steve McMasters San Luis Obispo Department of Planning and Building March 26, 2012

SCAC-64

To those individuals who are pushing for the overloading of the Nipomo Park.

1. Please listen to what the residents of Nipomo have to say.

2. This project is extremely large and intrusive.

3. The scope of this project is not reasonable for this community!

4. Your methods are like a bulldozer, continually pushing through the crowds to reach your goal with <u>NO</u> regard to the damage you are inflicting.
5. Tefft Street cannot accommodate more traffic.

I have been to 90% of the meetings for this project and 60% of the Nipomo residents <u>do not want</u> this project. 15% of the Nipomo residents do want this project, and 25% of them don't care.

The vocal minority should not be allowed to overrule the majority.

At every meeting about this matter, the <u>majority</u> of the residents are <u>apposed</u> to the build out of the park.

What is it going to take to get the elected officials to listen, and to stop pushing their personal agendas? Just because there is no environmental impact to stop this project, does not mean the park should be a full build out or <u>any build out</u>. The impact to the community will be long lasting and one more open area will be gone.

Give it a rest... and use the monies somewhere else.

I retired from the grocery business after 35 years, but continue to work full time at my own business. Yet... I still find time to defend my community.

Barbara Verlengiere PO Box 503 Nipomo, CA 93444 <u>ciondraeteciatores esta</u> 805-550-6323 Tax paying (working) resident

rage 1 OI 1

e i <

Subj:	Nipomo Commuity Park DEIR Reminder!!!
Date:	4/3/2012 8:04:12 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time
From:	rcdodds@sbcglobal.net
Ter	The other me Gool come Upon fuelle Ocher label as

To: <u>Theotherm@aol.com</u>, <u>Harryfwalls@sbcglobal.net</u>, <u>sbwlff@sbcglobal.net</u>

Addressing the Historical or Cultural Value that the Nipomo Park has, really gets its roots from the Equestrian Riders. I talked to Don Souza who gave me quite a bit of history regarding the park and riders, that date back to **1958.** Apparently they had a deal with the county to lease it for one dollar a year. The Mesa Riders put in all the piping, arena area, and a 12' cook shack that they sold food from. There would be 50 riders who did Gymkhana and horse shows, with as many as 40-50 horse trailers. They always kept it watered down to keep the dust from flying. It was used by them up until the 1990's where it then was then taken over by the Mexican Charros. The Charros used it until the County kicked them out. Then of course Brush Poppers tried to get in, but they were denied the access per environmental reasons, dust, and noise cited as reasons not to let them in. (I was there for those meetings)

On the other hand, the community center in its inception, apparently was given \$100,000 dollars by the men's center. Peg Miller and her husband carpeted or floored it for free. The Hermreck's and other locals all volunteered their services to make it work. Sometimes as much as \$32,000 dollars was accumulated through bingo nights. But the Community Center was allowed to be run into the ground, and lost all their money that had been raised.

In my opinion, an arena where local families and equine groups could ride their horses and have activities would be much more beneficial to the park, it has never even been a part of the design and should be part of this process. I feel that the Equines have more history and cultural value in the park than skaters, or a community center that doesn't have a proven track record here to succeed. The equestrians have lost the most in the proliferation of Nipomo. As we continue to be pushed out, the local businesses are not making it, because we are losing horses and trails. In the design element I would like to see an arena put back in, and the skate park and community center taken out. Cherie Dodds

Wednesday, April 04, 2012 AOL: Theotherm

SCAC-65

SCAC-66

EL-JAY HANSSON 2315 IDYLLWILD PLACE ARROYO GRANDE, CA. 93420 805/343-1949

March 15, 2012

đ

Mr. Steve McMasters County of San Luis Obispo Department of Planning & Building 976 Osos Street, Room 300 San Luis Obispo. Ca 93408-2040

Reference: Nipomo Park EIR

Dear Mr. McMasters:

There are a number of items, I would like to address.

ES5 - I believe a skate park was deemed too dangerous, in spite of the fact someone donated the material.

Total 27.5 acres - does this include all paving?

ES6 – When off considers the large number of people that use the trails now, is it prudent to remove nearly one half?

ES10 – To widen Osage have you considered that the banks are steep and several old oaks would have to be removed?

Where will they get the recycled water? Understand NCSD is not in position to take this on, and even when the supplemental water comes in, it is slated for existing needs.

That there are no Class One impacts, doesn't sound logical.

ES11 – Believe this was a former dump site. It this really where we want children playing in the sand?

ES17 - Makes sense to have the community center in a different location. All traffic would not be directed to the same area. Most children could bike or walk to a local one.

ES25- Alternative Master Plan B, seems to be a compromise which the community might adopt.

ES29 - What size are the new oak trees?

ES39- Is it allowed to use herbicide applications?

With the limited budget, who is going to pay for the additional maintenance, patrolling for vandalism and code enforcement?

ES41 - At then end of the 5 years, who is responsible for replacement? In the past many subdivisions were required to landscape – somehow many of the plants are no more.

ES44-- Oaks are notoriously slow growers, so why are you using only one gallon pots or tubes?

ES46-- Who is applying for "what" grant, and how sure are you of getting it, and how much will be requested?

ES54-- Who will pay for the park monitor program?

Who will protect the park after hours from people "hanging out"? Fences are easily jumped.

2-6 NCAC was told to ask for the sun and settle for much less. There would be no development shoved on the community, and soccer has more than enough fields.

2-8 Is the preschool "not a for profit" business, and if so should the tax payers be contributing?

3-2 Will Mesa Meadows remain as it?

3-25 -What happened to the trees the Eisner group planted many years ago? How large and healthy are the trees?

3-29 Is reclaimed water acceptable for young children playing on the lawns?

3-41 Several of these projects have no water

4-6-3 Nipomo is extremely limited on law enforcement

4-7-5 Skate Park - only 120 feed setback??

4-12-3 Why was there so much water delivered in 2007? If we get more years like this will it adversely hurt the community?

4-12-15 Has the NCSD put aside supplemental Water from pipeline to take care of the park's needs?

5-11 A very large community center could be built on any of these parcels

5-21 How large is the equestrian staging center?

7-13 Why not leave the trails as they are?

7-31 In all fairness to the community, the hours of operation should be no more than 8:00 a.m. To 8:00 p.m. This is a bedroom community, and many people retire earlier.

SCAC-66 (continued)

9.2.4 Response to Comments from South County Advisory Council Officers and Members

Comment No.	Response
R.W.Wright	
SCAC-1	While it is true that San Luis Obispo County does not currently have an ordinance in place, mitigation measure PSU/mm-1 incorporates relevant standards and guidelines identified in the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPED) document. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-2	While specific event types and other details (i.e. alcohol, security) are not included in the NCPMP at this time, the EIR considers a worst-case scenario, within the bounds of existing laws and regulations, such as park closure (10:00 p.m.) and the County General Services Agency permitting system, which includes restrictions and requirements related to noise, alcohol, and security. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-3	Mitigation measure PSU/mm-1 includes safety design standards, which are applicable to all development related to NCP or an off-site location for the proposed community center. At the time a specific proposal is considered by the County, the design will be required to incorporate these standards regardless of location. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-4	Please refer to EIR Section 4.6.1.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Potential for Crime, Table 4.6-1, Offenses Known to Law Enforcement – San Luis Obispo County. While this table does not specifically identify crime statistics for parks with or without community centers, it presents documented offenses within the County. This section of the EIR also notes that Nipomo has a low crime index, compared to the state. Crime rates within parks are influenced by the crime rate within the surrounding area and community; therefore, comparing crime statistics in other areas may be arbitrary and would not benefit the discussion in the EIR. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
Comments f	rom T&C
SCAC-5	The 2009 traffic counts establish a reasonable baseline for review, as this is the time the EIR was initiated (refer to CEQA Guidelines Section 15125 Environmental Setting). The NCPMP is long-range plan, and traffic and road conditions are expected to change over time; therefore, mitigation measure TR/mm-2 requires a re-assessment of traffic conditions prior to development of high-traffic generating uses. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-6	Based on the traffic analysis conducted for the project, no significant, adverse, project-specific transportation or circulation impacts would occur (refer to EIR Section 4.10.6.1 Increase in Traffic and Level of Service). The study noted that a transit stop is not currently located in close proximity to NCP; therefore mitigation is recommended requiring further coordination with the Regional Transportation Authority, as noted in the comment. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-7	As noted in TR/mm-2, in the event future re-assessment of traffic impacts identifies a significant impact, The County General Services Agency would implement Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures to reduce trip generation during peak traffic periods. This measure is proposed in addition to the assessment of payment of "in-lieu" fees to specifically address the project's potential contribution to significant cumulative traffic impacts. No changes to the EIR are necessary.

Comment No.	Response
SCAC-8	Please refer to EIR Section 2.4.1 Project Description, Project Phasing and Funding. The NCPMP does not include a phasing plan; however, as noted in the EIR, the timing, type, and extent of infrastructure extensions, offsite improvements such as traffic signals, and earthwork would depend upon the type and extent of the first new facilities to be implemented. EIR Section 2.3.3.1 Access has been expanded to include the following language, which clarifies that road improvements would be implemented prior to high-traffic generating uses, as follows: "The NCPMP does not include a specific phasing plan because amenities would be constructed as funds are available. The Public Works Department was consulted to assess the appropriate timing for implementation of road improvements. The Public Works Department determined that major road improvements would be required prior to construction and operation of any high-traffic generating facility, including the permanent pre-school and administration building, sports fields, community center, amphitheater, swimming pool, and skate park (Richard Marshall; March 7, 2006). Proposed uses that would not generate a substantial amount of new trips may be constructed prior to implementation of access and road improvements, such as open turf areas, playgrounds, dog park, handball courts, tennis courts, basketball courts, internal roads, parking areas group picnic areas, trails, restrooms, and stormwater improvements. " In addition, EIR Section 4.10.6.1 Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic generating facility, including the permanent pre-school and administration building, sports fields, community center, amphitheater, swimming pool, and skate park (The NCP Master Plan project, various on- and off-site circulation infrastructure improvements. " In addition, EIR Section 4.10.6.1 Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic generating facility, including the permanent pre-school and administration building, sports fields, community center, amphitheater, swimming pool, skate park, open tur
SCAC-9	County Public Works has reviewed the Draft EIR, and any future road improvements (including traffic signals) would be reviewed and approved by a County Traffic Engineer, and approved by the Board of Supervisors. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-10	NCP currently charges park admission during high-use seasons of the year; therefore no additional significant impacts are anticipated. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-11	Please refer to response to SCAC-9 above. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-12	Level of Service (LOS) relates to delay times and road congestion. Based on review of the affected road network surrounding NCP, County Public Works noted that Osage Road is not constructed in compliance with the County Road Standards. Therefore, widening of Osage Road is proposed as part of the proposed NCPMP. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-13	As noted above (SCAC-12) County Public Works reviewed the NCPMP proposal and assessed the adjacent road network, similar to other private development projects. The assessment includes an evaluation of compliance with County Road Standards. The EIR includes an assessment of potential environmental impacts related to ground disturbance and biological resources. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-14	Please refer to Figure 2-5, Nipomo Community Park Master Plan. The proposed path will be within the park boundaries. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-15	EIR Section 2.3.2 Proposed Facilities has been clarified to include the following: "an additional 3 acres of paved and unpaved trails/walkways <i>including a separate equestrian trail</i> " (note change in italics).

Comment No.	Response
SCAC-16	The NCPMP is a long-range (20-year) plan for NCP. While the current transit system does not include a transit stop at NCP, the NCPMP includes provisions for a transit stop in the future, in anticipation of additional growth and increased local use of NCP. The County will coordinate with RTA in order to ensure the future transit stop is appropriately sized, designed, and located for effective incorporation into the existing transit route. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-17	Based on the traffic analysis conducted for the project, no significant, adverse, project-specific transportation or circulation impacts would occur (refer to EIR Section 4.10.6.1 Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic, Increase in Traffic and Level of Service). The project includes measures to address project-related traffic (i.e., realignment of intersections and installation of traffic signals), and no other project-specific measures were determined to be necessary. The study noted that a transit stop is not currently located in close proximity to NCP; therefore mitigation is recommended (TR/mm-1). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-18	In addition to the noted comment, the EIR states that the project would not generate trips exceeding identified thresholds based on existing and forecasted conditions at the US 101/West Tefft Street Interchange; therefore a significant adverse project related impact would not occur. In addition, expansion of alternative transportation opportunities and the provision of additional and improved public facilities within the Nipomo urban area would result in a beneficial effect on the generation of localized traffic, including trips generated to the east and west of the US 101/West Tefft Street Interchange, such as reduced regional and local trips, and shorter trip lengths. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-19	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-20	Based on the Mitigated Negative Declaration that was adopted for the Community Health Center (County Project DRC2010-00027, adopted October 27, 2011), the project would not result in a project-specific or cumulative traffic impact. The project was within the generally envisioned uses expected for the property, as considered in the South County Traffic Model Update. The Update was applied to assess cumulative transportation, circulation, and traffic impacts in the EIR; therefore, the EIR analysis adequately considered this use when assessing cumulative effects. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-21	Please refer to response to comment SCAC-7.
SCAC-22	Based on the long-term nature of the NCPMP (approximately 20 years), it is reasonable to include proposed road improvement projects under the cumulative development scenario. In addition, the County notes that conditions may change, and re-assessment of traffic conditions is required pursuant to mitigation measure TR/mm-2. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-23	Please refer to response to comment SCAC-22 above.
SCAC-24	A summary of the potential Alternatives in Section 4.10.7 of the EIR is included for informational purposes only. As noted in the EIR, Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 (US 101/West Tefft Street Interchange) are not designed or funded at this time, and are not included in the baseline cumulative scenario. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-25	Transportation Demand Measures would apply to high-traffic generating uses, including events and use of the multi-use sports fields. These types of uses would be approved by The County General Services Agency, including hours of operation and game schedules. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-26	As noted above, the mitigation proposed under TR/mm-2 is not limited to South County Road Improvement Fee Area 1 ("in lieu") fees, but includes Transportation Demand Measures to avoid or reduce high trip generation during peak periods affecting the US 101/West Tefft Street Interchange. No changes to the EIR are necessary.

Comment No.	Response
SCAC-27	Please refer to response to comment SCAC-16.
SCAC-28	Based on the traffic analysis conducted for the project, no significant, adverse, project-specific transportation or circulation impacts would occur (refer to EIR Section 4.10.6.1 Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic, Increase in Traffic and Level of Service). The project includes measures to address project-related traffic (i.e., realignment of intersections and installation of traffic signals), and no other project-specific measures were determined to be necessary. The study noted that a transit stop is not currently located in close proximity to NCP (TR Impact 1); therefore mitigation is recommended (TR/mm-1). No changes to the EIR are necessary. TR Impact 2 identifies a potentially significant cumulative impact at the US 101/West Tefft Street Interchange. In addition to mitigation measure TR/mm1 (transit stop), mitigation measure TR/mm-2 is recommended, including incorporation of Transportation Demand Measures and payment of "in lieu" fees. Mitigation measure TR/mm-2 addresses the project's contribution to a significant cumulative traffic impact. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-29	Please refer to above response to SCAC-28, including an explanation of TR Impact 1, mitigation measure TR/mm-1, and TR Impact 2 and mitigation measure TR/mm-2. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
Community	Meeting Minutes
SCAC-30	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-31	Please refer to 9.3.9 Response to Letter from Jacqueline Sue Walls.
SCAC-32	Please refer to Section 4.1.5.3 Aesthetic Resources, Effects of Light and Glare of the EIR. Mitigation measures AES/mm-6 (addressing multi-use sports field lighting) and AES/mm-7 (addressing all other lighting within the park) include requirements for shielded light fixtures, and directing light downward to minimize effects to off-site land uses and the night sky. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-33	Please refer to 9.3.9 Response to Letter from Jacqueline Sue Walls.
SCAC-34	The County does not have discretion over maintenance of personal vehicles; however, the EIR recognizes that leaks from vehicles and other equipment may occur. Please refer to EIR Section 4.12.5.1 Water Resources, Violation of Water Quality Standards, WAT Impact 2 (During operation of the project, discharge of sediment, hydrocarbons, and other pollutants into stormwater and drainage infrastructure would directly affect water quality). In addition to the presence of a park ranger, who would be onsite to response to incidental leaks or spill, mitigation measure WAT/mm-3 includes measures to contain and filter pollutants within and adjacent to parking areas. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-35	Please refer to EIR Section 4.4 Cultural Resources of the EIR. Based on a Phase I Surface Survey conducted within NCP, no evidence of cultural resources, (aside from the historic dump site described in this section of the EIR), including historic evidence of charros (Mexican horsemen or cowboys) was observed. Please note that mitigation measure CULT/mm-4 includes a requirement to halt construction activities in the event archaeological (including historic) resources are discovered. No changes to the EIR are necessary.

Comment No.	Response
SCAC-36	Please refer to mitigation measure AES/mm-2, goal (s): "Landscaping shall primarily use native plant material." Also see mitigation measure AQ/mm-1, item (e): "Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading should be sown with a fast-germinating native grass seed and watered until vegetation is established" and mitigation measure AQ/mm-2, item (e): "Plant drought tolerant, native deciduous shade trees along southern exposures of buildings to reduce energy use to cool buildings in summer and allow for solar warming in the winter. Maintain trees for the life of the project" and item (r): "Use native plants that do not require supplemental watering once established and are low ROG emitting". Please note that all biological resources mitigation, including restoration and replanting of habitat and individual species such as oak trees, requires the use of native species. Please refer to mitigation measures BR/mm-5 (Habitat Restoration Plan) and BR/mm-7 (Oak Woodland Protection and Restoration Plan). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-37	As noted in EIR Section 4.3.6.2 Biological Resources, Native or Other Important Vegetation, all oak trees with a diameter greater than 5 inches (as measured at breast height) are considered sensitive, regardless of age. Based on implementation of recommended mitigation measure BR/mm-7 (Oak Woodland Protection and Restoration Plan), which includes protection of existing oak trees and replanting additional oak trees onsite, and establishment of an easement to preserve the restoration area, potential impacts are considered less than significant. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-38	The intention of the NCPMP is to avoid removal of oak trees to the maximum extent feasible. Trees proposed for removal are primarily located within or adjacent areas proposed for access or road improvements. Avoidance of oak trees would be implemented to the maximum extent feasible. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-39	The County would be responsible for obtaining and applying the funds required for a biological monitor. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-40	Oak tree removal would occur primarily within areas proposed for access or road improvements. Trails would be routed around mature oak trees (greater than 5-inch diameter at breast height) to preserve biological and aesthetic resources within NCP. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-41	As noted in the EIR, biological surveys were conducted over a two-day period in March 2010. This data was added to previous survey efforts conducted in 2004 (refer to EIR Section 4.3 Biological Resources introduction paragraphs, and EIR Section 4.3.2 Biological Resources, Survey Methods and Results). The EIR recognizes that NCP provides habitat for a variety of special-status and other wildlife species (refer to Section 4.3.1.2 Plant Communities and Habitat Types), which area assumed to be present based on documentation during field surveys, suitable habitat conditions and noted observations from the public. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-42	As noted in EIR Section 4.3.1.2 Biological Resources Plant Communities and Habitat Types, the project site supports habitat suitable for coyotes, which are considered a common species. The County recognizes the importance of the coyote to noted members of the public; however, the species is considered common to the area, and no significant adverse effects to coyote were identified during preparation of the EIR; therefore, no significant impacts are presented in the EIR. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-43	Removal of existing infrastructure would occur pursuant to existing regulations; therefore, no significant adverse impact was identified, and no mitigation is necessary for this action. No changes to the EIR are necessary.

Comment No.	Response
SCAC-44	Please refer to EIR Section 4.6.5.1 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Risk of Explosion, Release of, or Exposure to Hazardous Substances. Volatile organic vapors were not present in the area including the existing dog park near West Tefft Street; however, as noted in HM Impact 2 disturbance of the former [more recent] dump site along West Tefft Street may result in the disturbance or exposure of non-volatile hazardous materials including metals, long-chain hydrocarbons, or asbestos). Please refer to associated mitigation measure HM/mm-2, which establishes guidelines and requirements for further study of this area prior to ground disturbance. The older dump site, located closer to the Juniper Street park entrance is shallow, and observed materials are generally non-organic; therefore, no significant impacts related to hazards or hazardous materials were identified in this location. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-45	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-46	EIR Section 4.7.5.1 Land Use, Consistency with Land Use, Policy/Regulation, Land Use Setbacks, states the following: "Construction of a barrier within 25 feet of the edge of the skate park will reduce the noise level" The noise berm would be constructed within 25 from the edge of the skate park, and the actual height of the berm will be contingent on the final design of the skate park. Based on an in-ground design, the vegetated noise berm would likely be approximately four feet in height parallel to the skate park, which would not significantly obstruct views along West Tefft Street. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-47	Please note planning area standards and West Tefft Corridor Design Plan design principles, policies, and standards are included in Table 3-2, Consistency with Plans and Policies. These standards would be applied to the final design of all structures, such as the community center, pursuant to mitigation measure AES/mm-2. These policies and standards would be used as guidelines for future development; therefore, the proposed project appears to be consistent with applicable policies and standards. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-48	Development of soccer fields at Nipomo High School is within the discretion of the Lucia Mar Unified School District. In the event another jurisdiction (such as the school district) develops public sports fields in the future, the County would re-assess the need for additional fields in the community. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-49	The Lil Bits Preschool is currently operating as a temporary use in NCP under a permit issued by General Services, under a lease issued to the Nipomo Area Recreation Association. The permit was issued with the intention of authorizing management of uses with NCP, as part of the overall park program. The 2004 permit identified uses including a youth-oriented community recreation and child care program, and coordination of sports activities, clubs, and events within NCP. The County recognizes that conditions may have changed since the permit was originally issued in 2004; therefore, the NCPMP fulfills the vision of the original lease, and includes a method for resolving the issue of the temporary pre-school by identifying the need for a Conditional Use Permit prior to establishment of a permanent facility within NCP. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-50	Please refer to Section 4.8 Noise of the EIR, which includes an assessment of noise impacts. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-51	As discussed in EIR Section 4.8.1.2 Noise, Existing Noise Environment, Short and Long-term Ambient Noise "noise is generated by park users, including voices, portable radios and music players, use of courts and ball fields, and internal traffic". The use of portable radios is considered part of the existing noise environment, and is expected to continue pursuant to existing park rules, under the observance of the park ranger. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-52	Please refer to response to comments SCAC-1 through SCAC-4.

Comment No.	Response
SCAC-53	Please refer to EIR Section 4.12 Water Resources, Table 4.12-2, Estimated New Water Demand, for estimated swimming pool water demand (3.86 acre-feet/year). Treatment and discharge of swimming pool water would occur consistent with existing regulations mandated by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-54	Please refer to response to comment EE-24.
CNPS and N	ipomo Native Garden
SCAC-55	Please refer to response to letter 9.2.1 Response to Letter from California Native Plant Society.
Jackie Walls	
SCAC-56	Please refer to 9.3.9 Response to Letter from Jacqueline Sue Walls.
Susan Chola	akian
SCAC-57	Please refer to response to individual comments below.
SCAC-58	This is correct, as noted in the EIR (refer to Section 4.9.1 Public Services and Utilities, Existing Conditions). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-59	No evidence or correspondence from local or state emergency responders regarding inadequate setbacks has been received by the County. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-60	A noise berm is recommended to reduce noise generated within the proposed skate park, which may partially block direct views into the skate park as seen from West Tefft Street; however, a locked gate and fence would be constructed to limit use to daytime hours. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-61	Please refer to Section 4.12 Water Resources of the EIR. Section 4.12.1 Existing Conditions summarizes the existing water supply overdraft conditions, and Potential Future Water Supply summarizes options under consideration by the Nipomo Community Services District (NCSD). One such option includes improvements at the existing Southland Wastewater Treatment Facility (SWWTF) to allow for distribution and use of recycled water. While this system is not currently constructed, use of NCP for recycled water distribution is included in the adopted plans for the SWWTF. The NCPMP is a long-range plan (20 years), and build-out of the plan will depend on funding and availability of additional water resources issued by the NCSD. In addition, please note mitigation measures that require a <i>50%</i> reduction in current water use (WAT/mm-4), and applicability of water conservation measures to future uses (WAT/mm-5). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-62	The NCPMP includes restoration of "spur" or volunteer trails, and includes a separate equestrian trail (refer to Figure 2-5, Nipomo Community Park Master Plan). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC-63	Please refer to mitigation measure BR/mm-7 (Oak Woodland Protection and Restoration Plan), which includes protection of existing oak trees and replanting additional oak trees onsite, and establishment of an easement to preserve the restoration area. The County recognizes that the loss of mature oak trees would be noticeable in the short-term; however, the planting of new oak trees within a conservation easement will mitigate the potentially significant impact in the long term. No changes to the EIR are necessary.

Comment No.	Response	
Barbara Verlengiere		
SCAC-64	Please refer to 9.3.6 Response to Email from Barbara Verlengiere.	
Cherie Dodo	ls	
SCAC-65	Please refer to 9.3.7 Response to Email from Cherie Dodds.	
El-Jay Hans	El-Jay Hansson	
SCAC-66	Please refer to 9.3.4 Response to Letter from El-Jay Hansson.	

Vidomo Parks Conservancy	SLO CNTY FLANNING/BUILDING	
April 30, 2012	2012 APR 30 PH 12: 22	
Steven McMasters, Project Manager County Planning and Building Department 976 Osos Street, Room 300 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040		
Re: 2012 Nipomo Community Park Master Plan (NCPM)	P) Draft EIR	
Dear Mr. McMasters;		
The Nipomo Parks Conservancy is a locally based non-p and development of local parks with diverse recreation community's growth and needs while adhering to the r properly maintained facilities in all parks. Our Board ha following comments.	profit organization that encourages the acquisition nal opportunities commensurate with the rural ideal. We also advocate sustainable and as read your 907 page DEIR and submit the	NP
Project Desc	cription	
2.3.1 & 2.3.2 Existing and Proposed Facilities: Lil Bits te approximately 9 yrs ago without a CEQA environmenta is in violation of <i>San Vicente Nursery School v. County o</i> exclusive use of a building in a public park was an illega was affirmed on appeal and the appellate court declare the use of a public park for a private nursery school" It' existence and the proposed new facility are legal and la	emporary preschool was constructed in the park al determination (including public comment) and of Los Angeles which held that a nursery school's al diversion of public park property. This judgment ed:"There is no express authority which permits 's legal status needs to be addressed. It's current and use violations and thus a class I impact.	NP
Aesthet	tics	•
4.1-18AES impact 1: The cluster of facilities in the center cannot be adequately mitigated by shrubbery or set ba block. Ineffective mitigation and thus a class I impact.	er of the park would create a visual block that acks. Neither of these diminishes size or visual	NP
4.1.20 multiuse sports fields: There is only an estimate for 10 acres of lighting which seems low with a ratio of number of lights in the plan an effective mitigation can appropriate mitigations taking into account the cumula for the duration of 6 games, thus a class I impact.	of lighting for this area, approximately 8-10 poles only one light per acre. Without a definite not be made. Lighting plans must be specific with ative effect of all 6 fields lighted and in operation	NP
4.1-25 &4.1-27: The tennis courts, handball courts and would affect the surrounding neighborhoods. Combine must be addressed for the cumulative impact on surrou	basketball courts do not mention lighting which ed with other existing lighting in the plan, this unding residences. Data required, thus a class l	NP

P.O. BOX 2042 NIPOMO CALIFORNIA 93444-2042

Info@NipomoParks.org http://NipomoParks.org

4.1-31AES Impact 3: architectural design and landscaping are not effective mitigations to the visually imposing impact of the community center. Design and décor do not diminish size, thus a Class I impact.	NPC-7
4.1-32AES impact 4: Removal of 1.12 acres and 20 mature oak trees cannot be mitigated by replanting half of the loss with small trees in a park receptor site and the rest elsewhere. The mitigation must be immediate and this mitigation would take 50 or more years to recoup the Oak loss. Ineffetive mitigation and thus a class I impact.	NPC-8
Air Quality	
4.2-14Emissions Quantification: The EIR admits the development would exceed the daily ROG+NOx combined threshold requiring 18 on site mitigation measures. Two suggested mitigations are planting trees in the parking lot and creating internal paths to lossen auto traffic. Noither of these is affective. 20	NPC-9
mature Oak trees and half of the Central Dune Scrub vegetation removed for the project would negate	NPC-10
the addition of younger saplings. There would be no appreciable immediate benefit. Internal pathways	NPC-11
ranger housing is not applicable because it already exists, making that mitigation not feasible. Moving	NPC-12
the community center to the top of the hill at the Dana School property line violates the aesthetic	NPC-13
requirement not to block the view. The report further admits even with mitigations the levels are not lowered significantly enough to meet acceptable standards. With the above mitigations deemed	NPC-14
ineffective the emissions are further out of compliance and with sensitive receptors adjacent to the park, this is a Class I impact.	NPC-15
Biological Resources	
4.2-20 Special Status Wildlife: The methodology in determining the presence of special status species	NPC-16

4.1-29AES impact 2: With no specific design plan the mitigations are deferred. There must be a specific

plan and accompanying mitigations for impacts. Omission and thus a Class I impact.

4.2-20 Special Status Wildlife: The methodology in determining the presence of special status species appears to be limited data base information and two surveys done on March 4 & 5 of 2010 of unstated	NPC-16
duration. Several of the species listed including the White-tailed Kite have been seen by park visitors. Further the Coyote population wasn't given any consideration and they are an invaluable link in our nature's food chain. More time needs to be devoted to this survey to more accurately report the	NPC-17
presence of special species. Destroying the habitats of unknown numbers of special species is a Class 1 impact.	NPC-18
a Class I impact.	NPC-19

Hazardous Materials

4.6-4 Mitigation of using "Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design" is not feasible because the NPC-20 ordinance requiring it does not exist in SLO County. Not a feasible mitigation, therefore safety becomes a Class I impact.

P O BOX 2042 NIPOMO CALIFORNIA 93444-2042

Info@NipomoParks.org http://NipomoParks.org

NPC-6

4.6-10 4.6.5.2 Emergency Response or Emergency Evacuation Plan: Omission, does not address evacuation plan/ability with the full build out worse case scenario with only one interior road. Class I impact.	NPC-21
Land Use	
4.7-4 4.7.5.1 Consistency with Land Use Policy/Regulations: Lil Bits temporary day care center is in violation of two land uses. On page3-3 Figure 3-1 "Land use Designation" the land use map clearly shows the Lil Bits is located in the Recreation area. It is a fenced-in money making private day care center. Further as stated earlier, it is in violation of <i>San Vicente Nursery School v. County of Los Angeles</i> . The proposed expenditure of public resources (payment of road impact fees, undertaking of major road improvements, water and sewage connection, etc) in order to mitigate the development of the new facility are potentially significant and is an unlawful misappropriation of public funds. This is a Class I impact.	NPC-22
4.7-5 : The skate board park location on Tefft does not meet the setback requirement of 1,000 ft from a residential category. It would only be 120 ft. That is a substantial difference to be mitigated by a waiver, a berm of unknown size, and fencing. There is no information to quantify the noise reduction by these measures. Ineffective mitigation, and thus a class I impact.	NPC-23
Noise	
4.8-14 Stationary noise. The proposed build out is 10 acres of sports fields with no designation of what type. There needs to be a specific designation In order to adequately mitigate the noise. Will the sport require amplification? Will there be bleachers? If the potential is for 6 games at one time the noise measurements need to be based on that. Incomplete information, thus a class I impact.	NPC-24
4.8-16 N/mm-4: Policing by park rangers, park monitors or volunteers are not feasible mitigations. There is no assurance that any of these people will be available or capable of controlling the noise. One park ranger cannot patrol the whole built out park (27.5 new acres + 22 acres already developed) and there are no funds for additional staff. Class I impact.	NPC-25
Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic	
4.10.6.2 Create unsafe conditions. Osage Road Widening: A fully dimensioned grading plan is required to show the feasibility of the widening, since there are steep slopes adjacent the current road. The grading plan should also show the vegetation removal requirements. The east side of Osage has steep rising and falling slopes on the park property. Widening Osage to make a 34-foot width will require fill near Camino Caballo, and deep cuts south of Camino Roble. Such grading will disturb or destroy native plants including ancient Coast Live Oaks and Manzanitas (California Native Plant Society List 1B.2 plant species considered rare, threatened, or endangered) planted to mitigate the environmental impact of the	NPC-26
development of the Mesa Meadows neighborhood. Further widening and cuts to the east side will be required if the paved walkway in the park adjacent to Osage is to be a safe distance from motor vehicle traffic. Four residences on the west side of Osage will require cuts an fills that will both fill in existing,	NPC-27

P.O. ROX 2042 NIPOMO CALIFORNIA 93444-2042

Info@NipomoParks.org http://NipomoParks.org

County mandated drainage swales and cut into old-growth Coast Live Oaks and a previous environmental mitigation planting. Maintaining the County standard 2:1 cut/fill requirement will require earth moving into private property, and likely onto existing homes. The EIR should describe the effects of the cuts and fills on the 4 affected parcels. The widening will require removal of the curbs that currently act as drainage conduits for the steep Osage Road slope. A complete new drainage strategy for this 1,100 ft road section is required. There is no justification for this widening. Class I impact.

Water Resources

4.12-15 WAT impact 4 Additional demands for water from NCSD: Nipomo has been at a Level III water Resource Severity since 2003 and conservation measures have been in place. The voting results for funding of the pipeline from Santa Maria will not be tabulated until May 9, 2012. A funding resource for the project has not been determined so the completion of the project is years away. We are currently using more water than we are accumulating. With overdraft a possibility, it is doubtful NCSD could provide water for the massive park build out until completion of the pipeline. Alternative water sources would need to be explored for the Master Plan development. Class I impact.

We thank you for the opportunity to submit our concerns.

Respectfully submitted, 5. Walls

Harry F. Walls, President Nipomo Parks Conservancy PO Box 2042 Nipomo, CA 93444

P O BOX 2042 NIPOMO CAI IFORNIA 93444-2042

Info@NipomoParks.org http://NipomoParks.org

NPC-28

NPC-29

NPC-30

9-70

Comment No.	Response
NPC-1	Please refer to response to individual comments below.
NPC-2	The Lil Bits Preschool is currently operating as a temporary use in NCP under a permit issued by General Services, under a lease issued to the Nipomo Area Recreation Association. The permit was issued with the intention of authorizing management of uses with NCP, as part of the overall park program. The 2004 permit identified uses including a youth-oriented community recreation and child care program, and coordination of sports activities, clubs, and events within NCP. The County recognizes that conditions may have changed since the permit was originally issued in 2004; therefore, the NCPMP fulfills the vision of the original lease, and includes a method for resolving the issue of the temporary pre-school by identifying the need for a Conditional Use Permit prior to establishment of a permanent facility within NCP. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NPC-3	Based on the analysis of aesthetic impacts (refer to Sections 4.1.5.1 Effect on Scenic View and 4.1.5.2 Effect on Visual Character and Quality, Visual Compatibility), and incorporation of mitigation measures AES/mm-1 through AES/mm-5, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant. These measures have been prepared and reviewed to verify feasibility. The EIR acknowledges that the project would change the existing visual setting; however, key scenic views would be maintained. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant, and no changes to the EIR are necessary.
NPC-4	The EIR's analysis of aesthetic resource impacts, including the effects of lighting and impacts on the night sky, was conducted based on a worst-case scenario, including use of all the multi-use sports fields between the hours of 6:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. (refer to EIR Section 4.1.5.3 Effects of Light and Glare). As noted in the EIR, the number of lights was estimated based on the design of existing sports fields in San Luis Obispo County. Mitigation measure AES/mm-6 addresses potentially significant impacts resulting from use of lighted multi-use sports fields, based on this worst case scenario, and includes requirements for a lighting plan that would shield all lights and reduce adverse effects to off-site land uses. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NPC-5	The EIR's analysis of aesthetic resource impacts included a worst-case scenario, which includes use of sports field lighting, and all other lighting within the park, including courts, parking areas, the community center, and other amenities (refer to AES Impact 6). Mitigation measure AES/mm-7 includes standards to reduce off-site light and glare, applicable to all other lighting in the park. While the discussion in the EIR is separated to allow for impact analysis and more specific mitigation based on use, identified mitigation (AES/mm-6 and AES/mm-7) would reduce the adverse effects resulting from exterior lighting throughout the park as a whole. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NPC-6	As discussed in Chapter 1 Introduction, the proposed NCPMP is a long-range plan (20 years); therefore the appropriate level of CEQA review is a Program EIR. Use of a Program EIR allows for an analysis for a larger project as a whole (such as the NCPMP), while allowing for more specific evaluation of program elements at a later date when more information is available. At this level of review, information regarding significant environmental effects is disclosed and mitigation is provided based on available information. Regarding referenced AES Impact 2 and associated mitigation measure AES/mm-2, The County General Services Agency will be required to develop additional design guidelines consistent with identified performance goals. Consistency with the identified goals would reduce potential impacts to less than significant. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NPC-7	As noted in the comment, implementation of AES/mm-3 and AES/mm-4 would not reduce the overall size of the structures; however, the mitigation includes standards that would create visual articulation and improved visual consistency with the surrounding landscape. The proposed mitigation directly addresses the significant impact identified in AES Impact 3 (monolithic form, architectural style, and exterior colors and materials). No changes to the EIR are necessary.

9.2.5 Response to Letter from Nipomo Parks Conservancy

Comment No.	Response
NCP-8	The oak trees proposed for removal are located adjacent to existing internal and adjacent roadways. No oak trees would be removed along the dense oak woodland ridge through the center of the park. The County recognizes that the loss of mature oak trees would be noticeable in the short-term; however, the planting of new oak trees within a conservation easement will mitigate the potentially significant impact in the long term. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCP-9	The 21 mitigation measure options listed in AES/mm-2 are included in the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District <i>CEQA Handbook</i> (December 2009), as effective measures to reduce the effects of ROG and NO _x generated by transportation and stationary uses. Emissions generated from vehicles in parking areas are affected by air temperature, and planting trees within parking areas provides a cooling effect, and thus reduces vehicle hydrocarbon emissions. Therefore, this is an effective measure to reduce operational emissions generated by the project. Providing trails and paths within and adjacent to the park contributes to use of alternative sources of transportation, such as walking and use of bicycles, which in turn reduces emissions. As noted in the comment, numerous mitigation measures are recommended, which would have a beneficial effect when combined. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCP-10	In the long term, the NCPMP includes the planting of additional trees of varying native species onsite, which would have a long-term beneficial effect to air quality. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCP-11	Please refer to response to comment NCP-9 above.
NCP-12	Please note that the referenced bulleted list noted in the EIR (refer to Section 4.2.5.1 Air Quality, Violate Air Quality Standard or Exceed Emission Thresholds, Emission Quantification), includes features currently included in the NCPMP, and are not part of the 21 mitigation measures identified under AQ/mm-2. This list is provided to show how the NCPMP incorporates various measures recommended by the APCD. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCP-13	Mitigation measure AES/mm-1 recommends locating the proposed community center a minimum of 150 feet from the existing park road, which would be approximately in the same location as proposed, but shifted more to the west to preserve views. No air quality mitigation measures would require location of the structure at the Dana School property line. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCP-14	Please note under AQ Impact 2, Residual Impacts that "implementation of identified mitigation would not eliminate air emissionsthe concentration of pollutants would be reduced to below identified thresholds"; therefore impacts are considered less than significant. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCP-15	Please refer to response to comments NCP-9 through NCP-14 above. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCP-16	While only one occurrence of white-tailed kite was observed during field surveys conducted for the EIR (refer to Table 4.3-2, Special-status Wildlife Species Evaluated for Occurrence on the Project Site), the EIR recognizes that NCP provides roosting and foraging habitat for this species. The County appreciates additional documentation evidence provided by members of the public and other organizations in order to improve public knowledge and disclosure of species occurrence, which has been added to Table 4.3-2. Occurrence on the Project Site has been updated to reflect that the potential for occurrence of white-tailed kite is "Moderate to High". Please refer to section 4.3.6.4 Biological Resources Impacts to Nesting Birds and Roosting Bats, and BIO Impact 4 for a discussion of potential impacts to white-tailed kite and other bird and bat species. Noted clarifications do not elevate the impact determination identified in the EIR because this species was documented by the EIR biologist, and the analysis assumes continued presence of this species within NCP.

Comment No.	Response
NCP-17	As noted in EIR Section 4.3.1.2 Biological Resources, Plant Communities and Habitat Types, the project site supports habitat suitable for coyotes, which are considered a common species. The County recognizes the importance of the coyote to noted members of the public; however, the species is considered common to the area, and no significant adverse effects to coyote were identified during preparation of the EIR; therefore, no significant impacts are presented in the EIR. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCP-18	Loss of habitat for special-status species and wildlife is considered in the EIR (please refer to EIR Section 4.3.6.1 Biological Resources, Unique or Special Status Species or their Habitats). Based on the analysis of habitat loss, the NCPMP's proposal to restore "spur" or volunteer trails, and identification of mitigation measures including restoration of habitat for noted species (refer to BR/mm-2, BR/mm-5, BR/mm-6, and BR/mm-7), potential impacts are considered less than significant. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCP-19	Please refer to response to comment NCP-8.
NCP-20	While it is true that San Luis Obispo County does not currently have an ordinance in place, mitigation measure PSU/mm-1 incorporates relevant standards and guidelines identified in the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPED) document. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCP-21	The EIR considers emergency response and evacuation at full project build-out. As proposed, there are two options for ingress and egress (Pomeroy Road and West Tefft Street), as shown in Figure 2-5, Nipomo Community Park Master Plan, consistent with CALFIRE guidelines for access. In the event of a major disaster, US 101 is identified as a key evacuation route, and implementation of the project would not impede or interfere with mass evacuation (refer to EIR Section 4.6.5.2 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Emergency Response or Emergency Evacuation Plan). Therefore, no significant impact would occur. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCP-22	As noted in the County Land Use Ordinance, Table 2-2, Allowable Land Uses and Permit Requirements, "child day care centers" are identified as an allowed use within the Recreation land use category, and require issuance of a Conditional Use Permit. Please refer to response to comment NCP-2, which notes that a Conditional Use Permit is required for permanent establishment of this use. The NCPMP would fulfill the intention of the 2004 lease by incorporating the pre-school into the overall uses within NCP. Mitigation is required based on the assessment of all proposed uses identified in the NCPMP, and use of public funds to implement identified improvements and mitigation is not considered an environmental effect under CEQA. The EIR includes an assessment of the environmental effects resulting from implementation of improvements and identified mitigation, as is appropriate. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCP-23	Please refer to EIR Section 4.7.2.2 (Land Use, Local Policies and Regulations) of the EIR. Pursuant to County Land Use Ordinance Section 22.06.040, the NCPMP is exempt from land use permit requirements, such as waivers. The EIR discloses the potential inconsistency with the setback standards identified in the Land Use Ordinance, presents estimated noise levels that would be generated by the skate park use (73 decibels), and presents mitigation that would reduce the estimated noise level below identified thresholds of significance (5 to 10 decibel reduction at the noise barrier), resulting in a noise level of approximately 57 decibels at the noise-sensitive use (residential area on the opposite side of West Tefft Street) (refer to EIR Section 4.7.5.1 Land Use, Consistency with Land Use, Policy/Regulation), and adding approximately one decibel to the ambient noise level in the affected location. The actual design of the noise barrier will depend on the design of the skate park. Mitigation measure N/mm-2 has been clarified to state the following (additional standard noted in italics): "Prior to construction of the skate park, the design plans shall incorporate the following noise reduction measures, <i>achieving a maximum average hourly noise level of 65 decibels as measured 25 feet from the edge of the skate park</i> ". This addition does not change the impact determinations of the EIR, and this impact remains less than significant.

Comment No.	Response
NCP-24	At this time, the use of the sports fields is currently undetermined. The "reasonable worst case scenario" identified for the EIR analysis is six youth soccer fields (refer to EIR Section 2.3.2 Project Description, Proposed Facilities). The noise measurements were conducted during an actual soccer tournament, in order to obtain a realistic estimate, and the results were applied to an anticipated situation at NCP, assuming a reasonable worst case scenario. At this time, bleachers and amplified sound are not specifically included in the proposal for the NCPMP; however, the EIR considers that some amplified sound may occur. Mitigation is identified to direct any amplified sound towards the interior of the park and away from adjacent noise sensitive uses (refer to N/mm-3). Therefore, this impact remains less than significant, and no changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCP-25	NCP currently employs a park ranger (daytime) and park host (nighttime) to supervise activities within the park. Monitoring compliance with park rules, and other regulations, is effective and feasible. Mitigation measure N/mm-4 is recommended in the event substantiated noise complaints are received by The County General Services Agency, and additional monitoring is necessary to support park staff. This impact remains less than significant, and no changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCP-26	At this time, specific, engineered grading plans are not included in the program-level review of road improvements on Osage Road. The EIR analysis identified the anticipated affected area, in order to determine affected acreage, tree removals, sand mesa manzanita removals, and impacts to native vegetation. Such impacts are identified, and mitigation is recommended including restoration and conservation within an easement area (refer to BR/mm—2 and BR/mm-5 through BR/mm-10).
NCP-27	Please refer to EIR Section 2.3.3.1 Project Description, Access, which states that the paved walkway would be located within the County Right of Way. The improvements would be located within the existing roadway and extend onto County property; therefore, no cuts and fills would occur on private property. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NCP-28	As noted above in response to NCP-27, improvements to Osage Road would occur within County Right of Way. Preparation of road plans, including drainage management, would be conducted in coordination with County Public Works to ensure appropriate management of drainage and connection to the County drainage system. The General Services Agency will coordinate with Public Works to minimize grading and avoid oak tree removal to the maximum extent feasible. The EIR has been clarified to explain this process (Section 2.3.1.1 Project Description, Access): "The County General Services Agency will coordinate with the County Public Works Department prior to preparation of construction plans for road improvements in order to confirm that road improvements will meet the standards applicable at the time of actual development. In addition, there may be opportunities to incorporate design features that would avoid or minimize ground disturbance, and associated impacts to mature oak trees, drainage infrastructure, and the community." This clarification does not change the analysis or determinations presented in the EIR.
NCP-29	The EIR has been clarified to summarize recent events affecting the Supplemental Water Project, Water Intertie (please refer to Section 4.12.1 Existing Conditions, Potential Future Water Supply): "The NCSD initially proposed an assessment district to provide funding for the Supplemental Water Project, Waterline Intertie, which required approval by vote. In June 2012, a majority of property owners voted against the assessment district proposal, and the NCSD determined that construction of a pipeline (as currently proposed) to provide the supplemental water could not be funded by existing funds. The NCSD issued a moratorium on the issuance of new will serve letters while considering other options for supplemental water, which may include other funding sources and/or a scaled-down project." As noted in the EIR, provision of additional water by NCSD "is contingent on the implementation of improvements to the existing irrigation system to reduce current water supply, consistent with measures to target reducing consumption for high-use customers" (Section 4.12.5.5 Water Resources, Adversely Affect Community Water Service Provider). In addition, recommendations provided by the NCSD are incorporated into mitigation measures WAT/mm-4 (water survey for irrigated turf and landscaped areas, requires a 50% reduction in existing irrigation water use) and WAT/mm-5 (compliance with water survey recommendations and water conservation measures, and incorporation of recycled water for irrigation). Implementation of these measures would achieve a no net gain in additional water demand; therefore, the residual impact

Comment No.	Response
	remains less than significant.
NCP-30	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.

9.3 GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT LETTERS AND RESPONSES

The following members of the general public have submitted comments on the Draft EIR.

Respondent	Code	Contact Information	Page
Bill Deneen Email dated: March 8, 2012	BD(a)	1040 Cielo Lane Nipomo, CA 93444	9-75
Nora Jenae Email dated: March 12, 2012	NJ	692 Beverly Drive Nipomo, CA 93444	9-77
Istar Holliday Letter received: March 14, 2012	ІН	577 Sheridan Road Arroyo Grande, CA 93420	9-79
EI-Jay Hansson Letter dated: March 15, 2012	EJH	2315 Idyllwild Place Arroyo Grande, CA 93420	9-81
Stephanie Greene Letter dated: March 28, 2012	SG	1075 Cheyenne Court Nipomo CA 93444	9-87
Barbara Verlengiere Email dated: March 28, 2012	BV	PO Box 503 Nipomo, CA 93444	9-90
Cherie Dodds Email dated: April 5, 2012	CD	rcdodds@sbcglobal.net	9-94
Bill Deneen Comment card received: April 10, 2012	BD(b)	1040 Cielo Lane Nipomo, CA 93444	9-96
Jacqueline Sue Walls Letter received: April 10, 2012	WL	410 Tejas Place Nipomo, CA 93444	9-98
Cindy Jelinek President, Nipomo Native Garden Email dated: April 23, 2012	CJ	cjelinek@calpoly.edu	9-117
Vincent McCarthy Email dated: April 26, 2012	VM	vincemcc@att.net	9-119
Jane Peterson Letter dated: April 26, 2012	JP	355 Via Vicente Nipomo, CA 93444	9-121
Dan Woodson, PE Email dated: April 26, 2012	DW	william_woodson@hotmail.com	9-125
Ed Eby Email dated: April 29, 2012	EE	520 Camino Roble Nipomo, CA 93444	9-131
Harry F. Walls Letter received: April 30, 2012	HW	410 Tejas Place Nipomo, CA 93444	9-139
"BLME" Comment card received: (undated)	BLME	(no contact information given)	9-147

Respondent	Code	Contact Information	Page
Neighbor Comment card received: (undated)	N	(no contact information given)	9-145

Shawna Scott

From:	secooper@co.slo.ca.us
Sent:	Friday, March 09, 2012 9:48 AM
To:	smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us; ekavanaugh@co.slo.ca.us; Shawna Scott
Subject:	Fw: NIPOMO PARK

Good morning all,

FYI- See below comment from Bill Denneen.

Shaun Cooper Senior Planner SLO County Parks ph.(805) 781-4388 fx. (805) 781-1102 http://www.slocountyparks.org

----- Forwarded by Shaun E Cooper/GenSrvcs/COSLO on 03/09/2012 09:45 AM

 From:
 Bill Denneen <<u>bdenneen@kcbx.net</u>>

 To:
 <<u>secooper@CO.SLO.Ca.US</u>>

 Date:
 03/08/2012 08:41 PM

 Subject:NIPOMO PARK

Hi,

I enjoyed your coverage tonight (March 8). As an ancient I gave historical info. Take time to visit Nipomo Native Garden. I am so proud at what the community has done there. I go there almost daily to jog/walk the trails. Bill Denneen (white beard), 1040 Cielo Lane, Nipomo, 93444 929-3647

1

[Scanned @co.slo.ca.us]

9.3.1 Response to Email from Bill Deneen

Comment No.	Response
BD(a)-1	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.

Shawna Scott

From:	smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us
Sent:	Monday, March 12, 2012 10:52 AM
To:	Shawna Scott
Subject:	Fw: Nipomo Park EIR

----- Forwarded by Steve McMasters/Planning/COSLO on 03/12/2012 10:51 AM -----

From: "Nora Jenae" <<u>nijenae@sbcglobal.net</u>> To: <<u>smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us</u>> Date: 03/12/2012 10:49 AM Subject: Nipomo Park EIR

Steve McMasters Department of Planning and Building Environmental Division <u>smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us</u>

Thank you for your presentation of the EIR on March 8.	
As I recall you found nothing that could not be mitigated satisfactorily (Level 1).	
I disagree with that statement because all areas covered with cement and buildings cease to be a park despite a few scattered plantings in memory of what was destroyed. The acreage involved in effect reduces the actual	NJ-2
park by that much. A busy street with accompanying traffic, noise and fumes, to access the pre-school and a community center in the middle does not enhance the park. That loss cannot be mitigated with a few scattered plantings. A pre-school is not a park facility any more than the high-school would have been.	NJ-3
If a pre-school and community center are to replace park land, let them at least be located with the Library along Tefft which is already a busy street with all its negative impact. Playing fields and the required parking do have some resemblance to a park playground.	NJ-4

1

Sincerely, Nora Jenae' 692 Beverly Drive Nipomo, CA 93444

Comment No.	Response
NJ-1	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
NJ-2	Please note that parks may include a variety of uses, both passive and active. The County recognizes the commenter's noted preference. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NJ-3	Please refer to mitigation measures BR/mm-5 (Special-status Plant Mitigation Plan), BR/mm-5 (Habitat Restoration Plan) and BR/mm-7 through BR/mm-10 (Oak Woodland Protection and Restoration Plan), which require substantial restoration and protection of vegetation within NCP. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
NJ-4	Please note Alternative Master Plan A (refer to EIR Section 5.3.2.1 Alternatives Analysis, Alternative Master Plan A and Figure 5-1, Alternative Master Plan A), which locates the pre-school and community center near West Tefft Street. No changes to the EIR are necessary.

9.3.2 Response to Email from Nora Jenae

Steven McMasters. Project Manager County Planning and Building Department 976 Osos Street, Room 300 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040

Dear Mr. McMasters,

I could not attend the March 8 informational meeting, so I did not have the opportunity to get an answer to this question.	IH-1
Included in this draft are plans for a community center, gymnasium,pool, and skate park, which collectively, with parking, other structures, courts and fields, would occupy about a third of the present Nipomo Community Park. Who would design, administer, manage, and take liability for these facilities, designed to be built with taxpayers' money? Does the Nipomo Area Recreation Center, which has been lobbying for this Master Plan for many years, plan to occupy, manage, and profit from these spaces?	IH-2 IH-3
Originally built with private donations of time and money from the community, the Nipomo Area Recreation Center, which is a private non-profit organization that presently operates out of a shopping mall on Tefft, seems to be well-managed at present. However, in my 26 years in the area, I have witnessed several incarnations of the Nipomo Rec Center, with turnovers of management due to mismanagement, embezzlement, and other human frailties, and a loss of its long-time facility on Frontage Road. Since, several other appropriate sites have been offered, and rejected, for this community center.	IH-4
My questions follow: What control or responsibility would the County have on/for a privately run Community Center in a public space? What financial costs would the County (taxpayer) incur should there be a problem with operation or accidents?	IH-5
I know the need for such a facility in our community. My younger daughter worked there decades ago, and my now grown grandchildren took an excellent Karate class there for years. However, I do not believe that the taxpayers, especially in this difficult economy, should be asked to pay to build and maintain it, nor do I believe enough attention has been given to separating private and public monies and interests.	IH-6

I would appreciate a response to my concerns.

Sincerely,

Istar Holliday 577 Sheridan Road Arroyo Grande, CA 93420 (805) 343-2581

Comment No.	Response
IH-1	Please refer to responses to individual comments below.
IH-2	The County General Services Agency would be responsible for all facilities within NCP. Contractors may be retained by the County to prepare construction and design plans. Organizations, such as the Nipomo Native Garden, may be issued a lease or permit to administer and manage facilities and other improvements within NCP at the discretion of the County. The County will take liability for uses, or assign liability, as designated in the permit or lease for the specific use. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
IH-3	Aside from the 2004 use permit issued by the County General Services Agency, no other agreements or leases have been issued to the Nipomo Area Recreation Center by the County for improvements identified in the NCPMP, and no agreements have been made regarding the community center. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
IH-4	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
IH-5	As noted above in response to comment IH-2, the County General Services Agency would be responsible for all facilities within NCP. While a community center within NCP may be managed by an organization (pursuant to an issued permit or lease), the center would be a public facility. Identification of potential financial costs related to problems or incidents would be identified in the associated permit or lease, and at this point providing an assumption regarding such future costs is considered speculative and outside the scope of the EIR. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
IH-6	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.

9.3.3 Response to Letter from Istar Holliday

EL-JAY HANSSON 2315 IDYLLWILD PLACE ARROYO GRANDE, CA. 93420 805/343-1949

March 15, 2012

Mr. Steve McMasters County of San Luis Obispo Department of Planning & Building 976 Osos Street, Room 300 San Luis Obispo. Ca 93408-2040

Reference: Nipomo Park EIR

Dear Mr. McMasters:

EJH-1 There are a number of items, I would like to address. ES5 – I believe a skate park was deemed too dangerous, in spite of the fact someone donated the EJH-2 material. Total 27.5 acres - does this include all paving? EJH-3 ES6 – When on considers the large number of people that use the trails now, is it prudent to remove EJH-4 nearly one half? ES10 - To widen Osage have you considered that the banks are steep and several old oaks would have EJH-5 to be removed? Where will they get the recycled water? Understand NCSD is not in position to take this on, and even EJH-6 when the supplemental water comes in, it is slated for existing needs. EJH-7 That there are no Class One impacts, doesn't sound logical. ES11 – Believe this was a former dump site. It this really where we want children playing in the sand? EJH-8 ES17 - Makes sense to have the community center in a different location. All traffic would not be EJH-9 directed to the same area. Most children could bike or walk to a local one. ES25- Alternative Master Plan B, seems to be a compromise which the community might adopt. **EJH-10** EJH-11 ES29 – What size are the new oak trees?

ES39- Is it allowed to use herbicide applications?	EJH-12
With the limited budget, who is going to pay for the additional maintenance, patrolling for vandalism and code enforcement?	EJH-13
ES41 – At then end of the 5 years, who is responsible for replacement? In the past many subdivisions were required to landscape – somehow many of the plants are no more.	EJH-14
ES44 Oaks are notoriously slow growers, so why are you using only one gallon pots or tubes?	EJH-15
ES46 Who is applying for "what" grant, and how sure are you of getting it, and how much will be requested?	EJH-16
ES54 Who will pay for the park monitor program?	EJH-17
Who will protect the park after hours from people "hanging out"? Fences are easily jumped.	EJH-18
2-6 NCAC was told to ask for the sun and settle for much less. There would be no development shoved on the community, and soccer has more than enough fields.	EJH-19
2-8 Is the preschool "not a for profit" business, and if so should the tax payers be contributing?	EJH-20
3-2 Will Mesa Meadows remain as it?	EJH-21
3-25 -What happened to the trees the Eisner group planted many years ago? How large and healthy are the trees?	EJH-22
3-29 Is reclaimed water acceptable for young children playing on the lawns?	EJH-23
3-41 Several of these projects have no water	EJH-24
4-6-3 Nipomo is extremely limited on law enforcement	EJH-25
4-7-5 Skate Park – only 120 feed setback??	EJH-26
4-12-3 Why was there so much water delivered in 2007? If we get more years like this will it adversely hurt the community?	EJH-27
4-12-15 Has the NCSD put aside supplemental Water from pipeline to take care of the park's needs?	EJH-28
5-11 A very large community center could be built on any of these parcels	EJH-29
5-21 How large is the equestrian staging center?	EJH-30
7-13 Why not leave the trails as they are?	EJH-31
7-31 In all fairness to the community, the hours of operation should be no more than 8:00 a.m. To 8:00 p.m. This is a bedroom community, and many people retire earlier.	EJH-32

Sincerely,

El-Jay Hansson

Comment No.	Response
EJH-1	Please refer to response to individual comments below.
EJH-2	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-3	Yes, the 27.5 acres includes all paving. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-4	Trail removal is proposed to restore spur "volunteer" trails, and focus trail use in designated areas. As noted in Table 2-2, Master Plan Existing and Proposed Amenities, approximately 127,373 square feet of additional trails is proposed as part of the NCPMP. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-5	Potential impacts, including ground disturbance and vegetation and tree removal are identified in the EIR. Please refer to EIR Section 4.3.6.2 Biological Resources, Native or Other Important Vegetation, Oak Woodland.
EJH-6	As discussed in EIR Section 4.12 Water Resources, recycled water would be provided by the NCSD upon implementation of improvements to the Southland Wastewater Treatment Facility. The EIR has been clarified to summarize recent events affecting the Supplemental Water Project, Water Intertie (please refer to EIR Section 4.12.1 Existing Conditions, Potential Future Water Supply): "The NCSD initially proposed an assessment district to provide funding for the Supplemental Water Project, Waterline Intertie, which required approval by vote. In June 2012, a majority of property owners voted against the assessment district proposal, and the NCSD determined that construction of a pipeline (as currently proposed) to provide the supplemental water could not be funded by existing funds. The NCSD issued a moratorium on the issuance of new will serve letters while considering other options for supplemental water, which may include other funding sources and/or a scaled-down project." As noted in the EIR, provision of additional water by NCSD "is contingent on the implementation of improvements to the existing irrigation system to reduce current water supply, consistent with measures to target reducing consumption for high-use customers" (EIR Section 4.12.5.5 Water Resources, Adversely Affect Community Water Service Provider). In addition, recommendations provided by the NCSD are incorporated into mitigation measures WAT/mm-4 (water survey for irrigated turf and landscaped areas, requires a 50% reduction in existing irrigation water use) and WAT/mm-5 (compliance with water survey recommendations and water conservation measures, and incorporation of recycled water for irrigation). Development of NCP is not dependent on the NCSD's Supplemental Water Project, but rather on water conservation measures that would result in a no net gain in additional water demand. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-7	Impact significance is determined based on environmental analysis and use of identified thresholds of significance. Although significant impacts are identified, mitigation is proposed that would reduce noted impacts to less than significant. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-8	The County assumes commenter is referencing the proposed playground near Camino Caballo. Based on surveys conducted for the project, no hazardous waste or historic artifacts were documented within this location. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-9	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-10	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-11	Please refer to mitigation measure BR/mm-8 (Oak Woodland Protection and Restoration Plan). This measure notes that replacement oak trees would be seedlings, transplanted from one-gallon pots. No changes to the EIR are necessary.

9.3.4 Response to Letter from El-Jay Hansson

Comment No.	Response
EJH-12	Legal use of herbicides may occur during revegetation and maintenance activities. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-13	NCP is a public facility, and would be maintained and patrolled by existing County resources. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-14	The County, or an assigned organization, would remain responsible for restoration and maintenance of vegetation. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-15	One gallon pots are used to facilitate successful restoration. Larger trees have a lower rate of success when transplanted. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-16	Mitigation measure BR/mm-9, item (c) (Oak Woodlands Conservation Act grant), presents one option, out of three, to mitigate loss of oak woodland, pursuant to Senate Bill 1334, Oak Woodlands Conservation Act. In the event this option is selected, the County would be responsible for obtaining the grant and implementing subsequent actions funded by the grant, such as an oak tree ordinance, general plan element, or oak woodlands management plan. At this time, the amount is not determined. The County would be required to satisfy mitigation measure BR/mm-9 prior to ground disturbance in areas affecting oak woodland (refer to Chapter 7, Table 7-1, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-17	The County would be responsible for the park monitor program. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-18	As noted in EIR Section 4.8.5.1 Noise, Exposure to Noise Levels Exceeding County Thresholds, Stationary Noise, a park host is present during night hours. In addition, construction of a six-foot tall fence with vertical slats (similar to existing fencing surrounding the skate park at the Los Osos Community Park) would prevent climbing and unauthorized use of skate park facilities. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-19	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-20	The Lil Bits Preschool is currently operating as a temporary use in NCP under a permit issued by General Services, under a lease issued to the Nipomo Area Recreation Association. The permit was issued with the intention of authorizing management of uses with NCP, as part of the overall park program. The 2004 permit identified uses including a youth-oriented community recreation and child care program, and coordination of sports activities, clubs, and events within NCP. The County recognizes that conditions may have changed since the permit was originally issued in 2004; therefore, the NCPMP fulfills the vision of the original lease, and includes a method for resolving the issue of the temporary pre-school by identifying the need for a Conditional Use Permit prior to establishment of a permanent facility within NCP. Issuance of the Conditional Use Permit would clarify the facility's role within NCP as a secondary use relative to the overall uses and public benefit provided by the NCP. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-21	The Mesa Meadows area is included in the NCPMP, but it will remain "as is" (please refer to Figure 2-5, Nipomo Community Park Master Plan). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-22	The County assumes that the commenter is referencing the oak trees located within the Osage Road right-of-way. These trees are located within and adjacent to oak woodland, and the County is unable to clearly discern between trees that were planted, and "volunteer" oak trees. The EIR assessed all oak trees, regardless of the method of establishment. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-23	Preparation of the EIR included review of the Southland Wastewater Treatment Facility Master Plan (NCSD 2009), which includes a description of the standards required for use of reclaimed water. The California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 22, Division 4, Chapter 3, Section 60301 through 60355 are used to regulate recycled wastewater and are administered jointly by the California
Comment No.	Response
----------------	---
	Department of Health Services and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Disinfected tertiary recycled wastewater requires a level of treatment that meets the most stringent requirements for allowed uses, including parks and playgrounds (NCSD 2009). Based on these existing regulations, use of tertiary treated recycled water (as proposed in the Southland WWTF Master Plan) would be acceptable to ensure public safety, including children. No changes to EIR are necessary.
EJH-24	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-25	Please refer to section 4.9.1.3 Public Services and Utilities, San Luis Obispo County Sheriff, which also notes this existing deficiency in law enforcement personnel. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-26	As noted, the setback for the skate park (as measured from the nearest noise-sensitive use) is 120 feet, across West Tefft Street. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-27	Average rainfall in the Nipomo Mesa area is 15.52 inches (NMMA 2009), and the average rainfall in water (or fiscal year) 2007, as measured from the Nipomo CDF station was 7 inches. Therefore, additional irrigation was likely required to supplement the lack of rainfall. As noted in EIR Section 4.12.1 (Water Resources, Existing Conditions), the NCSD "requests that the County implement recommended water conservation measures within existing facility areas and incorporate the use of recycled water to minimize the anticipated demand for new uses." Water conservation measures are identified to reduce existing and future anticipated water demand for NCP, which would reduce adverse effects to the NCSD and community at large (refer to EIR Section 4.12.5.5 Water Resources, Adversely Affect Community Water Service Provider, mitigation measures WAT/mm-4 and WAT/mm-5). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-28	Please refer to response to comment EJH-6. Pursuant to mitigation measures WAT/mm-4 and WAT/mm-5, the primary source of additional water for irrigation would be recycled water. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-29	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-30	The equestrian staging center identified in Alternative Master Plan A includes seven pull-through spaces, similar to the proposed NCPMP (please refer to <i>Nipomo Community Park Master Plan CEQA Review Draft</i> , Table 2.0, Parking Tabulation; Firma, May 2009). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-31	The objectives of the NCPMP include providing "a range of passive and active facilities and use areas to meet the recreational needs of the community" and "maintain and upgrade existing recreational and community facilities and amenities" (please refer to EIR Section 2.2, Project Description, Project Objectives). Improving the trail system will allow for multiple uses and restoration of areas disturbed by "spur" trails. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EJH-32	No changes to current park hours are currently proposed. No changes to the EIR are necessary.

To- stine Mosters - Please include myth	Page 1 of 1
---	-------------

SCAC - deiR

RE: NIPOMO PARK - RURAL OPEN SPACE - NOT BUILT UP & NOT BLACKTOP

XXX ITEMS OF CONCERN:	
Air Quality - Big current issue in development - Run off - vehicles - oil slicks - fumes - DEIR says "emissions exceed threshold levels if built out" - Aesthetics (lights and view shed) - Unwanted - Class 11 Impact - Loss of rural character - Once lost it is never returned - Noise - Quiet space is desired - Air quality= DEIR says "emissions exceed threshold levels if built out" - Biological= loss of habitat for sensitive and protected species - oak trees - crucial loss - Land use= loss of horse trails for fields and activities that are available at schools - Mitigations -	SG-1 SG-2 SG-3 SG-4 SG-5 SG-6 SG-7
The overall cumulative loss of trails via development and no dedication of new trails -	SG-8
 Special and protected species - the DEIR says we have habitat for - The "Potential for Occurrence" should be changed from low/moderate to high for some important species - XX The biological impact on the following species of concern are: White Tailed Kite, Federally protected gull like bird, Observed; Alligator lizard, Observed; Silvery Legless Lizard, Observed; Coyotes, Observed; Egrets, Observed; Coast Horned Lizard, Observed; Pallid Bat, Observed; Monterey Dusky-footed Wood Rat, Observed many nests in wooded area. 	SG-9
XX ILLEGAL ACTIVITY: LIL BITS DAY CARE CENTER - ILLEGAL USE - Remove -	SG-10
Cultural Resources - Riding arena, reinstated.	SG-11
NOTE: Crucial evidence left out of all reports - including this one - that at many meetings the people have asked for and voted on to have the "d: None of the above" box included. It has never been included in any reports, including this meeting of today, and again this group majority again voted on including "d: None of the above." It is evident that Parks and Rec have refused to hear the majority vote and majority voices in the community that want the Nipomo Park left alone because the most important thing to be needed ten years from now is green, open space. Parks and Rec can put their 'wants' in other places. This point will be brought to the attention of SLO County Board of Directors and the fact that the "NO VOTE" has purposely not been included in any report to date. Majority of community want a rural park and not blacktop, big cement, hi-rise, or industrial build out. As the area is built up, the most important community need is a green, rural park. - Keep It Green and Keep it Rural For The Future - Respectfully, STEPHANIE GREENE - Nipomo - March 28, 2012 1075 Cheyenne Court Nipomo CA 93444 805.276.0067	SG-12

Saturday, April 14, 2012 AOL: REALVOICEOFTWH

Comment No.	Response
SG-1	Please refer to EIR Section 4.2 Air Quality, and Section 4.12 Water Resources, which address stormwater runoff, oil leaks, and emissions (fumes) from vehicles and construction equipment. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SG-2	Please note that AQ Impact 1 (fugitive dust) and AQ Impact 2 (ROG and NO _x) can be reduced to less than significant upon implementation of mitigation measures AQ/mm-1 and AQ/mm-2 (refer to EIR Section 4.2.5.1 Air Quality, Violate Air Quality Standard or Exceed Emission Thresholds). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SG-3	Please note that while the project would result in significant impacts to aesthetic resources, noted impacts can be reduced to less than significant upon implementation of mitigation measures (refer to EIR Section 4.1 Aesthetic Resources. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SG-4	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
SG-5	Please refer to response to comment SG-2 above.
SG-6	Please refer to mitigation measures BR/mm-5 (Special-status Plant Mitigation Plan), BR/mm-5 (Habitat Restoration Plan) and BR/mm-7 through BR/mm-10 (Oak Woodland Protection and Restoration Plan), which require substantial restoration and protection of vegetation within NCP. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SG-7	As shown in Figure 2-5, Nipomo Community Park Master Plan, the project includes a separate equestrian trail within NCP. Reviewer is unsure about reference to "activities available at schools". No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SG-8	As noted in Table 2-2, Master Plan Existing and Proposed Amenities, approximately 127,373 square feet of additional trails is proposed as part of the NCPMP. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SG-9	 Please refer to EIR Section 4.3.2.2 Biological Resources, Special-Status Species, which provides the following definitions for special-status wildlife: "Animals listed or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under the ESA (50 CFR 17.11 for listed animals and various notices in the Federal Register for proposed species). Animals that are candidates for possible future listing as threatened or endangered under the ESA (Federal Register Vol. 73, No. 238, pp. 75175-75244, December 10, 2008). Animals that meet the definitions of rare or endangered species under the CEQA (State CEQA Guidelines, §15380). Animals listed or proposed for listing by the State of California as threatened and endangered under the CESA (14 CCR 670.5). Animal species of special concern to the CDFG (Remsen 1978 for birds; Williams 1986 for mammals). Animal species that are fully protected in California (California Fish and Game Code, §3511 [birds], §4700 [mammals], and §5050 [reptiles and amphibians]). Please note that the alligator lizard, coyote, and egret are not designated special-status species (the Panamint alligator lizard, coyote, and egret are not designated special-status species (the Panamint alligator lizard is a Special-status Wildlife Species Evaluated for Occurrence on the Project Site, has been updated to reflect that the potential for occurrence of white-tailed kite is "Moderate to High", based on public responses that these species has been observed within NCP. The EIR noted the presence of this species, identified potential impacts to this species in addition to other avian species (refer to BIO Impact 1 and BIO Impact 4) and includes mitigation to avoid

9.3.5 Response to Letter from Stephanie Greene

Comment No.	Response
	adverse effects to this species. Please refer to BR/mm-1 (worker education and training), BR/mm- 11 (avoidance or pre-construction survey for nesting birds), and BR/mm-12 (pre-construction survey for nesting birds). Therefore, this clarification does not elevate the impact determination identified in the EIR. Regarding silvery legless lizard, coast horned lizard, pallid bat, and Monterey dusky-footed woodrat, the EIR notes the occurrence of these species and/or presence of suitable habitat. The occurrence rankings are appropriate based on observances, public comment, and noted habitat conditions.
SG-10	The Lil Bits Preschool is currently operating as a temporary use in NCP under a permit issued by General Services, under a lease issued to the Nipomo Area Recreation Association. The permit was issued with the intention of authorizing management of uses with NCP, as part of the overall park program. The 2004 permit identified uses including a youth-oriented community recreation and child care program, and coordination of sports activities, clubs, and events within NCP. The County recognizes that conditions may have changed since the permit was originally issued in 2004; therefore, the NCPMP fulfills the vision of the original lease, and includes a method for resolving the issue of the temporary pre-school by identifying the need for a Conditional Use Permit prior to establishment of a permanent facility within NCP. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SG-11	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
SG-12	Please refer to Appendix A of the EIR, which includes the <i>Nipomo Community Park Master Plan, CEQA Review Draft</i> (Firma, May 2009). This document includes the results of public surveys (refer to Attachment A). All public comment is filed in the Administrative Record for the EIR. The EIR is a public information document, and it will be considered along with public testimony and other comments provided by the public during review by the Parks and Recreation Commission (PRC) and Board of Supervisors (BOS). The Commission and Board will ultimately determine what elements are included in the NCPMP. No changes to the EIR are necessary.

From:	smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us
Sent:	Thursday, March 29, 2012 7:16 AM
To:	Shawna Scott
Cc:	secooper@co.slo.ca.us
Subject:	Fw: Nipomo Park

----- Forwarded by Steve McMasters/Planning/COSLO on 03/29/2012 07:13 AM -----

From: Barbara Verlengiere <<u>blondmare@hughes.net</u>> To: <u>smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us</u> Cc: <u>harryfwalls@sbccjobal.net</u> Date: 03/28/2012 04:27 PM Subject: Nipomo Park

Steve McMasters

March 28, 2012

San Luis Obispo

Department of Planning and Building

To those individuals who are pushing for the overloading of the Nipomo Park.	BV-1
1. Please listen to what the residents of Nipomo have to say.	
2. This project is extremely large and intrusive.	
3. The scope of this project is not reasonable for this community!	
4. Your methods are like a bulldozer, continually pushing through the crowds to reach your goal with <u>NO</u> regard to the damage you are inflicting.	
5. Tefft Street cannot accommodate more traffic.	BV-2
I have been to 90% of the meetings for this project and 60% of the Nipomo residents <u>do not want</u> this project. 15% of the Nipomo residents do want this project, and 25% of them don't care.	BV-3
The vocal minority should not be allowed to overrule the majority.	

1

At every meeting about this matter, the <u>majority</u> of the residents are <u>apposed</u> to the build out of the park.

What is it going to take to get the elected officials to listen, and to stop pushing their personal agendas? Just because there is no environmental impact to stop this project, does not mean the park should be a full build out or <u>any build out</u>. The impact to the community will be long lasting and one more open area will be gone.

Give it a rest... and use the monies somewhere else.

I retired from the grocery business after 35 years, but continue to work full time at my own business. Yet... I still find time to defend my community.

Barbara Verlengiere

Tax paying (working) resident

PO Box 503

Nipomo, CA 93444

blondmare@hughes.net

805-550-6323

[Scanned @co.slo.ca.us]

Comment No.	Response
BV-1	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
BV-2	Please refer to EIR Section 4.10 Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic, which includes an analysis of traffic conditions, including the project's effect on Tefft Street. Based on the analysis, no project-specific significant impacts are identified; however, the project will contribute to cumulative traffic conditions (refer to TR Impact 2). Mitigation is recommended to reduce the project's effect on the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange, resulting in a less than significant impact (refer to mitigation measure TR/mm-2). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
BV-3	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.

9.3.6 Response to Email from Barbara Verlengiere

From:	smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us
Sent:	Thursday, April 05, 2012 1:15 PM
То:	Shawna Scott
Cc:	secooper@co.slo.ca.us
Subject:	Fw: Nipomo Park

----- Forwarded by Steve McMasters/Planning/COSLO on 04/05/2012 01:14 PM -----

 From:
 "robert dodds" <<u>rcdodds@sbcglobal.net</u>>

 To:
 <<u>smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us></u>

 Cc:
 "Walls, Jacki & Harry" <<u>Harryfwalls@sbcglobal.net</u>>

 Date:
 04/05/2012 09:41 AM

 Subject:
 Nipomo Park

To Steve McMasters:

I attended the last Nipomo Park meeting at the Nipomo Community Services District last week and made comments regarding the Cultural Value of the arena in the park.	CD-1
Addressing the Historical or Cultural Value that the Nipomo Park has, really gets its roots from the Equestrian Riders. I talked to Don Souza a former Mesa Rider who gave me quite a bit of history regarding the park and it's riders, that date back to 1958 . Apparently they had a deal with the county to lease it for one dollar a year. The Mesa Riders put in all the piping, arena area, and a 12' cook shack that they sold food from. There would be 50 riders who did Gymkhana and horse shows, with as many as 40-50 horse trailers. They always kept it watered down to keep the dust from flying. It was used by them up until the 1990's where it then was then taken over by the Mexican Charros. The Charros used it until the County kicked them out. Then of course Brush Poppers tried to get in, but they were denied the access per environmental reasons, dust, and noise cited as reasons not to let them in. (I was there for those meetings)	CD-2
On the other hand, the community center in its inception, apparently was given \$100,000 dollars by the men's center. Peg Miller and her husband carpeted or floored it for free. The Hermreck's and other locals all volunteered their services to make it work. Sometimes as much as \$32,000 dollars was accumulated through bingo nights. But the Community Center was allowed to be run into the ground, and lost all their money that had been raised , not do to the initial supporters but those who took it over after its beginnings.	CD-3
In my opinion, an arena where local families and equine groups could ride their horses and have activities would be much more beneficial to the park, it has never even been a part of the design, and should be part of this process. I feel that the Equines have more history and cultural value in the park than skaters, or a community center that doesn't have a proven track record here to succeed. The equestrians have lost the most in the proliferation of Nipomo. The only arenas to have shows or other equine venues are in Santa Maria at the Elks Rodeo Grounds, or in the North County at the Paso Robles Fair grounds. Equine events bring in thousands of dollars annually. As we continue to be pushed out, the local businesses that are equine friendly are not making it, because we are losing horses and trails. In the design element I would like to see an arena put back in, and the skate park and community center taken out. I personally feel that weekend events like Gymkhana and horse shows, have more family structure and be greatly supported by residents, and would provide a different element in the park than skaters. Thank you, Sincerely Cherie Dodds	CD-4

1

Comment No.	Response
CD-1	Please refer to responses to individual comments below.
CD-2	Comment noted; please note the NCPMP includes an equestrian staging area and designated equestrian trails (refer to Figure 2-2, Nipomo Community Park Master Plan).
CD-3	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
CD-4	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.

9.3.7 Response to Email from Cherie Dodds

	COMMENTS ON THE NIPOMO COMMUNITY PARK MASTER PLAN PROGRAM EIR	
	I am commenting on the:	
	Draft Program EIR Master Plan	
	The following useful comments are addressing these issues:	
	Content of the EIR.	
	 Methods on how environmental issues are analyzed. Potential Alternatives to the project. 	
	Potential mitigation measures that would avoid or reduce environmental issues.	
	Comments on Draft Program EIR: The Tupomo Mative Standen (NNG) 12	BD(b)-1
	O Remove all non-matures particularly in the part west	
	of the regular park that goes around the houses, the problem	
	abu-native is aprican Velt grass.	
	3 Erpand The part area - particularly The reparian area west of His	
	D'more raptor poles	
	Comments on Master Plan: <u>less large structures</u>	вр(р)-2
	NAME ENAND BRANNEDAN @KCBX NOT	
	ADDRESS:Bill DenneenPHONE:PHONE:	
	CITY: RIDOWO CA 93444-9039 STATE: ZIP:	
14		
10	Bill Denneen 1040 Cielo Un Margan CA 93444-9039	
N	WED PROUD SUPPORTER	*1
		***-
	Linener -	
	Steve McMasters	
	County of San Luis Obispo	6
	Department of Planning and Building	
1	Sgn Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040	
	TE FACALLY.	
	the second se	
	+ AR 10 404	
	AND CO PLAN & BLEG.	
		E.
	9340832040 Ildadhahilladadhahilladadhahilladadha	-

Comment No.	Response
BD(b)-1	Comments noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary. Such elements may be included in future restoration efforts within NCP, and volunteers with the Nipomo Native Garden provide a good resource for these improvements within NCP.
BD(b)-2	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.

9.3.8 Response to Comment Card from Bill Deneen

April 2012

Mr. Steve McMasters County of San Luis Obispo Department of Planning and Building 976 Osos Street Room 300 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040

Reference: DEIR Nipomo Community Park 2012

Dear Mr. Mc Masters;

I have read the Draft Nipomo Park Plan Program Environmental Impact Report prepared February 2012 and I attended the County informational meeting at Nipomo High School on March 8, 2012. Attached is a list of my concerns, questions, corrections, and responses to the impacts and mitigations. I appreciate your careful consideration of my concerns.

JW-1

Respectfully submitted,

Jacqueline Au Walls

Jacqueline Sue Walls 410 Tejas Place Nipomo, CA 93444

Executive Summary

ES4	Existing Facilities needs a correction. The existing horse shoes were left out.	JW-2
ES5-6	states the total existing developed recreation area is 11% of the park. That is flawed math using incorrect figures. Table ES-1 does not list existing 2 horseshoe pits. That would change the developed area total. The report also includes the 22 acres from Mesa Meadows as a part of the remaining 130 acres available for development. Those 22 acres are limited to passive recreation, buffer and basin use only. Removing them from the total of available developmental land changes the percentage of existing park development upward. The EIR uses 145 total acres and 15 developed acres to get 11%. It should be 123 acres with 15 acres developed which would be 12%. (using another mathematical correction 2 entries below the percentage changes upward again).	JW-3 JW-4
ES6	table ES1 does not list existing 2 horseshoe pits. This would change stats.	JW-5
ES6	table ES1 lists Open Space (undeveloped) and Open Play Area (turf) in the same category. This is misleading as to the actual loss of Open Space because it is added back in under Open Play Area. Open Play Area (4 acres) should more accurately be placed under Recreation Area. The stats need to be changed accordingly. Total recreation area now including turf would be approx 24 acres of the 123 total available acres putting the existing portion at 20%.	JW-6
ES6	Preschool is listed at Infrastructure. It is a temporary contracted non-recreational business and should not be considered as Infrastructure. It is in the park via a temporary use permit.	JW-7
	Chapter 1 Introduction	
1-1.1	a "program EIR" sounds like a loop hole to not really establishing workable and specific mitigations to a project but rather allowing certification under vague non specific stock mitigations. Once certified under stock mitigations it is difficult to show substantial impacts at time of development.	JW-8
	Chapter 2 Project Description	
2-9	ref 2.3.1: see ES-4 above, horseshoes left out of existing facilities	JW-9
2-10	table 2-1 under "use type" category, "open space" should read "open space and trails" for consistency and clarity with ES1 on page ES-6. Stats are skewed by using 135 acres for the "open space and trail " total . Again, Mesa Meadows (22 acres) and The Native Garden (12 acres) need	JW-10
	to be subtracted as they are designated rural areas and should not be considered in the total available undeveloped acreage. Both are being used recreationally and should be classified as such. The new total would be 101. Remaining stats need to be adjusted accordingly. Are the 4 Mesa Meadows infiltration basins counted under infrastructure or open space?	JW-11

2-14	table2-2: see ES5-6 above	JW-13
	Chapter 3 Environmental Setting	
3-1	3.1.1 the temporary Lil Bits preschool as listed at infrastructure. It is a contractually permitted non recreational temporary business. Its current location is in the area designated by LUO as Recreation and should be in the Public Facilities designated LUO area.	JW-14
3-2	table 3-1 needs to include under land uses Dana Elementary School and CHCC medical clinic and its expansion currently in progress (add'l 15,000 sq ft).	JW-15
3-11	table3-2/1.F states NCP is the only public park in Nipomo. The Jack Reddy Park has been approved and will include a volleyball court, a basketball court, and approximately one acre of grassy fields. The Jim Miller Memorial Park on Tefft is approx 1 acre and is available for development. The Kaminaka project on Pomeroy includes 29 acre sports complex with ball fields in their plans. These should be referenced in the table and considered for recreation.	JW-16
3-15	table 3-2, policy 3.1: as mentioned earlier, EIR claims NCP is only park in Nipomo. Jack Reddy, Jim Miller Memorial Park and the Kaminaka sports complex development need to be mentioned and considered.	JW-17
3-16	table 3-2, policy3.2: see above, NCP listed as the only existing park in Nipomo.	JW-18
3-26	table 3-2, E1.3: typo, text should read, "the NCPMP is a conceptual plan and does NOT include renewal energy facilities;"	JW-19
3-39	table 3-3, Cumulative Projects List: There is a project currently under construction that is not listed. It is located at 239 Tefft. It is a mixed used development that will include commercial and 3 residential units to be completed in 2012. Once occupied this would add to the traffic on Tefft and should be considered as a cumulative traffic and circulation impact.	JW-20
	Chapter 4 Environmental Impacts Analysis	
AESTH	ETICS	
4.1-18	AES impact 1: sites the recreation center as the only visual block to existing rural view. In terms of aesthetic character, the NCP serves an important role in defining the visual identity of Nipomo. As development continues around the community, NCP remains one of the last surviving native areas tying it to its rural roots. There is a cumulative block from the combination facilities including the fenced pool and deck, the 36,000 sq. ft. recreation center (250'Lx230'Wx36'H) covering 2 acres plus a defensible space fire break, fenced basketball courts with pole lighting, 2 fenced tennis courts with wind screening and pole lighting, fenced skate board park, a hand ball court, a transit stop, and parking lot with cars. Further, native chaparral would be stripped away and replaced with 10 acres of ball fields with 8-10 pole lights. The view from the interior of the park (KVA1, KVA-2, &KVA-5) would be irreparably altered from a rural	JW-21

4.1 4.1 4.1 4.1	-20 mul not the visu crar a ca -25 Bas -27 Ten -29 AES to u	w to an urban utilitarian view not in character with our rural goals. Mitigation of shrubbery nuld not diminish the size of the view obstruction, only decorate it. Setting structures back O' from the road is equally ineffective. Ineffective mitigations. It use sports fields: It estimates 8-10 pole lights for 10 acres of playing fields. That ratio does t seem right, only one light per acre? The 25' high cut and fill slopes needed to accommodate e 10 acres of fields in combination with lights and its mere size would noticeably affect the ual view to the South (KVA-2). With the adjacent added facilities the rural ambiance would be nsformed into an active sports center with a definite urban feel. The park would change from alm, peaceful, rural setting to a bustling, noisy, and urban one. Class I impact. sketball courts and handball courts: no mention of lights nnis courts: no mention of lights S Impact 2: Basically defers impacts because there is no definite design plan. Mitigations are use rural designs. That is an ineffective mitigation because design does not diminish size. It is	JW-22 JW-23 JW-24 JW-25 JW-26
4.1 4.1 4.1 4.1	-20 mul not the visu trar a ca -25 Bas -27 Ten -29 AES to u	ulti use sports fields: It estimates 8-10 pole lights for 10 acres of playing fields. That ratio does t seem right, only one light per acre? The 25' high cut and fill slopes needed to accommodate e 10 acres of fields in combination with lights and its mere size would noticeably affect the ual view to the South (KVA-2). With the adjacent added facilities the rural ambiance would be nsformed into an active sports center with a definite urban feel. The park would change from alm, peaceful, rural setting to a bustling, noisy, and urban one. Class I impact. sketball courts and handball courts: no mention of lights nnis courts: no mention of lights S Impact 2: Basically defers impacts because there is no definite design plan. Mitigations are use rural designs. That is an ineffective mitigation because design does not diminish size. It is	JW-23 JW-24 JW-25 JW-26
4.1 4.1 4.1	not the visu trar a ca -25 Bas -27 Ten -29 AES to u	t seem right, only one light per acre? The 25' high cut and fill slopes needed to accommodate e 10 acres of fields in combination with lights and its mere size would noticeably affect the ual view to the South (KVA-2). With the adjacent added facilities the rural ambiance would be nsformed into an active sports center with a definite urban feel. The park would change from alm, peaceful, rural setting to a bustling, noisy, and urban one. Class I impact. sketball courts and handball courts: no mention of lights nnis courts: no mention of lights S Impact 2: Basically defers impacts because there is no definite design plan. Mitigations are use rural designs. That is an ineffective mitigation because design does not diminish size. It is	JW-24 JW-25 JW-26
4.1 4.1 4.1	-25 Bas -27 Ten -29 AES to u the	sketball courts and handball courts: no mention of lights nnis courts: no mention of lights S Impact 2: Basically defers impacts because there is no definite design plan. Mitigations are use rural designs. That is an ineffective mitigation because design does not diminish size. It is	JW-25 JW-26
4.1 4.1 4.1	-27 Ten -29 AES to u the	nnis courts: no mention of lights S Impact 2: Basically defers impacts because there is no definite design plan. Mitigations are use rural designs. That is an ineffective mitigation because design does not diminish size. It is	 JW-26
4.1	-29 AES to u the	S Impact 2: Basically defers impacts because there is no definite design plan. Mitigations are use rural designs. That is an ineffective mitigation because design does not diminish size. It is	JW-26
4.1	tou	use rural designs. That is an ineffective mitigation because design does not diminish size. It is	
4.1	arci	e cumulative number and mass of the additions that detract from the visual view not the chitectural design. 24 acres of illumination and all the required fencing detracts from the rural abiance and adds to the harsh, urban, industrial look. Inadequate mitigations. Class I impact.	JW-27
	-31 AES	S Impact 3: community center would be visually imposing	JW-28
	AES	S/mm-3: mitigation by architectural design is ineffective. The size not style is the imposing tor creating a significant impact on the rural character. Class I impact .	JW-29
	AES bui	S/mm-4: mitigation by landscaping is ineffective. Landscaping reduces the visual scale of the ilding but not the actual size. Class I impact	JW-30
4.1	-32 AES sma pur she rep alte imp	S Impact 4 : Impact on character of park by removal of 1.12 acres/20 mature trees. Planting haller trees at a biological mitigation receptor site on the other side of the park or at a rchased easement elsewhere does not mitigate the loss of trees, rural character, and view ed from the area where they were taken. It would take 50 plus years to see the benefit of the planting and the area where they were removed would be significantly and permanently ered. This is not an immediate mitigation; it would take 50+ yrs. Ineffective mitigation. Class I pact.	JW-31
AIF	QUALIT	ΓΥ	
4.2	-14 tab are bee	ole 4.2-8 emissions chart: where are pollutants listed for horseshoe pits, dog park, picnic/BBQ ea, horse staging area, turf, playgrounds, and rapid transit vehicles/stops? Have emissions en factored in from the 2 main thoroughfares that border the park (Tefft and Pomeroy)?	JW-32
	Idlii Sch	ing automobiles on Tefft while dropping off and picking up students at the adjacent Dana nool adds to the cumulative emissions. Have the emissions from the newly constructed .000sq ft Medical center adjacent to the park been factored in? Chart figures need updating.	JW-33

	Emissions Quantification: EIR states proposed project would exceed the daily ROG+NOx combined threshold. It currently requires 18 on site mitigation measures. That threshold may be inaccurately low if the items mentioned in above emissions chart notation have not been	JW-34
	factored in. The mitigations are not effective or feasible. Internal paths would not diminish the trips to the park. The auto traffic is not generated from trips within the park. Planting trees in the parking lot to reduce evaporative emissions will not offset the loss of the 20 mature trees removed. Has the removal of those trees been factored in the equation as a cumulative effect?	JW-35
	On site housing already exists for the ranger so that is not a feasible mitigation. A recreational	JW-36
	would limit development, the height of the property would interfere with the view shed and aesthetics, and it would be adjacent to the newly developed 16,000 sq ft medical center on	JW-37
	Tejas Place with its accompanying emissions. Not a feasible mitigation. There would be a significant air quality impact on the park visitors and day care children in the park as well as to the sensitive receptors adjacent to the park (Dana school, the medical center, the Library, and the church with its additional day care.) Class I mitigation.	JW-38
4.2-16	AQ Impact 2, AQ/mm-2 AQ emissions exceed daily thresholds: see chart corrections above that would increase daily emissions and threshold totals. Mitigation of valet bicycle parking at community events centers is not feasible given the rural nature of our community and how spread out the residents are. Residual impacts: EIR states even with implementation of mitigations the emissions would not be reduced. With additional contributing factors (noted above re chart) and mitigations not feasible (moving rec. facility, building ranger residence, & bicycle valet) this becomes a class I impact.	JW-39
4.2-19	4.2.5.3, Create or subject individuals to Objectionable Odors: When Lil Bits temporary day care was placed in the park turf was dug up and a septic system was installed. If they are removed or moved to the new site on the project map, what happens to that system? Will it be dug up?	JW-40
	In the 3/24/05 letter to Shawna Scott at Morro Group Inc. from Melissa A, Guise, Air Quality specialist from SLO Air Pollution Control District she states, "District staff supports Alternative 2, which provides for less development that Alternative 1 and does not increase parking. District staff commends the applicant on the multi-use trail system proposed throughout the park and recommends the pathways be linked to bus stops, pedestrian trails and bike paths outside the park to encourage the use of alternative transportation".	JW-41
BIOLOG	SICAL RESOURCES	
4.3-2	Oak woodland: correction- 2 nd paragraph, 1st sentence. "poison oak" is listed twice.	JW-42
4.3-20	Special status wildlife: white Tailed Kite. My husband has sited these frequently in the rural section of the park as has Bill Deneen a noted naturalist in Nipomo. With the frequency of citings, the limited habitats in the coastal area and the MBTA/FP status their potential for occurrence should be elevated to "High" and elevation to Class I Impact.	JW-43

4.3-23	Special status wildlife: Pallid Bat. My husband has observed bats in the park species unk. May or may not be Pallid. Do other species of bats live there?	JW-44
	Monterey Dusky-Footed Woodrat: My husband and I have both observed them in the rural section.	JW-45
	Silvery Legless lizard: My husband and I have both observed them in the rural section.	
	Coastal Horned Lizard: My husband, grandchildren and I have all observed them in the rural section.	
	Class Aves: My husband and I have observed Red Tailed Hawks, American Crows, Scrub Jays, Great horned owls and numerous quail in the rural section.	
	It further serves as habitat for rabbits and coyotes. At least 5 people have seen a Mountain Lion in the park; one has seen a Bob Cat and occasionally a Fox.	JW-46
4.3-28	Project would disturb natural habitat for special status plant and wildlife species. 4.3-29 BR/mm- 3, Legless and Horned Lizard: 27.5 acres of special status wildlife species habitat would be	JW-47
	eliminated, substantially affecting their ability to survive. Monitor's soil raking has limited protection against loss of wildlife during the removal/relocation efforts during the ground disturbing activities. Not an effective mitigation	JW-48
	BR/mm-4, Monterey Dusky-footed Woodrat: Special species Woodrats would be displaced with their destroyed nests to serve as a stockpile of materials to scavenger and rebuild their nests. They would have permanently diminished habitat by the removal of Oak Woodland and Maritime Chaparral, affecting their normal activities. These animals are nocturnal so they won't be sited by day time monitors. What time will their nests be moved to not disturb their natural way of life? Unknown numbers of the species would be without nests until they could be rebuilt leaving them subject to natural predators which could substantially affect their numbers. Ineffective mitigation.	JW-49
4.3-35	BR Impact 3, Loss of 1.12 acres of oak woodland, approx 20 trees, BR/mm7, BR/mm-8,BR/mm- 9,BR/mm-10:The mitigation only allows for 50% mitigation via replanting. That is not an	JW-50
	Immediate mitigation; that will take 50+ years. An additional feasible mitigation would be to alter path/trail plans to route around established trees. Trails do not need to be straight lines. Trails curving around established trees would add to the rural character Nipomo is attempting to maintain and habitat would be preserved.	JW-51
4.4-40	4.3.7 cumulative impacts: If all the biological impacts in this chapter have been considered class II with mitigation, how does the cumulative impact result in Class III? Shouldn't that be Class II as well?	JW-52
GEOLO	GY, SOILS, DRAINAGE	

4.5-8	Drainage: 5 th paragraph refers to intersection of Osage and Pomeroy. Those 2 streets do not intersect. Do you mean Osage and Camino Caballo?	JW-53
HAZAR	RDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	
4.6-4	3 rd paragraph, The Sheriff's Department recommends implementation of several safety measures in conjunction with development of additional park facilities, including "Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design" and "light and lighting system guidelines", which have been proven to prevent and reduce crime. This creates a Class I impact on the recreation center. Per the CPTED guidelines, youth facilities should be on main roads in plain view to allow effective policing and natural public surveillance. The lighting in lighting and lighting systems guidelines needs to be factored in when determining the aesthetic impacts of cumulative lighting. The cumulative lighting from both of these safety measures plus the activity lighting would be a Class I impact on lighting.	JW-54
4.6-7	4.6.3, Thresholds of Significance: Need to include 6 th category of Potential for Crime as discussed on pg 4.6-3. Building the youth recreation center in the center of the park would be out of compliance with recommended safety measure to use Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design principles. This would create a class I Hazard Impact.	JW-56
4.6-9	Exposure to Hazardous Emissions: 1 st sentence would be more accurately stated as, "The NCP is located directly adjacent to the Dana Elementary School. The closer proximity would also change the concern for emissions at the school which is an air quality sensitive receptor.	JW-57
4.6-10	4.6.5.2 Emergency Response or Emergency Evacuation Plan: states implementation of the Master Plan would not interfere with emergency evacuations because no element blocks the public. Evacuation plans must include adequacy of escape routes for the population functioning at full capacity. There is no information regarding the maximum capacities of all the activity areas and the ability to safely and efficiently evacuate them. Class I Impact.	JW-58
LAND	USE	
4.7-1	4.7.1.1 Existing Land Uses: needs to include horse shoes under "uses"	JW-59
	4.7.1.2 Land Use of Adjacent Properties: "other vacant area" is now the 15,000sq ft CHC medical center expansion.	JW-60
4.7-4	4.7.5.1 Consistency with Land Use, Policy/Regulations: County Gen Plan guides future growth to enhance scenic resources. So County Inland Area balances social, economic, environmental a governmental resources and activities affecting quality of life in an area. The So County Planning Area preserves the character of communities and rural	JW-61

	areas that currently exist in the area. The Recreation Element insures the development of new parks and equitable distribution of parks throughout the county. Principles of Strategic Growth attempts to preserve open space, scenic natural beauty, and sensitive environmental uses (like our sensitive an protected species in the park) and foster a distinctive, attractive community with a strong sense of place.1988 Master Plan included a plan for acquisition of new parklands which was never done. The massive build out of the park impacts all of these land use policies to preserve Nipomo's rural equestrian character, provide equitable distribution of parks, preservation of open space, scenic natural beauty, and sensitive environmental uses and to acquire additional	JW-61 (continued)
	parkland. As Nipomo has grown there has been considerable loss to riding trails and the county has failed to dedicate new trails as requested creating a net loss of recreation to equestrians. The impact needs to address the cumulative loss of recreation to our equestrians and the unnecessary duplication of amenities for organized sports already	JW-62
	existing in Nipomo violating our land use guidelines. Suggested mitigations would be 1. Acquisition of new parkland while real estate prices are low. 2. Enter into joint use agreements with our schools to share and save tax dollars during tight county budgets. There are funds for building but not maintenance. 3. Enter into joint use agreement with schools to pay for the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design changes to campuses so that they will feel safe to open them to the public on off school hours. 4. Place some smaller developments in Jim Miller Park instead of in NCP (horse shoes, Bocce Ball, gazebo, skateboard park) 5. Partner with Jack Reddy Park to get it up and running.	JW-63
4.7-5	2 nd paragraph, skate board park mitigation: Cannot state that using mitigations N/mm-2 will reduce the noise to a specific level when the dimensions of the berm used in that mitigation are not given. Facts are not supplied to support that conclusion.	JW-64
NOISE		
4.8-1	4.8.1.1 Identified Sensitive Land Uses: Final sentence needs to include the CHC medical center and its 15,000 sq ft expansion.	JW-65
4.8-12	Last paragraph: States Pomeroy/Juniper would experience decreased traffic under build out conditions. What is the basis for this? This street will be realigned, signalized, and have turn lanes added. A pay booth will be added to this entrance and will serve as one of two entrances joined by a circular interior road. It will generate more traffic than currently and as much as Tefft upon completion. With that entrance signalized, it is reasonable to assume an increase in the people who cut thru the park now in order to avoid that signal and the ones at Pomeroy/Tefft and Tefft/Orchard.	JW-66
4.8-14	Stationary Noise, 2 nd paragraph: Noise measurements were taken at Damon Garcia Sports Complex during 3 games without amplified sound. Our proposed build is 10 acres or 6 youth soccer fields/games that could be played on simultaneously with	JW-67

	amplification, whistles, and crowd roars. Also practice games would include whistles and loud coaching instructions. The comparison is not equal. The measurement needs to be more accurately calibrated based on 6 fields.	JW-67 (continued)
4.8-15	3 rd paragraph: The multi game soccer event would be closer that 200 ft from a sensitive receptor, Dana Elementary and the new 15,000 sq ft CHC expansion.	JW-68
4.8-16	2 nd paragraph: no description of the skate board park barrier other than earthen and 25' from the edge. What are the dimensions?	JW-69
	3 rd paragraph: Potential remediation options for noise abatement are not mitigations and are not acceptable or reliable measures to reduce noises. Noise impact would be Class I.	JW-70
	N/mm-2: What are the dimensions of the berm? It cannot be offered as an adequate mitigation if no dimensions are given to calculate its effects. Will its size be a conflict with the Aesthetics requirement not to block view of the park from the street? What is the style and height of the fence? In order to block noise it would have to be solid which would conflict if safety and aesthetic mitigations and the West Tefft Corridor Design elements. Ineffective conflicting mitigation, not feasible.	JW-71
	N/mm-3: Directing loud speakers inward would not mitigate sound from effecting sensitive receptors within 200 ft. The loud speakers currently at the football field on Pomeroy can be very clearly heard across the park to the homes on Tejas Place, well over 200 ft.	JW-72
	N/mm-4: These are not mitigations. They are POSSIBLE afterthought solutions of questionable value. The ranger and/or park host do not have police powers. The County has no money for a Park Monitor. They are cutting park personnel. There is no guarantee a volunteer could be secured and that position would not have police powers	JW-73
	either. What design and height would the fence be to effectively keep people out? If it is solid as needed to mitigate noise it would be in conflict with mitigating safety measures to use Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design. CPTED requires no blind spots and all recreational activities remain visually open for effective policing and naturally occurring public surveillance. If it is open for safe viewing it won't mitigate the sound. Conflicting and ineffective mitigations. Class I Impact.	JW-74
4.8-18	4.8.6: 1 st sentence is incorrect. The CHC 15,000 sq ft expansion on Tejas Place adjacent to the park will generate a significant level of stationary noise.	JW-75
	2 nd paragraph: Need to recalculate the increased number of visits to the park upon build out. With an additional 27.5 acres of new recreation (more than doubling its current size) the additional trips would be substantially higher. The new amenities would draw high numbers of people each both on a casual use and tournament basis. (recreation	JW-76

center, ball fields, skateboard park, swimming pool, tennis courts, basketball courts). Facts do not support this assumption.

JW-76 (continued)

Comment No.	Response
JW-1	Please refer to responses to individual comments below.
JW-2	Horseshoe pits were installed within NCP near West Tefft Street to temporarily address community requests; however the NCPMP includes a permanent location for the horseshoe pits southwest of the Juniper Street entrance (refer to Figure 2-5, Nipomo Community Park Master Plan). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-3	The two horseshoe pits are approximately 1,800 square feet, or 0.04 acre. Including this acreage under the existing column in Table ES-1 (also Table 2-2), Master Plan Existing and Proposed Amenities, would increase the existing developed area within NCP (not including Mesa Meadows) from (specifically) 10.88173 percent to 10.91189 (difference of approximately 0.030 percent). The EIR rounds this number to 11 percent, therefore this specification does not result in a change to the calculated percentage presented in the EIR. As noted in EIR sections Executive Summary C.1. Existing Facilities, and 2.31 Project Description, Existing Facilities, the existing developed area is approximately 15 acres (the specific calculation is 14.908 acres). Inclusion of the 0.04-acre horseshoe pits would increase this calculation to 14.948 acres, which is then also rounded to approximately 15 acres. Therefore these specifications do not result in a change to the developed area acreage or percentage presented in the EIR. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-4	The Mesa Meadows area (22 acres) is included as part of the NCPMP because the trail system connects to NCP. This acreage was not included in the total acreage of land available for development, because no changes, improvements, or additional amenities are proposed within the Mesa Meadows open space area. All new facilities and amenities would be located within NCP (137 acres). If the Mesa Meadows open space area were to be included in the calculation, the percentage of existing developed area would decrease to 9.4 percent. Please note that the 11 percent developed area identified in the EIR is calculated by dividing the acreage of existing recreation area (8.18 acres) and NCP infrastructure (6.72 acres) (total14.9 acres) by the total acreage of NCP (137 acres). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-5	Please refer to response to comments JW-2 and JW-3 above. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-6	As noted in Table ES-1, use types listed under "Open Space" include Open Space (undeveloped), Open Play Area (turf), and Trails (dirt). These distinctions are presented to show the loss of 25 acres of Open Space (undeveloped). The additional Open Space Play Area (turf) will consist of areas without structures or facilities. The amenities listed under "Recreation" include active use areas and structural facilities. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-7	The pre-school is listed under "Infrastructure" similar to the Nipomo Library. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
8-WL	A Program EIR is the appropriate level of review for this type of project, because the NCPMP is a long-range conceptual plan, including various elements that would be implemented in different stages in the future. The intent of the Program EIR is to assess the potential impacts of the project as a whole, while identifying where additional analysis may be necessary in the future to assess specific elements (i.e., community center). Where information was not available, a reasonable worst case scenario is identified. Proposed mitigation measures include measurable standards and review requirements to verify compliance. The Program EIR was prepared consistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 (Program EIR). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-9	Please refer to response to comment JW-2 above.
JW-10	In Table 2-1, Master Plan Existing and Proposed Use Types, the Use Type column has been clarified as follows (changes shown in italics): Recreation Area & Designated Trails; Open Space

9.3.9 Response to Letter from Jacqueline Sue Walls

Comment No.	Response
	& Trails (dirt); Open Play Area Turf; Infrastructure. This clarification does not affect the impact determinations of the EIR.
JW-11	Please refer to response to comment JW-4 above. Trails/walkways (paved/unpaved) are included under the "Recreation Area" category. All other undeveloped areas (i.e., no structures or trails) are included under "Open Space". Plant restoration and demonstration areas within the Nipomo Native Garden are considered "Open Space" uses. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-12	The four basins within Mesa Meadows are included under "Open Space" because the basins are vegetated depressions within a designated "Open Space" area. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-13	Please refer to response to comment JW-5 above.
JW-14	As noted in the County Land Use Ordinance, Table 2-2, Allowable Land Uses and Permit Requirements, "child day care centers" are identified as an allowed use within the Recreation land use category, and require issuance of a Conditional Use Permit. A Conditional Use Permit is required for permanent establishment of this use. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-15	Table 3-1, Surrounding Land Uses, includes "school" in the row describing uses to the south of NCP. The described land uses has been clarified to include " <i>health center</i> ". This clarification does not affect the impact determinations of the EIR.
JW-16	In Table 3-2, Consistency with Plans and Policies, Framework for Planning (1.F.) has been clarified to note (in italics) that "The NCP is currently the only <i>developed</i> public park in Nipomo. <i>Other opportunities for park improvements in the community include the recently approved Jack Ready Park, Jim Miller Memorial Park, and private developments.</i> " This clarification does not change the consistency determination identified in the EIR.
JW-17	In Table 3-2, Consistency with Plans and Policies, San Luis Obispo County General Plan, Parks and Recreation Element, Recreation Goal, Objectives and Policies, General Recreation, Policy 3.1 has been clarified to state (note clarification in italics): "The project proposes new and expanded recreational uses and facilities at the only existing <i>developed</i> park serving the Nipomo community, consistent with this policy. <i>Other opportunities for park improvements in the community include the recently approved Jack Ready Park, Jim Miller Memorial Park, and private developments.</i> " This clarification does not change the consistency determination identified in the EIR.
JW-18	In Table 3-2, Consistency with Plans and Policies, San Luis Obispo County General Plan, Parks and Recreation Element, Recreation Goal, Objectives and Policies, General Recreation, Policy 3.2 has been clarified to state (note clarification in italics): "The project entails new and expanded open space and recreational uses at Nipomo's only existing <i>developed</i> park, consistent with this policy." This clarification does not change the consistency determination identified in the EIR.
JW-19	In Table 3-2, Consistency with Plans and Policies, San Luis Obispo County General Plan, Conservation and Open Space Element, Policy E 1.3, Proposed Action, has been clarified to state (note change in italics): The NCPMP is a conceptual plan, and does <i>not</i> include renewable energy facilities". This clarification does not change the consistency determination identified in the EIR.
JW-20	In EIR Section 3.4 Cumulative Study Area, Table 3-3, Cumulative Projects List, has been updated to include the mixed use project under construction at 239 Tefft Street (east of US 101). The cumulative development scenario for the traffic analysis was based on the <i>South County Traffic Model</i> , which includes a Future Conditions Model. The cumulative traffic analysis identifies the projected traffic conditions at year 2025, which would include the noted project. The inclusion of this project in the list of "recently approved projects" does not affect the impact determinations of the EIR.

Comment No.	Response
JW-21	Please refer to EIR Section 4.1.6 Aesthetic Resources, Cumulative Impacts, which addresses the resulting effect of total NCPMP build-out. The EIR recognizes that the visual character of NCP would be affected by proposed major elements (refer to AES Impact 8). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-22	Based on the analysis of aesthetic impacts (refer to Sections 4.1.5.1 Effect on Scenic View and 4.1.5.2 Effect on Visual Character and Quality, Visual Compatibility), and incorporation of mitigation measures AES/mm-1 through AES/mm-5, potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant. These measures have been prepared and reviewed to verify feasibility. The EIR acknowledges that the project would change the existing visual setting; however, key scenic views would be maintained. Therefore, potential impacts would be less than significant, and no changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-23	The EIRs estimate of 8-10 lights would cover three adult soccer fields (or six youth fields), based on comparison with local multi-use and soccer fields in the area. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-24	The EIR recognizes that the proposed sports fields would substantially alter the south-central portion of NCP; however, the majority of the park area would not be affected. Mitigation including restoration with native vegetation is recommended to minimize the potential for erosion and exposed earth (AES Impact 7, mitigation AES/mm-8), which would reduce the long-term noticeability of the sports fields. Although the change would be visible, the residual impact would be less than significant. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-25	Please refer to impacts analysis EIR Section 4.1.5.3 Aesthetic Resources, Effects of Light and Glare, which states: "Lighting would also likely be required elsewhere as part of NCP improvementsSecurity lighting may be necessary at the community pool, skate park, tennis and basketball courts, and other areas". No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-26	Please refer to response to comment JW-8, regarding applicability of Program EIRs. In lieu of a defined plan, a reasonable worst case scenario was identified and assessed in the EIR. This scenario was applied to photo-simulations presented in 4.1-18 through 4.1-23. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-27	Please refer to EIR Section 4.1.6 Aesthetic Resources, Cumulative Impacts, which addresses the resulting effect of total NCPMP build-out. The EIR recognizes that the visual character of NCP would be affected by proposed major elements (refer to AES Impact 8). As noted in the comment, implementation of mitigation measures would not reduce the overall size of the structures; however, the mitigation includes standards that would create visual articulation and improved visual consistency with the surrounding landscape (refer to AES/mm-3 and AES/mm-4). The proposed mitigation directly addresses the significant impact identified in AES Impact 3 (monolithic form, architectural style, and exterior colors and materials). Mitigation measures AES/mm-7 and AES/mm-7 include standards to reduce off-site light and glare, applicable to the proposed sports fields all other lighting in the park. The combination of these measures would mitigate the project's effect on aesthetic resources to less than significant by incorporating rural design elements and minimizing adverse effects to the public viewshed, including changes to visual character. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-28	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-29	Please refer to response to comment JW-27 above.
JW-30	Please refer to response to comment JW-27 above.
JW-31	The oak trees proposed for removal are primarily located adjacent to existing internal and adjacent roadways. No oak trees would be removed along the dense oak woodland ridge through

Comment No.	Response
	the center of the park. The County recognizes that the loss of mature oak trees would be noticeable in the short-term; however, the planting of new oak trees within a conservation easement will mitigate the potentially significant impact in the long term. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-32	In EIR Section 4.2 Air Quality, Table 4.2-8, Estimated Operational and Area Source Emissions, includes the emissions generated by all proposed uses within the park (refer to Appendix C Air Quality Background Information for complete summary of emission model results), pursuant to the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District <i>CEQA Handbook</i> (December 2009). Uses that would not typically generate high levels of traffic as a single-destination type use are grouped within the "City Park" category. The emissions generated by vehicles would be dispersed along the travel route, including roads within and adjacent to NCP (i.e. Pomeroy Road and West Tefft Street). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-33	Existing uses, such as the Dana Elementary School, generate emissions, which are considered part of the environmental baseline and contribute to air pollutant emissions in the area. As noted in EIR Section 4.2.1 Air Quality, Existing Conditions, "motor vehicles are the primary source of air pollutant emissions and greenhouse gases" and in 2008, state ozone standards were exceeded (as measured from the Nipomo air quality monitoring station). Park access, trails, and road improvements may contribute to a reduction in trips generated by adjacent uses by providing safe options for alternative transportation. In EIR Section 4.2 Air Quality, Table 4.2-8, Estimated Operational + Area Source Emissions, identifies the estimated emissions that would be generated by various elements included in the NCPMP, which would not include the medical center. Cumulative impacts are addressed within EIR Section 4.2.6 Air Quality, Cumulative Impacts. Based on the Mitigated Negative Declaration that was adopted for the Community Health Center project on October 27, 2011 (County project number DRC2010-00027, Environmental Determination number ED10-193), the project would not generate a significant level of air pollutants during construction, potential air quality impacts include the generation of fugitive dust during construction, potentially affecting nearby residences and resulting in a nuisance, and the use of diesel equipment near sensitive receptors. Standard mitigation was adopted for the project, consistent with APCD guidelines. The NCPMP's contribution to the cumulative generation of air pollutants in the area was determined to be less than significant, based on elements incorporated into the NCPMP, which are consistent with the APCD's <i>Clean Air Plan,</i> and incorporation of additional mitigation measures to reduce project-specific emissions. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-34	Please refer to response to comment JW-32 and JW-33 above.
JW-35	The 21 mitigation measure options listed in AES/mm-2 are included in the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District <i>CEQA Handbook</i> (December 2009), as effective measures to reduce the effects of ROG and NO _x generated by transportation and stationary uses. Providing trails and paths within and adjacent to the park contributes to use of alternative sources of transportation, such as walking and use of bicycles, which in turn reduces emissions both within the park and surrounding area. Although traffic is not generated from trips within the park, community members may elect to ride their bicycles or walk to the park, or traverse the park using improved paths en-route to an offsite destination. Emissions generated from vehicles in parking areas are affected by air temperature, and planting trees within parking areas provides a cooling effect, and thus reduces vehicle hydrocarbon emissions (which is the intent of the mitigation measure). Therefore, this is an effective measure to reduce operational emissions generated by the project. In the long term, the NCPMP includes the planting of additional trees of varying native species onsite, which would have a long-term beneficial effect to air quality. As noted in the comment, numerous mitigation measures are recommended, which would have a beneficial effect when combined. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-36	Please note that the referenced bulleted list noted in the EIR (refer to Section 4.2.5.1 Air Quality, Violate Air Quality Standard or Exceed Emission Thresholds, Emission Quantification), includes features currently included in the NCPMP (such as the existing ranger residence), and are not part of the 21 mitigation measures identified under AQ/mm-2. This list is provided to show how the

Comment No.	Response
	NCPMP incorporates various measures recommended by the APCD. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-37	Mitigation measure AES/mm-1 recommends locating the proposed community center a minimum of 150 feet from the existing park road, which would be approximately in the same location as proposed, buts shifted more to the west to preserve views. No air quality mitigation measures would require location of the structure at the Dana School property line. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-38	Based on the analysis of air quality impacts, which was conducted consistent with the APCD's <i>CEQA Handbook</i> (December 2009) and considered full build-out of the NCPMP as proposed, all potentially significant impacts can be mitigated to less than significant. In addition the project is consistent with the APCD's <i>Clean Air Plan</i> (refer to EIR Section 4.2.5.4 Air Quality, Consistency with SLOAPCD Clean Air Plan), which identifies land use and transportation guidelines to achieve state and federal air quality standards. The intention of identified operational mitigation measures is to reduce trip generation, increase energy efficiency, and apply the use of alternative energy and fuels to reduce the project's emissions, which affect adjacent land uses and regional air quality. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-39	Please refer to response to comments JW-32, JW-33, and JW-35 above. Use of bicycle valet parking is not intended to reduce all trips, but provide an incentive for the public to ride their bicycle to an event rather than drive a vehicle. Please note under AQ Impact 2, Residual Impacts that "implementation of identified mitigation would not eliminate air emissionsthe concentration of pollutants would be reduced to below identified thresholds"; therefore impacts are considered less than significant. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-40	In the event the Lil Bits pre-school is relocated, the septic system would be removed and reconstructed pursuant to existing regulations. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-41	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-42	In EIR Section 4.3.1.2 Biological Resources, Plant Communities and Habitat Types, Oak Woodland has been corrected to eliminate a duplicate species "poison oak". This change is minor and does not affect the impact determinations of the EIR.
JW-43	In EIR Section 4.3 Biological Resources, Table 4.3-2, Special-status Wildlife Species Evaluated for Occurrence on the Project Site, has been updated to reflect that the potential for occurrence of white-tailed kite is "Moderate to High", based on public responses that these species has been observed within NCP. The EIR noted the presence of this species, identified potential impacts to this species in addition to other avian species (refer to BIO Impact 1 and BIO Impact 4) and includes mitigation to avoid adverse effects to this species. Please refer to BR/mm-1 (worker education and training), BR/mm-11 (avoidance or pre-construction survey for nesting birds), and BR/mm-12 (pre-construction survey for nesting birds). Therefore, this clarification does not elevate the impact determination identified in the EIR.
JW-44	As noted in Table 4.3-2, Special-status Wildlife Species Evaluated for Occurrence on the Project Site, NCP does support suitable habitat for pallid bat. Other common species of bat may also be present. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-45	Please refer to Table 4.3-2, Special-status Wildlife Species, which has been clarified to include community-noted occurrences of Monterey dusky-footed woodrat, silvery legless lizard, Coast horned lizard, and Class Aves (multiple bird species). These species were either observed, or assumed to be present based on habitat conditions; therefore, this clarification does not affect the impact determinations of the EIR.
JW-46	Please refer to EIR Section 4.3.1.2 Plant Communities and Habitat Types, which notes observed species or suitable habitat conditions for a variety of special-status and common wildlife species, including coyote, fox, and bobcat. Under the description of Oak Woodland, the following statement

Comment No.	Response
	has been added to clarify additional common wildlife species observed by the public: "Additional occurrences noted by the public include rabbits and mountain lion." This clarification does not affect the impact determinations of the EIR, because these species are not considered endangered, threatened, or species of special concern.
JW-47	In EIR Section 4.3.6.1 Biological Resources, Unique or Special Status Species or their Habitat, identifies the potential loss of varying types of habitat and vegetation types within NCP, ranging from oak woodland and maritime chaparral to grassland and ruderal/ornamental. The NCPMP generally focuses development in one section of NCP, to allow for contiguous habitat areas for noted species and common wildlife. Restoration activities are proposed within NCP, including a 5.6-acre biological mitigation receptor site for maritime chaparral (sand mesa manzanita) and oak woodland, which would improve habitat conditions for special-status species. Mitigation measures BR/mm-5 (Habitat Restoration Plan) and BR/mm-7 through BR/mm-9 (Oak Woodland Protection and Restoration Plan) include measures that would provide a long-term benefit to plants and wildlife within NCP. Therefore, potential impacts are considered less than significant, and no changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-48	Mitigation measure BR/mm-3 (silvery legless lizard and Coast horned lizard), including soil raking, is an acceptable and feasible measure to locate and capture these species for transfer outside of the construction area. This measure also includes onsite monitoring during all initial ground disturbing activities. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-49	Mitigation measure BR/mm-4 (Monterey dusky-footed woodrat), including relocation of nests (if necessary), is an acceptable and feasible measure to avoid adverse effects to these species. Nest relocation may occur during the day; however, upon evacuation the woodrat individual(s) would likely scatter along known routes into adjacent habitat areas. Based on the presence of adjacent habitat and suitable cover, these activities would not have a significant adverse effect. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-50	Mitigation measure BR/mm-9, item (c) (Oak Woodlands Conservation Act grant) presents one option, out of three, to mitigate loss of oak woodland, pursuant to Senate Bill 1334, Oak Woodlands Conservation Act. The County recognizes that maturation of oak trees within the restoration area will not be immediate; however, mitigation includes replanting and maintenance within a conservation area, which will mitigate potentially significant effects to less than significant. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-51	Please refer to mitigation measure BR/mm-10 item (b): "Oak Tree Avoidance Measures. Grading and development within the proposed project shall avoid the removal of oak trees to the maximum extent feasible". The EIR identifies a reasonable worst case scenario regarding tree impacts and removal. As final plans are developed, the County will locate trails and roads to avoid oak trees to the maximum extent feasible, such as curving around established trees, as noted in the comment. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-52	When considered with the cumulative development scenario (projects recently approved or under development in the area), the project's impacts to biological resources is not considered cumulatively considerable because the project primarily avoids areas identified as sensitive habitat (i.e. oak woodland) and includes restoration and conservation within the park. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-53	EIR Section 4.5.1.1 Geologic Setting, Drainage, has been corrected per your comment, as follows (note correction in italics): "In the northwestern section of the park, near the intersection of Osage Street and <i>Camino Caballo</i> " This clarification does not change the impact determinations of the EIR.
JW-54	The Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) Guidelines do not specifically state that youth facilities should be located on main roads; however a CPTED strategy notes that "Gathering areas or congregating areas need to be located or designed in locations where there is good surveillance and access control". The project is generally consistent with this guideline,

Comment No.	Response
	because the community center would be located in close proximity to the internal park road and park ranger residence. The NCPMP was reviewed by the San Luis Obispo County Sheriff (refer to Appendix B, Notice of Preparation Comment Letters, letter dated December 3, 2009). All suggestions provided by the County Sheriff's office, which incorporate CPTED measures, are listed in mitigation measure PSU/mm-1 (refer to EIR Section 4.9 Public Services and Utilities). Based on the project's incorporation of these measures, potentially significant impact related to adverse effects to police and emergency services would be less than significant, and no changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-55	Please refer to EIR Section 4.1.5.3 (Aesthetic Resources, Effects of Light and Glare), which states that "Safety regulations and guidelines require lighting for parking areas, pedestrian uses, and buildings" and "Security lighting may be necessary at the community pool skate park, tennis and basketball courts, and other areas". The EIR analysis considered all types of lighting that would either be proposed or included per existing regulations and recommended guidelines, and includes mitigation to shield and direct light towards its intended target and purpose, as noted in mitigation measure AES/mm-7. These standards have been considered by the County Sheriff, as noted in their response to the Notice of Preparation, dated December 3, 2009 (refer to Appendix B of the EIR), and are incorporated into mitigation measure PSU/mm-1, item (c), including the following: "Proper care should be taken to ensure exterior lighting is properly shielded to prevent illumination that would affect the ambient level of light in the nighttime sky". Therefore, potentially significant impacts can be mitigated to less than significant, and no changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-56	Pursuant to Section 15131 (CEQA Guidelines, Economic and Social Effects): "Economic or social effects of a project shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment. An EIR may trace a chain of cause and effect from a proposed decision on a project through anticipated economic or social changes resulting from the project to physical changes caused in turn by the economic or social changesThe focus of the analysis shall be on the physical changes". This Section of the CEQA Guidelines further states that "Economic, social, and particularly housing factors shall be considered by public agencies together with technological and environmental factors in deciding whether changes in a project are feasible to reduce or avoid the significant effects on the environment identified in the EIR". Based on analysis of the project, and incorporation of recommended mitigation measures (PSU/mm-1), economic or social changes will not occur, resulting in an adverse physical effect. Please refer to EIR Section 4.6.1.5 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Potential for Crime), which refers the reader to EIR Section 4.9 Public Services and Utilities "for further discussion of the potential for additional crime within the project area". This potential environmental impact is appropriately analyzed under EIR Section 4.9 Public Services and Utilities, including incorporation of recommended CPTED guidelines, under the following threshold of significance: "Have an effect upon, or result in the need for new or altered public services in any of the following areasPolice protection (e.g. Sheriff, CHP)". Therefore, potentially significant impacts can be mitigated to less than significant, and no changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-57	EIR Section 4.6.5.1 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Risk of Explosion, Release of, or Exposure to Hazardous Substances, Exposure to Hazardous Emissions, has been clarified to state (note changes in italics): "The NCP is located <i>immediately adjacent to</i> the Dana Elementary School". This clarification does not change the analysis or impact determinations of the EIR, because this impact is considered under HM Impact 1 (which considers all actions within NCP at varying distances from Dana Elementary School) and would be mitigated by incorporation of mitigation measure HM/mm-1 (which also applies to all actions within NCP at varying distances from Dana Elementary School). Regarding air quality, and exposure to toxic air emissions, the potentially affected area includes sensitive uses within 1,000 feet, which would include Dana Elementary School (refer to EIR Section 4.2.3.2 Air Quality, SLO APCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Special Considerations for Construction Activity, Sensitive Receptors and EIR Section 4.2.5.2 Air Quality, Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations). No changes to the EIR are necessary.

Comment No.	Response
JW-58	EIR Section 4.6.5.2 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Emergency Response or Emergency Evacuation Plan refers to community-wide and regional evacuation. Regarding project-specific emergency response and evacuation, the NCPMP includes two vehicle ingress/egress opportunities on Pomeroy Road and West Tefft Street and several access points for pedestrians and bicyclists. Based on review by CALFIRE, the project does not include design or access components that would be inconsistent with general planning guidelines for emergency evacuation and response. The County is required to comply with the State Fire Code for all structures and facilities (including capacity limits), and prior to development, a Fire Prevention Plan (including emergency access) will be required for review and approval by CALFIRE prior to operation of any major facilities (refer to EIR Section 4.6.5.4 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Fire Hazard Risk). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-59	Please refer to response to comment JW-2 above. No changes to the EIR are necessary
JW-60	EIR Section 4.7.1.2 Land Use, Land Use of Adjacent Properties has been clarified to state (note changes in italics): "There are also two parcels at the southeast corner of the project area within other designations: a Public Facility parcel at the location of Dana Elementary School and an Office Professional parcel with some general office buildings and <i>a community health center expansion (under construction)</i> ". This clarification does not change the impact determinations of the EIR.
JW-61	Please refer to Chapter 3 Environmental Setting, Table 3-2, Consistency with Plans and Policies, which includes an assessment of the project's consistency with specific plans and policies. Please note that the decision-makers (County General Services Agency and Parks and Recreation Commission [PRC] and Board of Supervisors [BOS]) will consider and provide the final recommendation and determination regarding the project's consistency with plans and policies. As noted in Table 3-2, the project appears to be consistent with the policies referenced in the comment, because the project includes equestrian-use parking and trails within NCP, provides contiguous open space and undeveloped area, avoids sensitive habitats and species to the maximum extent feasible, includes restoration of habitat within the park, and preserves highly scenic areas within the park (i.e., oak woodland ridge). Regarding equitable distribution of parks and acquisition of additional parkland, the project does not interfere or conflict with implementation of this standard. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-62	The project includes designated equestrian trails and a parking area, and therefore, does not result in a significant loss of equestrian use areas. Provision of additional recreational opportunities for the community is consistent with the Parks and Recreation Element. Specific impacts to the environment related to the physical changes that would occur upon implementation of the NCPMP are addressed in the EIR. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-63	The mitigation suggestions identified by the commenter would apply to higher level of park planning, outside of the scope of the EIR for the NCPMP. These suggestions are appreciated by the County, and will be considered by County management and appropriate decision makers, such as the County General Services Agency, PRC, and BOS. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-64	The actual design of the noise barrier will depend on the design of the skate park. Mitigation measure N/mm-2 has been clarified to state the following (additional standard noted in italics): "Prior to construction of the skate park, the design plans shall incorporate the following noise reduction measures, <i>achieving a maximum average hourly noise level of 65 decibels as measured 25 feet from the edge of the skate park</i> ". This addition does not change the impact determinations of the EIR, and this impact remains less than significant.
JW-65	EIR Section 4.8.1.1 (Noise, Identified Sensitive Land Uses), has been clarified to state (note addition in italics): "Existing noise sensitive uses within, adjacent to, and in the vicinity of NCP include residences, Dana Elementary School, Little Bits Preschool, Day Springs Preschool, Nipomo Library, <i>Community Health Center (expansion under construction),</i> and NCP itself." This

Comment No.	Response
	minor clarification does not change the impact determinations of the EIR.
JW-66	Based on data obtained from the South County Traffic Model, estimated trips in this location would be reduced under community build-out conditions (year 2020) (likely due to the construction of other roadways in the area). Please refer to EIR Section 4.10 Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic, which includes an analysis of existing, existing plus project (i.e., build-out of the NCPMP), build-out (of the community), build-out plus project (i.e., build-out of the community and build-out of the NCPMP). As shown in Table 4.8-7, Estimated Traffic Noise Level Increase (Existing Plus Project), the project would add approximately 202 trips at the Pomeroy/Juniper intersection. Based on the traffic study, the trips generated on Pomeroy would not equal that of Tefft Street (refer to EIR Section 4.10 Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic, Table 4.10-9, Existing and Existing with Project Street Roadway Segment Daily Traffic Conditions). Please note that all park entrances would be signalized, and there is no evidence that proposed improvements and additional signalization would result in increased "cut-throughs" within NCP. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-67	At this time, the use of the sports fields is currently undetermined. The "reasonable worst case scenario" identified for the EIR analysis is six youth soccer fields (refer to EIR Section 2.3.2 Project Description, Proposed Facilities). The noise measurements were conducted during an actual soccer tournament (including crowd and coaching-related noise and whistles), in order to obtain a realistic estimate, and the results were applied to an anticipated situation at NCP, assuming a reasonable worst case scenario. At this time, bleachers and amplified sound are not specifically included in the proposal for the NCPMP; however, the EIR considers that some amplified sound may occur. Mitigation is identified to direct any amplified sound towards the interior of the park and away from adjacent noise sensitive uses (refer to N/mm-3). Therefore, this impact remains less than significant, and no changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-68	The multi-use sports fields would be located approximately 350 feet from school facilities (the uses are separated by an existing ball field associated with the school), and a minimum of 200 feet from the Community Health Center property boundary. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-69	The actual height of the berm will be contingent on the final design of the skate park. Based on an in-ground design, the vegetated noise berm would likely be approximately four feet in height parallel to the skate park. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-70	As documented in the EIR, the NCPMP has been designed to avoid exceedance of the noise standard by incorporating setbacks from noise sensitive land uses, and taking advantage of natural barriers such as West Tefft Street and the Dana Elementary School ball field. The EIR analysis considers "reasonable worst-case scenario" situations, such as a multi-field soccer tournament. In addition, the County recognizes that there may be times when the public engages in activities that generate unwanted noise affecting other users within NCP and adjacent noise-sensitive uses. For this reason (in addition to others), the County has a park ranger and park host present onsite to monitor conditions during both open and closed park hours. This existing method has proved effective to address unwanted situations, and could reasonably continue to address any future conditions requiring remediation. In addition, The County General Services Agency has the discretion to issue and revoke permits for use of amplified sound, and could do so in the event of documented noise violations. Mitigation measure N/mm-4 is included in order to address any situations that do not prove to be addressed by the park ranger or park host. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-71	The actual height of the berm and fencing will be contingent on the final design of the skate park. Based on an in-ground design, the vegetated noise berm would likely be approximately four feet in height parallel to the skate park, which would not significantly obstruct views along West Tefft Street. Pursuant to AES/mm-2, standard, uncoated, galvanized fencing would be avoided. Potential options include dark-coated fencing to improve the appearance, and vertical bars to avoid climbing. The height of the fence would likely be approximately six feet. No changes to the EIR are necessary.

Comment No.	Response
JW-72	Please refer to EIR Section 4.8 Noise, Table 4.8-6, Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure- Stationary Noise Sources, which includes measurable noise thresholds. The Noise Element does not require that noises cannot be heard, but establishes limits to the level of acceptable exposure. The EIR recognizes this fact, as noted in N Impact 2 Residual Effects: "Operation of new uses within NCP would increase the noise levels both within and surrounding the park. Implementation of recommended mitigation would reduce anticipated noise levels to a level below identified County thresholds; however, persons within and adjacent to NCP may experience noise levels above current levels during higher levels of use (i.e. sports field tournaments, summertime use of skate park)". No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-73	Please refer to response to comment JW-70.
JW-74	Please refer to response to comment JW-69 and JW-71. Construction of an approximately four- foot high berm and six-foot fence (vertical posts) would not significantly block surveillance views. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-75	Based on the Mitigated Negative Declaration that was adopted for the Community Health Center project on October 27, 2011 (County project number DRC2010-00027, Environmental Determination number ED10-193), the project would not generate significant levels of noise during operation, and restrictions on construction activities was identified to further reduce temporary noise impacts. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JW-76	Please refer to EIR Section 4.10 Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic, which includes an analysis of cumulative traffic counts, based on documented trip generation estimates and the County-adopted traffic model. No changes to the EIR are necessary.

From:	smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us
Sent:	Tuesday, April 24, 2012 8:23 AM
To:	Shawna Scott; secooper@co.slo.ca.us
Subject:	Fw: Comments on Master Plan for the Nipomo Regional Park

----- Forwarded by Steve McMasters/Planning/COSLO on 04/24/2012 08:22 AM -----

 From:
 Cindy Jelinek <cielinek@calpoly.edu>

 To:
 smcmasters@cc.slo.ca.us

 Date:
 04/23/2012 06:34 PM

 Subject:
 Comments on Master Plan for the Nipomo Regional Park

Dear Steve: At the meeting you held months ago at Nipomo High School going over the DEIR for the regional park, I talked with you a bit about the Nipomo Native Garden. You suggested I email you to remind you of our conversation. Of course, I forgot. But I just came across the notes that I took and hope you can pass these on to the folks who might be interested.

On the Master Plan for the Nipomo Native Garden, our parking lot is shown in the wrong place. Since the Master plan process begin a number of years ago, we have installed the parking lot and it is located further up Osage Road from where it is shown on your maps. Additionally, we have changed our mind about building a visitor center.

The Nipomo Native Garden's Board looked at the Master Plan and would like to suggest that the cross-walk shown going from the NNG across Camino Caballo to a proposed children's playground be changed. Unless you are planning to put a stop sign right in the middle of the block, this is a dangerous place to have parents and children crossing the street. The logical crossing would be at the corner of Osage and Camino Caballo. $\end{CJ-3}$

Additionally, we disagree with the idea of putting a children's playground in that area at all. It is supposed to be the Cesar Chavez Native Garden and should be kept with drought tolerant native plants. It is also far away from any other services that children might require like restrooms.

Thanks for seeing that this goes to the correct person, Steve.

Cindy Jelinek President, Nipomo Native Garden

[Scanned @co.slo.ca.us]

1

CJ-4

9.3.10 Response to Email from Cindy Jelinek

Comment No.	Response
CJ-1	Please refer to response to individual comments below.
CJ-2	The NCPMP will be adjusted to show the current location of the Nipomo Native Garden parking area. In addition, the Parks and Recreation Commission (PRC) and Board of Supervisors (BOS) will review the NCPMP, EIR, public comments, and testimony, and provide recommendations and direction regarding the type and location of specific facilities and amenities. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
CJ-3	The proposed modification to the NCPMP can be accommodated to address the commenter's concerns regarding the crosswalk as proposed the Draft EIR. The existing raised crosswalk and entrance to the Nipomo Native Garden would remain in place. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
CJ-4	This modification to the NCPMP will be considered by the County General Services Agency, PRC, and BOS. No changes to the EIR are necessary.

smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us
Thursday, April 26, 2012 4:37 PM
Shawna Scott
secooper@co.slo.ca.us
Fw: DEIR Comments for Nipomo Community Park

----- Forwarded by Steve McMasters/Planning/COSLO on 04/26/2012 04:36 PM -----

From: Vince McCarthy <<u>vincemcc@att.net</u>> To: <u>smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us</u> Date: 04/26/2012 04:33 PM Subject: DEIR Comments for Nipomo Community Park

Mr Steve McMasters,	
I am writing you with comments on the Nipomo Draft EIR. These comments have to do with the amount of building in the park and the Intensive building that	VM-1
will cause more traffic congestion in the area of the park. I realize	
this is a twenty year plan, but it still has a hugh possibility of traffic problems. When the NCAC(now the SCAC) examined several of the large drain basins here in Nipomo several years ago, it found in the summer time that they could be used as parks. There are three to five of the largest drain basins that could be used for this purpose. Using these drain basins as parks would dissipate the traffic that would be in the area of the park.	VM-2
The traffic congestion during the weekdays would be from off	
work people trying to get nome. This is also the time many games are	VIVI-3
This would add more problems for the Community than it would save. All the mitigations proposed still have to find a way to get paid for. At this time, with a recession going on no one is going to have money to donate to the	VM-4
building in the Park. The recession is expected to last another five years. None of these ideas were mentioned in the Draft EIR. It is just about the build out of the Community and the central area of the Nipomo Community Park.	VM-5
The Planning and Building Dept need to relook at this whole situation, before accepting the Final EIR and committing this beautiful park to this kind of use.	VM-6
There are other problems with the proposed use of the park. I am sure other people will touch on all of these problems,	VM-7
Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter. Vincent McCarthy	

1

9.3.11 Response to Email from Vincent McCarthy

Comment No.	Response
VM-1	Please refer to EIR Section 4.10 Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic, which includes a comprehensive traffic analysis. Please refer to responses to individual comments below.
VM-2	At this time, The County General Services Agency is not aware of potential drainage basins that could be used for public parks within the community of Nipomo. These basins provide open space when not functioning as part of a stormwater management system; however, they could not be developed with amenities or other uses. Please note that based on the traffic analysis conducted as part of the EIR (refer to EIR Section 4.10), the project would not result in a significant amount of traffic adversely affecting the immediate area. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
VM-3	Please refer to EIR Section 4.10 Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic, which includes an assessment of the p.m. peak hour (i.e., typical weekday evening traffic congestion period referred to in the comment). The NCPMP includes road improvements, which would address existing and anticipated operational traffic issues, such as the need for additional traffic signals and pedestrian crosswalks. Based on this analysis, implementation of the proposed NCPMP would not result in a significant, project-specific adverse traffic impact related to congestion (refer to EIR Section 4.10.6.1 Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic, Increase in Traffic and Level of Service). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
VM-4	The County recognizes the funding challenges currently facing public projects; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
VM-5	The EIR includes an assessment of the project as proposed, and identifies Alternatives to the project that would avoid or reduce identified significant impacts. As noted in response to comment VM-2 above, the use of drainage basins as public parks may not be feasible for the development of recreational amenities. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
VM-6	Please note that the County General Services Agency, Parks and Recreation Commission, and County Board of Supervisors will review all public comments when considering approval or modification of the NCPMP (as currently proposed) and certification of the Final EIR. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
VM-7	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.

From:	smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us
Sent:	Thursday, April 26, 2012 5:02 PM
То:	Shawna Scott
Cc:	secooper@co.slo.ca.us
Subject:	Fw: Nipomo Park Master Plan DEIR
Attachments:	Park EIR response letter.docx

----- Forwarded by Steve McMasters/Planning/COSLO on 04/26/2012 05:01 PM -----

 From:
 Gary & Jane Peterson <garyjane@charter.net>

 To:
 smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us

 Date:
 04/26/2012 04:47 PM

 Subject:
 Nipomo Park Master Plan DEIR

Hello Mr. McMasters,

Attached find a letter I composed in response to the draft EIR for Nipomo Regional Park. I am also sending you a signed copy by US Mail. You should have that by the Monday deadline but if not, you do at least have this one.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to respond. I love that park and want it to be the best it can be.

1

Jane Peterson

[Scanned @co.slo.ca.us]
JP-2

JP-3

Jane Peterson

355 Via Vicente• Nipomo, CA 93444• Phone: 805 929-1849 • E-Mail: garyjane@charter.net

April 26, 2012

Steven McMasters Project Manager County Planning & Building Dept. 976 Osos St, Rm 300 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040

Dear Mr. McMasters:

I am a 21-year resident of Nipomo, as well as a retired Lucia Mar teacher who has taught at both Nipomo and Dana Schools. I have lived and worked in Nipomo long enough to have a feeling as to how some of the changes could impact our community in both positive and negative ways so I would like to share a few thoughts regarding the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan and its DEIR.

General comments: This community greatly needs a community center and many of the other amenities proposed in the master plan. Years ago I volunteered at the old rec center on Frontage and know what a great asset that building was to our community. We certainly need sports fields and a preschool, and a skate park would be nice for our older kids. A pool the entire community could use would be wonderful and keeping space for horseback riding is a must in this rural community, with trails disappearing at an alarming rate.

I question the placement of an extra playground near the Native Garden when that adjoining neighborhood has so very few children. Personally, I think that area would be better suited for the equestrian staging area, keeping those large horse rigs out of the middle of the park where there could be traffic and pedestrian issues with driving them through a crowded park. Actually, I question the rationale of your planners in the placement of the horse staging area smack in the middle of a busy park; perhaps that location could be re-evaluated.

I also question having a second dog park, when the first one is not that well used. That space might be better for the extra playground area for youngsters. It adjoins the ballparks and I think parents would appreciate one located there. Perhaps another re-evaluation is in order here.

Lighting: I am very concerned about the amount of lighting that would be generated with a full build out. Yes, I understand that the lighting would be focused down with shades and would hopefully be of low wattage. However the amount of reflected light is still going to light up the skies around the park. If the lighting was spread out in different places around the park, as in the alternate plans, the impact would be reduced. I do not live directly next to the park but if I did I would be very upset to think that my comforting dark skies would forever be gone. I have lived in a city, a suburb of LA, and know what it is like to have the skies always aglow. Nipomo is special because of its rural nature and dark skies in the midst of suburban sprawl. Encroaching light from Santa Maria and the Five Cities are already having an impact. We rarely see the Milky Way anymore when it used to be a regular sight. Let's do what we can now to minimize the impact of lights by doing less, not more, when we build up our park.

Noise: I live about ½ mile from the park and can hear noise from there on occasion when there are big events. I have lived in Nipomo long enough to remember the loud music and speakers from the vaqueros riders when they had their arena

1 -

there and would meet on weekends. It disturbed the calm of our rural neighborhood and there was no escape other than leaving the area if we didn't want to hear it. If sports fields were installed behind Dana School the amount of noise generated would be similar, I am sure, and would happen more than one day a week. If I lived on Tejas or Mesa, alongside the park, I could not have a quiet weekend for months on end.	JP-7 (continued)
*** The sports fields belong near Nipomo High School and 101 where the distraction of extra noise would be negligible. I have brought up the point before that the long empty field adjoining the parking lot at the high school was designated in the high school master plan as community soccer fields. There is more than enough parking for large tournaments, not to mention that the area can easily handle the large amount of excess traffic. This is where we should be considering the placement of soccer fields. There would obviously be details to work out with Lucia Mar USD and some mitigations regarding the adjoining agricultural fields, but the places in this scenario and the negatives with the park scenario make this a no brainer. Please look into this as a viable alternative to having soccer fields in the park.	JP-8
<i>Traffic:</i> As a former teacher at Dana School I am intimately aware of traffic concerns in and around the park. You need to be doing all you can to keep as much traffic away from the school as possible. I appreciate the fact that the master plan does indeed create a new road that takes traffic to the other side of the library away from the school. But you can do more This means putting less, not more, amenities in the middle of the park. Please make the major, traffic-generating build-outs, like the community center, along Tefft. There really is a lot of space in that area, especially if you consider moving the existing dog park to another location. You need to be in close communication with Lucia Mar USD about traffic near the school, as a lot of children walk home through the park or are picked up in the park by their parents. I assume that you and LMUSD have already been in communication on this issue.	JP-9
Safety: Putting the major build-outs along Tefft has another advantage in that it makes the park much more accessible and visible to law enforcement as they increase their patrol to keep the park safe. Putting a skate park on Tefft is a MUST for law enforcement reasons—it has to be easily visible as it has great potential to be a problem spot if off the beaten track. That location also makes the park amenities most likely to need emergency medical help, like the community center and skate park, more accessible.	JP-10
Environment: I have always been interested in science and our natural world. I believe that minimal build-out in the park's center is consistent with maintaining a natural area for future generations to enjoy as our community continues to grow and change with the inevitable loss of natural areas.	JP-11
<i>Closing:</i> All in all, I like what has been proposed in concept—our community needs it—but lean definitely towards minimal build-out in the center of the park for a number of reasons, many cited above. Therefore I suggest that we move towards the alternate plans as we go forward. I hope my comments, suggestions, and insights have been helpful. I love my community and want it to be the best it can be for generations to come.	JP-12

Sincerely,

Petersa Jane

Jane Peterson

9

9.3.12	Response to Letter from Jane Peterson
--------	---------------------------------------

Comment No.	Response
JP-1	Please refer to responses to individual comments below.
JP-2	Please refer to responses to individual comments below.
JP-3	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
JP-4	These suggested modifications to the NCPMP will be considered by the County General Services Agency, Parks and Recreation Commission (PRC) and Board of Supervisors (BOS). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JP-5	This suggested modification to the NCPMP will be considered by the County General Services Agency, PRC, and BOS. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JP-6	The EIR acknowledges that implementation of the NCPMP would result in additional lighting, what would be visible, and have an effect on surrounding land uses and the night sky (refer to EIR Section 4.1.5.3 Aesthetic Resources, Effects of Light and Glare). As noted in the comment, mitigation is required, including use of shields, timers, and directional lighting to minimize offsite effects to the maximum extent feasible. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JP-7	The County recognizes that there may be times when the public engages in activities that generate unwanted noise affecting other users within NCP and adjacent noise-sensitive uses. For this reason (in addition to others), the County currently has a park ranger and park host present onsite to monitor conditions during both open and closed park hours. This existing method has proved effective to address unwanted situations, and could reasonably continue to address any future conditions requiring remediation. In addition, The County General Services Agency has the discretion to issue and revoke permits for use of amplified sound, and could do so in the event of documented noise violations. Mitigation measure N/mm-4 is included in order to address any situations that do not prove to be addressed by the park ranger or park host. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JP-8	Please note that approval of the NCPMP as proposed does not preclude further discussions between the County and the Lucia Mar School District. The County General Services Agency, PRC, and BOS may consider this option when reviewing public comments. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JP-9	Please refer to EIR Section 5.3.2.1 Alternatives Analysis, Alternative Master Plan A, which considers the suggestion option to locate the community center near West Tefft Street. The NCPMP includes road improvements such as signalization and crosswalks to improve vehicle access into NCP, and improve safety for pedestrians, including school children, accessing NCP and surrounding uses. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JP-10	Suggested options are considered in EIR Chapter 5, Alternatives Analysis; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
JP-11	Suggested options are considered in EIR Chapter 5, Alternatives Analysis, and further reduced options or varying combinations of uses may be considered by the County General Services Agency, PRC, and BOS. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
JP-12	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.

Shawna Scott

smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us
Thursday, April 26, 2012 3:16 PM
Shawna Scott; secooper@co.slo.ca.us
Fw: Nipomo Park DEIR Response
Comments Regarding Traffic With Respect to the Nipomo Park DEIR.pdf

I believe this was already in the SCAC group of comments...but here it is again for good measure. ----- Forwarded by Steve McMasters/Planning/COSLO on 04/26/2012 03:14 PM -----

 From:
 D Woodson william woodson@hotmail.com

 To:
 <smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us>

 Cc:
 "James Patterson, BOS Chair" <jpatterson@co.slo.ca.us>

 Date:
 04/26/2012 01:24 PM

 Subject:
 Nipomo Park DEIR Response

Mr. McMasters:

The attached document is my response to the Nipomo Park DEIR. I have only commented on Section 4.10, <i>Transportation, Circulation and Traffic.</i> As a member of the Nipomo Traffic and Circulation Committee and a Civil Engineer I have been observing Nipomo traffic problems for eleven years and feel that I have some expertise on the Nipomo traffic situation. I also am a member of SLOCOG's Citizens Transportation Advisory Council. This has allowed me to adapt a more regionalized viewpoint of those traffic situations that affect Nipomo	DW-1
In my opinion those two mitigation measures (TR/mm-1 and TR/mm-2) proposed in the DEIR will do nothing to alleviate near-term and long-traffic problems. Meanwhile the proposed park will gradually be developing thus, causing increased traffic loads on key intersections initiating a traffic-carrying failure of these intersection resulting in Class III traffic impacts and PMS problems.	DW-2
Nipono's Road Impact Fee account is nearly empty and as local and State agencies have labored long and hard to get the funding to complete the Willow Road Interchange completed I would not expect any financial help from them to provide an improved southbound freeway ramp and bridge deck widening to allow a more efficient northbound freeway	DW-3
on ramp. I hope you can address this in the EIR.	

Thank you for your consideration,

Dan Woodson, PE

[Scanned @co.slo.ca.us]

1

4.10 Traffic and Circulation Impacts

General Comments

All the traffic tables are from 2009 or earlier. There is a need for more current data.

TR/mm-1 – Asking the RTA to approve a local fixed route transit expansion <u>does not mitigate</u> the traffic impacts created by this proposal. Nipomo does not have sufficient population density to justify transit expansion and this request to RTA would be denied. **The traffic impacts will continue to be unresolved.**

TR/mm-2 – Merely paying into the Road Impact Fee account <u>does not mitigate</u> the traffic impacts created by this proposal. The Area 1 Road Impact Fee account is nearly exhausted and is in debt to the Area 2 account. It will take a considerable amount of development to create sufficient RIF funds for any Tefft/101 improvements. This development cannot occur until there is sufficient water to cancel the building moratorium. The current waterline intertie project will not provide sufficient water for future development and there are no additional water acquisition projects scheduled for the future. The traffic impacts will continue to be unresolved.

Specifics

4.10.6.1 Increase in Traffic and Level of Service

Proposed Intersection and Roadway Improvements

The DEIR indicates that a realignment of Orchard Road and Juniper Street will occur to provide appropriate entrances to the Park. However, the DEIR does not mention when during this 20 year plan this proposed new traffic related construction will occur or whether the traffic improvements must be completed prior to any major development in the park.

Traffic signal at Juniper and Pomeroy – This is a decision that must be made by the County Traffic Engineer and submitted to the BOS for approval. A traffic signal should only be placed in accordance with the Manual of Uniform Traffic control Devices.

Neighborhood Impacts

Impacts are to be expected. When the Park charges admission people will park on public streets in the adjacent neighborhoods causing friction between residents and park users.

4.10.6.2 Create Unsafe Conditions

Traffic signal at Juniper and Pomeroy – This is a decision that must be made by the County Traffic Engineer and submitted to the BOS for approval. A traffic signal should only be placed in accordance with the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices or other, accepted prevailing standards.

Osage Road widening – Based on the statement, Osage road will be widened to meet County road standards, allowing for adequate room for two vehicles to pass in alternate directions. These improvements would have a beneficial impact related to safety and road hazards by remediating sub-

DW-4

4.10 Traffic and Circulation Impacts

standard existing conditions. No significant project access impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are warranted, then, why is the Osage Street widening is even included in this DEIR for the park, particularly since Osage St. is rated Level of Service "A" and the existing ADT is the same as the anticipated ADT with the project.

This not wanted by the adjacent landowners. It has never appeared on any of the South County Traffic Model updates, a report published by Public Works documenting the transportation and circulation needs for the South County Planning Area. Furthermore, the topography does not lend itself to easy road construction. Construction will require the taking of property or the placement of extensive and expensive retaining walls to accommodate the necessary cut and fill slopes. Filling on the park side will destroy some stately, old oaks.

4.10.6.5 Alternative Transportation

Pedestrian Impacts

Path along Osage – There is insufficient roadway width along part of Osage (see above) to allow a path. Path construction along that segment must be within the park boundary.

Bicycle Impacts

Although the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan 1" to 150' scale plan sheet shows separate paved and equestrian trails, this must be reemphasized in the final EIR.

Transit Impacts

TR/mm-1*

County does <u>not</u> need to coordinate with RTA. Public Works is capable designing and siting a transit stop. Such stop should be located on Tefft Street and serve the Library, the School and the Park. A transit stop may encourage transit service in the future. This should be completed before any interior improvements. There will be no transit service in Nipomo until there is a significant increase in population density and this cannot be considered a mitigating factor for many years. With the addition of the park amenities traffic generation will increase starting from the first day of operations.

* TR/mm-1 will not be mitigated for many years.

Residual impacts

Improved pedestrian and bicycling access will not reduce potential vehicle trips contributing to the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. Those that choose to bicycle or walk to the park will come from local neighborhoods. These people would not contribute to decreasing potential vehicle trips at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange.

Even with a transit stop there will be no transit service in Nipomo until there is a significant increase in population density.

4.10.7.1 Year 2025 Cumulative Impacts

DW-4

4.10 Traffic and Circulation Impacts

Now that the Central Coast Community Health Center is under construction has the traffic generated from that project been considered as a cumulative impact.

4.10.7.2 Cumulative Planned Road Improvements

General

The monies that would fund those projects listed in the latest edition of the South County Traffic Model are depleted. Funds can only be generated from future development. Development will not occur unless developers can provide a water source separate from the existing purveyors.

North Frontage Road Connection to Willow Road Extension

This will not be achieved until buildout of the area between Hettrick and Highway 101 in the vicinity of Willow. This development will not occur unless they can provide a water source separate from the existing purveyors. These improvements should not be assumed to be completed under the baseline cumulative scenario.

State Route 1 connections to Dawn Road, Mesa Road and Eucalyptus Road

Mesa Road and Eucalyptus Road traverse Woodlands with a slow circuitous alignment. Dawn road is not scheduled to be a through road. Of the three roads only Mesa is a designated truck route. These improvements should not be assumed to be completed under the baseline cumulative scenario.

Alternatives 1, 2, and 3

Action on all three alternatives are dependent on the results of a Highway Corridor Study. Alternative 3 is a separate consideration. It is not influenced by Alternatives 1 and 2. CalTrans indicates that implementation of Alternative 3 would require additional deck widening. This would be a very expensive project.

TR Impact 2 Buildout of the NCP Master Plan will potentially have a significant cumulative impact at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange southbound ramps during the p.m. peak hour.

TR/mm-2*

Transportation Demand Management measures – Who will monitor this? How will we know it's being done given Parks and Recreation minimal budget?

-in lieu fees

To mitigate problems caused by park activities these fees will need to be supplemented by other road impact fees. These fees will not be generated without future development This development will not occur unless developers can provide a water source separate from the existing purveyors.

- and incorporation of a transit stop within NCP (if requested by RTA)

4.10 Traffic and Circulation Impacts

County does <u>not</u> need a request from RTA. In fact RTA will not request a transit stop. Public Works is capable designing and siting a transit stop. Such stop should be located on Tefft Street and serve the Library, the School and the Park. A transit stop may encourage transit service in the future. This should be completed before any interior improvements. There will be no transit service in Nipomo until there is a significant increase in population density and this cannot be considered a mitigating factor for many years. With the addition of the park amenities traffic generation will increase starting from the first day of operations.

Does a transit stop rectify both TR/mm-1 and 2?

It does not appear that TR/mm-2 can be mitigated until there is development. Development can only commence when there is water available from sources other than the purveyors.

DW-4

9.3.13 Response to Email from Dan Woodson, PE

Comment No.	Response
DW-1	Comment noted; please refer to responses to individual comments. Your letter was received as an attached report in a packet from the South County Advisory Council. Please refer to response to comments SCAC-5 through SCAC-29.
DW-2	Please refer to response to comments SCAC-6 and SCAC-7.
DW-3	Please refer to response to comments SCAC-7 and SCAC-22.
DW-4	Your letter was received as an attached report in a packet from the South County Advisory Council. Please refer to response to comments SCAC-5 through SCAC-29.

Shawna Scott

From:	smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us
Sent:	Monday, April 30, 2012 8:40 AM
То:	Shawna Scott
Cc:	secooper@co.slo.ca.us
Subject:	Fw: Comments to Nipomo Community Parks PEIR
Attachments:	2012 Park Draft PEIR Comments.docx

----- Forwarded by Steve McMasters/Planning/COSLO on 04/30/2012 08:37 AM -----

 From:
 edeby@charter.net

 To::
 smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us

 Date:
 04/29/2012 04:50 PM

 Subject:
 Comments to Nipomo Community Parks PEIR

Steve McMasters,Project Manager County Planning & Building Dept. 976 Osos St. Room 300 SLO,CA 93408-2040

Dear Mr. McMasters:

Please find attached my comments to the draft PEIR for the Nipomo Community Parks Master Plan. I find three major problems with the PEIR including at least one Class I Impact that was missed.

1

Regards, Ed Eby

[Scanned @co.slo.ca.us]

EE-2

COMMENTS to the DRAFT NIPOMO COMMUNITY PARK MASTER PLAN PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

SCH NO 2009111067

(Dated February 2012)

Submitted by: Ed Eby 520 Camino Roble Nipomo, CA 93444 April 29, 2012

Summary:

The following comments describe deficiencies in the draft PEIR for the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan.	EE-3
1. Disturbance of the oak woodlands should be a Class I impact, as there are no current mitigations. Future mitigations are not permitted under CEQA. In addition, there are possible alternatives to the oak woodlands disturbance that were completely ignored in the alternatives section.	EE-4
The widening of Osage Street will have many environmental impacts that were not examined. In addition, there is no nexus of between the park modifications and the widening of Osage Street	EE-5
3. There is a misconception of water supplies that might be available to the park.	EE-6

DISCUSSION

4.3 Biological Resources	
statement is made that: "If project modifications are <u>not feasible</u> and <u>conversion of oak woodland</u> <u>is unavoidable</u> , [emphasis added] the County allows mitigation for oak woodland impacts to be implemented via oak tree replanting and implementation of a conservation easement, or payment of a fee to the Wildlife Conservation Board."	EE-7
In fact project modifications <u>are feasible</u> and <u>conversion of oak woodland</u> <u>is avoidable</u> . Trails can be routed around oak trees, and ball fields and picnic areas can be located in areas lacking oak trees. The EIR made no attempt to recommend alternatives with feasible modifications to the project that avoid oak woodlands. The design was laid out on a flat map with total disregard to avoidance of oak woodlands disturbance. The lack of a zero-impact alternative to oak woodland disturbance is a fatal flaw in this EIR.	
In addition, the need to remove oak trees to permit widening of Osage Street is negated by the lack of requirement in the Master Plan to have a wider street. The street is outside the park boundaries, and will not even have an access road into the park. All park entrances and exits are on the opposite side of the park from Osage Street.	EE-8
Regarding BR/mm-7 and BR/mm-8: Neither of these "mitigations" are mitigations at all. The impact of removing 75 to 100 year-old oak trees is permanent and not possible to mitigate. When they are gone, they leave a biological vacuum. These mature trees cannot be transplanted. Replacement of a 75 to 100 year-old oak tree with a sapling would not be a mitigation for 75 to 100 years. This is a deferred mitigation, which is not permitted under CEQA. <u>There is not even any evidence cited that shows the success of a replanting program that produced a living 75 to 100 year-old oak tree</u> . It is speculative that such a "mitigation" would ever produce a successful mature living oak.	EE-9
The impact on tree removal in the oak woodland is permanent and should be redefined as a Class I Impact.	EE-10
The impact on the Oak Woodland is completely avoidable by alternatives not considered except in the No Project alternative.	EE-11
 4.10 Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic. Under 4.10.6.2 Create Unsafe Conditions, the statement is made that: "Osage Road will be widened to meet County road standards, allowing for adequate room for two vehicles to pass in alternate directions. These improvements would have a beneficial impact related to safety and road hazards 	EE-12

by remediating sub-standard existing conditions. <u>No significant project access</u> <u>impacts are anticipated and no mitigation measures are warranted</u> . [emphasis added]"	EE-12 (continued)
This impact conclusion is deficient and incorrect. Widening Osage Street requires the removal of 75 to 100 year-old oak trees as is discussed in section 3. In addition to the Class I impact of destroying ancient trees, significant grading and earthmoving is required to widen Osage Street, affecting both the park geology and neighboring residences.	
On the east side of Osage the park has steep rising and falling slopes on the park property. Widening Osage to make a 34-foot width will require fill near Camino Caballo, and deep cuts south of Camino Roble. Such grading will disturb or destroy native plants including ancient Coast Live Oaks and manzanitas planted to mitigate the environmental impact of the development of	EE-13
the Mesa Meadows heighborhood. Further widening and cuts on the east side will be required if the paved walkway in the park adjacent Osage is to be a safe distance from motor vehicle traffic.	EE-14
On the west side of Osage, four residences will require cuts and fills that will both fill in existing, County mandated drainage swales and cut into old-growth Coast Live Oaks and a previous environmental mitigation planting. Maintaining the County standard 2:1 cut/fill requirement will require earth moving onto private property, and likely onto existing homes.	EE-15
The EIR should describe the effects of the cuts and fills on the following residential parcels: 091-431-015 (cuts)	EE-16
091-431-016 (fills, effect on drainage, interference with fire hydrant, encroachment of property, removal of at least two 50+ year-old Coast Live Oaks)	EE-17
091-431-030 (cuts and fills, effect on drainage, encroachment of property) 091-431-029 (cuts, encroachment of property, removal of at least one 50+ year-old Coast Live Oak)	EE-18 EE-19
In addition, the widening will require removal of the curbs that currently act as drainage conduits for the steep Osage Road slope. A complete new drainage strategy for this 1,100-foot road section will be required.	EE-20
The requirement to change a relatively newly constructed Osage Road requires justification beyond "widening for consistency." The justification must be related to the environmental impact of the park improvements. When this road was approved, prior to the home construction in the late 1990s these standards might more logically have been applied. It is additionally questionable why a requirement to make "improvements" to Osage Road exists. None of the developments in the Master Plan require any entrances or exits via Osage Road.	EE-21

In fact, only two roads, Pomeroy and Tefft will access the park, nearly one mile from any Osage Road pavement. The EIR must establish any nexus to the park improvements to this apparently unrelated road project.	EE-22
Recognition of these impacts and mitigations, if and where possible, are required in the EIR.	EE-23
4.12 Water Resources	
Under 4.12.1 Existing Conditions, on pages 4.12-3 and 4, the statement is made that: "The NCSD is addressing this issue by obtaining water from Santa Maria	EE-24
(Supplemental Water Project, Waterline Intertie), and planning phased improvements at the Southland Wastewater Treatment Facility to allow for distribution and use of recycled water."	
This statement is incorrect, and should be retracted. There is no	
Supplemental Water Project funding approved for the pipeline, so this is not an existing condition, just a potential future condition. In addition, there are no plans, approved projects or approved funds to provide use recycled water from the Southland Wastewater Treatment Facility.	
	1

9.3.14 Response to Email from Ed Eby

Comment No.	Response
EE-1	Please refer to responses to individual comments below.
EE-2	Noted coverpage of comment letter; please refer to responses to individual comments below.
EE-3	Please refer to responses to individual comments below.
EE-4	Please refer to mitigation measures BR/mm-7, BR/mm-8, BR/mm-9, and BR/mm-10 (Oak Woodland Protection and Restoration Plan), which include feasible mitigation measures that address potentially significant impacts to oak woodland and individual oak trees. These mitigation measures would be implemented prior to development within the park that would impact oak trees, and include measurable performance standards and verification measures. In addition, the NCPMP includes identification of suitable area within NCP for biological mitigation and restoration. Specific comments regarding potential alternatives are addressed below. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EE-5	As noted in the EIR and correspondence between the County General Services Agency and County Public Works (initiated by a referral response to the Initial Study in 2005), Osage Street is not currently constructed in compliance with County Road Standards, and improvements are necessary to bring the adjacent road system into compliance. The affected area includes the County road right-of-way adjacent to NCP. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EE-6	Specific comments regarding water supply are addressed below.
EE-7	Please note that affected oak trees are primarily located in areas where major road improvements are proposed or required, such as the widening of Osage Street and realignment of the park entrance at Juniper and Pomeroy Roads. No oak trees would be removed for the construction of trails or picnic areas. For these reasons, oak tree removal and other impacts are avoided to the maximum extent feasible. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EE-8	Please refer to response to comment EE-5 regarding the required for the widening of Osage Street.
EE-9	Please refer to mitigation measure BR/mm-7 (Oak Woodland Protection and Restoration Plan), which includes protection of existing oak trees and replanting additional oak trees onsite, and establishment of an easement to preserve the restoration area. The County recognizes that the loss of mature oak trees would be noticeable in the short-term; however, the planting of new oak trees within a conservation easement will mitigate the potentially significant impact in the long term. Implementation of BR/mm-7 is not deferred mitigation, because the EIR identifies potential impacts to oak trees, and the mitigation is specific to the loss of individual oak trees and oak woodland, based on the conceptual plan, and assuming a "worst-case" or maximum development scenario. The County is required to implement the mitigation <i>prior to site disturbance and grading activities</i> , which is a specific milestone. Requirements for oak woodland restoration have not been in place for 75 to 100 years; however, the mitigation as proposed includes standards such as use of young seedlings, hand-weeding to remove invasive plants, irrigation, and implementation of a minimum seven-year monitoring program to ensure successful establishment. Requirements for a conservation easement would protect the restoration area in perpetuity. Therefore, potential impacts are considered less than significant, and no changes to the EIR are necessary.
EE-10	Please refer to response to comment EE-9 above. Based on implementation of identified mitigation measures, the effects would not be permanent. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EE-11	Please refer to response to comment EE-7 above.

Comment No.	Response
EE-12	Please note that the cited section (4.10.6.2 Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic, Create Unsafe Conditions) includes an assessment of the project's effect on the road system, and specifically determines that the project would not include any features that would result in a traffic hazard. Impacts related to biological resources are discussed in EIR Section 4.3 Biological Resources, and impacts related to slope stability and soil erosion are discussed in EIR Section 4.5 Geology and Soils. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EE-13	Potential adverse impacts to individual oak trees and sand mesa manzanita are documented in EIR Section 4.3 Biological Resources. Biological mitigation is typically not implemented within County road right-of-way, specifically because the County reserves the right to develop the right-of-way to bring roads in compliance with adopted road standards. The proposed mitigation would replace all removed oak trees at a 4:1 ratio (refer to BR/mm-8), and all sand mesa manzanita plants at a 5:1 ratio (refer to BR/mm-2). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EE-14	At this time, specific, engineered grading plans are not included in the program-level review of road improvements on Osage Road. As noted in EIR Section 2.3.3.1 Project Description, Access, that the paved walkway would be located within the Osage Road right-of-way. The EIR analysis identified the anticipated affected area within the Osage Road right-of-way, in order to determine affected acreage, tree removals, sand mesa manzanita removals, and impacts to native vegetation. Such impacts are identified, and mitigation is recommended including restoration and conservation within an easement area (refer to BR/mm—2 and BR/mm-5 through BR/mm-10). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EE-15	Please refer to EIR Section 2.3.3.1 Project Description, Access, which states that the paved walkway would be located within the County right-of-way. The improvements would be located within the existing roadway and extend onto County property; therefore, no cuts and fills would occur on private property. Preparation of road plans, including drainage management, would be conducted in coordination with County Public Works to ensure appropriate management of drainage and connection to the County drainage system. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EE-16	Please refer to response to comment EE-15. No cuts or fills are proposed outside of the road right-of-way.
EE-17	Please refer to response to comment EE-15. No cuts or fills are proposed outside of the road right-of-way.
EE-18	Please refer to response to comment EE-15. No cuts or fills are proposed outside of the road right-of-way.
EE-19	Please refer to response to comment EE-15. No cuts or fills are proposed outside of the road right-of-way.
EE-20	Preparation of road plans, including drainage management, would be conducted in coordination with County Public Works to ensure appropriate management of drainage and connection to the County drainage system. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EE-21	Currently, Osage Road is narrow, and does not meet County Road Standards for average daily trips. Based on review of the project by County Public Works, improvements to Osage Road are required along the park frontage because additional development is proposed within the NCP, which will contribute additional daily trips on this sub-standard roadway. Therefore, improvements are required by County Public Works. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
EE-22	Please refer to response to comments EE-5 and EE-21 above.
EE-23	Please refer to responses to comments above.

Comment No.	Response
EE-24	The EIR has been clarified to summarize recent events affecting the Supplemental Water Project, Water Intertie (please refer to EIR Section 4.12.1 Existing Conditions, Potential Future Water Supply): "The NCSD initially proposed an assessment district to provide funding for the Supplemental Water Project, Waterline Intertie, which required approval by vote. In June 2012, a majority of property owners voted against the assessment district proposal, and the NCSD determined that construction of a pipeline (as currently proposed) to provide the supplemental water could not be funded by existing funds. The NCSD issued a moratorium on the issuance of new will serve letters while considering other options for supplemental water, which may include other funding sources and/or a scaled-down project." As noted in the EIR, provision of additional water by NCSD "is contingent on the implementation of improvements to the existing irrigation system to reduce current water supply, consistent with measures to target reducing consumption for high-use customers" (EIR Section 4.12.5.5 Water Resources, Adversely Affect Community Water Service Provider). In addition, recommendations provided by the NCSD are incorporated into mitigation measures WAT/mm-4 (water survey for irrigated turf and landscaped areas, requires 50% reduction in existing irrigation water use) and WAT/mm-5 (compliance with water survey recommendations and water conservation measures, and incorporation of recycled water for irrigation). While recycled water is not currently available, the EIR identifies measures that can be implemented to address existing water use. In addition, implementation of the NCPMP would be phased over the next 20 years, and by the time the sports fields can be funded, recycled water may be available and incorporated into the irrigation system (pursuant to WAT/mm-5).

Nipomo Community Park

Draft Environmental Impact Report

Response

2.3.1 Existing Facilities

The Lil' Bits pre-school is located in Park illegally. The California Supreme Court decided sixty years ago in San Vincente etc. v. County of L. A., 147 Cal.App.2d 79 that the laws governing nursery schools made them incompatible with the laws governing county parks. The Environmental Impact Report cannot sanction an illegal activity. As such, the pre- school cannot be mitigated and is a Class one impact.

HW-1

Sena

Harry F. Walls 410 Tejas Pl. Nipomo, CA 93444

SANTA BARBARA CA 931 27 APR 2022 PH1 1 []和]]

Steven McMasters, Project Manager County Planning and Bldg. Dept, 976 Osos St. Rm. 300 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040

99408\$2040

Ihlandhahallandahahdhaaladhadhad

9.3.15 Response to Letter from Harry F. Walls

Comment No.	Response
HW-1	The Lil Bits Preschool is currently operating as a temporary use in NCP under a permit issued by General Services, under a lease issued to the Nipomo Area Recreation Association. The permit was issued with the intention of authorizing management of uses with NCP, as part of the overall park program. The 2004 permit identified uses including a youth-oriented community recreation and child care program, and coordination of sports activities, clubs, and events within NCP. The County recognizes that conditions may have changed since the permit was originally issued in 2004; therefore, the NCPMP fulfills the vision of the original lease, and includes a method for resolving the issue of the temporary pre-school by identifying the need for a Conditional Use Permit prior to establishment of a permanent facility within NCP. No changes to the EIR are necessary.

COMMENTS ON THE NIPOMO COMMUNITY PARK MASTER PLAN PROGRAM EIR	
I am commenting on the:	
The following useful comments are addressing these issues:	
 Content of the EIR. Methods on how environmental issues are analyzed. Potential Alternatives to the project. 	
· Potential mitigation measures that would avoid or reduce environmental issues. Comments on Draft Program EIR: Dlease, Dease, Leave it a low 5	BLME-1
We want a friendly-quict park Crime]	BLME-2
NO-Skate Park in Park in City - Server?	BLME-3
NO - Comm Ctr in Park - Naint ? Who plays.	BLME-4
Traffic on tomery - O aC Hor Noise ADA?	BLME-5
Comments on Master Plan:	BLME-6
NAME: BLME EMAIL:	

- **x** - **x** -

9.3.16	Response to Comment Card from "BLME"
--------	--------------------------------------

Comment No.	Response
BLME-1	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.
BLME-2	Please refer to EIR Section 4.6.1.5 Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Potential for Crime and for Section 4.9.5.1 Public Services and Utilities, Effect Upon or Result in New or Altered Public Services, Police Protection. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
BLME-3	Please refer to EIR Section 4.12 Water and Section 4.11 Wastewater. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
BLME-4	The County General Services Agency is responsible for maintenance of the park facilities, and securing funding for improvements and maintenance.
BLME-5	Please refer to Section 4.10 Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic. Please refer to Section 4.8 Noise. An American Disabilities Act (ADA) trail system is not specifically proposed as part of the NCPMP; however, the plan does not preclude the development of ADA-compliant facilities. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
BLME-6	Please refer to Chapter 2, Table 2-2, Master Plan Existing and Proposed Amenities. An additional 1,490 square feet of restrooms and an additional 422 parking spaces are proposed as part of the NCPMP. All festivals and events at NCP will occur pursuant to existing guidelines and temporary event permit requirements, as issued by County General Services. No changes to the EIR are necessary.

			I am c	ommenting	on the:		n.	. 0	INIT OF	(*)
	The following		aft Progra	m EIR	Master	Plan	8)			
Comments on Dr	Conte Metho Poten Poten	ent of the foods on how tial Alterno tial mitiga	EIR. w environm atives to the tion measu	nental issues e project. yres that wou	are analyzed Ild avoid or r e_	l. educe env μ	ironmento	Il issues. HaQ_QT	ch ?	/ r
Lib exf	5 hib	Rela	SINO			· · · ·				
Instaic	- 1 1 7					<u>.</u>			•	Ť
why pre	School				· · ·		· .			
Horse	nails -1	102.5	• .	A			•: ¹			
		1	-				· .			
omments on Ma	ster Plan:	:	• • •							•
	·	1			•			<u> </u>		
1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -	a			- 11		-				
NAME: Not	sh hor	· ·	<u>.</u>		EMAIL:		<u> </u>			<u>.</u>
ADDRESS:		1.14		5. 1.	STATE:		ZIP:		÷	

9.3.17	Response to	Comment	Card from	"Neighbor"
--------	-------------	---------	-----------	------------

Comment No.	Response
N-1	Please refer to EIR Section 4.12 Water Resources. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
N-2	Please refer to EIR Section 2.3.2 Project Description, Proposed Facilities. The proposed project includes a 4,000-square foot expansion of the library near West Tefft Street. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
N-3	Please refer to Section 4.10 Transportation, Circulation, and Traffic. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
N-4	The Lil Bits Preschool is currently operating as a temporary use in NCP under a permit issued by General Services, under a lease issued to the Nipomo Area Recreation Association. The permit was issued with the intention of authorizing management of uses with NCP, as part of the overall park program. The 2004 permit identified uses including a youth-oriented community recreation and child care program, and coordination of sports activities, clubs, and events within NCP. The County recognizes that conditions may have changed since the permit was originally issued in 2004; therefore, the NCPMP fulfills the vision of the original lease, and includes a method for resolving the issue of the temporary pre-school by identifying the need for a Conditional Use Permit prior to establishment of a permanent facility within NCP. No changes to the EIR are necessary
N-5	Comment noted; no changes to the EIR are necessary.

9.4 ADDITIONAL NON-AGENCY ORGANIZATIONS COMMENT LETTERS AND RESPONSES

The following non-agency organizations have submitted comments on the Draft EIR.

Respondent	Code	Contact Information	Page
South County Advisory Council Attached report and individual comments	ASCAC	Council Officers and Members	9-150

Jacquelore-

SCAC 3-18-12 Park Meeting

Response the Nipomo Park DEIR

Aesthetics

The aesthetic section analyzes the extent that the proposed development would alter the visual quality of the project site and the areas surrounding it. The project related actions would be considered to have a significant impact on the visual character of the site and surroundings if they altered the area in a way that significantly changed, detracted, or degraded the visual quality of the site and was inconsistent with community policies regarding visual character. NCP serves an important role defining the visual identity of Nipomo. County policies as well as community scoping workshops have identified the preservation of rural character as a goal for the NCP site.

The DEIR finds the development in the center of the park with mitigations to be a class II impact. The center of the park developments would include a 36,000 sq ft (250'Lx230'wx36'H , which is the absolute maximum allowable height by LU policy) recreational center covering 2 acres plus a defensible space fire break, fenced basketball courts with pole lighting, 2 tennis courts with wind screening and pole lights, fenced skate board park, an 8,400 sq ft pool with decking, a transit stop ,a lighted parking lot with 422 cars, 10 acres of ball fields with an estimated 8-10 pole lights built on25' high cut and fill slopes, a hand ball court, 2 restroom sites, open play area with play ground equipment, horse shoes, horse staging area, paved pathways, and a drainage basin. A total of 27.5 acres of rural land, habitat, and trails would be replaced, significantly and permanently altering the view. The rural view shed would become urban and utilitarian. The mitigations were to set back the recreational center 150', use a rural architectural building design, plant shrubs that visually change the proportions of the building, and paint it in earth tones. Further, there would be a restriction from ridge top development; new structures would be so located that they would not be silhouetted against the sky as viewed from public roads or the ocean. This last mitigation conflicts with the emissions mitigation to move the recreation center 1/4 mile to the land adjacent the school, residences, and new medical center addition because the elevation would constitute a ridge top. It could also be a violation of the noise set back requirements because of its close proximity to the school, medical center, and residences. The mitigations to use earth tone paints, rural architecture, shrubs, and set backs are only attempts to camouflage amenities but cannot diminish their massive cumulative size. These are ineffective and conflicting mitigations. Class I impact.

The EIR states apart from the multi use sports field lighting, visibility of lighting throughout the NCP would affect nighttime views resulting in a long term impact. They mitigate it with shielded lighting, motion detector activated security lighting, and by directing light downward and using full cut-off fixtures or shields. Per table 4.7-1 on page 4.7-4 the areas established to have lights are; the sports turf area, the group picnic area, the tennis courts, and the basket ball courts totaling 17 acres. It says unlit areas would be the pool, dog park, skate park, hand ball, and horse shoes. Areas not noted either way are the amphitheater, playground, and recreation center. One of the mitigations in the Hazard/Crime section is to use Crime Prevention Thru Environmental Design (CPTED) principles in the development of the park. Compliance with CPTED requires potential problem areas to be well lit including: pathways, stairs, entrances and exits, parking areas, bus stops ,children's play area ,recreation areas, pools, storage areas and dumpsters. Further lighting along pathways is to be at the proper height for people's faces to be identified in case of potential attacks. The DEIR declares with mitigation, lighting is a class II impact but admits the light and glare would still be visible from within the park and adjacent residences. All the

ASCAC-1

ASCAC-2

ASCAC-3

ASCAC-4

ASCAC-5

in. This would change the amount of lighting significantly and the impact to a Class I. Note that a standard of CPTED is that all youth facilities should be on main roads in plain view to allow effective policing and natural public surveillance. The recreation center's location in the middle of the park puts it in direct conflict with CPTED standard and there for is not a feasible mitigation under Crime/Hazards)

Air Quality

The DEIR states the proposed project would exceed the daily ROG+NOx combined threshold and requires 18 on site mitigations. Special attention needs to be given to this impact because of the nearby sensitive receptors including The Lil Bits temporary Day care center, the adjacent church and daycare center, Dana Elementary School, CHC and its 15,000sq ft expansion currently under construction, the library and its expansion, and the residences on Tefft and Tejas Place. The emissions chart (table 4.2-8) may be inaccurately low because some activities have not been factored in. Additional pollution emissions need to be calculated for the horse shoes pits, dog park, picnic/BBQ areas, horse staging area, turf, play ground, and rapid transit vehicles. Cumulative impacts would be the emissions from the adjacent CHC addition and the traffic from 2 main thoroughfares that border the park; Tefft and Pomeroy. Also the Dana school student drop off and pick up emissions from bumper to bumper idling vehicles 2x a day. The DEIR's suggested mitigations include; developing internal pathways to reduce vehicle traffic, moving the rec facility to the property adjacent to the school and residences, building a ranger residence. planting trees in the parking lot to reduce evaporative emissions, and providing valet bicycle parking at community event centers. The report admits the implementation of the stated mitigations would NOT eliminate the emissions; however, the concentration of pollutants would be reduced to below identifiable thresholds and therefore, the impacts would be Class II. The mitigations are unfeasible or ineffective. Moving the rec facility to the land adjacent to the school and residences is in conflict with the set back mitigations for land use/noise impacts and aesthetic mitigations not to build on ridge tops. Plus the emissions from the CHC need to be factored in, and consideration that Dana School and CHC are sensitive receptors. Internal paths will not reduce emissions because traffic is to and from the park not within it once visitors are there. Those internal walkways exist now as does the ranger residence. Planting small new trees in the parking lot to absorbed emissions would not offset the 20 mature trees removed. Bicycle valet parking is not feasible. With the new emissions calculated into the already excessive levels and ineffective mitigations, the impact of air quality is significant and Class I.

Land Use

LUO regulations are in place to minimize adverse effects on the public resulting from land use and development, as well as to protect and enhance the significant natural, historic, archeological, and scenic resources within the county as identified by the **County General Plan**. The **South County Inland Plan** seeks to guide future development that will balance social, economic, environmental, and governmental resources and activities affecting the quality of life within the area. This plan includes planning area standards for the **South County Planning Area**, which includes the urban community of Nipomo, and seeks to preserve the character of the communities and rural areas that currently exist in the area. The **Recreation Element** establishes goals policies, and implementation measures for management, renovation, and expansion of existing, and development of new parks and recreation facilities in order to meet existing and projected needs and to insure an equitable distribution of parks throughout the county. The **Principals of Strategic Growth** adopted by the BOS include: 1. Preserve open space, scenic natural beauty and sensitive environmental uses, and 2. Foster distinctive attractive communities with a strong sense of place. The **1988 Park Master Plan** included purchasing additional parkland. The massive build out of the park impacts all of these land use policies to preserve Nipomo's rural equestrian character,

ASCAC-7

ASCAC-8 ASCAC-9 ASCAC-10 ASCAC-11 ASCAC-12 ASCAC-13

ASCAC-14

provide equitably distribution of parks, preserve open space, scenic natural beauty, and sensitive environmental uses and to acquire additional parkland. The DEIR proposes eliminating 27.5 acres of scenic rural parkland, habitat and trails to develop many facilities that duplicate what has been built at our new schools. Nipomo H.S. has a track& football field, several baseball and soccer fields, multiple volleyball, basketball, and tennis courts, a gymnasium, state of the art fitness room and Olympic size pool. Dorothea Lange has playground equipment, 2 handball courts and open playing fields. Our older schools also have similar amenities. The Kamanaka property has included fields in its development On the other hand, as Nipomo has grown there has been considerable loss to riding trails plus the county has failed to dedicate new trails as requested creating a net loss of recreation to those equestrians who are the foundation to Nipomo's character. The impact needs to address the cumulative loss of recreation to our equestrians and the unnecessary duplication of amenities already existing in Nipomo violating our land use guidelines. Suggested mitigations would be:

- 1. Acquisition of new parkland while real estate prices are low and because we have money for development and acquisition but not maintenance.
- 2. Enter into joint use agreements with the schools to develop amenities on site for their use during school hours and for the public during evenings, weekends, and summer months. It would be a tax saving endeavor at a time of tight County budgets.
- 3. Our local public schools currently have closed campuses with access to facilities only allowed to sports organizations due to fear of crime and graffiti. Our park is subject to those same problems but is mitigated by utilizing the concepts of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). The standards utilize fences and lighting. Parks could partner with the school to install the necessary lighting (that would be so effective in our parks) in our school yards. Then recreation would be available to the public throughout Nipomo as our planning elements require. Tax payers would save money. Schools would have better security, Parks would not have to worry about the lack of maintenance funds, recreation would be available at a neighborhood level, traffic and circulation would be improved, equestrians could retain one of the last remaining trail areas, and our rural character would be preserved.
- 4. Place some smaller developments in Jim Miller Park i.e. horse shoes, Bocce balls, gazebo, or the skate board park.
- 5. Partner with Jack Reddy Park to get it up and running. Park building funds could be used again without worry about lack of maintenance funds. This park would serve the need of those currently neglected in our recreational element.

ASCAC-14

ASCAC-15

ASCAC-16

ASCAC-17

ASCAC-18

(continued)

ASCAC-19

Monday, April 19, 2012 From: Dan Gaddis, SCAC Area 2 Representative

To: Steve McMasters, County of S.L.O., Dept. of Bldg. & Planning, Room 300, & To: SCAC Members.

Re: Comments on February 2012 Draft Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program Environmental Impact Report (E.I.R.)

All of these comments regard the "Content of the E.I.R.":

Comment # 1: Security & Crime concerns:

New park development would place additional service demands on existing South County Sheriff services. (See page 4.9-8)

The February 2012 Master Plan calls for a Community Center/Gymnasium of 36,000 s.f. near the center of the park (See Executive Summary pages ES-6 & 7).

A County Parks and Nipomo Community Advisory Council (NCAC) public meeting was held in July 2004 at the Nipomo High School Auditorium.

At that meeting a Sheriff's Department Commander told those in attendance that only one patrol car is on patrol in the South San Luis Obispo County area at nighttime, and that sheriff cars patrol mostly major streets and that it would be <u>difficult to patrol</u> <u>adequately a Community Center located deep in the center of the park.</u> (Like in the Master Plan (See Executive Summary pages ES-6 & 7).

<u>He recommended if you build a Community Center to build it off a major road such as at</u> <u>Tefft Street where patrol cars can easily drive by and spot suspicious behavior</u> (Like in the Master Plan Alternative "A". See pages ES-15 & 19).

In addition, currently the Sheriff's Department is understaffed (See pages 4.6-3 & 4).

The current ratio of deputies per population unit is one deputy per 1,140 citizens, which is deficient (See page 4.9-2).

The F.B.I. standard is one deputy per 1,000 citizens.

City police departments within San Luis Obispo County have a ratio of one deputy per 750 citizens (See page 4.9-2).

<u>Comment # 2: Monies from Private Organizations could build the Community</u> <u>Center:</u>	ASCAC-20
It is possible that the Nipomo Community, a concessionaire, and/or a community organization may be a partner in the development of the Community Recreation buildings planned for the park (See page 2-18).	
Do we want private developers/organizers to have an ownership status on facilities in our County Nipomo Community Park?	
<u>Comment # 3: Is an area near the intersection of Osage Street and Camino Caballo</u> <u>Street a safe area for a Playground?</u>	ASCAC-21
A play structure and open play area is to be built near Osage Street and Camino Caballo Street (See Executive Summary page ES-5 & page 2-9).	
This area is now known as the Caesar Chavez park area, and it is very small. The corner of Osage Street and Camino Caballo Street is an intersection of two busy streets. There is no parking for this area.	
This small area adjacent to busy streets is not a safe area to put a playground for small children.	
<u>Comment # 4: Regarding widening Osage Street to meet County Road Standards</u> allowing for two vehicles to pass in alternate directions.	ASCAC-22
Osage Street will be widened to meet County Road Standards allowing for adequate room for two vehicles to pass in alternate directions (See page 4.10-15).	
Osage Street already has adequate room for two vehicles to pass in alternate directions.	
Plan is to: Widen street to County Road Standard A-1 (d) (two 11 ft wide travel lanes, with 6 ft shoulders on each side for a total of 34 ft), & 6 ft wide paved multi use trail, & parallel equestrian trail (See Executive Summary page ES-10 & page 2-10).	
So: 34 ft + 6ft + \sim 4 Ft could = \sim 44 ft. expansion width for Osage Street plus paved trail plus equestrian trail.	
This will result in the removal of a large number of oak trees along side Osage Street.	

Comment # 5: Regarding County do E.I.R. on more intense Concept Plan.

On July 12, 2004, County Parks staff and the Nipomo Community Advisory Council (NCAC) held a noticed public meeting at the Nipomo High School Auditorium.

The Draft E.I.R. states that: "The NCAC recommended that the County move forward with environmental review on the more intense Concept Plan, based on the face that it is easier to take items out of a master plan than put them in later" (See page 2-6).

This content statement of the E.I.R. is not accurate.

It was the County Parks staff, over the objections of the NCAC members, who insisted on the NCAC accepting moving forward with the more intense Concept Plan based on the premise that it is easier to take items out of a master plan than to put them in later.

ASCAC-23



Paul Teixeira, District 4 Supervisor San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors County Government Center San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 April 24, 2012

Dear Supervisor Teixeira.

At last night's regular meeting of the South County Advisory Council, the Council considered the following issues :

DRC2011-00071 Sandberg-CUP to modify minimum site area for a kennel project. 2.3 acre site located off Summit Station Road in Arroyo Grande. APN:091-131-059 (existing permit to train rescue, companion and service dogs,but needs Kennel permit is required to allow dogs to stay overnight).

A motion was passed to recommend approval on the condition that the permit does not follow the property if ownership changes, and owner fully complies with all laws and rules of Animal Control.

Review of DEIR on The Master Plan for Nipomo Community Park:

A motion was passed thanking the ad hoc committee members for their hard work on the Draft EIR for the Master Plan for the Nipomo Community Park, and that The SCAC submit their appraisal and the attached comments by individual SCAC members and residents of the Nipomo community for the Planning Department's careful consideration.

By direction of the South County Advisory Council,

Istar Holliday Corresponding Secretary

•	
Steven McMasters. Project Manager County Planning and Building Department 976 Osos Street, Room 300 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040	
Dear Mr. McMasters,	
I have read the DEIR, the SCAC ad hoc committee's response and the attached responses from other individual SCAC members and concerned Nipomo community members.	ASCAC-26
I agree with several comments already made: in particular, the following:	
The impact of a Recreational center with all its described structures, facilities, pool, skateboard park, parking requirements, and expectation of intensive use, an assigned use in the Master Plan that would take up approximately one third of the only community park in the Nipomo area, cannot be mitigated and is, therefore, a Class 1 impact, not the Class II assigned by the DEIR.	
The issue of public monies being spent to build what is intended to be privately run structures has been litigated and denied in several court cases, and should be explored by counsel before the final EIR containing the community center plans is put forth.	ASCAC-27
There are two major errors in the DEIR in the section entitled 2.1.4 Public Workshops and Scoping Meetings on page 2-6:	ASCAC-28
On July 12, 2004, at the public meeting called by County Parks Staff and the Nipomo Community Advisory Council at the Nipomo High School, a highly vocal minority, not a majority, of those 100 residents present, requested additional development within the park.	
In addition, it was not the NCAC that "recommended that the County move forward with environmental review on the more intense Concept Plan, based on the fact that it is easier to take items out of a master plan than put them in later." It was Jan di Leo of the Parks Department that recommended this approach after vigorous objection from the NCAC, which favored a more passively developed park, as Mrs.Di Leo claimed it was less expensive than a piecemeal approach should the community ever decide to place a center in the park (see DEIR 2.1.5 Initial Study) , and the NCAC deferred to her request.	ASCAC-29
Istar Holliday 577 Sheridan Road (Nipomo Mesa) Arroyo Grande, CA 34320 (805) 343-2581	

9.4.1 Response to Additional Comments from South County Advisory Council Officers and Members

Comment No.	Response	
Jacqueline Walls – Park Meeting		
ASCAC-1	Comment noted. No changes to the EIR are necessary.	
ASCAC-2	Comment noted. No changes to the EIR are necessary.	
ASCAC-3	The referenced language regarding "Ridgetop Development" is a policy from the County's Parks and Recreation Element, and is not a specific mitigation measure identified in the EIR (refer to EIR Section 4.1.3.2 Aesthetics, Consistency with County of San Luis Obispo Plans and Policies). Mitigation measure AES/mm-1 requires relocation of the community center within 150 feet of the existing, internal park road, consistent with this policy. This location is not adjacent to the school, residences, or new medical addition, and would be consistent with all setback requirements related to land use and noise. The reference to "1/4 mile" in the EIR (Section 4.2.5.1 Violate Air Quality Standard or Exceed Emission Thresholds) is taken from the Air Pollution Control District's Clean Air Plan land use policies, which recommend provision of recreational facilities within one quarter-mile of residential areas and schools. As noted in the EIR, the project is consistent with this policy. No changes to the EIR are necessary.	
ASCAC-4	As noted in Section 4.1.6 Cumulative Impacts, the EIR analysis considered the cumulative development of all proposed elements of the NCPMP, in addition to development in the area. Mitigation is recommended (AES/mm-1 through AES/mm-8), which would address each component, and the NCPMP as a whole. The EIR recognizes that new facilities and amenities will be visible to the public; however, based on implementation of these measures, cumulative impacts would be less than significant. No changes to the EIR are necessary.	
ASCAC-5	Please refer to EIR Section 4.1.5.3 (Aesthetic Resources, Effects of Light and Glare), which states that "Safety regulations and guidelines require lighting for parking areas, pedestrian uses, and buildings" and "Security lighting may be necessary at the community pool skate park, tennis and basketball courts, and other areas". The EIR analysis considered all types of lighting that would either be proposed or included per existing regulations and recommended guidelines, and includes mitigation to shield and direct light towards its intended target and purpose, as noted in mitigation measure AES/mm-7. These standards have been considered by the County Sheriff, as noted in their response to the Notice of Preparation, dated December 3, 2009 (refer to Appendix B of the EIR), and are incorporated into mitigation measure PSU/mm-1, item (c), including the following: "Proper care should be taken to ensure exterior lighting is properly shielded to prevent illumination that would affect the ambient level of light in the nighttime sky". Therefore, potentially significant impacts can be mitigated to less than significant, and no changes to the EIR are necessary.	
ASCAC-6	The Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) Guidelines do not specifically state that youth facilities should be located on main roads; however a CPTED strategy notes that "Gathering areas or congregating areas need to be located or designed in locations where there is good surveillance and access control". The project is generally consistent with this guideline, because the community center would be located in close proximity to the internal park road and park ranger residence. The NCPMP was reviewed by the San Luis Obispo County Sheriff (refer to Appendix B, Notice of Preparation Comment Letters, letter dated December 3, 2009). All suggestions provided by the County Sheriff's office, which incorporate CPTED measures, are listed in mitigation measure PSU/mm-1 (refer to EIR Section 4.9 Public Services and Utilities). Based on the project's incorporation of these measures, potentially significant impact related to adverse effects to police and emergency services would be less than significant, and no changes to the EIR are necessary.	

Comment No.	Response
ASCAC-7	In EIR Section 4.2 Air Quality, Table 4.2-8, Estimated Operational and Area Source Emissions, includes the emissions generated by all proposed uses within the park (refer to Appendix C Air Quality Background Information for complete summary of emission model results), pursuant to the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District CEQA Handbook (December 2009). Uses that would not typically generate high levels of traffic as a single-destination type use are grouped within the "City Park" category. The emissions generated by vehicles would be dispersed along the travel route, including roads within and adjacent to NCP (i.e. Pomeroy Road and West Tefft Street). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
ASCAC-8	Existing uses, such as the Dana Elementary School, generate emissions, which are considered part of the environmental baseline and contribute to air pollutant emissions in the area. As noted in EIR Section 4.2.1 Air Quality, Existing Conditions, "motor vehicles are the primary source of air pollutant emissions and greenhouse gases" and in 2008, state ozone standards were exceeded (as measured from the Nipomo air quality monitoring station). Park access, trails, and road improvements may contribute to a reduction in trips generated by adjacent uses by providing safe options for alternative transportation. In EIR Section 4.2 Air Quality, Table 4.2-8, Estimated Operational + Area Source Emissions, identifies the estimated emissions that would be generated by various elements included in the NCPMP, which would not include the medical center. Cumulative impacts are addressed within EIR Section 4.2.6 Air Quality, Cumulative Impacts. Based on the Mitigated Negative Declaration that was adopted for the Community Health Center project on October 27, 2011 (County project number DRC2010-00027, Environmental Determination number ED10-193), the project would not generate a significant level of air pollutants during construction, potentially affecting nearby residences and resulting in a nuisance, and the use of diesel equipment near sensitive receptors. Standard mitigation was adopted for the project, consistent with APCD guidelines. The NCPMP's contribution to the cumulative generation of air pollutants in the area was determined to be less than significant, based on elements incorporated into the NCPMP, which are consistent with the APCD's Clean Air Plan, and incorporation of additional mitigation measures to reduce project-specific emissions. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
ASCAC-9	Please note that the EIR does not include a mitigation measure to locate the community center (recreation facility) adjacent to the school and residences. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
ASCAC-10	The 21 mitigation measure options listed in AES/mm-2 are included in the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District CEQA Handbook (December 2009), as effective measures to reduce the effects of ROG and NOx generated by transportation and stationary uses. Providing trails and paths within and adjacent to the park contributes to use of alternative sources of transportation, such as walking and use of bicycles, which in turn reduces emissions both within the park and surrounding area. Although traffic is not generated from trips within the park, community members may elect to ride their bicycles or walk to the park, or traverse the park using improved paths en-route to an offsite destination. Emissions generated from vehicles in parking areas are affected by air temperature, and planting trees within parking areas provides a cooling effect, and thus reduces vehicle hydrocarbon emissions (which is the intent of the mitigation measure). Therefore, this is an effective measure to reduce operational emissions generated by the project. In the long term, the NCPMP includes the planting of additional trees of varying native species onsite, which would have a long-term beneficial effect to air quality. Numerous mitigation measures are recommended, which would have a beneficial effect when combined, and would reduce potential impacts related to air quality to less than significant (Class II). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
ASCAC-11	Please refer to response to comment ASCAC-3 above. No changes to the EIR are necessary.

Comment No.	Response
ASCAC-12	Regarding emissions from existing surrounding sources, please refer to response to comment ASCAC-8 above. Regarding air quality, and exposure to toxic air emissions, the potentially affected area includes sensitive uses within 1,000 feet (refer to EIR Section 4.2.3.2 Air Quality, SLO APCD CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Special Considerations for Construction Activity, Sensitive Receptors and EIR Section 4.2.5.2 Air Quality, Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations). Mitigation measures apply to any sensitive uses within 1,000 feet, which may include existing and future uses (refer to AQ/mm-3). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
ASCAC-13	Please refer to response to comment ASCAC-10 above. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
ASCAC-14	As noted in EIR Table 3-2 Consistency with Plans and Policies (Chapter 3 Environmental Setting), the proposed project is consistent with all applicable policies and goals. With incorporation of mitigation measures identified in Section 4.1 Aesthetics, development of the NCPMP would not have a long-term, significant, adverse effect on visual character. As noted in the EIR (Table 3-2), "the South County Inland Area Plan of the LUO indicates that the South County Inland Area averages almost twice the annual growth rate of the rest of the County in general, with the Nipomo urban area experiencing the majority of new development. The project proposes new and expanded recreational uses and facilities at the only existing developed park serving the Nipomo community", which is consistent Recreation Policy 3.1 to provide an equitable distribution of recreation. The NCPMP includes preservation of open space, areas considered highly scenic, and sensitive environmental resources (such as the oak woodland ridge). The EIR does assess alternative locations for the community center, as noted in Chapter 5, Alternatives Analysis. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
ASCAC-15	As noted in EIR Table 4.3-3 Habitat Impacts (Section 4.3 Biological Resources), areas affected by the NCPMP include coastal scrub, annual grassland, and ruderal (disturbed) areas. A majority of the 130 acres of oak woodland habitat and 14.6 acres of maritime chaparral habitat would be preserved (1.12 acres would be affected primarily by road improvements). No changes to the EIR are necessary.
ASCAC-16	Please note that approval of the NCPMP as proposed does not preclude further discussions between the County and the Lucia Mar School District regarding shared use of school facilities. The County General Services Agency and BOS may consider this option when reviewing public comments. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
ASCAC-17	As shown in EIR Figure 2-5, Nipomo Community Park Master Plan, the project includes a separate equestrian trail and staging area within NCP. No significant impact to recreational resources and opportunities would occur. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
ASCAC-18	The County may consider further discussions with the Lucia Mar School District regarding shared use of school facilities, assistance with CPTED measures at school facilities, and further development of other parks in the area. The County General Services Agency and BOS may consider these options when reviewing public comments. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
Dan Gaddis	
ASCAC-19	Comments noted. The NCPMP was reviewed by the San Luis Obispo County Sheriff (refer to Appendix B, Notice of Preparation Comment Letters, letter dated December 3, 2009). All suggestions provided by the County Sheriff's office, which incorporate CPTED measures, are listed in mitigation measure PSU/mm-1 (refer to EIR Section 4.9 Public Services and Utilities). Based on the project's incorporation of these measures, potentially significant impact related to adverse effects to police and emergency services would be less than significant, and no changes to the EIR are necessary.
Comment No.	Response
----------------	--
ASCAC-20	The County General Services Agency would be responsible for all facilities within NCP. Contractors may be retained by the County to prepare construction and design plans. Organizations, such as the Nipomo Native Garden, may be issued a lease or permit to administer and manage facilities and other improvements within NCP at the discretion of the County. The County will take liability for uses, or assign liability, as designated in the permit or lease for the specific use. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
ASCAC-21	No significant impacts related to environmental hazards specific to the playground were identified during preparation of the EIR. Fencing is installed around the park boundary, and caution will need to be practiced near all roadways surrounding the park, similar to existing conditions. Public comment regarding the location and type of facilities included in the NCPMP will be considered by the Board of Supervisors.
ASCAC-22	As noted in the EIR and correspondence between the County General Services Agency and County Public Works (initiated by a referral response to the Initial Study in 2005), Osage Street is not currently constructed in compliance with County Road Standards, and improvements are necessary to bring the adjacent road system into compliance. The affected area includes the County road right-of-way adjacent to NCP. Potential adverse impacts to individual oak trees and sand mesa manzanita are documented in EIR Section 4.3 Biological Resources. The No changes to the EIR are necessary.
ASCAC-23	The summary of the July 12, 2004 meeting states that the NCAC recommended that environmental review be conducted on a more intensive plan, not that the NCAC was recommending approval of the more intense plan. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
SCAC – Mee	ting on April 23, 2012
ASCAC-24	Comment related to other project. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
ASCAC-25	Comment noted. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
Istar Hollida	y .
ASCAC-26	Please note that all potential impacts related to the NCPMP, including the community center and other passive and active recreational amenities identified in the plan, have been assessed based on resource topics and County adopted thresholds of significance. Based on this analysis, no significant, unavoidable, adverse impacts were identified. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
ASCAC-27	The County General Services Agency would be responsible for all facilities within NCP. While a community center within NCP may be managed by an organization (pursuant to an issued permit or lease), the center would be a public facility. Identification of potential financial costs would be identified in the associated permit or lease. No changes to the EIR are necessary.
ASCAC-28	Comment noted, and will be considered by the County BOS.
ASCAC-29	The summary of the July 12, 2004 meeting states that the NCAC recommended that environmental review be conducted on a more intensive plan, not that the NCAC was recommending approval of the more intense plan. No changes to the EIR are necessary.

This page intentionally left blank.



CEQA Review Draft

Nipomo Community Park Master Plan

Prepared for:

The County of San Luis Obispo General Services- Parks Division



Landscape Architecture Planning Environmental Studies Ecological Restoration

849 Monterey Street San Luis Obispo CA 93401 805.781.9800

Table of Contents

1	Introduct	ion	Page
	1.1	Purpose and Background	1
	1.2	Environmental Constraint Study and Design Responses	1
	1.3	Community Survey	3
	1.4	Public Workshops	4
	1.5	Conceptual Alternative Plans	4
2	Master Pl	an Project Description	
	2.1	Overview of Proposed Park Facilities	5
	2.2	Park Programs and Operational Activities	5
	2.3	Alternative Community Recreation Center Location	5
	2.4	Parking Tabulation	6
		Table 2.0– Parking Tabulation	7
		Table 2.1- Summary of Approximate Areas and New Facilities	8
		Table 2.2- Summary of Approximate Areas and New Facilities	-
		Alternative Project	9
3	Master Pl	an Cost to Construct	
	3.1	Project Phasing	10
	3.2	Master Plan Amendment	10
4	Master Pl	an and Alternative Plan Exhibits	12
	Appendic	es	

Appendix A- Community Survey Appendix B- Public Workshop Summary Appendix C- Conceptual Alternatives 2 and 3 Appendix D- Nipomo Recreation Center Facilities Appendix E- Construction Cost



1 - Introduction

1.1 Purpose and Background

The purpose of this Master Plan report is to establish the long range plan for the park. The County's Draft Parks and Recreation Element (PRE) includes a policy that requires new development at parks to be consistent with an approved Master Plan.

Nipomo Community Park currently consists of about 140 acres of land situated at the corner of Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road. The park is only partially developed with about 23 acres of traditional park land including turf, sports fields, parking, etc.

In 2001, the County added 22 acres of passive open space developed with a path as part of the Mesa Meadows subdivision. This land is contiguous to the park along Osage Road. With this addition, the total park area is about 159 acres¹ comprised of four parcels.

When the existing park improvements were made in the 1970's and early 1980's the land surrounding the park on the west, southwest and northwest was undeveloped. Today, in addition to Dana School to the south, all the lands around the park are developed with residences.

As the community has grown, the developed portion of the park has intensified in use. Recently, a pressing need for more sports fields has been met at the new Nipomo high school. However, many park and recreation needs remain unmet. This Master Plan is the result of a process of determining needs and priorities in the community and translating them into a park plan for the future.

1.2 Environmental Constraint Study and Design Responses

As part of the creation of this Master Plan, the County retained the Morro Group to prepare an environmental constraints analysis. This study is a prelude to preparation of the CEQA document for the Master Plan and is incorporated by reference into the Master Plan. The key findings of the Constraints Analysis as they relate to the Master Plan design are summarized below:

¹ The park acreage calculation is gross acres to existing surrounding paved roads since some existing and proposed paths are in the rights of way. The Assessor's parcel maps indicate the four parcels total 153.95 acres.



• The site contains areas of important and sensitive native plant communities that serve as wildlife habitat, including Oak Woodland and Maritime Chaparral. No endangered species were found on the property. The Master Plan design avoids removing any substantial portion of these plant communities.

• The park site receives stormwater from nearby developed areas and percolates the water into the ground in a series of basins. Most of the park also drains to the basins and any increase in runoff form new paving or buildings in the park will impact that area. The Master Plan design proposes to capture the increase in stormwater runoff in a new basin in the center of the park that is shallow and attractively landscaped.

• The Tefft Avenue and Pomeroy Road has significant amounts of existing traffic. In addition, both existing park entrances off these streets are poorly located and need to be shifted for safety reasons as shown on the master Plan. Further, the proposed Master Plan uses will increase traffic and may require signalization at the new park entry aligned at Juniper Street.

• New and intensified recreation activities on the property have the potential to increase noise in the neighboring residential areas. The Master Plan locates activities that generate noise away from nearby homes. For example, the proposed sports fields are situated at least 100 feet away for residential property lines and 25 to 35 feet lower in elevation to attenuate noise increases.

• The park obtains water for domestic and irrigation purposes for the Nipomo Community Services District (NCSD) under an allocated agreement. Current park water use meets or exceeds this allocation. Development of new facilities at the park may be limited until the NCSD augments its water resources.

1.3 Community Survey

The County commissioned a public survey to find out what the citizens of Nipomo think about their parks and what additions or improvements may be needed. The survey was sent to 3000 households in Nipomo and Oceano. Responses were received from 552 households, which provides a good level of statistical accuracy.

The survey found that, for the recreation opportunities currently provided, people wanted more walking trails, park restrooms, playgrounds, picnic areas, parking and sports fields. When asked



what new recreation facilities they want most respondents favored a community recreation center, swimming pool, amphitheater and skateboard park.

The Master Plan includes all the facilities that ranked high in the survey as well as many lower on the list of facilities. Appendix A includes the Community Survey results tabulated in their entirety.

1.4 Public Workshops

Four Public workshops were conducted in two sets, at the initial stage and later to review the Conceptual Park Alternatives. Workshops one and two included an exercise to let groups of participants draw ideas on a park plan. The tabulated results of the workshops are presented in Appendix B. The facilities with the highest degree of consensus included:

- Preserve existing park facilities
- Preserve existing oaks and open space
- Retain existing multi-use trails
- New community center / recreation building
- Additional sports fields
- Multi-use path around park perimeter
- Equestrian staging area and multi use arena
- Enhance safety at both park entrances

The second set of workshops presented three alternative park designs. These conceptual alternatives include a range of park development intensities as well as options for the locations of some key elements. Appendix C includes the three alternative concept plans presented. The workshop participants did not arrive at a full consensus as to the level of development or precise locations for some elements, however most participants favored Scheme 1, the most intense alternative.

1.5 Conceptual Alternative Plans

The three Conceptual Alternative Plans were presented to the Nipomo Community Advisory Council (now the South County Advisory Committee, SCAC) in July 2004. At the meeting the Council took public testimony from about thirty persons before an audience of about 120 people. The SCAC recommended that the County proceed with the environmental (CEQA) review and land use permits for Scheme 1 with the understanding that 1) Scheme 1 represented to highest utilization of the park, 2) the CEQA document analyze an alternative to locate the community center to the Tefft Street



frontage, and 3) the community would have an opportunity for more input upon completion of the CEQA document. There was consensus that it is preferable to plan for the most use and determine at phased increments whether all the Master Plan elements ultimately need to be built.

2 - Master Plan Project Description

2.1 Overview of Proposed Park Facilities

The Master Plan presented here is a refinement of the preferred Scheme 1 alternative, as revised in 2009. The Master Plan Alternative Project includes an alternative location on the site for the proposed community center complex, as described below.

Table 2.1 lists all the proposed Master Plan facilities and their approximate respective land areas, along with the existing facilities and areas to be substantially left undeveloped. The existing undeveloped knoll in the northwest end of the park would remain natural. The existing unimproved horse trails in that area would remain as they are now.

The Master Plan identifies an area for multi-use sports fields. This are is viewed as a mid- to long-term holding area for active sports fields. The type of sports to be accommodated would be determined at the time the need for added fields arises. The maximum intensity of use would likely be youth soccer. The area could accommodate about 6 youth soccer fields. The fields are not shown to be lighted.

Improvements to make Osage Street consistent with County road standard A-1(d) is shown on the Master Plan². The improvements include a 6 foot wide path would link to the park path system creating a loop around the park.

The detailed list of Community Recreation facilities envisioned by the Nipomo Recreation Center (2004) is listed in Appendix D.

2.2 Park Programs and Operational Activities

In addition to the proposed facilities shown on the Master Plan map and on Table 2.1, the following activities and facilities are part of the project description for the Master Plan:

- Removal of diseased trees and replacement tree planting program.
- Utility infrastructure additions and maintenance.

 $^{^2}$ The existing pavement width is 24 feet with AC dikes, which meets the road standard. The path is required to meet the standard. The standard allows the path to be attached or detached; both are shown on the Master Plan in response to topographic conditions.



• Cellular communication repeater station.

The Tree Replacement Program is needed because many of the existing park trees are Monterey Pine (*Pinus radiata*) which are highly susceptible to devastating disease. Trees need to be evaluated and removed and replaced on a regular, planned basis. Replacement trees need not await a removal to be installed. The Tree Replacement Program should be developed as a basis to fund regular removal and planting. The Program should identify suitable replacement trees. Examples of suitable park trees are California Live Oak, California Sycamore, California Pepper, Coast Redwood and Monterey Cypress.

2.3 Alternative Community Recreation Center Location

The Alternative Project shows a different location for the Community Center Recreation facilities. The SCAC requested that the environmental review analyze an alternative that shifts these facilities to the Tefft Street frontage area. However, not all the facilities envisioned for the Community Center Recreation Facilities can be accommodated at this location. The facilities that can be accommodated at the location represent less than half of the total facilities originally envisioned by the Nipomo Recreation Center. The facilities included, based on the priorities of the Nipomo Recreation Center, are limited to:

- Gymnasium with locker rooms and restrooms (10,000 s.f)
- Preschool and small play area (4,400 s.f.)
- Teen Center (5,000 s.f.)
- Administration office (1,000 s.f.)

Table 2.2 shows all the proposed Alternative Project facilities and their respective land areas, along with the existing facilities and areas to be substantially left undeveloped.

2.4 Alternative Sites for Community Center Recreation Facilities

The community desires the County to study potential alternative sites for the Community Center recreation facilities. In 2008, the program of possible facilities where reevaluated and the needed land area estimated. It was determined a site of at least two acres is required. If the site is constrained by slope, lot configuration or access more acreage would be needed.

If the Community Center Recreation facilities are located on an alternative site in the community, the Master Plan core area would not include these facilities and the adjoining passive and active park



areas would shift "inward" to the core. The resulting increase in park open space would be about 3 acres.

The Alternative Master Plan shows the Community Center Recreation facilities along Tefft Street instead of the core area in the park. If these are located to another site in the community, the more active facilities on the Alternative Plan shown in the core area (pool or skate park) could be shifted to the Tefft Street area, similar to the Master Plan scheme.

2.5 Parking Tabulation

The County Land Use Ordinance (LUO) contains the parking requirements for new development. However, for many of the proposed recreation uses there is no established standard. As a result, the parking requirement has been determined by applying the LUO where possible and referring to other park projects and traffic trip generation reports for similar uses and facilities. In addition, some double use is assumed. The various recreation activities provided in the Master Plan would rarely, if ever, all be used to the maximum capacity all at the same time. For example, evening use of the gym would not overlap with the day use of the ballfields, therefore the full parking requirement for both facilities need not be provided. Table 2.0 tabulates the parking provided for each proposed use.



Table 2.0 Parking Tabulation

Facility or use	Master Plan	Alternative Project		
Sports fields (calc'd for 6 AYSO size soccer)	159 spaces	159 spaces		
Community Recreation facilities	150 spaces	135 spaces		
Pool or skatepark	20 to 56 spaces	20 to 56 spaces		
Amphitheater	24 spaces	24 spaces		
Play / Picnic area	24 spaces	24 spaces		
Horseshoe area	12 spaces	12 spaces		
Dog park	4 spaces	4 spaces		
Basketball 2 courts	4 spaces	4 spaces		
Tennis 2 courts	4 spaces	4 spaces		
Handball 4 courts	8 spaces	8 spaces		
Total	379-415 spaces	364-400 spaces		
Equestrian trailer	7 pull-through	7 pull-through		



	Fristing	Proposed	Total
	(sf)	(sf)	(sf)
Amphitheaters	0	5.227	5.227
Basketball Courts	0	10,000	10,000
Playgrounds	6,534	8,276	14,810
Community Center / Gymnasium	0	36,000	36,000
Dog Parks	31,988	19,000	50,988
Group Picnic Areas	9,433	0	9,433
Handball Courts	0	4,000	4,000
Horseshoe Pits	0	1,800	1,800
Skate Park	0	10,000	10,000
Sports Fields (Turf)	231,633	439,520	671,153
Swimming Pool / Deck	0	8,400	8,400
Tennis Courts	26,404	14,400	40,804
Trails / Walkways (paved)	50,724	127,373	178,097
	0 356 716	11,200 605 276	1 051 002
	SU0,710	090,270 Drenegod	1,031,992
OPEN SPACE	Existing (ef)	ef)	iotai
Open Space (undeveloped)	5 689 881	(3 1) _1 113 510	4 576 371
Open Play Area (Turf)	403 855	172 498	576 353
Trails (dirt)	190,000	-84 276	105 924
SUBTOTAL OPEN SPACE	6.283.936	-1.025.288	5.258.648
INFRASTRUCTURE	Existing	Proposed	Total
	(sf)	(sf)	(sf)
Basins	54,900	108,900	163,800
Library Building	7,134	4,000	11,134
Parking	137,166	183,388	320,554
Ranger Residence	1,284	0	1,284
Restrooms / Maintenance Bldgs	3,155	1,490	4,645
Roads	89,036	32,234	121,270
SUBTOTAL INFRASTRUCTURE	292,675	330,012	622,687
TOTALS			
Parking Spaces	325	415	740
TOTALS (Acres)	Existing	Proposed	Total
	(acres)	(acres)	(acres)
	8.19	15.96	24.15
	144.26	-23.54	120.72
TOTAL	0.72	7.00	14.30
TOTAL	159.17		159.17
TOTALS (Percentages)	Existing	Proposed	Total
	(%)	(%)	(%)
RECREATION AREA	5.2%	10.0%	15.2%
	90.6%	-14.8%	75.8%
INFRASTRUCTURE	4.2%	4.8%	9.0%
TOTAL			

Table 2.1Summary of Approximate Areas and New Facilities

Note: Total estimate gross park area = 6,933,327sf (159.17 acres). Estimate includes Nipomo Park & Mesa Meadows.



Table 2.2 Summary of Approximate Areas and New Facilities - Alternative Project

*Existing preschool is a temporary use within existing facilities; no square footage is shown.



3 - Master Plan Implementation

3.1 Project Phasing

At the time of the Master Plan adoption, the basic priorities derived from the community were to construct a gymnasium and other community recreation buildings, establish a multi purpose trail around the park, develop sports fields and expand play, picnic and horseshoe facilities.

The Master Plan does not establish a phasing plan. The timing, type and extent of infrastructure extensions, off site improvements such as traffic signals, and earthwork would depend upon the type and extent of the first new facilities to be implemented. Conversely, the choice of which facilities to implement first, second or third may be influenced by the kinds of infrastructure and earthwork that must accompany the recreation facilities.

The overall cost to construct the Master Plan is shown in Appendix E. The cost for each element is based on conceptual design characteristics, therefore the cost for any particular element could go up or down once the more detailed design is developed.

The Nipomo Recreation Center, a non-profit community organization, is envisioned as a possible partner in the development of the community recreation buildings planned for the park. The cost to construct these facilities is identified as a separate item on the construction cost breakdown (2003 dollars) in Appendix E.

3.2 Master Plan Amendment

The Master Plan is intended to guide development of the park to an envisioned "build out" some undetermined years in the future. While the purpose of a Master Plan is to guide decisions over a number of years, it is recognized that as time passes community needs and priorities may change and the Master Plan may need updating and revising.

The Master Plan should be updated at ten-year intervals to ensure that it remains viable and relevant as a guide for meeting the park and recreation needs of the community.

The Master Plan may be amended at any point along the way if new ideas or pressing needs warrant a change in the Plan. The process for amending the Plan would involve community workshops and



SCAC input and review and approval by the County Parks and Recreation Commission.



Appendix A- Community Survey

NIPOMO COMMUNITY PARK RECREATION SURVEY PRELIMINARY REPORT

San Luis Obispo County Parks and the Nipomo Community Advisory Council Recreation and Parks Committee are working together on the development of a Master Plan for Nipomo Community Park. The Master Plan will serve as a blueprint reflecting the desires and needs of park users for the next fifteen years. As a part of this effort, a public attitude survey was conducted to identify the recreational preferences of potential park users in the Nipomo vicinity.

The survey packet was distributed to 3000 randomly selected households and completed surveys were returned by 522 households. The survey packet included a bilingual cover letter, a two-page English version of the survey, a two-page Spanish version of the survey, and a postage paid return envelope. An additional 51 surveys were completed by park users onsite at Nipomo Community Park.

The two-page survey included questions on existing recreation opportunities, proposed recreation opportunities, park funding, unmet recreation needs, and provided a space for addition comments and suggestions.

The survey also included a question on frequency of park use and six questions about the demographic characteristics of the responding households, including the ages of the residents of the household, the area of residence, the gender of the survey respondent, home ownership, racial/ethnic background, and household income. These questions serve two purposes. First, it allows examination of how recreation and funding preferences are modified by frequency of use and demographic characteristics. For example, it is possible to identify the recreation preferences of households with children. Second, it allows comparison of the demographic characteristics of the survey respondents to Census data for the area, an indication of the validity of the survey responses.

Sampling error for surveys is calculated based on the number of surveys returned. For the current sample of 573 (522 returned by mail; 51 conducted on site), the margin of error is plus or minus 5%. Thus, the percentages reported are expected to be within 5% of the percentages that would be obtained if all community residents had responded to the survey.

Tables and graphs summarizing the results of the survey are attached.

. . . .

Table 1: Existing Recreation Opportunities

Question 1: Existing Recreation Opportunities. Please indicate whether each of the following recreation opportunities and facilities should be reduced, remain the same, or be increased.

		Remain	Increase a	Increase a
Existing Recreation Opportunities	Reduce	the same	little	lot
Walking/jogging/bicycling trails	3%	35%	35%	27%
Restrooms	1%	36%	49%	13%
Children's play equipment	3%	38%	43%	15%
Individual picnic areas	3%	43%	43%	12%
Parking	2%	46%	39%	12%
Group picnic areas	3%	49%	40%	8%
Multipurpose sports fields	4%	51%	28%	17%
Wilderness areas	10%	49%	21%	20%
Basketball courts	4%	55%	30%	11%
Botanical gardens/exhibits	11%	50%	26%	14%
Equestrian trails	15%	50%	22%	13%
Off-leash dog area	15%	54%	19%	12%
Volleyball courts	6%	63%	26%	5%
Tennis courts	6%	66%	22%	6%
Horseshoe pits	8%	65%	23%	4%



Table 2: Proposed Recreation Opportunities

Question 2: Proposed Recreation Opportunities. Please indicate your level of support for the following proposed recreation opportunities and facilities.

	Strongly				Strongly
Proposed Recreation Opportunities	Oppose	Oppose	Neutral	Support	Support
Recreation/Community Center (gym,	8%	12%	2100	31%	25%
meeting rooms, kitchen, etc.)	0 10	1270	2470	5170	25 /0
Swimming pool	11%	14%	22%	28%	25%
Amphitheater for outdoor performing arts	10%	13%	29%	31%	17%
Low impact activities (shuffleboard, lawn	70%	70%	110%	210	0.07
bowling, etc.)	170	170	44 70	54%	9%
Skateboard park	18%	13%	27%	28%	14%
Community meeting rooms	9%	15%	37%	30%	9%
Equestrian arena (no rodeos or commercial	1507	100	210	210	1107.
events)	15%	19%	54%	21%	1170
Horse trailer parking area	17%	17%	38%	19%	10%
Community vegetable gardens	13%	20%	42%	18%	7%
Paved bicycle paths	4%	54%	31%	11%	0%



Table 3: Park Use

Question 3: Park Use. How often have you or your family used Nipomo Community Park during the past 12 months?

Category	Percent
Total	100%
Never	16%
Occasionally	38%
Once a month	17%
Once a week	17%
More than once a week	11%



Table 4: Funding Options

Question 4: Funding. In order to finance the development and maintenance of improvements in Nipomo Community Park, which of the following funding methods would you support?

Options	Total	Strongly Oppose	Oppose	Neutral	Support	Strongly Support
Property tax assessment on property owners	100%	40%	18%	20%	17%	5%
Assess special fees on new construction	100%	15%	8%	27%	32%	18%
User fees paid by those who use the park facilities	100%	9%	9%	16%	43%	23%
		Total	100%]		
Question 5: Funding Amount. If an	\$0		25%			
assessment of properties is proposed to fund	\$1-10		23%]		
improvements that you want in Nipomo	\$11-25		17%	1		
Community Park, how much would you be	\$26-50	\$26-50		1		
willing to pay annually?	\$51-10	\$51-100		1		
	Over \$	100	4%			

Area of Residence	Survey	
Nipomo east of 101	14%	
Nipomo west of 101	54%	
Black Lake Village	8%	
Callender-Garrett	2%	
Los Berros	5%	
Palo Mesa	30/	
Oceano	5%	
Rural Arrovo Grande	7%	
Other	2%	
	100%	
	10070	
Ninomo Only	Survey	Censue
Ninomo east of 101	21%	210%
Nipomo west of 101	700%	700/-
	1970	1970
	Survey	Conona
Number of households w/ shildren under 19		
Number of households w/ children under 18	2107	41%
Number of nousenoids w/ adults of and over	51%	28%
Gender	Survey	Census
Female	55%	51%
Male	45%	49%
	100%	100%
		~
Home Ownership	Survey	Census
Uwn	91%	71%
Kent	9%	29%
	100%	100%
Racial/ethnic background	Survey	Census
Hispanic	14%	21%
Other Anglo/White/Caucasian	83%	74%
Black or African-American	0%	5%
Native American	2%	
Asian or Pacific Islander	1%	
Other	0%	
	100%	100%
Household Income	Survey	Census
Less than \$10,000 a year	2%	6%
\$10,000 - \$24,999	9%	17%
\$25,000 - \$39,999	15%	20%
\$40,000 - \$59,999	22%	20%
\$60,000 - \$99,999	31%	24%
\$100,000 and over	21%	13%
	100%	

Table 5: Demographic Characteristics

The Nipomo Community Park Recreation Survey contained several background variables that describe the participants in the survey. These background variables include the frequency of use of the park in the last year; whether there are children in the household; whether there are Seniors (65 and over) in the household; place of residence; gender; homeownership; racial/ethnic background; and annual income. In addition, the sample includes surveys that were collected by mail and on-site.

The analysis of background variables used statistical techniques (t-tests, analysis of variance, Chi square, and correlation) to determine whether the background variables were "significantly" (in a statistical sense) related to the participants' opinions about existing recreation opportunities, proposed recreation opportunities, and park funding issues. Highlights of that analysis are presented below.

Regular park users (those that use the park at least occasionally), were:

- more likely to be Nipomo residents;
- more likely to have children in the home;
- more supportive of increases in basketball courts, children's play equipment, and equestrian trails;
- more supportive of adding an amphitheater for outdoor performing arts, community meeting rooms, paved bicycle paths, a recreation / community center, and a swimming pool; and,
- more supportive of the use of property tax assessments and special fees on new construction to fund improvements (see Figures 4 and 5; 457 respondents).

Households with children were:

- generally more supportive of increasing existing recreation facilities and adding more proposed recreation facilities;
- more likely to use the park than households without children;
- more supportive of increases in basketball courts, children's play equipment, and multipurpose sports fields; and,
- more supportive adding a horse trailer parking area, paved bicycle paths, recreation / community center, skateboard park, and swimming pool (see Figures 5 and 6; 229 respondents).

Renters were:

- more supportive of increasing the group picnic areas; and,
- more supportive of adding a swimming pool to the park.

The Hispanic participants were:

- more supportive of increasing the following existing recreation facilities: basketball courts, group picnic areas, horseshoe pits, and restrooms; and,
- more supportive of the creation of a recreation / community center at the park (see Figures 7 and 8; 66 respondents; margin of error plus or minus about 10%).

Participants interviewed onsite at the park were

- more supportive of increasing the horseshoe pits and more supportive of the proposed swimming pool; and,
- less supportive of user fees to fund improvements in the park.

Figures are included on the following page displaying facility preferences for three of the demographic groups: regular park users (those that use the park at least occationally), households with children, and Hispanic households. The facilities are ordered on the basis of the overall community ratings to facilitate comparison. The ratings of small subgroups should be interpreted with care.













Appendix B- Public Workshop Summary

Nipomo Community Park Summary of Workshops #1 and #2 Recommendations

Summary of Key ideas:

Preservation of existing facilities (e.g. open space trails, ball fields, tennis courts, picnic areas, off-leash dog park, native garden, etc.) is important. Preservation of existing oaks and open space, while retaining existing multi-use trails, is important. New improvements should be concentrated within or adjacent to the existing developed portions of the park. Emphasis should focus on providing activities for children and youth, such as development of additional multi-use fields and trails. Multiple uses of existing fields and facilities is important. Enhanced safety at park entrances off of Pomeroy and West Tefft is important.

Proposed improvements: N	umber of Group	s Supporting
Preserve existing facilities:	11	100%
Preserve existing oaks and open space; retain existing multi-use trails	10	91%
Community / Recreation center, with gymnasium.	10	91%
Additional Multi-use sports fields (softball, soccer, etc)	7	77%
Multi-use (accessible) trail at park perimeter	7	77%
Equestrian staging area / multi-use arena (for equestrian events, BMX bike	track) 6	55%
Enhance safety at West Tefft / Orchard Road entrance	5	45%
Enhance safety and improve entrance at Pomeroy Road	4	36%
Additional basketball courts	4	36%
Bocce courts / lawn bowling	4	36%
Handball courts	4	36%
Horseshoe courts	4	36%
Gazebo, stage or amphitheater for seasonal community activities (e.g. Okto	berfest) 4	36%
Renovate / enhance detention basin at corner of West Tefft & Pomeroy.	4	36%
Skate park	4	36%
Additional restrooms	3	27%
Additional tennis courts	2	11%
Additional barbeque areas	2	11%
Additional off-leash dog area adjacent to Pomeroy Road.	2	11%
"Pocket park" at Mesa Meadows open space		
(e.g. ball field, horseshoe & handball courts)	2	11%
Frisbee golf	1	9%
Community swimming pool	1	9%
Observatory	1	9%
Expand library facility	1	9%
Fitness "Par" course at Mesa Meadows existing open space trail	1	9%
Toddler play area adjacent to existing ball fields	1	9%
Volleyball court	1	9%
Implement approved Mesa Meadows landscape plan	1	9%
Preschool at (or near) community center	1	9%
Eliminate day-use fees.	1	9%

Appendix C- Conceptual Alternatives 2 and 3





Appendix D- Nipomo Recreation Center Facilities

Nipomo Recreation Center Community Center Program

1. PROGRAM OF FACILITIES in order of priority:

and the second second

- a. Multi-Purpose Gymnasium (requires 9000 s/f)
- b. Preschool; (Licensed for 40; requires 4400 s/f)
- c. Administrative Offices; 6–10 offices (requires 1000 s/f)
- d. Teen Center with game room and lounge (requires 5000 s/f)
- e. Senior Center; (requires 2500 s/f)
- f. Multi-Purpose Community Rooms; 2-seating 100 each (recommended 1500 s/f)
- g. Multi-Purpose Conference Hall (recommended 5000s/f)
- h. Kitchen Facilities (To service Gymnasium and Conference Hall simultaneously; recommended 1000 s/f)
- i. Fitness Room; 2 Rooms for Contract Classes-Capacity 50 each (requires 2000 s/f)
- j. Computer Room; 20-25 Stations (requires 1000 s/f)
- k. Board Room (recommended 500 s/f)
- I. Restrooms (ADA Compliant)
- m.Skatepark (recommended 6000 s/f; cement)
- n. Outside Facilities with Access to Building
 - i. Patio Areas
 - ii. Storage Facilities

Source : Nipomo Recreation Center, October 2004

Appendix E- Cost to Construct

opinion of probable cost

Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Nov-04

SITE WORK	QUANTITY	/ UNIT		UNIT COST		TOTAL COST
Sports Fields						
Earthwork	435,600	s.f.	х	0.50	=	217,800
turf, irrigation & amenities	435,600	s.f.	х	2.00	н	871,200
Open Turf / Play/ Picnic						
Earthwork, irrig, tables	174,240	s.f	х	1.75	=	304,920
Park Roads						
Paved 24 ft wide	32,234	s.f.	х	2.25	=	72,527
Parking						
415 spaces,AC, grading, no curb	145,250	s.f.	х	4.00	=	581,000
Multi use Trail						
Eight ft wide D.G. stabilized	17,800	l.f.	х	9.00	=	160,200
Amphitheater						
Earthwork, turf, stage	52,275	s.f.	х	2.75	=	143,756
Play Grounds						
Two areas, surface, equipment	2	ea	х	60,000.00	=	120,000
Restrooms						
Two buildings, 575 s.f each	1,150	s.f.	х	250.00	=	287,500
Dog Park						
fenced	2000	l.f.	х	20	=	40,000
Handball						
Four courts	4	ea	х	6,500.00	=	26,000
Horseshoe pits						
12 pits, fenced, benches	12	ea	х	3,200.00	=	38,400
Tennis						
Two courts fenced, lighted	14,400	s.f	х	13.50	=	194,400
Basketball						
Two courts	10,000	s.f	х	6.00	=	60,000
Stormwater Basin						
grading, landscape , no fence	108,900	l.f.	Х	1.5	=	163,350
Skate park						
Concrete, fenced	10,000	s.f	х	20.00	=	200,000
Pool						
75'x75'	300	p.f	х	350.00	=	105,000
Deck, fence, mechanical	1	ls.	х	200,000.00	=	200,000

Misc infrastructure / offsite							
signal, traffic, power, water	1	l.s.	x	300,000	=		300,000
Environmental Mitigation							
Native Planting	1	l.s.	x	25,000.00	=		25,000
Tree Replacement / Landscape							
	1	l.s.	x	50,000.00	=		50,000
SUB TOTAL:						\$	4,161,053
10% CONTINGENCY:							\$416,105
SUBTOTAL:						\$	4,577,158
6% A/E COST							\$274,629
Park Site Work TOTAL:						\$	4,851,788
Community Center Facilites	Appendix D					\$1.0-\$3.0 million	

(b) Server think order to be follow

for the transmission of structures of

-

17 - K. 14

and the first strength


Notice of Preparation for the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report November 17, 2009



NOTICE OF PREPARATION – DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND BUILDING 976 OSOS STREET * ROOM 200 * SAN LUIS OBISPO * CALIFORNIA 93408 * (805) 781-5600 Promoting the Wise Use of Land * Helping to Build Great Communities

DATE: November 17, 2009

FROM: Department of Planning and Building 976 Osos St., Room 300 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040

PROJECT TITLE: Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR

PROJECT APPLICANT: County of San Luis Obispo, County Parks

RESPONSES DUE BY: December 23, 2009

The County of San Luis Obispo is the lead agency for the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan and will prepare a Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) for the project described in the attached project description. We need to know the views of your agency as to the scope and content of the environmental information which is germane to your agency's statutory responsibilities in connection with the proposed project. Your agency will need to use the Environmental Impact Report prepared by our agency when considering your permit or other approval for the project. If you are not a government agency, the following is for your informational purposes only. Your comments are welcome but not required.

PLEASE provide us the following information at your earliest convenience, but not later than the 30-day comment period, which began with your agency's receipt of the Notice of Preparation (NOP).

- 1. NAME OF CONTACT PERSON. (Please include address, e-mail and telephone number)
- 2. PERMIT(S) or APPROVAL(S) AUTHORITY. Please provide a summary description of these and send a copy of the relevant sections of legislation, regulatory guidance, etc.
- 3. ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION. What environmental information must be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report to enable your agency to use this documentation as a basis for your permit issuance or approval?
- 4. PERMIT STIPULATIONS/CONDITIONS. Please provide a list and description of standard stipulations (conditions) that your agency will apply to features of this project. Are there other conditions that have a high likelihood of application to a permit or approval for this project? If so, please list and describe.

- 5. ALTERNATIVES. What alternatives does your agency recommend be analyzed in equivalent level of detail with those listed above?
- 6. REASONABLY FORESEEABLE PROJECTS, PROGRAMS or PLANS. Please name any future project, programs or plans that you think may have an overlapping influence with the project as proposed.
- 7. RELEVANT INFORMATION. Please provide references for any available, appropriate documentation you believe may be useful to the county in preparing the Environmental Impact Report. Reference to and/or inclusion of such documents in an electronic format would be appreciated.
- 8. FURTHER COMMENTS. Please provide any further comments or information that will help the county to scope the document and determine the appropriate level of environmental assessment.

The project description, location, and the probable environmental effects are contained in the attached materials.

Due to the time limits mandated by State law, your response must be sent at the earliest possible date, but not later than 30 days after receipt of this notice.

Please send your response to Mr. Steve McMasters at the address shown above. As requested above, we will need the name for a contact person in your agency. If you have any questions regarding the NOP or the proposed project, please contact Mr. Steve McMasters at <u>smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us</u> or (805) 781-5096.

In addition, a notice will be sent out regarding an EIR scoping meeting, which will be held on December 1, 2009 at the Nipomo Community Services District Boardroom, located at 148 South Wilson Street in Nipomo, San Luis Obispo County, California. The EIR scoping meeting will be open to all interested parties and provide an opportunity for input relating to the scope and content of the EIR.

ClenCemoll Signature

Ellen Carroll County of San Luis Obispo Department of Planning and Building

Reference: California Administrative Code, Title 14, Section 15082

Attachments

Project Description Initial Study

ATTACHMENT 1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

San Luis Obispo County Parks (County) proposes to implement the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan (proposed project), which would result in the phased construction of recreation facilities and related infrastructure over a 20-year timeframe. The proposed project under consideration in this Program EIR includes the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan (NCPMP). A description of the project location, project history, and project elements are provided within this chapter in the sections below.

1.1 PROJECT LOCATION

The project site is located in the unincorporated community of Nipomo, within San Luis Obispo County, California (refer to Figure 1). The proposed project consists of two connected park areas, Nipomo Community Park (NCP), including the Nipomo Native Garden, and Mesa Meadows (refer to Figure 2). The project site is located northwest of the Pomeroy Road / Tefft Street intersection, approximately one mile west of Highway 101.

NCP is an approximately 137-acre angular parcel bounded by Pomeroy Road and Tefft Street to the east, Osage Street to the west, and the Tejas Street neighborhood to the south. The approximately 22-acre Mesa Meadows open space area is located within two parcels adjacent to, and immediately southwest of, NCP, on the northwest corner of Mesa Road and Osage Road. The total park and open space area is approximately 159 acres, comprised of four parcels (Assessor Parcel Numbers 091-313-049, 091-313-050, 092-121-085, and 092-121-086) (refer to Figures 3 and 4).

1.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The park was initially developed in the 1970s, and additional improvements were constructed in the 1980's. The Mesa Meadows open space area was accepted by the County of San Luis Obispo on November 7, 2000. The area within Mesa Meadows was donated in fee to the County as open-space, which limits the County use to passive land uses only. The Mesa Meadows Landscape and Amenity Plan (2002) was approved in association with the residents living in the Mesa Meadows subdivision.

1.2.1 Initial Scoping

In 2003, the County commissioned an environmental constraints analysis report (Morro Group 2004). The constraints analysis identified sensitive resources within the park and Mesa Meadows. The report included the existing setting; a summary of potentially proposed recreation and infrastructure; and project-specific technical studies and focused surveys for aesthetics, biological resources, noise, and traffic. The report also assessed potential constraints due to cultural resources, geology and soils, drainage, erosion, sedimentation, flooding, public utilities and services, land use, and planning.

Figure 1. Regional Location Map





Figure 2. Project Vicinity Map



Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Notice of Preparation

Attachment A





Source: County of San Luis Obispo

County of San Luis Obispo

Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Administrative Draft Program EIR In addition to the environmental constraints analysis, the County commissioned a public survey to identify public opinions regarding Nipomo Community Park and what additions or improvements are needed at the park (Kocher 2004). The survey was mailed out in January 2004 to 3,000 randomly selected households in the communities of Nipomo and Oceano; 522 survey responses were returned by mail. In addition to the mail survey, 51 surveys were conducted onsite at NCP, resulting in a total of 573 responses/returned surveys. The two-page survey included questions on existing recreation, proposed recreation, park funding, unmet recreation needs, and demographic characteristics of the survey respondents. The survey found that, for the recreation opportunities currently provided, people wanted more walking trails, park restrooms, playgrounds, picnic areas, parking, and sports fields. When asked what new recreation facilities they wanted, a majority favored a community recreation center, swimming pool, amphitheater, and skateboard park. The County retained a design firm to prepare a draft park master plan (Firma 2004). Firma reviewed the project survey results, attended public workshops, and ultimately prepared plans for the park's master plan.

1.2.2 Public Workshops and Scoping Meetings

To obtain public input, four public workshops were conducted. The workshops were arranged in two sets. The purpose of first two workshops was to obtain input regarding what people would like to see in the park and obtain input regarding potential concerns. The first two public workshops were held at the Nipomo Community Services District (NCSD) on March 3 and 4, 2004. These workshops included an exercise to let groups of participants draw ideas on a park plan. The facilities with the highest degree of consensus included:

- Preserve existing park facilities
- Preserve existing oaks and open space
- Retain existing multi-use trails
- New community center / recreation building
- Additional sports fields
- Multi-use path around park perimeter
- Equestrian staging area and multi use arena
- Enhance safety at both park entrances

The second set of workshops, held on May 5 and 6, 2004, presented three Concept Plans. These plans were developed based on the survey results, public input received at the March 2004 workshops, and data from the constraints analysis. These Concept Plans included a range of park development intensities as well as options for the locations of some key elements. At the May 2004 workshops there was no overall consensus regarding any one of the concept plans or the precise location of recreation elements.

On July 12, 2004, County Parks staff and NCAC held a noticed public meeting at the Nipomo High School Auditorium to: present information from the constraints analysis, the project's public survey, take public testimony, and obtain community and NCAC input on the NCPMP Concept Plans. Over 100 residents attended the meeting, and diverse viewpoints were expressed, including a majority of persons requesting additional development within the park. The NCAC recommended that the County move forward with environmental review on the more intense Concept Plan, based on the fact that it is easier to take items out of a master plan than put them in later. NCAC also requested that the County review a second alternative that moved some of the larger components (such as a community center) to Tefft Street versus the park's interior.

The NCAC requested that the County return to the community for additional input upon completion of the environmental document. In late 2004, Firma completed two Draft NCPMP drawings based on NCAC input. The drawings included two alternatives as requested by the NCAC.

1.2.3 Initial Study

In January 2005, the County's consultant started preparation of the project's environmental document (i.e., the CEQA initial study), including the submittal of referrals to agencies and advisory groups. The NCAC held a special meeting on March 24, 2005 to respond to the referral. County Parks staff did not attend this meeting, nor was the County's noticing list used. At the March 2005 meeting, the NCAC objected to the designs being analyzed in the project's environmental document and proposed a "rural friendly" design alternative. In 2006 a draft initial study was completed by the County's consultant. County staff coordinated with the South County Advisory Council (SCAC, previously identified as the NCAC) and held public meetings in Nipomo on August 14 and 21, 2006 to obtain input on the draft initial study. A majority of public comments included requests that the park remain rural with new recreation largely located elsewhere. On August 21, 2006, the majority of the SCAC supported the idea that the park should remain largely rural.

On March 22, 2007, County staff presented the project to the County Parks and Recreation Commission (PRC) for input. Numerous members of the public attended this meeting, and expressed various views regarding future park development. Based on County staff's input that it is easier to take items out of the park plan once environmental review is complete than to add items later, the PRC directed staff to complete the environmental review for the two proposed alternatives (as described in the draft initial study) and then bring the item back to the Commission for further discussion. In September 2007, the County issued a draft initial study (#ED05-225) for the NCPMP for public review. The initial study reviewed two alternative projects. The two alternative park master plans were similar, with the exception of the location of major facilities such as the community center. No un-mitigable impacts were identified in the initial study. Public comments received regarding the initial study raised issues regarding:

- aesthetics, including night lighting;
- biological resources, including impacts to oak trees;
- hazardous materials related to the site's previous use;
- noise from proposed facilities;
- adequacy of public services, such as fire and sheriff;
- land use;
- adequacy of public services for proposed facilities;
- traffic and circulation;
- adequacy of wastewater to serve the proposed park development, and,
- water use.

Some of the letters received in response to the draft initial study raised concern whether the initial study was adequate, indicating that an EIR should be completed for the project. On November 13, 2007, Parks staff met with the Environmental Coordinator and other Department of Planning and Building staff involved with the NCPMP to discuss the comments received on the draft initial study. On November 26, 2007, the Environmental Coordinator recommended that an EIR be prepared for the NCPMP.

1.2.4 Project Changes Since 2007

Since the release of the Master Plan, Master Plan Alternative, and 2007 Initial Study document, Parks has amended the project description as follows:

- All Osage Street improvements, including an adjacent trail, are now included in the Master Plan design
- Modification to proposed trail locations, including a paved trail adjacent to Osage Street
- The Alternative Master Plan identified in the 2007 Initial Study (which moved some of the larger recreation facilities such as a community center to Tefft Street) will be assessed in the Alternatives chapter of the EIR
- The existing, temporary pre-school is identified as an existing, temporary use
- Conceptual architectural drawings are provided for the proposed community center.

1.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The primary goal of the NCPMP is to establish the long-range plan for Nipomo Community Park and Mesa Meadows. The objectives of the NCPMP are to:

- provide a range of passive and active facilities and use areas to meet the recreational needs of the community;
- maintain and upgrade existing recreational and community facilities and amenities;
- effectively manage current and projected levels of park uses;
- provide amenities that are aesthetically consistent with the regional character of the area;
- provide a community recreation center within the unincorporated community of Nipomo;
- incorporate infrastructure and circulation improvements to meet existing and estimated future (2025) motor vehicle transportation warrants;
- apply adaptive management strategies, including the use of improved technology, to address new planning and management issues as they arise;
- consider and support active citizen input in the decision-making process; and,
- periodically review and update the NCPMP through a public review process (approximately 15-year intervals), including consideration of the changing needs of the community when evaluating existing and potential new amenities.

1.4 PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed project under consideration in this Program EIR includes the proposed NCPMP (refer to Figure 5). The plan includes a variety of recreational opportunities, including the expansion of existing facilities, the addition of new facilities to the park, active recreational uses including multi-use sports fields, passive recreational uses and open space, and improvements to infrastructure. Table 1 shows the existing and proposed acreage of land use-types within the park, and the percentage of the park area for each identified use. Table 2 lists all the proposed NCPMP facilities and their approximate respective land areas, along with the existing facilities and areas to be substantially left undeveloped.

1.4.1 Existing Facilities

Existing major amenities in the park include: four sports fields accommodating baseball, soccer, and football (5.3 acres), including one lighted field; four lighted tennis courts (0.6 acre); a 0.7-acre dog park; 6,534-square foot playground; group and individual picnic areas (9,433 square feet); the 12-acre Nipomo Native Garden including trails and planted areas; open play area (9.3 acres); 1.1 acres of paved trails/walkways; and, 4.3 acres of dirt and spur trails. Infrastructure within the park includes: 1.2 acres of drainage improvements including a basin, two acres of roads; 3.1 acres of parking; 3,155 square feet of restrooms and a maintenance building (consisting of a shop, office and restroom); two host sites (1,284 square feet); and, an air quality monitoring station. In addition, 7,134-square foot Nipomo Library is located within the park, and is accessed from Tefft Street. An existing, temporary pre-school and fenced outdoor play area occupies approximately 4,050-square feet within the park. The pre-school is proposed to remain until a new pre-school is approved onsite, or elsewhere in the community of Nipomo.

Existing recreation and infrastructure cover approximately 15 acres or approximately 11 percent of the park. The remaining 130-acre area is generally a natural area consisting of oak woodland and coastal scrub, annual and ruderal grassland, and trails. Public recreation at Mesa Meadows includes a roughly one mile Class I bicycle path and contiguous equestrian trail. The site also contains native and non-native vegetation. The trail system at Mesa Meadows connects into the trail system of Nipomo Community Park.

1.4.2 Proposed Facilities

The NCPMP proposes approximately 15.96 acres of new recreational uses, 3.96 acres of new open play area (turf), and 7.57 acres of new infrastructure. Approximately 27.5 acres of existing undeveloped area and dirt trails would be converted to accommodate these new uses (refer to Table 1). The proposed project includes the expansion of the following existing uses: 4,000-square foot expansion of the library near Tefft Street; an additional 8,276 square feet of playground, including a play structure and open play area near Osage Street and Camino Caballo; 19,000-square foot expansion of the off-leash dog park; an additional 14,400 square feet of tennis courts; and additional three acres of paved and unpaved trails/walkways; restoration of spur trails; an additional four acres of open play area (turf). In addition, the NCPMP includes an additional 10 acres of multi-use sports fields. The type of sports to be accommodated would be determined at the time the need for added fields arises. The maximum intensity of use would likely be youth soccer. The area could accommodate about six youth soccer fields. The fields are proposed to be lighted.

Proposed new amenities include a skate park or community pool (10,000 square feet) near Tefft Street. Additional new facilities would be located near the center of the park, including: a 5,227-square foot amphitheater (gazebo/informal stage); basketball courts (10,000 square feet); handball courts (4,000 square feet); horseshoe pits (1,800 square feet); and, 8,400-square foot swimming pool and deck (if not constructed near Tefft Street). A paved walkway (11,280 square feet) is proposed along Osage Street. The NCPMP includes a 36,000-square foot community center/gymnasium to be located within the park.

The total area for the proposed community center/gymnasium and associated improvements would be approximately two acres. A conceptual schematic of the community center is shown in Figure 6.

Use Type	E	xisting	Proposed		Total	
	Acres	Percentage	Acres	Percentage	Acres	Percentage
Recreation Area	8.19	5.2	15.96	10.0	24.15	15.2
Open Space	144.26	90.6	-23.54	-14.8	120.72	75.8
Infrastructure	6.72	4.2	7.58	4.8	14.3	9.0
TOTAL	159.17	100			159.17	100

Table 1. Master Plan Existing and Proposed Use Types



Figure 5. Nipomo Community Park Master Plan

Facilities	Existing (sf)	Proposed (sf)	Total (sf)
RECREATION AREA			
Amphitheaters	0	5,227	5,227
Basketball Courts	0	10,000	10,000
Playgrounds	6,534	8,276	14,810
Community Center/Gymnasium	0	36,000	36,000
Dog Parks	31,988	19,000	50,988
Group Picnic Areas	9,433	0	9,433
Handball Courts	0	4,000	4,000
Horseshoe Pits	0	1,800	1,800
Skate Park	0	10,000	10,000
Sports Fields (Turf)	231,633	439,520	671,153
Swimming Pool/Deck	0	8,400	8,400
Tennis Courts	26,404	14,400	40,804
Trails/Walkways (paved/unpaved)	50,724	127,373	178,097
Osage Street Walkway (paved)	0	11,280	11,280
Subtotal	356,716	695,276	1,051,992
OPEN SPACE			
Open Space (undeveloped)	5,689,881	-1,113,510	4,576,371
Open Play Area (Turf)	399,805	172,498	572,303
Trails (dirt)	190,200	-84,276	105,924
Subtotal	6,283,936	-1,025,288	5,258,648
INFRASTRUCTURE			
Basins	54,900	108,900	163,800
Library Building	7,134	4,000	11,134
Parking	137,166	183,388	320,554
Temporary Pre-school	4,050	0	4,050
Two Host Sites	1,284	0	1,284
Restrooms/Maintenance Buildings	3,155	1,490	4,645
Roads	89,036	32,234	121,270
Subtotal	292,675	330,012	622,687

Table 2. Master Plan Existing and Proposed Amenities

Project Description



Figure 6. Community Center Conceptual Schematic

County of San Luis Obispo

Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Notice of Preparation

1-13

1.4.3 Access and Parking

1.4.3.1 Access

There are two motor vehicle entrances to NCP. One entrance is located on Pomeroy Road, offset and east of Juniper Street. The second motor vehicle entrance is located on Tefft Street, adjacent to the Nipomo Library, offset and south of Orchard Avenue. The Tefft Street and Orchard Street intersection is currently signalized, and a pedestrian crosswalk is located across Tefft Street. Pedestrian, bicyclist, and equestrian trail access into NCP is located off of: Osage Street (near Charro Way), Camino Caballo (near Osage Street), and at the northern terminus of La Serena Way. NCP is accessible from a number of collector and local streets including: Camino Caballo, Mesa Road, Osage Road, and Tejas Place. The trail system within Mesa Meadows is accessible from Charro Way, Tejas Place, and Amigo Place; this trail system connects with the NCP trail system immediately east of the Charro Way and Osage Street intersection (refer to Figure 5).

Major road improvements proposed for the NCPMP include: the re-alignment of existing park entrances on Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road; installation of a traffic signal at the re-aligned Pomeroy Road/Juniper Street intersection; construction of a westbound left turn pocket and an eastbound right turn pocket on Pomeroy Road; and improvements to Osage Road, including road widening for consistency with County road standard A-1(d) (two 11-foot wide travel lanes, with six-foot shoulders on each side, for a total width of 34 feet), and construction of a trail within the road right-of-way. The project includes construction of a six-foot wide, paved, multi-use trail and parallel equestrian trail creating a loop around the park.

1.4.3.2 Internal Circulation and Parking

Internal vehicular access within the park is provided by a loop road, which connects the Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road park entrances. Additional paved access is provided for the existing ballpark area. An additional paved loop road is proposed to provide access to proposed facilities and parking areas in the center of NCP.

The park currently provides 325 parking spaces within several parking lots located within the southeastern portion of the park. The parking area for the Nipomo Native Garden, located adjacent to Osage Street, includes 10 automobile spaces and two bus spaces. The proposed NCPMP includes an additional 386 to 422 spaces, including seven equestrian pull-through spaces.

1.4.4 Park Programs and Operational Activities

In addition to the proposed facilities discussed above, the following activities and facilities are proposed as part of the NCPMP: removal of diseased trees and replacement tree planting program; utility infrastructure additions and maintenance; and a cellular communication repeater station. Tree removal would be required to accommodate access improvements at Pomeroy Road and Juniper Street, and Osage Road widening and pathway improvements.

1.4.4.1 Replacement Tree Planting Program

Many of the existing park trees are Monterey pine (*Pinus radiata*); this species is highly susceptible to devastating disease including pine pitch canker. The replacement tree planting program includes regular evaluation of trees, and subsequent maintenance, removal (if the tree

is dead and/or a hazard to public safety), and replacement depending on the monitored health of the tree. Pre-emptive replacement of trees prior to removal may be implemented. Proposed replacement trees may include: Coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*), California sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*), California pepper (*Schinus molle*), Coast redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*), and Monterey cypress (*Callitropsis macrocarpa*).

1.4.4.2 Utility Infrastructure Additions and Maintenance

Water Supply

Water service is currently supplied to NCP through a contractual Water Service Agreement (WSA) executed between the NCSD and the County (recorded May 29, 1984). The WSA states that the NCSD will provide water to the park for the purposes of irrigation, sanitation, and miscellaneous uses. In 2004, the NCSD constructed a waterline through the park adjacent to Dana Elementary School, within a five-foot wide easement executed between the County and the NCSD. The width of this utility easement is approximately 20 feet from the southern edge of the property. Water is delivered to the park via a three-inch water main that is located within the right-of-way on Pomeroy Road. The County proposes to continue receiving water from the NCSD to serve the park, potentially including the use of recycled water.

The Mesa Meadows subdivision (Tract 2304) is served by the NCSD. Water mains are located along Osage Street, Charro Way, Tejas Place, and Amigo Place.

<u>Wastewater</u>

Wastewater disposal for the park is currently treated by individual septic systems for four existing restroom facilities. The project includes two additional restroom facilities to serve park visitors. Effluent disposal and treatment could be accomplished by two methods: septic tanks and leachfield systems, or fiberglass holding tanks that are regularly pumped and maintained. The Mesa Meadows subdivision (Tract 2304) is served by onsite, individual septic systems.

Stormwater Management

The project site currently receives stormwater flow from adjacent developed areas, which is directed into an existing onsite, 1.2-acre, stormwater basin. Existing drainage improvements in the northeast area of the park include small drainage channels, v-shaped concrete swales, culverts, and unlined infiltration basins. Collected stormwater percolates into the soil within the basins. An earthen drainage channel located along the northern property line accommodates storm water flows originating from the parking lot along the Pomeroy Road frontage. The earthen drainage channel then flows southwest and empties onto a rock riprap energy dissipater into an unlined retention basin constructed at the Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road intersection. The retention basin also receives storm flows via three 12-inch culverts: one that conveys storm water from underneath Pomeroy Road from a low-lying area across the street at the intersection of Tefft and Pomeroy, a storm drain on the park side of Tefft Street, and a culvert that flows underneath Tefft Street originating from bordering residential developments to the east of the park.

An engineered drainage system is located within Mesa Meadows, including multiple 24-inch corrugated metal culverts designed to convey stormwater runoff from the residential development into four infiltration basins located adjacent to Mesa Road. The basins discharge stormwater via percolation into the sandy topsoil.

The proposed project includes the following drainage improvements to manage stormwater flow during rain events: (1) construct a new basin in the center of the southern half of the park, and (2) install a drainage pipe along Pomeroy Road within the existing drainage swale.

1.4.4.3 Cellular Communication Repeater Station

A repeater station is a combination of a receiver and a transmitter that receives a weak or lowlevel signal and retransmits it at a higher level or higher power, so that the signal can cover longer distances without degradation. These facilities require a power source for operation. One repeater station is currently located at NCP on an existing light pole that illuminates the football field. A second repeater station was approved by the County Planning & Building Department in 2009. The second station is located in the same vicinity as the existing station.

1.5 MASTER PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

1.5.1 Project Phasing and Funding

The Master Plan does not establish a phasing plan. Once a master park plan is adopted, County Parks staff will go back to the community to determine priorities. The timing, type, and extent of infrastructure extensions, off site improvements such as traffic signals, and earthwork would depend upon the type and extent of the first new facilities to be implemented. Conversely, the choice of which facilities to implement first, second, or third may be influenced by the cost of infrastructure and earthwork that must accompany the recreation facilities.

The overall cost to construct the Master Plan is shown in Appendix A (Master Plan). The cost for each element is based on conceptual design characteristics; therefore, the cost for any particular element could go up or down once the more detailed design is developed.

It is possible that the Nipomo community, a concessionaire, and/or a community organization may be a partner in the development of the community recreation buildings planned for the park. The cost to construct these facilities is identified as a separate item on the construction cost breakdown (2003 dollars) in Appendix A (Master Plan).

1.5.2 Master Plan Amendment

The Master Plan is intended to guide development of the park to an envisioned "build out" some undetermined years in the future. While the purpose of a Master Plan is to guide decisions over a number of years, it is recognized that as time passes community needs and priorities may change and the Master Plan may need updating and revising. The Master Plan should be updated at 15-year intervals to ensure that it remains viable and relevant as a guide for meeting the park and recreation needs of the community. The Master Plan may be amended at any point along the way if new ideas or pressing needs warrant a change in the Plan. The process for amending the Plan would involve community workshops, SCAC and County Parks and Recreation Commission input, as well as review and approval by the County Board of Supervisors.



COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO INITIAL STUDY SUMMARY - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Project Title & No. County Parks Nipomo Community Park Master Plan; ED05-225

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The proposed project could have a "Potentially Significant Impact" for at least one of the environmental factors checked below. Please refer to the attached pages for discussion on mitigation measures or project revisions to either reduce these impacts to less than significant levels or require further study.

Aesthetics	Geology and Soils	Recreation
Agricultural Resources	Hazards/Hazardous Materials	Transportation/Circulation
🖾 Air Quality	🖂 Noise	🖂 Wastewater
Biological Resources	Population/Housing	🖂 Water
Cultural Resources	Public Services/Utilities	🖂 Land Use

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation, the Environmental Coordinator finds that:

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

Steve McMasters Prepared by (Print)	A. McM Signature	isters by M. Fra	In 11-16-09 Date
Reviewed by (Print)	Signature	Ellen Carroll, Environmental Coordinator (for)	<u> · (J·09</u> Date

Project Environmental Analysis

The County's environmental review process incorporates all of the requirements for completing the Initial Study as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines. The Initial Study includes staff's on-site inspection of the project site and surroundings and a detailed review of the information in the file for the project. In addition, available background information is reviewed for each project. Relevant information regarding soil types and characteristics, geologic information, significant vegetation and/or wildlife resources, water availability, wastewater disposal services, existing land uses and surrounding land use categories and other information relevant to the environmental review process are evaluated for each project. Exhibit A includes the references used, as well as the agencies or groups that were contacted as a part of the Initial Study. The Environmental Division uses the checklist to summarize the results of the research accomplished during the initial environmental review of the project.

Persons, agencies or organizations interested in obtaining more information regarding the environmental review process for a project should contact the County of San Luis Obispo Environmental Division, Rm. 200, County Government Center, San Luis Obispo, CA, 93408-2040 or call (805) 781-5600.

A. PROJECT

Refer to Attachment 1, Project Description.

B. EXISTING SETTING

ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBERS: 091-313-047, -048, -049, SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT # 4 and -050; 092-122-056, -058, and -060.

Latitude: 35 degrees 01' 53.76" N Longitude: 120 degrees 30' 10.08" W

- PLANNING AREA: South County Inland, Nipomo
- LAND USE CATEGORIES: Recreation, Residential Suburban
- COMBINING DESIGNATION(S): None applicable
- EXISTING USES: Nipomo Community Park, botanical garden, Mesa Meadows
- TOPOGRAPHY: Gently sloping
- VEGETATION: Coastal scrub, oak woodland, maritime chaparral, annual grassland, pine and eucalyptus trees, and landscaping/turf
- PARCEL SIZE: 157 acres

SURROUNDING LAND USE CATEGORIES AND USES:

North: Residential Suburban/ residences	East: Residential Suburban, Residential Single Family/ residences
South: Public Facilities, Office and Professional, Residential Single Family, Residential Suburban/ school, library, residences	West: Residential Suburban/ residences

C. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

During the Initial Study process, several issues were identified as having potentially significant environmental effects (see following Initial Study). Since 2003, the scoping process included preparation of an environmental constraints analysis, public survey, and public workshops and scoping meetings. In September 2007, the County issued a draft initial study (#ED05-225) for the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan for public review. The initial study (IS) reviewed two alternative projects. No un-mitigable impacts were identified in the IS. Public comments received on the IS raised issues regarding: aesthetics including night lighting, biological resources including impacts to oak trees, hazardous materials related to the site's previous use, noise from proposed facilities, the adequacy of public services such as fire and sheriff, land use, adequacy of public services for proposed facilities, traffic and circulation, adequacy of wastewater to serve the proposed park development, and water use. Some of the letters received in response to the draft initial study raised issues whether the initial study was adequate, indicating that an EIR should be completed for the project. On November 13, 2007, Parks staff met with the Environmental Coordinator and other Planning and Building Department staff involved with the project to discuss the comments received on the draft initial study. On November 26, 2007, the Environmental Coordinator recommended that an environmental impact report (EIR) be prepared for the Nipomo Park Master Plan. This Initial Study Checklist summarizes issues identified during public scoping and review of the project to date, which will be assessed in the Program EIR.

COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1.	AESTHETICS - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Create an aesthetically incompatible site open to public view?		\boxtimes		
b)	Introduce a use within a scenic view open to public view?			\boxtimes	
c)	Change the visual character of an area?	\boxtimes			
d)	Create glare or night lighting which may affect surrounding areas?	\boxtimes			
e)	Impact unique geological or physical features?			\boxtimes	
f)	Other				

Setting. The Nipomo Community Park, Mesa Meadows, and the Nipomo Native Garden are located on four parcels totaling 157 acres on the west side of Pomeroy Road, approximately one mile west of Highway 101, in the community of Nipomo. The South County region has a generally rural visual character, and supports a variety of uses including agriculture, open space, and large-lot residential development. The community of Nipomo supports a variety of urban development including single-family residences, multi-family residential complexes, commercial, retail, and office buildings, and public facilities. The park is located within the community of Nipomo, and is surrounded by residential neighborhoods, and is bounded by Pomeroy Road to the north, Tefft Street to the east, Tejas Place to the south, and Osage Street to the west. Camino Caballo traverses the northern section of the project site, south of the botanical gardens.

The eastern and central portion of the park is developed with sports and play fields, including ball fields with night lighting, group and individual picnic facilities, children's play areas, lighted tennis courts, basketball courts, restrooms and parking lots. Maintenance buildings and a storage yard are located near the center of the park, including a wooden building with scattered maintenance accessory structures and vehicles. The northern, eastern and southern portions of the park appear mostly natural and are developed with trails, an interpretive garden, parking area, informational kiosks, and open space areas. The Mesa Meadows portion of the site consists of residential development, passive recreational uses, a loop trail around the perimeter, and a portion of open space serving as a storm water detention area and a buffer from the agricultural field to the south.

The topography of the park is generally flat along the eastern side, in the area of the existing play fields. The southern perimeter of the site is slightly elevated along the back yards of residences on Tejas Place. Moving north from Tejas Place toward the interior of the site the landform drops off then rises again forming a natural depression in the landscape. The landform elevates gently from this area to form an east-west oriented ridge along the northern third of the site rising noticeably above the surroundings. This oak covered ridge is one of the most important visual features of the park. It is recognizable from the surrounding community, it helps establish a natural scenic character for the park as well as the adjacent neighborhoods, the topography provides visual variety and interest, it helps define spatial zones within the park, and it offers up-close and unique viewing opportunities of nature. North of the ridge toward Pomeroy Road the landform flattens out again to match the terrain

of the adjacent neighborhoods. The Mesa Meadows area to the west is mostly level. The existing landform offers visual interest as seen from both internal and external viewing locations, allows viewing opportunities from the elevated areas and visual enclosure at the lower elevations. Views of the distant hills to the north and west are limited, but where visible, they provide an attractive backdrop and visually frame the regional setting.

Vegetation within the more developed eastern side of the park includes mature pines and eucalyptus. reaching heights of up to approximately 80 feet, as well as a variety of non-native shrubs. The tall eucalyptus and pine trees within the existing developed area are valuable because they have skyline qualities as seen from the surrounding community, they filter the glare of the sports field lighting, they add to the vegetated character of the park, they provide spatial definition for the park perimeter as well as internal areas, and they create a sense of overhead visual enclosure for park users. Turf areas cover most of this developed portion of the park. The southern portion of the park is more open and has predominantly scattered native shrubs with native and non-native grasses. The ridge area along the mid-section of the site is mostly covered with well-established native oak woodland species. The oak trees in this area form a moderately dense visual canopy, are evergreen and average approximately 15 to 30 feet in height. The forest understory is comprised of a variety of native shrubs, perennials, and related plants. On the flatter portion of the site north of the ridge, the vegetation is scattered oaks and native shrubs, appearing less dense than the forested area along the ridge. The Nipomo Native Garden is located in the northern corner of the park. This garden is currently under development, and the associated plantings are not yet major visual elements in the landscape. Vegetation within the Mesa Meadows area of the park includes oaks along the perimeter pathway, large windrows of eucalyptus trees along the northwest and southeast corners, landscaping. and typical residential plantings associated with the houses and neighborhood streets. The majority of the park is bounded by some type of fencing, including post and wire, pipe, wood, and chain link.

The project site is mostly surrounded by development and as a result has some degree of visibility from all sides. Intermittent views of the park from the surrounding area include adjacent and distant neighborhoods, public roadways, and other public facilities such as Dana Elementary School, the library, and a local church. The developed portion of the park is visible to the north, as seen from Dana Elementary School. The southern, undeveloped portion of the park can be seen toward the west. As with most viewing locations surrounding the park, much of the view from the school is somewhat blocked by landform and existing vegetation. Viewer activities associated with these potential locations vary greatly. In general, views to the interior of the park are limited to some extent by existing vegetation and/or topography. Visibility of the park from longer distances is mostly restricted to the tops of the existing trees near the sports fields and the oak covered ridge. During evening sporting events, the sports field lighting can be seen from the surrounding area, although the existing trees filter some of the light and glare.

Public roads border the park on four sides and provide direct visual access to the site. The majority of views toward the site from Osage Street, Camino Caballo and the eastern portion of Pomeroy Road are of dense oak woodland on slopes rising up from the property edge. The eastern portion of Pomeroy Road is adjacent to one of the park entrances, and views include the developed sports field section of the site. Baseball diamonds, bleachers, lights, restrooms and parking are part of the view. The developed portion of the park is visible from Pomeroy Road and Tefft Street, however traveling south on Tefft Street from this point, views to the interior of the site are somewhat blocked by mature landscaping and development along the roadway. The Nipomo Community Library and Dana Elementary School obstruct views of the park as seen from further south along Tefft Street. The eastern entrance road to the park is located along this section of Tefft Street. Tejas Place parallels the southern perimeter of the park, and existing residences along the north side of this street block approximately 80 percent of views to the park from this public roadway.

Views toward the park west of Osage Street include wooded slopes and the native gardens areas near Camino Caballo. From the Mesa Meadows neighborhood, views are available to the interior of the park, along the southern more open portion of the site. The residential neighborhoods in the vicinity of Tefft and Orchard Streets are at a somewhat higher elevation than the park, which allows potentially greater visibility of the exterior perimeter of the project site. Views to the interior of the park are largely hindered by the masses of tall trees near the eastern perimeter of the park. The southern residential neighborhood has limited visibility of the park, with the exception of the homes along the north side of Tejas Place, which back up to the park. The existing topography within the park between the southern portion of Tejas Place and the proposed sports field location slopes approximately 30 feet to the southwest. The gaps between the residences allow some neighborhood views to the park site, primarily of the oak covered ridge. The homes are located at a lower elevation than an earthen berm located along the southern park boundary, which obstructs some views of the project site.

The Pomeroy Road area has views of the park that are mostly limited to either the wooded ridgeline along the western section or the tops of the eucalyptus and pine trees of the developed area to the east. From this area the sports field lights can be seen above or through the trees. As with most of the residential neighborhoods surrounding the park, unless a residence is directly across a street from the park, the views of the park are substantially if not completely blocked by intervening structures and landscaping.

Impact. The existing park setting and surrounding natural resources contribute to the scenic quality of the area, including the ridge, trees, topography, and distant hills. These visual resources are important because they either support or enhance the natural visual character of the site, they are a unique or interesting example of their type, they function to screen or filter objectionable views, they have some degree of "landmark" characteristics, or they serve to define the park as seen from the surrounding community. Some of the visual resources have value mainly as seen from a distance, while others provide a close-in aesthetic benefit. Implementation and build-out of the proposed master plan would result in increased development within the park including facilities, structures, paving, and lighting, which have the potential to degrade existing views, limit aesthetic opportunities, or result in visually incompatible uses and activities. The proposed project complies with the setback distances listed in the County Land Use Ordinance (LUO) (refer to Section 13, Land Use), with the exception of the skate park location proposed near Tefft Street. The skate park would not include lighting.

The proposed project would have a high degree of potential visibility and would be seen from local public transportation corridors and nearby residences. In addition to the inherent change associated with conversion to more intensive recreational development, visible project components would include new buildings, sports fields, parking and roads, trails, earthwork, amphitheaters, playgrounds, support facilities, a swimming pool, a skate park, and other features. It is anticipated that potential viewers may experience the project as an alteration of overall visual character in addition to focusing on its individual components.

Components that would be visible from public roads include development near Tefft Street, such as the proposed skate park or community center facilities. New facilities within the northern portion of the park, including the amphitheater, interpretive center, and play structure would be visible from Osage Street. The proposed multi-use sports fields and associated bleachers, goal netting, and field lighting would be visible in varying degrees as seen from Tefft Street, Orchard Road, and Tejas Place neighborhoods.

Buildings such as restrooms, the community recreation center, and maintenance buildings can either enhance or degrade views within the park and the nearby community. Structures such as large-scale fly-ball netting, very tall light poles, and bleachers can be visually intrusive in the setting. The siting, form, style and number of structures can have a substantial affect on the quality of views and aesthetic character to and from the park and its surroundings. Existing landscaping, trees, topography, and structures along the perimeter and within the park would provide some screening of future development as seen from public roads and adjacent neighborhoods. Visibility of future structures would be brief and intermittent. The construction of new buildings and structures would change the character of the central area of the park; however, the concentration of structural features outside of existing natural, and generally undisturbed areas, would preserve the overall visual character of the park.

Additional proposed changes to the park design, including re-aligned entrances on Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road and installation of a new traffic signal would affect the appearance of the park and immediate area; however, these changes are not likely to be visually significant due to the existing presence of park entrances and traffic signals along both Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road.

<u>Lighting.</u> Existing as well as future night lighting for sports fields, parking lots, roadways, buildings, and security purposes create glare within the park as well as in the adjacent neighborhoods. The "spill-over" of park illumination has the potential for affecting the ambient level of light in the nighttime sky. The construction of new fields and installation of new lighting in the southwest portion of the park may significantly affect the Tejas Place neighborhood if lighting is not minimized and shielded.

<u>Earthwork.</u> The undulating topography of portions of the site may necessitate extensive grading to accommodate the proposed multi-use fields and community recreation center facilities. Without appropriate design, large excavation and embankment slopes have the potential to appear unnatural and detract from the viewing experience as seen from Mesa Meadows, Tejas Place, Dana School, Tefft Street, and within Nipomo Community Park.

<u>Parking areas.</u> Large expanses of pavement for parking can visually urbanize a setting and can significantly alter the visual character. In addition to the paved surface, the associated parked vehicles can create glare as well as visual clutter. The extent of views of parking areas can affect the quality of the viewing experience and visitor enjoyment. Proposed new parking areas would be located near the center of the park, adjacent to the proposed sports fields and community recreation center. The parking area would be landscaped with shrubs and trees to minimize visibility and glare, and would not likely be visible from public roads, neighborhoods, or natural areas of the park.

<u>Crowds of park users.</u> Views of large gatherings of people associated with some types of park activities can reduce the visual experience sought by other visitors interested in more passive, solitary recreation. The interior roadway, sports fields, and active recreation facilities focus larger crowds of people near the southeast and southern portions of the park, and maintain natural trails and features in the western and northern portions of the park. The existing and proposed design of the park would minimize negative visual experiences associated with crowds.

Mitigation/Conclusion. The aesthetics and visual impacts potentially resulting from the proposed project, as seen from public roadways and use areas, shall be evaluated as part of the Program EIR. The aesthetics section shall compare the existing on-site and through-site visual resources with the project features as proposed, and will identify any potential impacts to visual character. The evaluation will include all proposed structures and site amenities as they apply, including structures, signage, grading and earthwork, utilities, lighting, increased vehicles and spectators, landscaping and other improvements for their complete affect on views. Potential visual changes will be identified as they relate to the phased construction of the park plans, in terms of long-term operational affects and short-term impacts. Construction activities and disturbance will be addressed, as well as consideration of proposed landscaping growth rates and size potential. The analysis methodology shall also evaluate the cumulative effect that each of the individual project components will have on the visual character of the surroundings. The visual section will consider the project's contribution to

a potential change in character when seen with other approved or pending projects in the region. Specific project impacts will be determined by evaluating the physical changes proposed by the project in the context of the existing and surrounding landscape, as seen from important and representative viewing locations. Expected viewer sensitivity will be assessed and considered as part of the analysis.

This analysis shall form the basis for any required measures necessary to mitigate potentially significant impacts. Measures may include, but not be limited to, locating structures outside of visually sensitive areas, height limitations, roof and building design and exterior color/materials recommendations, implementation of revegetation and landscaping efforts, and shielding of night lighting away from sensitive receptors.

2.	AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Convert prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use?				\boxtimes
b)	<i>Impair agricultural use of other property or result in conversion to other uses?</i>			\boxtimes	
C)	Conflict with existing zoning or Williamson Act program?			\boxtimes	
d)	Other				

Setting/Impact. The proposed project site is located in the Recreation land use category. Based on the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), the soil type mapped for the project site is Oceano sand (non-irr: IV, irr: IV). The project site is generally developed with park-related uses and does not support agricultural use. Surrounding land uses include residential development to the north, east, and west, and a school, library, and residences to the south. Impacts to agricultural resources would be less than significant.

Mitigation/Conclusion. Based on the lack of agricultural uses on or in the immediate vicinity of the project site, implementation of the proposed Master would not impact agricultural lands or soils, or conflict with existing agricultural operations in the region. Further analysis in the EIR is not warranted.

3.	AIR QUALITY - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Violate any state or federal ambient air quality standard, or exceed air quality emission thresholds as established by County Air Pollution Control District?		\boxtimes		
b)	Expose any sensitive receptor to substantial air pollutant concentrations?		\boxtimes		

3.	AIR QUALITY - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
c)	Create or subject individuals to objectionable odors?		\boxtimes		
d)	Be inconsistent with the District's Clean Air Plan?			\boxtimes	
e)	Other				

Setting. The Air Pollution Control District (APCD) estimates that automobiles currently generate about 40% of the pollutants responsible for ozone formation. Nitrous oxides (NOx) and reactive organic gasses (ROG) pollutants (vehicle emission components) are common contributors towards this chemical transformation into ozone. Dust, or particulate matter less than ten microns (PM₁₀) that become airborne and which find their way into the lower atmosphere, can act as the catalyst in this chemical transformation to harmful ozone. In part, the land use controls currently in place for new development relating to ROG and NOx (e.g., application of the <u>2003 CEQA Air Quality Handbook</u>) have helped reduce the formation of ozone. The proposed project was referred to the County of San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (APCD) for review and determination of any air quality impacts potentially resulting during both the construction and operational phases of the proposed project.

Impact. Implementation of the Master Plan would require grading and construction activities. As identified by the APCD, air quality impacts during construction include: the creation of fugitive dust (PM₁₀), the generation of diesel particulates during use of heavy construction equipment, the potential release of asbestos during demolition and removal of pipelines, the potential release of naturally occurring asbestos during grading, and un-permitted developmental burning. No operational impacts were identified; however, the APCD initially supported less intensive development (Melissa Guise; March 24, 2005). In addition, the APCD recommends linking proposed and existing pathways to bus stops, pedestrian trails, and bike paths outside the park to encourage the use of alternative transportation.

The issue of global climate change has recently been debated and discussed on the international, national, state, and local level. These changes are caused by the buildup of gases in the atmosphere that trap heat, similar to a greenhouse. These "greenhouse gases" include carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide and others. A portion of them exist naturally and help regulate the temperature of the earth. Emissions from human activities, such as burning fossil fuels, have elevated greenhouse gas levels. The effects of climate change have been documented in studies issued by the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the production of greenhouse gases; however, accommodating alternative transportation and encouraging community use of the park may offset trips generated by Nipomo residents currently using park facilities in other areas of the County. With the passage of AB 32, the State requires all land use projects to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, a reduction of 30% over current rates. Because this project is a master plan, the County may be required to prepare a Climate Action Plan (CAP) to address greenhouse gas emissions.

Mitigation/Conclusion. Air quality impacts resulting from the proposed project shall be evaluated as part of the EIR in consultation with the APCD. The analysis shall include a qualitative analysis of potential impacts related to on-site fugitive dust generation and other pollutants during project construction. Long-term generation of pollutants from automobile traffic and on-site energy consumption shall be quantitatively assessed. The EIR shall include a discussion of the 2001 Clean

Air Plan, and the project's consistency with adopted goals and policies. Regarding climate change, the EIR shall identify potential greenhouse gases, assess the potential of the proposed project to emit significant levels of greenhouse gases (either directly or indirectly), and identify procedures that may reduce those emissions.

Mitigation measures may be necessary in order to reduce potentially significant air quality impacts including, but not limited to: reducing construction phase emissions through fugitive dust control and control of equipment emissions; asbestos control; vehicular emission reductions (activity management, Best Available Control Technology, efficient vehicular entry and circulation, etc.); and, energy efficiency and site design.

4.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Result in a loss of unique or special status species or their habitats?	\boxtimes			
b)	<i>Reduce the extent, diversity or quality of native or other important vegetation?</i>		\boxtimes		
c)	Impact wetland or riparian habitat?			\boxtimes	
d)	Introduce barriers to movement of resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or factors which could hinder the normal activities of wildlife?		\boxtimes		
e)	Other				

Setting. Five natural plant communities and habitat types are located within the project site, including coastal scrub, oak woodland, a mixture of coastal scrub and maritime chaparral, annual grassland, and ruderal/disturbed areas. Landscaped/turf areas, and windrows of pine and eucalyptus trees are also present in the recreationally developed eastern portion of the park. Several drainage basins are present in the developed area of the site. The project site is located within vernal pool habitat region; however, no evidence of vernal pools or areas of standing water were observed onsite. Biological field surveys of the project site were conducted in January, April, and May 2004 (Morro Group, Inc.; June 14, 2004).

<u>Special-status Plant Species.</u> Based on the California Natural Diversity Database (2005) and habitat types present on the project site, the following eight special-status plant species have the potential for presence within the park: sand mesa manzanita (*Arctostaphylos rudis*); Pismo clarkia (*Clarkia speciosa* ssp. *immaculata*); dune larkspur (*Delphinium parryi* ssp. *blochmaniae*); Blochman's leafy daisy (*Erigeron blochmaniae*); Kellogg's horkelia (*Horkelia cuneata* ssp. *sericea*); San Luis Obispo County lupine (*Lupinus ludovicianus*); crisp monardella (*Monardella crispa*); and San Luis Obispo monardella (*Monardella frutescens*). During comprehensive botanical surveys conducted in April and May 2004, only sand mesa manzanita was observed within the proposed site.

Sand Mesa Manzanita

Sand mesa manzanita is a Federal Species of Concern (FSC), and California Native Plant Society (CNPS) List 1B (rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere) evergreen shrub. This

species occurs in chaparral and coastal scrub on sandy soils. Numerous individuals of this species were observed within the oak woodland and coastal scrub/chaparral areas of the project site.

<u>Special-status Wildlife Species.</u> Based on the California Natural Diversity Database (2005) and habitat types present on the project site, the following three special-status wildlife species have the potential for presence within the park: silvery legless lizard (*Anniella pulchra pulchra*); California horned lizard (*Phrynosoma coronatum frontale*); and, sharp-shined hawk (*Accipiter striatus*).

Silvery Legless Lizard

The silvery legless lizard is a Federal Species of Concern, coastally distributed from the San Francisco Bay area southward into northern Mexico. Suitable habitat includes loose soils of coastal dune, valley foothill woodland, chaparral, and coastal scrub areas. This species could occur in undisturbed areas of dune scrub and chaparral located within the project area.

Coast Horned Lizard

The coast horned lizard is a California Species of Special Concern, distributed throughout foothills and coastal plains in areas with abundant, open vegetation such as chaparral or coastal sage scrub. This lizard is a ground dweller, and does not climb shrubs or trees. The native plant communities of the park property are expected to support individuals of this species.

Sharp-shinned hawk

The sharp-shinned hawk is a California Species of Special Concern that ranges throughout California and forages in most habitats. It is an uncommon transient and winter visitor within San Luis Obispo County. Winter foraging and roosting typically occurs in association with coniferous, deciduous, or mixed forest woodland areas. Grassland habitats may also be used for foraging purposes. This species could be present within the park on a seasonal basis.

<u>Native and/or Important Vegetation.</u> Oak woodland is present throughout the northern and western portion of the park. Oak species include coast live oak (*Quercus agrifolia*) and valley oak (*Quercus lobata*).

<u>Wetland and Riparian Habitat.</u> No wetland or riparian habitats were observed on the project site. Existing stormwater basins within the park and Mesa Meadows area do not support any riparian vegetation or wetland indicator species.

<u>Wildlife Activities.</u> Oak woodlands and grassland areas could provide nesting and foraging habitat for several raptor species, including Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*), white-tailed kite (*Elanus leucurus*), red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*), red-shouldered hawk (*Buteo lineatus*), and American kestrel (*Falco sparverius*). These raptor species and their nests are protected under CDFG regulations.

Impact. The Master Plan was designed to minimize disturbance to natural areas and sensitive habitat types where feasible. As proposed, the Master Plan would result in the loss of up to 13 acres of coastal scrub, seven acres of annual grassland, three acres of maritime chaparral, and 0.5 acre of oak woodland. Approximately four acres of development would occur within currently developed and disturbed areas.

<u>Special-Status Plant Species.</u> Approximately 60 to 80 individual sand mesa manzanita plants are present in the central oak woodland areas, and the northernmost portion of the project site. The manzanita present range from juveniles to mature specimens, and are interspersed with oak woodland and chaparral/coastal scrub habitat. 27 sand mesa manzanita plants are located in the immediate vicinity of existing trails located in the park. The proposed master plan was designed to avoid removal or impacts to this species. Inadvertent impacts could occur during construction, if

equipment and materials are not utilized or stored properly during improvement or maintenance of existing trails. In addition, operational impacts, including the use of equestrian trails, may result in impacts to sensitive vegetative communities and native plant habitat due to the spread of non-native grasses and grains.

<u>Special-Status Wildlife Species.</u> No special-status wildlife species were observed on the project site during surveys conducted in January, April, and May 2004 (Morro Group, Inc.; June 14, 2004); however, based on the presence of suitable habitat, development of the project site could result in impacts to silvery legless lizard, coast horned lizard, and sharp-shinned hawk. Suitable habitat for these species is present throughout the park, and these species may be harmed during construction phases of the proposed Master Plan. In addition, comment letters from the public identified other fish and wildlife species that have been observed in the park, including Cooper's hawk.

<u>Native and/or Important Vegetation.</u> Based on the design of the proposed Master Plan, oak woodland and individual oak trees would not be directly impacted by the construction of proposed amenities. Realignment of the Pomeroy Road park entrance (at Juniper Street) and road improvements to Osage Road may impact or require the removal of up to eighteen coast live oak trees.

<u>Wildlife Activities.</u> In addition to the removal of coast live oak trees discussed above, future construction activities would require the removal of individual pine or eucalyptus trees, which may provide nesting habitat for sharp-shinned hawk and other bird species. In addition, grading and construction activities during the nesting season (typically February through September) may disrupt the natural behavior of birds.

Mitigation/Conclusion. Habitat mapping and reconnaissance biological surveys, including wildlife surveys and botanical surveys following California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) guidelines, were conducted on the project site in 2004. As part of the EIR analysis, existing habitat mapping shall be reviewed and updated as necessary to quantify impacts to habitat types, and evaluate whether vegetation impacts may also impact special-status species. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, California Native Plant Society, and County-approved biological groups and societies shall be consulted to supplement existing information. Potential impacts to biological resources shall be addressed and evaluated in the EIR. Mitigation measures will likely be required, including recommendations to avoid plants and wildlife, and special-status and sensitive species and habitats through site design, pre-emptive construction measures (i.e., installation of protection fencing, construction crew training), construction monitoring, habitat revegetation and restoration; and operational standards (i.e., protection fencing, public educational materials).



Setting. Both prehistoric and historic cultural resources are known to exist in the Nipomo area. A *Cultural Resource Investigation* (John Parker; June 21, 2002) was completed for the project site, including a records search for cultural resources in the area, and a field surface survey.

<u>Archaeological Resources.</u> The project site is located in an area historically occupied by the Obispeño Chumash. Based on the results of the records search and field survey, three archeological deposit sites are located within one mile of the proposed project site; however, no archaeological deposits were recorded or observed on the project site.

<u>Historical Resources.</u> In the mid-1800's, the town site of Nipomo was subdivided for the sale and development of lots. By 1887, the town of Nipomo had two hotels, shops, a schoolhouse, stable, real estate offices, saloons, and a newspaper. The Pacific Coast Railway had a depot in town; however the Southern Pacific Railway was established west of Nipomo through the town of Guadalupe in 1895. By 1942, the Pacific Coast Railway was put out of commission, disassembled, and sold for scrap. A major economic slump occurred in the town of Nipomo, until Highway 101 was completed in the 1940's. The record search revealed the presence of one historic site located on the project site. Documented findings at the site included glass, ceramics, and metal artifacts dating from 1880 to 1930. The location of the historic site was confirmed during the field surface survey.

<u>Paleontological Resources.</u> The proposed project site is located on sand dune deposits, which are generally too young to contain significant paleontological resources.

Impact.

<u>Archaeological Resources.</u> Based on the negative results of the surface survey for cultural resources, it is unlikely that significant archaeological deposits are present onsite (Parker and Associates; June 21, 2002). Implementation of the proposed master plan would not likely impact archaeological resources.

<u>Historical Resources.</u> The surface survey for cultural resources resulted in a positive discovery of historical resources. Implementation of proposed improvements may disturb or result in the exposure of subsurface resources. In addition, any improvement or maintenance activities that require soil disturbance within the deposit area may result in the disturbance or looting of resources.

Mitigation/Conclusion. As noted in Section 7 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials), the County will initiate a testing program to clarify the contents of the historic deposit area. The analysis shall incorporate the results and recommendations from the 2002 cultural resources report into the EIR. The proposed project shall be evaluated with respect to impacts to cultural resources of the project site and surrounding area. Mitigation measures shall be identified to address potential impacts, which may include implementation of a monitoring program during ground disturbance.

6.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Result in exposure to or production of unstable earth conditions, such as landslides, earthquakes, liquefaction, ground failure, land subsidence or other similar hazards?			\boxtimes	
b)	Be within a CA Dept. of Mines & Geology Earthquake Fault Zone (formerly Alquist Priolo)?				\boxtimes

6.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
c)	Result in soil erosion, topographic changes, loss of topsoil or unstable soil conditions from project-related improvements, such as vegetation removal, grading, excavation, or fill?		\boxtimes		
d)	<i>Change rates of soil absorption, or amount or direction of surface runoff?</i>		\boxtimes		
e)	Include structures located on expansive soils?			\boxtimes	
f)	Change the drainage patterns where substantial on- or off-site sedimentation/ erosion or flooding may occur?		\boxtimes		
g)	Involve activities within the 100-year flood zone?			\boxtimes	
h)	<i>Be inconsistent with the goals and policies of the County's Safety Element relating to Geologic and Seismic Hazards?</i>			\boxtimes	
i)	Preclude the future extraction of valuable mineral resources?			\boxtimes	
j)	Other				

Setting.

<u>Geology</u>. The topography of the project site consists of gently undulating older sand dune deposits. The area proposed for development is outside of the Geologic Study Area designation. The liquefaction potential is moderate. The landslide potential is low. The project site is located in the regional vicinity of the Wilmar/Santa Maria River, Oceano, Pecho, Oceanic West Huasna, San Luis Bay, and Casmalia-Orcutt-Little Pine faults. The potentially active Wilmar Avenue Fault is mapped east of Highway 101 in the vicinity of Nipomo Creek. The project is not located within a known area containing serpentine or ultramafic rock or soils.

<u>Drainage and Flooding</u>. The area proposed for development is outside the 100-year Flood Hazard designation. As described in the NRCS Soil Survey, the soil is considered well drained. Nipomo Creek is located approximately one mile to the east; however, there is no evidence of off-site stormwater discharge. In addition to rainfall on the project site, stormwater discharged from adjacent residential developments flows onto the park site. Due to the rolling topography of the park area, presence of closed depressions, and lack of drainage inlets, stormwater accumulates in several areas of the park, causing localized flooding during rain events. Existing drainage improvements throughout the park include small drainage channels, concrete swales, culverts, and unlined infiltration basins.

<u>Erosion and Sedimentation.</u> The soil type mapped for the project site is Oceano sand (0-9% slope). As described in the NRCS Soil Survey, the soil has a high erodibility and low shrink swell
characteristics. Due to the lack of concentrated storm flows and presence of vegetation throughout the park, only minor evidence of erosion was observed within the project site. Along the northern property line, an earthen drainage channel has been constructed to accommodate storm water flows originating from the parking lot along the Pomeroy Road frontage. This channel starts out as nothing more than a small roadside swale, but develops into a 3-foot wide by 2-foot deep erosive channel near Primrose Lane, where it picks up residential runoff from the north via a 12-inch culvert that runs underneath Pomeroy Road. The earthen drainage channel then flows southwest and empties onto a rock riprap energy dissipater into the primary unlined infiltration basin constructed at the Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road intersection. The infiltration basin also receives storm flows via three 12-inch culverts: one that conveys storm water from underneath Pomeroy Road from a low-lying area across the street at the intersection of Tefft and Pomeroy, a storm drain on the park side of Tefft Street, and a culvert that flows underneath Tefft Street originating from bordering residential developments to the east of the park. This existing drainage channel appears subject to erosion, and subsequent sedimentation within the primary retention basin.

Impact.

<u>Geology.</u> The project site is not located within an area subject to severe geologic hazards, and future development of the proposed master plan would not result in exposure to or cause unstable geologic conditions. There is no evidence that measures above what would already be required by code are necessary.

<u>Drainage and Flooding.</u> Based on review of the existing drainage system within the park, existing facilities are not adequate to handle existing and future stormwater flows, and localized flooding within the park occurs during storm events. In addition, the existing drainage swale adjacent to Pomeroy Road is subject to erosion, and subsequent sedimentation of the primary retention basin. If this basin becomes inundated with sediment and debris during a major rain event, storm water could back up, flow across the spillway, and discharge into the low-lying areas near the Tefft Street and Pomeroy Avenue intersection.

Additional flooding occurs within the softball field parking lot, and the park access road west of the existing tennis courts. Stormwater sheet flows from two adjacent parking lots towards the softball field, and the lack of drainage outlets and bowl shaped topography cause flooding in the parking lot. In addition, stormwater flows from the upland areas of the park, and flows west where it ponds on the access road, which is a low point. Implementation of the proposed master plan would create additional impervious surfaces (e.g., roofs, structures, sidewalks, and paved parking) that would increase the amount of stormwater flow directed towards to lower areas of the park. Increased flooding could also occur if subsurface clay layers inhibit percolation of runoff beneath potential development sites, and rising ground water levels surface, resulting in flooding conditions. The proposed Master Plan includes the following drainage improvements to manage stormwater flow during rain events: 1) construct a new basin in the center of the southern half of the park, and 2) install a drainage pipe along Pomeroy Road within the existing drainage swale.

<u>Erosion and Sedimentation.</u> Erosion and subsequent down-gradient sedimentation would likely occur during future grading and vegetation removal activities associated with implementation of the proposed master plan. In addition, erosion of surface materials is likely to occur if concentrated storm runoff is allowed to flow onto erodible soil from impervious surfaces, causing deposition of sediment in areas of lower park elevation.

Mitigation/Conclusion. The potential site alteration and drainage, erosion, and sedimentation impacts of the proposed project shall be evaluated in the EIR. Due to the conceptual nature of the proposed master plan, preparation of the Geology and Soils section of the EIR will primarily rely on existing information. Mitigation measures shall be developed relative to site disturbance, preliminary

drainage and stormwater management recommendations, incorporation of low impact development (LID) measures, minimizing sedimentation and erosion impacts during construction through preparation and implementation of a SWPPP. Public Works staff shall be consulted regarding operational standards, including improvements to existing drainage facilities, on-going maintenance of drainage facilities, and implementation of best management practices (BMPs) to minimize erosion and down-gradient sedimentation.

7.	HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Result in a risk of explosion or release of hazardous substances (e.g. oil, pesticides, chemicals, radiation) or exposure of people to hazardous substances?		\boxtimes		
b)	Interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan?			\boxtimes	
c)	Expose people to safety risk associated with airport flight pattern?			\boxtimes	
d)	Increase fire hazard risk or expose people or structures to high fire hazard conditions?		\boxtimes		
e)	Create any other health hazard or potential hazard?	\boxtimes			
f)	Other				

Setting. The project site is located within the Nipomo urban area. Based on the results of a cultural resources field survey (John Parker; June 21, 2002), and consultation with County maintenance staff and other sources, a historic dump site is present within the park. The project site is within a high fire hazard zone, and within the State Responsibility Area for wildland fires. During preliminary scoping, the proposed project was referred to the County Fire Department/California Department of Forestry (CAL FIRE) for review. CAL FIRE did not identify any significant fire hazard concerns; however, the department recommended preparation of a Fire Prevention Plan for the park, including vegetation fuel management, no smoking areas, and evacuation plan, and noted emergency access and fire hydrant locations (Robert Lewin, CAL FIRE; September 27, 2005). The project site is not located within an Airport Review area, or within two miles of a private or public airport.

Impact. Potential hazards and public safety issues associated with development of the Master Plan include increased risk for fire hazard, adequate secondary and emergency access, potential for crime, risks from road traffic, and exposure due to a known historic dump onsite. The County has retained a qualified specialist to conduct a focused Phase One ESA and investigate test pits within the park. During construction, the use of large equipment may result in an incidental oil/fuel leak or spill, potentially adversely affecting park users and adjacent areas.

Mitigation/Conclusion. The EIR shall identify potential hazards, including public exposure to hazardous materials. The results of the focused Phase One ESA and subsurface investigation shall be reviewed in consultation with the County Environmental Health Division, and information shall be considered in the EIR. Consultation with CAL FIRE and the County Sheriff shall be implemented to

identify potential hazards or risks to the public. Mitigation measures may include remediation of potential hazards, implementation of BMPs to avoid public exposure to incidental exposure during construction, and operational standards to minimize public risk.

8.	NOISE - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Expose people to noise levels which exceed the County Noise Element thresholds?		\boxtimes		
b)	Generate increases in the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas?	\boxtimes			
c)	Expose people to severe noise or vibration?			\boxtimes	
d)	Other				

Setting. The environmental constraints report prepared for the proposed Master Plan included transportation noise measurements taken from six locations along the perimeter of the park, and 34 ambient noise readings along the perimeter and within the park. The six transportation noise measurement locations were selectively chosen surrounding the park area, at the intersection of Pomeroy Road and Tefft Street, the intersection of Tefft Street and Orchard Road, the intersection of Pomeroy Road and Juniper Street, the intersection of Pomeroy Road and Camino Caballo, the intersection of Camino Caballo and Osage Street, and one location at the intersection of Osage Street and Tejas Place.

<u>Transportation Related Noise</u>. Based on the results of the noise measurements, the average noise level due to transportation-related noise ranges from 59.6 to 72.7 decibels (db). Higher levels of noise occur along Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road, near the existing sports fields due to automobile and truck traffic on these roads. Noise levels rapidly attenuate as one moves towards the interior of the park due to the varying topography and dense wooded vegetation (Morro Group, Inc. June 14, 2004). Existing noise-sensitive uses within the park include outdoor sports fields, a library, and passive park facilities (i.e., trails, walkways, gardens).

<u>Stationary Noise.</u> The only existing, continually operating stationary noise sources are the high volume sampler operated by the California Air Resources Board, which is located in the undeveloped portion of the park near the existing maintenance/caretaker residence, and Dana Elementary School, located in the southeastern corner adjacent to the park. Measured noise levels originating from the sampler at a distance of 25 feet were approximately 54-55 average db (dBA). Noise levels originating from the school were approximately 57-58 dBA, measured along the property line of the school and park boundary. The existing sports fields would also be characterized as stationary noise sources; however, they are not continually being utilized, and are considered intermittent sources of noise, more likely to be subject to maximum noise levels associated with a stationary source.

<u>Generation of Noise</u>. Noise sources generated by existing park facilities include baseball fields, tennis courts, handball courts, basketball courts, picnic areas, children's play areas, and traffic generated by park visitors. Ambient noise levels within the park in the vicinity of these uses range from 48 to 56 dBA. Noise sensitive land uses in the immediate vicinity of the park include residences, Dana Elementary School, and a community library.

Impact. The proposed Master Plan complies with the setback distances listed in the County Ordinance (refer to Section 13, Land Use), with the exception of the skate park location proposed adjacent to Tefft Street.

<u>Transportation Related Noise.</u> In addition to existing park facilities, noise sensitive uses proposed in the Master Plan include outdoor amphitheaters, outdoor sports and recreation areas, pre-school, and a community/recreation center. Based on the County Noise Element, the maximum allowable noise exposure level generated by transportation noise sources is 35 Leq (worst-case hour level of interior noise) and 60 dB (outdoor noise exposure) for public assembly uses, and 70 dB for outdoor sports and recreation uses.

Based on noise measurement data collected in 2004, the average noise level generated by traffic on Pomeroy Road at Juniper Street was 69.7 dBA, as measured at the intersection of Pomeroy Road and Juniper Street. The average noise level generated by traffic was 69.5 dB (as measured from the intersection of Pomeroy Road and Camino Caballo), and 64.8 dB (as measured from the intersection of Osage Street and Camino Caballo) (Morro Group, 2004).

Determining whether the acceptable noise threshold will be exceeded will depend on current and estimated future noise levels, and the location of noise sensitive uses (i.e., community center, amphitheater, outdoor recreation facilities, and the library expansion in relation to the roadway.

<u>Stationary Noise.</u> The only existing, continually operating stationary noise sources are the high volume sampler operated by the California Air Resources Board, which is located in the undeveloped portion of the park near the existing maintenance/caretaker residence, and Dana Elementary School, located in the southeastern corner adjacent to the park. Measured noise levels originating from the sampler at a distance of 25 feet were approximately 54-55 average db (dBA). Noise levels originating from the school were approximately 57-58 dBA, measured along the property line of the school and park boundary (2004). The existing sports fields would also be characterized as stationary noise sources; however, they are not continually being utilized, and are considered intermittent sources of noise, more likely to be subject to maximum noise levels associated with a stationary source, as discussed below (Generation of Noise). The noise levels generated by the ARB air emission sampler and Dana Elementary School do not exceed the threshold for acceptable levels of noise generation.

<u>Generation of Noise.</u> Multi-use sports fields are proposed in the southern portion of the park, approximately 180 feet northeast of existing residences along Tejas Place. The elevation along most of the property line on the southern boundary is higher and slopes downward as one moves north towards the interior of the park. South of the property line, the topography also slopes downward toward the residences; the result of this natural topographical dune feature would be more or less characterized as a berm. This natural feature would help attenuate much of the noise increase due to new facilities development in the park near this boundary. Operation of these fields would potentially subject this existing residential area to adverse levels of noise, including the use of loud speakers and microphones during sporting events.

A skate park or community pool, teen center, and community center may be proposed near Tefft Street. A residential neighborhood is located on the opposite side of Tefft Street. Activities that would create noise in the park include the use of skateboards and skates, the use of radios, and loud laughter or shouting by park users. Residential land uses may be adversely affected by noise generated by persons using park facilities.

The ambient noise level within the park is expected to increase upon operation of new park amenities. The new sports fields and additional facilities proposed within the center of the active recreation park area would contribute to the overall generation of noise within the park. Maintenance activities, including mowing and use of equipment and tools, would continue to generate noise in the park. Unless an emergency situation exists, these activities are limited to daytime hours, which would reduce the effects of noise. The use of amplified music and microphones within proposed amphitheatres and spill-over noise from the community center would likely generate noise exceeding thresholds established by the County Noise Element. The County Parks Division currently requires issuance of a permit prior to the use of microphones and amplified music. Permit conditions limit use of amplified sound to business hours only, and the Parks Division reserves the right to revoke permits at any time during the event if the noise is excessive. The permit requires reservation of any adjacent group area that might be impacted by amplified sound. In addition, amplified concerts are prohibited at Nipomo Community Park. These regulations would apply to all existing and proposed uses within the park to minimize the effects of amplified sounds within and outside of the park.

In addition to noise generated by the operation of existing and future park facilities, an increase in traffic volume associated with new park development would occur. It generally takes one doubling of traffic volume to cause a 3 dBA increase in noise levels. Given the large traffic volumes on Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road, it is very unlikely that increased vehicle traffic associated with the park would make a noticeable difference in noise levels.

Mitigation/Conclusion. Preparation of the Noise section of the EIR shall include a review of the previous noise analysis (Morro Group; 2004), completion of a supplemental analysis with updated noise measurement data. Updated measured noise data shall be used to predict compliance with the future noise environment resulting from estimated buildout of traffic as defined in the County's Noise Element, and build-out of the proposed master plan. The impact of the proposed project on ambient noise levels and sensitive receptors within and near the park due to project construction and long-term operation of the project, as well as potential exposure of sensitive receptors to existing off-site noise sources (i.e., Tefft Street, Pomeroy Road), shall be evaluated in the EIR. The EIR shall identify existing policies in place to control and monitor amplified noise within County park facilities. Mitigation measures may include modifications to the proposed design, incorporation of exterior and interior noise level reduction measures (e.g., earthen berms, noise walls, construction standards, etc.), and operational standards including use of a park monitor.

9.	POPULATION/HOUSING - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?				
Ь)	Displace existing housing or people, requiring construction of replacement housing elsewhere?			\boxtimes	
c)	Create the need for substantial new housing in the area?			\boxtimes	
d)	Use substantial amount of fuel or energy?			\boxtimes	
e)	Other				

Setting/Impact. The proposed park improvements would be constructed to meet the recreational demands of the community of Nipomo and south county area. The proposed project is not anticipated

to induce growth, create the need for new housing, or use a substantial amount of fuel or energy to construct and maintain. The proposed project does not displace existing housing or people.

Mitigation/Conclusion. Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would not have a significant effect on population or housing. Further analysis in the EIR is not warranted.

10.	PUBLIC SERVICES/UTILITIES - Will the project have an effect upon, or result in the need for new or altered public services in any of the following areas:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Fire protection?		\boxtimes		
b)	Police protection (e.g., Sheriff, CHP)?		\boxtimes		
c)	Schools?			\boxtimes	
d)	Roads?		\boxtimes		
e)	Solid Wastes?		\boxtimes		
Ŋ	Other public facilities?		\boxtimes		
g)	Other				

Setting.

<u>Fire Protection.</u> County Fire/California Department of Forestry (CAL FIRE) provides fire protection in the Nipomo Mesa area. The Safety Element of the County's General Plan indicates that the Nipomo community developed with a primarily low-density residential pattern with supporting commercial uses. The element also notes that Nipomo's fire response needs are increased because of the wooded and urban area interfaces that are in the area. This represents a higher risk than other unincorporated communities. CAL FIRE is responsible for the administration of the fire stations that serve Nipomo, and provides equipment and training for volunteer stations. Two stations serve the Nipomo area, Station 22 located on the Mesa off of Highway 1, and Station 20 located in the Town of Nipomo. The stations are staffed to provide for 24 hours a day, 7 days a week emergency response and include volunteer programs to increase response capabilities.

<u>Sheriff Protection.</u> The County Sheriff's Department provides police and patrol services in the Nipomo Mesa area. The Oceano CSD funded the construction of the Sheriff's South Station located at 1681 Front Street that opened in October 2002. This station improves the Sheriff's ability to respond to calls in the Nipomo area. There is presently a need to expand police services in the South County area, and this need will increase as the population grows. New park development would place additional service demands on existing South County Sheriff services. Current average response times generally range from five to thirty minutes.

<u>Emergency Responders.</u> Private companies in Arroyo Grande and Santa Maria provide ambulance service to the Nipomo area. Emergency service operations and County emergency medical services would not be significantly impacted by new development within the park. The California Highway Patrol (CHP) services San Luis Obispo County's highways, with stations located in San Luis Obispo and Templeton. They are available to respond in emergency situations, but generally do not respond to domestic calls. In addition, a Park Ranger is present onsite.

Schools. The park is located within the Lucia Mar School District.

<u>*Roads.*</u> The park is accessed from Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road, and is located within Area 1 of the South County Fee Area (refer to Section 12, Transportation and Circulation).

<u>Solid Waste.</u> South County Sanitary Service is the private vendor that provides solid waste collection services to the park area; however, Waste Connections, Inc. has purchased the Cold Canyon Landfill, Coastal Rolloff Service, and the South County Sanitary Service. Waste Connections, Inc. is a regional, integrated, non-hazardous solid waste services company that provides collection, transfer, disposal and recycling services to commercial, industrial and residential customers in the Nipomo area. Solid waste is disposed of at either the Santa Maria Landfill or the Cold Canyon Sanitary Landfill north of Arroyo Grande. The Nipomo Transfer Station is located one-half mile west of Highway 101, at 325 Cuyama Lane (Highway 166) in Nipomo. Estimated area landfill capacities are shown in Table 6. These two landfills would be able to adequately meet the small increase in solid waste that would be generated by new development of the park. The County is currently pursuing alternative landfill sites, anticipating the closure of Cold Canyon in 2017.

<u>Other Public Facilities.</u> The County Parks and Recreation Element states that based on National Recreation and Park Association standards, five to eight acres of community parkland is recommended per 1,000 residents.

Impact. The Nipomo Mesa area has a "high" hazard zone rating in the Safety Element of the General Plan. The park area is within a five-minute response time zone. The addition of new park facilities would increase the service demand on the two CAL FIRE stations that serve the area. The Sheriff's Department (South Station) serves the communities of Oceano, Nipomo, rural Arroyo Grande, New Cuyama, and Lopez Lake. The cumulative development and build-out of these communities, including the proposed Nipomo Park Master Plan, impacts the Sheriff Department's capacity to respond to emergency calls. The current ratio of deputies per population unit is 0.64 deputy per 1,000 citizens, which is deficient. The acceptable ratio is considered 1.0 deputy per 1,000 citizens (Martin Basti, Commander South Station; January 18, 2006). Funds for operating and staffing expenses are provided by the County General Fund, and are determined by the County Board of Supervisors. Based on the Sheriff Department's response to the proposed project, several safety measures are recommended, including the "Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design" and "Lighting and Lighting Systems" guidelines (San Luis Obispo County Sheriff's Department). Implementation of these measures have proven to prevent and reduce crime (Martin J. Basti, Commander, South Station; January 18, 2006).

The Nipomo Community Park is intended to serve the residents of Nipomo and immediate fringe areas with a variety of recreational opportunities including both active and passive recreation. Implementation of the proposed project would result in a beneficial impact by helping to meet the projected demand for recreational public services in the area. Subsequently, as additional facilities are constructed, the public's use of the park may increase, which may have a significant impact on public services, including police and fire protection, road use, and solid waste disposal.

Mitigation/Conclusion. The need for any additional service facilities shall be evaluated in the project EIR. The project's ability to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any public service shall be evaluated and mitigation measures identified. Mitigation measures recommended by the Sheriff's Department may include site design measures and the need for adequate exterior lighting. Mitigation measures recommended by CAL FIRE may include provision of fire hydrants, adequate water flows, and the use of fire retardant roof materials. Implementation of solid waste redirection programs both during project construction and long-term operation of the project shall also be required.

11.	RECREATION - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Increase the use or demand for parks or other recreation opportunities?			\boxtimes	
b)	Affect the access to trails, parks or other recreation opportunities?			\boxtimes	
c)	Other				

Setting/Impact. The intent of the proposed project is to increase recreational opportunities in the community of Nipomo. Project components would provide a greater diversity of activities including field sports, court sports, multi-use trails, skating, swimming, and a dog park for a greater number of individuals. No significant impacts to recreational resources would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Mitigation/Conclusion. Due to the nature of the proposed project, analysis of recreational resources shall be incorporated into the Land Use section of the EIR.

12.	TRANSPORTATION/ CIRCULATION - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Increase vehicle trips to local or areawide circulation system?	\boxtimes			
b)	Reduce existing "Levels of Service" on public roadway(s)?		\boxtimes		
c)	Create unsafe conditions on public roadways (e.g., limited access, design features, sight distance, slow vehicles)?		\boxtimes		
d)	Provide for adequate emergency access?			\boxtimes	
e)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?			\boxtimes	
f)	Result in inadequate internal traffic circulation?		\boxtimes		
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., pedestrian access, bus turnouts, bicycle racks, etc.)?			\boxtimes	
h)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns that may result in substantial safety risks?			\boxtimes	
i)	Other				

Setting. Vehicle access to the park is currently stop sign-controlled at two existing egresses. The main entry way is located on Pomeroy Road, offset and east of Juniper Street. The second entrance is located on Tefft Street, offset and south of Orchard Avenue. Pedestrians access the park via "pedestrian only" trails located in the southwest corner, northwest corner, and the terminus of La Serena Way along the southern park boundary. A traffic and pedestrian circulation analysis was prepared in 2004 using data from the County Department of Public Works, San Luis Obispo Council of Governments (SLOCOG) 2001, South County Traffic Model 2002, South County Traffic Model Update 2006, South County General Plan Update, Woodlands Specific Plan EIR 1998, and traffic counts obtained by Morro Group, Inc. on April 20, 2004 (Morro Group, Inc.; June 14, 2004).

Tefft Street

Tefft Street is a primary arterial roadway within the Nipomo area. Regionally, Tefft Street extends from Dana Foothill Road at the northeast to Las Flores Drive at the southwest. The roadway varies in width from two to four lanes with a center turn lane. The section of Tefft Street that serves the park area extends from U.S. Highway 101 to just south of Orchard Avenue is four lanes wide, with a left-turn median and bike lanes. The posted speed limit along this roadway section ranges between 35 and 45 miles per hour. The four-lane section also serves small businesses and residential uses. A two-lane section with a center left-turn median and bike lanes exists from just south of Orchard Avenue to south of Verbena Street. The posted speed limit along the two-lane section of Tefft Street is 45 miles per hour. The two-lane section serves adjacent residential uses. The intersections of Tefft Street with Pomeroy Road, Orchard Avenue, Mary Avenue, and U.S. 101 ramps are controlled by 3-stage traffic signals. The remaining Tefft Street intersections are controlled by side-street stop signs.

Pomeroy Road

Pomeroy Road is a two-lane arterial, undivided roadway with bike lanes from Tefft Street to Willow Road. The posted speed limit on Pomeroy Road from Tefft Street to Hetrick Avenue is 45 miles per hour, and 55 miles per hour from Hetrick Avenue to Willow Road. The roadway width is approximately 40 feet along the entire section from Tefft Street to Willow Road. The intersections along Pomeroy Road are controlled by stop signs on the side street approaches, with the exception of Tefft Street, which is signalized.

Local Roads

There are a number of collector and local streets that provide access to the park area. These include: Camino Caballo, Mesa Road, Osage Road, and Tejas Place. The widths of these roadways range from 20-30 feet. Many of these roadways are not fully improved and do not have any control at cross streets.

<u>Level of Service.</u> The threshold for Level of Service (LOS) in urban areas, such as the project area, is LOS D, which indicates stable flow, restricted speed and maneuverability, and some operational problems caused by small increases in traffic volume. Use of park is primarily limited to mid-day, afternoon, and evening hours, and weekends. Based on 2004 traffic counts, the overall LOS for the road network surrounding the park ranges from LOS A to LOS C, as shown in the table below. The P.M. peak hour operations range from LOS A to LOS D. Based on the South County Traffic Model Update 2006, the LOS for the roadways noted below did not degrade since the 2004 traffic counts.

Based on the traffic analysis, Tefft Street intersections at Orchard Avenue and Pomeroy Road are currently operating at LOS C during the P.M. peak hour. The Pomeroy and Juniper intersection and the Mesa Road and Tefft Street intersections are operating at LOS B, and the Osage Street intersections at Camino Caballo and Mesa Road are operating at LOS A during the P.M. peak hour. These roads and intersections are currently operating at acceptable LOS.

Roadway	Roadway Classification	ADT Capacity	Existing ADT	Volume/ Capacity	Existing LOS
Mesa Road	2-lane Collector	10,600	1,800	0.17	A
Orchard Avenue	2-lane Arterial	10,600	3,290	0.31	В
Pomeroy Road	2-lane Arterial	18,000	7,260	0.40	С
Tefft Street	4-lane Arterial	35,900	15,700	0.44	С
	2-lane Arterial	18,000	5,900	0.33	В
Osage Road	2-lane Collector	10,600	930	0.09	А

TABLE 1 2004 Study-Area Overall Roadway LOS

Traffic Data Obtained by Morro Group, Inc. (April, 2004)

TABLE 22004 P.M. Peak-Hour Roadway LOS

Roadway	Count Location	P.M. Peak Hour 2- Way Volumes	P.M. Peak Hour LOS
Mesa Road	West of Tefft Street	160	В
Orchard Avenue	Southeast of Tefft Street	329	C
Pomeroy Road	West of Tefft Street	726	D
	North of Mesa Road	485	С
Tefft Street	North of Orchard Avenue	694	D
	Southwest of Mary Avenue	1570	С
Osage Road	North of Mesa Road	93	Α

Traffic Data Obtained by Morro Group, Inc. (April, 2004)

<u>Traffic Hazards.</u> There are two existing vehicular egresses to access park facilities. The first is located off of Tefft Street, just south of the signalized Tefft and Orchard intersection. The park egress at this location is situated between the County Library and Dana Elementary School. This access point has poor sight distance to the south, and a relatively short distance from the park exit to the intersection to the north, which affects left-turn movements from the park onto Tefft Street. Long queues tend to develop on Tefft Street at this location during peak-hours, blocking left-turn movements from the park because of backed-up traffic at the light. This is a highly trafficked and congested area during peak hours due to the mixture of drop-off and pick-up of students at Dana Elementary School, patrons of the library, pass-by traffic, and park users.

The main access point to park facilities is located off of Pomeroy Road. This entrance has very limited sight distance because of a small hill that descends to the west that is coupled with a banked curve. High traffic volumes on Pomeroy Road, and a 45 mph speed limit, create safety issues for left and right turn movements into and out of the park from Pomeroy Road due to the limited sight distance to the west and the fast rate of vehicle travel.

The Pomeroy Road and Juniper Street intersection is located approximately 100-150 feet to the northwest of the existing park egress. This intersection is currently stop sign controlled at the Juniper Street approach leg (Pomeroy Road currently has no stop control at this location). Turning

movements from Juniper Street can be dangerous during peak hour travel periods because of the high rate of travel and limited sight distance on Pomeroy Road. Several accidents have occurred at this intersection in the past few years. Turning movements from the park onto Pomeroy Road could also be dangerous during peak hour periods because of the high rate of travel and limited sight distance to the west.

The area between Juniper Street and Camino Caballo is a dense residential neighborhood with a significant amount of pedestrian traffic. A large number of schoolchildren cross Pomeroy Road in this area to access the park on their way to and from Dana Elementary School. This area has issues with the safe movement of pedestrians across Pomeroy Road during peak hour periods because of the lack of designated crossing facilities.

<u>Emergency Access.</u> The park is surrounded on three sides by public roads, and internal access is provided via Tefft Street and Camino Caballo.

<u>Parking and Internal Circulation.</u> The park currently provides 325 parking spaces within several parking lots located within the southeastern portion of the park. Internal vehicle circulation is limited to the existing ballpark area. Existing trails within the park are multi-use, and support bicycles.

Air Traffic. The park is not located within two miles of a public or private airport or airstrip.

Impact. The park egress on Tefft Street has poor sight distance to the south, and a relatively short distance from the park exit to the intersection to the north, which affects left-turn movements from the park onto Tefft Street. Long queues tend to develop on Tefft Street at this location during peak-hours, blocking left-turn movements from the park because of backed-up traffic at the light. This is a highly trafficked and congested area during peak hours due to the mixture of drop-off and pick-up of students at Dana Elementary School, patrons of the library, pass-by traffic, and park users. The main access point to park facilities is located off of Pomeroy Road. This entrance has very limited sight distance because of a small hill that descends to the west that is coupled with a banked curve. High traffic volumes on Pomeroy Road, and a 45 mph speed limit, create safety issues for left and right turn movements into and out of the park from Pomeroy Road due to the limited sight distance to the west and the fast rate of vehicle travel. The Pomeroy Road and Juniper Street intersection is located approximately 100-150 feet to the northwest of the existing park egress. This intersection is currently stop sign controlled at the Juniper Street approach leg (Pomeroy Road currently has no stop control at this location). Turning movements from Juniper Street can be dangerous during peak hour travel periods because of the high rate of travel and limited sight distance on Pomeroy Road. Several accidents have occurred at this intersection in the past few years. Turning movements from the park onto Pomeroy Road could also be dangerous during peak hour periods because of the high rate of travel and limited sight distance to the west. The area between Juniper Street and Camino Caballo is a dense residential neighborhood with a significant amount of pedestrian traffic. A large number of schoolchildren cross Pomeroy Road in this area to access the park on their way to and from Dana Elementary School. This area has issues with the safe movement of pedestrians across Pomeroy Road during peak hour periods because of the lack of designated crossing facilities.

During preliminary scoping, the proposed project was referred to the County Public Works Department for review. The Public Works Department is currently consulting with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) regarding future improvements to the Highway 101 and Tefft Street interchange. Based on the South County Traffic Study Update 2006, the Level of Service at the Highway 101 and Tefft Street interchange is LOS E (southbound ramps/south frontage street/Tefft Street, p.m. peak hour). The Public Works Department reviewed the proposed development (including proposed road and intersection improvements), and determined that no project-specific traffic impacts would occur; however, standard offsite road improvements on Osage Road are required to bring Osage Road into compliance with County road standards (Mike Goodwin; March 21, 2005).

The continued development of Nipomo, including the proposed project, would increase the traffic demands on West Tefft Street, and the Highway 101 and Tefft Street interchange. Based on consultation with the Public Works Department and the South County Traffic Study Update 2006, the Level of Service at the interchange would decrease to LOS F under the cumulative, 2025, build-out scenario. The County has developed the South County Road Fee Program to collect fees to be used towards road improvement projects within Nipomo and South County, including future improvements to the Highway 101 and Tefft Street interchange, and the Nipomo area road network. Collection of development fees and implementation of projects listed in the South County Circulation Study is required to mitigate cumulative impacts.

The proposed Master Plan proposes the construction of an additional looped road to serve internalized circulation; however, internal congestion could occur during operation of the sporting fields. Approximately 371 to 422 additional parking spaces, including seven new equestrian pull-through spaces, are proposed to accommodate uses included in the Master Plan.

Mitigation/Conclusion. Transportation and circulation impacts resulting from the proposed project shall be evaluated as part of the EIR. Based on the time that has passed since the 2004 study occurred, and subsequent updates to the South County Traffic Study, an updated traffic analysis shall be implemented. The updated analysis shall be conducted consistent with county modeling efforts for the area, and the County Department of Public Works, Caltrans, and San Luis Obispo Council of Governments shall be consulted. This analysis shall include, but not be limited to, existing conditions, proposed project only conditions, cumulative conditions, and cumulative conditions plus proposed project conditions. Based on consultation with County Public Works staff, the evaluation shall focus on an analysis of operations along Tefft Street and Pomerov Road. At the request of County staff, the traffic analysis will also include a qualitative evaluation of potential impacts at the US101/Tefft Street interchange. The analysis will include documenting existing traffic conditions, deriving the master plan trip generation estimates, an evaluation of potential project specific impacts, and a review of access. The analysis will also include a qualitative evaluation of peak demands associated with the use of multiple park facilities (i.e., concerts at amphitheater, sporting tournaments, etc). The analysis contained within the EIR shall identify mitigation measures necessary to reduce traffic and circulation impacts to the greatest extent feasible.

13.	WASTEWATER - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Violate waste discharge requirements or Central Coast Basin Plan criteria for wastewater systems?	\boxtimes			
b)	Change the quality of surface or ground water (e.g., nitrogen-loading, daylighting)?		\boxtimes		
c)	Adversely affect community wastewater service provider?		\boxtimes		
d)	Other				

Setting. Wastewater disposal for the park is currently treated by individual septic systems for the four existing restroom facilities. The park is located within the Nipomo urban area, and surrounding uses are served by the Nipomo Community Services District (NCSD).

Impact. The proposed Master Plan includes two additional restroom facilities to serve park visitors. On-site effluent disposal and treatment could be accomplished by two methods: septic tanks and leachfield systems, or fiberglass holding tanks that are regularly pumped and maintained. Potential constraints to on-site wastewater disposal include slope, depth to bedrock, depth to groundwater, and percolation rates. There appears to be multiple, level to relatively level, areas within the park that would be suitable for leachfield siting. Prior to development of the Mesa Meadows residential area, percolation tests were performed by Earth Systems Consultants to assess the Mesa Meadows area for suitability of on-site effluent disposal via septic system, and to determine the ability for onsite stormwater retention via percolation. Observed percolation rates ranged from a low of <1 min/inch up to 8 min/inch. Because of the large separation from the ground surface to groundwater depth, soil conditions were judged to be adequate for on-site septic systems. The Master Plan does not propose to construct restrooms in the Mesa Meadows area; however the existing soils and percolation data can be generally be applied to the park area. Because Mesa Meadows is located immediately adjacent to the park, contains the same soil profile mapped by the NRCC (Oceano sand), and standard septic systems were constructed for that development, the park would be able implement standard septic systems as well.

Based on consultation with Environmental Health (Leslie Terry; December 17, 2008), the California Regional Water Quality Control Board Central Coast Region (RWQCB) is proposing to amend the *Water Quality Control Plan, Central Coast Basin* (Basin Plan) regarding the on-site wastewater system implementation program. The RWQCB has entered into a multi-agency memorandum of understanding (MOU) governing regulation of on-site systems, and local permitting agencies (i.e., County) implemented criteria for on-site systems through their own permits.

Implementation of on-site wastewater disposal would be subject to updated regulations regarding wastewater disposal and water quality. In addition, based on the location of the park within an urban reserve line, the County may be required to connect to existing sewer lines operated and maintained by the NCSD. Based on consultation with the NCSD (Bruce Buel; December 17, 2008), the NCSD notes that a connection is possible, based on further review of additional information.

Mitigation/Conclusion. Preparation of the EIR shall include consultation with RWQCB to clarify how proposed Basin Plan amendments affect the proposed project. Data collection shall include consultation with County Environmental Health and County Building Division regarding the existing wastewater disposal systems, and obtain information regarding use, capacity, maintenance issues, and the feasibility for expansion areas. Further consultation with NCSD shall be conducted regarding the potential for connection to the sewer system. Primary and secondary impacts, and subsequent mitigation measures, related to wastewater treatment and disposal shall be identified in the EIR based on consultation with the RWQCB, County staff, and NCSD.

14.	WATER - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Violate any water quality standards?		\boxtimes		

14.	WATER - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
b)	Discharge into surface waters or otherwise alter surface water quality (e.g., turbidity, temperature, dissolved oxygen, etc.)?		\boxtimes		
c)	Change the quality of groundwater (e.g., saltwater intrusion, nitrogen- loading, etc.)?			\boxtimes	
d)	Change the quantity or movement of available surface or ground water?	\boxtimes			
e)	Adversely affect community water service provider?	\boxtimes			
f)	Other				

Setting.

<u>Surface Water.</u> The area proposed for development is outside the 100-year Flood Hazard designation. As described in the NRCS Soil Survey, the soil is considered well drained. Nipomo Creek is located approximately one mile to the east; however, there is no evidence of off-site stormwater discharge. In addition to rainfall on the project site, stormwater discharged from adjacent residential developments flows onto the park site. Due to the rolling topography of the park area, presence of closed depressions, and lack of drainage inlets, stormwater accumulates in several areas of the park, causing localized flooding during rain events. Existing drainage improvements throughout the park include small drainage channels, concrete swales, culverts, and unlined infiltration basins.

<u>Water Supply.</u> The project will be using water provided by the NCSD, extracted from the Santa Maria groundwater basin, which is made up of three interconnected sub areas (Tri-Cities, Nipomo Mesa, and Santa Maria). Approximately 30 percent of the basin's area lies north of the Santa Maria River in San Luis Obispo County. In 1994, the DWR began an update of the 1979 study of the Arroyo Grande Valley – Nipomo Mesa Area groundwater sub area and the northern portion of the Santa Maria River Valley groundwater sub area. The study, "Water Resources of the Arroyo Grande -Nipomo Mesa Area", was completed and published in 2003. The study contains the following findings and conclusions:

- Observations of groundwater elevations in 1975, 1985 and 1995 revealed the development and subsequent expansion of a depression in groundwater elevations generally south of Willow Road and east of Highway 1 - the south central portion of the Nipomo Mesa.
- Nipomo Community Services District and Southern California Water Company have many of their wells in or near the depression. The extractions of these two agencies have increased from about 940 afy in 1979 to 2,790 afy in 1995 and 3,620 in 2000.
- There have also been increases in demand for water to serve rural residences and agricultural uses.
- Since the depression enlarges, the reduced water in storage could result in increased inflow from Santa Maria Valley and decreased outflow to the ocean from the mesa and the valley. If the pumping depression on the mesa pulls in water from the Santa Maria Valley, the possibility exists for the poorer quality groundwater of the valley, containing high concentrations of

dissolved solids, to locally reduce the quality of the mesa's groundwater. Also, in the future, if subsurface outflows to the ocean cease, and the seaward hydraulic gradient is reversed, this condition could lead to seawater intrusion of the groundwater resources. Currently, there is no evidence of seawater intrusion.

A major source of recharge for the Nipomo Mesa is deep percolation of precipitation. This makes the groundwater basin vulnerable to protracted periods of below-average rainfall.

<u>Political/Legal History</u>. In 1998, a complaint was filed by agricultural pumpers in Santa Barbara County against the basin's water purveyors, including the City of Santa Maria, the NCSD and Cal Cities Water Co. Because of inconsistencies in the DWR study, the County commissioned an additional study by S.S. Papadopulos & Associates (SSPA) to provide clarification of water issues on the Mesa. SSPA concluded that the data presented in the DWR study correctly identified overdraft conditions in the Nipomo Mesa area of the groundwater basin.

Concurrently, the judge in the groundwater litigation issued a finding that the basin as a whole was not being overdrafted and that there was insufficient evidence to support the existence of sub-basins. The County's Water Resources Advisory Committee (WRAC) reviewed the SSPA study and the judge's decision and concluded that overdraft in the Nipomo Mesa area either exists currently or is imminent. In November 2004 the Board of Supervisors certified Level of Severity II and approved several actions intended to strengthen water conservation efforts in the Nipomo Mesa area.

Litigation of the basin has resulted in a settlement in which the stipulating parties have agreed to a "physical solution establishing a legal and practical means for ensuring the Basin's long-term sustainability". The physical solution establishes three management areas, creates a management entity for each area and directs each management entity to monitor groundwater conditions and prepare plans for dealing with water shortages. The agenda for the Nipomo Mesa Management Area (NMMA) also includes importation of at least 2,500 acre feet per year of supplemental water by the NCSD from the City of Santa Maria and an agreement of the major water purveyors in the area to purchase some of that water. New urban uses proposed by stipulating parties within the service area of a major water purveyor or within the Sphere of Influence of the NCSD must obtain water service from the local supplier. New urban uses proposed by stipulating parties outside these areas and within one-quarter mile of a service area or NCSD Sphere of Influence must conduct good faith negotiations with the local supplier before forming a mutual water company to provide water service.

In May, 2006, as a part of the annual Growth Management Ordinance update, the County Board of Supervisors adopted the following relating to the Nipomo area:

- Reaffirm limiting new residential development in the Nipomo Mesa Area to an annual 1.8% growth rate;
- Change the Level of Severity for Water Supply from II to III; however, the Board further determined that a building moratorium would not be necessary based on implementing the following measures, as well as environmental determinations for development proposals on the Nipomo Mesa would continue to be made on a case-by-case basis, where an EIR would not necessarily be required if water supply is identified as the only significant issue. The following water conservation measures were required of all new development (and added as County LUO planning area standards) as of August, 2006:
 - Require all sink faucets in bathrooms and kitchens in new residences be equipped with automatic shut off devices. This also applies when a bathroom is added, or when the floor area is increased by twenty per cent (20%). Automatic shut off faucets operate by means of a hands-free electric sensor.
 - Require drip-line irrigation for all landscaped areas (except turf areas) installed for new construction. The drip irrigation system must include an automatic rain shut-off device, soil

moisture sensors, a separate meter for outdoor water and an operating manual to instruct the building occupant on how to use and maintain the water conservation hardware.

• The maximum amount of turf (lawn) area may not exceed twenty percent of the site's total irrigated landscape area, and, in all cases the site's total irrigated landscape area shall be limited to 1,500 square feet.

The County Flood Control and Water Conservation District will implement improved well monitoring and water quality monitoring programs for the Nipomo Mesa area. Water purveyors in the Nipomo Mesa area are encouraged to strengthen their water conservation programs, increase their use of reclaimed water and continue their efforts to secure supplemental water.

Also, in an effort to monitor the effectiveness of these water conservation measures, each annual update of the Growth Management Ordinance will include data to indicate if the water use rate per dwelling unit is trending downward. If progress toward water conservation targets is not evident, further growth limitations may be recommended.

In August, 2006, The Board also approved new requirements for all land divisions accepted for processing after June 23, 2006 and General Plan Amendments submitted after June 23, 2006 in the Nipomo and the Nipomo Mesa areas. Applications for general plan amendments and land divisions in the Nipomo Mesa Water Conservation Area shall include documentation regarding estimated existing and proposed non-agricultural water demand for the land division or development that could occur with the General Plan Amendment. If this documentation indicates that the proposed non-agricultural water demand without the land division, the project will be subject to contributing towards acquiring supplemental water.

On June 26, 2007, the Board of Supervisors, as a part of the County's Resource Management System annual update, reaffirmed and certified a level of Severity III for water supply in the Nipomo area, and directed the preparation of additional water conservation ordinance(s). The new ordinance(s) will require the establishment of retrofit program(s) and/or other new water conservation program(s) where new development will be required to participate to offset/reduce new impacts to water consumption from the Nipomo Mesa groundwater basin.

The NCSD currently provides water supply to the park through a contractual Water Service Agreement (WSA) executed between the NCSD and the County of San Luis Obispo (recorded May 29, 1984). The WSA states that the NCSD will provide water to the park for the purposes of irrigation, sanitation, and miscellaneous uses. The maximum annual rate agreed upon in the WSA was set at 43 acre-feet per year, and the County was not permitted to exceed the rates or quantities agreed upon in the WSA unless it is demonstrated to the mutual satisfaction of both the County and NCSD that said expansion or changes can occur without detriment to the water resources and delivery system of the NCSD. The park is currently one of the NCSD's largest single water users, with annual demand approaching 50-acre feet per year (Michael LeBrun, NCSD; March 28, 2005). As noted in the Initial Study, the NCSD approved a 38 percent increase in water usage (additional 16.34 afy) for a total water allotment of 59.34 afy.

In 2004, the NCSD constructed a waterline through the park adjacent to Dana Elementary School, within a five-foot wide easement executed between the County and the NCSD. The width of this utility easement is approximately 20 feet from the southern edge of the property. Water is delivered to the park via a three-inch water main that is located within the right-of-way on Pomeroy Road.

Impact.

<u>Surface Water.</u> Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would not directly affect any sources of surface water. Future grading activities would disturb soil, and potentially result in off-site sedimentation and/or clogging within existing and proposed retention basins. Standard erosion and sedimentation control measures would be required, as discussed in Section 6 (Geology and Soils). In

addition, the Clean Water Act has established a regulatory system for the management of storm water discharges from construction, industrial and municipal sources. The California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) has adopted a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Storm Water General Permit, which requires the implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for discharges regulated under the SWRCB program. Currently, construction sites of one acre and greater may need to prepare and implement a SWPPP that focuses on controlling storm water runoff. The Regional Water Quality Control Board is the local extension of the SWRCB, who currently monitors these SWPPPs. Pursuant to Clean Water Act regulations, the Parks Division is required to prepare and implement a SWPPP during construction to minimize off-site sedimentation and erosion impacts.

<u>Water Supply.</u> Implementation of the Master Plan would result in an increase of irrigated areas and facilities, and would require additional water supplied from the NCSD. The proposed Master Plan would be constructed in phases, and supplemental water would need to be secured prior to construction of the new sports fields and open turf areas. Based on consultation with the NCSD (Bruce Buell; December 17, 2008), no project can be given more than 20 percent of the annual water allocation per year. The NCSD proposes to purchase water from the City of Santa Maria, via a Waterline Inter-tie Project; however, the NCSD cannot guarantee water availability for the park. The NCSD may consider eliminating the existing MOU with the County and develop a new service agreement. Regarding existing water use, the NCSD conducted a water audit of the Nipomo Community Park in September 2007. Based on the results of the audit, the County could apply water conservation measures to existing irrigation systems, which would result in a savings of \$26,445 annually. The NCSD requests that the County implement recommended water conservation measures within existing facility areas and incorporate the use of recycled water to minimize the anticipated demand for new uses.

Mitigation/Conclusion. The EIR analysis shall include a review of existing documents and consultation with County and RWQCB staff regarding water quality. The EIR shall identify a baseline for existing water use, and assess future demand for water uses at the park, based on consultation with County Parks staff and the NCSD. Consultation with these agencies will also be necessary to identify appropriate water conservation measures and best available technology to reduce current and future water demands. In addition to technology, the EIR shall investigate the feasibility of the County's inclusion in the NCSD's water reclamation project, which would include connection to existing wastewater treatment facilities as a non-potable water source. Mitigation options shall focus on improving water conservation within existing areas, developing a "toolbox" of measures for use with future development.

15.	LAND USE - Will the project:	Inconsistent	Potentially Inconsistent	Consistent	Not Applicable
a)	Be potentially inconsistent with land use, policy/regulation (e.g., general plan [county land use element and ordinance], local coastal plan, specific plan, Clean Air Plan, etc.) adopted to avoid or mitigate for environmental effects?				
b)	<i>Be potentially inconsistent with any habitat or community conservation plan?</i>			\boxtimes	

15.	LAND USE - Will the project:	Inconsistent	Potentially Inconsistent	Consistent	Not Applicable
c)	Be potentially inconsistent with adopted agency environmental plans or policies with jurisdiction over the project?			\boxtimes	
d)	Be potentially incompatible with surrounding land uses?		\boxtimes		
e)	Other				

Setting. The park is located within the Nipomo urban area, and is generally surrounded by residential development. The park is within the Recreation land use category. The proposed project is not located within a Habitat Conservation Plan Area.

Impact. During preliminary scoping, the project was found to be generally consistent with applicable plans and policies including the County General Plan and Clean Air Plan. The proposed Master Plan is potentially inconsistent with Section 22.30.340 of the Land Use Ordinance, which states that amusement parks (including skate parks) shall not be located closer than 1,000 feet to a residential land use category. The proposed skate park element to the proposed project would be located approximately 120 feet from residential property boundaries to the east, and therefore does not comply with the ordinance requirement. We understand that County agencies are not required to comply with ordinance standards; however, we recommend disclosure of any potential ordinance and land use inconsistencies in the EIR. In addition, during the preliminary scoping, neighbors have raised concerns regarding the compatibility of this project with the existing park setting and surrounding neighborhood.

Mitigation/Conclusion. The Land Use section of the EIR shall include an analysis of existing and proposed uses, and identify potential inconsistencies or incompatibilities on both a site specific and area-wide level. Information from other applicable PEIR sections such as Transportation, Noise, and Aesthetics shall be used during preparation of this section.

16. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF Significant SIGNIFICANCE - Will the project:

Potentially

Impact can Insignificant Not & will be Impact Applicable mitigated

- Have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the a) habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below selfsustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of $[\mathbf{N}]$ California history or prehistory?
- Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? b) ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of

	probable future projects)		\boxtimes		
c)	Have environmental effects which beings, either directly or indirectly?	will cause substant	ial adverse el	fects on hu	ıman

For further information on CEQA or the county's environmental review process, please visit the County's web site at "www.sloplanning.org" under "Environmental Review", or the California Environmental Resources Evaluation System at "http://ceres.ca.gov/topic/env_law/ ceqa/guidelines/" for information about the California Environmental Quality Act.

Exhibit A - Initial Study References and Agency Contacts

The County Planning or Environmental Division has contacted various agencies for their comments on the proposed project. With respect to the subject application, the following have been contacted (marked with a \boxtimes) and when a response was made, it is either attached or in the application file:

Contacted	Agency	<u>Response</u>
\boxtimes	County Public Works Department	In File
\boxtimes	County Environmental Health Division	In File
\boxtimes	Air Pollution Control District	In File
\boxtimes	CA Department of Forestry	In File
\boxtimes	San Luis Obispo County Sheriff	In File
\boxtimes	Nipomo Community Services District	In File
\boxtimes	South County Advisory Council	In File
\boxtimes	Nipomo Parks Conservancy	In File
\boxtimes	Native American Heritage Commission	No Response
\boxtimes	San Luis Obispo County Chumash Council	No Response

** "No comment" or "No concerns"-type responses are usually not attached

The following checked ("X") reference materials have been used in the environmental review for the proposed project and are hereby incorporated by reference into the Initial Study. The following information is available at the County Planning and Building Department.

- \square Project File for the Subject Application County documents

 \boxtimes

 \square

- Airport Land Use Plans
- Annual Resource Summary Report
- **Building and Construction Ordinance**
- **Coastal Policies**
- 冈 Framework for Planning (Coastal & Inland)
- \square General Plan (Inland & Coastal), including all maps & elements; more pertinent

elements considered include:

- Agriculture & Open Space Element \boxtimes
- **Energy Element**
- \boxtimes **Environment Plan (Conservation,** Historic and Esthetic Elements)
- Housing Element
- $\overline{\mathbf{N}}$ Noise Element
- 团 Parks & Recreation Element
- \boxtimes Safety Element
- Land Use Ordinance
- Real Property Division Ordinance
- **Trails Plan**

- \square South County Area Plan and Update EIR
- \boxtimes South County Circulation Study Other documents
- \boxtimes Archaeological Resources Map
- Area of Critical Concerns Map
- Areas of Special Biological Importance Map
- \boxtimes **California Natural Species Diversity** Database
- \boxtimes Clean Air Plan
- Fire Hazard Severity Map
- $\overline{\boxtimes}$ Flood Hazard Maps
- \bowtie Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey for SLO County
- **Regional Transportation Plan**
- \boxtimes Uniform Fire Code
- \square Water Quality Control Plan (Central Coast Basin – Region 3)
- \square GIS mapping layers (e.g., habitat, streams, contours, etc.)

In addition, the following project specific information and/or reference materials have been considered as a part of the Initial Study:

Earth Systems Pacific. April 26, 1994. Soils Engineering Report Proposed Tract 1924. Firma. November 2004. Nipomo Community Park Master Plan. Morro Group, Inc. June 14, 2004. Nipomo Regional Park Constraints Analysis. Parker, John. June 21, 2002. Cultural Resource Investigation of the Nipomo Community Park.

Notice of Preparation Comment Letters



STATE OF CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR'S OFFICE *of* PLANNING AND RESEARCH STATE CLEARINGHOUSE AND PLANNING UNIT



CYNTHIA BRYANT

DIRECTOR

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER GOVERNOR

Notice of Preparation

November 19, 2009

To: Reviewing Agencies

Re: Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR SCH# 2009111067

Attached for your review and comment is the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Responsible agencies must transmit their comments on the scope and content of the NOP, focusing on specific information related to their own statutory responsibility, within 30 days of receipt of the NOP from the Lead Agency. This is a courtesy notice provided by the State Clearinghouse with a reminder for you to comment in a timely manner. We encourage other agencies to also respond to this notice and express their concerns early in the environmental review process.

Please direct your comments to:

Steve McMasters San Luis Obispo County County Government Center 976 Osos Street, Rm 200 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040

with a copy to the State Clearinghouse in the Office of Planning and Research. Please refer to the SCH number noted above in all correspondence concerning this project.

If you have any questions about the environmental document review process, please call the State Clearinghouse at (916) 445-0613.

Sincerely,

for: Scott Morgan Acting Director, State Clearinghouse

Attachments cc: Lead Agency

> 1400 10th Street P.O. Box 3044 Sacramento, California 95812-3044 (916) 445-0613 FAX (916) 323-3018 www.opr.ca.gov

Document Details Report State Clearinghouse Data Base

.

.

.

SCH# Project Title Lead Agency	2009111067 Nipomo Community Park Master Pla San Luis Obispo County	n Program EIR		
Туре	NOP Notice of Preparation			
Description	The NCPMP porposes approximately 15.96 acres of new recreational uses, 3.96 acres of new open play area (turf), and 7.57 acres of new infrastructure. Approximately 27.5 acres of existing undeveloped area and dirt trails would be converted to accommodate these new uses. The proposed project includes the expansion of the following existing uses: 4,000-square foot expansion of the library near Tefft Street; an additional 8,276 square feet of playground, including a play structure and open play area near Osage Street and Camino Caballo; 19,000-square foot expansion of the off-leash dog park; an additional 14,400 square feet of tennis courts; and additional three acres of paved and unpaved trails/walkways; restoration of spur trails; an additional four acres of open play area (turf). In addition, the NCPMP inlcudes an additional 10 acres of multi-use sports fields.			
Lead Agenc	y Contact			
Name	Steve McMasters			
Agency	San Luis Obispo County			
Phone	805-781-5096	Fax		
email				
Address	County Government Center			
	976 Osos Street, Rm 200			
City	San Luis Obispo	State CA	Zip 93408-2040	
Project Loc	ation			
County	San Luis Obispo			
City	Nipomo			
Region				
Cross Streets	Pomeroy Road and Tefft Street, Osa	ge Street and Tejas Streel		
Lat / Long				
Parcel No.	091-313-049, 091-313-050, -092-121-085 and 092-121-086			
Township	Range	Section	Base	
Proximity to):			
Highways	Hwy 101			
Airports				
Railways				
Waterways				
Schools				
Land Use				
Project Issues	Aesthetic/Visual; Biological Resources; Toxic/Hazardous; Noise; Public Services; Landuse; Traffic/Circulation; Water Quality; Water Supply			
Reviewing	Resources Agency; Department of C	Conservation; Cal Fire; Offi	ce of Historic Preservation; Department	
Agencies	of Parks and Recreation; Department of Water Resources; Department of Fish and Game, Region 4; Office of Emergency Services; Native American Heritage Commission; California Highway Patrol; Caltrans, District 5; Air Resources Board, Transportation Projects; Department of Toxic Substances Control: Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 3			
Date Received	11/19/2009 Start of Review	11/19/2009 End of	Review 12/21/2009	

NUP Distribution List

esources Agency

Resources Agency Nadell Gayou

- Dept. of Boating & Waterways Mike Sotelo
- California Coastal Commission Elizabeth A. Fuchs
- Colorado River Board Gerald R. Zimmerman
- Dept. of Conservation Rebecca Salazar
- California Energy Commission Eric Knight
- Cal Fire Allen Robertson
- Office of Historic Preservation Wayne Donaldson
- Dept of Parks & Recreation Environmental Stewardship Section
- Central Valley Flood Protection Board James Herota
- S.F. Bay Conservation & Dev't. Comm. Steve McAdam
- Dept. of Water Resources Resources Agency Nadell Gayou

Conservancy

ish and Game

- Depart. of Fish & Game Scott Flint Environmental Services Division
- Fish & Game Region 1 Donald Koch
- Fish & Game Region 1E Laurie Harnsberger

- Fish & Game Region 2 Jeff Drongesen Fish & Game Region 3 Charles Armor
- Fish & Game Region 4 Julie Vance
- Fish & Game Region 5 Don Chadwick Habitat Conservation Program

Fish & Game Region 6 Gabrina Gatchel Habitat Conservation Program

- Fish & Game Region 6 I/M Brad Henderson Inyo/Mono, Habitat Conservation Program
- Dept. of Fish & Game M
 George Isaac
 Marine Region

Other Departments

- Food & Agriculture Steve Shaffer Dept. of Food and Agriculture
- Depart. of General Services Public School Construction
- Dept. of General Services Anna Garbeff Environmental Services Section
- Dept. of Public Health Bridgette Binning Dept. of Health/Drinking Water

Independent Commissions.Boards

- Delta Protection Commission Linda Flack
- Office of Emergency Services Dennis Castrillo
- Governor's Office of Planning & Research State Clearinghouse
- Native American Heritage Comm. Debbie Treadway

Public Utilities Commission
 Leo Wong
 Santa Monica Bay Restoration

ハ

Guangyu Wang

County: SUM MIN MISHO

- State Lands Commission Marina Brand
- Lahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) Cherry Jacques

Business, Trans & Housing

- Caltrans Division of Aeronautics Sandy Hesnard
- Caltrans Planning Terri Pencovic
 - California Highway Patrol Scott Loetscher Office of Special Projects
 - Housing & Community Development CEQA Coordinator Housing Policy Division

Dept. of Transportation

- Caltrans, District 1 Rex Jackman
- Caltrans, District 2 Marcelino Gonzalez
 - Caltrans, District 3 Bruce de Terra
 - Caltrans, District 4 Lisa Carboni
- Caltrans, District 5 David Murray
 - Caltrans, District 6 Michael Navarro
- Caltrans, District 7 Elmer Alvarez

Caltrans, District 8 Dan Kopulsky Caltrans, District 9 Gayle Rosander

- Caltrans, District 10 Tom Dumas
- Caltrans, District 11 Jacob Armstrong
- Caltrans, District 12 Chris Herre

Cal EPA

Air Resources Board Airport Projects Jim Lemer Transportation Projects Douglas Ito Industrial Projects Mike Tollstrup **California Integrated Waste** Management Board Sue O'Learv State Water Resources Control Board **Regional Programs Unit Division of Financial Assistance** State Water Resources Control Board Student Intern, 401 Water Quality **Certification Unit** Division of Water Quality State Water Resouces Control Board Steven Herrera Division of Water Rights

- Dept. of Toxic Substances Control CEQA Tracking Center
- Department of Pesticide Regulation CEQA Coordinator

νννάτττΛΔ·(SCH# **Regional Water Quality Control** Board (RWQCB) **RWQCB 1** Cathleen Hudson North Coast Region (1) RWQCB 2 Environmental Document Coordinator San Francisco Bay Region (2) **RWQCB 3** Central Coast Region (3) **RWQCB4 Teresa Rodgers** Los Angeles Region (4) RWOCB 5S Central Valley Region (5) RWQCB 5F Central Valley Region (5) Fresno Branch Office **RWQCB 5R** Central Valley Region (5) Redding Branch Office RWQCB 6 Lahontan Region (6) **RWQCB 6V** Lahontan Region (6) Victorville Branch Office Colorado River Basin Region (7) Santa Ana Region (8) **RWQCB 9** San Diego Region (9) O Other

Last Updated on 11/16/2009

es d'ann 1949 e Ann 1949 e

ECEN EL

GLO CO PLAN & BLDG



SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Paavo Ogren, Director

County Government Center, Room 207 • San Luis Obispo CA 93408 • (805) 781-5252

Fax (805) 781-1229

email address: pwd@co.slo.ca.us

MEMORANDUM

November 20, 2009 Date:

- Ms. Ellen Carroll, Environmental Coordinator To: San Luis Obispo County Planning & Building Department
- Glenn Marshall, Development Services Engineer From:

Subject: Notice of Preparation - Nipomo Community Park Master Plan, San Luis Obispo County

Thank you for the opportunity to provide information on the Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the subject project. It has been reviewed by several divisions of Public Works, and this represents our consolidated response.

- 1. Contact person: Glenn Marshall, County Government Center Room 207, San Luis Obispo CA 93408. (805) 781-1596, gdmarshall@co.slo.ca.us.
- 2. County Public Works will review required public improvements including streets and utilities, as well as drainage and flood hazard, under the provisions of the Real Property Division Ordinance and the Land Use Ordinance.
- 3. For our use, the report must address project anticipated impacts to traffic and circulation, drainage and flood hazard. The Initial Study Summary-Environmental Checklist appears to adequately cover these topics.
- 4. A list of "Standard Conditions" is available from our office and available upon request. Minimum conditions would include road improvements, circulation improvements, drainage improvements, utility improvements, and maintenance requirements of the new improvements.
- 5. We do not have any alternative projects to suggest for evaluation.
- 6. Reasonably foreseeable Department projects, programs or plans in the area of this proposed development may include:
 - a. Ongoing scheduled maintenance operations within the public right of way.
 - b. US 101 and Tefft Street interchange Project Study Report (PSR).
 - c. Realignment and extension of Willow Road.
- 7. The following information may be relevant for consideration in the EIR:
 - a. San Luis Obispo County Public Improvement Standards.
 - b. County Traffic Impact Study Policies (revised 3/26/07)
 - c. County of San Luis Obispo July 2008 Pavement Report.
 - d. County of San Luis Obispo National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Phase II, Stormwater Management Program (County Code Section 8.68)
 - e. County Code (Title 22) Sections 22.52-Grading & Drainage, and 22.14.060-Flood Hazard Area

8. Public Works has no further comments on the Notice of Preparation.

Please provide us notification that the Draft EIR is available for review via the web and the related web address where the document may be viewed. If you have any questions or comments I can be contacted by phone at 805/781-1596, by email at (gdmarshall@co.slo.ca.us), or at the above address.

Cc: Frank Honeycutt, Transportation and Roads Division Manager

V:_DEVSERV Referrals_Referral Responses\EIRs\Nipomo Community Park\NOP response 20091120.doc

MEMORANDUM

San Luis Obispo County Department of Public Works • Utilities Division County Government Center, Room 207 • San Luis Obispo, California 93408 ph: (805) 781-5252 • fax: (805) 781-1229

Date:	November 25, 2009				
To:	Glenn Marshall, Development Services Engineer				
Cc:	Jill Ogren, Hydraulic Planning Engineer			·	
From:	Nola Engelskirger, Hydraulic Planning Staff Engineer	-			
SUBJECT:	Nipomo Community Park Master Plan EIR Drainage Comments				
					_

Glenn:

We have some general comments relevant to drainage and in accordance with the Nipomo Drainage and Flood Control Study prepared by RMC (April 2004).

The proposed community park is located at the corner of Pomeroy and Tefft Street. According to the 2004 Flood Study, there are no reported drainage issues in that specific area of the Nipomo Mesa.

The Mesa's typical problem includes water ponding at road intersections, road shoulders and on private property. Due to the undulating topography of the area, the Mesa was not planned with a centralized gravity driven storm water management system. Therefore, runoff must be directed to retention basins shared by a number of properties in larger land developments, or to small retention basins on each property.

In order to mitigate the typical drainage problems we are recommending that:

- 1. Development plans include analysis of existing drainage routes with grading plan submittals. Plans should identify where drainage routes currently exist and identify changes proposed in drainage due to site development.
- Drainage improvements should be planned with proposed development. Regardless of whether drainage problems exist prior to development, mitigation should be planned as not to increase the severity or frequency of problems. Such mitigation could include on-site retention/detention of run-off, thereby preventing the increase of runoff onto lower lying properties.
- 3. To control erosion, runoff from impervious surfaces should be collected and retained onsite, or released to the public right of way through a drainage system approved by the County Public Works Department. In general, the new development should achieve the following:
 - a. Increase vegetative ground cover, to the maximum extent possible, as a means of reducing stormwater runoff.
 - b. Install on-site natural drainage channels or detention basins to retain runoff from impervious surfaces prior to reaching the public right of way.
- 4. Divert runoff from impervious surfaces to landscaped areas, swales, or infiltration basins where water can percolate into the ground. This can greatly reduce runoff to streets.

Of course, all Public Works Standards and typical drainage conditions for new development should also be incorporated and adhered to by the project developers.

We understand that many of these comments may not be appropriate for preparation of the EIR and would be more appropriate at the time of future development, but wanted to provide them in advance to assist with any preliminary planning efforts.

Please contact me at 788-2100 if you have any guestions.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Arnold Schwarzenegger, Govemor

NATIVE AMERICAN HERITAGE COMMISSION

915 CAPITOL MALL, ROOM 364 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814 (916) 653-4082 (916) 657-5390 - Fax RECEIVED DEC - 7 2005 S.L.O. CO PLANNING M

November 30, 2009

Steve McMasters San Luis Obispo County County Government Center 976 Osos Street, Room 200 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040

RE: SCH#200911167 Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR: San Luis Obispo County.

Dear Mr. McMasters: :

The Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) has reviewed the Notice of Preparation (NOP) referenced above. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) states that any project that causes a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource, which includes archeological resources, is a significant effect requiring the preparation of an EIR (CEQA Guidelines 15064(b)). To comply with this provision the lead agency is required to assess whether the project will have an adverse impact on historical resources within the area of project effect (APE), and if so to mitigate that effect. To adequately assess and mitigate project-related impacts to archaeological resources, the NAHC recommends the following actions:

- ✓ Contact the appropriate regional archaeological Information Center for a record search. The record search will determine:
 - If a part or all of the area of project effect (APE) has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
 - If any known cultural resources have already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
 - If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
 - If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.
- ✓ If an archaeological inventory survey is required, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
 - The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measurers should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum, and not be made available for public disclosure.
 - The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional archaeological Information Center.
- ✓ Contact the Native American Heritage Commission for:
 - A Sacred Lands File Check. USGS 7.5 minute guadrangle name, township, range and section required.
 - A list of appropriate Native American contacts for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in the mitigation measures. <u>Native American Contacts List attached.</u>

Lack of surface evidence of archeological resources does not preclude their subsurface existence.

- Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of accidentally discovered archeological resources, per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) §15064.5(f). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American, with knowledge in cultural resources, should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
- Lead agencies should include in their mitigation plan provisions for the disposition of recovered artifacts, in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
- Lead agencies should include provisions for discovery of Native American human remains in their mitigation plan. Health and Safety Code §7050.5, CEQA §15064.5(e), and Public Resources Code §5097.98 mandates the process to be followed in the event of an accidental discovery of any human remains in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

Sincerely. Jancher

Katy Sanchez Program Analyst (916) 653-4040

CC: State Clearinghouse

Native American Contact San Luis Obispo County November 30, 2009

Beverly Salazar Folkes 1931 Shadybrook Drive Thousand Oaks, CA 91362 805 492-7255 (805) 558-1154 - cell folkes9@msn.com

Chumash Tataviam Ferrnandeño

Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians Vincent Armenta, Chairperson P.O. Box 517 Chumash Santa Ynez, CA 93460 varmenta@santaynezchumash. (805) 688-7997 (805) 686-9578 Fax San Luis Obispo County Chumash Council Chief Mark Steven Vigil 1030 Ritchie Road Chumash Grover Beach CA 93433 cheifmvigil@fix.net (805) 481-2461 (805) 474-4729 - Fax

Diane Napoleone and Associates Diane Napoleone 1433 Camino Trillado Chumash Carpinteria , CA 93013 805-684-4213

Julie Lynn Tumamait 365 North Poli Ave Chumash Ojai , CA 93023 jtumamait@sbcglobal.net (805) 646-6214 Santa Ynez Tribal Elders Council Adelina Alva-Padilla, Chair Woman P.O. Box 365 Chumash Santa Ynez, CA 93460 elders@santaynezchumash.org (805) 688-8446 (805) 693-1768 FAX

Lei Lynn Odom 1339 24th Street Chumash Oceano , CA 93445 (805) 489-5390 Randy Guzman - Folkes 655 Los Angeles Avenue, Unit E Moorpark , CA 93021 ndnRandy@gmail.com (805) 905-1675 - cell

Chumash Fernandeño Tataviam Shoshone Paiute Yaqui

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH# 2009111067 Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR: San Luis Obispo County.

Native American Contact San Luis Obispo County November 30, 2009

Coastal Band of the Chumash Nation Janet Garcia, Chairperson P.O. Box 4464 Chumash Santa Barbara CA 93140 805-964-3447 Salinan-Chumash Nation Xielolixii 3901 Q Street, Suite 31B Bakersfield CA 93301 xielolixii@yahoo.com

Salinan Chumash

408-966-8807 - cell

Mona Olivas Tucker 660 Camino Del Rey Arroyo Grande CA 93420 (805) 489-1052 Home (805) 748-2121 Cell Northern Chumash Tribal Council Fred Collins, Spokesperson 67 South Street San Luis Obispo CA 93401 (805) 801-0347 (Cell)

Matthew Darian Goldman 495 Mentone Chumash Grover Beach CA 93433 805-748-6913 Frank Arredondo PO Box 161 Chumash Santa Barbara Ca 93102 805-617-6884 ksen_sku_mu@yahoo.com

Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians Sam Cohen, Tribal Administrator P.O. Box 517 Chumash Santa Ynez , CA 93460 (805) 688-7997 (805) 686-9578 Fax

This list is current only as of the date of this document.

Distribution of this list does not relieve any person of statutory responsibility as defined in Section 7050.5 of the Health and Safety Code, Section 5097.94 of the Public Resources Code and Section 5097.98 of the Public Resources Code.

This list is only applicable for contacting local Native Americans with regard to cultural resources for the proposed SCH# 2009111067 Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR: San Luis Obispo County.



Patrick Hedges Sheriff-Coroner

1585 Kansas Avenue San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

December 3, 2009

TO: County of San Luis Obispo Department of Planning and Building 976 Osos St., Room 300 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 Attn: Ellen Carroll



- FROM: Chief Deputy Rob Reid San Luis Obispo County Sheriff's Department 1585 Kansas Avenue San Luis Obispo, California 93406 rreid@co.slo.ca.us 805-781-4542
- RE: Planning Referral Response / Public Service Utilities Sheriff Protection Project Name: Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program -EIR

PATROL AREA: South / COMMUNITY: Nipomo

Law enforcement needs for the unincorporated area of San Luis Obispo County are served by the Sheriff's Department. San Luis Obispo County encompasses 3615 Sq. miles of which sixty-six miles are incorporated (City) and served by police departments.

The South Patrol Station is located at 1681 Front Street, Oceano. The South Station serves the communities of Oceano, Nipomo, Huasna, rural Arroyo Grande, New Cuyama, and Lopez Lake. South Station deputies work in a demanding environment and handle a high volume of calls.

The California Highway Patrol (CHP) is primarily responsible for traffic-related calls along highways and streets in the unincorporated areas of the County. Unlike the Sheriff's Department, they will not investigate, take action, or respond to crimes in progress in residential, commercial, or industrial areas. They may respond upon request as back-up to the Sheriff's Department response, if available; however, the CHP does not normally provide police protection services. Their primary role is traffic enforcement.

Emergency response times for the South Station are dependent on where the patrol vehicles are in relation to a call, as well as the nature of the call. Estimated average response time to the project area is five to thirty minutes. Currently, the Sheriff's Department is understaffed, and with the cumulative impact of approved development, response times most likely will
increase. As there is already a need to expand police services in South County, the further development of this park area, and the addition of a community center, has the potential for a significant impact on Sheriff's Department patrol and related resources.

In an attempt to - forecast future needs for additional personnel, vehicles, equipment, and buildings, i.e., jail facilities, formulas are used to predict public safety needs:

Using a model by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), ** the need for new law enforcement can be projected. This model is based on the number of deputies to population per 1,000. The ratio of deputy to population has not kept pace with population growth for many years. Our current ratio is one deputy to 1140 citizens. This is not an acceptable ratio. A ratio of one deputy per 750 citizens would align our level of service with city police departments in the County.

As San Luis Obispo County grows, the Sheriff's Department must anticipate public safety needs. Funds required for operating and staffing expenses for the Sheriff's Department are derived from the General Fund, and are a budgetary matter to be determined by the Board of Supervisors on an annual basis. The Sheriff's Department, like other County services, i.e., fire and engineering, must petition funding for new personnel positions. Each project creates a law enforcement impact that should be addressed upon approval.

Any enterprise has the potential to generate the need for public safety response, and therefore impact Sheriff's Department resources. Because of the on-going budgetary issues, and the ratio of deputy to population, a beneficial approach to any new project, would be to incorporate the principles and practices of "Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design" (CPTED) while in the planning stages of the project.

The following suggestions incorporate CPTED practices:

- After hours access points to the park and community center should be protected with adequate security, however, admission is also necessary for emergency personnel, therefore, combinations to locks/lockboxes should be provided to Sheriff's Department Dispatch.
- Visible signage with hours of operation and any type of regulations should be strategically placed throughout the park, and properly maintained.
- Proper illumination is paramount inside structures, exterior doors, designated parking areas, entry and walkways. Not only is adequate lighting essential to deter property crime, but it is also vital for personal safety. Lights should be on timers, and a manual override is recommended in case of a greater need for light. Adequate exterior / interior lighting is a great deterrent to a would-be assailant, vandal or burglar. Because concern has been expressed regarding "spill-over" of park illumination, which might affect the ambient level of light in the nighttime sky, special care should be taken to have exterior lighting properly shielded.
- Key control for employees is essential, with accurate information indicating who has access to which areas of any structures or access points.

During the Construction of the Community Center:

• •

- The construction site should be temporarily fenced off, with signage indicating that the area is off limits to the general public.
- All construction equipment should be secured at the site after hours, with a complete recorded inventory kept on file.
- Adequate lighting of the construction area should be implemented.

Regarding the Design of the Community Center:

- Special care should be taken to avoid creating "hiding places" in alcoves or entry areas.
- A clear view of the exterior of the structure from the interior, and vice versa, would create an opportunity for several sets of eyes to observe any suspicious activity in either area.
- Sufficient lighting should be installed on the exterior and interior of the structure.
- All exterior doors should meet all safety requirements, should be solid core, and have adequate locks.

At such time as development occurs on this project, the builders are encouraged to contact the Sheriff's Department Crime Prevention Unit at (805) 781-4483, for assistance and to learn additional strategies that will make them less likely to be a target of criminal activity.

** FBI, Uniform Crime Reports (Law Enforcement Officers)

Shawna Scott

From: smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us

Sent: Saturday, December 12, 2009 1:11 PM

To: Shawna Scott

Subject: Fw: NOP for Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR

-----Forwarded by Steve McMasters/Planning/COSLO on 12/12/2009 01:10PM -----

To: "'smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us'" <smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us> From: "Hackett, Jeff" <JHackett@CIWMB.ca.gov> Date: 12/10/2009 03:52PM cc: 'Thea Tryon' <ttryon@waterboards.ca.gov>, "Friedlander, Randy" <RFriedlander@CIWMB.ca.gov> Subject: NOP for Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR

Hi Steve,

Attached is California Integrated Waste Management Board staff's comments on the subject NOP. If you have any questions regarding the comments, please contact me. If you have any trouble opening the attachment, let me know and I will fax or mail you a copy of the letter.

Sincerely,

Jeff Hackett, Supervisor

MSW Facilities and EA Inspection and Enforcement B

Compliance Evaluation and Enforcement Division

CA Integrated Waste Management Board

916.341.6413

jhackett@ciwmb.ca.gov

[Scanned @co.slo.ca.us]



CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD



1001 I Street, Sacramento, California 95814 • P.O. Box 4025, Sacramento, California 958124025 (916) 341-6000 • WWW.CIWMB.CA.GOV

MARGO REID BROWN CHAIR December 10, 2009 MBROWN@CIWMB.CA.GOV (916) 341-6051 Mr. Steve McMasters smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us SHEILA JAMES KUEHL SKUEHL@CIWMB.CA.GOV San Luis Obispo County (916) 341-6039 Department of Planning and Building 976 Osos St., Room 300 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040 JOHN LAIRD SUBJECT: Notice of Preparation (NOP) - Draft Environmental Impact Report, JLAIRD@CIWMB.CA.GOV Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR (916) 341-6010 Dear Mr. McMasters: CAROLE MIGDEN NOP for the proposed project and have the following comments: CMIGDEN@CIWMB.CA.GOV (916) 341-6024 • As stated in Section 7. – Hazards & Hazardous Materials, a historic dump/disposal site is present in the park. According to limited documentation on file at the CIWMB, the disposal site is noted as being one acre in size and operated from 1965-1972. However, there is no documentation on file at the **ROSALIE MULÉ** RMULE@CIWMB.CA.GOV CIWMB that describes the exact location, extent, or nature (e.g., types of waste (916) 341-6016 disposed, burn dump, etc.) of the disposal area. Although the exact extent of the disposal site is not well documented, CIWMB was previously informed that the disposal site is located on the southeastern portion of the park near the Nipomo Library. As a result, the former Local Enforcement Agency (San Luis Obispo County Environmental Health Department) and CIWMB required that the Nipomo Library be equipped with a continuous combustible/methane gas sensor system in 1996.

The closed disposal site is required to be maintained by the owner and is inspected by the CIWMB annually to evaluate compliance with applicable requirements of Title 27, California Code of Regulations (27 CCR), Chapter 3.

The project applicant must be informed that any proposed change in postclosure land use of the closed disposal site is required to be submitted to the CIWMB, Regional Water Quality Control Board, local air district and local land use agency for review and approval in accordance with 27 CCR Section 21190, excerpt below, and can be viewed on the CIWMB's web page at http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/Regulations/Title27/ch3sb5.htm#Article2.

California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) staff appreciates receipt of the



Via E-Mail

NOP – Nipomo Community Park Master Plan December 10, 2009 Page 2 of 3

• CIWMB staff supports the completion of a focused Phase One ESA and investigative test pits within the park as indicated in the NOP. Completion of such an investigation will assist the CIWMB in reviewing any subsequent proposed land use change(s) on or adjacent to the closed disposal site. The CIWMB's Closed, Illegal, and Abandoned Disposal Site Program web page includes information regarding site investigations of closed disposal sites, which can be reviewed at http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LEACentral/CIA/.

Please provide CIWMB staff with any subsequent documentation regarding the focused Phase One ESA and draft Environmental Impact Report for review and comment.

If you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please contact me at (916) 341-6413 or <u>jhackett@ciwmb.ca.gov</u>.

Sincerely,

Jeff Hackett, Supervisor MSW Facilities & EA Inspections & Enforcement B Compliance Evaluation and Enforcement Division

cc via e-mail:

Thea Tryon, Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board <u>ttryon@waterboards.ca.gov</u>

Excerpt from Title 27 CCR 21190:

21190. CIWMB - Postclosure Land Use. (T14:Section 17796)

(a) Proposed postclosure land uses shall be designed and maintained to:

(1) protect public health and safety and prevent damage to structures, roads, utilities and gas monitoring and control systems;

(2) prevent public contact with waste, landfill gas and leachate; and

(3) prevent landfill gas explosions.

(b) The site design shall consider one or more proposed uses of the site toward which the operator will direct its efforts, or shall show development as open space, graded to harmonize with the setting and landscaped with native shrubbery or low maintenance ground cover.

(c) All proposed postclosure land uses, other than non-irrigated open space, on sites implementing closure or on closed sites shall be submitted to the EA, RWQCB, local air district and local land use agency. The EA shall review and approve proposed postclosure land uses if the project involves structures within 1,000 feet of the disposal area, structures on top of waste, modification of the low permeability layer, or irrigation over waste.

(d) Construction on the site shall maintain the integrity of the final cover, drainage and erosion control systems, and gas monitoring and control systems. The owner or operator shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the EA that the activities will not pose a threat to public health and safety and the environment. Any proposed modification or replacement of the low permeability layer of the final cover shall begin upon approval by the EA, and the RWQCB.

NOP – Nipomo Community Park Master Plan December 10, 2009 Page 3 of 3

(e) Construction of structural improvements on top of landfilled areas during the postclosure period shall meet the following conditions:

(1) automatic methane gas sensors, designed to trigger an audible alarm when methane concentrations are detected, shall be installed in all buildings;

(2) enclosed basement construction is prohibited;

(3) buildings shall be constructed to mitigate the effects of gas accumulation, which may include an active gas collection or passive vent systems;

(4) buildings and utilities shall be constructed to mitigate the effects of differential settlement. All utility connections shall be designed with flexible connections and utility collars;

(5) utilities shall not be installed in or below any low permeability layer of final cover;

(6) pilings shall not be installed in or through any bottom liner unless approved by the RWQCB;

(7) if pilings are installed in or through the low permeability layer of final cover, then the low permeability layer must be replaced or repaired; and

(8) periodic methane gas monitoring shall be conducted inside all buildings and underground utilities in accordance with section 20933 of Article 6, of Subchapter 4 of this Chapter.

(f) The EA may require that an additional soil layer or building pad be placed on the final cover prior to construction to protect the integrity and function of the various layers of final cover.

(g) All on site construction within 1,000 feet of the boundary of any disposal area shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the following, or in accordance with an equivalent design which will prevent gas migration into the building, unless an exemption has been issued:

(1) a geomembrane or equivalent system with low permeability to landfill gas shall be installed between the concrete floor slab of the building and subgrade;

(2) a permeable layer of open graded material of clean aggregate with a minimum thickness of 12 inches shall be installed between the geomembrane and the subgrade or slab;

(3) a geotextile filter shall be utilized to prevent the introduction of fines into the permeable layer;

(4) perforated venting pipes shall be installed within the permeable layer, and shall be designed to operate without clogging;

(5) the venting pipe shall be constructed with the ability to be connected to an induced draft exhaust system;

(6) automatic methane gas sensors shall be installed within the permeable gas layer, and inside the building to trigger an audible alarm when methane gas concentrations are detected; and

(7) periodic methane gas monitoring shall be conducted inside all buildings and underground utilities in accordance with Article 6, of Subchapter 4 of this chapter (section 20920 et seq.).

Note:

Authority cited:

Sections 40502 and 43020, Public Resources Code; and Section 66796.22(d), Government Code.

Reference:

Sections 43021, 43103 and 44105, Public Resources Code; and Section 66796.22(d), Government Code.



December 17, 2009

Steve McMasters San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning and Building County Government Center San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

SUBJECT: APCD Comments Regarding Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan (NCPMP).

Dear Mr. McMasters,

Thank you for including the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) in the environmental review process. We have completed our review of the proposed project located in the unincorporated community of Nipomo, northwest of the Pomeroy Road and Tefft Street intersection, approximately one mile west of Highway 101. San Luis Obispo County Parks proposes to implement the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan which would result in the phased construction of the recreation facilities and related infrastructure over a 20-year timeframe. The proposed project consists of connected park and open space areas, approximately 159 acres in size, called Nipomo Community Park (NCP), which includes the Nipomo Native Garden and roughly 22 acres known as the Mesa Meadows Open Space.

The following are APCD comments that are pertinent to this project.

1. Contact Person:

Gary Arcemont Air Pollution Control District 3433 Roberto Court San Luis Obispo, CA 93401 (805) 781-5912

2. Permit(s) or Approval(s) Authority:

Portable equipment activities may require statewide registration or an APCD permit. Additionally, any future developments may require APCD permits and applicants may need to apply for an Authority to Construct. Please contact our Engineering Division at (805) 781-5912 for more information. Project Referral for Nipomo Park Master Plan EIR December 17, 2009 Page 2 of 5

Demolition and remodeling activities have potential negative air quality impacts, including issues surrounding proper demolition and disposal of asbestos containing material (ACM). Demolition and remodeling projects are subject to the requirements stipulated in the National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP), which includes but is not limited to: 1) notification requirements to the APCD, 2) asbestos survey conducted by a Certified Asbestos Inspector, and, 3) applicable removal and disposal requirements of identified ACM. Please contact the APCD Enforcement Division at 781-5912 prior to final approval of these types of projects by your agency.

Developmental Burning

Effective February 25, 2000, <u>the APCD prohibited developmental burning of vegetative</u> <u>material within San Luis Obispo County</u>. Under certain circumstances where no technically feasible alternatives are available, limited developmental burning under restrictions may be allowed. This requires prior application, payment of fee based on the size of the project, APCD approval, and issuance of a burn permit by the APCD and the local fire department authority. The applicant is required to furnish the APCD with the study of technical feasibility (which includes costs and other constraints) at the time of application. If you have any questions regarding these requirements, contact the APCD Enforcement Division at 781-5912.

3. Environmental Information:

The potential air quality impacts should be assessed in the EIR. This analysis should address both short-term and long-term emissions impacts (including traditional air pollutants and greenhouse gas emissions) and include the following information:

- a. A description of existing air quality and emissions in the impact area, including the attainment status of SLO County relative to State and Federal air quality standards and any existing regulatory restrictions to development. The most recent Clean Air Plan should be consulted for applicable information.
- A complete emission analysis should be performed on all relevant emission sources, using emission factors from the EPA document AP-42 "Compilation of Air Pollutant Emission Factors", the latest approved version of URBEMIS, EMFAC, OFF-ROAD or other approved emission calculator tools. The emissions analysis should include calculations for estimated emissions of all criteria air pollutants and toxic air contaminants released from the anticipated land use on a quarterly and yearly basis. Documentation of emission factors and all assumptions (i.e. anticipated land uses, average daily trip rate from trip generation studies, etc.) should be provided in an appendix to the EIR. The quantitative analysis should address criteria pollutants, greenhouse gases, toxics and fugitive dust from vehicles traveling to the park.

Project Referral for Nipomo Park Master Plan EIR December 17, 2009 Page 3 of 5

- c. The EIR should include a range of feasible alternatives to the proposed project that could effectively minimize air quality impacts. A thorough emissions analysis should be conducted for each of the proposed alternatives identified. The EIR author should contact the SLO County APCD if additional information and guidance is required. All calculations and assumptions used should be fully documented in an appendix to the EIR.
- d. Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solution Act of 2006 and California Governor Schwarzenegger Executive Order S-3-05 (June 1, 2005), both require reductions of greenhouse gases in the State of California. The Governor has recognized mitigation efforts will be necessary to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. In order to address these issues, greenhouse gas emissions should be evaluated in the EIR, and appropriate mitigation identified.
- e. If there is the potential to emit toxic or hazardous air pollutants, including diesel exhaust, especially in close proximity to sensitive receptors, impacts may be considered significant due to increased cancer risk for the affected population, even at very low levels of emissions. A risk assessment may be required to determine the potential level of risk. The SLO County APCD should be consulted on any project with the potential to emit toxic or hazardous air pollutants.

Pursuant to the requirements of California Health and Safety Code Section 42301.6 (AB 3205) and Public Resources Code Section 21151.8, subd. (a)(2), any new school or proposed industrial or commercial project site located within 1000 feet of a school must be referred to the SLO County APCD for review.

- f. A consistency analysis with the Clean Air Plan is required for a Program Level environmental review.
- g. A cumulative impact analysis should be performed to evaluate the combined air quality impacts of this project and impacts from existing and proposed future development in the area. This should encompass all planned construction activities within one mile of the project.
- h. The data analyses requested above should address local and regional impacts with respect to maintaining applicable air quality standards. Authors should consult the SLO County APCD to determine if a modeling analysis should be performed and included in the EIR.
- i. Any temporary construction impacts, such as fugitive dust and combustion emissions from construction and grading activities, should be quantified and mitigation measures proposed.
- j. The project site is located in a candidate area for Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA), which has been identified as a toxic air contaminant by the California Air Resources Board (ARB). Under the ARB Air Toxics Control Measure (ATCM) for Construction,

Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations, prior to any grading activities at the site, the project proponent shall ensure that a geologic evaluation is conducted to determine if NOA is present within the area that will be disturbed. If NOA is not present, an exemption request must be filed with the District. If NOA is found at the site, the applicant must comply with all requirements outlined in the Asbestos ATCM. This may include development of an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan and an Asbestos Health and Safety Program for approval by the APCD. Please refer to the APCD web page at http://www.slocleanair.org/business/asbestos.asp for more information or contact the APCD Enforcement Division at 781-5912. The EIR should indicate that a plan will be developed to comply with the requirements listed in the Air Resources Board's Asbestos ATCM for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations. The EIR should indicate that if naturally occurring asbestos is not present at the site an exemption request will need to be filed with the APCD.

k. Describe feasible mitigation measures to reduce air quality impacts from vehicle travel to the park.

If you would like to receive a copy of an example of a recommended format for the qualitative analysis section on air emissions impacts, contact the APCD Planning Division at 781-5912.

4. Permit Stipulations/Conditions:

It is recommended that you refer to the 2009 version of the "CEQA Air Quality Handbook" (the Handbook). If you do not have a copy, it can be accessed on the APCD web page (<u>www.slocleanair.org</u>) in the Business Assistance section, listed under Regulations, or a hardcopy can be requested by contacting the APCD. The Handbook provides information on mitigating emissions which should be referenced in the EIR.

5. Alternatives:

Any alternatives described in the EIR should involve the same level of air quality analysis as described in section 3 listed above.

6. Reasonably Foreseeable Projects, Programs or Plans:

The 2009 version of the APCD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook provides guidance for preparing the EIR.

7. Relevant Information:

As mentioned earlier, the Handbook should be referenced in the EIR for determining the significance of impacts and level of mitigation recommended.

Project Referral for Nipomo Park Master Plan EIR December 17, 2009 Page 5 of 5

8. Further Comments:

The EIR must address any activities that have the potential to produce air quality impacts to sensitive receptors in the area.

GENERAL COMMENTS

As a commenting agency in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review process for a project, the APCD assesses air pollution impacts from both the construction and operational phases of a project, with separate significant thresholds for each. <u>Please address the action</u> <u>items contained in this letter, with special attention to items that are highlighted by bold</u> <u>and underlined text</u>.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal. If you have any questions or comments, feel free to contact me at 781-5912.

Sincerely,

muy an

Gary Arcemont Air Quality Specialist

GJA/MAG/arr

cc: Tim Fuhs, Enforcement Division, APCD Karen Brooks, Enforcement Division, APCD

h:\plan\ceqa\project_review\3000\3002-2\3002-2.doc

NIPOMO COMMUNITY

BOARD MEMBERS JAMES HARRISON, PRESIDENT LARRY VIERHEILIG, VICE PRESIDENT MICHAEL WINN, DIRECTOR ED EBY, DIRECTOR BILL NELSON, DIRECTOR



SERVICES DISTRICT

STAFF

MICHAEL LEBRUN, INTERIM GENERAL MANAGER LISA BOGNUDA, FINANCE DIRECTOR JON SEITZ, GENERAL COUNSEL

148 SOUTH WILSON STREET POST OFFICE BOX 326 NIPOMO, CA 93444 - 0326 (805) 929-1133 FAX (805) 929-1932 Website address ncsd.ca.gov

December 22, 2009

Mr. Steve McMasters San Luis Obispo County Dept. Planning and Building 976 Osos St., Room 300 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040

RE: NOTICE OF PREPARATION – DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, NIPOMO COMMUNITY PARK MASTER PLAN

Dear Mr. McMasters:

Nipomo Community Services District (NCSD) appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the County's Notice of Preparation (NOTICE) pertaining to the Community Park Master Plan EIR. The Nipomo Community Park, and parks in general, represent a community asset and expression of community ideals. The District's comments specific to services provided currently, or in the future, follow.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The NOTICE incorrectly references a retired Water Service Agreement (page 1-15 and elsewhere). This Agreement was usurped when the Community Park annexed into the District in 1992 and became a 'regular' District customer. This means the Park, like all other regular customers, is no longer limited to the quantity of water it may use. However, the Community Park is one of the District's single largest customers. The District's 2007 water audit (Attached) of Park irrigation indicates a low (53%) efficiency. This means the Park is currently using <u>nearly twice as much water</u> as may be needed. Improvement in the Park irrigation system now and/or through implementation of the Master Plan is highly recommended and may significantly offset planned demand increases.

The District will work with County to improve irrigation and other water uses in the Park, now, and in the future as part of Master Plan implementation. While irrigation of open spaces is not a water use *necessity*, a well managed park



Nipomo Community Park DEIR NOP

irrigation system serving community recreation needs can serve as an important drought buffer. These non-necessary community uses can be accounted for during water planning and served during normal to above normal supply years. In turn, during drought periods and/or water emergency scenarios, these demands can be significantly curtailed to insure water remains available for community necessities (drinking, bathing, human waste conveyance, drinking, and the like).

WASTE WATER

Connection to the District's sewer collection system is possible. The Nipomo Library is currently connected to the system and collection lines run along the north side of Tefft Street. A standard District application for service and consultation with the District will be required. An estimate of wastewater quantity generated by planned facilities should be included in EIR. Percolation testing specific to areas where future wastewater leachfields might be located are recommended since percolation rates vary widely across the area.

WATER

Surface Water

Deep infiltration of rain water constitutes a significant fraction of local aquifer supply. Collection and infiltration of storm water from Park areas and, to the degree feasible, surrounding areas should be emphasized.

Water Supply

See comments above regarding current uses and irrigation efficiency. The District will require a significant improvement in irrigation efficiency as part of Master Plan implementation and consideration of any additional water service. Include an estimate of future water demands in the EIR.

In the future the District may have reclaimed water available for irrigation use. We recommend the County separate the Park water distribution system into an irrigation distribution system and a potable/interior distribution system near the current point of connection with District water. This would facilitate future connection of the irrigation system to a reclaimed source or dedicated irrigation well.

General Comments

In the Hazardous & Hazardous Materials section, the presence on an historic dump site at the park is noted. Historic abandoned waste sites pose a significant risk to water quality – specifically groundwater quality. Some years back, a well at Dana School, adjacent to the Park, tested high for arsenic. The source of the contamination was never identified. A thorough investigation of the dump site should be undertaken through EIR development.

2

Thank you again for this opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Nipomo Community Master Plan. If you should any questions, please call.

Sincerely,

NIPOMO COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT

Michael LeBrun

Michael LeBrun Interim General Manager

Enclosures

t:\services\parks\nop comment.doc

	Jan-Feb (Billed Mar)	Mar-Apr (Billed May)	May-Jun (Billed Jul)	Jul-Aug (Billed Sep)	Sep-Oct (Billed Nov)	Nov-Dec (Billed Jan+yr)	TotalCCF	AF	Gallons
Yr2004			6418	5929	3978	1562		1	
Yr2005	422	2210	4675	6539	4966	2706	21518	49.40	16,095,464.00
Yr2006	2102	413	4715	5853	5648	3127	21858	50.18	16,349,784.00
Yr2007	1681	3916	5982	5553	4987	4448	26567	60.99	19,872,116.00
Yr2008	486	4411	5776	6184	102	0	16959	38.93	12,685,332.00
Yr2009	3027	4448	5743	5240	4077				

Distribution Uniformity on Water Audit of four stations, August 2006: 53%

Translation:

 Almost half of the amount of water applied is wasted because of poor distribution uniformity.
Almost 2-times the water actually needed by the plants must be applied because the application components (sprinkler heads, etc.) are only 53% of the efficiency needed to apply water uniformly to all parts of the landscape under irrigation.





SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Paavo Ogren, Director

County Government Center, Room 207 • San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 • (805) 781-5252

Fax (805) 781-1229

email address: pwd@co.slo.ca.us

December 22, 2009

MEMORANDUM

TO:

Mary Whittlesey, Solid Waste Coordinator MWi2/2009 FROM:

SUBJECT: Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR NOP

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation for the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR.

1) In the paragraph on Solid Waste, page 21 of the NOP, there is the statement "County is currently pursuing alternative landfill sites." This is not correct. The Cold Canyon Landfill is undergoing an EIR due to its expansion plans (DRC2005-01740). There are no siting studies underway for another landfill site.

2. In that same paragraph, the NOP also refers to a Table 6 for the landfill capacities. I could not locate the Table in my packet so I cannot verify any numbers. If it would be helpful for me to verify the estimated capacities, please let me know.

3. A note about grading in the park: as noted in Section 7- Hazards & Hazardous Materials, an informal dump site exists in the park. Not knowing the extent or type of materials buried, the 'extensive' grading (p 7) that may be needed to provide multi-use fields should be approached with obvious caution. It may even be necessary to map and remove the disposed waste (hazardous and non-hazardous) from its current location and take it to a properly permitted disposal facility. There may be funds from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB.ca.gov) or the USEPA (EPA.gov) to help with such a 'cleanup'. Having the APCD and the Environmental Health Division of the Health Agency involved will also provide appropriate expertise.

I hope these comments are helpful. Thank you for bringing the project to my attention.

File: SW 2.3 Comments - Environmental Review /Planning Department Development Projects



SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

Paavo Ogren, Director

County Government Center, Room 207 • San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 • (805) 781-5252

Fax (805) 781-1229

email address: pwd@co.slo.ca.us

December 22, 2009

MEMORANDUM

TO:

Mary Whittlesey, Solid Waste Coordinator M Win 2009 FROM:

SUBJECT: Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR NOP

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation for the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR.

In the paragraph on Solid Waste, page 21 of the NOP, there is the statement 1) "County is currently pursuing alternative landfill sites." This is not correct. The Cold Canyon Landfill is undergoing an EIR due to its expansion plans (DRC2005-01740). There are no siting studies underway for another landfill site.

2. In that same paragraph, the NOP also refers to a Table 6 for the landfill capacities. I could not locate the Table in my packet so I cannot verify any numbers. If it would be helpful for me to verify the estimated capacities, please let me know.

3. A note about grading in the park: as noted in Section 7- Hazards & Hazardous Materials, an informal dump site exists in the park. Not knowing the extent or type of materials buried, the 'extensive' grading (p 7) that may be needed to provide multi-use fields should be approached with obvious caution. It may even be necessary to map and remove the disposed waste (hazardous and non-hazardous) from its current location and take it to a properly permitted disposal facility. There may be funds from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB.ca.gov) or the USEPA (EPA.gov) to help with such a 'cleanup'. Having the APCD and the Environmental Health Division of the Health Agency involved will also provide appropriate expertise.

I hope these comments are helpful. Thank you for bringing the project to my attention.

File: SW 2.3 Comments - Environmental Review /Planning Department Development Projects

SLUUNTY PLANNING/BUILDING DEPT

2009 DEC 22 PH 1: 14



P.O. Box 2042 Nipomo CA 93444

Mr. Steve McMasters County of San Luis Obispo Department of Planning & Building 976 Osos Street, Rm. 300 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040

Dear Mr. McMasters

The Nipomo Parks Conservancy is pleased with this opportunity to provide public comment on the Notice of Preparation -- Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan dated November 17, 2009.

We find this Notice of Preparation to be a useful tool to guide the preparation of the Environmental Impact Report for the Master Plan. Unfortunately, the environmental impacts from this enormous development proposed for the Nipomo Community Park have not been adequately addressed in the Notice of Preparation. For the reasons outlined below, we believe that the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that additional material be provided for the Environmental Impact Report.

Project Description Inadequate. The Project Description is insufficient to provide the details for thorough environmental impact analysis. Since the Master Plan was described in 2007 (and not updated for this Notice of Preparation), several significant changes have been conceptualized, but not described.

• There is a notion for widening Osage Road that is described simply but inadequately by a single bullet point. Justification for the "required" change is anecdotal, vague, and unsupported.

Layout details for new trails adjacent to Osage Road are lacking.

• Designation of a pre-school as "temporary" neither explains nor implies the impact of assigning this designation. In addition, previous construction of the pre-school within the park without a CEQA environmental determination (including public comment) should be addressed and at least be subject to a legal environmental determination if its existence in the park should be allowed to continue.

December 22, 2009

 Restroom, kitchen, and shower room facilities are not thoroughly or accurately quantified. These details are required to address the wastewater disposal requirements, impacts, and mitigations.

• The water demand is not specified. A demand analysis is crucial to the analysis of project improvements, impacts, and mitigations.

We expect that a more thorough Project Description and answers to the issues we present in our comments to the Initial Study Checklist will help make the Environmental Impact Report a useful disclosure document for the decision makers.

Project Alternatives. While the Project Description and Initial Study Checklist did not address Project Alternatives, we choose this opportunity to suggest guidelines for the CEQArequired alternatives that must be presented in the EIR.

1. Community Distributed Facilities Alternative - This alternative would locate the community center/gymnasium, swimming pool, and skateboard park outside the current park boundaries to other community areas such as near Nipomo High School. This option would eliminate most of the traffic and circulation mitigations whose costs will likely make the development of additional park facilities unfeasible. All of the Project Objectives could be met with this alternative.

2. Resource Neutral Alternative - This alternative would require no additional water demand or wastewater loading. Developments requiring additional water (additional playing fields, showers, etc.) could be eliminated or traded by removing other irrigated areas in the park. Additional wastewater production could be reduced by eliminating facilities requiring kitchen related wastewater, showers, and restrooms. While all the overly ambitious Project Objectives may not be met by this alternative, realistic resource availability may require this alternative as a feasible solution. Concurrently, the reduced facilities and associated reduced visitor population may eliminate the perceived, but not yet justified, requirement for off-site road enhancements.

Reduced Resource Demand Alternative - This alternative would demand less water than current use. Developments requiring additional water (additional playing fields, showers, etc.) could be scaled back in conjunction with removing some irrigated areas in the park. Water conservation in the existing park would also solve the irrigation waste observed in studies. While all the overly ambitious Project Objectives may not be met by this alternative, realistic resource availability may require this alternative as the only feasible solution. Concurrently, the reduced facilities and associated reduced visitor population may eliminate the perceived, but not yet justified, requirement for off-site road enhancements.

4. No Project/Reduced Impact Alternative - While this alternative meets few of the Project Objectives, its implementation, with a badly needed water conservation program, could maintain the park as a sustainable community resource water rationing is required.

Sincerely yours,

Atany 3 Wals

Harry Walls Nipomo Parks Conservancy



P.O. Box 2042 Nipomo CA 93444

COMMENTS to the NIPOMO COMMUNITY PARK MASTER PLAN ED05-225 Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) --Notice of Preparation (Dated November 17, 2009)

Submitted by Nipomo Parks Conservancy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Definitions	4	
Comments on the Project Description	5	
Comments of the Existing Setting	7	
Comments on the Initial Study Checklist	8	
12. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION	8	
13. WASTEWATER	10	
14. WATER	12	
15. LAND USE	15	
Appendices	19	

•

•

- DATE: December 22, 2009
- TO: Mr. Steve McMasters County of San Luis Obispo Department of Planning & Building 976 Osos Street, Rm. 300 •San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040
- SUBJECT: Nipomo Park Master Plan, Initial Study dated September 27, 2007

This letter is submitted in response to the Notice of Preparation -- Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan dated November 17, 2009. Pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the public review period stipulated by the lead agency ends December 23, 2009. This response is being filed in a timely manner.

The following information is provided in response to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) cover letter, however we are also providing additional comments to the Project Description and Initial Study to assist you in providing a thorough (EIR).

- 1. NAME OF CONTACT PERSON. Harry Walls, P.O. Box 2042 Nipomo CA 93444, <u>harryfwalls@sbcglobal.net</u>, (805) 929-6085.
- 2. PERMIT(S) or APPROVAL(S) AUTHORITY. Not Applicable.
- 3. ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION. See attached comments.
- 4. PERMIT STIPULATIONS/CONDITIONS. Not Applicable.
- 5. ALTERNATIVES. See attached comments.
- 6. REASONABLY FORSEEABLE PROJECTS, PROGRAMS or PLANS. Not Applicable.
- 7. RELEVANT INFORMATION. See attached comments.
- 8. FURTHER COMMENTS. See attached comments.

Definitions

The term "County Parks" as used herein shall be construed as a reference to the County of San Luis Obispo General Services Department Parks Division.

The term "Proponent" as used herein shall be construed as a reference to County Parks and its staff, agents, and representatives.

The term "Initial Study" as used herein shall be construed to mean the document prepared by the Proponent setting forth a development plan for Nipomo Community Park, entitled "County Parks Nipomo Community Park Master Plan," signed November 16, 2009, and identified by Project Number ED05-225. The term "Project" shall be construed as a reference to the particulars of the park development plan described by Proponent in the Initial Study.

The term "CEQA" as used herein shall be construed as a reference to the California Environmental Quality Act and its various subdivisions, as promulgated in California Public Resources Code §§21000 et seq.

The term "NOP" as used herein shall be construed as a reference to the Notice of Preparation – Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Nipomo Community Park Master Plan dated November 17, 2009.

"We," "us," and "our" as used herein refers to the Nipomo Parks Conservancy, the submitter of this comment document.

Comments on the Project Description

In paragraph 1.1 (Project Location) the 137-acre park parcel and the 22acre Mesa Meadows open space area are described. Since there is nothing in the Master Plan involving any development in the Mesa Meadows area, its area should not be used in any calculations regarding the percentage of area that the Master Plan development impacts.

Paragraph 1.2.4 (Project Changes Since 2007) lists five bullet points describing the changes proposed since the release of the original 2007 Initial Study document. Beyond these bullet points, there appear to be no further details of the changes. At a NOP informational meeting on December 1, 2009, the audience was told that there was no additional documentation detailing the changes. More detailed information (including layouts, dimensions, sight lines, grading implications, drainage requirements, etc.) about the Osage Road improvements, modification to proposed trail locations and paving, and the privately-owned-and-operated supposedly "temporary" pre-school is required to adequately assess the potential environmental impact of these changes to the Master Plan.

In the Proponent's "Scoping Meeting Notes" dated December 1, 2009, which can be found on the San Luis Obispo County' Parks website at http://www.slocountyparks.com/information/nip scoping mtg notes.pdf, County Parks employee Jan Di Leo is quoted as telling a member of the public that "Temporary means the pre-school is not permitted." If that is the case, then the pre-school is being operated illegally. She went on to say that how long it will remain in the park "depends on whether the preschool will be included in the community center plans." In fact, the pre-school has been operating in the park since the summer of 2004...it has already been there more than five years, and it appears that County Parks has always intended that this facility would be permanent, regardless of the community's desires or priorities. This assertion is based on the rather fact that County Parks signed a contract in 2001 in which it would allow a private group, Nipomo Area Recreation Association (NARA), to build a "a large recreation center" and a pre-school on public park land.¹ This lease, which we believe is unlawful, is discussed further in Section 15 of this Response - ("Land Use: Unlawful Diversion of Park Land, Misappropriation of Public Funds")

Paragraph 1.4.1 (Existing Facilities) - The potential environmental impacts of the existing "temporary" pre-school needs to be analyzed as though it does not yet exist, since no environmental determination (required by CEQA) was ever made when the County allowed it to be constructed in the Park outside any Master Plan. It must also be treated as a permanent fixture rather than minimized or dismissed as a "temporary" facility, and appropriate mitigations, including the road impact mitigation fees described in Section 12 below must be applied. The

¹ A copy of this contract is found in Appendix B of this response.

"temporary" designation is totally misleading to the factual requirements of an EIR. This facility has been in full operation for five years, with no specified plan to move its location.

The park area proposed for development in the Master Plan is 137 acres (see 1.1 Project Location). If 15 acres is covered with existing recreation and infrastructure, that leaves 122 acres remaining, not 130 acres.

Paragraph 1.4.3.1 (Access) The road widening of Osage needs further description. The development threshold for the requirement to be consistent with County Road Standard A-1(d) must be defined. Future definition of a threshold is not permitted under CEQA. The dimensioned layout of the widened road needs to be shown, as it appears that the cuts and fills required on the adjacent residential properties would encroach on those properties. Moreover, the layout of the paved multi-use trail needs to be shown as it may require additional cuts in the steeply inclined slopes in the park which are populated with 50-100 year-old Coast Live Oak trees and native vegetation plantings that mitigated a previous environmental impact.

Paragraph 1.4.4.2 (Utility Infrastructure Additions and Maintenance) The description of the septic systems is incomplete. The existing wastewater disposal should include and describe the sewage from the "temporary" pre-school. It should further be noted that the restrooms in the pre-school facility are "dedicated" solely to the pre-school children and staff and, as dictated by State Health and Safety codes. These restrooms may not be used in any manner by the users of other nearby facilities, other park-goers, or the public at large.

In addition what is described, the proposed project will require wastewater disposal from restrooms in the Community Center, Gymnasium, Swimming Pool, and from the commercial kitchen in the Community Center, the showers in the Gymnasium and showers at the Swimming Pool. Not described are any restrooms required for other facilities such as the skate park, remote Osage/Camino Caballo playground, and maintenance buildings.

Paragraph 1.5.1 (Project Phasing and Funding) The Master Plan, as it presently exists, is not updated to adequately include the changes briefly mentioned in paragraph 1.2.4. Any construction costs in the outdated (2003) document must be revised to reflect 2010 costs and the additional costs of the changes in 1.2.4.

Comments on the Existing Setting

The Initial Study references the Residential Suburban Land Use Category, yet no property with this zoning designation is included in the proposed development. While Mesa Meadows is zoned Residential Suburban, no development is being proposed in that area. Mesa Meadows is not included in EXISTING USES of the proposed development.

In the Project Description (1.1 Project Location) the two areas discussed total 159 acres, not 157 acres. Since no development is proposed in the 22 acres of Mesa Meadows, the correct area that could face environmental impact is only 137 acres.

If widening Osage road and other traffic and circulation changes are to be part of the project, their area should be added as well as the area of any private property facing encroachment from cuts and fills.

Comments on the Initial Study Checklist

12. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

Osage Road Widening - The project description referred to widening Osage Road to 34 feet, from its present 22 feet (curb-to-curb) width. Osage Road is currently confined between asphalt curbs from Camino Caballo to approximately 1,100 feet southward. The curbs define the limit of travel and provide drainage control. Since the feasibility of such an expansion can not be determined from the inadequate description of such a development, a more detailed study will be required as part of the EIR. A fully dimensioned grading plan is required to show the feasibility of the widening, since there are steep slopes adjacent the current road. The grading plan should also show the vegetation removal requirements.

On the east side of Osage the park has steep rising and falling slopes on the park property. Widening Osage to make a 34-foot width will require fill near Camino Caballo, and deep cuts south of Camino Roble. Such grading will disturb or destroy native plants including ancient Coast Live Oaks and manzanitas planted to mitigate the environmental impact of the development of the Mesa Meadows neighborhood. Further widening and cuts on the east side will be required if the paved walkway in the park adjacent Osage is to be a safe distance from motor vehicle traffic.

On the west side of Osage, four residences will require cuts and fills that will both fill in existing, County mandated drainage swales and cut into old-growth Coast Live Oaks and a previous environmental mitigation plantings. Maintaining the County standard 2:1 cut/fill requirement will require earth moving onto private property, and likely onto existing homes.

The EIR should describe the effects of the cuts and fills on the following residential parcels:

091-431-015 (cuts)

091-431-016 (fills, effect on drainage, interference with fire hydrant, encroachment of property, removal of at least two 50+ year-old Coast Live Oaks)

091-431-030 (cuts and fills, effect on drainage, encroachment of property) 091-431-029 (cuts, encroachment of property, removal of at least one 50+ year-old Coast Live Oak)

In addition, the widening will require removal of the curbs that currently act as drainage conduits for the steep Osage Road slope. A complete new drainage strategy for this 1,100-foot road section will be required.

The requirement to change a relatively newly constructed Osage Road requires justification beyond "widening for consistency." The justification must be related to the environmental impact of the park improvements. When this road

was approved, prior to the home construction in the late 1990s these standards might more logically have been applied. It is additionally questionable why a requirement to make "improvements" to Osage Road exists. None of the developments in the Master Plan require any entrances or exits via Osage Road. In fact, only two roads, Pomeroy and Tefft will access the park, nearly one mile from any Osage Road pavement.

Traffic Generated by Group C Projects and Road Impact Fees - In the Proponent's (2007) *Draft Negative Declaration*, Section 12 (Transportation/Circulation) we find on page 32: "The Public Works Department determined that major road improvements would be required prior to construction and operation of any high-traffic generating facility, including the pre-school and administration building..." (Richard Marshall; March 7, 2006)." Yet, as previously noted, County Parks has already allowed a private group to set up and operate a pre-school in the park. It has been operating outside of any Master Plan since 2004, and during this time, County Parks, while obviously aware of its obligation, has consistently ignored the requirement that it complete major road improvements prior to construction and operation of this facility.

In the *Draft Negative Declaration*, again on page 35, the Proponent claims the pre-school and administration building will "generate approximately 4.48 ADT (average daily trips) per student (Richard Marshall, County Public Works Dept.; June 1, 2005). Based on the size of the proposed facility, an assumption of 15 students was used."

We believe that the Proponent dangerously underestimated the number of students served in its "assumption of 15 students." The Proponent certainly knows or should know the true number of children served at the pre-school which it permitted, as well as how many children were historically served at the pre-school's former location on Frontage Road. By understating this figure, the Proponent denies the County the substantial impact fees necessary to mitigate the severe and chronic road impacts which residents of the community would be forced to endure as a direct consequence of this project.

The minutes of the South County Advisory Council's January 23, 2006, meeting reflect that a presentation was given by Becky Crowe, who introduced herself as NARA's new executive director: "In response to an audience question, she stated that Lil Bits Preschool currently serves about 30 children, and 15 others are scattered around in other locations." We understand that the existing "temporary" pre-school has a capacity of 40 children, and at its previous site on Frontage Road, the pre-school served over 100 children. We must therefore reasonably conclude that the pre-school, at the very least, will serve 40 children, and if given permanent status, will likely return to its historic population of 100 or more children.

Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Comments on Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) -- Notice of Preparation

On page 35-37 of the Proponent's *Draft Negative Declaration*, Table 6 shows that the pre-school and NARA administration building are Group C projects which will "generate a significant amount of project-specific traffic, and would also contribute to the cumulative congestion of the Nipomo area." County Parks is required to complete major road improvements and contribute to the Area 1 Traffic Program, *prior* to implementing any of the Group C projects. These improvements would logically be required on the Pomeroy and Tefft entrances and exits.

On page 38, we find that County Parks would be required to pay \$4,510 for each weekday peak hour traffic trip generated by the facilities listed in Groups B and C which includes the pre-school and administration building.) Table 8 shows that County Parks' share of road impact fees arising from the preschool and administration building – based on its underestimated assumption of 15 students – would be calculated as follows: 6.72 Weekday Peak Hour ADT trips, multiplied by \$4,510 per trip, equals \$30,308 in road impact mitigation fees.

In reality, given that the "temporary" pre-school facility serves up to 40 children, and the historic pre-school population is 100 children, these impact fees should be calculated as shown below. We note that practically all of the weekday trips would consist of parents dropping off children on their way to work, and then picking up their children on the way home from work, both trips occurring in most cases during peak traffic hours. We also note that the \$4,510 per trip number is now obsolete, and the current road impact fee for 2010 is \$5,133.

_ At a minimum, 40 students, each generating two Weekday Peak Hour trips per day, would total 80 peak hour trips, multiplied by \$5,133 per trip, for a total of \$410,640 in road impact mitigation fees.

_ Based on the pre-school's historic population of 100 students, each generating two Weekday Peak Hour trips per day, would total 200 peak hour trips multiplied by \$5,133 per trip, for a total of \$1,026,600 in road impact fees.

In addition to the foregoing traffic computations, additional weekday trips by pre-school staff and NARA employees staffing the proposed administrative building must also be calculated and properly assessed. Likewise, potential new clients, vendors, state and local regulators, public service accesses, and other traffic likely to occur in the course of doing routine business at the facilities must also be calculated and added to the above road impact mitigation fees.

13. WASTEWATER

Wastewater Treatment - The wastewater treatment requirements of the park expansion plan cannot be determined from the Project Description. The addition of recreation center/teen center/preschool/ gymnasium/commercial kitchen/amphitheatre/office buildings, and more than 400 new parking spaces, as

well as the Proponent's expectation that gatherings of up to 2,000 concurrent park users would be a regular, ongoing occurrence, clearly implies that significant toilet additions and wastewater treatment facilities will be required to handle the peak demand. Only two additional restrooms are described. This hardly seems adequate to serve up to 2,000 visitors -- or even a crowd half that size. Yet, the Proponent continues to assert, incorrectly, in the NOP (pg. 26) that the proposed Master Plan will add "two additional restrooms to serve park visitors."

When considering the various facilities described in the Initial Study, it is clear two additional restrooms would be utterly inadequate. State mandated licensing criteria for preschools require that separate restrooms be provided for children and adults. These restrooms must be dedicated; that is, use of these restrooms by the public is not allowed. Likewise, health codes require that a commercial kitchen must have bathrooms for the use of employees and the public. The community center will be required to provide restrooms for its patrons; the gymnasium will need public separate restrooms and showers for male and female sporting participants. So, in reality, eight restroom facilities would be required to support the proposed amenities -- in addition to those needed for the proposed expansion to serve the public throughout the remainder of the park. Specific details about the location of these restrooms, whether some or all of them will be required to be ADA-compliant, how the considerable effluent and other wastewater from these facilities will be disposed of, whether quasicommercial activities such as those proposed here can be safely (or legally) use a septic system or "porta-potties." A thorough analysis of the sewage loading is necessary in order to adequately evaluate the potential impacts and determine the appropriate mitigations.

The Initial Study suggests that wastewater disposal will be handled by a system of septic tanks and leach fields that would supplement the existing septic systems installed in the park or a connection to the Nipomo Community Services District (NCSD) sewer system. The NCSD Water and Sewer Master Plan recently published provides for the community's sewer requirements through 2030. No treatment of park sewage was requested in the development of that plan. The ability of the recently approved Southland Wastewater Treatment Plant to process the additional park sewage will require analysis by the NCSD.

The Proponent suggests that existing soils and percolation data from a nearby housing development (Mesa Meadows) can generally be applied to the vicinity of the Community Park. However, any restrooms and leach fields serving the Park would be well over a quarter-mile from Mesa Meadows. A geotechnical analysis and percolation data will be required for each specific site where a leach field is planned.

Title 19 of the San Luis Obispo County Code promulgates new procedures for sewage disposal systems and is currently in draft form. For leach fields, it

requires exploratory borings that "... extend to a minimum depth of ten (10) feet below the bottom of the proposed disposal system so as to determine the depth of the water table, bedrock, and/or impervious material." This analysis must be performed at the site of the proposed disposal system, not taken from data collected from a housing development nearly a quarter-mile away. There is no evidence presented that these exploratory borings have been made to support the claim that some unspecified site in the Community Park may be suitable for wastewater disposal for an unspecified number of visitors.

14. WATER

Water Availability - One of the most critical deficiencies of the Initial Study is the failure to project a water demand for the Master Plan. While historic water use was discussed, it is not a useful topic for a Master Plan with significant increased demands from a diminishing resource. A thorough and detailed water demand must be provided by the EIR as well as alternative project configurations that will require significantly less water in the likely condition of less water availability than today.

The Nipomo Mesa is a plateau in south San Luis Obispo County with elevations up to 300 feet above mean sea level. The only source of water for the Nipomo Mesa area is from wells tapping the aquifer beneath. The aquifer is replenished primarily from rainwater that percolates into the sandy soil. There are no rivers, creeks, reservoirs, or pipelines as other viable sources for the Mesa water users.

Water "stored" in the saturated sands beneath the Nipomo Mesa Subarea is found at levels from 200 feet above to 150 feet below mean sea level. "Stored" is a misleading term, because the water above sea level migrates out of the elevated area to the lower adjacent off-mesa territory. A fractional amount of water flows into the Subarea from adjacent areas, where the water table is higher. It is important that the net groundwater in storage (GWS) be maintained above sea level to prevent seawater intrusion, and cause permanent contamination of the aquifer.

Various studies² have concluded that the annual amount of water that can be extracted without a net reduction in the GWS is between 4,800 and 6,000 acre-feet per year (AFY). Over the long term, continuous extraction beyond this "safe yield" will drive the GWS below zero, creating the conditions conducive to seawater intrusion. Recent measurements in test wells north of the Nipomo Mesa show evidence of seawater intrusion subsequent to the local water table being pumped below sea level. This "canary in the mine" serves as a warning to

^{2 •}WATER RESOURCES OF THE ARROYO GRANDE - NIPOMO MESA AREA, California Department of Water Resources, 2002, p. 154

[•]NIPOMO MESA GROUNDWATER RESOURCE STUDY, S. S. Papadopulos & Associates Inc., March 2004, p. 13

[•]Resource Capacity Study -Water Supply in the Nipomo Mesa Area, SLO County Dept. of Planning and Building, August 2004, p. 13, Table 8

conditions likely to develop in the Nipomo Mesa if water extraction beyond the safe yield continues.

Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) was commissioned by the NCSD to establish GWS trigger points for water rationing in the event that conditions for seawater intrusion were imminent. In a technical memorandum³, they projected future GWS levels based on historic rainfall, its effect on well levels, and different water extraction scenarios. A rainfall pattern (and its resultant effect on well levels) identical to that experienced from 1975 to 2007 was overlaid on predicted water extractions to project GWS in the future. A result of this study was projections of depletion of the GWS to and below zero.

As expected, soon after the safe yield of 6,000 AFY extraction (or consumptive use) was reached (between 1995 and 2005) the GWS established an unmistakable downward trend. Different accelerations in water use (growth rates) and net rainfall were examined with different rates of reduction in GWS, but the GWS went below zero in all cases.

The table on page 4 of the "technical memorandum" summarizes the number of years until there is no GWS above sea level. In cases with the annual growth rates between zero and 4% table shows that the GWS reaches zero in 12 years (from 2008). This demonstrates that even a growth moratorium would not prevent the total depletion. If a 50% water conservation were immediately implemented by customers of the four the Nipomo Mesa water purveyors, the GWS reaches zero in 14 years in all growth scenarios including the no-growth case.⁴ Of course, a rainfall pattern drier than the 32-year historical pattern would accelerate the depletion.

The Nipomo Mesa has been at a Level III Water Resource Severity since 2003. This means that the wells providing Nipomo Mesa with water are pumping more water than is being naturally replaced. This creates a water deficit, which increases yearly. Such "mining" of water can drop the level of the water table below sea level, until seawater intrudes into the aquifer. This causes permanent contamination and resultant destruction of the water source. This condition will continue to worsen until supplemental water is brought to the Mesa.

In April, 2009, the Nipomo Mesa Management Area (NMMA) Technical Group (TG), a court established association, issued the finding that a "Potentially Severe Water Shortage Condition exists in the NMMA."⁵ This condition is determined by the water level in widely spaced "key wells" on the Nipomo Mesa. There is only one worse condition, a "Severe Water Shortage Condition," which could be reached in one to two years if drought patterns of 2007 and 2008

³ Emergency Water Shortage Regulations and Future Groundwater in Storage, Pappas, Degner, Beckwith and Newton, Science Applications International Corporation, January 6, 2008.

⁴ Unfortunately, a recent court decision protects the water rights of the other overlying pumpers, where no conservation can legally be imposed.

⁵ Nipomo Mesa Management Area 1st Annual Report, Calendar Year 2008, Prepared by NMMA Technical Group. April 2009

continue. This latter condition is a mandatory action trigger point where the court orders restricted water use.

The NCSD has anticipated no increase in park water use in its long range planning. Neither the Urban Water Management Plan 2005 Update of the NCSD nor the Water and Sewer Master Plans (Water and Sewer Load Projections, January 5, 2007) have contemplated any additional water allocation for the park.

The NCSD is facing major difficulties augmenting its dwindling water supply with supplemental water. The supplemental water project from Santa Maria has seen the projected cost soar from \$6 million to \$24 million, just to provide water for identified uses, not including increased demand for park water. One long-term alternative, desalination of sea water, is being explored but faces initial cost projections approaching \$100 million and an eight-year schedule to completion. Until the supplemental water pipeline is funded and constructed and new water is flowing in the tap, the NCSD will be under pressure to avoid additional water delivery commitments required by this Park Master Plan.

Correspondence from a former NCSD General Manager dated March 28, 2005, suggested conservation measures in the design of the Community Parks Master Plan, but gave no encouragement that the NCSD was willing or able to provide additional water. In fact, this letter was written when the NCSD still had a \$6 million estimate for its supplemental water project. A July 21, 2006, letter from a former Acting General Manager cautioned County Parks that the Initial Study, as it stood then, was deficient in recognizing the existing Level III Water Resource Severity in Nipomo. He also stated that the details of water conservation measures being proposed by the Proponent were insufficient to provide evidence that the impact would be mitigated to less than significant. This letter also gave no encouragement that the NCSD was willing or able to provide additional water.

In 2007, the NCSD began revision of its Emergency Water Shortage Regulations to deal with the decreasing quantity of GWS which supplies NCSD customers. On October 10, 2007, the NCSD Board of Directors was presented a draft ordinance implementing four stages of water conservation that would trigger successively more stringent water conservation measures. At the third and fourth conservation stages, prohibition of the use of potable water to irrigate grass, lawns, ground cover, shrubbery, crops, vegetation, ornamental trees, etc. would be mandatory. Had this ordinance been in effect since 1975, the NCSD would have been in the third and fourth stage (with irrigation prohibition) for fifteen years -- one period of five successive years and another period of ten successive years would have passed with no Community Park irrigation allowed. This surely would have had a fatal effect on most or all of the irrigated parkland. Although this version of the Emergency Water Shortage Regulations was not codified, it is an example of the water restrictions the park could face, and a condition the EIR must examine. Contrary to the statement in the NOP, the Community Park is not <u>one of</u> the biggest water users of the NCSD; it is <u>the</u> biggest water user. In times of decreasing water availability, the NCSD must examine water commitments to all its customers, especially those who create the biggest impact on demand. In the event that sufficient water is not available for residential customers, it may be prudent for the NCSD to consider limiting or eliminating water delivery to customers for irrigation purposes. This is a situation the EIR must examine and provide alternative project solutions.

If additional water cannot be secured from the NCSD, execution of the Master Plan, as written is impossible.

15. LAND USE

West Tefft Corridor Design Plan (Specific Plan) - The Tefft Street side of the Nipomo Community Park is within the boundaries of the Specific Plan of the West Tefft Corridor Design Plan. This Specific Plan, adopted by the County Board of Supervisors, expresses concern that the Community Park area, the "gateway corridor to downtown Nipomo," be landscaped in accordance with the Design Plan. No evidence has been presented in the Initial Study that the Specific Plan has been analyzed and steps taken to insure that the Park Master Plan is compliant. As a minimum, a checklist should be prepared to demonstrate that proposed changes to the Community Park are compatible with the Specific Plan and provide mitigations as required.

Encroachment on Private Property - If the Osage Road widening requires cuts and fills that cause earth movement onto private property (in order to maintain a 2:1 slope standard), County-owned road improvements will encroach on the useful area of the residential properties, requiring lot line adjustments, title revisions, and possible reduction of parcel sizes, in violation of the Residential Suburban designation. The mitigation may be a General Plan Amendment with all its administrative requirements. This potential impact needs to be addressed by the EIR.

Unlawful Diversion of Park Land, Misappropriation of Public Funds -Item 15(a) on the Initial Study asks whether the project is potentially inconsistent with land use ordinances, policy/regulation, etc. The answer is yes -- one or more of facilities proposed in the Initial Study are inconsistent with land use because these proposals would violate state law. Regardless of whether County land use ordinances recognize that a particular development is unlawful, State law prohibits the unlawful diversion of park land, thus, the proposed use set forth in the Initial Study cannot be approved

As explained earlier, the Proponent claims that the privately-owned-andoperated pre-school that now exists in the park is "temporary" and is not considered in this Environmental Review. In fact, its impact should be fully

Comments on Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) - Notice of Preparation

"A park is a pleasure ground set apart for recreation of the public, to promote its health and enjoyment. It need not and should not be a mere field or open space, but no objects, however worthy, such as court houses and school houses, which have no connection with park purposes, should be permitted to encroach upon it without the legislative authority plainly conferred, even when the dedication to park purposes is made by the public itself..."¹⁰

In addition, County Parks' stated intention to pay road impact fees and other costs in order to mitigate environmental impacts, which it admits will result from the development would violate the State Constitution. Section 31 of article IV of the Constitution of California prohibits a county from using public funds for private purposes.¹¹

There is no mitigation for this dilemma, making this a Class I impact under CEQA, requiring mandatory findings of significance.

As a footnote, the above referenced lease also express County Parks' desire to turn over control of Nipomo Community Park to NARA, and for this private group to "coordinate all sports activities, clubs, and events within Nipomo Regional Park on behalf of the County." This ceding of public park land to a private group clearly violates State law and represents a gross diversion of park resources. The lease was drafted and signed without any hearings, with no input whatsoever from the community, and without formal action by County Board of Supervisors. It should be further noted that the Nipomo Community Services District currently has conditional and limited "park powers" pending by LAFCO and is the only public agency in Nipomo capable of legally assuming such control of the park.

Another problem is that the previously mentioned lease between County Parks and NARA was signed in August 2001 – four years before County Parks ever began eliciting "community input." This explains why every design configuration proposed by County Parks included a preschool for NARA, and why every design configuration offered by the community (including the South County Advisory Council on at least four occasions) that did not have the preschool and private offices, were rejected by County Parks. It is unfortunate that County Parks has engaged in the wasteful spending of \$250,000 of Nipomo's scarce park funds on "unbiased" surveys, public workshops, and studies to deduce "what the community wants in our park" when the staff of County Parks had already decided the answer long before.

Even the editorial staff of the *Times Press Recorder*, a local newspaper that has always been extremely supportive of Nipomo youth, sports, and parks,

¹⁰ Williams v. Gallatin, 229 N.Y. 248 [128 N.E. 121, 18 A.L.R 1238]

¹¹ Goodall v. Brite, 11 Cal.App.2d 540, 544-545 [54 P.2d 510]

questioned the wisdom and the potential environmental impacts of the proposed Park Master Plan, stating:

"If all those amenities are centrally located in the park -- or elsewhere -how will that affect traffic on surrounding roads? . . . Think about what the traffic is already like around West Tefft Street.

"Most communities have found that centralizing so many facilities has created problems, and not just with traffic. Scheduling to avoid conflicts has also become an issue. Eventually, people end up traveling long distances to get to centralized facilities. The park may be considered the "center" of the community now, but it may not be in 10, 15, or 20 years.

"Communities are now trying to find ways to provide parks and facilities closer to the people who use them. But if all the land has already been built upon, that's not an easy task.

"Nipomo citizens, Nipomo Recreation and San Luis Obispo County have some hard decisions to make regarding the community center and the future of the park. All three should take a hard look at traffic impacts and future road plans, consider where the commercial and residential growth is zoned to take place and decide if they really want to combine every conceivable service and amenity into one facility.

"While the financial cost may be higher to separate them at regional sites, the social cost may be even higher if everything is centralized."¹²

¹² (*Times Press Recorder* editorial, by TPR Staff, October 4, 2006)
٠

.

APPENDIX A - LETTERS OF TESTIMONY PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF COMMISSIONING AN EIR

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT 1 AESTHETICS

.

•

•

.

July 17, 2007

Nipomo Park Conservancy P.O. Box 2042 Nipomo, CA 93444

I would like to voice my concerns with the upcoming projected build-out and subsequent addition of additional lighting in Nipomo Park. It was my understanding that this is a rural park, horse friendly and neighbor/family friendly park. What I am seeing is the break down of a truly wonderful gern in our community.

I am particularly concerned about the lights. There are currently two areas that have lights and one of those has an amplified sound system. I realize they are a necessary part of the recreation portion of this park. I live almost a half mile down Tejas and I can see these lights and hear every word the announcers say very clearly. There is absolutely no way that the new lighting proposed for this area will be blocked by trees, etc, as these trees are coming down at a rapid rate due to disease and expansion needs.

I don't understand why we are adding anything to this park in the first place. I use this park daily and rarely do I see more than 10-20 people (adults) in it. The exception being on the weekends when there are a number of family barbeques going on. We should have additional picnic facilities to accommodate the most popular activity that I witness all the time. I feel the money would be better spent in addressing the growing homeless population in the park and not adding uscless recreation facilities that will go as unused as the rest of the items in the park.

Sincerely AUCA Elizabeth Kerby 448 Tejas Place Nipomo, CA 93444

Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Comments on Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) -- Notice of Preparation

Sept. 27, 2007

Nipomo Park Conservancy P.O. Box 2042 Nipomo, CA 93444

To whom it may concern,

First of all I would like to commend you for the diligent work you have been doing to help preserve the rural essence of our community – Nipomo. We have lived in this community for 35 years and it has saddened us to see the encroaching ways of city life reach farther and farther into the boundaries of Nipomo. This does not mean we do not appreciate "progress" but we have become very aware that everyone has a different definition of that word. Unfortunately it seems that the definition depends upon who is going to profit (financially or career-wise) from it.

For an example, we have attended a few meetings regarding the proposed changes for the Nipomo Park. It is an understatement to say that we were APALLED at the ludicrous of the presentations being made. It seems as though the SLO board members and the group that is promoting the multiple additions to the park are void of COMMON SENSE. How can they even suggest that there will be NO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT on this area???

Our family lives on the northwest boundary of the park (Camino Caballo/Pomeroy). We set our home up to enjoy the view of the oak trees & gentle hills of the park. Will all that be lost?? The thought of mature trees being removed & replaced by concrete is so sad. How many trees & bushes & acres of grass are going to be sacrificed for this project? How many light poles are in the plan? We can see the current light poles from our home. On the nights of current park activity the skies in our area are brightly lit up - no more star gazing®

While our family enjoys watching the kids in particular play sports, it seems like the plans are an overkill for a multitude of sport activities – all in one selected spot in Nipomo. <u>Noise</u> will become an even bigger concern – *noise from spectators, loud speakers and much increased traffic.* Currently we can hear the games from our bone. We can hear all the activities that play music etc. When we have friends over it becomes especially bothersome to talk over the noise. Currently we cannot even use our front courtyard because 24/7 traffic noise. The trees do not diffuse the sound at all!! All the proposed additional structures, lighting & activities will only intensity these problems for ALL THE SURROUNDING NEIGHBORS!!

Again, we appreciate your efforts – but there are so many questions that need answers. Why must everything be in this one spot – we just do not understand & at the meetings we attended it seems like this question never gets a direct answer. Who or what is behind this plan??

Keep up your good and much approciated work.

1 LLAG 7 XLASI (CC) The Davis Family 886 Camino Caballo Nipomo, CA 93444 Once a lovely rural community <u>Nipomo Community Park Master Plan</u> Comments on Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) -- Notice of Preparation

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT 4 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

From: juliaste@sbcglobal.net Subject: park biological resources Date: October 20, 2007 10:55:16 AM PDT To: juliaste@sbcglobal.net

To Whom It May Concern:

I have witnessed the effects our growing community and increased recreational use are having on the existing wild area. I ride through the park 3 to 5 days a week. Six months ago there was a very large California King snake under the big oak tree where the Brushpoppers rodeo used to be held (behind where the parking lot is planned). This large orange, black, and white-banded snake had its head crushed by a large pop bottle. An unfortunate encounter with a cruel or naive human. I have also seen a young Gopher snake whose home was near the entrance gate on Camino Caballo. Several weeks later he had been run over by a car. Every summer I've seen several California Horned Lizards, popularly called "horned or horny toads" in the wild area of the park where the soccer fields are planned. They like the warm, flat, sandy areas. The numbers I've witnessed never have varied from 2 or 3 a year. Moving them during construction (if found) may or may not help them to survive. The Morro survey could find no Horned Lizards. Only an adequate biological field survey can determine if the reduction of the wild area and the increased use of the remaining wild area will further stress the existence of these and other species in the park to the point of extinction. Horned Lizards are not on the California endangered list, however, they are vanishing in Nipomo. They were readily seen around my house when I first moved to Nipomo 17 years ago.

Julie Steiner (805) 929-2134

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT 7 HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

.

.

From: ljwalden@charter.net Subject: glass problem in Nipomo Park Date: October 20, 2007 8:41:12 AM PDT To: ljwalden@charter.net

To Whom It May Concern,

While walking in the park adjoining Tefft St (Oak Park BBQ and dog park area), I've often noted glass that keeps coming up from the ground. I do pick it up, but it is an unending situation.

While in the Dog Park, glass is cleaned up almost daily. This is NOT the result of recent broken glass perhaps done by kids; while building the offleash area, we encountered countless items buried underground between inches and as much as 3' in the area.

I have oft heard rumors that most of the park was an official dump and privately owned at that time.

Linda Walden (805) 929-0849

Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Comments on Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) -- Notice of Preparation

From: <u>Charles Hail</u> To: <u>liwalden@charter.net</u> Sent: Wednesday, October 17, 2007 11:55 AM Subject: Dog Park

To Whom it May Concern:

As head of the volunteer fencing crew that built the dog park known as the "Nipomo Off-leash Recreation Area" at Nipomo Community Park, I have first hand knowledge of the kinds of articles we unearthed while digging the post holes. I had another young man helping me - we used a 2-man motorized posthole digger - and in most of the holes, we encountered some type of debris that halted our progress. Things like shoes, bottles, cans, silverware, clothes, even an automobile bumber and a box spring turned up under the surface. On the latter 2 occasions, we simply had to move the hole over by a foot or so just to get the post in. It became clear to me during this process that the land had been a landfill at one time.

Charles Hail 805-343-0157

Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Comments on Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) -- Notice of Preparation

From: James Harrison To: ljwalden@charter.net Sent: Thursday October 18, 2007 Subject: Old Dump in Nipomo County Park

To Whom it May Concern:

In July 2006 my Grandson and I were assisting the dog park extend a water line from one side of the dog park to the other putting water into the smaller area for the dogs to have a place to drink.

During the digging of the approximately 200 feet trench 18 inches deep, and the post hole for the post to hold the faucet for the water my grandson collected over 75 old bottles and we also found various vehicle parts, a starter from an old vehicle, a clutch, part of a flywheel, broken knife, etc. Some of the bottles had applied bottoms and tops which would indicate that they were older type bottles.

If within inches of the surface these items can be found one has to wonder how long the dump existed, and just what hazardous materials were dumped here. What efforts were made by the County to safeguard our health when they put this park there and in my opinion prior to any future development a complete environmental impact report (E.I.R.) needs to be completed that will determine exactly what hazard to our families exist on this old dump site. Failure to comply with this need could result in massive legal problems for the County and increase of taxes to pay for this failure to comply with the environmental review necessary for this project.

Jim Harrison (805) 929-2935 From: <u>Kkubiak@aol.com</u> To: <u>liwalden@charter.net</u> Sent: Tuesday, October 16, 2007 4:03 PM Subject: Re: Nipomo Park

Hi Linda,

The property, now known as Nipomo Community Park, was indeed a dump in the past. When the owner decided to call it quits, he donated the land to the County. I'm not sure of the timeline though.

Volunteers in the past put in baseball fields and irrigation lines that were supplied water by a well that was situated just west of the Little League Fields. It went dry in the 1970's and the county decided to abandon the well and opted for city water, even though there were offers within the community to put in a new well free of charge.

I know that when my husband and myself put in the concession stand up by the Babe Ruth Field, we found various items as we dug the footing for the building.

I can ask some other old timers to see if they can remember the timeline.

Hope this helps.

Kathy Kubiak (805) 929-1241 ٠

.

.

APPENDIX B - COPY OF LONG-TERM LEASE AGREEMENT BETWEEN COUNTY AND NARA

Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Comments on Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) -- Notice of Preparation



USE PERMIT

THIS USE PERMIT is entered into between the County of San Luis Obispo, hereinafter referred to as "County" and the Nipomo Area Recreation Association, a non-profit 501(c)(3) charitable organization doing business as Nipomo Recreation Center hereinafter referred to as "Permittee."

WHEREAS, due to space limitations at its present location, Permittee wishes to relocate its current youth-oriented community recreation and child care program; and

WHEREAS, the County and Permittee desire a permanent, long term lease of a portion of Nipomo Regional Park in which Permittee will build a large community recreation center, will offer expanded services to the community, and will coordinate all sports activities, clubs, and events within Nipomo Regional Park on behalf of the County; and

WHEREAS, said long term lease arrangement is compatible with County Parks Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, County and Permittee can not venture into said long term lease until Permittee has secured funding sources to build the new community recreation center; and

WHEREAS, Permittee desires a suitable temporary location at which to offer its current youthoriented community recreation and child care program until the aforementioned permanent lease is secured; and

WHEREAS, County owns a temporary location located within the Nipomo Regional Park that meets Lessee's temporary needs until the long term lease agreement within Nipomo Regional Park is settled;

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants and agreements herein contained, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. <u>Premises</u>: County hereby grants to Permittee, and Permittee hereby hires and takes from County, for the term and upon the conditions hereinafter set forth, those certain premises defined as approximately 1,500 square feet of vacant land located in Nipomo Regional Park adjacent to the Perimeter Road near the tennis courts, hereinafter referred to as "Premises," as outlined and described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein.

2. <u>Use of Premises</u>: The Premises shall be used for the purpose of conducting and operating a youth-oriented community recreation and child care program to serve the community's needs.

Dated: May 31, 2001

3. <u>Ouist Possession</u>: County shall place Permittee in quiet possession of the Premises on the commencement of the term hereof, and subject to Permittee performing and observing all applicable conditions and covenants, as contained in this Use Permit, County shall secure to Permittee the quiet possession of the Premises during the term hereof against all persons claiming the same.

4. <u>Term</u>: The term shall commence upon execution of this Use Permit by the County General Services Director ("Director") and shall automatically renew on an annual basis. Director or Permittee may terminate this Use Permit for any reason by providing at least Ninety (90) days prior written notice to the other.

5. <u>Improvements</u>: Permittee may install one temporary modular building on the Premises, not to exceed 1,000 square feet and may install a temporary fence on the Premises adjacent to the temporary modular building, surrounding 500 square feet or less of vacant land.

However, no improvement of any type shall be constructed or located on the premises unless and until design, location, and the type of any and all proposed construction materials have been expressly approved in writing by the Director or his designee.

Permittee shall have the right on said Premises, at Permittee 's sole cost and expense, to construct other temporary improvements on said Premises subject to prior written approval by the Director or his designee.

Permittee agrees to submit to the Director, for review and written approval, all plans including specifications, working drawings, and other information required by Director covering the projects to be accomplished by Permittee. Said plans shall be submitted to the Director for County approval at least thirty (30) days in advance of the initiation of any such projects. If the Director objects to all or any portion of such plans, the Director shall state the objections specifically, and the Permittee shall make the changes specified and resubmit the plans as revised for the Director's approval as herein provided. No improvement or alteration shall be made to the Premises or any portion thereof without the submission to and prior written approval of the plans by the Director or his designee. In addition, the following shall apply to any construction or improvement to the Premises:

A. Nothing herein shall be construed to be a waiver of formal County building and land use review procedures and Permittee shall comply fully with same at Permittee 's sole cost and expense.

B. All utilities to the Premises shall be extended at the sole cost and expense of Permittee

Dated: May 31, 2001

. Said utilities shall include, but not be limited to, water, sewer, electricity, natural gas and telephone.

C. Permittee shall be responsible for any environmental determination. If an E.I.R. or C.E.Q.A. or other environmental review is needed, Permittee shall comply at Permittee 's sole cost and expense.

D. Permittee shall be responsible for the monitoring of all activity during construction, installation and maintenance and shall comply with all such rules and regulations necessary to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public therein. The County Parks Manager and Environmental Coordinator shall determine, in each instance, whether an Environmental Monitor is necessary during construction, installation, repair and maintenance of the project. If County determines an Environmental Monitor is necessary, County shall provide said Monitor on site and Permittee shall be solely responsible for all costs associated with said monitoring.

E. County retains the right to make any improvements to the Premises as necessary which improvements shall not be inconsistent with the Permittee 's use of the Premises.

6. <u>Ownership of Improvements</u>: At the termination of this Use Permit, Permittee shall be responsible for the removal of all alterations, modifications, or improvements upon the Premises made by Permittee , absent any agreement between the County and Permittee to the contrary, or unless County otherwise elects, which election shall be made by giving a notice in writing not less than fifteen (15) working days prior to the termination of this Use Permit. Permittee shall be responsible for the removal of said improvements, at Permittee's sole cost and expense, no later than sixty (60) days from the termination of this Use Permit or at such further time as County may agree to in writing, and Permittee shall promptly repair any damage caused by such removal in a first class manner. In the event Permittee fails to remove any or all of the alterations, additions, or improvements required by County, County may remove same and charge Permittee for the cost of such removals and Permittee hereby agrees to pay any and all such costs upon demand. Permittee shall defend and indemnify the County against all liability and loss arising from such claims or from the County's exercise of the rights conferred by this paragraph.

In the event the County elects that any or all alterations, modifications, or improvements made by Permittee upon the Premises remain, then said alterations, modifications, or improvements shall become County property without compensation to Permittee, free and clear of all claims to or against the improvements by Permittee or any third person.

Dated: May 31, 2001

7. <u>Repairs and Maintenance</u>: Permittee, at Permittee's sole cost and expense, shall maintain and keep the Premises and every portion thereof in a good state of repair during the term of this Use Permit and shall not, at any time, commit or suffer to be committed any waste, nuisance, or unlawful act thereon. The Director, or his designee, shall have the right to inspect the Premises at any reasonable time to protect the health, safety and welfare of individuals using the Premises. Permittee shall promptly repair or correct any problem identified in writing by the Director, or his designee. Should Permittee fail or neglect to make such repairs as necessary to protect the health, safety or welfare of individuals using the Premises, Director may, after ten (10) days written notice to Permittee , make said repairs and charge Permittee for same and Permittee shall reimburse County for said costs upon demand.

8. Janitorial Services: Permittee shall provide janitorial service for the Premises, at Permittee 's sole cost and expense.

 Parking: Permittee shall have the non-exclusive right to use available public parking within Nipomo Regional Park.

10. Landscaping / Grounds Maintenance: County agrees to maintain exterior turf and irrigation systems, and to provide parking lot repair and maintenance. Permittee shall provide exterior ornamental care on Premises (e.g. line trimming at base of fence, maintenance of shrubs and flowers, if applicable.)

11. <u>Refuse</u>: The removal and disposal of all rubbish, refuse, and garbage resulting from Permittee 's operations will be accomplished by Permittee. Permittee may dispose of reasonable amounts of garbage in the Park's garbage containers in accordance with applicable law. Garbage removal of the Park's garbage containers shall be performed by County.

12. <u>Utilities</u>: During the term of this Use Permit, Permittee shall establish and pay for all monthly utility services to the Premises, including but not limited to, water and sewer, telephone, gas, and electric used by Permittee during its occupation of the Premises. If the establishment of separate utility meters is not possible or cost effective, Permittee, upon written permission by Director or his designee, may tap into County's utility systems and pay to County a flat fee for monthly utility usage, as negotiated between County and Permittee.

Any required fire detection systems shall be maintained by Permittee according to

Dated: May 31, 2001

-52

requirements of CDF/County Fire under which jurisdiction the Premises is located.

13. <u>Taxes</u>: During the term of this Use Permit, Permittee hereby agrees to pay, prior to delinquency, all taxes and assessments, including both general and special, levied or assessed against the Premises and in connection with the Premises and Permittee's operation thereof, including without limitation, taxes on Permittee 's possessory interest hereunder or in the Premises, and taxes or assessments on all structures, improvements, and fixtures now or hereinafter existing on the Premises, and on any personal property situated in, on, or about the Premises, or in, on or about any structures or improvements thereon. Permittee is hereby informed that a possessory interest subject to property taxation may be created by this Use Permit and that the party to whom the possessory interest is vested (Permittee) may be subject to the payment of property taxes levied on such interest. Permittee hereby agrees to pay such taxes prior to delinquency.

14. <u>Signs</u>: Permittee, at its sole cost, shall have the right to construct, place and maintain a sign on the Premises, advertising its business on the Premises. Any sign that Permittee constructs, places, and maintains shall comply with all laws, and Permittee shall obtain prior written approval from Director or his designee prior to placement of said sign.

15. <u>Protection of Premises</u>: Permittee agrees to take all reasonable precautions to protect Premises from damage, theft, vandalism and other such hazards.

16. Insurance: Permittee shall obtain and maintain for the entire term of the Agreement and Permittee shall not perform any work under this Agreement until after it has obtained insurance complying with the provisions of this paragraph. Said policies shall be issued by companies authorized to do business in the State of California. Permittee shall maintain said insurance in force at all times. The following coverage with the following features shall be provided:

A. <u>Commercial Liability Insurance</u>: Permittee shall maintain in full force and effect for the period covered by this Agreement, commercial liability insurance. This insurance shall include, but shall not be limited to, comprehensive general and automobile liability insurance providing protection against claims arising from bodily and personal injury, including death resulting therefrom, and damage to property resulting from any act or occurrence arising out of Permittee 's operations in the performance of this Agreement, including, without limitation, acts involving vehicles. The policy shall provide not less than single limit coverage applying to bodily and personal injury, including death resulting therefrom, and property damage in the total amount of One Million Dollars (\$1,000,000). The following endorsements must be

Dated: May 31, 2001

attached to the policy:

(1) If the insurance policy covers on an "accident" basis, it must be changed to "occurrence".

(2) The policy must cover personal injury as well as bodily injury.

(3) Blanket contractual liability must be afforded and the policy must contain a cross liability or severability of interest endorsement.

B. <u>Workers' Compensation Insurance</u>: In accordance with the provisions of sections 3700 et seq., of the California Labor Code, if Permittee has any employees, Permittee is required to be insured against liability for workers' compensation or to undertake self insurance. Permittee agrees to comply with such provisions before commencing the performance of this Contract.

C. <u>Additional Insureds to be Covered</u>: The commercial general liability policies shall name "County of San Luis Obispo, its officers, employees, and agents" as additional insureds. The policy shall provide that the Permittee 's insurance will operate as primary insurance and that no other insurance maintained by the County, or additional insureds will be called upon to contribute to a loss hereunder.

D. <u>Certification of Coverage</u>: Prior to commencing work under this contract, Permittee shall furnish County with the following for each insurance policy required to be maintained by this Agreement:

(1) A copy of the Certificate of Insurance shall be provided. The certificate of insurance must include a certification that the policy will not be canceled or reduced in coverage or changed in any other material aspect without thirty (30) days prior written notice to the County.

(2) A Workers' Compensation certificate of insurance must be provided.

(3) Upon written request by the County, the Permittee shall provide a copy of the complete insurance policy.

(4) Approval of Insurance by County shall not relieve or decrease the extent to which the Permittee may be held responsible for payment of damages resulting from Permittee 's services or operations pursuant to this Agreement. Further, County's act of acceptance of an insurance policy does not waive or relieve Permittee 's obligations to provide the insurance coverage required by the specific written provisions of this Agreement.

E. Effect of Failure or Refusal: If Permittee fails or refuses to procure or maintain the

Dated: May 31, 2001

6

December 22, 2009

insurance required by this contract, or fails or refuses to furnish County with the certifications required by Subparagraph D. above, County shall have the right, at it's option, to forthwith terminate the Agreement for cause.

17. Indemnity: Permittee shall defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County, its officers and employees from any and all claims and demands, costs, expenses, judgments, attorney fees or liabilities that may be asserted by any person or entity that arise out of or in connection with the acts or omissions relating to the performance of any obligation or duty provided for or relating (directly or indirectly) to this Use Permit, the tenancy created under this Use Permit, or the Premises hereunder. The obligation to indemnify shall be effective and shall extend to all such claims and losses, in their entirety, even when such claims or losses arise from the comparative negligence of the County, its officers and employees. However, this indemnity will not extend to any claims or losses arising out of the sole negligence or willful misconduct of the County, its officers and employees.

The preceding paragraph applies to any theory of recovery relating to said act or omission by the Permittee, or its agents, employees or other independent contractors directly responsible to Permittee, including, but not limited to, the following:

- A. Violation of statute, ordinance, or regulation.
- B. Professional malpractice.
- C. Willful, intentional or other wrongful acts, or failures to act.
- D. Negligence or recklessness.
- E. Furnishing of defective or dangerous products.
- F. Premises liability.
- G. Strict liability.
- H. Inverse Condemnation.
- L Violation of civil rights.

J. Violation of any federal or state statute, regulation, or ruling resulting in a determination by the Internal Revenue Service, California Franchise Tax Board or any other California public entity responsible for collecting payroll taxes, when the Permittee is not an independent contractor.

It is the intent of the parties to provide the County the fullest indemnification, defense, and hold harmless rights allowed under the law. If any word(s) contained herein are deemed by a court to be in

Dated: May 31, 2001

contravention of applicable law, said word(s) shall be severed from this contract and the remaining language shall be given full force and effect.

18. <u>Surrender</u>: Upon termination of this Use Permit, Permittee shall surrender the Premises unto County in the same condition as when received, reasonable use and wear excepted.

19. <u>Assignment</u>: Permittee shall neither transfer nor assign this Use Permit or any property on the Premises, nor sublet the Premises or any part thereof or any property thereon, nor grant any interest, privilege, or license whatsoever in connection with this Use Permit without the prior written consent of the County.

20. <u>Provisions Deemed Covenants and Conditions</u>: The parties hereto agree that all the provisions hereof are to be construed as covenants and conditions as though the words importing such covenants and conditions are used in each instance, and that all of the provisions hereof shall bind and inure to the benefit of the parties hereto and their respective heirs, legal representative, successors and assigns.

21. <u>Environmental Matters / Covenants Regarding Hazardous Materials</u>: Permittee and County shall at all times and in all respects comply with all federal, state and local laws, ordinances and regulations ("Hazardous Materials Laws") relating to industrial hygiene, environmental protection or the use, analysis, generation, manufacture, storage, disposal or transportation of any oil, flammable explosives, asbestos, urea formaldehyde, radioactive materials or waste, or other hazardous, toxic, contaminated or polluting materials, substances or wastes, including without limitation, any "hazardous substances," "hazardous wastes," "hazardous materials," or "toxic substances" under such laws, ordinances or regulations (collectively, "Hazardous Materials").

Permittee shall, except in the event of County's negligence, indemnify, defend, protect, and hold County and each of County's officers, directors, employees, agents, attorneys, successors and assigns, free and harmless from and against any and all claims, liabilities, penalties, forfeitures, losses or expenses or death of or injury to any person or damage to any property whatsoever, arising from or caused in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, by:

A. The presence in, on, under or about the Premises or discharge in or from the Premises of any Hazardous Materials or Permittee's use, analysis, storage, transportation, disposal, release, threatened release, discharge or generation of Hazardous Materials to, in, on, under, about or from the Premises, or

B. Permittee 's failure to comply with any Hazardous Materials Law. Permittee 's

Dated: May 31, 2001

obligations hereunder shall include, without limitation, and whether foreseeable or unforeseeable, all costs of any required or necessary repair, cleanup or detoxification or decontamination of the Premises, and the preparation and implementation of any closure, remedial action or other required plans in connection therewith caused by Permittee and shall survive the expiration or earlier termination of the term of this Use Permit. For purposes of the release and indemnity provisions hereof, any acts or omissions of Permittee, or by employees, agents, assignces, contractors or subcontractors of Permittee or others acting for or on behalf of Permittee (whether or not they are negligent, intentional, willful or unlawful) shall be strictly attributable to Permittee.

22. <u>Condemnation</u>: If the whole of the Premises shall be taken or condemned by any competent authority under power of eminent domain for a public or a quasi-public use or purpose, then the leasehold estate hereby created shall cease and terminate as of the date actual physical possession of the Premises is taken by the condemnor. All compensation and damages awarded for such total taking shall belong to and be the sole property of County, provided, however, that Permittee shall be entitled to receive a sum attributable to the taking of damage to Permittee 's equipment, fixtures, or any improvements to the Premises which Permittee would have had, but for the condemnation, the right to remove on termination of this Use Permit. Upon termination of the Use Permit by a total taking all charges payable by Permittee to or on behalf of County under the provisions of this Use Permit shall be paid up to the date on which actual physical possession of the leased Premises shall be taken by the condemnor, and the parties hereto shall thereafter be released from all further liability in relation thereto.

In the event that there shall be partial taking of the leased Premises during the permit term under the power of eminent domain, this Use Permit shall terminate as to the portion of the released premises so taken on the date when actual physical possession of said portion is taken by the condemnor. At Permittee 's option, this Use Permit shall continue in force and effect as to the remainder of the leased Premises. In the event of such partial taking, all compensation and damages for such partial taking shall belong to and be the sole property of County, provided, however, that Permittee shall be entitled to receive any award made for the taking of, or damage to, Permittee 's equipment, fixtures, and any improvements made by Permittee to the leased Premises which Permittee would have had, but for the condemnation, the right to remove on termination of this Use Permit. In the event that this Use Permit is retained as to the portion of the leased Premises not condemned, any award made for alteration, modifications or repairs which may be reasonably

Dated: May 31, 2001

required in order to place the remaining portion of the leased Premises not taken in a suitable condition for the continuance of Permittee 's tenancy shall belong to and be the sole property of County.

23. <u>Destruction of Premises</u>: Should any matter or condition beyond the control of the parties hereto, such as war, public emergency, or calamity, fire, earthquake, flood, act of God, strike, or any other labor disturbance, prevent performance of this Use Permit in accordance with the rights and privileges granted herein, this Use Permit shall immediately be terminated and the County shall be under no legal obligation to the Permittee by reason of said matter or condition.

Should any aforementioned matter or condition create eligibility for Federal, State, or any other governmental jurisdictional relief assistance and/or aid, both parties agree to take all reasonable steps necessary to procure such assistance and/or aid, in their respective capacities at the time of such application.

24. <u>Law</u>: This Use Permit has been executed and delivered in the State of California and the validity, enforceability and interpretation of any of the clauses of this Use Permit shall be determined and governed by the laws of the State of California.

25. <u>Venue</u>: The duties and obligations of the parties created hereunder are performable in San Luis Obispo County, and such County shall be the venue for any action or proceeding that may be brought or arise out of or in connection with or by reason of this Use Permit.

26. <u>Inspection of Premises</u>: County reserves the right of ingress and egress at any reasonable time to inspect, investigate and survey the Premises as deemed necessary by County, and the right to do any and all work of any nature for the preservation and maintenance of the Premises or improvements thereon without interfering with Permittee's use of the Premises.

27. <u>Employment Status</u>: Neither Permittee nor any of Permittee 's agents or contractors are or shall be considered to be employees or agents of County in connection with the performance of Permittee 's right and obligations under this Use Permit.

28. <u>Non-Discrimination</u>: Permittee and County shall not discriminate against any person or class of persons in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended or any other applicable laws prohibiting discrimination in the use of the Premises.

29. <u>Drug Free Workplace</u>: Permittee and Permittee 's employees shall comply with County's policy of a drug free workplace. Neither Permittee nor Permittee 's employees shall unlawfully manufacture, distribute, dispense, possess, or use controlled substances, including but not limited to marijuana, heroin,

Dated: May 31, 2001

cocaine, methamphetamine, or amphetamines at any of Permittee's facilities or County facilities or work sites. If any employee of Permittee is found to be under the influence of or in possession of any illegal substance at or on County's premises, that employee may not return to any of County's premises. Further return shall be a breach of this Use Permit. If Permittee becomes aware that any of Permittee 's employees, during the course of their employ with Permittee, are convicted or plead nolo contendere to a criminal substance abuse statute, Permittee shall be responsible for notifying the Director within seventy-two (72) hours of becoming aware of said conviction or plea. Violation of this notification provision shall constitute grounds for termination of this Use Permit.

30. <u>Americans with Disabilities Act</u>: The Permittee acknowledges the passage of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. sect. 12101 et seq., ("ADA"). Permittee, as required by law, hereby agrees and is required to install any and all equipment, perform any and all alterations, improvements or modifications to the Premises such that the Premises are in strict compliance with ADA requirements.

31. <u>Notices</u>: All notices to Permittee shall be given in writing personally or by depositing the same in the United States mail, postage prepaid, or by certified or registered mail, return receipt requested, and addressed to Permittee at:

Nipomo Area Recreation Association

170 South Frontage Road

Nipomo, CA 93444

Attn: Executive Director

All notices to County shall be given in writing personally or by depositing the same in the United States mail, postage prepaid, or by certified or registered mail, return receipt requested, and addressed to:

County of San Luis Obispo

Department of General Services

1087 Santa Rosa

San Luis Obispo, CA, 93408

Attention: Parks Manager.

Either party can change address by notifying the other party in writing.

32. <u>Breach</u>: Notwithstanding any other provisions contained herein, Director may cancel and terminate this Use Permit if Permittee shall fail, neglect or refuse to perform and obey any term or condition

Dated: May 31, 2001

set forth in this Use Permit, after Director has given to Permittee written notice of thirty (30) days to do so, unless such failure, neglect or refusal by nature cannot be remedied within thirty (30) days of said notice and Permittee has within thirty (30) days of the notice commenced and does thereafter continue diligent efforts to remedy such failure, neglect or refusal. Any waiver by County of any failure by Permittee to comply with the terms and conditions of this Use Permit shall not be construed to be a waiver by County of any similar or other failure by Permittee to comply with any other term or condition hereof.

33. <u>Immediate Suspension and Termination Clause</u>: If Permittee or Permittee's agents, employees, or any party responsible to Permittee cause an occurrence on the Premises which seriously threatens or damages the health, safety and or welfare of the public, the Director may, upon written notice to Permittee , immediately suspend all activities on the Premises and this Use Permit may be terminated, if Permittee is determined to be negligent, upon direction of the County Board of Supervisors. Permittee shall have no recourse against County of said action and Permittee shall defend, and indemnify the County against all liability and loss arising from the occurrence.

34. <u>Waiver of Claim</u>: Permittee hereby waives any claim against the County, its officers, agents or employees for damage or loss caused by any suit or proceeding directly or indirectly attacking the validity of this Use Permit, or any part thereof or by any judgement or award in any suit or proceeding declaring this Use Permit null, void or voidable, or delaying the same or any part thereof from being carried out.

35. <u>Severability:</u> The invalidity of any provision of this Use Permit shall not affect the validity, enforceability of any other provision of this Use Permit.

36. <u>Entire Agreement and Modifications</u>: This Use Permit embodies the whole agreement between the parties hereto as it pertains to the subject real property and there are no promised terms, conditions, or obligations referring to the subject matter hereof, other than as contained herein. Any alterations, changes or modifications to this Use Permit must be in writing and executed by both Permittee and County.

Dated: May 31, 2001

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Use Permit this _____ day of NIPOMO AREA RECREATION ASSOCIATION APPROVED AS TO FORM AND LEGAL EFFECT: By: <u>Ulin & Ulinan</u> Cheryl Villanda, Executive Director JAMES B. LINDHOLM, JR. County Counsel Faias m By: By: Bris Canton Bob Armstrong, President of the Board of Directors County Counsel 8/13/01 Date: Corporate Certificate I._______ certify that I am the Secretary of the Corporation named in the foregoing Use Permit; that Bob Arnhstrong, who signed said Use Permit on behalf of the corporation, was then President of the Board of Directors of said Corporation, and said Use Permit was duly signed for and op behalf of said Corporation by authority of its governing body and is within the scope of its corporate powers. COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO SPI Ву: ___ Duane P. Leib ÛЦ (CORPORATE SEAL) Secretary

PAPEOPAGENTINIPOMONILes Assoc Use Permit wpd

Dated: May 31, 2001

.

.....

Shawna Scott

From:jdileo@co.slo.ca.usSent:Monday, November 30, 2009 9:52 AMTo:smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us; Shawna ScottSubject:Fw: Nipomo Community Park

Our first comment....

Jan Di Leo Parks Planner SLO County Parks (805) 781-4089 http://www.slocountyparks.org

----- Forwarded by Jan DiLeo/GenSrvcs/COSLO on 11/30/2009 09:53 AM -----

From: Bill Denneen <bdenneen@kcbx.net>

To: <jdileo@co.slo.ca.us>

Date: 11/25/2009 06:39 PM

Subject: Re: Nipomo Community Park

Hi Jan, I hope to be at this meeting. Nipomo Park should NOT be "developed" (invaded). At one time it was proposed for Nipomo High School-----yuk. I jog there almost daily. We need a hint of what Nipomo was before being invaded by LA-slurbanization. Build your Rec-Center by the High School----not in our wonderful Nipomo Community Park. Bill Denneen, Executive Director, Friends of Nipomo Park, PO# 73, Nipomo, 93444

> FROM: STEVEN MCMASTERS, PROJECT MANAGER > > SUBJECT: NIPOMO COMMUNITY PARK MASTER PLAN PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL > IMPACT REPORT (EIR) -- NOTICE OF PREPARATION > > A Program EIR is being prepared for the Nipomo Community Park Master > Plan (NCMP). The NCMP is proposed by San Luis Obispo County Parks and > would result in the phased construction of recreation facilities and > related infrastructure over a 20-year timeframe. At this point a > Notice of Preparation (NOP) is being circulated for comments. The NOP > is the vehicle by which agencies (Federal, State and Local) can > comment on the proposed scope of the EIR and inform the County as to > what if any permit authority they may have over the proposed project. > While the NOP is primarily addressed to governmental agencies, it also > provides an excellent opportunity for the public and other > non-governmental groups to comment on the proposed scope of the EIR as > well. The County encourages any interested party to review the > information in the NOP and provide comments to the County. The NOP and > supporting documents can be accessed at the County Planning Department > website: > PUBLIC MEETING: > > The County will also hold a public EIR scoping meeting on December 1, > 2009 from 6:30 - 8:30 pm, at 148 South Wilson Street in Nipomo, San

> Luis Obispo County, California. The public scoping meeting is an > additional avenue for commenting on the scope of work for the EIR. >

- > If you need more information about this project, please contact Steven
- > McMasters at (805)781-5096 (or e-mail: > _smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us)_, or Jan DiLeo at (805) 781-4089 (or > e-mail: _jdileo@co.slo.ca.us_).

Shawna Scott

From:jdileo@co.slo.ca.usSent:Wednesday, December 02, 2009 12:39 PMTo:smcmasters@co.slo.ca.usCc:Shawna ScottSubject:Fw: Nipomo Park Build Out

A comment!

Jan Di Leo
Parks Planner
SLO County Parks
(805) 781-4089 http://www.slocountyparks.org
----- Forwarded by Jan DiLeo/GenSrvcs/COSLO on 12/02/2009 12:39 PM ----From: Ernie DelRio/GenSrvcs/COSLO
To: Jan DiLeo/GenSrvcs/COSLO@Wings, Curtis Black/GenSrvcs/COSLO@Wings
Date: 11/30/2009 01:37 PM
Subject: Fw: Nipomo Park Build Out

FYI

From: SLOParks General Services/GenSrvcs/COSLO

To: Ernie DelRio/GenSrvcs/COSLO@Wings, Mark Wagner/GenSrvcs/COSLO@Wings

Date: 11/30/2009 12:57 PM

Subject: Fw: Nipomo Park Build Out

Sent by: Anna Diaz

San Luis Obispo County Parks 1087 Santa Rosa Street San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 (805) 781-5930 http://www.slocountyparks.org

----- Forwarded by Anna Diaz/GenSrvcs/COSLO on 11/30/2009 12:57 PM -----

From: "robert dodds" <rcdodds@sbcglobal.net>

To: <sloparks@co.slo.ca.us>

Date: 11/25/2009 03:50 PM

Subject: Nipomo Park Build Out

To Whom it may concern: I live very close to Nipomo Park and over the last ten years have watched all the new development that has gone in surrounding it. Most of the animals that used this area for habitat were pushed out. Many have been killed on Camino Caballo, Pomeroy, and the other streets outlining the park. This is one of the last remaining greenbelts left in Nipomo. So many animals use it for their home, I would hate to see them pushed out and their last chance for survival. It is a wonderful spot for everyone to use for dog walking, human retreat, and equestrians. We the surrounding neighbors feel it is perfect!

We all agree that there needs to be a recreation center for the children and adults of Nipomo but I haven't seen any other areas actively pursued. I would think that there would be plenty of land available at Nipomo High School for a center that could be used by the High School and the rec. dept. It could be a win/win situation for all. It would also be cost effective as the kids from the high school wouldn't have to drive to it, and the kids from the elementary schools could be bused there for care if it was used for that purpose. Please do not take our last open space left. Sincerely, Cherie Dodds

Shawna Scott

Subject:

From:

Sent: To: Cc: Subject:	Monday, December 21, 2009 9:03 AM smcmasters@co.slo.ca.us; Shawna Scott hansson@verizon.net Fw: Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR
Follow Up Flag: Flag Status:	Follow up Red
Steve, Below are comm	ents I received on the Notice of Preparation.
Jan Di Leo Parks Planner SLO County Par (805) 781-4089	ks http://www.slocountyparks.org
Forwarde	d by Jan DiLeo/GenSrvcs/COSLO on 12/21/2009 09:02 AM
From:	"Hans & El-Jay Hansson" <hansson@verizon.net></hansson@verizon.net>
To:	<planning@co.slo.ca.us></planning@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: <jdileo@co.slo< td=""><td>"Dan Gaddis" <silverwings1@sbcglobal.net>, "Jan Di Leo" .ca.us>, "Katcho Achadjian" <kachadjian@co.slo.ca.us></kachadjian@co.slo.ca.us></silverwings1@sbcglobal.net></td></jdileo@co.slo<>	"Dan Gaddis" <silverwings1@sbcglobal.net>, "Jan Di Leo" .ca.us>, "Katcho Achadjian" <kachadjian@co.slo.ca.us></kachadjian@co.slo.ca.us></silverwings1@sbcglobal.net>
Date:	12/20/2009 05:10 PM

idileo@co.slo.ca.us

After reviewing the draft EIR, there are a number of items that disturb us.

Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR

1. The 2004 survey, we have yet to identify any participants, which leads us to believe the range was very limited. Also why was Oceano involved in the survey? 1.2.1)

2. With so many other more appropriate venues such as Kaminaka, and the smaller Nipomo parks, why would you want to ruin the rural ambiance of this pristine property? It sems logical to spread out the facilities while you still can, before all available land has been developed. (1.2.2)

3. The SCAC, which is supposed to represent the community and those that will have to live with any decision you make, objected to this ambitious plan, requesting a more rural approach. (1.2.3)

4. To pave over another 183,388 square feet, is leading us to the "concrete jungle" we want to avoid. (1-12)

5. How is removing 84,276 square feet of trail going to help us maintain a rural setting? (1-12)

6. If future gang activity takes over this park, it will leave nothing for the regular youths in our area. Thus the argument that we spread out facilities around (do not put

all the eggs in one basket).

 $7.\ \mbox{How}$ about water and waste management? The EIR does not seem to address this properly with the current drought.

Thank you for your consideration.

Hans & El-Jay Hansson

[Scanned @co.slo.ca.us]

December 22, 2009



Mr. Steve McMasters County of San Luis Obispo Department of Planning and Building 976 Osos Street, Rm.300 San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040

Dear Mr. McMasters

I attended your Nipomo Park Master Plan Notice of Preparation meeting on December 1, 2009 at the Nipomo Community Services District building. In compliance with your stated process, I am submitting my written response to your NOP and EIR.

My comments refer to the category of "Aesthetics":

- Both alternatives 1&2 include lighting the soccer fields, parking, group picnic area, tennis courts, basketball courts and includes security and building lights. Using your figures, the totals for the existing and proposed recreation areas totals over 24 acres of lighting. That's the equivalent of lighting up the entire developed portion of the park at its current size plus an additional 2 acres. The park is surrounded on all four sides by residential housing. That much light cannot be mitigated for the surrounding neighborhoods by grading, landscaping, or light shields. Currently the park tennis court is lit automatically from dusk to 10PM whether or not anyone is playing. That one area of light already causes glare for the homes and drivers on Pomeroy. Your report does not state what hours the lights will be on and the impact on the surrounding residents and drivers.
- A Community Park should reflect a community's character and Nipomo's character is equestrian. Just as Tahoe has snow parks and Pismo has dune parks Nipomo's recreational niche is equestrian trails. Currently the rural portion of the park provides a unique variety of trails for walkers hikers, bird watchers and equestrians. This park

draws visitors from surrounding communities and out of state tourists. With all the residential development our trail numbers have been shrinking and the county has refused to accept dedication of new trails. Ride Nipomo has actively pursued the inclusion of trails in our community planning with Nipomo Community Park being the trail hub. The master plan calls for eliminating 84,276 square feet of trails and 1,113,510 square feet of undeveloped open space. This reduction would alter the park's character and impact Ride Nipomo's years of trail planning How can you mitigate the elimination recreation for one group of people to build recreation for another?

Please include my comments and respond to them in your EIR.

Respectfully submitted,

poquelere Sue Walls

Jacqueline Sue Walls 410 Tejas Place Nipomo, CA 93444 805/929-6085


Air Emissions Screening Analysis

11/8/2011 1:51:00 PM

Urbemis 2007 Version 9.2.4

Combined Annual Emissions Reports (Tons/Year)

File Name: P:\15000\15542 Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR\Reports\A Working EIR\Air Quality\Nipomo AQ Screening\NCP Emissions Screening.urb924

Project Name: Nipomo Community Park Construction Emissions Screening

Project Location: San Luis Obispo County APCD

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

11/8/2011 1:51:00 PM

Summary Report:											
CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES											
	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	PM10 Dust P	M10 Exhaust	<u>PM10</u>	PM2.5 Dust	<u>PM2.5</u> Exhaust	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
2007 TOTALS (tons/year unmitigated)	0.06	0.46	0.26	0.00	1.32	0.03	1.35	0.28	0.02	0.30	36.40
2008 TOTALS (tons/year unmitigated)	0.38	1.75	1.37	0.00	0.54	0.12	0.66	0.11	0.11	0.23	169.07
AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES											
		<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>			
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)		0.02	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.46			
OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSION ESTIN	MATES										
		<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	PM2.5	<u>CO2</u>			
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)		3.03	4.29	34.66	0.03	5.19	0.99	2,672.09			
SUM OF AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONA	AL EMISSION EST	IMATES									
		<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	PM2.5	<u>CO2</u>			
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)		3.05	4.29	34.91	0.03	5.19	0.99	2,672.55			

11/8/2011 1:51:00 PM

Area Source Unmitigated Detail Report:

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES Annual Tons Per Year, Unmitigated

Source	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
Natural Gas	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hearth	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Landscape	0.02	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.46
Consumer Products	0.00						
Architectural Coatings	0.00						
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	0.02	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.46

Area Source Changes to Defaults

al Unmitigated Detail Report:						
iai Oniningated Detail Report.						
RATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES	Annual Tons Per Ye	ear, Unmitigated				
Source	ROG	NOX	СО	SO2	PM10	PM25
park	3.03	4.29	34.66	0.03	5.19	0.99
TALS (tons/vear. unmitigated)	3.03	4.29	34.66	0.03	5.19	0.99

Operational Settings:

Does not include correction for passby trips

Does not include double counting adjustment for internal trips

Analysis Year: 2013 Season: Annual

Emfac: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

11/8/2011 1:51:00 PM

	<u>Sur</u>	mmary of Land U	<u>ses</u>			
Land Use Type	Acreage	Trip Rate	Unit Type	No. Units	Total Trips	Total VMT
City park		3,058.00	acres	1.00	3,058.00	16,513.20
					3,058.00	16,513.20
		Vehicle Fleet N	<u>Mix</u>			
Vehicle Type	Perce	nt Type	Non-Cataly	st	Catalyst	Diesel
Light Auto		41.6	0	.7	99.1	0.2
Light Truck < 3750 lbs		18.8	1	.6	92.0	6.4
Light Truck 3751-5750 lbs		19.9	0	.5	99.0	0.5
Med Truck 5751-8500 lbs		8.0	0	.0	100.0	0.0
Lite-Heavy Truck 8501-10,000 lbs		2.1	0	.0	71.4	28.6
Lite-Heavy Truck 10,001-14,000 lbs		1.2	0	.0	50.0	50.0
Med-Heavy Truck 14,001-33,000 lbs		1.0	0	.0	20.0	80.0
Heavy-Heavy Truck 33,001-60,000 lbs		0.3	0	.0	0.0	100.0
Other Bus		0.1	0	.0	0.0	100.0
Urban Bus		0.0	0	.0	0.0	0.0
Motorcycle		5.2	53	.8	46.2	0.0
School Bus		0.1	0	.0	0.0	100.0
Motor Home		1.7	0	.0	88.2	11.8
		Travel Condition	ons			
	Res	dential			Commercial	
	Home-Work H	lome-Shop	Home-Other	Commute	Non-Work	Customer
Urban Trip Length (miles)	13.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	5.0	5.0

11/8/2011 1:51:00 PM

		Travel Cond	itions			
		Residential		C		
	Home-Work	Home-Shop	Home-Other	Commute	Non-Work	Customer
Rural Trip Length (miles)	13.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	5.0	5.0
Trip speeds (mph)	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0
% of Trips - Residential	32.9	18.0	49.1			
% of Trips - Commercial (by land use)						
City park				5.0	2.5	92.5

11/8/2011 1:50:30 PM

Urbemis 2007 Version 9.2.4

Combined Summer Emissions Reports (Pounds/Day)

File Name: P:\15000\15542 Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR\Reports\A Working EIR\Air Quality\Nipomo AQ Screening\NCP Emissions Screening.urb924

Project Name: Nipomo Community Park Construction Emissions Screening

Project Location: San Luis Obispo County APCD

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

11/8/2011 1:50:30 PM

Summary Report:											
CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES											
	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10 Dust P</u>	M10 Exhaust	<u>PM10</u>	PM2.5 Dust	<u>PM2.5</u> Exhaust	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
2007 TOTALS (lbs/day unmitigated)	9.74	61.80	35.74	0.01	120.04	3.76	123.79	25.07	3.46	28.53	4,942.74
2008 TOTALS (lbs/day unmitigated)	13.48	76.96	49.52	0.01	120.05	4.92	124.96	25.08	4.52	29.60	6,766.52
AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES											
		<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	PM2.5	<u>CO2</u>			
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)		0.12	0.02	1.55	0.00	0.01	0.01	2.81			
OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSION ESTIM	IATES										
		<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	PM2.5	<u>CO2</u>			
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)		15.46	21.47	180.22	0.14	28.42	5.45	14,903.09			
SUM OF AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONA	L EMISSION EST	IMATES									
		<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	PM2.5	<u>CO2</u>			
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)		15.58	21.49	181.77	0.14	28.43	5.46	14,905.90			

11/8/2011 1:50:30 PM

Area Source Unmitigated Detail Report:

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES Summer Pounds Per Day, Unmitigated

Source	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	PM2.5	<u>CO2</u>
Natural Gas	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hearth - No Summer Emissions							
Landscape	0.12	0.02	1.55	0.00	0.01	0.01	2.81
Consumer Products	0.00						
Architectural Coatings	0.00						
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	0.12	0.02	1.55	0.00	0.01	0.01	2.81

Area Source Changes to Defaults

Operational Unmitigated Detail Report:							
OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATE	S Summer Pounds P	er Day, Unmitiga	ted				
Source	ROG	NOX	СО	SO2	PM10	PM25	CO2
City park	15.46	21.47	180.22	0.14	28.42	5.45	14,903.09
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	15.46	21.47	180.22	0.14	28.42	5.45	14,903.09

Operational Settings:

Does not include correction for passby trips

Does not include double counting adjustment for internal trips

Analysis Year: 2013 Temperature (F): 75 Season: Summer

Emfac: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

11/8/2011 1:50:30 PM

	<u>S</u>	Summary of Land U	<u>ses</u>			
Land Use Type	Acrea	ge Trip Rate	Unit Type	No. Units	Total Trips	Total VMT
City park		3,058.00	acres	1.00	3,058.00	16,513.20
					3,058.00	16,513.20
		Vehicle Fleet N	<u>Mix</u>			
Vehicle Type	Per	cent Type	Non-Cataly	st	Catalyst	Diesel
Light Auto		41.6	0	.7	99.1	0.2
Light Truck < 3750 lbs		18.8	1	.6	92.0	6.4
Light Truck 3751-5750 lbs		19.9	0	.5	99.0	0.5
Med Truck 5751-8500 lbs		8.0	0	.0	100.0	0.0
Lite-Heavy Truck 8501-10,000 lbs		2.1	0	.0	71.4	28.6
Lite-Heavy Truck 10,001-14,000 lbs		1.2	0	.0	50.0	50.0
Med-Heavy Truck 14,001-33,000 lbs		1.0	0	.0	20.0	80.0
Heavy-Heavy Truck 33,001-60,000 lbs		0.3	0	.0	0.0	100.0
Other Bus		0.1	0	.0	0.0	100.0
Urban Bus		0.0	0	.0	0.0	0.0
Motorcycle		5.2	53	.8	46.2	0.0
School Bus		0.1	0	.0	0.0	100.0
Motor Home		1.7	0	.0	88.2	11.8
		Travel Condition	ons			
	Re	esidential			Commercial	
	Home-Work	Home-Shop	Home-Other	Commute	Non-Work	Customer
Urban Trip Length (miles)	13.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	5.0	5.0

11/8/2011 1:50:30 PM

		Travel Cond	itions			
		Residential		(
	Home-Work	Home-Shop	Home-Other	Commute	Non-Work	Customer
Rural Trip Length (miles)	13.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	5.0	5.0
Trip speeds (mph)	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0
% of Trips - Residential	32.9	18.0	49.1			
% of Trips - Commercial (by land use)						
City park				5.0	2.5	92.5

11/8/2011 1:50:45 PM

Urbemis 2007 Version 9.2.4

Combined Winter Emissions Reports (Pounds/Day)

File Name: P:\15000\15542 Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR\Reports\A Working EIR\Air Quality\Nipomo AQ Screening\NCP Emissions Screening.urb924

Project Name: Nipomo Community Park Construction Emissions Screening

Project Location: San Luis Obispo County APCD

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

11/8/2011 1:50:45 PM

Summary Report:											
CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES											
	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10 Dust F</u>	M10 Exhaust	<u>PM10</u>	PM2.5 Dust	<u>PM2.5</u> Exhaust	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
2007 TOTALS (lbs/day unmitigated)	9.74	61.80	35.74	0.01	120.04	3.76	123.79	25.07	3.46	28.53	4,942.74
2008 TOTALS (lbs/day unmitigated)	13.48	76.96	49.52	0.01	120.05	4.92	124.96	25.08	4.52	29.60	6,766.52
AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES											
	<u> </u>	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>			
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			
OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSION ESTIN	IATES										
	<u> </u>	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>			
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	1	8.94	27.61	209.30	0.14	28.42	5.45	14,118.66			
SUM OF AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONA	L EMISSION ESTI	MATES									
	<u>F</u>	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>			
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	1	8.94	27.61	209.30	0.14	28.42	5.45	14,118.66			

11/8/2011 1:50:45 PM

Area Source Unmitigated Detail Report:

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES Winter Pounds Per Day, Unmitigated									
Source	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>						

Natural Gas	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hearth	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Landscaping - No Winter Emissions							
Consumer Products	0.00						
Architectural Coatings	0.00						
TOTALS (Ibs/day, unmitigated)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

<u>SO2</u>

<u>PM10</u>

PM2.5

<u>CO2</u>

Area Source Changes to Defaults

perational Unmitigated Detail Report:						
PERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATE	S Winter Pounds Per	Day, Unmitigate	d			
Source	ROG	NOX	со	SO2	PM10	PM25
ity park	18.94	27.61	209.30	0.14	28.42	5.45
OTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	18.94	27.61	209.30	0.14	28.42	5.45

Operational Settings:

Does not include correction for passby trips

Does not include double counting adjustment for internal trips

Analysis Year: 2013 Temperature (F): 50 Season: Winter

Emfac: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

11/8/2011 1:50:45 PM

	<u>S</u>	Summary of Land U	ses				
Land Use Type	Acrea	ge Trip Rate	Unit Type	No. Units	Total Trips	Total VMT	
City park		3,058.00	acres	1.00	3,058.00	16,513.20	
					3,058.00	16,513.20	
		Vehicle Fleet N	<u>Mix</u>				
Vehicle Type	Per	cent Type	Non-Cataly	st	Catalyst	Diesel	
Light Auto		41.6	0	.7	99.1	0.2	
Light Truck < 3750 lbs		18.8	1	.6	92.0	6.4	
Light Truck 3751-5750 lbs		19.9	0	.5	99.0	0.5	
Med Truck 5751-8500 lbs		8.0	0	.0	100.0	0.0	
Lite-Heavy Truck 8501-10,000 lbs		2.1	0	.0	71.4	28.6	
Lite-Heavy Truck 10,001-14,000 lbs		1.2	0	.0	50.0	50.0	
Med-Heavy Truck 14,001-33,000 lbs		1.0	0	.0	20.0	80.0	
Heavy-Heavy Truck 33,001-60,000 lbs		0.3	0	.0	0.0	100.0	
Other Bus		0.1	0	.0	0.0	100.0	
Urban Bus		0.0	0	.0	0.0	0.0	
Motorcycle		5.2	53	.8	46.2	0.0	
School Bus		0.1	0	.0	0.0	100.0	
Motor Home		1.7	0	.0	88.2	11.8	
		Travel Condition	ons				
	Re	esidential			Commercial		
	Home-Work	Home-Shop	Home-Other	Commute	Non-Work	Customer	
Urban Trip Length (miles)	13.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	5.0	5.0	

11/8/2011 1:50:45 PM

Travel Conditions								
		Residential		Commercial				
	Home-Work	Home-Shop	Home-Other	Commute	Non-Work	Customer		
Rural Trip Length (miles)	13.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	5.0	5.0		
Trip speeds (mph)	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0		
% of Trips - Residential	32.9	18.0	49.1					
% of Trips - Commercial (by land use)								
City park				5.0	2.5	92.5		

Master Plan Operational and Area Source Emissions

11/9/2011 1:26:42 PM

Urbemis 2007 Version 9.2.4

Combined Annual Emissions Reports (Tons/Year)

File Name: P:\15000\15542 Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR\Reports\A Working EIR\Air Quality\06-14-11 Nipomo Park Urbemis Operational & Area Calcs\6-15-11 NCP.urb924

Project Name: Nipomo Park EIR Updated AQ Calculations

Project Location: San Luis Obispo County APCD

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

Summary Report:

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES								
	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	PM2.5	<u>CO2</u>	
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	0.53							
TOTALS (tons/year, mitigated)	0.53							
Percent Reduction	0.00	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	
OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSION ESTIMATES								
	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>	
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	2.78	3.39	28.09	0.00	3.48	0.66	1,816.95	
SUM OF AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES								
	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>	
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	3.31	3.39	28.09	0.00	3.48	0.66	1,816.95	

Both Area and Operational Mitigation must be turned on to get a combined mitigated total.

11/9/2011 1:26:42 PM

Area Source Unmitigated Detail Report:

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES Annual Tons Per Year, Unmitigated								
Source	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	PM2.5	<u>CO2</u>	
Natural Gas								
Hearth								
Landscape								
Consumer Products								
Architectural Coatings	0.53							
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	0.53							
Area Source Mitigated Detail Report:								
AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATE	S Annual Tons Per Ye	ear, Mitigated						
Source	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	PM2.5	<u>CO2</u>	
Natural Gas								
Hearth								
Landscape								
Consumer Products								
Architectural Coatings	0.53							
TOTALS (tons/year, mitigated)	0.53							

Area Source Changes to Defaults

11/9/2011 1:26:42 PM

Operational Unmitigated Detail Report:

OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES Annual Tons Per Year, Unmitigated

Source	ROG	NOX	СО	SO2	PM10	PM25	CO2
Single family housing	0.01	0.02	0.15	0.00	0.02	0.00	10.47
Day-care center	0.02	0.01	0.12	0.00	0.01	0.00	6.66
Library	0.55	0.62	5.19	0.00	0.60	0.12	315.62
City park	0.02	0.01	0.10	0.00	0.01	0.00	6.68
Racquet club	0.76	0.85	7.14	0.00	0.84	0.16	441.52
Racquetball/health	0.15	0.16	1.37	0.00	0.16	0.03	84.48
Baseball/softball fields	0.13	0.17	1.37	0.00	0.18	0.03	92.99
Basketball courts	0.41	0.56	4.57	0.00	0.60	0.12	309.97
Handball courts	0.08	0.11	0.91	0.00	0.12	0.02	61.99
Tennis courts	0.21	0.28	2.28	0.00	0.30	0.06	154.92
Sports fields (soccer)	0.44	0.60	4.89	0.00	0.64	0.12	331.65
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	2.78	3.39	28.09	0.00	3.48	0.66	1,816.95

Operational Settings:

Includes correction for passby trips

Includes the following double counting adjustment for internal trips:

Residential Trip % Reduction: 0.00 Nonresidential Trip % Reduction: 0.00

Analysis Year: 2012 Season: Annual

Emfac: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

11/9/2011 1:26:42 PM

Summary of Land Uses									
Land Use Type	Acreage	Trip Rate	Unit Type	No. Units	Total Trips	Total VMT			
Single family housing	0.33	9.57	dwelling units	1.00	9.57	63.94			
Day-care center		4.48	1000 sq ft	4.05	18.14	39.34			
Library		56.24	1000 sq ft	11.13	625.95	1,904.71			
City park		1.59	acres	6.24	9.92	40.88			
Racquet club		22.88	1000 sq ft	36.00	823.68	2,673.17			
Racquetball/health		15.76	1000 sq ft	10.00	157.60	511.48			
Baseball/softball fields		30.00	acres	4.00	120.00	572.76			
Basketball courts		200.00	acres	2.00	400.00	1,909.20			
Handball courts		40.00	acres	2.00	80.00	381.84			
Tennis courts		33.32	acres	6.00	199.92	954.22			
Sports fields (soccer)		71.33	acres	6.00	427.98	2,042.75			
					2,872.76	11,094.29			
	$\underline{\vee}$	ehicle Fleet	<u>Mix</u>						
Vehicle Type	Percent T	уре	Non-Cata	lyst	Catalyst	Diese	əl		
Light Auto	2	11.6		1.0	98.5	0.	5		
Light Truck < 3750 lbs		18.8		2.1	91.5	6.	4		
Light Truck 3751-5750 lbs		19.9		0.5	99.0	0.	5		
Med Truck 5751-8500 lbs		8.0		1.2	98.8	0.	0		
Lite-Heavy Truck 8501-10,000 lbs		2.1		0.0	71.4	28.	6		
Lite-Heavy Truck 10,001-14,000 lbs		1.2		0.0	50.0	50.	0		
Med-Heavy Truck 14,001-33,000 lbs		1.0		0.0	20.0	80.	0		

11/9/2011 1:26:42 PM

Vehicle Fleet Mix

Vehicle Type	Percent Type	Non-Catalyst	Catalyst	Diesel
Heavy-Heavy Truck 33,001-60,000 lbs	0.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other Bus	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Urban Bus	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Motorcycle	5.2	57.7	42.3	0.0
School Bus	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Motor Home	1.7	0.0	88.2	11.8

Travel Conditions

		Residential		Commercial			
	Home-Work	Home-Shop	Home-Other	Commute	Non-Work	Customer	
Urban Trip Length (miles)	13.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	5.0	5.0	
Rural Trip Length (miles)	13.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	5.0	5.0	
Trip speeds (mph)	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	
% of Trips - Residential	32.9	18.0	49.1				

% of Trips - Commercial (by land use)			
Day-care center	5.0	2.5	92.5
Library	5.0	2.5	92.5
City park	5.0	2.5	92.5
Racquet club	5.0	2.5	92.5
Racquetball/health	5.0	2.5	92.5
Baseball/softball fields	2.0	1.0	97.0

11/9/2011 1:26:42 PM

Travel Conditions

	Residential			Commercial		
	Home-Work	Home-Shop	Home-Other	Commute	Non-Work	Customer
Basketball courts				2.0	1.0	97.0
Handball courts				2.0	1.0	97.0
Tennis courts				2.0	1.0	97.0
Sports fields (soccer)				2.0	1.0	97.0

11/9/2011 1:26:29 PM

Urbemis 2007 Version 9.2.4

Combined Winter Emissions Reports (Pounds/Day)

File Name: P:\15000\15542 Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR\Reports\A Working EIR\Air Quality\06-14-11 Nipomo Park Urbemis Operational & Area Calcs\6-15-11 NCP.urb924

Project Name: Nipomo Park EIR Updated AQ Calculations

Project Location: San Luis Obispo County APCD

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

Summary Report:

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES							
	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	PM2.5	<u>CO2</u>
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	2.92						
TOTALS (lbs/day, mitigated)	2.92						
Percent Reduction	0.00	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN
OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSION ESTIMATES							
	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	17.13	21.80	173.25	0.09	19.12	3.69	9,608.05
SUM OF AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONAL EMISSIC	N ESTIMATES						
	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	PM10	PM2.5	<u>CO2</u>
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	20.05	21.80	173.25	0.09	19.12	3.69	9,608.05

Both Area and Operational Mitigation must be turned on to get a combined mitigated total.

11/9/2011 1:26:29 PM

Area Source Unmitigated Detail Report:

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATE	S Winter Pounds Per	Day, Unmitigated					
Source	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
Natural Gas							
Hearth							
Landscape							
Consumer Products							
Architectural Coatings	2.92						
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	2.92						
Area Source Mitigated Detail Report:							
AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATE	S Winter Pounds Per	Day, Mitigated					
Source	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
Natural Gas							
Hearth							
Landscape							
Consumer Products							
Architectural Coatings	2.92						
TOTALS (lbs/day, mitigated)	2.92						

Area Source Changes to Defaults

11/9/2011 1:26:29 PM

Operational Unmitigated Detail Report:

OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES Winter Pounds Per Day, Unmitigated

Source	ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10	PM25	CO2
Single family housing	0.08	0.12	0.91	0.00	0.11	0.02	55.39
Day-care center	0.09	0.09	0.77	0.00	0.07	0.01	35.24
Library	3.45	3.95	32.42	0.02	3.28	0.64	1,669.71
City park	0.07	0.08	0.63	0.00	0.07	0.01	35.33
Racquet club	4.65	5.46	44.42	0.02	4.61	0.89	2,335.45
Racquetball/health	0.89	1.04	8.50	0.00	0.88	0.17	446.86
Baseball/softball fields	0.77	1.08	8.37	0.00	0.99	0.19	491.58
Basketball courts	2.57	3.60	27.88	0.02	3.29	0.63	1,638.59
Handball courts	0.52	0.72	5.58	0.00	0.66	0.13	327.72
Tennis courts	1.29	1.80	13.94	0.01	1.64	0.32	818.97
Sports fields (soccer)	2.75	3.86	29.83	0.02	3.52	0.68	1,753.21
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	17.13	21.80	173.25	0.09	19.12	3.69	9,608.05

Operational Settings:

Includes correction for passby trips

Includes the following double counting adjustment for internal trips:

Residential Trip % Reduction: 0.00 Nonresidential Trip % Reduction: 0.00

Analysis Year: 2012 Temperature (F): 50 Season: Winter

Emfac: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

11/9/2011 1:26:29 PM

Summary of Land Uses									
Acreage	Trip Rate	Unit Type	No. Units	Total Trips	Total VMT				
0.33	9.57	dwelling units	1.00	9.57	63.94				
	4.48	1000 sq ft	4.05	18.14	39.34				
	56.24	1000 sq ft	11.13	625.95	1,904.71				
	1.59	acres	6.24	9.92	40.88				
	22.88	1000 sq ft	36.00	823.68	2,673.17				
	15.76	1000 sq ft	10.00	157.60	511.48				
	30.00	acres	4.00	120.00	572.76				
	200.00	acres	2.00	400.00	1,909.20				
	40.00	acres	2.00	80.00	381.84				
	33.32	acres	6.00	199.92	954.22				
	71.33	acres	6.00	427.98	2,042.75				
				2,872.76	11,094.29				
	Vehicle Fleet	Mix							
Percent	Туре	Non-Catal	yst	Catalyst	Diese	əl			
	41.6		1.0	98.5	0.9	5			
	18.8		2.1	91.5	6.4	4			
	19.9	(0.5	99.0	0.9	5			
	8.0		1.2	98.8	0.0	0			
	2.1	(0.0	71.4	28.0	6			
	1.2	(0.0	50.0	50.0	0			
	1.0	(0.0	20.0	80.0	0			
	Sumn Acreage 0.33 Percent	Summary of Land L Acreage Trip Rate 0.33 9.57 4.48 56.24 1.59 22.88 15.76 30.00 200.00 40.00 33.32 71.33 Vehicle Fleet Percent Type 41.6 18.8 19.9 8.0 2.1 1.2 1.0 1.0	Summary of Land Uses Acreage Trip Rate Unit Type 0.33 9.57 dwelling units 4.48 1000 sq ft 56.24 1000 sq ft 1.59 acres 22.88 1000 sq ft 15.76 1000 sq ft 30.00 acres 200.00 acres 200.00 acres 33.32 acres 33.32 acres 71.33 acres 71.33 acres Vehicle Fleet Mix 9.9 0 3.32 Percent Type Non-Catal 9.9 0 8.0 2.1 0 3.0 1.2 0 1.0 0	Summary of Land Uses Acreage Trip Rate Unit Type No. Units 0.33 9.57 dwelling units 1.00 0.34 1000 sq ft 11.13 1.59 1.59 acres 6.24 22.88 1000 sq ft 10.00 15.76 1000 sq ft 10.00 30.00 acres 2.00 30.00 acres 2.00 40.00 acres 2.00 33.32 acres 6.00 71.33 acres 6.00 41.6 1.0 18.8 2.1 1.0 19.9 0.5 8.0 8.0 1.2 0.0 1.2 0.0 1.2	Summary of Land Uses Acreage Trip Rate Unit Type No. Units Total Trips 0.33 9.57 dwelling units 1.00 9.57 14.48 1000 sq ft 11.13 625.95 1.59 acres 6.24 9.92 22.88 1000 sq ft 36.00 823.68 15.76 1000 sq ft 10.00 157.60 30.00 acres 2.00 400.00 200.00 acres 2.00 80.00 33.32 acres 6.00 199.92 71.33 acres 6.00 427.98 2.1 Non-Catalyst Catalyst 41.6 1.0 98.5 19.9 0.5	Summary of Land Uses Acreage Trip Rate Unit Type No. Units Total Trips Total VMT 0.33 9.57 dwelling units 1.00 9.57 63.94 1.59 acres 6.24 9.92 40.88 2.673.17 15.76 1000 sq ft 36.00 823.68 2.673.17 15.76 1000 sq ft 10.00 157.60 511.48 30.00 acres 2.00 40.00 1,909.20 40.00 acres 2.00 80.00 381.84 33.32 acres 6.00 427.98 2.042.75 2.672.76 11.094.29 2.672.76 0.6 18.8			

11/9/2011 1:26:29 PM

Vehicle Fleet Mix

Vehicle Type	Percent Type	Non-Catalyst	Catalyst	Diesel
Heavy-Heavy Truck 33,001-60,000 lbs	0.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other Bus	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Urban Bus	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Motorcycle	5.2	57.7	42.3	0.0
School Bus	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Motor Home	1.7	0.0	88.2	11.8

Travel Conditions

		Residential			Commercial				
	Home-Work	Home-Shop	Home-Other	Commute	Non-Work	Customer			
Urban Trip Length (miles)	13.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	5.0	5.0			
Rural Trip Length (miles)	13.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	5.0	5.0			
Trip speeds (mph)	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0			
% of Trips - Residential	32.9	18.0	49.1						

% of Trips - Commercial (by land use)			
Day-care center	5.0	2.5	92.5
Library	5.0	2.5	92.5
City park	5.0	2.5	92.5
Racquet club	5.0	2.5	92.5
Racquetball/health	5.0	2.5	92.5
Baseball/softball fields	2.0	1.0	97.0

11/9/2011 1:26:29 PM

Travel Conditions

	Residential			Co	ommercial	
	Home-Work	Home-Shop	Home-Other	Commute	Non-Work	Customer
Basketball courts				2.0	1.0	97.0
Handball courts				2.0	1.0	97.0
Tennis courts				2.0	1.0	97.0
Sports fields (soccer)				2.0	1.0	97.0

11/9/2011 1:26:13 PM

Urbemis 2007 Version 9.2.4

Summary Report for Summer Emissions (Pounds/Day)

File Name: P:\15000\15542 Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Program EIR\Reports\A Working EIR\Air Quality\06-14-11 Nipomo Park Urbemis Operational & Area Calcs\6-15-11 NCP.urb924

Project Name: Nipomo Park EIR Updated AQ Calculations

Project Location: San Luis Obispo County APCD

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>	
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	2.92							
TOTALS (lbs/day, mitigated)	2.92							
Percent Reduction	0.00	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	NaN	
OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSION ESTIMATES	5							
	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>	
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	14.26	16.99	144.25	0.09	19.12	3.69	10,129.97	
SUM OF AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES								
	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>	
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	17.18	16.99	144.25	0.09	19.12	3.69	10,129.97	

Both Area and Operational Mitigation must be turned on to get a combined mitigated total.
Alternative Master Plan A Air Emissions Screening Analysis

11/9/2011 1:31:02 PM

Urbemis 2007 Version 9.2.4

Combined Annual Emissions Reports (Tons/Year)

File Name: C:\Documents and Settings\sscott\Desktop\NCP Alternatives Master Plan A.urb924

Project Name: NCP Alternative Master Plan A Screening Analysis

Project Location: San Luis Obispo County APCD

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

Area Source Unmitigated Detail Report:

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES Annual Tons Per Year, Unmitigated

Source	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	PM2.5	<u>CO2</u>
Natural Gas	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hearth	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Landscape	0.02	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.46
Consumer Products	0.00						
Architectural Coatings	0.00						
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	0.02	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.46

Area Source Changes to Defaults

11/9/2011 1:31:02 PM

Operational Unmitigated Detail Report:

OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES Annual Tons Per Year, Unmitigated

Source	ROG	NOX	со	SO2	PM10	PM25	CO2
City park	0.65	0.92	7.41	0.01	1.11	0.21	571.47
TOTALS (tons/year, unmitigated)	0.65	0.92	7.41	0.01	1.11	0.21	571.47

Operational Settings:

Does not include correction for passby trips

Does not include double counting adjustment for internal trips

Analysis Year: 2013 Season: Annual

Emfac: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Summary of Land Uses										
Land Use Type	Acreage	Trip Rate	Unit Type	No. Units	Total Trips	Total VMT				
City park		654.00	acres	1.00	654.00	3,531.60				
					654.00	3,531.60				
Vehicle Fleet Mix										
Vehicle Type	Percent	Туре	Non-Cataly	/st	Catalyst	Diesel				
Light Auto		41.6	C).7	99.1	0.2				
Light Truck < 3750 lbs		18.8	1	1.6	92.0	6.4				
Light Truck 3751-5750 lbs		19.9	C).5	99.0	0.5				
Med Truck 5751-8500 lbs		8.0	C	0.0	100.0	0.0				
Lite-Heavy Truck 8501-10,000 lbs		2.1	C	0.0	71.4	28.6				
Lite-Heavy Truck 10,001-14,000 lbs		1.2	0).0	50.0	50.0				

11/9/2011 1:31:02 PM

Vehicle Fleet Mix

Vehicle Type	Percent Type	Non-Catalyst	Catalyst	Diesel
Med-Heavy Truck 14,001-33,000 lbs	1.0	0.0	20.0	80.0
Heavy-Heavy Truck 33,001-60,000 lbs	0.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other Bus	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Urban Bus	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Motorcycle	5.2	53.8	46.2	0.0
School Bus	0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Motor Home	1.7	0.0	88.2	11.8

Travel Conditions

		Residential			Commercial			
	Home-Work	Home-Shop	Home-Other	Commute	Non-Work	Customer		
Urban Trip Length (miles)	13.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	5.0	5.0		
Rural Trip Length (miles)	13.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	5.0	5.0		
Trip speeds (mph)	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0		
% of Trips - Residential	32.9	18.0	49.1					

% of Trips - Commercial (by land use)

City park	5.0	2.5	92.5

11/9/2011 1:30:52 PM

Urbemis 2007 Version 9.2.4

Combined Winter Emissions Reports (Pounds/Day)

File Name: C:\Documents and Settings\sscott\Desktop\NCP Alternatives Master Plan A.urb924

Project Name: NCP Alternative Master Plan A Screening Analysis

Project Location: San Luis Obispo County APCD

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

Area Source Unmitigated Detail Report:

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES Winter Pounds Per Day, Unmitigated

Source	ROG	NOx	<u>C0</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
Natural Gas	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Hearth	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Landscaping - No Winter Emissions							
Consumer Products	0.00						
Architectural Coatings	0.00						
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Area Source Changes to Defaults

11/9/2011 1:30:52 PM

Operational Unmitigated Detail Report:

OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES Winter Pounds Per Day, Unmitigated

Source	ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10	PM25	CO2
City park	4.05	5.90	44.76	0.03	6.08	1.17	3,019.49
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	4.05	5.90	44.76	0.03	6.08	1.17	3,019.49

Operational Settings:

Does not include correction for passby trips

Does not include double counting adjustment for internal trips

Analysis Year: 2013 Temperature (F): 50 Season: Winter

Emfac: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Summary of Land Uses Land Use Type Trip Rate Unit Type No. Units **Total Trips** Total VMT Acreage City park 654.00 1.00 654.00 3,531.60 acres 654.00 3,531.60 Vehicle Fleet Mix Vehicle Type Percent Type Non-Catalyst Catalyst Diesel Light Auto 41.6 0.7 99.1 0.2 Light Truck < 3750 lbs 92.0 6.4 18.8 1.6 Light Truck 3751-5750 lbs 19.9 0.5 99.0 0.5 Med Truck 5751-8500 lbs 8.0 0.0 100.0 0.0 Lite-Heavy Truck 8501-10,000 lbs 2.1 0.0 71.4 28.6 Lite-Heavy Truck 10,001-14,000 lbs 1.2 0.0 50.0 50.0

11/9/2011 1:30:52 PM

Vehicle Fleet Mix

Percent Type	Non-Catalyst	Catalyst	Diesel
1.0	0.0	20.0	80.0
0.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5.2	53.8	46.2	0.0
0.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
1.7	0.0	88.2	11.8
	Percent Type 1.0 0.3 0.1 0.0 5.2 0.1 1.7	Percent Type Non-Catalyst 1.0 0.0 0.3 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0 5.2 53.8 0.1 0.0 1.7 0.0	Percent Type Non-Catalyst Catalyst 1.0 0.0 20.0 0.3 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 1.1 0.0 0.0

Travel Conditions

		Residential			Commercial			
	Home-Work	Home-Shop	Home-Other	Commute	Non-Work	Customer		
Urban Trip Length (miles)	13.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	5.0	5.0		
Rural Trip Length (miles)	13.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	5.0	5.0		
Trip speeds (mph)	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0	35.0		
% of Trips - Residential	32.9	18.0	49.1					

% of Trips - Commercial (by land use)

City park	5.0	2.5	92.5
	0.0	2.0	52.0

11/9/2011 1:30:09 PM

Urbemis 2007 Version 9.2.4

Summary Report for Summer Emissions (Pounds/Day)

File Name: C:\Documents and Settings\sscott\Desktop\NCP Alternatives Master Plan A.urb924

- Project Name: NCP Alternative Master Plan A Screening Analysis
- Project Location: San Luis Obispo County APCD

On-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: Version : Emfac2007 V2.3 Nov 1 2006

Off-Road Vehicle Emissions Based on: OFFROAD2007

CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES

	<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10 Dust PI</u>	M10 Exhaust	<u>PM10</u>	PM2.5 Dust	PM2.5 Exhaust	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
2007 TOTALS (lbs/day unmitigated)	9.98	62.41	35.93	0.01	137.64	3.78	141.42	28.75	3.48	32.23	5,007.70
2008 TOTALS (lbs/day unmitigated)	13.72	77.53	49.69	0.01	137.65	4.94	142.59	28.75	4.54	33.29	6,831.48
AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES											
		<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>			
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)		0.12	0.02	1.55	0.00	0.01	0.01	2.81			
OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSION EST	IMATES										
		<u>ROG</u>	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>			
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)		3.31	4.59	38.54	0.03	6.08	1.17	3,187.25			

11/9/2011 1:30:09 PM

SUM OF AREA SOURCE AND OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES

	ROG	<u>NOx</u>	<u>CO</u>	<u>SO2</u>	<u>PM10</u>	<u>PM2.5</u>	<u>CO2</u>
TOTALS (lbs/day, unmitigated)	3.43	4.61	40.09	0.03	6.09	1.18	3,190.06



Plant and Wildlife Species Observed within Nipomo Community Park

Scientific Name	Common Name	Native	Species Status / Notes		
Vascular Plants nomenclature follows " The Je	epson Manual" and http://ucjeps.be	erkeley.edu/int	erchange.html		
PTERIDOPHYTES					
Dryopteridaceae	Wood fern Family				
Dryopteris arguta	coastal wood fern	Yes			
Pteridaceae	Brake family				
Adiantum jordanii	California maiden-hair	Yes			
Pentagramma triangularis	goldback fern	Yes			
Taxodiaceae	Bald cypress family				
Sequoia sempervirens	coast redwood	Yes	landscaped/developed areas		
GYMNOSPERMS					
Cupressaceae	Cypress Family				
Hesperocyparis macrocarpa	Monterey cypress	Yes	landscaped/developed areas		
Pinaceae	Pine family				
Pinus radiata	Monterey pine	Yes*	landscaped/developed areas		
ANGIOSPERMS (DICOTS)					
Aizoaceae	Fig-marigold family				
Carpobrotus edulis	ice plant	No			
Anacardiaceae	Sumac family				
Rhus integrifolia	lemonadeberry	Yes			
Toxicodendron diversilobum	poison oak	Yes			
Apiaceae	Carrot family				
Conium maculatum	poison hemlock	No			
Daucus pusillus	rattle snake weed	Yes			
Asteraceae	Sunflower family				
Achillea millefolium	yarrow	Yes			
Anaphalis margaritacea	pearly everlasting	Yes			
Anthemis cotula	mayweed	No			
Artemisia californica	California sagebrush	Yes			
Baccharis pilularis var. consanguinea	coyote brush	Yes			
Carduus pycnocephalus	Italian thistle	No			

Plant Species Observed within Nipomo Community Park

Scientific Name	Common Name	Native	Species Status / Notes
Centaurea melitensis	tocolote	No	
Encelia californica	California brittlebush	Yes	Nipomo Botanical Garden
Ericameria ericoides	mock heather	Yes	
Eriophyllum confertiflorum	golden yarrow	Yes	
Gnaphalium luteo-album	cudweed	No	
Helianthus annus	sunflower	1	
Heterotheca grandiflora	telegraph weed	Yes	
Hypochaeris glabra	smooth cat's ear	No	
Hypochaeris radicata	rough cat's ear	No	
Lessingia filaginifolia	beach aster	Yes	
Senecio vulgaris	ragwort	No	
Silybum marianum	milk thistle	No	
Sonchus asper	prickly sow-thistle	No	
Sonchus oleraceus	common sow-thistle	No	
Taraxacum officinale	dandelion	No	
Brassicaceae	Mustard family	1	
Brassica nigra	black mustard	No	
Cardamine californica	milk maids	Yes	
Hirschfeldia incana	short-pod mustard	No	
Raphanus sativus	wild radish	No	
Caprifoliaceae	Honeysuckle family		
Sambucus mexicana	blue elderberry	Yes	
Lonicera involucrata	twinberry	Yes	Nipomo Botanical Garden
Caryophyllaceae	Pink family	1	
Cardionema ramosissimum	sand mat	Yes	
Chenopodiaceae	Goosefoot family	1	
Chenopodium californicum	California pigweed	Yes	
Cistaceae	Rock-rose family	1	
Helianthemum scoparium	broom rose	Yes	
Crassulaceae	Stonecrop family	1	
Dudleya lanceolata		Yes	Nipomo Botanical Garden
Cucurbitaceae	Gourd family		
Marah fabaceus var. fabaceus	wild cucumber	Yes	

Scientific Name	Common Name	Native	Species Status / Notes
Ericaceae	Heath family		
Arctostaphylos rudis	sand mesa manzanita	Yes	1B.2
Euphorbiaceae	Spurge family		
Croton californicus	croton	Yes	
Euphorbia peplus	petty spurge	No	
Fabaceae	Pea family		
Acacia longifolia	golden wattle	No	landscaped/developed areas
Lathyrus vestitus var. vestitus		Yes	
Lotus scoparius	deer weed	Yes	
Lupinus arboreus	yellow bush lupine	Yes	
Lupinus bicolor	miniature lupine	Yes	
Lupinus chamissonis	dune lupine	Yes	
Lupinus nanus	sky lupine	Yes	
Lupinus succulentus	Arroyo lupine	Yes	
Melilotus alba	white sweetclover	No	
Melilotus indica	sourclover	No	
Vicia sativa	spring vetch	No	
Fagaceae	Oak family		
Quercus agrifolia	coast live oak	Yes	
Geraniaceae	Geranium family		
Erodium cicutarium	red-stemmed filaree	No	
Erodium botrys	filaree	No	
Geranium dissectum		No	
Grossulariaceae	Gooseberry Family		
Ribes sanguineum	red flowering currant	Yes	Nipomo Botanical Garden
Hydrophyllaceae	Waterleaf f family		
Eucrypta chrysanthemifolia	common eucrypta	Yes	
Phacelia parryi	Parry's phacelia	Yes	Nipomo Botanical Garden
Lamiaceae	Mint Family		
Salvia mellifera	black sage	Yes	
Salvia apiana	white sage	Yes	Nipomo Botanical Garden
Salvia spathacea	pitcher sage	Yes	
Malvaceae	Mallow family		

Scientific Name	Common Name	Native	Species Status / Notes
Malva parviflora	cheeseweed	No	
Myricaceae	Wax Myrtle Family		
Morella (Myrica) californica	California wax myrtle	Yes	Nipomo Botanical Garden
Myrtaceae			
Eucalyptus globulus	blue gum eucalyptus	No	windrows, landscaped areas
Eucalyptus camaldulensis	red gum eucalyptus	No	windrows, landscaped areas
Onagraceae	Evening primrose family		
Camissonia cheiranthifolia	beach primrose	Yes	
Camissonia micrantha	small primrose	Yes	
Clarkia purpurea ssp quadrivulnera	purple clarkia	Yes	
Epilobium canum	California fuchsia	Yes	Nipomo Botanical Garden
Oxalidaceae	Oxalis family		
Oxalis pes-caprae	Bermuda buttercup	No	
Paeoniaceae	Peony family		
Paeonia californica	California peony	Yes	
Papaveraceae	Poppy family		
Eschscholzia californica	California poppy	Yes	
Plantaginaceae	Plantain family		
Plantago erecta	California plantain	Yes	
Plantago lanceolata	English plantain	No	
Plantago coronopus	cut leaf plantain	No	
Plantago major	common plantain	No	
Polemoniaceae	Phlox family		
Leptodactylon californicum	prickly phlox	Yes	Nipomo Botanical Garden
Polygonaceae	Buckwheat family		
Eriogonum fasciculatum	California buckwheat	Yes	
Rumex acetosella	sheep sorrel	No	
Rumex crispus	curly dock	No	
Portulacaceae	Purslane family		
Calandrinia ciliata	redmaids	Yes	
Claytonia perfoliata	miners lettuce	Yes	
Platanaceae	Sycamore family		

Scientific Name	Common Name	Native	Species Status / Notes
Platanus racemosa	western sycamore	Yes	Nipomo Botanical Garden
Primulaceae	Primrose family		
Anagallis arvensis	scarlet pimpernel	No	
Rhamnaceae	Buckthorn family		
Ceanothus cuneatus	buck brush	Yes	
Ceanothus thyrsiflorus	blue blossom ceanothus	Yes	
Ceanothus impressus var. nipomensis	Monterey ceanothus	Yes	
Rhamnus californica	coffeeberry	Yes	
Rhamnus crocea	holly-leafed redberry	Yes	
Rosaceae	Rose family		
Adenostoma fasciculatum	chamise	Yes	
Cercocarpus betuloides	buck brush	Yes	
Heteromeles arbutifolia	toyon	Yes	
Horkelia californica	horkelia	Yes	
Prunus ilicifolia	holly-leafed cherry	Yes	
Rosa californica	California wild rose	Yes	
Rubus ursinus	California blackberry	Yes	
Rubiaceae	Madder family		
Galium aparine	goose grass	Yes	
Galium californicum	California bedstraw	Yes	
Salicaceae	Willow family		
Salix lasiolepis	arroyo willow	Yes	Mesa Meadows
Scrophulariaceae	Figwort family		
Mimulus aurantiacus	sticky monkey flower	Yes	
Penstemon centranthifolius	scarlet bugler	Yes	
Solanaceae	Nightshade family		
Solanum douglasii	purple nightshade	Yes	
Solanum xanti	white nightshade	Yes	
Violaceae	Violet family		
Viola pedunculata	Johnny jump-up	Yes	
ANGIOSPERMS (MONOCOTS)			
Cyperaceae	Sedge family		
Carex praegracilis		Yes	Nipomo Botanical Garden

Scientific Name	Common Name	Native	Species Status / Notes
Scirpus californicus		Yes	Nipomo Botanical Garden
Liliaceae	Lily family		
Asphodelus fistulosus	asphodel	No	
Chlorogalum pomeridianum var. pomeridianum	soap plant	Yes	
Dichelostemma capitatum ssp. capitatum	blue dicks	Yes	
Poaceae	Grass family		
Avena barbata	slender wild oats	No	
Avena fatua	Wild oats	No	
Bromus diandrus	ripgut brome	No	
Bromus hordeaceus	soft chess brome	No	
Bromus madritensis ssp. rubens	Red brome	No	
Cortaderia jubata	pampas grass	No	
Cynodon dactylon	Bermuda grass	No	
Ehrharta calycina	veldt grass	No	
Hordeum marinum ssp. gussoneanum	Mediterranean barley	No	
Leymus condensatus	giant wild-rye		Nipomo Botanical Garden
Muhlenbergia rigens	deer grass	Yes	Nipomo Botanical Garden
Nassella pulchra	purple needle-grass	Yes	
Vulpia myuros	rattail fescue	No	

Scientific Name	Common Name	Comment	
Birds			
Elanus leucrus	white-tailed kite	Observed flying over large coastal scrub area west of ball fields.	
Charadrius vociferus	killdeer	Ball fields	
Thryomanes bewickii	Bewick's wren		
Aphelocoma californica	Western scrub jay		
Cyanocitta stelleri	Steller's jay		
Corvus brachyrhynchos	American crow		
Calypte anna	Anna's hummingbird		
Falco sparverius	American kestrel		
Buteo lineatus	red-shouldered hawk		
Sialia mexicana	Western bluebird		
Callipepla californica	California quail		
Psaltriparus minimus	bushtit		
Tyrannus verticalis	Western kingbird		
Passerina amoena	lazuli bunting		
Buteo jamaicensis	red-tailed hawk		
Accipiter cooperi	Cooper's hawk	Observed foraging in oak woodland habitat	
Bubo virginianus	great-horned owl	Observed in eucalyptus windrow along the mesa meadows bike path.	
Circus cyaneus	northern harrier	Observed flying over the coastal scrub area located west of Dana School.	
Colaptes auratus	northern flicker		
Mimus polyglottos	northern mockingbird		
Junco hyemalis	dark-eyed junco		
Poecile rufescens	chestnut-backed chickadee		
Baeolophus inornatus	oak titmouse		
Toxostoma redivivum	California thrasher		
Vireo huttoni	Hutton's vireo		
Melanerpes formicivorus	acorn woodpecker		

Wildlife Species Observed within Nipomo Community Park

Scientific Name	Common Name	Comment		
Picoides nuttallii	Nuttal's woodpecker			
Sturnella neglecta	western meadowlark			
Sturnus vulgaris	European starling	Power lines		
Euphagus cyanocephalus	Brewer's blackbird	Power lines		
Melospiza melodia	song sparrow			
Zonotrichia leucophrys	white-crowned sparrow			
Dendroica coronata	yellow-rumped warbler	1		
Zenaida macroura	mourning dove			
Sayornis nigricans	black phoebe	1		
Sayornis saya	Say's phoebe			
Pipilo crissalis	California towhee			
Pipilo maculatus	spotted towhee			
Passer domesticus	house sparrow			
Mammals				
Lynx rufus	bobcat			
Canus latrans	coyote			
Puma concolor	mountain lion	Observed by Ride Nipomo equestrian group		
Spermophilus beecheyi	California ground squirrel			
Urocyon cinereoargenteus	gray fox	Observed by Ride Nipomo equestrian group		
Reptiles				
Sceloporus occidentalis	western fence lizard			
Uta stansburiana	side-blotched lizard			
Cnemidophorus tigris	coastal whiptail			
Phrynosoma blainvilii	coast horned lizard	Observed commonly by Ride Nipomo equestrian group during the Summer months.		

Photo Documentation



PHOTO 1:

View of maritime chaparral habitat located along a spur trail within the NCP. Note oak woodland habitat behind maritime chaparral vegetation (refer to arrow).

Picture taken on March 05, 2010.



PHOTO 2:

View of several sand mesa manzanita specimens located along Osage Street (refer to arrows)

Picture taken on March 05, 2010.

PHOTO DOCUMENTATION



PHOTO 3:

View of several mature coast live oak trees observed in close proximity to the north entrance to the park and within the ornamental/develop ed areas of the NCP.

Picture taken on March 05, 2010.



PHOTO 4:

View of coastal scrub habitat located along the south boundary of the NCP. Note mock heather and coyote brush shrubs.

Picture taken on March 05, 2010.



PHOTO 5:

View of annual grassland habitat located west of the ornamental /developed portions within the NCP. Note gopher spoil piles in the photo (refer to arrow). The active recreation / community center is proposed in this area of the NCP

Picture taken on March 05, 2010.



PHOTO 6:

View of ruderal habitat located east of the of the annual grassland habitat shown in Photo 5. This area receives regular disturbance from equestrian and park visitors. Several bicycle jumps were observed in this area.

Picture taken on March 05, 2010.

PHOTO DOCUMENTATION

This page intentionally left blank.



BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Earth Systems Pacific

March 8, 2011

(805) 544-3276 • FAX (805) 544-1786 E-mail: esc@earthsys.com FILE NO.: SL-16172-EA

Mr. Shaun Cooper San Luis Obispo County General Services Department 1087 Santa Rosa Street San Luis Obispo, California 93408

SUBJECT: Results of Site History Research and Exploratory Trenching Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Update West Tefft Street at Pomeroy Road Nipomo, California

Dear Mr. Cooper:

This letter presents the findings of historical site use research and limited subsurface exploration at Nipomo Community Park (NCP) in Nipomo, California. The purpose of this work was to research the location, occurrence and general nature of past dumping in the park, and to evaluate whether the dump areas contain materials that could cause soil/groundwater contamination, or affect future improvements to the NCP. The scope of work performed has consisted of:

- Historical research regarding past site uses
- Interviews with current and former State/County staff regarding known and suspected areas of dumping within the park boundaries
- A reconnaissance of the site to look for surface evidence of past dumping
- A limited program of exploratory trenching in areas where dumping has been documented
- Field monitoring of soils from the trenches for volatile contaminants
- Preparation of this report

Included with this report are a Vicinity Map, a Trench Location Map, site photographs, historic aerial photographs, topographic maps, trench logs and other supporting documents

Site Description

The NCP is an irregularly shaped, approximately 137-acre parcel located near the eastern edge of the Nipomo Mesa. The site is bordered by Pomeroy Road to the northeast, Tefft Street to the southeast, Osage Road to the west and residential lots along Tejas Place to the south. Development around the park is primarily residential, with the exception of a County library building and Dana Elementary School near the southern corner of the site.



Historical Research

Aerial Photographs

In order to evaluate past land uses and identify areas of past dumping, aerial photographs of the site flown between 1939 and 2005 were reviewed. A summary of this review is presented below. Copies of the aerial photographs are attached with this report.

1939: The central portion of the park property appears unimproved, with areas of dryfarmed agriculture visible in the northern and southern parts of the site. Pomeroy Road and Tefft Street are present, as well as several dirt roads or tracks that cross the park from east to west. No significant areas of ground disturbance that would suggest the presence of a dump or landfill are evident within the park boundaries. The area surrounding the park is undeveloped, with the exception of a small house at the eastern corner of Pomeroy Road and Tefft Street.

1949: Conditions over most of the park property appear similar to those shown on the 1939 photograph; however, a loop road is present in the southeastern corner of the park, southwest of the intersection of Pomeroy Road and Tefft Street. The road extends southwest from the intersection for approximately 600 feet, and curves southeastward to re-join Tefft Street just east of the present-day location of Dana Elementary School. The ground surface along the northwest edge of the road appears disturbed, and may indicate the presence of dumping. A few new residential structures are present east of the site, on the east side of Pomeroy Road.

1956: The loop road in the southeast corner of the site is still present, and the ground surface along both sides of the road appears to be disturbed. Two small structures are present in the northern part of the park property, a short distance south of the future right-of-way for Camino Caballo. Elsewhere on the site, conditions on the site appear essentially the same as those shown on earlier photographs.

1969: The southern portion of the park has been developed; two baseball fields are present along the west side of Pomeroy Road, and what appears to be an equestrian arena is present west of the ball fields, on the south side of the central ridge. Dana Elementary School has been built to the southwest of the park, and widely scattered residential development is present in the area surrounding the site. The ground surface still appears to be disturbed in the southeast part of the park in the area noted on the earlier photographs, but the loop road is no longer present, and a large number of trees have been planted in this area.

<u>1978</u>: Additional improvements made to the park include a third baseball field and tennis courts to the west of the original fields. The structure south of Camino Caballo observed in earlier photographs is no longer present, and residential development has increased markedly in the area northeast of the site.

2



1989: A fourth baseball field has been added to the southern part of the site, and the network of footpaths and trails in the northern part of the park has been expanded. No indications of dumping are visible in the photograph. Residential development continues to increase in the areas east and south of the park.

<u>1994-2005</u>: Conditions at the park are essentially the same as those observed during the 2010 site reconnaissance. The public library building is present in a 2002 photograph, and the equestrian arena was removed or abandoned between 1994 and 2002. Residential development has increased on all sides of the park throughout this period.

Topographic Maps

Historic topographic maps of the Nipomo area dating from 1922 to 1965 were reviewed to see if any cultural or geomorphic features indicated the likelihood of a disposal area. The NCP property spans across two maps, and only the eastern map was readily available for review. This map shows the easternmost corner of the park, near the intersection of Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road. The 1922 and 1952 maps show a closed topographic contour indicating a basin-like depression, just west of the Tefft Street/Pomeroy Road intersection. Similar depressions are shown elsewhere in the area north and southeast the park. These areas are typical topographic features in a stabilized sand dune environment, and in several locations outside the NCP have been found to contain buried debris and waste. Copies of the maps are attached with this report.

Previous Assessment Work/Reports

During construction of the Nipomo Branch library in 1996, soil vapor sampling was conducted around the library site by the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB), due to the site's proximity to a former waste disposal site. State and County records had indicated the presence of a landfill site known as the Old Nipomo Dump, reportedly located northeast of the library. Low combustible gas concentrations (a maximum of 900 parts per million by volume [ppmv]) were found at several locations in the northeastern part of the library site, although the highest were found in a planter area that had been recently mulched and fertilized. The instrumentation used to collect the readings was not compound-specific, and the CIWMB requested that the County conduct additional, more detailed analysis to evaluate soil gas conditions.

The County General Services Department retained Earth Systems Consultants Northern California (ESCNC) to provide supplemental soil gas sampling and analysis in the area around the library. ESCNC collected soil gas samples from a depth of 8 feet below grade at two locations at the rear of the library parcel, closest to the former disposal area as identified by the CIWMB. Field readings from an instrument calibrated specifically to methane ranged from 3 to 6 ppmv; soil gas samples were also collected for laboratory analysis to determine concentrations of other volatile compounds that could present health risks to occupants of the building.

3



4

Low (part per billion) levels of several volatile organic compounds were detected in the vapor samples collected in June 1996; however, the concentrations were several orders of magnitude below regulatory thresholds established for these compounds, and the ESCNC report concluded that they did not present a health risk to future occupants of the site. As a precautionary measure, the CIWMB recommended that a landfill gas monitoring system be installed for the library to provide ample warning in the event combustible gas levels in the building were to rise.

In 2002, a cultural resource report was prepared by Parker & Associates of Cayucos, California. The report focused on a historic dump site in the southeastern part of the park, but included a survey of the entire park property for surface indications of other possible dump sites, although no other sites were identified. The historic dump site was found to contain household trash dating from the 1880's to the 1930's, and consisted primarily of ceramic, glass and metal artifacts. According to the report, the dump site is located along the southwest side of Pomeroy Road, and extends from near the park entrance road near Juniper Lane southward to within 100 feet of Tefft Street. The deposit extends approximately 80 feet into the park and has a depth of at least two feet. The report did not identify any other areas of dumping within the park boundary, and did not refer to the dump area near the library building.

Staff Interviews

Earth Systems Pacific contacted various State and County employees familiar with the site to obtain anecdotal information as to where dumping had been observed in the past.

Mr. Randy Friedlander of the California Department of Resources Recycling and Recovery (CalRecycle) was contacted by telephone to discuss the site. Mr. Friedlander has been responsible for monitoring the status of the landfill gas detection system in the County library building since approximately 2005. He indicated that during his annual inspections, the monitoring system has been functioning properly, and that no detections of landfill gas had been logged. Mr. Friedlander has not directly observed the nature of the waste in the dump, and his office does not have any technical reports relating to its past operations; he was not aware of any other areas on the site where dumping had occurred. He did provide the most recent inspection form for the site, dating from November 2009, which indicates the monitoring system is functioning properly, and that no landfill gases had been detected during the previous 12 months. A copy of the form is attached with this report.

Mr. Mark Wagner of the San Luis Obispo County Parks Department was also contacted regarding past episodes of dumping at the site. Mr. Wagner was aware of the dump area near the library building, but did not know of any other large-scale dumps within the park that contained buried debris. He indicated that occasional occurrences of 'midnight' dumping had occurred along County roads that border the park, but that these had been dealt with as they occurred and were not a long-term problem.



5

Mr. Bill Currens, a retired County Road Department employee, was contacted regarding past dumping at the park. Mr. Currens was a Road Department Lead Man for the Nipomo area from the late 1960's until his retirement in 2000. He stated that he recalled the disposal site near the library building, but also commented that his work was related to road projects, and did not directly involve the park property. Mr. Currens also stated that during his employ at the County, surface dumping of appliances and household trash commonly occurred along County roads around the perimeter of the park, particularly along Osage Road, which until the mid-1990's was a little-used dirt road. He indicated that the dumping in this area was surficial in nature, and was he was not aware of any buried trash deposits elsewhere in the NCP.

Site Reconnaissance

Earth Systems Pacific personnel visited the site on November 18, 2010, to observe general site conditions and perform a surface reconnaissance of the park property for indications of dumping. The reconnaissance consisted of traverses across the site along established footpaths and roads, and observation of the ground surface for evidence of dumping (disturbed ground, man-made artifacts such as glass or metal in rodent burrow piles, unusual topographic features, etc.).

Small fragment of glass were present on the ground surface along the southwest side of Pomeroy Road, east of the baseball field parking lot, in the general area described in the 2002 Parker & Associates report. Similar glass shards and widely scattered ceramic and gravel fragments were observed around the off-leash dog park and unimproved areas of the park northwest of Tefft Street. No indications of large-scale disposal were observed elsewhere in the park; the majority of the park perimeter is presently protected from vehicle access by wooden fences and posts, and access roads and footpaths are secured by bollards and/or locked gates. No indications of surface disposal were noted during the November 2010 site reconnaissance.

Subsurface Assessment

On February 7, 2011, a limited program of subsurface exploration was conducted to observe the nature of the materials that had been disposed of at the site, and to make a preliminary evaluation of their potential to contain volatile compounds that could impact future development at the park. The program consisted of excavating five exploratory trenches, using a standard backhoe with an 18-inch wide bucket. The trenches were dug to depths ranging from 6.0 to 8.5 feet below ground surface (bgs), and were logged by a Californialicensed Professional Geologist from Earth Systems Pacific. Trenches T-1 through T-3 were excavated in the dump area, northeast of the current library building near the off-leash dog park. Trenches T-4 and T-5 were excavated along the west side of Pomeroy Road, in the area of the disposal site identified in the 2002 Parker & Associates cultural resource report. The locations of the trenches are shown on the Site Map attached with this report.



6

Trench T-1 contained approximately 2 feet of fill, which consisted of sand containing abundant tree roots and a large stump. No trash-type debris was noted in the trench, which was dug to a depth of 7 feet bgs. Trench T-2 contained nearly 4 feet of fill, which contained glass fragments, brick, and metal. A metal cooking pot and tea kettle were also noted in the fill. Trench T-3 contained at least 8 feet of fill, including large amounts of broken and intact glass bottles, brick, concrete and metal, with lesser amounts of wood. The bottom of the fill was not encountered in the trench, which was dug to 8 feet bgs.

Trench T-4 was dug on the east side of the main baseball field, adjacent to Pomeroy Road. This trench encountered approximately four feet of fill, containing widely scattered glass fragments, gravel and tree roots. The soil below the fill appeared undisturbed, based on the presence of laminations in the sandy soil. Trench T-5 was excavated on the east side of the baseball field parking lot, near the entrance road opposite Juniper Avenue. Although the ground surface in this area contained abundant small glass fragments no fill was encountered in the trench, which was dug to a depth of 6 feet bgs.

Volatile organic vapors in the fill materials and underlying native soil were screened in the field using a photoionization detector (PID) calibrated to isobutylene. Head-space readings were taken by placing a sample of the materials in a sealed plastic bag, allowing the bag to off-gas for at least 5 minutes, and inserting the probe of the PID into the bag to obtain a vapor reading. No measurable organic vapors were detected in any of the samples. No other indications (odors, discoloration) of organic compound (in particular, hydrocarbon) contamination were noted in the trenches.

Logs of the materials encountered in the trenches are attached with this report.

Summary

Two areas of past dumping were identified during the current study; both of these areas were already known to the County, and no new dump areas were found within the NCP boundaries. The older of the two dumps is located along the west side of Pomeroy Road, and extends from a short distance north of Tefft Street to approximately 150 feet south of Juniper Avenue. The more recent dump is located on the north side of Tefft Street, approximately 200 feet west of Pomeroy Road, and extends several hundred feet to the southwest, in the vicinity of the existing dog park, picnic area and the unimproved area between the dog park and the County library building.

Based on the results of exploratory trenching and the information in the 2002 Parker & Associates report, the older dump along Pomeroy Road appears to be a relatively shallow feature (less than 5 feet deep) that was a surface dump along the shoulder of Pomeroy Road. The dump was apparently used between the 1880's and 1930's, and ceased operation after that time. Aerial photographs are consistent with this timeline, as no visual indications of dumping in this area were visible by 1939.


Nipomo Regional Park Master Plan Update

7

Given its location, the older dump is unlikely to substantially affect or be affected by future improvements to the park unless the main ball field is planned to be replaced with some other feature. The disposed materials in the dump appear to be generally non-organic, and consequently the likelihood of landfill gas being generated is low.

The more recent dump north of Tefft Street is more extensive, and contains debris to a depth of at least 8 feet. State and County records indicate the dump operated over a relatively short period from 1965-1972, but aerial photographs suggest that the dump first operated between 1939 and 1949 and had ceased operation by 1969, as the area had been planted with numerous trees by that time.

In the February 2011 trenches, the dumped materials appeared to be glass, metal, concrete and brick, with only minor amounts of wood or plant waste. In general, these materials were non-organic, and would be unlikely to generate significant amounts of landfill gas. The results of soil gas testing completed for County library building in 1996 and subsequent monitoring since that time support the premise that the dump is not generating significant amounts of combustible gases. However, the nature of the materials in other parts of the dump is unknown, and it should not be assumed that conditions are uniform throughout the dump if this area is to be developed, and a more site-specific study should be conducted once structures are sited.

Field monitoring of the dumps indicates that volatile organic vapors were not present in the areas trenched. These results and the nature of the debris encountered in the trenches indicates that volatile organic compounds are not likely to affect proposed development; however, they could contain non-volatile contaminants such as metals, long-chain hydrocarbons or asbestos that could present a health or disposal concern if they are disturbed.

In its current state, the former dump along the north side of Tefft Street appears to be covered with a veneer of clean surface soil and does not present an imminent health risk to users of the park. If this is considered for development, or if dumped materials will be disturbed/exposed as part of Park improvements, we recommend the following measures be considered:

- Once a building footprint or area of disturbance has been identified, exploratory trenches or borings should be excavated to determine whether it is underlain by dumped materials. Samples of the debris and soil should be collected for laboratory analysis to evaluate whether they present any health or environmental concerns.
- Soil gas testing should be conducted in and around any proposed building footprint to determine whether landfill gas is present, and whether it could accumulate in the finished building. Depending on the results of the soil gas testing, it may be necessary to incorporate design features that will prevent gas accumulation.



Nipomo Regional Park Master Plan Update

8

• If soil/and or debris from the dump area are proposed to be removed from or relocated within the Park, they should be tested for contaminants of potential concern to determine whether it is subject to disposal/placement restrictions. Based on our trenching, the testing should include analysis for metals, longchain (semi-volatile) hydrocarbons, and semivolatile organic compounds; additional testing may be needed depending on the specific nature of the materials to be removed.

Limitation

This report has been prepared for the use of the San Luis Obispo County General Services Department, regarding the Nipomo Regional Park Master Plan Update in Nipomo, California. The findings and conclusions rendered in this report are based on the results of anecdotal information, review of historic documents and a limited program of subsurface exploration. This report does not reflect subsurface variations that may exist between or beyond the locations investigated. This work has been performed in accordance with the level of care and skill normally exercised by members of our profession currently providing similar services in this area of California. No warranty, either expressed or implied, is made.

We appreciate this opportunity to be of service. Should you have any questions or comments regarding this report, please contact our office at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Earth Systems Pacific

Timothy Conroy, C.E.G. 1698 Senior Geologist

Attachments: Vicinity Map Trench Location Map Site Photographs Historic Aerial Photographs, 1939-2005 Historic Topographic Maps, 1922-1965 Trench Logs Supporting Documents

Doc. No.: 1103-030.LTR/jr

1698 GENERAL GEOLOGIST GENERAL GEOLOGIST CERTIFIED ENGINEERING GEOLOGIST OF CALIFORM

VICINITY MAP Nipomo Community Park Master Plan Update Tefft Street at Pomeroy Road Nipomo, California





TRENCH LOCATION MAP

Nipomo Community Park Pomeroy Road and Tefft Street Nipomo, California









Excavated soil from trench T-1, showing lack of buried trash/debris.



Tea kettle and metal pot excavated from trench T-2.



Earth Systems Pacific Project No. SL-16172-EA



Southern sidewall of trench T-2, arrow indicates level of buried debris.



Abundant debris, bottles and bricks in trench T-3.



Earth Systems Pacific Project No. SL-16172-EA

February 2011



Sidewall of trench T-3, arrow indicates level of buried debris.



Abundant debris, bottles and bricks in trench T-3.



Earth Systems Pacific Project No. SL-16172-EA



Soils from trench T-4, showing only minor amounts of buried debris.





Earth Systems Pacific Project No. SL-16172-EA













INQUIRY #: 2687264.1		
YEAR: 1994 ├────┤ = 666'		

and a series of the		States and	A AND A
ALC: NO PERSONNEL STREET		1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	
		1 13 M.S.	3 Start Hills
5 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	9.00 11 00	Care and the	Second Second
- an a constant	and the second second	and the second sec	and the second
and the second	and the h	1. 19	- 5 0 B
		- M. 3	the second second
		A SA AND	No. 1997 N. C.
	-		
	-2	CAL DEAN	
1000	The states	S State S	
		States in Street	
		A Star	Contract Start
and a multiple / / /		20100 4	
F PROVER THE SECOND	the second second		Por Star
		CI I Frank to the	
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	K		S. Stille 2
	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		
and the second second second	1 Martin		
370			all states of
		The second second	1 1 1 1 1
		in the second second	SAN IN C
	- T	The State	AT IN A
		and the second	
VARIA 11 5-2 H & BROT	Jan 1		
	Pro Ul	ASSC 1	5
	State P	SAM	Col Any
MARTIN STATISTICS	K S ASIA		A Starter C
- 5		and the second	Spark Staffer
	NTB -	151.54	alling here
		the let	
	A B Ball	ARS AND	
THE STATE STATES			Constant of s
			UN J Car
	S-3-13	The second second	
	S G SAT	a grand	
TIME TO A STATE	A BAR SAN	a Pip Sa	2000 - 3/51
		See. 21	Sing Start
INQUIRY #: 2687264.1		and the state	
YEAR: 2002		Sheep 5	THE AMERICAN
Cuterout Distances	The first for the state of the	A REAL PROPERTY AND A REAL	Sector Manual And
= 666'	A DITE HAR	1 2	The second second

The Marcard		And the second	
			B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B
			S. S
		A DECEMBER OF	
	<t []<="" td=""><td></td><td></td></t>		
THERE			a sat and
			160
		A Star	
	PHASE A		
	HOT S		
INQUIRY #: 2687264.1 YEAR: 2005		Stease -	
= 604'	TO STALLE	SASPER E	ATTAC AND A STATE

Historical Topographic Map



N NAME: NIPOMO MAP YEAR: 1922 SERIES: 15 SCALE: 1:62500	SITE NAME: NCSD-Miller Park ADDRESS: NEC Tefft St/Carrillo St Nipomo, CA 93444 LAT/LONG: 35.0397 / 120.4806	CLIENT: Earth Systems Pacific CONTACT: Tim Conroy INQUIRY#: 2609263.4 RESEARCH DATE: 10/09/2009
---	--	--

Historical Topographic Map



TARGET QUAD NAME: NIPOMO MAP YEAR: 1952	SITE NAME: NCSD-Miller Park ADDRESS: NEC Tefft St/Carrillo St Nipomo, CA 93444 LAT/LONG: 35.0397 / 120.4806	CLIENT: Earth Systems Pacific CONTACT: Tim Conroy INQUIRY#: 2609263.4 RESEARCH DATE: 10/09/2009
SERIES: 15 SCALE: 1:62500		

Historical Topographic Map



	TARGET QU NAME: MAP YEAR: SERIES: SCALE:	AD NIPOMO 1965 7.5 1:24000	SITE NAME: ADDRESS: LAT/LONG:	NCSD-Miller Park NEC Tefft St/Carrillo St Nipomo, CA 93444 35.0397 / 120.4806	CLIENT: CONTACT: INQUIRY#: RESEARCH	Earth Systems Pacific Tim Conroy 2609263.4 DATE: 10/09/2009
--	--	--	-------------------------------------	--	--	--

LO EQ BU	gge Uipn Cke	D BY: T. Conroy //ENT: Backhoe T SIZE: 18-inch			JOB	Tren P/ NO.: SI DATI	ICH NO. 1 AGE 1 OF 1 L-16172-EA E: 02/10/11
S.		NIPOMO REGIONAL PARK		SAN	IPLE D		
SCS CLA	SYMBOL	Nipomo, California	TERVAL (feet)	AMPLE TYPE	D/d	BLOWS ER 6 IN.	WELL SONST.
) n		SOIL DESCRIPTION	<u>Z</u>	S		ш _о .	
SM		SILTY SAND: red brown, loose to medium dense, moist, abundant tree roots and stump, no trash or other debris (Fill)			ND		
SM		SILTY SAND: light brown, medium dense, moist, fine to medium grained, poorly graded (Native Soil)					
		Total Depth 7.0' No subsurface water encountered.					
	LO E D SM SM	LOGGE EQUIPT BUCKE	LOGGED BY: T. Conroy EQUIPMENT: Backhoe BUCKET SIZE: 18-inch Son Image: Son	LOGGED BY: T. Conroy EQUIPMENT: Backhoe BUCKET SIZE: 18-inch	LOGGED BY: T. Conroy EQUIPMENT: Backhoe BUCKET SIZE: 18-inch	LOGGED BY: T. Conroy EQUIPMENT: Backhoe BUCKET SIZE: 18-Inch Sign of or or or or or or or or or or or or or	Tree Point Backhoe BUCKET SIZE: 18-inch gg gg NIPOMO REGIONAL PARK Point Point

Earth Systems Pacific

LEGEND: Ring Sample O Grab Sample Shelby Tube Sample SPT NOTE: This log of subsurface conditions is a simplification of actual conditions encauntered. It applies at the location and time of drilling. Subsurface conditions may differ at other locations and times.

	E	art	h Systems Pacific					
9	Image: Construction of the co						ch No. AGE 1 OF 16172-E E: 02/10/1	
			NIROMO REGIONAL PARK		SA	NPLE [DATA	
DEPTH (feet)	CS CLASS	SYMBOL	Pomeroy/Tefft Streets Nipomo, California	ERVAL (feet)	AMPLE	D/d	LOWS ER 6 IN.	WELL ONST.
	ns		SOIL DESCRIPTION		'S		82	- 0
- 0 1 - 2 - 3	SM		SILTY SAND: dark red brown, loose, moist, debris includes glass fragments, broken milk bottles, tea kettle and iron pan (Fill)			ND		
- 4 - 5 - 6 -	SM		SILTY SAND: light orange brown, medium dense, moist, fine grained, poorly graded (Native Soil)					
/ - 8 - 9			Total Depth 7.0' No subsurface water encountered.					
- 10 - 11 -								
12 - 13 -								
14 - 15 - 16								
- 17 - 18 -								
19 - 2D -								
21 22 23								
- 24 - 25								
- 26 -	1							

9	LO EQ BU	gge Uipn Cke	D BY: T. Conroy MENT: Backhoe T SIZE: 18-inch			JOB	Tren P/ NO.: SI DATI	nch No. 3 Age 1 OF 1 L-16172-EA E: 02/10/11
	S		NIPOMO REGIONAL PARK		SAN	APLE C	ATA	
DEPTH (feet)	SCS CLAS	SYMBOL	Pomeroy/Tefft Streets Nipomo, California	TERVAL (feet)	AMPLE TYPE	Q/d	BLOWS ER 6 IN.	WELL SONST.
	Š		SOIL DESCRIPTION	2	S S		ш <u>д</u>	0
0	SM		SILTY SAND: red brown, loose, moist, abundant debris includes glass, bottles, brick, metal and minor amounts of wood (Fill) No deposit-no return bottles present, date form mid 1960's? Total Depth 8.0' No subsurface water encountered.					
ı –	1	1		1	1	1	1	1

Earth Systems Pacific

	Logge Equipi Bucke	D BY: T. Conroy //ENT: Backhoe T SIZE: 18-inch			JOB	I rer P/ NO.: S DAT	n ch No . Age 1 of L-16172-e E: 02/10/1
	ι Ω	NIPOMO REGIONAL PARK		SAN	MPLE [ATA	
DEPTH (feet)	V I Pomeroy/Tefft Streets 0 BH Nipomo, California	ERVAL feet)	MPLE YPE	D/D	-OWS R 6 IN.	VELL DNST.	
	SN SN	SOIL DESCRIPTION	LNI ()	SA		В픱	>8
0 - 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 - 6 - 7 - 8 - 7 - 8 - 7 - 10 - 12 - 10 - 12 - 12 - 13 - 14 - 15 - 14 - 15 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 13 - 14 - 15 - 16 - 17 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 12 - 13 - 14 - 15 - 16 - 17 - 18 - 20 - 21 - 22 - 22 - 22 - 22 - 22 - 22 - 22 - 22 - 22 - 22 - 23 - - 23 - - - - - - - -	SM SM	SILTY SAND: light orange brown, medium dense, slightly moist to moist, fine grained, with tree roots and widely scattered gravel and glass fragments (Fill) SILTY SAND: light brown, medium dense, moist, fine to medium grained, poorly graded (Native Soil) Total Depth 8.5' No subsurface water encountered.			ND		

9	LO EQ BU	gge UIPN CKE	D BY: T. Conroy /IENT: Backhoe T SIZE: 18-inch			JOB	Tren PA NO.: SL DATE	ch No. GE 1 OF 16172-E : 02/10/1
	ASS	NIPOMO REGIONAL PARK			SAN	APLE [
DEPTH (feet)	SCS CLA	SYMBO	Nipomo, California	TERVAL (feet)	AMPLE TYPE	D/d	ILOWS ER 6 IN.	WELL CONST.
	ŝ		SOIL DESCRIPTION	Ľ	S S			
- 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5 -	SM		SILTY SAND: light brown, medium dense, slightly moist to moist, tree roots to 2', fine grained, poorly graded (Native Soil)					
6 7 8 9 10			Total Depth 6.0' No subsurface water encountered.					
- 11 - 12 - 13 - 14								
- 15 - 16								
- 17 - 18 -								
19 - 20 - 21								
- 22 - 23								
- 24 - 25								
25 - 26								

LEGEND: In Ring Sample O Grab Sample Shelby Tube Sample SPT NOTE: This log of subsurface conditions is a simplification of actual conditions encountered. It applies at the location and time of drilling. Subsurface conditions may differ at other locations and times.

ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES

Č

FAX 805-781-5215

P.02

JUN-27-1996 16:12



Cal/EPA

California Environmental Protection Agency

Integrated Waste Management Board

. . .

8800 Cal Center Drive Sacramento, CA 95836 (916) 255-2200
 Post-It** brand fax transmittal memo 7671 # of pages + 7

 To
 BRIAN

 From/KA74Y
 MAC. NEILL

 Co.
 COUNTY

 Dept.
 Phone # 781-5988

 Fax #
 Fax #



P. 1

Pete Wilson Governor

James M. Strock Secretary for Environmental Protection

Michael Mc Gee San Luis Obispo County Health Department 2156 Sierra Way P.O. Box 1489 San Luis Obispo, CA 93406

Subject: Inspection Report for Nipomo Library/Nipomo Dump

Dear Mr. Mc Gee.

June 27, 1996

On May 27, 1996 during our telephone conversation you informed me that while conducting your annual Closed, Illegal and Abandoned (CIA) site inspections you had become aware that the County of San Luis Obispo, General Services Department was in the process of constructing a public library on top of the old Nipomo Landfill, which had been identified earlier during your CIA site assessment process. During that assessment process your Department with concurrence from this agency had determined that the Old Nipomo Dump posed no immediate threat to human health and the environment, therefore the quarterly site inspections were reduced to annually. As part of this agencies approval of the reduced inspection frequency was the understanding that San Luis Obispo County Environmental Health acting as the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA), would notify the County Planning Department that this landfill existed and that if permits were ever requested for development of the site that the LEA would be notified. This procedure was setup to assure that any development that may occur on the old landfill would meet all the requirements of Title 14, California Code of Regulation (14CCR) Section 17796. This section requires that all proposed construction on landfills should be submitted to the Local Enforcement Agency (LEA) and the California Integrated Waste Management Board (Board) for review and comment concerning possible construction problems, hazards to public health and safety and factors which might affect the construction.

Board staff understand that your notification to the Planning department came after the County General Services Department requested and received a building permit for construction of the library. Therefore, no one was apparently aware that the library was being constructed on an old landfill. While this situation is unfortunate I feel that actions can still be taken to assure that this project does not pose a threat to public health and safety. JUN-27-1996 16:13

C1同時

916 255 4073 P.03

On June 7, 1996 myself, Steve Dolan from the Boards Enforcement Branch and yourself conducted a preliminary site inspection to check for subsurface landfill gas and/or landfill gas in the library structure. During the inspection we used the GMI GasSurveyor Instrument (GMI) serial number C9401400, to take gas readings and record them. A 36" bar hole punch was used to collect subsurface landfill gas measurements at a depth of approximately 2.5 feet.

Investigation

The first part of the investigation consisted of placing three 0.5 inch diameter PVC pipes to a depth of approximately 2.5 feet (P-1, P-2, P-3) as shown on Attachment 1. From these three probes very low, parts per million (ppm) gas levels were detected (8-20ppm) as shown in Attachment 2. Since small amounts of gas were found additional sampling was conducted. At the additional sampling locations a bar hole punch was used so shallow subsurface readings could be obtained. Sampling locations P-1 through P-17 were all taken around the library (see Attachment 1). Sample P-8 was taken inside of the library building, in the air space of the west wall. Samples P-18 through P-28 are sampling location around the Dana Elementary school. Results from sampling location P-17 and P-18 are not shown on Attachment 2 (the down loaded data from the GMI) because those samples indicated nondetect for landfill gas. They were recorded on the field notes (Attachment 3) but not logged into the GMI data recorder.

As can be seen on Attachment 2, locations P-7, P 10, P-11 and P-12 show elevated combustible gas reading in comparison with the other locations. These locations are all around the north west corner of the library structure. Since detected gas levels are relatively low there is no immediate threat to public Health and Safety. However, they do indicate that there is potential hazard from this site. At this point, it is unknown whether there are trace gases which may be a health threat to people in the library or if there is the potential for combustible levels of gas to accumulate in the library structure.

Recommendation

Based on the historical evidence, which indicates that this site was definitely used as a dump, the fact that small amounts of debris were found during preconstruction borings for the library and that gas sampling conducted by the Board and yourself indicates that combustible gas may be present below the surface, I recommend that your agency prohibit the County General Services Department from occupying the building until they can assure your agency and the Board that proper precautions have been taken to protect people using the library facility. CIUMB

JUN-27-1996 15:13

ŧ

The two main potential hazards which exist at the site are: 1) the explosive hazard that would occur if combustible landfill gas was to accumulate in the building at high enough levels that an ignition source could ignite it; and 2) the exposure to trace gases which can accompany methane. Some trace gases can be harmful even at very low concentrations if a person has chronic exposure to that substance.

To protect against the exposure hazard a combustible gas monitoring system should be designed and installed in the building. This will assure that if methane levels ever reach unsafe levels an alarm will sound which would inform the people that they should leave the premises.

To determine if the second hazard exists subsurface gas samples need to be obtained and analyzed using the EPA test method TO 14. The gas samples should be collected using the Suma canister collection method in the same vicinity as where P-7, P-10, P-11 and P-12 were taken.

Once the sampling and analyses are complete a final report should be submitted outlining the finding and any proposed corrective actions.

Should you have any questions please call me at (916) 255-3826.

Sincerely,

Stacey Mason

Stacey Mason Closure and Remediation Branch Permitting and Enforcement Division

enclosures,

cc: Kathy McNeil - San Luis Obispo County, Department of General Services

Gene Johnson - San Luis Obispo County, Department of General Services Michael Lebrun - Regional Water Quality Control Board, Ċ,

ţ

JUH+27-1996 16:14 CTUNE

916 255 4073 P.07

ATTACHMENT 3

INSPECTION REPORT

Location: Nipomo Library, Nipomo CA.
 Visitation Date: June 7, 1996
 Propose for Visit: Gas sampling
 Individuals Present: Steve Dolan, CIWMB
 Stacey Mason, CIWMB
 Michael Mc Gee, LEA
 Sampling Instrument: GMI - GaSurveyor Instrument

*- Indicates gas readings which were recorded into the data bank of the GMI.

ł

(Reproduction of hand written field notes)

Sampling Point	Time	Gas Reading / PPM	Sampling Location
D_1	11:25am	20 PPM *	east side of Building 15ft. away
1.41			from building
D_0	11:29	10 PPM *	north-East (N-E) corner 50ff. away
D 3	11:31	10 PPM-*	N-E of building 100ft. away
Г~3 Ю.А	11:35	ND	north side 15ft. away
D 5	11:40	30 PPM*	N-E corner 20ft. away
1~5 D.5	11:41	10 PPM*	
P-6	11:45	500 PPM (spike)	N-E behind building Iff.
1-0 Р.б	11:45	10 PPM*	in 18 14 1
P-6	11:45	10 PPM*	. 16 24 16
τ-V p 7	11:50	910 PPM (spike)	Next to P-6 1ft. away
r-7 D 7	11.50	150 PPM*	ce is it
Г~/ р.7	11:50	210 PPM*	<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>
r-/ p.g	11:52	ND*	inside building
D_8 1~0	11:53	5 PPM*	in building, inside of east wall near
£.40			electrical panel
D.0	11:58	70 PPM *	N-E corner 12-15ft. away
P-10	12:00pm	170 PPM (spike)	N-E corner 8ft. away
P_10	12:00	140 PPM*	
D 10	12:00	180 PPM*	44 16 34
P-10	12:01	610 PPM* (spike)	east side 6fl. away
	12:02	355 PPM*	(ç 42 64
1-11 P.12	12:05	940 PPM(spike)	east side 2ft. away near windows
P-12 P-12	12:05	640 PPM*	
P_12	12:05	250 PPM*	
P-12 P-12	12:05	310 PPM*	
P.13	12:16	5 PPM*	in down spout, south-west corner
4			(front of building)
P_14	12:20	65 PPM(spike)	S-W side 25ft. away
P-14	12:20	45 PPM*	

7

JUN-27-1996 16:42 CIWMB

.]

916 255 4073 P.02

:

.

.

•

P-15	12:22	175 PPM*	N-W side 25ft away
1-1J D 15	12.22	40 PPM*	
F-15	12.24	ND*	N-E 75ft. away
P-10	12.20	NTD	north side
P-17	12:20 W Sheweles taken on Da	no Elementary School grounds	
(P-18 - P-2)	8) Samples taken on Da	NITY STORE STORES	between building at school
P-18	1:28		in grass next to black top
P-19	1:33	200 PPM(spike)	
P-19	1:33	120 PPM*	
P-20	1:38	50 PPM*	south of black top
P-21		ND	along fence line
p_77	1:40	10 PPM*	20ft. from fence line in grass
P. 77	1:40	15 PPM*	
1-22	1.42	ND*	near pavement
r-22	1.42	140 PPM spike	next to pavement inbetween
P-24	1.40		buildings
		120 0014	zz zż że te
P-24	1:43	100 E F ML	between sidewalk and blacktop
P-25	1:46	55 PPML	
P-25	- 1:46	90 PPM*	under school building part side
P-26	1:49	ND*	under school bundning east she
P-27	2:01	30 PPM*	norm side of school along
			playground
P-28	2:04	15 PPM*	north of school in grass along tence



4378 Santa Fe Road San Luis Obispo, CA 93401 (805) 544-3276 FAX (805) 544-1786

July 5, 1996

County of San Luis Obispo, Department of General Services County Government Center, Room 460 San Luis Obispo, California 93408

Attention: Ms. Kathy McNeil

Subject: Results of Soil Vapor Sampling Nipomo Branch Library

Dear Ms. McNeil:

This letter presents the results of the soil vapor analysis conducted at the Nipomo Branch Library site on June 26, 1996. The work was conducted in accordance with our proposal dated June 24, 1996, and was observed by Ms. Stacy Mason of the California Integrated Waste Management Board and Mr. Michael McGee of the San Luis Obispo County Health Agency.

The attached results are for non-methane volatile organic compounds. As we discussed by telephone this morning, I have not been able to determine the status of analysis for methane. I will discuss this issue with the project manager on Monday, July 8, and contact you so that we may resolve the matter.

I am also attaching a table which compares the concentrations of compounds detected in the samples with occupational exposure levels. The two types of exposure levels shown are Threshold Limit Values (TLVs), which are published by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists, and Permissible Exposure Levels (PELs), which are promulgated by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). TLVs are scientifically based *recommendations* for worker exposure, but are not enforceable as a regulatory level. PELs are *enforceable* regulatory levels for worker exposure. As the table demonstrates, the levels detected in the soil beneath the site are at least two orders of magnitude below the allowable PELs or TLVs for the compounds.

This letter has been prepared for the exclusive use of San Luis Obispo County, regarding the Nipomo Branch Library site at the southwest corner of Tefft Street and Orchard Avenue in Nipomo, California. The conclusions rendered in this letter are opinions based on readily available information obtained to date within the scope of the work authorized by the client. Use of or reliance on the information and opinions contained in this letter by other parties without first consulting this office is at those parties' own risk.

The results contained in this letter are based upon the laboratory analysis of soil vapor samples collected during the study. It is possible that variations exist beyond or between points sampled during the course of the assessment. Also, changes in conditions found could occur at some time in the future due to contaminant migration, variations in rainfall, temperature, or other factors not apparent at the time of the field reconnaissance.

The services performed by Earth Systems Consultants have been conducted in a manner consistent with the level of care and skill ordinarily exercised by members of our profession currently practicing under similar conditions in this area of California. No other warranty is expressed or implied.

We appreciate this opportunity to be of service. Please contact me at 544-3276 if you have any questions regarding the attached results or table.

Sincerely,

Earth Systems Consultants Northern California

Timothy Conroy, C.E.G. 1698 Senior Geologist

attachments



July 5, 1996

SOIL VAPOR ANALYTICAL RESULTS COMPARED TO **OCCUPATIONAL EXPOSURE STANDARDS**

Compound	Result (S-1 @8')	Result (S-2 @8')	TLV	PEL
Benzene	0.0009	0.0009	0.1	1.0
Chloroform	0.012	0.005	10	2.0
1,1,1-trichloroethane (Methyl chloroform)	0.0007	0.0027	350	350
Toluene	0.0027	0.0029	100	100
Trichlorofluoromethane (Freon-11)	0.001	0.0011	1,000	
1,2,4-trimethylbenzene	0.0005	0.0006	25	
Xylenes	0.0021	0.0022	100	100

Notes:

All numbers indicate parts per million by volume (ppmv) -- PEL not listed for this compound TLV Threshold Limit Value, ACGIH PEL Permissible Exposure Level, OSHA PELs and TLVs are 8-hour time weighted averages



Client: Brian Hale Earth Systems Consultants 4378 Santa Fe Rd. San Luis Obispo, CA 93401		Lab Number: Collected: Received: Matrix:	9106-1 06/26/96 06/26/96 Air
Project: Project Number:	Nipomo Library NGL-09839-01 Brian Hale	Sample Descriptio Analyzed: Method:	on: S-1 @ 8' 07/01/96 See Below
CONSTITUENT	Dian Haie	PQL* ppbv	RESULT** ppbv

VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS

	0.5	0.9
Benzene	0.5	ND
Bromomethane	0.5	ND
Carbon Tetrachloride	0.5	ND
Chlorobenzene	0.5	ND
Chloroethane	0.5	12.
Chloroform	0.5	ND
Chloromethane	0.5	ND
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	0.5	ND
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	0.5	
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	0.5	
Dichlorodifluoromethane	0.5	
1.1-Dichloroethane	0.5	
1.2-Dichloroethane (EDC)	0.5	ND
1.1-Dichloroethene	0.5	ND
cis-1.2-Dichloroethene	0.5	ND
1 2-Dichloropropane	0.5	ND
cis-1 3-Dichloropropene	0.5	ND
trans-1 3-Dichloropropene	0.5	ND
Ethylbenzene	0.5	ND
Havaablarabutadiene	0.5	ND
Methylong Chloride	0.5	ND
Tetrachleroothono (PCE)	0.5	ND
	0.5	ND
Styrene	0.5	ND
1,1,2,2-Tetrachioroethane	0.5	ND
Trichlorotrifluoroetnane	0.5	0.7
1,1,1-Trichloroethane (ICA)	0.5	2.7
Toluene	0.0	

ZymaX envirotechnology, inc. is certified by CA Department of Health Services: Laboratory #1717

*PQL - Practical Quantitation Limit

**Results listed as ND would have been reported if present at or above the listed PQL.

Note: Analyzed by EPA 8260 and GC/MS Combination.

MSD #1 9106-1.xls JMM/jgt/wr


Client: Brian Hal Earth Sys 4378 Sa San Luis	e stems Consultants nta Fe Rd. Obispo, CA 93401	Lab Number: Collected: Received: Matrix:		9106-1 06/26/96 06/26/96 Air
Project: Project Number:	Nipomo Library NGL-09839-01 Brian Hale	Sample Descript Analyzed: Method:	ion: S-1 @ 8' 07/01/96 See Below	
CONSTITUENT		PQL* ppbv		RESULT** ppbv

VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS

1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene 1,1,2-Trichloroethane Trichloroethene (TCE) Trichlorofluoromethane (freon 11) 1,2,4-Trimethylbenzene 1,3,5-Trimethylbenzene Vinyl Chloride	1.0 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5 0.5	ND ND 1.0 0.5 ND ND
Vinyl Chloride Xylenes	0.5	2.1

ZymaX envirotechnology, inc. is certified by CA Department of Health Services: Laboratory #1717

*PQL - Practical Quantitation Limit

**Results listed as ND would have been reported if present at or above the listed PQL.

Note: Analyzed by EPA 8260 aqnd GC/MS Combination.

Submitted by, ZymaX envirotechnology, inc.

John MacMurphey Laboratory Director

MSD #1 9106-1.xls JMM/jgt/wr



Client: Brian Hale Earth Sys 4378 Sar San Luis	e tems Consultants nta Fe Rd. Obispo, CA 93401	Lab Number: Collected: Received: Matrix:	9106-2 06/26/96 06/26/96 Air
Project: Project Number:	Nipomo Library NGL-09839-01	Sample Description	on: S-2 @ 8' 07/01/96 See Below
CONSTITUENT		PQL* ppbv	RESULT** ppbv

VOLATILE ORGANIC COMPOUNDS

	0.5	0.9
Benzene	0.5	ND
Bromomethane	0.5	ND .
Carbon Tetrachloride	0.5	ND
Chlorobenzene	0.5	ND
Chloroethane	0.5	5.0
Chloroform	0.5	ND
Chloromethane	0.5	ND
1,2-Dichlorobenzene	0.5	ND
1,3-Dichlorobenzene	0.5	ND
1,4-Dichlorobenzene	0.5	ND
Dichlorodifluoromethane	0.5	ND
1,1-Dichloroethane	0.5	ND
1,2-Dichloroethane (EDC)	0.5	ND
1,1-Dichloroethene	0.5	ND
cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	0.5	ND
1,2-Dichloropropane	0.5	
cis-1,3-Dichloropropene	0.5	
trans-1,3-Dichloropropene	0.5	ND
Ethvibenzene	0.5	
Hexachlorobutadiene	0.5	ND
Methylene Chloride	0.5	ND
Tetrachloroethene (PCE)	0.5	ND
Styrene	0.5	ND
1 1 2 2-Tetrachloroethane	0.5	ND
Trichlorotrifluoroethane	0.5	ND
1 1 1-Trichloroethane (TCA)	0.5	2./
Toluana	0.5	2.9
I UIGOIIO		

ZymaX envirotechnology, inc. is certified by CA Department of Health Services: Laboratory #1717 *PQL - Practical Quantitation Limit

**Results listed as ND would have been reported if present at or above the listed PQL.

Note: Analyzed by EPA 8260 and GC/MS Combination.

MSD #1 9106-2.xls JMM/jgt/wr



Client: Brian Hale		Lab Number:	9106-2
Earth Syst	ems Consultants	Collected:	06/26/96
4378 Sant	ta Fe Rd.	Received:	06/26/96
San Luis C)bispo, CA 93401	Matrix:	Air
Project:	Nipomo Library	Sample Description:	
			6-2 @ 8'
Project Number:	NGL-09839-01	Analyzed: C)7/01/96
Collected by:	Brian Hale	Method:	See Below
CONSTITUENT		PQL*	RESULT**
CONOTITIOLINI		ppbv	ppbv
VOLATILE ORGANI	C COMPOUNDS		
1 2 4-Trichlorobenz	ene	1.0	ND
1 1 2-Trichloroetha	ne	0.5	ND
Trichloroethene (TC	E)	0.5	ND
Trichlorofluorometh	ane (freon 11)	0.5	1.1
1 2 4 Trimethylhen	zene	0.5	0.6
1 3 5-Trimethylben	7ene	0.5	ND
Vinyl Chloride	20110	0.5	ND
Yulonee		0.5	2.2

ZymaX envirotechnology, inc. is certified by CA Department of Health Services: Laboratory #1717

***PQL - Practical Quantitation Limit**

**Results listed as ND would have been reported if present at or above the listed PQL.

Note: Analyzed by EPA 8260 aqnd GC/MS Combination.

Submitted by, ZymaX envirotechnology, inc.

John MacMurphey Laboratory Director

MSD #1 9106-2.xls JMM/jgt/wr

Xylenes

ZymaX envirotechnology 71 zaca iane, suite 110	- san luis obispo, ca	93401 - fax E	305/544 8	226 - tel 8	05/544 469	ø	chain	of custoc	ly
roject Menson (NALF	Phone 544-327	7.6 Fear	0-hp5,	531	Ana	lysis Reque	ested		
COMPANY 5757FM 5 CONFUCTAUTS.	Project Number	39-01							. <u> </u>
IZZZ SANTAFE ROTA	Project Name	LIBRARY			31 6				
San UNS BRISPO, CA 93401	Sampler	HUE			44				
For ZymaX Sample Description	Date Sampled S	Time 1 Sampled	Matrix F	reserve	201			Ren	narks
9121.1 5-1 @ A'	1 96-98-9	400	AIR	DMMA >	×			S DAV	- 747 -
-2 5.2 6 8	1	5 00	AVR :	Dat mild	×			PLEASE	OBSENL
								down h	TWES.
		<u> </u>			-				
Special Billing/Comments:	Relinquished by: Signature Print	1 Ald	1 and	E C	<u>*</u>	eceived by Signature Print			
	Company Date	120-96-96	Time	4:45	Land Land	Company Date		Time	
	Relinquished by:				E C	eceived to	r ZymaX by:	VYU.	
Sample Integrity upon receipt: ////////////////////////////////////	Signature					Signature Print	KACMU KILUA	EN DEP	- Charlo
Samples received cold	Company Date		Time			Company Date	1442-0	Z Time	16 45
COLLECT COLLEGINE () PCS						Page	1 at 1		



Nipomo Community Park Master Plan EIR Nipomo, California

Noise Study Report

Prepared for:

Shawna Scott SWCA Environmental Consultants San Luis Obispo, CA 93402

Prepared by:



Karl Mikel, PE

November 25, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	. 1
II.	APPLICABLE NOISE STANDARDS	. 1
	A. Transportation Noise SourcesB. Stationary Noise Sources	. 1 . 4
III.	STUDY METHOD	. 5
	A. Stationary Noise Assessment	. 5
	B. Traffic Noise Assessment	. 5
IV.	MEASURED NOISE LEVELS	. 6
	A. General Information	. 6
	B. Stationary Noise Measurements At Similar Facilities	. 6
	C. Traffic Noise Measurements Around The NCP	. 9
V.	PROJECT IMPACTS	11
	A. Stationary Sources	11
	B. Traffic Sources	12

TABLES

Table 1:	Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure-Transportation Noise Sources	3
Table 2:	Land Use Compatibility Near transportation Sources	3
Table 3:	Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure-Stationary Noise Sources	. 4
Table 4:	Noise Summary, Damon Garcia Sports Complex	. 6
Table 5:	Noise Summary, Templeton Skate Park	. 9
Table 6:	Measured Traffic Noise Levels	11
Table 7:	Estimated Future traffic Noise Level increase	12

FIGURES

Figure 1:	Nipomo Regional Park	2
Figure 2:	Damon Garcia Sports Complex	7
Figure 3:	Templeton Skate Park	8
Figure 4:	Traffic Measurement Location Map	

I. INTRODUCTION

An outdoor noise assessment has been conducted for the Nipomo Park Master Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR), in the community of Nipomo, CA (refer to Figure 1). Karl Mikel, PE, and approved County of San Luis Obispo acoustical noise consultant has prepared this report at the request of Ms. Shawna Scott of SWCA Environmental Consultants (SWCA). The project site is located in a semi-urban area of Nipomo, adjacent land uses consist of undeveloped lots, commercial, residential, and a school (Dana Elementary). This report has been prepared in support of the EIR for the proposed project to address the future noise environment of the area resulting from development of the proposed NCP facilities. Specifically this report presents collected noise measurements from similar proposed park facilities (i.e., local skate park, soccer field, etc.) to estimate stationary noise levels expected by the proposed project. This analysis includes noise data generated from existing peak-hour traffic on Tefft Street, Orchard Road, Pomeroy Road, Juniper Street, Camino Caballo, and Osage Street at potentially affected locations to compare to future noise levels due to project generated traffic. This acoustical analysis is required to determine if proposed facilities development would impact surrounding sensitive noise receptors (residential) located in close proximity to the NCP.

II. APPLICABLE NOISE STANDARDS

The County of San Luis Obispo Noise Element of the General Plan provides a policy framework for addressing potential and existing noise impacts during the planning process. Its purpose is to minimize future and existing noise conflicts. Among the most significant polices found in the Noise Element are numerical noise standards that limit noise exposure within noise-sensitive land uses resulting from transportation sources. An increase in the ambient stationary noise level surrounding the project site would result from the addition of the new facility, which could potentially result in a stationary noise impact that would exceed the thresholds defined in the County Noise Element.

A. TRANSPORTATION NOISE SOURCES

Policy 3.3.2 of the Noise Element states that "new development of noise-sensitive land uses shall not be permitted in areas exposed to existing or projected future levels of noise from transportation noise sources which exceed 60 dB Ldn or CNEL for outdoor activity areas and 45 Ldn or CNEL for interior spaces unless the project includes effective mitigation measures to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas and interior spaces to or below the levels for the given land use," (refer to Tables 1 and 2).

Policy 3.3.3 of the Noise Element states that "Noise created by new transportation noise sources, including roadway improvement project, shall be mitigated so as not to exceed the levels specified in Table 1 within the outdoor activity areas and interior spaces of existing noise sensitive land uses.



Figure 1: Nipomo Regional Park

Land Use	Outdoor Activity Areas ¹	Interior Spaces		
	L _{dn} /CNEL, dB	L _{dn} /CNEL, dB	L _{EQ} , dB ²	
Residential (Except Temporary)	60 ³	45	-	
Bed and Breakfast, Hotels, Motels	60 ³	45	_	
Hospitals, Nursing and Personal Care	60 ³	45	_	
Public Assembly and Entertainment	_	_	35	
Offices	60 ³	_	45	
Churches, Meeting Halls	_	_	45	
Schools, Libraries, Museums	_	_	45	
Outdoor Sports and Recreation	70	_	_	

TABLE 1 Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure-Transportation Noise Sources

Notes: 1. Where the location of outdoor activity areas is unknown, the exterior noise level standard shall be applied to the property line of the receiving land use.

2. As determined for a typical worst-case hour during periods of use.

3. For other than residential uses, where an outdoor activity area is not proposed, the standard shall not apply. Where it is not possible to reduce noise in outdoor activity areas to 60 dB Ldn/CNEL or less using a practical application of the best-available noise reduction measures, an exterior noise level of up to 65 dB Ldn/CNEL may be allowed.

Source: Noise Element, County of San Luis Obispo, General Plan

TABLE 2

Land Use Compatibility For New Development Near Transportation Sources

Land Llas	Ex	terior No	ise Expo	sure, Ld	n or CNE	L (dB)	
	55	60	65	70	75	80	
Residential, Public Assembly, Entertainment							
Bed and Breakfast, Hotel, Motel							
Schools, Libraries, Museums, Hospitals				۰.			
Outdoor Sports and Recreation					۰.		
Offices							
Acceptable, no mitigation required							
Conditionally Acceptable, Mitigation r	required						
Unacceptable, mitigation may not be	feasible						
Source: SLO County Noise Element, Policy Document							

B. STATIONARY NOISE SOURCES

Policy 3.3.4 of the Noise Element states that "new development of noise-sensitive land uses shall not be permitted where the noise level due to existing stationary noise sources would exceed the noise level standards included in the Noise Element unless effective noise mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design of the development to reduce noise exposure to or below the levels specified." The hourly daytime stationary noise standard for a residential development is 50 dBA, while the maximum is 70 dBA. The hourly nighttime stationary noise standard for a residential development is 45 dBA, while the maximum is 60 dBA (refer to Table 3).

Level	Daytime (7 a.m. to 9 p.m.)	Nighttime (9 p.m. to 7 a.m.)
Hourly Leq, dBA ²	50	45
Maximum Level, dBA ²	70	60
Maximum Level, Impulsive Noise dBA ³	65	60
Notes:		
1. As determined at the property line of the of the receiving land us	ie.	
2. Sound level measurements shall be made with slow meter response	onse.	
3. Sound level measurements shall be made with fast meter respo	nse.	
Source: SLO County Noise Element, Policy Document		

 TABLE 3

 Maximum Allowable Noise Exposure-Stationary Noise Sources¹

Policy 3.3.5 of the Noise Element states that "new proposed stationary noise sources or existing stationary noise sources that undergo modifications that may increase noise levels shall be mitigated as follows and shall be the responsibility of the developer of the stationary noise source. Policy 3.3.5 can be found in its entirety on page 3-3 of the County Noise Element, applicable standards from Policy 3.3.5 are provided below as follows:

b) Noise levels shall be reduced to or below the noise level standards in Table 3-2 (refer to Table 1 in this report) where the stationary noise source will expose an **existing** noise-sensitive land use (which is listed in the Land Use Element as an allowable use within its existing land use category) to noise levels that exceed the standards in Table 3-2.

c) Noise levels shall be reduced to or below the noise level standards in Table 3-2 where the stationary noise source will expose **vacant** land in the Agriculture, Rural Lands, Residential Rural, Residential Suburban, Residential Single Family, Residential Multi-Family, Recreation, Office and Professional, and Commercial Retail land use categories to noise levels that exceed the standards in Table 3-2.

Note: This policy may be waived when the Director of Planning and Building determines that such vacant land is not likely to be developed with a noise sensitive land-use.

III. STUDY METHOD

A. STATIONARY NOISE ASSESSMENT

The procedure used to assess noise resulting from this project focused on measuring noise levels at similar events and facilities such as soccer games at multi-use sports fields and skate parks to estimate noise levels that could be expected by these types of uses at the NCP. Ambient preproject noise levels are measured at select locations to determine if recreational development would result in a stationary noise impact. The expected noise levels are then compared to published threshold values in the County's Noise Element to determine if a significant change in the noise environment would occur and if an exceedance of the threshold value would be expected. The one-hour Leq threshold outlined in the Noise Element is 50 dBA at the property line of the nearest sensitive receptor location, with a maximum noise level of 70 dBA allowed for short periods of time so long as the hourly average is maintained at 50 dBA Leq.

B. TRAFFIC NOISE ASSESSMENT

The procedure for assessing vehicular traffic noise impacts included measuring the peak-hour noise levels at select locations around the NCP while counting the traffic generating the noise during the period of measurement. The measured peak-hour noise levels are then adjusted logarithmically to determine the "future" noise levels by using the estimated traffic volume predictions for various road segments. Logarithms are used because they produce linear correlations, which can then be used to more readily evaluate future noise levels. Generally speaking, doubling the traffic volume will produce a 3 dB increase in the ambient noise environment.

From a practical standpoint, the peak-hour Leq noise level is essentially equivalent to the Ldn noise level (generally yielding results within 1-2 dBA of each other). The Ldn is the standard measure used for evaluating community noise impacts in the County Noise Element. For most situations involving noise originating from vehicular traffic, the peak-hour Leq can be used as the Ldn level in situations where there is little nighttime traffic or significant heavy truck volumes. Peak hour Leq was the methodology used in evaluation of traffic noise impacts for the proposed project. Noise measurements were taken for a duration of 15 minutes at each location. Further analysis is based on the average noise levels (Leq) as discussed in this report.

General guidelines for determining community noise impacts typically include:

- A three-dB change is barely perceptible, and is the minimum most people will notice in most environments.
- A five-dB change is a readily perceptible increase or decrease in sound level.
- A ten-dB increase in sound level is perceived as an approximate doubling of the loudness of the sound and represents a substantial change in loudness.

IV. MEASURED NOISE LEVELS

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

The subject noise investigation was conducted using a Bruel and Kjaer (B & K) Model 2231 precision integrating sound level meter. The meter internally computes a new Leq from the sound pressure level and updates the digital display once each second. The meter was calibrated externally at the beginning of each period of measurement using a B & K Model 4230 acoustic calibrator. In combination, these instruments yield sound level measurements accurate to within 0.1 decibel (dB). All models fulfill standards of relevant sections of IEC (International Electrotechnical Commission) 651 and ANSI (American National Standard) S1.4.1971 for Type 1 (precision) integrating sound level meters. All noise readings were conducted in the A-weighted decibel range. The A-weighting correlates well with how humans hear sounds, deemphasizing very high and low frequencies.

B. STATIONARY NOISE MEASUEMENTS AT SIMILAR FACILITIES

To help assess expected stationary noise levels resulting from development due to the project, similar noise sources and events were monitored. Noise was measured on November 19, 2010 at the Damon Garcia Sports Complex during a youth soccer tournament, and at the Templeton Skate Park on November 21, 2010 (Figures 2 & 3).

The measurement set conducted at Damon Garcia consisted of a multi-game youth soccer tournament. Three games were being played at the same time, measurement Location 3 was the combination of all three games being played at once. There was no amplified sound at any of the games; most of the noise measured from the games resulted from the crowd cheering during exciting plays. Very little noise is actually generated by participants or action on the field. Table 4 presents the results of the monitoring conducted during the soccer event.

Location	Distance from Center of Field	Noise Levels (dBA)	
	(Feet)	Leq	Max
1	25	66.5	76.6
2	50	59.1	75.1
3	100	54.0	73.1
4	10	66.4	79.1

 TABLE 4

 Noise Summary, Damon Garcia Sports Complex



Figure 2: Damon Garcia Sports Complex

Noise Measurement Location: Damon Garcia Sports Complex

Figure 3: Templeton Skate Park



Noise Measurement Location: Templeton Skate Park

The skaters primarily generate the skate park noise when they are actively skating within the confines of the concrete at the facility. The noise environment around the park is subject to multiple impulsive types of episodes when the skaters fall off their boards and the boards bang around on the concrete. When the skaters are on their boards and skating through the facility, the sound of the skate wheels and trucks are quite noticeable in close proximity to the park. Table 5 presents the results of the monitoring conducted at the skate park.

Location	Distance from Center of Field	Noise Levels (dBA)	
	(Feet)	Leq	Max
1	25	73.5	82.9
2	50	68.4	79.6
3	100	62.2	74.4

 TABLE 5

 Noise Summary, Templeton Skate Park

C. TRAFFIC NOISE MEASUEMENTS AROUND THE NCP

The level of traffic noise depends on the following three factors: (1) the volume of traffic; (2) the speed of the traffic; and, (3) the number of trucks in the traffic flow. Generally, heavier traffic volumes, higher speeds, and the greater numbers of trucks increase the loudness of traffic noise. Any condition (such as a steep incline) that causes heavy laboring of motor vehicle engines will also increase the resultant traffic noise levels. Vehicle noise around the NCP is a combination of the noise produced by the engines, exhausts, and tires.

Higher levels of existing noise resulting from automobile and truck traffic characterize the perimeter portions of the existing NCP site, especially adjacent to the West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road corridors. Although higher levels of noise are found along the existing transportation corridors surrounding the NCP; noise levels rapidly attenuate as one moves towards the interior of the site because of the varying topography and in some locations the presence of dense thick wooded vegetation. A field investigation was conducted on November 23, 2010, noise measurements were conducted from approximately 3:30 PM to 5:45 PM to determine traffic related ambient noise levels around the perimeter and within the proposed NCP site (refer to Figure 4). Each of the short-term sites was measured for a duration of 15 minutes while vehicle volumes were classified. The hourly counts are then normalized from the data generated.

Generally speaking, the loudest traffic noise levels are associated with sites monitored adjacent to West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road, which are the primary noise sources in the general area. There are a variety of commercial and retail areas to the north and east of the NCP (including Highway 101), which are additional noise generators in the immediate area. Most other areas surrounding the NCP are residential and do not have significant traffic volumes or excessive traffic noise levels. Table 6 presents the results of the sites monitored.

Figure 4: Nipomo Regional Park



Traffic Noise Measurement Locations: Nipomo Regional Park

Location*	Period of	Noise Levels (dBA)	Traffic Volume, Measured	
	Measurement	Leq	Number	Vehicles/ Hr
1	3:30-3:45 pm	63.8	228	912
2	4:00-4:15 pm	64.5	240	960
3	4:30–4:45 pm	61.0	150	600
4	5:00–5:15 pm	57.1	118	472
5	5:15–5:30 pm	55.6	70	280
6	5:30–5:45 pm	63.0	195	780

TABLE 6Measured Traffic Noise Levels

*Refer to Figure 4 for Measurement Locations

V. PROJECT IMPACTS

A. STATIONARY SOURCES

The project area is a mix of hardscaped surfaces, undeveloped fields, commercial/retail uses, and residential development. The topography surrounding the NCP is characterized as a "hard", which means that it would tend to be more reflective than absorptive of sound pressure waves. Hard sites generally do not have absorptive ground surfaces such as soft dirt, grass, or bushes and trees to attenuate noise levels.

Existing vegetation at the NCP consists of annual grassland, scattered herbaceous vegetation, and small clumps of brush and oak woodland habitat. The existing project site would be characterized as a "soft site", meaning that excess attenuation of sound pressure levels would be observed due to the ground cover and vegetation. After project development, more of the site would be hardscaped, decreasing the project areas natural noise attenuation capabilities. When added to the natural geometric spreading of sound pressure waves, this would result in an overall noise drop-off rate of approximately 6.0 dBA/(doubling distance) for a stationary source.

If one were to assume a conservative drop-off rate of 6 dBA per distance doubled, a safedistance offset could be estimated in order to determine how far way from the nearest sensitive noise receptor location new facilities must be sited. Referring to Table 4, for a hypothetical nonamplified multi-game soccer event, the nearest field would need to be no closer than 200 feet from the closet receptor location to meet County exterior noise thresholds. Referring to Table 5, for a skate park, the active skating area should be no closer than 400 feet from the nearest receptor location. This evaluation is based on average conditions, with no loud music playing, and assumes only the sounds from voices and skateboards.

B. TRAFFIC SOURCES

To determine the traffic noise level increase due to project generated trips, the Traffic Impact Analysis (March 2010) was used in order to determine buildout traffic conditions with the additional NCP Master Plan uses included for future traffic conditions. Expected noise increases resulting from implementation of the NCP Master Plan resulting from additional vehicle trips are presented in Table 7. All estimated noise increases have been rounded to one decimal place.

Location*	Baseline Buildout ADT	Buildout Plus Project ADT	Estimated Noise Level Increase (dBA) Leq
1	8,400	8,602	0.1
2	19,200	19,510	0.1
3	9,350	9,564	0.1
4	3,100	3,122	0.0
5	1,300	1,322	0.1
6	6,700	6,764	0.0

TABLE 7
Estimated Future Traffic Noise Level Increase

*Refer to Figure 4 for Measurement Locations

As seen in Table 7, due to the relatively low number of expected additional trips, estimated noise level increases due to project generated traffic are expected to be negligible. Under controlled conditions in an acoustics laboratory, the trained healthy human ear is able to discern changes in sound levels of 1 dBA when exposed to steady single-frequency (pure tone) signals in the mid-frequency range. Outside such controlled conditions, the trained ear can detect changes of 2 dBA in normal environmental noise. It is widely accepted that the average healthy ear, however, can barely perceive noise level changes of 3 dBA (Caltrans Technical Noise Supplement, 2009). Since the expected noise level increase would be less than 1 dBA, traffic noise impacts are not expected to occur due to buildout of the NCP uses.



TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION BACKGROUND INFORMATION

NIPOMO COMMUNITY PARK MASTER PLAN San Luis Obispo County, California

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS

SWCA Environmental Consultants

1422 Monterey Street, Suite C200 San Luis Obispo, CA 93401



Larry D. Hail, PE, PTOE **PINNACLE TRAFFIC ENGINEERING** 2 South Pointe Drive, Suite 275 Lake Forest, California 92630 PinnacleTE.com

February 10, 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Repo	rt Section	Page	
I.	Introduction	••	1
II.	Existing Conditions		3
III.	Project Conditions	••	9
IV.	Buildout Conditions	. 2	1
V.	Mitigation Measures	. 3	0

LIST OF TABLES

Existing Roadway Segment Analysis	6
Existing PM Peak Hour LOS Analysis	7
ITE and Applicable Trip Generation Rates	11
NCP Master Plan Trip Generation Estimates	11
NCP Master Plan Trip Distribution Percentages	12
Existing Plus NCP Master Plan Roadway Segment Analysis	14
Existing Plus NCP Master Plan PM Peak Hour LOS Analysis	15
NCP Master Plan Alternative Trip Generation Estimates	16
Existing Plus NCP Master Plan Alt. Roadway Segment Analysis	19
Existing Plus NCP Master Plan Alt. PM Peak Hour LOS Analysis	20
Baseline Buildout Roadway Segment Analysis	22
Baseline Buildout PM Peak Hour LOS Analysis	24
Buildout Plus NCP Master Plan Roadway Segment Analysis	25
Buildout Plus NCP Master Plan PM Peak Hour LOS Analysis	26
Buildout Plus NCP Master Plan Alt. Roadway Segment Analysis	28
Buildout Plus NCP Master Plan Alt. PM Peak Hour LOS Analysis	29
	Existing Roadway Segment Analysis Existing PM Peak Hour LOS Analysis ITE and Applicable Trip Generation Rates NCP Master Plan Trip Generation Estimates NCP Master Plan Trip Distribution Percentages Existing Plus NCP Master Plan Roadway Segment Analysis Existing Plus NCP Master Plan PM Peak Hour LOS Analysis NCP Master Plan Alternative Trip Generation Estimates Existing Plus NCP Master Plan Alt. Roadway Segment Analysis Existing Plus NCP Master Plan Alt. PM Peak Hour LOS Analysis Existing Plus NCP Master Plan Alt. PM Peak Hour LOS Analysis Baseline Buildout Roadway Segment Analysis Baseline Buildout PM Peak Hour LOS Analysis Buildout Plus NCP Master Plan Roadway Segment Analysis Buildout Plus NCP Master Plan PM Peak Hour LOS Analysis Buildout Plus NCP Master Plan Alt. Roadway Segment Analysis Buildout Plus NCP Master Plan Alt. PM Peak Hour LOS Analysis Buildout Plus NCP Master Plan Alt. PM Peak Hour LOS Analysis

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 -	Project Location Map	2
Figure 2 -	Existing Traffic Volumes	5
Figure 3A -	NCP Master Plan	10
Figure 3B -	NCP Master Plan Traffic Volumes	13
Figure 4A -	NCP Master Plan Alternative	17
Figure 4B -	NCP Master Plan Alternative Traffic Volumes	18
Figure 5 -	Buildout Traffic Volumes	23

APPENDIX MATERIAL

- New 24-Hour Traffic Counts (May 2009); West Tefft Street, Pomeroy Road and Osage Street

- New PM Peak Period Turning Movement Traffic Count Data:
- 6 Study intersections (May 2009)
- Level of Service (LOS) Descriptions
- Level of Service 24-Hour ADT Threshold Criteria
- Level of Service (LOS) Value Vehicle Delay Relationship Data
- Level of Service (LOS) Worksheets
- California MUTCD Traffic Signal Warrant #3 (Minimum Peak Hour Volume)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The traffic report presents an evaluation of the potential impacts associated with the Nipomo Community Park (NCP) Master Plan. The NCP Master Plan includes Mesa Meadows and a variety of new recreational facilities to be constructed over 20 years. New recreational facilities include additional park and playground area, a community recreation center and gymnasium, an amphitheater, a skate board park, a swimming pool, sporting fields, basketball and handball courts, tennis courts, a dog park, restrooms, trails and walkways, etc. The infrastructure improvements include a realignment of the existing access road at West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road. The existing access road connection to West Tefft Street will be realigned to the north side of the Nipomo Public Library opposite Orchard Avenue. The existing access road connection to Pomeroy Road will be realigned opposite Juniper Street and a traffic signal will be installed. The NCP Master Plan also includes a project "alternative" that represents a reduced project scope.

Project trip generation estimates for the NCP Master Plan were derived using data contained in the ITE Trip Generation publication and other sources. The trip generation estimates included quantifying the "net" increase in trips associated with the buildout of uses defined in the NCP Master Plan and NCP Master Plan Alternative. Buildout of the NCP Master Plan will generate a total of 3,058 daily trips; which is a "net" increase of approximately 1,258 daily trips (+70%). The NCP Master Plan Alternative will generate approximately 48% fewer daily trips than the NCP Master Plan (+654 daily trips). During the PM peak hour the NCP Master Plan will generate a total of 500 trips, which is a net increase of approximately 247 trips (+98%). The NCP Master Plan Alternative will generate approximately 247 trips than the NCP Master Plan (+196 PM peak hour trips). Trips associated with the NCP Master Plan and Alternative were distributed on the local street system based on a review of peak hour travel patterns and traffic demands included in the South County Traffic Model Final Report.

The traffic analysis scope was developed in consultation with staff at San Luis Obispo County Public Works. The evaluation of potential impacts includes an analysis of traffic operations along West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road. An analysis of average weekday afternoon peak hour operations is also provided at selected study intersections. At the request of County staff, the analysis also includes a qualitative evaluation of potential impacts at the US101 and West Tefft Street interchange. The evaluation of existing conditions indicates that existing daily traffic volumes on the study roadway segments are within acceptable limits (LOS C or better). Daily traffic volumes along West Tefft Street (Mary Avenue to Pomeroy Road) and on US 101 are also within acceptable limits. The evaluation of PM peak hour operations indicates that vehicle delays at the study intersections are also within acceptable limits. However, information in the South County Traffic Model Final Report indicates that vehicle delays at the US 101 / West Tefft Street interchange southbound ramps are within the LOS E range during the PM peak hour. The primary reason for the excessive delays is the current intersection configuration.

The evaluation of potentially significant impacts associated with the NCP Master Plan and NCP Master Plan Alternative was based on "level of significance" criteria defined by San Luis Obispo County and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). An evaluation of the "existing plus project" scenario demonstrates that daily volumes on the study area roadway segments will remain within acceptable limits with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan or NCP Master Plan Alternative (LOS C or better). Vehicle delays at the study intersections will also remain within acceptable limits

with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan or NCP Master Plan Alternative. However, delays at the US 101 / West Tefft Street interchange southbound ramps are currently within the LOS E range during the PM peak hour (documented in the South County Traffic Model Update Final Report). It is anticipated that buildout of the NCP Master Plan or NCP Master Plan Alternative could add 10-15 trips to this intersection during the critical PM peak hour. However, the US 101/Willow Road "grade separated" interchange is currently under construction. The traffic operations report included an evaluation of the potential benefits to the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. The Willow Road Extension Final SEIR analyzed the benefits associated with the "preferred" alternative. The analysis of 2030 traffic conditions demonstrated that the US 101/Willow Road interchange would reduce delays at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange ramp intersections by about 40% during the PM peak hour. Therefore, buildout of the NCP Master Plan or NCP Master Plan Alternative will not have a potentially significant impact on existing PM peak hour traffic operations.

The evaluation of baseline buildout conditions was conducted using data contained in the South County Traffic Model Final Report. This scenario represents long-term future conditions and traffic forecast for the Year 2025. The buildout transportation network also includes various roadway improvements. It should also be noted that the County is evaluating various operational improvements for the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. However, these improvements are not designed or funded at this time, and therefore, are not assumed to be completed under the baseline buildout. Discussions with County staff indicate that the "preferred" alternative could achieve acceptable levels of service under buildout conditions.

An evaluation of the buildout plus project scenario demonstrates that daily traffic volumes on the majority of study area roadway segments will remain within acceptable limits with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan or NCP Master Plan Alternative (LOS C or better). However, daily traffic volumes near the US 101 interchange are projected to be within the LOS E range. Completion of the US 101/Willow Road interchange is anticipated to reduce daily traffic on West Tefft Street (west of US 101) by about 20-25%. The Willow Road Extension SEIR analysis indicates that the benefits associated with the project are estimated to improve the buildout LOS E to an acceptable LOS C (27,200 ADT) on West Tefft Street (near US 101 interchange). Therefore, it is concluded that buildout of the NCP Master Plan or NCP Master Plan Alternative will not significant impact future daily traffic operations. The analysis of buildout plus project conditions identified a potentially significant project impact at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange during the PM peak hour.

The appropriate mitigation measures are presented for the potentially significant impacts attributable to the project. Development of additional recreational facilities included in the NCP Master Plan or NCP Master Plan Alternative will occur over the next 20 years. It should be noted that the analysis of potential project impacts represents a "worst case" scenario (ie: all facilities being used at peak levels simultaneously). Implementation of "transportation demand management" (TDM) measures would reduce the potentially significant impact to a level of "less than significant" for the existing plus project scenario. TDM measures should include, but not be limited to, reducing the number tennis court and/or sporting fields, delay the library expansion or construction of amphitheater, etc. In addition, game starting times at the baseball / softball and sporting fields should be scheduled to avoid generating a significant amount of "regional" traffic during the PM peak hour (4:00-6:00 PM). Implementation of TDM measures will reduce the potential impacts at the US 101 / West Tefft Street interchange to a level of "less than significant".

In addition, to reduce the potential impacts to a level of "less than significant" the buildout of the recreational facilities included in the NCP Master Plan or Alternative should be limited until the County has completed a design, secured funding and established a formal schedule for the future operational improvements at the West Tefft Street/US 101 southbound ramps intersection. Future improvements at this intersection identified by the County could provide acceptable levels of service. Once this project becomes part of the long range infrastructure improvement plans in the South County Traffic Model they can be assumed to mitigate the potentially significant project impact at this intersection. It should also be mentioned that the "roadway improvement" fees defined in the South County Traffic Model Final Report provide a funding mechanism for long range infrastructure improvements in this portion of the County, and therefore, payment of the County "roadway improvement" fees serves at the project mitigation.

I. INTRODUCTION

The following report presents an evaluation of the potential traffic impacts associated with the Nipomo Community Park (NCP) Master Plan. The NCP is located south of Pomeroy Road, between West Tefft Street and Osage Street. Access to the NCP is provided via one driveway on West Tefft Street (south of Orchard Avenue) and one driveway on Pomeroy Road (east of Juniper Street). The NCP Master Plan also includes Mesa Meadows, which is located west of Osage Street and north of Mesa Road. Access to Mesa Meadows is provided via Charro Way, Tejas Place and Amigo Place. A variety of new recreational facilities and infrastructure improvements will be constructed over the next 20 years. The new facilities include additional playground areas, a recreation center, a swimming pool, an amphitheater, sporting fields, tennis courts, basketball courts, tennis courts, walking trails, etc. The NCP Master Plan infrastructure improvements include a realignment of the existing access road at West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road. A traffic signal will also be installed at the Pomeroy Road and Juniper Street intersection (opposite the realigned park access road). The NCP Master Plan also includes a project "alternative". The alternative represents a reduced project scope (ie; teen center in lieu of recreation center, etc). The general locations of the NCP and Mesa Meadows are shown on Figure 1.

The traffic analysis scope was developed in consultation with staff at San Luis Obispo County Public Works. The evaluation of potential impacts includes an analysis of traffic operations along West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road. The evaluation also includes an analysis of average weekday afternoon peak hour operations at the following study intersections:

- 1. West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road
- 2. West Tefft Street and Orchard Avenue
- 3. West Tefft Street and Existing Park Access Road
- 4. Pomeroy Road and Existing Park Access Road
- 5. Pomeroy Road and Juniper Street
- 6. Pomeroy Road and Camino Caballo

New daily traffic count data was collected on West Tefft Street, Pomeroy Road and Osage Street. New turning movement traffic count data was also collected at the study intersections. At the request of County staff, the traffic analysis also includes a qualitative evaluation of potential project impacts at the US 101 and West Tefft Street interchange. Information contained in the following public documents was reviewed during the course of conducting the analysis:

- San Luis Obispo County Initial Study Summary
- Constraints Analysis prepared by the Morro Group (June 2004)
- South County Traffic Model Update (2008) Final Report
- San Luis Obispo County General Plan Transportation Plan
- US101/Willow Road Interchange Project Final Traffic Operations Report
- Willow Road Extension Final Supplemental EIR



NCP Master Plan Traffic Impact Report

II. EXISTING CONDITIONS

The local street system serving the NCP and Mesa Meadows includes US 101, West Tefft Street, Pomeroy Road, Orchard Avenue and a network of local collector streets. The following is a brief description of the street system and an evaluation of existing traffic operations.

Network Description

<u>US 101</u> is a four lane north-south divided freeway through the Nipomo area of unincorporated San Luis Obispo County. US 101 provides regional access between northern and southern California. In the vicinity of Nipomo, there are "grade separated" interchanges at State Route (SR) 166 (Cuyama Highway), West Tefft Street and Los Berros Road-North Thompson Avenue. The new Willow Road "grade separated" interchange is currently under construction and will connect to the Willow Road extension (planned for completion in late 2012/early 2013). The north and southbound ramps at the US 101 / West Tefft Street interchange are signalized.

<u>West Tefft Street</u> extends west from Thompson Avenue to North Las Flores Drive. West Tefft Street in the vicinity of the NCP is posted with a 45 miles per hour (mph) speed limit. West Tefft Street also has a "school zone" speed limit posted for the Dana Elementary School (25 mph). The "school zone" speed limit signs are supplemented with "your speed" read-out signs. West of US 101, West Tefft Street has two travel lanes in each direction with a raised median. West of Mary Avenue this primary arterial has a two-way left turn lane that provides access for various commercial driveways and collector streets. West Tefft Street continues along a horizontal curve to the south adjacent to Pomeroy Road. South of Pomeroy Road, West Tefft Street has a single travel lane in each direction with a two-way left turn lane. West Tefft Street has a single travel lane in each direction with a two-way left turn lane. West Tefft Street is signalized at Thompson Avenue, Oakglen Avenue, US 101 ramps, Mary Avenue, Pomeroy Road and Orchard Avenue. In the vicinity of the NCP, West Tefft Street also provides access for the Nipomo Public Library, Dana Elementary School and the Nipomo Community Health Center.

<u>Pomeroy Road</u> extends west of West Tefft Street to Los Berros Road. Pomeroy Road has a single travel lane in each direction with a posted speed limit of 45 mph (adjacent to the NCP). The 45 mph speed limit signs are supplemented with "your speed" read-out signs. There are 35 mph "curve advisory" signs for the horizontal curve near the NCP access road and Juniper Street intersections. Left turn lanes are provided for access at Primrose Lane, the NCP park access road, Juniper Street and Camino Caballo.

<u>Orchard Avenue</u> extends east of West Tefft Street to Joshua Road. Orchard Avenue has a single travel lane in each direction with a posted 45 mph speed limit. Left turn lanes are provided for access at Grande Street, Division Street, Soares Drive and Story Street. The Orchard Avenue and Division Street intersection is signalized.

<u>NCP Access Road</u> extends between West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road. The existing access road has a single lane in each direction with a width of approximately 18-20'. There is a posted speed limit of 15 mph and speed humps within the park. The existing park access road also provides access for the northerly parking lot at the Dana Elementary School (23 stalls used by staff and faculty).

The network of local collector streets serving the NCP and Mesa Meadows includes Primrose Lane, Bernita Place, Juniper Street, Camino Caballo, Osage Street, Tejas Place and Mesa Road. Each local collector streets has a single lane in each direction.

Local Bicycle, Pedestrian and Transit Facilities

West Tefft Street, Pomeroy Road and Orchard Avenue have Class II bike lanes. The Class II bike lanes include no parking signs. bike lane signs and striping. In the vicinity of the NCP there are pedestrian sidewalks on the east side of West Tefft Street (north of Orchard Avenue), west side of West Tefft Street (south of Orchard Avenue), north side of Pomeroy Road (between West Tefft Street and Camino Caballo) and north side of Orchard Avenue. Access to various trails within the NCP and Mesa Meadows is provided connections to Pomeroy Road, Camino Caballo, Osage Street, Tejas Place and La Serena Way. South County Area Transit (Regional Transit Authority, RTA) currently provides limited service to the Nipomo community (Route 10). Local transit stops are provided at the Nipomo High School and on West Tefft Street near Carillo Street. The RTA also provides a "dial a ride" service for Nipomo.

Traffic Volumes

As stated in the Introduction, the evaluation of potential project impacts includes an analysis of average weekday afternoon peak hour operations at the selected study intersections. It should be noted that traffic associated with the Dana Elementary School (approximately 600 students) does create congestion along West Tefft Street on a daily basis (before classes start @ 9:00AM and after classes end @ 3:15). Schools typically generate sharp peaks in traffic demand prior to the beginning of classes and when classes end (15-30 minutes). However, traffic during an average weekday afternoon commuter peak hour (highest hour between 4:00 and 6:00 PM) is generally higher and spread out over the entire hour (60 minutes). Traffic count data on the County's website demonstrates that the afternoon peak hour on West Tefft Street (west of Mary Avenue) typically starts between 4:00 and 5:00 PM. Therefore, traffic demands along West Tefft Street adjacent to the project site are higher during the weekday afternoon commuter peak period than when classes end at the Dana Elementary School.

To document existing conditions new 24-hour traffic count data was collected on West Tefft Street (south of Pomeroy Road), Pomeroy Road (west of West Tefft Street) and Osage Street (south of Camino Caballo). New turning movement traffic count data was also collected at the study intersections during a weekday afternoon commuter period (4:00-6:00 PM). Existing traffic volume data contained in the South County Traffic Model Final Report and published on the County's website was also referenced. The existing traffic volumes are illustrated on Figure 2. Copies of the new traffic count data are included with the Appendix Material.

A review of the new traffic count data indicates that the total intersection volumes during the afternoon peak hour are approximately 10% lower than documented in the South County Traffic Model Final Report. Daily traffic volumes on West Tefft Street (east of Pomeroy Road) are also about 10% less than documented in the South County Traffic Model Final Report. Daily traffic volumes on Orchard Avenue (east of West Tefft Street) are about 25% lower that documented in the final report. However, it should be noted that daily traffic volumes on Pomeroy Road (west of West Tefft Street) are about 50% higher than published in the South County Traffic Model Final Report.


Level of Service Threshold Criteria and Analysis

Various "level of service" (LOS) analyses methodologies are used to evaluate traffic operations. Conditions range from LOS "A" (free-flow) to LOS "F" (forced-flow). LOS values for roadway segments can be estimated by comparing daily traffic volume data to "24 Hour Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Threshold Criteria" developed from data in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM2000). ADT criterion is also published in the South County Traffic Model Final Report. Traffic can be constrained at local intersections during peak demands periods. Therefore, an evaluation of peak hour intersection operations is a good method for measuring the potential impact associated with a specific project. The LOS values for intersection operations are based on estimated vehicle delays (number of delay seconds per vehicle). Delays are reported for the overall intersection operations as an average, as well as for each "critical" movement.

San Luis Obispo County has established the LOS C threshold as the lower limit for acceptable operations on rural facilities and LOS D threshold as the lower limit for acceptable operations on urban facilities. The Caltrans traffic impact study guidelines state that, "Caltrans endeavors to maintain a target level of service at the transition between LOS C and D on State highway facilities." The LOS C threshold is used in the South County Traffic Model Final Report as the lower limit for acceptable operations on the local street system serving the NCP and Mesa Meadows. A brief description of the LOS values, the 24 Hour ADT Volume Threshold Criteria and the LOS-to-vehicle delay relationship data are included with the Appendix Material. The analysis of existing roadway segments is presented in Table 1.

Roadway Segment	# of Lanes LOS E Capacity		- ADT - May '09	Level of Service
W. Tefft Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	4 (a)	36,000	17,000	А
W. Tefft Street, Pomeroy Rd Orchard Ave.	3 (b)	24,000	13,100	А
W. Tefft Street, s/o Orchard Avenue	2 (c)	18,000	9,800	А
Pomeroy Road, n/o W. Tefft Street	2 (d)	13,500	8,900	В
Pomeroy Road, Juniper St Camino Ca.	2 (d)	13,500	8,500	В
Pomeroy Road, n/o Camino Caballo	2 (e)	12,000	6,500	В
Camino Caballo, w/o Pomeroy Road	2 (e)	12,000	2,300	А
Orchard Avenue, e/o W. Tefft Street	2 (d)	13,500	5,900	А
Juniper Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	2 (e)	12,000	1,600	А
Osage Street, s/o Camino Caballo	2 (e)	12,000	1,200	А
Mesa Road, w/o Tefft Street	2 (e)	12,000	2,900	А

Table 1 - Existing Roadway Segment Analysis

(a) 4 lane divided arterial with left turn lanes

(b) 3 lane undivided arterial with left turn lanes, 2 NB lanes and 1 SB lane

(c) 2 lane arterial with left turn lanes

(d) 2 lane arterial with no left turn lanes

(d) 2 lane collector

The roadway segment analysis indicates that existing daily traffic volumes are within acceptable limits as defined by San Luis Obispo County (LOS C or better). Existing daily traffic volumes on other local collector streets are also within acceptable limits (Tejas Place, Bernita Place and Primrose Lane). It should be noted that traffic volume data contained in the South County Traffic Model Final Report and published on the County's website demonstrates that existing daily traffic volumes along West Tefft Street are within the LOS A-B range (Mary Avenue to Pomeroy Road). Data published on the Caltrans website indicates that daily traffic volumes on US 101 adjacent to the West Tefft Street interchange are within the LOS B-C range.

The Synchro traffic signal simulation software was used to analyze the existing afternoon peak hour traffic operations at the study intersections. A peak hour factor (PHF) of 0.85 was used to be consistent with the analysis methodology in the South County Traffic Model Final Report. Observations of existing conditions were conducted to document signal phasing and timing parameters. The analysis of the existing afternoon peak hour operations is presented in Table 2. Also presented in Table 2 are the LOS values for selected study intersections as documented in the South County Traffic Model Final Report. Copies of the LOS worksheets are included with the Appendix Material.

	Vehicle Dela	y - LOS Value
Study Intersection	May 2009	So. Co. Study
W. Tefft Street / Pomeroy Road (a)	14.6 - B	23.7 - C
W. Tefft Street / Orchard Ave. (a)	20.8 - C	17.5 - B
W. Tefft Street / Park Access Road (b)	1.5 - A	-
EB Stop Sign Approach -	(22.0 - C)	(-)
Pomeroy Road / Park Access Road (b)	0.9 - A	-
EB Stop Sign Approach -	(14.2 - B)	(-)
Pomeroy Road / Juniper Street (b)	1.8 - A	-
WB Stop Sign Approach -	(14.6 - B)	(13.7 - B)
Pomeroy Road / Camino Caballo (b)	2.7 - A	-
Stop Sign Approach (c)	(22.8 - C)	(-)

Table 2 - Existing PM Peak Hour LOS Analysis

(a) Signalized intersection

(b) Stop sign controlled intersection, average delay - LOS value

(c) Stop sign controlled intersection, worst case delay - LOS value

The data in Table 2 indicates that vehicle delays at the study intersections are within acceptable limits during a typical weekday afternoon peak hour period (LOS C or better). Observations of actual peak hour operations confirmed the LOS analysis of existing traffic conditions.

Information in the South County Traffic Model Final Report indicates that delays at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange northbound ramps are within the LOS C range during the PM peak hour. However, the final report also demonstrates that delays at the southbound ramps

(opposite the Frontage Road) are within the LOS E range during the PM peak hour. The primary reason for the excessive delays is the current intersection configuration. The US 101 southbound ramps-Frontage Road intersection essentially has 5 legs, with a 2 stage left turn signal phase for the westbound left turn movements at the US 101 southbound on-ramp and at the Frontage Road. 2008 traffic count data provided by County staff demonstrates that PM peak hour traffic volumes have remained relatively stable as compared to the data presented in final report.

As previously stated the new US 101/Willow Road "grade separated" interchange is currently under construction and will connect to the Willow Road extension (planned for completion in late 2012/early 2013). The US101/Willow Road Interchange Project - Final Traffic Operations Report included an evaluation of the potential benefits to the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. The Willow Road Extension Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (EIR) analyzed the benefits associated with the "preferred" alternative. The analysis of 2030 traffic conditions demonstrated that the US 101/Willow Road interchange would reduce vehicle delays at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange ramp intersections by about 40% during the PM peak hour (sum of critical movements).

III. PROJECT CONDITIONS

The following is a description of the proposed project, an estimate of the project trip generation quantities, an assignment of trips to the local street system and an evaluation of the potential impacts on existing traffic conditions.

Description

As previously stated, the NCP Master Plan includes a variety of new recreational facilities to be constructed within the NCP over the next 20 years. New recreational facilities include additional park and playground area, a community recreation center and gymnasium, an amphitheater, a skate park, a swimming pool, sporting fields, basketball and handball courts, tennis courts, a dog park, restrooms, trails and walkways, etc. The NCP Master Plan infrastructure improvements include a realignment of the existing access road at West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road. The existing access road connection to West Tefft Street will be realigned to the north side of the library opposite Orchard Avenue. Project improvements at this intersection should provide 2 approach lanes for the park access road at Orchard Avenue (ie; a shared left-through lane and a right turn lane). The existing split signal phasing operations for Orchard Avenue should be eliminated. An exclusive left turn signal phase should also be provided on the northbound approach of West Tefft Street. The existing access road connection to Pomeroy Road will be realigned opposite Juniper Street and a traffic signal will be installed. A northbound left turn lane and southbound right turn lane will also be installed on Pomeroy Road. A copy of the NCP Master Plan is provided on Figure 3A. A description and an evaluation of the NCP Master Plan "alternative" are also presented in the following sections.

Trip Generation and Trip Assignment

The trip generation estimates for the NCP Master Plan were derived using data contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation publication (8th Edition) and other sources. Various land use descriptions were reviewed to determine the most appropriate rates for each component. The trip rates were approved by County staff and are displayed in Table 3.

Currently the NCP includes selected recreational facilities (ie; park and playground area, tennis courts, restrooms, trails, Little Bits Preschool, etc). It should also be noted that the existing NCP has a "pay booth" to collect a \$2 per vehicle entrance fee on weekends and holidays (April through September). As previously stated, the existing park access road also provides access for the northerly parking lot at the Dana Elementary School (23 stalls used by staff and faculty). Both the preschool and access to the elementary school parking lot are included in the NCP Master Plan. The number of PM peak hour trips associated with the existing park uses was quantified using the new traffic count data (see Figure 2). Daily traffic volumes for the existing uses were estimated using the trip generation rates presented in Table 3. The trip generation estimates associated with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan are presented in Table 4, along with the "net" increase in trips (buildout minus existing).



	Number of Vehicle Trips per Unit					
ITE Land Use Code	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		D-11-	
	In	Out	In	Out	Dany	
ITE #210 - Residential (a)	0.19	0.56	0.64	0.37	9.57	
ITE #417 - Regional Park (b)	NA	NA	0.09	0.11	4.57	
ITE #488 - Soccer Fields (c)	0.70	0.70	14.26	6.41	71.33	
ITE #490 - Tennis Courts (c)	0.84	0.83	1.84	1.83	33.32	
ITE #495 - Rec. Community Center (d)	0.99	0.63	0.54	0.91	22.88	
ITE #565 - Day Care / Preschool (e)	0.42	0.38	0.39	0.43	4.48	
ITE #590 - Library (d)	0.74	0.30	3.50	3.80	56.24	
City of San Diego - Baseball Field (c)	NA	NA	4.90	2.60	30.00	
Other Source - Basketball Court (c)	NA	NA	32.50	17.50	200.00	
Other Source - Handball Court (c)	NA	NA	6.50	3.50	40.00	
Other Source - Skate Park (d)	NA	NA	1.46	0.90	15.76	

Table 3 - ITE and Applicable Trip Generation Rates

(a) Trip generation rates per unit

(b) Trip generation rates per acre

(c) Trip generation rates per field / court (PM peak 25% of ADT, 65% in and 35% out)

(d) Trip generation rates per 1,000 SF

(e) Trip generation rates per student

	Number of Vehicle Trips				
Land Use Component	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		Deller
	In	Out	In	Out	Dany
Existing NCP Uses (159.167 acres)	-	-	154	99	1,800
Proposed NCP Master Plan Uses:					
Various Park Uses - 6.12 Ac. (a)	0	0	1	1	28
Community Center - 36,000 SF (b)	36	22	19	33	824
4 Baseball / Softball Fields	0	0	20	10	120
2 Basketball Courts	0	0	65	35	400
2 Handball Courts	0	0	13	7	80
6 Tennis Courts	5	5	11	11	200
6 Multi Purpose Sporting Fields (Soccer)	4	4	86	38	428
Skate Park or Comm. Pool - 10,000 SF	0	0	15	9	158
Amphitheater - 5,227 SF (50-75 Seats)	0	0	15	4	50
Library - 11,134 SF	8	3	39	42	626
Preschool - 4,050 SF (30 Students)	13	11	12	13	134
Ranger Residence	0	1	1	0	10
Totals:	66	46	297	203	3,058
Net Change:	NA	NA	+143	+104	+1,258

Table 4 - NCP Master Plan Trip Generation Estimates

(a) Uses include playgrounds, dog park area, picnic areas, horseshoe pits & trails/walkways

(b) Uses include gymnasium and pool (8,400 SF)

The data in Table 4 indicates that buildout of the NCP Master Plan will generate 3,058 daily trips (two-way trip ends), 112 trips during the AM peak hour (66 inbound and 46 outbound) and 500 trips during the PM peak hour (297 inbound and 203 outbound). The data also demonstrates that the additional uses included in the NCP Master Plan will generate a "net" increase of 1,258 daily trips (+70%) and 247 trips during the PM peak hour (+98%). It should be noted that information contained in the various trip rate sources indicates that a small portion of the trips attracted to the NCP and Mesa Meadows will come from traffic already on the local street system (5-10%). In addition, it is anticipate that there will also be "multiple-use" type trips associated with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan. However, to present a "worst case" analysis the evaluation of potential impacts was conducted without any reductions applied to the trip generation estimates presented in Table 4.

As previously stated, the NCP Master Plan infrastructure improvements include a realignment of the existing access road at West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road. The trips associated with the NCP Master Plan were distributed on the local street system based on a review of current peak hour travel patterns and traffic demands included in the South County Traffic Model Final Report. The trip distribution percentages are presented in Table 5.

Trip Route and Roadway	Distribution Percentage
To & From Northwest via Pomeroy Road -	12-17%
To & From Northeast Via West Tefft Street -	35-25%
To & From South via West Tefft Street -	28-30%
To & From East via Orchard -	15-18%
To & From Local Collector Street (a) -	10%

ruster indition i fun inp Distribution i ereentuges

(a) Local Streets include Juniper Street, Camino Caballo, Primrose Lane and Bernita Place

It should also be mentioned that a small portion of the NCP Master Plan trips are anticipated to use Osage Street, Mesa Road, Tejas Place and Charro Way (less than 5%), and US 101 (5-10%). The trips associated with the individual uses (Table 4) were assigned to the local street system using the distribution percentages in Table 5 and assuming that the master plan infrastructure improvements are in place. The traffic volumes associated with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan are illustrated on Figure 3B.

Level of Significance Criteria

Project specific impacts are identified using "level of significance" criteria defined by San Luis Obispo County and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The following criteria are used to identify potentially significant impacts associated with the NCP Master Plan:



- Substantially increased traffic relative to existing load and capacity
- Exceeded an established LOS standard (LOS C)
- Resulted in a change to air traffic patterns
- Substantially increased hazards due to design or incompatible uses;
- Results in inadequate emergency access;
- Results in inadequate parking capacity; or
- Conflicts with adopted alternative transportation policies, plans, or programs.

Any identified project specific or cumulative impact will require the appropriate mitigation measure to offset the impact to a "less than significant" level.

Level of Service Analysis

An analysis of "project" conditions provides an evaluation of the potential project impacts on existing traffic operations. Similar to the analysis conducted for existing conditions, the roadway segment and intersection peak hour LOS values were calculated assuming the addition of trips associated with the NCP Master Plan (net increase). The results of the roadway segment analysis are presented in Table 6. The existing roadway segment ADT / LOS values are also presented for comparison purposes. The data in Table 6 indicates that daily traffic volumes on the study area roadway segments will remain within acceptable limits with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan (LOS C or better).

	# of LOSE		ADT	ADT / LOS	
Roadway Segment	Roadway Segment Lanes Capacity	Capacity	Exist.	Plus Project	
W. Tefft Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	4 (a)	36,000	17,000 / A	17,426 / A	
W. Tefft Street, Pomeroy Rd Orchard Ave.	3 (b)	24,000	13,100 / A	13,410 / A	
W. Tefft Street, s/o Orchard Avenue	2 (c)	18,000	9,800 / A	10,144 / A	
Pomeroy Road, n/o W. Tefft Street	2 (d)	13,500	8,900 / B	9,122 / B	
Pomeroy Road, Juniper St Camino Ca.	2 (d)	13,500	8,500 / B	8,702 / B	
Pomeroy Road, n/o Camino Caballo	2 (e)	12,000	6,500 / B	6,664 / B	
Camino Caballo, w/o Pomeroy Road	2 (e)	12,000	2,300 / A	2,338 / A	
Orchard Avenue, e/o W. Tefft Street	2 (d)	13,500	5,900 / A	6,114 / A	
Juniper Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	2 (e)	12,000	1,600 / A	1,634 / A	
Osage Street, s/o Camino Caballo	2 (e)	12,000	1,200 / A	1,222 / A	
Mesa Road, w/o Tefft Street	2 (e)	12,000	2,900 / A	2,922 / A	

Table 6 - Existing Plus NCP Master Plan Roadway Segment Analysis

(a) 4 lane divided arterial with left turn lanes

(b) 3 lane undivided arterial with left turn lanes, 2 NB lanes and 1 SB lane

(c) 2 lane arterial with left turn lanes

(d) 2 lane arterial with no left turn lanes

(e) 2 lane collector

The Synchro traffic signal simulation software was again used to analyze the PM peak hour operations at the study intersections. The intersection peak hour LOS values were calculated assuming the addition of trips associated with the NCP Master Plan (net increase). The analysis was also conducted assuming that the NCP Master Plan infrastructure improvements are in place. This includes the park access road realignment at West Tefft Street (opposite Orchard Avenue) and Pomeroy Road (opposite Juniper Street), and the installation of a traffic signal at the Pomeroy Road / Juniper Street intersection. A copy of the NCP Master Plan is provided on Figure 3A. A description and an evaluation of the NCP Master Plan "alternative" are also presented in the following sections. The results of the PM peak hour LOS analysis are presented in Table 7. The existing intersection LOS values are also presented for comparison purposes. Copies of the LOS worksheets are included with the Appendix Material.

	Vehicle Delay - LOS Value			
Study Intersection	Existing	Plus Project		
W. Tefft Street / Pomeroy Road (a)	14.6 - B	15.4 - B		
W. Tefft Street / Orchard Ave. (a)	N/A	19.9 - B		
Pomeroy Road / Juniper Street (a)	N/A	5.4 - A		
Pomeroy Road / Camino Caballo (b) Stop Sign Approach (c)	2.7 - A (22.8 - C)	2.7 - A (24.5 - C)		

 Table 7 - Existing Plus NCP Master Plan PM Peak Hour LOS Analysis

(a) Signalized intersection

(b) Stop sign controlled intersection, average delay - LOS value

(c) Stop sign controlled intersection, worst case delay - LOS value

The data in Table 7 indicates that vehicle delays will remain within acceptable limits at the study intersections with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan. As discussed under existing conditions vehicle delays at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange southbound ramps intersection are within the LOS E range during the PM peak hour (reported in the South County Traffic Model Final Report). However, completion of the US 101/Willow Road interchange is anticipated to reduce delays at the US 101 West Tefft Street interchange by about 40% during the PM peak hour. As previously stated, the new facilities associated NCP Master Plan will be constructed over 20 years. Ultimately, the project could add 10-15 PM peak hour trips to the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. Therefore, it is concluded that buildout of the NCP Master Plan will not significant impact existing operations during the PM peak hour.

NCP Master Plan Alternative Trip Generation and Level of Service

As stated in the Introduction, the NCP Master Plan includes a project "alternative". The NCP Master Plan Alternative represents a reduced project scope. A copy of the NCP Master Plan

Alternative is provided on Figure 4A. The trip generation estimates for the proposed uses included in the NCP Master Plan Alternative were derived using the trip generation rates presented in Table 3. The trip generation estimates associated with the buildout of the NCP

Master Plan Alternative are presented in Table 8, along with the "net" increase in trips (buildout alternative minus existing).

	Number of Vehicle Trips				
Land Use Component	AM Peak Hour		PM Peak Hour		D-11-
	In	Out	In	Out	Dany
Existing NCP Uses (159.167 acres)	-	_	154	99	1,800
Proposed NCP Master Plan Alt. Uses:					
Various Park Uses - 6.12 Ac. (a)	0	0	1	1	28
Teen Center / Gymnasium - 14,000 SF	14	9	8	13	320
4 Baseball / Softball Fields	0	0	20	10	120
2 Basketball Courts	0	0	65	35	400
4 Tennis Courts	3	3	7	7	134
6 Multi Purpose Sporting Fields (Soccer)	4	4	86	38	428
Skate Park or Comm. Pool - 10,000 SF	0	0	15	9	158
Amphitheater - 5,227 SF (50-75 Seats)	0	0	15	4	50
Library - 11,134 SF	8	3	39	42	626
Preschool - 5,400 SF (40 Students)	17	15	16	17	180
Ranger Residence	0	1	1	0	10
Totals:	46	35	273	176	2,454
Net Change:	NA	NA	+119	+77	+654

Table 8 - NCP Master Plan Alternative Trip Generation Estimates

(a) Uses include playgrounds, dog park area, picnic areas, horseshoe pits & trails/walkways

The data in Table 8 indicates that buildout of the NCP Master Plan Alternative will generate 2,454 daily trips (two-way trip ends), 81 trips during the AM peak hour (46 inbound and 35 outbound) and 449 trips during the PM peak hour (273 inbound and 176 outbound). The data demonstrates that the additional uses included in the NCP Master Plan Alternative will generate a "net" increase of 654 daily trips (+36%) and 196 trips during the PM peak hour (+77%). As previously discussed, to present a "worst case" analysis the evaluation of potential impacts was conducted without any reductions applied to the trip generation estimates presented in Table 8 (ie; by-pass and multiple use trips).

The trips associated with the NCP Master Plan Alternative were assigned to the local street system using the distribution percentages presented in Table 5 and assuming the master plan infrastructure improvements are in place. The traffic volumes associated with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan Alternative are illustrated on Figure 4B.

Similar to the analysis conducted for the existing and project conditions, the roadway segment and intersection peak hour LOS values were calculated assuming the addition of trips associated with the NCP Master Plan Alternative (net increase). The results of the roadway segment analysis are presented in Table 9.





		LOSE	ADT / LOS		
Roadway Segment	Lanes	Capacity	Eviet	Plus	
	Lanos	Cupucity	Exist.	Project	
W. Tefft Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	4 (a)	36,000	17,000 / A	17,232 / A	
W. Tefft Street, Pomeroy Rd Orchard Ave.	3 (b)	24,000	13,100 / A	13,304 / A	
W. Tefft Street, s/o Orchard Avenue	2 (c)	18,000	9,800 / A	9,976 / A	
Pomeroy Road, n/o W. Tefft Street	2 (d)	13,500	8,900 / B	9,008 / B	
Pomeroy Road, Juniper St Camino Ca.	2 (d)	13,500	8,500 / B	8,598 / B	
Pomeroy Road, n/o Camino Caballo	2 (e)	12,000	6,500 / B	6,582 / B	
Camino Caballo, w/o Pomeroy Road	2 (e)	12,000	2,300 / A	2,316 / A	
Orchard Avenue, e/o W. Tefft Street	2 (d)	13,500	5,900 / A	6,004 / A	
Juniper Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	2 (e)	12,000	1,600 / A	1,620 / A	
Osage Street, s/o Camino Caballo	2 (e)	12,000	1,200 / A	1,214 / A	
Mesa Road, w/o Tefft Street	2 (e)	12,000	2,900 / A	2,914 / A	

Table 9 - Existing Plus NCP Master Plan Alternative Roadway Segment Analysis

(a) 4 lane divided arterial with left turn lanes

(b) 3 lane undivided arterial with left turn lanes, 2 NB lanes and 1 SB lane

(c) 2 lane arterial with left turn lanes

(d) 2 lane arterial with no left turn lanes

(e) 2 lane collector

The data in Table 9 indicates that daily traffic volumes on the study area roadway segments will remain within acceptable limits with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan Alternative (LOS C or better). Buildout of the NCP Master Plan will not significantly impact existing operations.

The Synchro simulation software was again used to analyze the PM peak hour operations at the study intersections. The intersection LOS values were calculated assuming the addition of trips associated with the NCP Master Plan Alternative (net increase). The analysis was also conducted assuming that the NCP Master Plan infrastructure improvements are in place. This includes the park access road realignment at West Tefft Street (opposite Orchard Avenue) and Pomeroy Road (opposite Juniper Street), and the installation of a traffic signal at the Pomeroy Road / Juniper Street intersection. The results of the PM peak hour LOS analysis are presented in Table 10. The existing intersection LOS values are also presented for comparison purposes. Copies of the LOS worksheets are included with the Appendix Material.

	Vehicle Delay - LOS Value			
Study Intersection	Existing	Plus Project		
W. Tefft Street / Pomeroy Road (a)	14.6 - B	15.3 - B		
W. Tefft Street / Orchard Ave. (a)	20.8 - C	16.2 - B		
Pomeroy Road / Juniper Street (a)	-	5.6 - A		
Pomeroy Road / Camino Caballo (b) Stop Sign Approach (c)	2.7 - A (22.8 - C)	2.7 - A (24.4 - C)		

Table 10 - Existing Plus NCP Master Plan AlternativePM Peak Hour LOS Analysis

(a) Signalized intersection

(b) Stop sign controlled intersection, average delay - LOS value

(c) Stop sign controlled intersection, worst case delay - LOS value

The data in Table 10 indicates that delays will remain within acceptable limits at the study intersections with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan Alternative. As discussed under existing conditions delays at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange southbound ramps intersection are within the LOS E range during the PM peak hour. However, completion of the US 101/Willow Road interchange is anticipated to reduce delays at this intersection by about 40% during the PM peak hour. The new facilities associated NCP Master Plan Alternative will be constructed over 20 years. Ultimately, the project could add 10-15 PM peak hour trips to the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. Therefore, it is concluded that buildout of the NCP Master Plan Alternative will not significant impact existing operations during the PM peak hour.

IV. BUILDOUT CONDITIONS

The following is a description of buildout conditions and an evaluation of the potential impacts associated with the NCP Master Plan.

Description and Traffic Volumes

Buildout traffic conditions are referenced from the South County Traffic Model Final Report. These future conditions represent buildout of the County's General Plan land uses (vacant and/or underdeveloped lands). The South County Traffic Model Final Report provides an overview of the methodology used to develop long range land use and traffic volume projections. This scenario represents long-term future conditions and traffic model forecast for the Year 2025. The buildout transportation network also includes the following roadway improvements:

- Willow Road Extension to Thompson Avenue (Under Construction)
- US 101/Willow Road Interchange Construction (Under Construction)
- North Frontage Road Connection to Willow Road Extension
- State Route 1 connections to Dawn Road, Mesa Road and Eucalyptus Road (resulting from completion of the Woodlands development)

It should be noted that the buildout analysis presented in the South County Traffic Model Final Report designates the segment of West Tefft Street between Pomeroy Road and Orchard Avenue as a four lane arterial with left turn lanes. Therefore, the buildout analysis assumes that future improvements in this portion of Nipomo will include providing 2 through travel lanes in each direction along this segment of West Tefft Street. It should also be noted that the County Public Works Department is also evaluating various operational improvements for the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. However, these improvements are not designed or funded at this time, and therefore, are not assumed to be completed under the baseline buildout scenario. The following is a brief description of the three (3) alternatives under consideration:

<u>Alternative 1</u> - This alternative would include closing the existing US 101 southbound on ramp and constructing a new southbound "hook" on ramp on the frontage road opposite Hill Street. The northbound left turn movement on the frontage road would be prohibited at West Tefft Street. Southbound traffic exiting the US 101 with a destination to West Tefft Street (west of US 101) would utilize the Hill Road and Mary Avenue. This alternative would also eliminate the existing 2 stage left turn signal phase for westbound traffic on West Tefft Street at the existing the southbound on ramp.

<u>Alternative 2</u> - This alternative would include moving the existing US 101 southbound off ramp to the previous location opposite the southbound on ramp. This alternative would also eliminate the existing 2 stage left turn signal phase for westbound traffic on West Tefft Street at the existing US 101 southbound ramps intersection.

<u>Alternative 3</u> - This alternative would include restriping the eastbound approach on West Tefft Street at the US 101 northbound ramps intersection. The eastbound approach would be striped for dual left turn lanes and one through lane. This alternative would not include any traffic signal modifications at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. Discussions with County staff indicate that the "preferred" alternative at this point is Alternative 1. A preliminary analysis associated with the potential benefits of this alternative indicates that levels of service in the LOS C-D range could be achieved under buildout conditions.

Buildout daily and peak hour traffic volumes for the local street system serving the NCP were obtained from the South County Traffic Model Final Report. The relation between daily and peak hour traffic volumes in the traffic model were used to derive roadway segment and intersection turning movement volumes not included in the final report. Minor adjustments were applied to the PM peak hour traffic volumes at the West Tefft Street and Orchard Avenue intersection to reflect for the actual amount of traffic utilizing the library driveway. The buildout traffic volumes for the local street system are illustrated on Figure 5. It should be mentioned that the buildout traffic volumes on Figure 5 only reflect the current uses at the NCP and not buildout of all the proposed uses in the NCP Master Plan.

Levels of Service Analysis

Similar to the analysis conducted for the existing and project conditions, the roadway segment and intersection peak hour LOS values were calculated for the "baseline" buildout conditions. The results of the baseline buildout roadway segment analysis are presented in Table 11.

Roadway Segment	# of Lanes	LOS E Capacity	- ADT -	Level of Service
W. Tefft Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	4 (a)	36,000	25,550	C
W. Tefft Street, Pomeroy Rd Orchard Ave.	4 (a)	36,000	19,200	A
W. Tefft Street, s/o Orchard Avenue	2 (b)	18,000	10,600	A
Pomeroy Road, n/o W. Tefft Street	2 (c)	13,500	7,150	A
Pomeroy Road, Juniper St Camino Ca.	2 (c)	13,500	8,400	В
Pomeroy Road, n/o Camino Caballo	2 (d)	12,000	6,700	В
Camino Caballo, w/o Pomeroy Road	2 (d)	12,000	2,900	А
Orchard Avenue, e/o W. Tefft Street	2 (c)	13,500	9,350	В
Juniper Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	2 (d)	12,000	2,800	А
Osage Street, s/o Camino Caballo	2 (d)	12,000	1,300	А
Mesa Road, w/o Tefft Street	2 (d)	12,000	3,100	A

 Table 11 - Baseline Buildout Roadway Segment Analysis

(a) 4 lane divided arterial with left turn lanes

(b) 2 lane arterial with left turn lanes

(c) 2 lane arterial with no left turn lanes

(d) 2 lane collector



The roadway segment analysis indicates that baseline buildout daily traffic volumes on the study street segments will be within acceptable limits (LOS C or better). Future buildout daily traffic volumes on other local residential collector streets will be within acceptable limits (Tejas Place, Bernita Place and Primrose Lane). Information in the South County Traffic Model Final Report indicates that buildout daily traffic volumes along West Tefft Street near the US 101 interchange are projected to be within the LOS E range. The physical constraints along West Tefft Street through the interchange are related to the close spacing of intersections and limited capacity of the US 101 overpass bridge structure.

The Synchro traffic signal simulation software was used to analyze the baseline buildout PM peak hour traffic operations at the study intersections. The analysis of baseline buildout PM peak hour traffic operations is presented in Table 12. Also presented in Table 12 are the LOS values for selected study intersections as documented in the South County Traffic Model Final Report. Copies of the LOS worksheets are included with the Appendix Material.

	Vehicle Delay	y - LOS Value
Study Intersection	РТЕ	So. County Final Report
W. Tefft Street / Pomeroy Road (a)	27.2 - C	28.1 - C
W. Tefft Street / Orchard Ave. (a)	34.4 - C	35.0 - D
<u>W. Tefft Street / Park Access Road</u> (b)	2.0 - A	-
EB Stop Sign Approach -	(36.0 - E)	(-)
Pomeroy Road / Park Access Road (b)	0.8 - A	-
EB Stop Sign Approach -	(17.4 - C)	(-)
Pomeroy Road / Juniper Street (b)	3.9 - A	-
WB Stop Sign Approach -	(23.8 - C)	(23.2 - C)
Pomeroy Road / Camino Caballo (b)	3.4 - A	-
Stop Sign Approach (c)	(43.4 - E)	(-)

Table 12 - Baseline Buildout PM Peak Hour LOS Analysis

(a) Signalized intersection

(b) Stop sign controlled intersection, average delay - LOS value

(c) Stop sign controlled intersection, worst case delay - LOS value

The data in Table 12 indicates that average vehicle delays at the study intersections will be within acceptable limits during a typical weekday afternoon peak hour period (LOS C or better). However, delays on the stop sign controlled approaches at two of the study intersections will be within the LOS E range.

The minimum "peak hour volume" traffic signal warrant contained in the 2006 California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) was reviewed to determine if buildout demands will satisfy the minimum criteria (Warrant #3) at either intersection. Side street traffic demands during the PM peak hour at the West Tefft Street and Park Access Road intersection will not satisfy the minimum criteria for considering the installation of traffic signal control. In

addition, due to the limited spacing (175') between the park access road and Orchard Avenue a traffic signal would not be recommended for this intersection. If significant delays are experienced by vehicles exiting the NCP a typical solution would be to restrict the egress left turn movement to northbound West Tefft Street. Buildout PM peak hour traffic demands at the Pomeroy Road and Camino Caballo intersection will satisfy the minimum "peak hour volume" warrant criteria (70% factor). A review of the LOS worksheet indicates that the "LOS E" delays are reported for the westbound approach. The potential capacity improvements at this intersection include the addition an eastbound right turn lane, a westbound left turn lane and a southbound left turn lane. The combined improvements at this intersection would not reduce delays on the westbound approach to an acceptable level (LOS C or better). Additional traffic signal warrants contained in the California MUTCD should be satisfied before considering the installation of traffic signal control at the Pomeroy Road and Camino Caballo intersection. Therefore, at this time the installation of traffic signal control is not recommended. A copy of the California MUTCD traffic signal warrant graph is included with the Appendix Material.

NCP Master Plan Level of Service Analysis

An analysis of buildout conditions with the additional NCP Master Plan uses provides an evaluation of the potential impacts on future traffic operations. Similar to the analysis conducted for baseline buildout conditions, the roadway segment and intersection peak hour LOS values were calculated assuming the additional trips associated with the NCP Master Plan (net increase). The results of the roadway segment analysis are presented in Table 13. The baseline buildout roadway segment ADT / LOS values are also presented for comparison purposes.

	# of	LOSE	ADT	/ LOS
Roadway Segment	Lanes	Capacity	Baseline	Plus
		cupacity	Buildout	Project
W. Tefft Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	4 (a)	36,000	25,550 / C	25,976 / C
W. Tefft Street, Pomeroy Rd Orchard Ave.	4 (a)	36,000	19,200 / B	19,510 / B
W. Tefft Street, s/o Orchard Avenue	2 (c)	18,000	10,600 / A	10,944 / A
Pomeroy Road, n/o W. Tefft Street	2 (d)	13,500	7,150 / B	7,372 / B
Pomeroy Road, Juniper St Camino Ca.	2 (d)	13,500	8,400 / B	8,602 / B
Pomeroy Road, n/o Camino Caballo	2 (e)	12,000	6,700 / B	6,764 / B
Camino Caballo, w/o Pomeroy Road	2 (e)	12,000	2,900 / A	2,938 / A
Orchard Avenue, e/o W. Tefft Street	2 (d)	13,500	9,350 / B	9,564 / C
Juniper Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	2 (e)	12,000	2,800 / A	2,834 / A
Osage Street, s/o Camino Caballo	2 (e)	12,000	1,300 / A	1,222 / A
Mesa Road, w/o Tefft Street	2 (e)	12,000	3,100 / A	3,122 / A

Table 13 - Buildout Plus NCP Master Plan Roadway Segment Analysis

(a) 4 lane divided arterial with left turn lanes

- (b) 3 lane undivided arterial with left turn lanes, 2 NB lanes and 1 SB lane
- (c) 2 lane arterial with left turn lanes
- (d) 2 lane arterial with no left turn lanes
- (e) 2 lane collector

The data in Table 13 indicates that daily traffic volumes on the study area roadway segments will remain within acceptable limits with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan (LOS C or better). Daily traffic volumes on other local residential collector streets will also remain within acceptable limits. As discussed under the baseline buildout conditions, daily traffic along West Tefft Street near the US 101 interchange is projected to be within the LOS E range.

Completion of the US 101/Willow Road interchange is anticipated to reduce daily traffic on West Tefft Street (west of US 101) by about 20-25%. The analysis in the Willow Road Extension EIR indicates that the benefits associated with the project are estimated to improve the buildout LOS E to an acceptable LOS C (27,200 ADT) on West Tefft Street (near US 101 interchange). The new facilities associated NCP Master Plan will be constructed over 20 years. Ultimately, the project will add daily traffic to the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. However, it is concluded that buildout of the NCP Master Plan Alternative will not significant impact future daily traffic operations along West Tefft Street east of Pomeroy Road.

The Synchro traffic signal simulation software was again used to analyze the PM peak hour operations at the study intersections. The intersection peak hour LOS values were calculated assuming the addition of trips associated with the NCP Master Plan buildout. The analysis was also conducted assuming that the NCP Master Plan infrastructure improvements are in place. This includes the park access road realignment at West Tefft Street (opposite Orchard Avenue) and Pomeroy Road (opposite Juniper Street), and the installation of a traffic signal at the Pomeroy Road/Juniper Street intersection. In addition, it was assumed that the exclusive right turn lanes on West Tefft Street at Orchard Avenue will be converted to a shared through-right turn lanes. The 2 southbound lanes on West Tefft Street would then merge to 1 lane southbound lane south of Orchard Avenue. The results of the PM peak hour LOS analysis are presented in Table 14. The baseline buildout intersection LOS values are also presented. Copies of the LOS worksheets are included with the Appendix Material.

	Vehicle Delay - LOS Value					
Study Intersection	Baseline Buildout	Plus Project				
W. Tefft Street / Pomeroy Road (a)	27.2 - C	34.0 - C				
W. Tefft Street / Orchard Ave. (a)	34.4 - C	20.6 - C				
Pomeroy Road / Juniper Street (a)	-	6.1 - A				
Pomeroy Road / Camino Caballo (b) Stop Sign Approach (c)	3.4 - A (43.4 - E)	4.0 - A (>50 - F)				

Table 14 - Buildout Plus NCP Master Plan PM Peak Hour LOS Analysis

(a) Signalized intersection

(b) Stop sign controlled intersection, average delay - LOS value

(c) Stop sign controlled intersection, worst case delay - LOS value

The data in Table 14 indicates that average vehicle delays will be within acceptable limits at the study intersections with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan. As discussed under baseline

buildout conditions vehicle delays on the westbound approach at the Pomeroy Road and Camino Caballo intersection will be within unacceptable limits (LOS E-F). Buildout traffic demands will satisfy the minimum "peak hour volume" signal warrant criteria (California MUTCD 70% factor). However, the construction of capacity improvements at this intersection would not reduce delays on the westbound approach to an acceptable level (LOS C or better). Additional traffic signal warrants should be satisfied before considering the installation of traffic signal control, and therefore, the installation of signal control at this intersection is not recommended. As documented under existing conditions delays at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange southbound ramps are within unacceptable levels (LOS E).

Completion of the US 101/Willow Road interchange is anticipated to reduce traffic demands and vehicle delays at the US101/West Tefft Street interchange by about 40% during the PM peak hour. PM peak hour traffic demands will also be reduced on Pomeroy Road and at the Pomeroy Road/Camino Caballo intersection. However, the analysis in the Willow Road Extension EIR indicates that the benefits associated with the project will not eliminate the adverse LOS at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange during the PM peak hour period. The new facilities associated NCP Master Plan will be constructed over 20 years. Ultimately, the project could add 10-15 PM peak hour trips to the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. Therefore, buildout of the NCP Master Plan will potentially have a significant impact on traffic operations during the PM peak hour at the US 101 / West Tefft Street interchange.

Again it should be mentioned that the County has identified improvements at the US 101/ West Tefft Street interchange (Alternative 1) that could result in acceptable LOS during the PM peak hour. However, these improvements are not designed or funded at this time, and therefore, are not assumed to be completed under the buildout scenario.

NCP Master Plan Alternative Level of Service Analysis

The roadway segment and intersection peak hour LOS values were calculated assuming the addition of trips associated with the NCP Master Plan Alternative (net increase). The results of the roadway segment analysis are presented in Table 15. The baseline buildout roadway segment ADT / LOS values are also presented for comparison purposes.

The data in Table 15 indicates that daily traffic volumes on the study area roadway segments will remain within acceptable limits with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan (LOS C or better). Daily volumes on other local collector streets will also remain within acceptable limits (Tejas Place, Bernita Place and Primrose Lane). As discussed under the baseline buildout conditions, daily traffic along West Tefft Street near the US 101 interchange is projected to be within the LOS E range.

	# of	LOSE	ADT / LOS			
Roadway Segment	Lanes	Capacity	Baseline	Plus		
		Suparity	Buildout	Project		
W. Tefft Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	4 (a)	36,000	25,550 / C	25,782 / C		
W. Tefft Street, Pomeroy Rd Orchard Ave.	4 (a)	36,000	19,200 / B	19,404 / B		
W. Tefft Street, s/o Orchard Avenue	2 (b)	18,000	10,600 / A	10,776 / A		
Pomeroy Road, n/o W. Tefft Street	2 (c)	13,500	7,150 / A	7,258 / A		
Pomeroy Road, Juniper St Camino Ca.	2 (c)	13,500	8,400 / B	8,498 / B		
Pomeroy Road, n/o Camino Caballo	2 (d)	12,000	6,700 / B	6,782 / B		
Camino Caballo, w/o Pomeroy Road	2 (d)	12,000	2,900 / A	2,916 / A		
Orchard Avenue, e/o W. Tefft Street	2 (c)	13,500	9,350 / B	9,454 / B		
Juniper Street, e/o Pomeroy Road	2 (d)	12,000	2,800 / A	2,820 / A		
Osage Street, s/o Camino Caballo	2 (d)	12,000	1,300 / A	1,314 / A		
Mesa Road, w/o Tefft Street	2 (d)	12,000	3,100 / A	3,114 / A		

Table 15 - Buildout Plus NCP Master Plan Alternative Roadway Segment Analysis

(a) 4 lane divided arterial with left turn lanes

(b) 2 lane arterial with left turn lanes

(c) 2 lane arterial with no left turn lanes

(d) 2 lane collector

Completion of the US 101/Willow Road interchange is anticipated to reduce daily traffic on West Tefft Street (west of US 101) by about 20-25%. The analysis in the Willow Road Extension EIR indicates that the benefits associated with the project are estimated to improve the buildout LOS E to an acceptable LOS C (27,200 ADT) on West Tefft Street (near US 101 interchange). The new facilities associated NCP Master Plan Alternative will be constructed over 20 years. Ultimately, the project will add daily traffic to the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. However, it is concluded that buildout of the NCP Master Plan Alternative will not significant impact future daily traffic operations along West Tefft Street east of Pomeroy Road.

The Synchro traffic signal simulation software was again used to analyze the PM peak hour operations. The intersection peak hour LOS values were calculated assuming the addition of trips associated with the NCP Master Plan Alternative (net increase). The analysis was also conducted assuming that the NCP Master Plan infrastructure improvements are in place. This includes the park access road realignment at West Tefft Street (opposite Orchard Avenue) and Pomeroy Road (opposite Juniper Street), and the installation of a traffic signal at the Pomeroy Road / Juniper Street intersection. In addition, it was assumed that the exclusive right turn lanes on West Tefft Street at Orchard Avenue will be converted to a shared through-right turn lanes. The 2 southbound lanes on West Tefft Street would then merge to 1 lane southbound lane south of Orchard Avenue. The results of the PM peak hour LOS analysis are presented in Table 16. The baseline buildout intersection LOS values are also presented for comparison purposes. Copies of the LOS worksheets are included with the Appendix Material.

	Vehicle Delay - LOS Value				
Study Intersection	Base Line Buildout	Plus Project			
W. Tefft Street / Pomeroy Road (a)	27.2 - C	32.5 - C			
W. Tefft Street / Orchard Ave. (a)	34.4 - C	17.4 - B			
Pomeroy Road / Juniper Street (a)	-	6.0 - A			
Pomeroy Road / Camino Caballo (b) Stop Sign Approach (c)	3.4 - А (43.4 - Е)	3.9 - A (>50 - F)			

Table 16 - Buildout Plus NCP Master Plan AlternativePM Peak Hour LOS Analysis

(a) Signalized intersection

(b) Stop sign controlled intersection, average delay - LOS value

(c) Stop sign controlled intersection, worst case delay - LOS value

The data in Table 16 indicates that average vehicle delays will be within acceptable limits at the study intersections with the buildout of the NCP Master Plan Alternative. Vehicle delays on the westbound approach at the Pomeroy Road and Camino Caballo intersection will be within unacceptable limits (LOS E-F). Buildout traffic demands will satisfy the minimum "peak hour volume" signal warrant criteria (California MUTCD 70% factor). However, the construction of capacity improvements at this intersection would not reduce delays to an acceptable level (LOS D or better). Additional signal warrants should be satisfied before considering the installation of traffic signal control, and therefore, the installation of signal control is not recommended at this intersection. As documented under existing conditions vehicle delays at the US 101 / West Tefft Street interchange southbound ramps are within unacceptable levels (LOS E).

Completion of the US 101/Willow Road interchange is anticipated to reduce traffic demands and vehicle delays at the US101/West Tefft Street interchange by about 40% during the PM peak hour. PM peak hour traffic demands will also be reduced on Pomeroy Road and at the Pomeroy Road/Camino Caballo intersection. However, the analysis in the Willow Road Extension EIR indicates that the benefits associated with the project will not eliminate the adverse LOS at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange during the PM peak hour period. The new facilities associated NCP Master Plan will be constructed over 20 years. Ultimately, the project could add 10-15 PM peak hour trips to the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. Therefore, buildout of the NCP Master Plan Alternative will potentially have a significant impact on traffic operations during the PM peak hour at the US 101 / West Tefft Street interchange.

Again it should be mentioned that the County has identified improvements at the US 101/ West Tefft Street interchange (Alternative 1) that could result in acceptable LOS during the PM peak hour. However, these improvements are not designed or funded at this time, and therefore, are not assumed to be completed under the buildout scenario.

V. MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures are presented for potentially significant impacts identified under development of the NCP Master Plan and NCP Master Plan Alternative.

Existing Plus Project (NCP Master Plan or Alternative)

The analysis of existing plus project traffic conditions did not identify any potentially significant impacts associated with the project. As previously discussed, the new Willow Road interchange is currently under construction and will connect to the Willow Road extension (planned for completion in late 2012/early 2013). The US 101/Willow Road interchange will reduce local traffic demands along West Tefft Street and Pomeroy Road, and at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange. Therefore, no significant project impacts were identified and no mitigations are required under the "existing plus project" scenario.

Buildout Plus Project (NCP Master Plan or Alternative)

The analysis of buildout plus project conditions did not identified any potentially significant impacts to daily roadway traffic operations along West Tefft Street. However, the analysis of PM peak hour operations did identify a potentially significant project impact at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange.

Buildout of the additional recreational facilities included in the NCP Master Plan or Alternative will occur over the next 20 years. As previously discussed, the analysis of potential impacts represents a "worst case" scenario (ie; all facilities being used at peak levels simultaneously). The implementation of "transportation demand management" (TDM) measures would reduce the potentially significant impacts at the US 101/West Tefft Street interchange to a level of "less than significant" during the PM peak hour. TDM measures should include, but not be limited to, reducing the number tennis court and/or sporting fields that could be utilized during peak traffic demand periods, delay the library expansion or construction of amphitheater, etc. In addition, games at the baseball/softball and sporting fields should be scheduled to avoid generating a significant amount of "regional" traffic during the weekday afternoon commuter peak period (ie: 4:00-6:00 PM).

In addition, to reduce the potential impacts to a level of "less than significant" the buildout of the recreational facilities included in the NCP Master Plan or Alternative should be limited until the County has completed a design, secured funding and established a formal schedule for the future operational improvements at the West Tefft Street/US 101 southbound ramps intersection. Future improvements at this intersection identified by the County could provide acceptable levels of service. Once this project becomes part of the long range infrastructure improvement plans in the South County Traffic Model they can be assumed to mitigate the potentially significant project impact at this intersection. It should also be mentioned that the "roadway improvement" fees defined in the South County Traffic Model Final Report provide a funding mechanism for long range infrastructure improvements in this portion of the County, and therefore, payment of the County "roadway improvement" fees serves at the project mitigation.

END

APPENDIX MATERIAL

Contents:

- New 24-Hour Traffic Counts (May 2009); West Tefft Street, Pomeroy Road and Osage Street
- New PM Peak Period Turning Movement Traffic Count Data:
- 6 Study intersections (May 2009)
- Level of Service (LOS) Descriptions
- Level of Service 24-Hour ADT Threshold Criteria
- Level of Service (LOS) Value Vehicle Delay Relationship Data
- Level of Service (LOS) Worksheets
- California MUTCD Traffic Signal Warrant #3 (Minimum Peak Hour Volume)

PINNACLE TRAFFIC ENGINEERING

330 Tres Pinos Road • Suite B2-12 • Hollister, CA 95023

(831) 638-9260 • FAX (831) 638-9268

PinnacleTE.com

Nipomo Community Park EIR; San Luis Obispo County, California Summary of Traffic Count and Speed Data (5/13/09 - 5/19/09)

West Tefft	Street, Be	etween C	Drchard an	d Bernita I	Place (M	ay 2009)		
Date		<u>Sun.</u>	<u>Mon.</u>	<u>Tue.</u>	<u>Wed.</u>	<u>Thur.</u>	<u>Fri.</u>	<u>Sat.</u>
		5/17/09	5/18/09	5/19/09	5/13/09	5/14/09	5/15/09	5/16/09
ADT		10,495	12,458	13,512	12,861	12,806	13,867	12,934
24 Hr. Vol.	NB	5,154	6,156	6,697	6,405	6,315	6,862	6,443
	SB	5,341	6,302	6,815	6,456	6,491	7,005	6,491
Mav 2009 -								
3-Day	Avg. Weekda	ay (Tuesday	, Wednesday	& Thursday):	13,060	ADT		
	5	-Day Avg. V	Veekday (Mon	day - Friday):	13,101	ADT		
		7-Day Avg	erage (Sunday	/ - Saturday):	12,705	ADT		
5/15	5/09 (Friday):	<u>106%</u>	Weekday Av	verage (3 Day)				
5/16/0	9 (Saturday):	<u>99%</u>	Weekday Av	verage (3 Day)				
5/17/	09 (Sunday):	<u>80%</u>	Weekday Av	verage (3 Day)				
Pomeroy F	Road, Betv	ween We	st Tefft St	reet and P	rimrose	Lane		
Date		Sun.	Mon.	Tue.	Wed.	<u>Thur.</u>	<u>Fri.</u>	<u>Sat.</u>
		5/17/09	5/18/09	5/19/09	5/13/09	5/14/09	5/15/09	5/16/09

ADT		6,583	8,673	8,800	8,877	8,930	9,078	7,398
24 Hr. Vol.	EB	3,357	4,322	4,368	4,441	4,491	4,487	3,652
	WB	3,226	4,351	4,432	4,436	4,439	4,591	3,746

<u>May 2009 -</u>

3-Day Avg. Weekday (Tuesday, Wednesday & Thursday): 8,869 ADT

- 5-Day Avg. Weekday (Monday Friday): 8,872 ADT
 - 7-Day Avgerage (Sunday Saturday): 8,334 ADT

5/15/09 (Friday):	<u>102%</u>	Weekday Average (3 Day)
5/16/09 (Saturday):	83%	Weekday Average (3 Day)
5/17/09 (Sunday):	<u>74%</u>	Weekday Average (3 Day)

Volumes for: Wednesday, May 13, 2009					City:	Nipor	no	NB		Da SB	aily T	otals EB		WB	Total		
Location:	Wes	st Tefi	ft St	btwi	1 Orcha	rd Rd &	Project	09-7194	1-001	6,405		6,456		0		0	12,861
AM Period	NB	ilita i-	SB		EB	WB	and the standard standards and share	PM Period	NB		SB		FB		WB		
00:00	1		12					12:00	102		119						
00:15	1		3					12:15	102		125						
00:30	1		1					12:30	168		96						
00:45	4	7	7	23			30	12:45	96	468	111	451					919
01:00	2		9					13:00	102		130						
01:15	4		2					13:15	99		79						
01:30	1	7	5	16			22	13:30	76	266	95 100	457					902
01:45	<u> </u>			10			25	13:43	80	300	133	437					003
02:00	2		5					14:00	09 84		90						
02:10	2		3					14:30	122		85						
02:45	3	7	2	10			17	14:45	89	384	123	419					803
03:00	4		5					15:00	91		138						
03:15	1		3					15:15	123		152						
03:30	4		0					15:30	141		127						
03:45	7	16	10	18			34	15:45	118	473	145	562					1035
04:00	3		3					16:00	111		114						
04:15	6		0					16:15	108		117						
04:30	13		2				(5)	16:30	130		156						
04:45	9	31	/	12			43	16:45	92	441	1//	564					1005
05:00	22		4					17:00	146		146						
05:15	19 19		11					17:15	112		158						
05:30	33 47	123	38	60			183	17:30	91	481	108	571					1052
05:00	56	123	28				105	10:00	1/11	101	125	571					1052
06:00	50 80		20 34					10:00	171		100						
06:30	93		61					18:30	104		136						
06:45	84	313	80	203			516	18:45	92	465	92	472					937
07:00	97		50					19:00	55		98						
07:15	143		77					19:15	67		85						
07:30	130		83					19:30	55		80						
07:45	83	453	128	338			791	19:45	59	236	72	335					571
08:00	109		78					20:00	60		80						
08:15	111		61					20:15	44		84						
08:30	160		85		-		~~ .	20:30	63		76	o/-					
08:45	176	556	94	318			874	20:45	40	207	17	317	,				524
09:00	89		73					21:00	47		68 62						
09:15	85		63 60					21:15	37		83						
09:30	89 116	370	60 67	266			645	21:30	30	136	49 40	240					276
10.00	110	5/5	74	200				22.00	17	150	21	6. IU					570
10:00	88 89		64					22:00	17 18		24 21						
10:15	99		70					22:30	15		21						
10:45	115	363	77	285			648	22:45	15	65	19	105					170
11:00	85		77				i	23:00	12		20						
11:15	111		80					23:15	7		16						
11:30	116		102					23:30	6		10						
11:45	86	398	118	377			775	23:45	5	30	11	57					87
Total Vol.		2653		1926			4579			3752		4530					8282

Total Vol.	2003	1920	4579		3/32	4530			8282
			n Anna Albara an Albara (El sine el en el Nom Statut Albara (Albara)		NB	SB	EB	WB	Total
				Daily Totals :	6,405	6,456	0		12,861
	6 (A) (A) (A)		AM				PM		
Split %	57,9%	42,1%	35:6%		45,3%	54.7%			64.4%
AM				PM					
Peak Hr.	-08:00	11:30	11:45	Peak Hr.	15:15	16:45			16:45
Volume	556	464	916	Volume	493	640	·		1122
P.H.F.	0.790	0.928	0.867	PiHiF.	0.874	0.904	X		0.961
7 - 9 Vol.	1009	656	1665	4 = 6 Vol.	922	1135			2057
Peak Hr.	08:00	07:15	08:00	Peak Hr.	16:45	16:45			16:45
Volume	556	366	874	Volume	482	640			1122
P.H.F.	0.790	0.715	0,809	P,H.F.	0,825	0.904			0.961

Prepared by NDS/ATD

Volumes for: Thursday, May 14, 2009 City: Nigomo Daily Total Total Concine: Permitting P West Teff, S1 byte Orchard Rd 8. Project 09.7194-001 6,315 6,401 0 0 12.805 Over 10 10 S8 E8 WB Pholecut, NB S8 E8 WB 000 2 10 12255 101 138	2 21-11-11-11-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-							Prepare	d by NDS/	ATD	. An an an an an art an arts							
West Telft S2 twm Orchand Rd & Project: 09-7194-001 6,315 6,491 0 12,205 AM Period NB SB EB WB PM Period NB SB EB WB 0000 2 10 12,200 94 103 138 -	Volumes for: Thursday, May 14, 2009 City: Nipomo						Daily Totals NB SB EB WB Total											
AP Perido NB SB EB WB PM Period NB SB EB WB Discover 0000 2 10 1200 94 103 003 000 000 000 000 000 111 111 0000 000 7 1300 94 1117 000 000 7 13300 94 1117 000 000 5 1315 107 91 000 000 5 1330 1245 92 99 001 000 000 1000 113 114 11400 84 101 000 000 1000 114 1141 101 000 1000 115 11 11 9 1000	Location	Wes	st Tef	ft St	btwr	n Orchari	i Rd &	Project	09-7194	-001	6,315		6,491		0		0	12,806
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	AM Perior	d NB	illa r	SR	a jiya an di	FB	W/B	an a	PM Period	MB		SR		FR		WB	everence i	 Solution of the second s
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	00.00	<u>a no</u> 2		10					12:00	94		103				110		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	00:00	2		3					12:00	101		138						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	00:30	2		1					12:30	154		111						
	00:45	6	12	8	22			34	12:45	108	457	96	448					905
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	01:00	0		7					13:00	94		117						,
01:00 0 5 13:30 82 99 01:45 1 3 1 17 20 13:49 97 390 116 423 803 02:00 2 1 14:00 84 101 113 96 02:00 5 4 14:30 133 96 629 03:00 3 5 15:00 95 135 629 03:00 3 5 15:00 95 135 629 03:04 3 1 2 15:05 135 629 03:04 3 5 0 15:33 137 129 136 03:04 4 2 16:50 127 141 130 141 04:04 4 2 16:60 126 131 141 142 146 141 141 141 141 141 141 141 141 141 141 141 141 141 141 141 141 141 141 141 <	01:15	2		4					13:15	107		91						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	01:30	0		5					13:30	82		99						
	01:45	1	3	1	17			20	13:45	97	380	116	423					803
02:15 1 3	02:00	2		1					14:00	84		101						
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	02:15	1		3					14:15	88		121						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	02:30	5		4					14:30	113		96						
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	02:45	3	11	1	9			20	14:45	99	384	127	445					829
03:15 1 2 15:15 109 141 03:30 5 0 15:30 137 129 03:45 4 13 9 16 29 15:45 130 471 151 556 1027 04:00 4 2 16:00 126 123 100 101 100 101 100 101 100 101 100 101 100 101 100 101 100 101 100 101 100 101 100 101 100 101 100 101 100 10	03:00	3		5					15:00	95		135						
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	03:15	1		2					15:15	109		141						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	03:30	5		0					15:30	137		129						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	03:45	4	13	9	16			29	15:45	130	471	151	556					1027
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	04:00	4		2					16:00	126		123						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	04:15	4		0					16:15	96		131						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	04:30	11		2					16:30	128		146						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	04:45	9	28	4	8			36	16:45	109	459	159	559					1018
05:15 24 6 17:15 97 143 05:30 39 16 17:30 129 156 05:45 48 129 33 60 189 17:45 108 464 118 554 1018 06:00 63 31 18:00 135 126 106 106 106 106 106 108 1018 <td>05:00</td> <td>18</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>17:00</td> <td>130</td> <td></td> <td>137</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	05:00	18		5					17:00	130		137						
	05:15	24		6					17:15	97		143						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	05:30	39		16					17:30	129		156						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	05:45	48	129	33	60			189	17:45	108	464	118	554					1018
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	06:00	63		31					18:00	135		126						
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	06:15	75		32					18:15	118		120						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	06:30	98		60					18:30	86		106						
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	06:45	90	326	83	206			532	18:45	70	409	92	444					853
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	07:00	102		46					19:00	51		88						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	07:15	168		71					19:15	68		88						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	07:30	133		90					19:30	69		87						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	07:45	92	495	126	333			828	19:45	44	232	82	345					577
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	08:00	107		74					20:00	59		98						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	08:15	112		68					20:15	39		115						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	08:30	141		88					20:30	35		88						
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	08:45	163	523	97	327			850	20:45	39	172	70	371					543
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	09:00	105		75					21:00	38		59						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	09:15	91		58					21:15	31		66						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	09:30	84	.	62					21:30	25		76						
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	09:45	101	381	58	253			634	21:45	25	119	41	242					361
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	10:00	71		78					22:00	20		39						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	10:15	84		63					22:15	16		35						
10:45 110 353 78 292 645 22:45 14 61 26 123 184 11:00 89 85 23:00 18 27 11:15 97 73 23:15 9 24 11:30 105 88 23:30 5 15 11:45 101 392 111 357 749 23:45 9 41 15 81 122	10:30	88	a	73				<u> </u>	22:30	11	<i>.</i>	23	400					
11:00 89 85 23:00 18 27 11:15 97 73 23:15 9 24 11:30 105 88 23:30 5 15 11:45 101 392 111 357 749 23:45 9 41 15 81 122	10:45	110	353		292			645	22:45	14	61	26	123					184
11:15 97 73 23:15 9 24 11:30 105 88 23:30 5 15 11:45 101 392 111 357 749 23:45 9 41 15 81 122	11:00	89		85					23:00	18		27						
11:30 105 88 23:30 5 15 11:45 101 392 111 357 749 23:45 9 41 15 81 122	11:15	97		73					23:15	9		24						
11:43 101 374 111 337 749 23:45 9 41 15 81 122	11:30	105	202	88	257			740	23:30	5	44	15	01					122
	11:45	101	392	111	35/			/49	23:45	Я	41	12	01					122

Total Vol.	2666	1900	4566		3649	4591			8240
			Stin De Legiter Soulingerenne. And betrevelene bezehrennet.		NB	SB	EB	WB	Total
				Daily Totals :	6,315	6,491	0	1	12,806
		A	M				PM		
Split %	58.4%	41.6%	35.7%		44;3%	55.7%			64.3%
AM				РМ			,		
Peak Hr.	08:00	11:45	11:45	Peak Hr.	15:15	16:45			-16:45
Volume	523	463	913	Volume	502	595			1060
P.H.F.	0.802	0.839	0.861	P.H.F.	.0;916	0.936			0.930
7 - 9 Vol.	1018	660	1678	4 - 6 Vol.	923	1113			2036
Peak Hr,	08:00	-07:15	07:15	Peak Hr.	-16:45	16:45	CRANE CON		16:45
Volume	523	361	861	Volume	465	595			1060
P.H.F.	0,802	0.716	0.901	P.H.F.	0.894	0.936			0,930

Prepared by NDS/ATD																
Volumes	for:	Friday	y, Ma	y 15, :	2009		City:	Nipo	mo	NB		Da SB	ily Tot	als B	W	B Total
Location:	Wes	st Tef nita P	ft St	btwn	Orcha	rd Rd &	Project:	09-7194	4-001	6,862		7,005		0	0	13,867
AM Period	NB		SB	,	EB	WB		PM Period	NB		SB		EB		WB	
00:00	5		17					12:00	126		100					
00:15	1 3		6 8					12:15	127		127					
00:45	7	16	6	37			53	12:45	94	466	102	461				927
01:00	4		4					13:00	104		134					
01:15	3		5					13:15	88		106 05					
01:45	2	12	6	22			34	13:45	102	409	95 116	451				860
02:00	1		3					14:00	105		124					
02:15	2		3					14:15	111		124					
02:30	2 3	8	4	12			20	14:30 14:45	111 114	441	121	485				926
03:00	5		2					15:00	91		171					,
03:15	3		3					15:15	143		165					
03:30 03:45	2	12	5	13			25	15:30 15:45	132 140	506	146 124	606				1117
04:00	4		1					16:00	138	300	157	000				
04:15	12		0					16:15	142		160					
04:30	8 12	27	2	F			42	16:30	140	660	146	502				1145
01:45	25	- 27	2					10:45	132	552	161	293				1145
05:15	18		3					17:15	135		158					
05:30	31		21	- 4				17:30	114		156					
05:45	34 54	108	25	56			164	17:45	143	514	140	615				1129
06:00	50 64		27					18:00	115		133					
06:30	84		52					18:30	84		124					
06:45	92	296	75	187			483	18:45	74	380	102	478				858
07:00	97 165		46 88					19:00	70 67		93 01					
07:30	147		81					19:30	69		108					
07:45	133	542	116	331			873	19:45	51	257	80	372				629
08:00	86		81					20:00	53		102					
08:15	100		103	-				20:15	50 65		75 71					
08:45	161	496	131	386			882	20:45	40	214	75	323				537
09:00	127		75					21:00	50		92					
09:15	119		81 88					21:15	51 41		74 63					
09:45	93	444	81	325			769	21:45	25	167	51	280				447
10:00	92		87					22:00	32		61					
10:15	109		69 05					22:15	25		44 26					
10:30	87	407	65 75	316			723	22:30	26 24	107	30 42	183				290
11:00	92		88					23:00	19		37					
11:15	112		91					23:15	10		16					
11:30 11:45	122 94	420	95 110	385			805	23:30 23:45	10 12	51	18 12	83				134
Total Vol	- 1	2709		2075						4054		4020				0004
		2790		2073			4075			NB		SB		B	WF	8994 012
								Daily To	tals :	6,862		7,005	á. 19. (ö. 4	0	0	13,867
<u>.</u>					A	M							PN	1		
Split %		57,4%		42.6%			35,1%	PM		45,2%		59:8%				64.9%
Peak Hr.		08:30		11:45			08:30	Peak Hr.		15:45		17:00				15:45
P.H.F.		-0.851		0.888			958 0.803	PiHiFi		560 0,986		0.955				1147 0.950

1755

07:15

897 0,886

4 - 6 Vol. Peak Hr.

Volume

P,H,F.

1066

16:00 552

0,972

1208

17:00 615

0.955

2274

16:00

1145

0.948

1038

07:00 542 0.821

717

08;00 386

0.737

7 - 9 Vol. Peak Hr.

Volume P.H.F.

Prepared by NDS/ATD															
Volumes for: Saturday, May 16, 2009 City:							Nipon	10	NB		Da SB	aily To	otals EB	WB	Total
Location	Wes	st Tef	ft St	btwn Orch	nard Rd &	Project	09-7194	-001	6,443		6,491		0	0	12.934
AM Period	5 NB	nica r	SB	EB	WB	ana ang sa	PM Period	NB		SR	adal dalar ya	FB	M/R		NEED CONTRACTOR
00:00	9		17				12:00	159		130					
00:15	9		10				12:15	128		129					
00:30	12		9				12:30	114		125					
00:45	8	38	8	44		82	12:45	103	504	118	502				1006
01:00	8		8				13:00	118		129					
01:15	1		19				13:15	113		118					
01:30	3 1	13	/ 5	30		52	13:30	115	150	125	504				060
02:00	4	15	- <u>-</u>			JZ	13.43	121	430	120	504				902
02:00	4		8				14:00	121		101					
02:30	4		6				14:30	128		125					
02:45	1	13	4	21		34	14:45	113	476	113	469				945
03:00	4		3				15:00	104		127					
03:15	0		2				15:15	92		125					
03:30	4		2				15:30	126		119					
03:45	3	11	3	10		21	15:45	125	447	126	497				944
04:00	0		0				16:00	97		116					
04:15	3		3				16:15	110		114					
04:30	10	22	4	11		24	16:30	99 116	422	116	450				070
05:00	17	23	т с	11		J4	10:45	102	444	110	450				8/8
05:00	17		0 8				17:00	80		111					
05:30	22		11	×			17:30	94		91					
05:45	20	72	27	52		124	17:45	99	376	104	420				796
06:00	29		26				18:00	85	·	108					
06:15	33		19				18:15	87		104					
06:30	34		34				18:30	88		100					
06:45	56	152	44	123		275	18:45	81	341	75	387				728
07:00	67		28				19:00	65		89					
07:15	48		31				19:15	69		66					
07:30	75	262	43	100		400	19:30	40		72					
07:45	12	202	58	160		422	19:45	68	242	/0	297				539
08:00	80 100		60 04				20:00	73		76					
08:15	95		94 77				20:15	70 37		72 50					
08:45	113	402	81	312		714	20:30	34	220	65	263				483
09:00	129		101				21:00	55		50					
09:15	141		98				21:15	43	-	63					
09:30	143		106				21:30	41		56					
09:45	119	532	9 8	403		935	21:45	35	174	44	213				387
10:00	136		111				22:00	19		44					
10:15	109		148				22:15	23		50					
10:30	134		125	100		***	22:30	37		38					
10:45	118	497	105	489		986	22:45	27	106	31	163		*#*****		269
11:00	141		130				23:00	33		35					
11:15	105		148				23:15	27		24					
11:45	117	568	150	548		1116	23:30	19	94	22 27	108				202
Total Vol.		2583		2212	ti ya ta mana ana ana ana ana ana ana ana ana a	4795			3860		4279				8139
									NB		SB		ЕВ	WB	Total

					<u>NB</u>	SB	EB ۱	NB	Total
				Daily Totals :	6,443	6,491	andad () daya siya je kel	0	12,934
		A	M		17.X X.2		PM		
Split %	53,9%	46,1%	37.1%		47.4%	52.6%			62,9%
AM				PM.	999 B B				
Peak Hr.	11:15	11:00	11:15	Peak Hr.	12:00	13:15			12:00
Volume	586	548	1134	Volume	504	505			1006
P.H.F.	0.888	0.913	0.906	P.H.F.	0.792	0,956			0.870
7 - 9 Vol,	664	472	1136	4 - 6 Voli	798	876		2	1674
Peak Hr.	08:00	08:00	08:00	Peak Hr.	16:15	16:00		x	16:15
Volume	402	312	714	Volume	428	456			879
P.H.F.	0.889	0.830	0.884	P.H.F.	0.922	0.983			0.972

	Prepared by NDS/ATD															
Volume:	s for:	Sund	ay, M	1ay 17	, 2009		City:	Nipor	no	NB		Da SB	aily T	otals EB	WB	Total
Location	We Bei	st Te nita l	fft St Pl	btwi	n Orcha	ard Rd &	Project:	09-7194	-001	5,154		5,341		0	0	10,495
AM Perio	d NB		SB		EB	WB		PM Period	NB		SB		EB	WB		
00:00	13		27					12:00	134		113					
00:15	16		14					12:15	131		126					
00:30	15	61	22	84			145	12:30	109	474	146	404				640
01:00	11		21	01			145	12:45	120	4/4	109	494				968
01:15	5		10					13:15	113		144					
01:30	5		12					13:30	93		93					
01:45	8	29	8	51			80	13:45	92	418	97	459				877
02:00	11		11 14					14:00 14:15	100 79		130					
02:30	4		5					14:30	96		112					
02:45	6	22	11	41			63	14:45	86	361	114	471				832
03:00	3		4					15:00	96		110					
03:15	2		4 २					15:15	91 97		92					
03:45	3	12	4	15			27	15:50	07 84	358	110	413				771
04:00	5		2				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	16:00	85		100					
04:15	4		3					16:15	73		82					
04:30	12	35	0	F			20	16:30	81	~~ .	100					
05-00	- 4	25	 					10:45	<u>65</u>	304	98	380				684
05:15	9		8					17:00	73 70		101 84					
05:30	15		5					17:30	71		88					
05:45	14	45	7	20			65	17:45	88	302	101	374				676
06:00	19		6					18:00	76		89					
06:15 06:30	18 17		16 19					18:15	84 40		81					
06:45	25	79	17	58			137	18:30	57	266	86	345				611
07:00	33		21					19:00	61		72					
07:15	40		14					19:15	61		62					
07:30	49	174	26	01			025	19:30	70		67					
07.45	54	174	20	01			255	19:45	68	260	61	262				522
08:15	63		20					20:00	50 50		81 63					
08:30	74		33					20:30	46		60					
08:45	73	264	61	149			413	20:45	42	192	42	246				438
09:00	93		51 ro					21:00	31		59					
09:15	103		59 76					21:15	38 20		54 59					
09:45	98	399	73	259			658	21:30	18	117	37	208				325
10:00	127		76					22:00	19		21					
10:15	107		87					22:15	14		34					
10:30 10:45	111	467	88 05	246			900	22:30	10	<u></u>	18	~~				
10.45	105	102	101	540			000	22:45	17	60	20	90				150
11:15	103		99					23:00	5		20 10					
11:30	119		101					23:30	5		21					
11:45	108	436	124	425			861	23:45	7	34	14	65				99
Total Vol.		2008		1534	t Marada (Sangtan Sa		3542			3146		3807				6953
										NB		SB		EB	WB	Total
	29.455.00					M		Daily Tot	als :	5,154		5,341		0	0	10,495
Split %		56.7%		43,3%		N.4	33.7%			45 2%		54.8%		<1)] 		66 20%
AM							<u> </u>	PM				<u>v.nu/0</u>				00/3//0
Volume		11(30 492		11:45 509			11:45 001	Peak Hr.		12:00		12;30				12:00
P.H.F.		0.918		0.872			0.964	P.H.F.		0.884		0.897				968 0,942
7 - 9 Vol.		438		230			668	4 - 6 Vol.		606		754				1360
Volume		264		149			08:00	reak Hr. Volume		16:00 304		16:30				16:00
P.H.F.		0.892		0.611			0,771	P.H.F.		0.894	Q.	0.948				0.924

							Prepar	ed by NDS	S/ATD				Active and the second second			
Volumes	for:	Mond	ay, N	⁄lay 18,	2009		City:	Nipo	omo	NB		Da SB	aily To	tals EB	WB	Total
Location	We	st Tefi	ft St	btwn	Orcha	rd Rd &	Project	: 09-719	94-001	6.156		6.302		0	ſ	12 458
AM Period	Ben NB	nita P	SB	99999999999999999999999999999999999999	F8	WB		PM Period	I NR		ŚR		FR	10/6	2	
00:00	10		6				····	12:00	110		98		<u></u>			
00:15	4		6			•		12:15	95		120					
00:30	3	25	7	24			46	12:30	105		102					
00:95	2	25	2	21			46	12:45	104	414	99	419				833
01:00	3		3					13:00	78 90		99 81					
01:30	1		2					13:30	107		99					
01:45	2	9	1	13			22	13:45	96	371	108	387				758
02:00	1		0					14:00	108		97					
02:15	3 0		2					14:15 14:30	89 103		93 109					
02:45	1	5	3	8			13	14:45	92	392	121	420				812
03:00	3		0					15:00	99		164					
03:15	2		i					15:15	128		148					
03:30	3	12	1	7			·	15:30	138	470	139	576				
04:00	<u> </u>	12	5 1	/			20	15:45	105	470	125	5/6				1046
04:15	9		2					16:00	109		158					
04:30	9		3					16:30	141		146					
04:45	15	39	5	11			50	16:45	132	504	160	626				1130
05:00	14		5					17:00	118		156					
05:15	28		8					17:15	108		152					
05:50	38	116	27	58			174	17:30	117	458	171	615				1073
06:00	59		31					18:00	101		132	010				10/0
06:15	74		40					18:15	92		122					
06:30	80		46					18:30	89		103					
06:45	89	302	70	187		•	489	18:45	98	380	104	461				841
07:00	90 170		44 92					19:00	66 52		98 02					
07:15	119		02 80					19:15	52 51		93 84					
07:45	109	497	127	333			830	19:45	53	222	76	351				573
08:00	99		87					20:00	49		82					
08:15	98		65					20:15	52		65					
08:30	128	470	86 70	216			705	20:30	43	160	51	255				(00
00:45	174	479	94	210			795	20:45	<u></u>	108	5/	255			F	423
09:00	99		69					21:00	45 26		56 56					
09:30	81		57					21:30	19		45					
09:45	78	382	68	278			660	21:45	18	108	40	199				307
10:00	93		58					22:00	13		26					
10:15	83 99		70 62					22:15	20		31 10					
10:45	66	341	71	261			602	22:30	17	59	23	99				158
11:00	95		67					23:00	9		14					
11:15	97		106					23:15	9		13					
11:30	83	071	80	250			204	23:30	4	-	12					
11:45	90	371	97	350			/21	23:45	9		12	51				82
Total Vol.	1940-144 tit.	2579	872103 A	1843			4422	and we produce the sold		3577		4459				8036
										NB		SB		33	WB	Total
					۸	M		Dally I	otals :	6,156		6,302	See Di	M	U	12,458
Split %		58,3%		41.7%			35.5%			44.5%		55.5%	<u>г</u>)	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		64.5%
AM								PM.								
Peak Hr.		07:15		11:45 417			07:15 201	Peak Hr.		16:15 512		. 16:45 620				16:15
P.H.F.		0.707		0.869			0.845	P.H.F.		0.910		0,934				0.973
7 - 9 Voli		976		649			1625	4 - 6 Vol.		962		1241				2203
Peak Hr. Volume		07;15		07:15		22.0	07:15 992	Peak Hr.		16:15		16:45				16:15
P.H.F.		0.707		0:740			0.845	P.H.F.		0.910		0.934				0.973

Volumes	for:	Tueso	day, I	May 19	9, 2009		City:	Nipon	10	NB		Da SB	ily Tot	als B	W/R	Total
Location:	We	st Tel	ift St	btwn	I Orchard	i Rd &	Project:	09-7194	-001	6,697		6.815		0	0	13 512
AM Period	NB	mirari	SB		EB	WB		PM Period	NB		SB		EB	WR		
00:00	3		7					12:00	102		118					· · · · · ·
00:15	4		10					12:15	99		111					
00:30	4	16	6 1	74			40	12:30	96 05	202	96	405				
01:00	6		4	21				12:45	95	392	100	425				817
01:15	3		6					13:15	100		104					
01:30	4		3					13:30	108		115					
01:45	2	15	2	15			30	13:45	94	393	115	446			·	839
02:00	0		0					14:00	110		116					
02:15	ა 5		2 २					14:15	111		138					
02:45	1	9	Ő	5			14	14:45	100	444	130 114	498				947
03:00	3		3					15:00	118		179					272
03:15	6		0					15:15	145		151					
03:30	4		1					15:30	151		123					
03:45	3	16	1	5			21	15:45	139	553	142	595				1148
04:00	5		0					16:00	115		160					
04:15	12 Q		2					16:15	135		174					
04:45	12	38	3	7			45	16:45	139	541	164	669				1210
05:00	20		10			···-		17:00	131		178					1210
05:15	36		5					17:15	103		169					
05:30	39		21					17:30	143		186					
05:45	47	142	40	76			218	17:45	115	492	151	684				1176
06:00	66		41					18:00	103		165					
06:15	79		21					18:15	95		132					
06:30	104 78	327	50 70	101			E10	18:30	81	700	114	500				
07:00	115	547	40	191			510	10:45	109	300	91	502			******	890
07:15	172		73					19:00	72 59		102 85					
07:30	132		62					19:30	58		71					
07:45	96	515	126	310			825	19:45	47	236	87	345	_			581
08:00	119		101					20:00	48		71					
08:15	123		72					20:15	56		67					
08:30	154	EEO	88 106	267			000	20:30	47		52					
00:43	105	339	100	307			926	20:45	19	170	62	252				422
09:00	120		65 65					21:00	52 10		55 ro					
09:30	102		71					21:15	20 23		53 42					
09:45	90	401	98	323			724	21:45	15	118	44	194				312
10:00	102		75					22:00	17		28			<u> </u>		
10:15	113		83					22:15	22		27					
10:30	110		94 07	2.00				22:30	8		17					
10:45	92	417	96	348			765	22:45	21	68	24	96				164
11:00	98 97		104 87					23:00	8		13					
11:30	124		96					∠3:15 23:30	9 7		1/ 8					
11:45	97	416	99	386			802	23:45	, 7	31	14	52				83
Total Vol.		2871		2057			4928			3826		4758				0504
								9		NB		SR			WB	0384
								Daily Tot	als :	6,697		6,815				13.512
					MA								- PM			
Split %		58.3%		41,7%			36.5%	014		44.6%		55.4%				63.5%
Peak Hr.		08:15		11:30			08:00	Peak Hr.		16:15		16:45				16:15
Volume		566		424			926	Volume		557		697				1244
PiHiFi		0,868		0.898			0.861	P.H.F.		0.916		.0,937				0.963

4 - 6 Vol. Peak Hr.

Volume P.H.F.

1751

08:00

926 0.861 1353 16:45 697

0.937

2386

16:15

1244

0.963

1033 16:15

-557

0.916

1074 08:00 559

0.857

677

07:45 387

0.768

7 - 9 Vol. Peak Hr.

Volume

P.H.F.

Prepared by NDS/ATD

Prepared by NDS/ATD

Volumes for: Wednesday, May 13, 2009							City: Nipomo			Daily Totals NB SB EB						Total	
Location:	Pomeroy	Rd	btwn Wes	st Tef	ft St &		Project:	09-7194-002			<u> </u>		- 4 441		4 436	0 077	
AM Period	Primrose	Ln SB	FR	(Selletti)	\\/B	4 (d)				СD		ED		un	4,430	0,077	
00.00			<u> </u>		1					30		<u> </u>					
00:15			2		4			12:00				58		01 63			
00:30			3		2			12:30				70		02 76			
00:45			1	9	5	12	21	12:45				64	269	72	271	540	
01:00			0		3			13:00	****			74		51		0.10	
01:15			0		3			13:15				59		78			
01:30			0		1			13:30				71		67			
01:45			0		0	7	7	13:45				69	273	58	254	527	
02:00			3		3			14:00				77		76			
02:15			0		0			14:15				72		68			
02:30			0		2			14:30				76		73			
02:45			1	4	0	5	9	14:45				60	285	78	295	580	
03:00			5		2			15:00				84		101			
03:15			4		7			15:15				88		105			
03:30			3		1			15:30				100		97			
03:45			1	13	2	12	25	15:45				86	358	98	401	759	
04:00			3		0			16:00				88		82			
04:15			2		7			16:15				86		100			
04:30			5		6			16:30				89		103			
04:45			16	26	4	17	43	16:45	···-			82	345	96	381	726	
05:00			12		5			17:00				96		93			
05:15			17		13			17:15				54		108			
05:30			17		17			17:30				91		92			
05:45			27	73	27	62	135	17:45				79	320	96	389	709	
06:00			27		39			18:00				75		83			
06:15			36		51			18:15				74		76			
06:30			54		59			18:30				89		79			
06:45			54	171	40	189	360	18:45				68	306	62	300	606	
07:00			80		53			19:00				71		60			
07:15			90		76			19:15				52		70			
07:30			90		68	· ·-		19:30				55		56			
07:45			98	358	70	267	625	19:45				32	210	45	231	441	
08:00			84		55			20:00				28		44			
08:15			89		62			20:15				38		40			
08:30			85	255	60	~ ~ ~		20:30				51		58			
08:45			97	355	12	249	604	20:45				32	149	55	197	346	
09:00			77		56			21:00				34		64			
09:15			54		56			21:15				28		28			
09:30			6U F0	240	47	200	455	-21:30				21		24			
09:45			58	249	47	206	455	21:45				16	99	17	133	232	
10:00			50		50			22:00				9		14			
10:15			80		34			22:15				19		17			
10:30			57	254	68 60		477	22:30				6		12			
10:45			04	201	09	221	472	22:45				3	37	12	55	92	
11:00			56		67			23:00				6		9			
11:15			66		60 C m			23:15				7		16			
11:30			/4 61	257	00 55	247	ኗስ/	23:30				6 r	24	5	25	50	
Total Vol				1766		1404	2760	23,73				<u> </u>		<u> </u>	33		

	1700	1494	3200				2675	2942	5617
					NB	SB	EB	WB	Total
				Daily Totals :			4,441	4,436	8,877
	AM						PM		
Split %	54,2%	45.8%	36,7%				47.6%	52,4%	63.3%
AM		ele di tanggi	en se	Ì РМ					
Peak Hr.	07:15	07:15	07;15	Peak Hr.			15:15	15:00	15:00
Volume	362	269	631	Volume			362	- 401	759
PiHiFi	0,923	0,885	0.939	P.H.F.			0.905	0.955	0.963
7 - 9 Vol.	- 713	516	1229	4 - 6 Vol,			665	770	1435
Peak Hr.	07:15	07:15	07:15	Peak Hr.			16:15	16:30	16:15
Volume	362	269	631	Volume		teria contra de la contra	353	400	745
PiHiFi	0.923	0.885	0,939	P.H.F.			0.919	0.926	0.970
Prepared by NDS/ATD

Volumes for: Thurs	sday,	May 14, 20	009			City:	Nipomo	N	B	Daily SB	Totals EB		WB	Total
Location: Pomeroy	/ Rd	btwn West	: Teff	t St &		Project	: 09-7194-002	2		0	4,491		4,439	8,930
AM Period NB	SB	EB	et daugt de	WB			PM Period NB		SB	EB		WB		
00:00		2		4			12:00			61		65		
00:15		2		2			12:15			76		72		
00:30		1		1			12:30			56		7i		
00:45		1	6	1	8	14	12:45			63	256	70	278	534
01:00		1		4			13:00			72		65		
01:15		2		2			13:15			67		72		
01:30		1		2			13:30			56		72		
01:45		1	5	3	11	16	13:45			78	273	63	272	545
02:00		0		1			14:00			60		67		
02:15		2		4			14:15			92		76		
02:30		0		2			14:30			91		84		
02:45		1	3	2	9	12	14:45			65	308	83	310	618
03:00		2		0			15:00			85		76		
03:15		4		1			15:15			89		86		
03:30		3		1			15:30			99		85		
03:45		3	12	2	4	16	15:45			96	369	81	328	697
04:00		3		2			16:00			105		89		
04:15		4		5			16:15			83		88		
04:30		5		9			16:30			76		93		
04:45		12	24	5	21	45	16:45			63	327	81	351	678
05:00		8		7			17:00			90		107		
05:15		20		5			17:15			62		111		
05:30		20		19			17:30			85		104		
05:45		21	69	17	48	117	17:45			91	328	87	409	737
06:00		26		48			18:00			70		102		
06:15		39		50			18:15			90		73		
06:30		61		46			18:30			70		77		
06:45		67	193	40	184	377	18:45			69	299	55	307	606
07:00		86		23			19:00			87		61		
07:15		94		81			19:15			64		56		
07:30		88		91			19:30			46		62		
07:45		88	356	70	265	621	19:45			47	244	63	242	486
08:00		94		56			20:00			44		72		
08:15		78		66			20:15			44		58		
08:30		87		58			20:30			25		52		
08:45		88	347	81	261	608	20:45			25	138	39	221	359
09:00		70		59			21:00			34		35		
09:15		63		53			21:15			18		37		
09:30		72		56			21:30			9		27		
09:45		76	281	48	216	497	21:45			19	80	27	126	206
10:00		49		53			22:00			12		16		
10:15		64		59			22:15			15		18		
10:30		69		53			22:30			6		17		
10:45		52	234	64	229	463	22:45			<u>1</u> 1	44	7	58	102
11:00		61		72			23:00		• • •	6		12		
11:15		74		55			23:15			6		5		
11:30		67		63			23:30			8		9		
11:45		69	271	61	251	522	23:45			4	24	4	30	54
			4004		4100	0000					2600		2022	5600

Total Vol.	1801	1507	3308				2690	2932	5022
					NB	SB	EB	WB	Total
				Daily Totals :			4,491	4,439	8,930
	AM						PM		
Split %	54.4%	45.6%	37.0%				47.8%	52.2%	63:0%
AM		si, sicris p		PM.					
Peak Hr.	07:15	07:15	07:15	Peak Hr.			15:15	17:00	17:00
Volume		298	662	Volume			389	409	737
P.H.F.	0.968	0.819	0.925	P.H.F.			0.926	0.921	0.935
7 - 9 Vol.	703	526	1229	4 - 6 Vol.			655	760	- 1415
Peak Hr.	07;15	07:15	07:15	Peak Hr.			17:00	17:00	17:00
Volume	364	298	662	Volume			328	409	737
P.H.F.	0.968	0.819	0.925	P.H.F.	19 19 19 19 1		0,901	0.921	0.935

Prepared	bv	NDS/ATD	
i topatou	vy.	NDOIAID	

Volumes for: Frida	y, Ma	ay 15, 2009				City:	Nipomo	NB		D SB	aily [·]	Totals EB		WB	Total
Location: Pomeroy	y Rd	btwn Wes	t Tefi	ft St &		Project:	09-7194-002	0		0		4,487		4,591	9,078
AM Period NB	SB	FB		WB			PM Period NB		SB		FB		WB		The office of the second second second
00.00		<u></u>		7			12:00				79		65		
00:15		2		í1			12:15				52		66		
00:30		2		4			12:30				60		76		
00:45		1	7	4	,26	33	12:45				57	248	72	279	527
01:00		1		3			13:00				74		72		
01:15		3		1			13:15				92		77		
01:30		0		3			13:30				86		79		
01:45		2	6	3	10	16	13:45				81	333	82	310	643
02:00		0		2			14:00				76		83		
02:15		2		2			14:15				74		64		
02:30		2		3			14:30				76		89		
02:45		1	5	3	10	15	14:45			. .	79	305	95	331	636
03:00		1		0			15:00				97		84		
03:15		1		0			15:15				94		99		
03:30		4	~	3		10	15:30				/5	220	111	200	305
03:45			9		4	13	15:45		*****		/3	339	92	360	725
04:00		1		1			16:00				101		101		
04:15		8 1		4			16:15				93		90		
04:30		2	10	1 1	20	30	10:30				00	365	07 85	363	778
		0	15	<u>1</u>			10.10						0.0	505	720
05:00		9		4 c			17:00				84 00		88 00		
05:15		10		5			17:13				90 82		101		
05:45		29	72	28	47	119	17:45				86	342	83	362	704
06:00		20	<u> </u>	35			18.00				68		71		
06:15		35		42			18:15				56		75		
06:30		48		46			18:30				65		77		
06:45		46	149	44	167	316	18:45				78	267	74	297	564
07:00		76		47			19:00				62		61		
07:15		91		56			19:15				58		61		
07:30		92		95			19:30				49		54		
07:45		68	327	77	275	602	19:45				41	210	50	226	436
08:00		71		62			20:00				28		37		
08:15		66		62			20:15				40		45		
08:30		74		64			20:30				38		51		
08:45		104	315	69	257	572	20:45				32	138	44	177	315
09:00		73		61			21:00				34		30		
09:15		59		62			21:15				20		38		
09:30		75		74		_	21:30				22		41		
09:45		78	285	74	271	556	21:45				28	104	22	131	235
10:00		89		53			22:00				10		31		
10:15		85		56			22:15				17		28		
10:30		66	240	64 re	224	F 4 4	22:30				5	40	25	104	
10:45		70	310	58	231	541	22:45				11	43	17	101	144
11:00		68		63			23:00				11		12		
11:15		67		12			23:15				8		10		
11:30		51 60	255	61 61	750	514	23:30				o a	74	15 14	51	85
11.73		60	200	VI	233	717	27.73				7	7,	7.1	1¢.	00

Total Vol.	1759	1577	3336				2728	3014	5742
	ing an				NB	SB	EB	WB	Total
and the second se	an a			Daily Totals :		11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-11-	4,487	4,591	9,078
	AM		19-19-19-19 19-19-19-19-19-19-19-19-19-19-19-19-19-1				PM		
Split-%	52.7%	47.3%	36,7%				47.5%	52.5%	63.3%
AM				PM		se generations			
Peak Hr.	07:00	07:30	07:15	Peak Hr.			16:00	15:15	15:15
Volume ,	327	296	612	Volume			365	403	746
PiHiFi	0.889	0.779	0.818	P.H.F.			0.903	0,908	0.923
7 - 9 Vol.	642	532	1174	4 - 6 Vol.			707	725	1432
Peak Hr.	07:00	07:30	07:15	Peak Hr.			16:00	16:45	16:00
Volume	327	296	612	Volume			365		728
P.H.F.	0.889	0.779	0,818	P.H.F.	50 Y	643 <u>8 8 8</u> 8 9 4	0,903	0.901	0.901

Prepared by NDS/ATD

Volumes fo	r: Saturday,	May 16, 20	009			City:	Nipomo	NB		D SB	aily	Totals EB		WB	Total
P Location: p	omeroy Rd	btwn Wes	t Tef	ft St &		Project:	09-7194-002	0		0		3,652		3.746	7.398
AM Period	VB SB	FB		WB	9799103		PM Period NB	111111-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1-1	SB		FR		14/B		
00:00	<u>,o </u>	5		9			12:00	-			50		95		
00:15		8		10			12:15				89		80		
00:30		5		11			12:30				61		77		
00:45		1	19	3	33	52	12:45				88	297	98	340	637
01:00		5		5			13:00				71		91		
01:15		1		2			13:15				65		72		
01:30		5		4			13:30				70		75		
01:45		2	13	3	14	27	13:45				82	288	75	313	601
02:00		1		4			14:00				73		62		
02:15		4		5			14:15				51		74		
02:30		1		2			14:30				49		60		
02:45		2	8	4	15	23	14:45				70	243	75	271	514
03:00		-1		3			15:00				61		56		
03:15		3		0			15:15				59		71		
03:30		3		6			15:30				54		50		
03:45		3	10	6	15	25	15:45				53	227	66	243	470
04:00		0		6			16:00				49		72		
04:15		2		3			16:15				73		59		
04:30		4		4			16:30				84		75		
04:45		8	14	3	16	30	16:45				70	276	68	274	550
05:00		8		4			17:00				58		74		
05:15		11		5			17:15				57		53		
05:30		7		6			17:30				63		59		
05:45		12	38	12	27	65	17:45				58	236	71	257	493
06:00		12		13			18:00				54		52		
06:15		16		19			18:15				59		53		
06:30		34		20			18:30				39		52		
06:45		26	88	16	68	156	18:45				48	200	57	214	414
07:00		15		23			19:00				40		52		
07:15		31		26			19:15				40		55		
07:30		42		26			19:30				33		35		
07:45		46	134	38	113	247	19:45				24	137	42	184	321
08:00		49		44			20:00				33		29		
08:15		49		34			20:15				28		27		
08:30		39		40			20:30				38		32		
08:45		60	197	41	159	356	20:45				38	137	33	121	258
09:00		54		57			21:00				28		38		
09:15		62		70			21:15				15		31		
09:30		70		58			21:30				23		31		
09:45		68	254	52	237	491	21:45				22	88	42	142	230
10:00		63		52			22:00				27		37		
10:15		60		67			22:15				22		40		
10:30		91		49			22:30				19		20		
10:45		74	288	74	242	530	22:45				15	83	27	124	207
11:00		69		72			23:00				10		14		
11:15		104		69			23:15				17		7		
11:30		80		75			23:30				13		10		
11:45		71	324	61	277	601	23:45				13	53	16	47	100
Total Mal			1207		1210	2602									

Total Vol.	1387	1216	2603		-		2265	2530	4795
					NB	SB	EB	WB	Total
				Daily Totals :	•	0	3,652	3,746	7,398
	AM						PM		
Split %	53,3%	46.7%	.35.2%				47,2%	52.8%	64.8%
AM				PM					
Peak Hr.	10:30	11:45	10:45	Peak Hr.	a de la com		12:15	12:15	12:15
Volume	338	303	617	Volume			309	346	655
P.H.F.	0.813	0.891	0.892	P.H.F.			0.868	0.883	0.880
7 - 9 Vol.		272	603	4 - 6 Vol.			512	531	1043
Peak Hr.	08:00	08:00	08:00	Peak Hr.			16:15	16:15	16:15
Volume	197	159	356	Volume			285	276	561
P.H.F.	0,821	0,903	0.881	P.H.F.		1911-03-03-03-03-03-03-03-03-03-03-03-03-03-	0,848	0,920	0.882

			ana		Prepare	d by NDS/ATD							
Volumes for: Sunday, N	4ay 17, 20	09			City:	Nipomo	NB		Daily SB	Totals EB		WB	Total
Location: Pomeroy Rd	btwn Wes	st Tef	ft St 8		Proiect:	09-7194-002	0		0	3.357		3.226	6 583
AM Period NB SP	CD					DM Daried ND						U/LEV	0,303
AM PEHOU ND 5D	<u> </u>					PM Period NB		SB	<u></u> <u>EB</u>		WB		
00:00	/ 0		010			12:00			74		65		
00:30	5		9 10			12:15			/4 66		/b		
00:45	4	26	9	44	70	12:45			76	290	05 74	300	500
01:00	8		6			13:00			76	200	60	500	330
01:15	1		5			13:15			70 68		69		
01:30	3		5			13:30			60		60		
01:45	4	16	10	26	42	13:45			64	268	60	258	526
02:00	2		6			14:00			66		60		
02:15	- 1		8			14:15			84		52		
02:30	0		4			14:30			69		67		
02:45		7	3	21	28	14:45			80	299	67	246	545
03:00	0		2			15:00			65		62		
03:15	0		1			15:15			63		84		
03:30	4		0		_	15:30			59		62		
03:45	0	4	1	4		15:45			60	247	71	279	526
04:00	2	,	5			16:00			43		58		
04:15	2		4			16:15			69		65		
04:30	5 7	10	5	17	22	16:30			62		52		
04:45	/	10	<u> </u>	1/	33	16:45				239	51	226	465
05:00	5		4			17:00			63		72		
05:15	5 1		5			17:15			55		46		
05:45	ч 5	10	5 10	22	41	17:30			51	310	57	226	445
05:00		17	10		-71	17,43			50	219	51	220	445
06:00	9		19			18:00			58		45 40		
06:30	8		10			10:13			51		40		
06:45	13	35	16	57	92	18:45				203	30 44	101	304
07:00	17		14			10:00				205	45	191	
07:15	21		23			19:15			35		45 40		
07:30	33		24			19:30			46		48		
07:45	32	103	20	81	184	19:45			32	145	34	176	321
08:00	28		34			20:00			39		41		
08:15	37		25			20:15			41		26		
08:30	45		25			20:30			36		38		
08:45	54	164	29	113	277	20:45			37	153	29	134	287
09:00	33		43			21:00			23		22		
09:15	50		43			21:15			22		22		
09:30	56		40			21:30			24		22		
09:45	57	196	45	171	367	21:45			22	91	26	92	183
10:00	55		39			22:00			20		14		
10:15	59		41			22:15			16		18		
10:30	66		68			22:30			19		14		
10:45	61	241	53	201	442	22:45			13	68	14	60	128
11:00	76		62			23:00			16		10		
11:15	57		65			23:15			7		5		
11:30	75 56	764	54 67	240	513	23:30			9		11	22	
		204	0/	240 ·	512	23;45			12	44	/	33	
Total Vol.		1091		1005	2096					2266		2221	4487
						Daily Tatal	NB		SB	EB		WB	Total
		A.M.				Daily Totals :				3,357		3,226	6,583.
Snlit %		 		47 00/	21 00/					FM		40 501	20.00
AM		32:170		17:5270	<u>31,07/0</u>	PM				3U.3%		49,5%	08.2%
Peak Hr,		11:30		11:45	11:45	Peak Hr.		÷.		14:00		12:15	12:15

299 0.890

458

16:15

259 0,938 304 0.894

452

16:15

240

0.833

596 0.987

910

16:15

499

0,924

279 0.930

267

08:00

164

0,759

293

0.862

194

08:00

113

0.831

563

0.932

461

08:00

277

0,834

Volume

P.H.F.

4 - 6 Voli

Peak Hr,

Volume

P.H.F.

Volume

P.H.F.

7 - 9 Vol.

Peak Hr.

Volume

P.H.F.

					Prepare	d by NDS/ATD						
Volumes for: Monday, M	ay 18, 20()9			City:	Nipomo	NB	Daily ⁻ SB	Fotals EB		WB	Total
Location: Pomeroy Rd	btwn Wes	t Teff	t St &		Project	09-7194-002	0	0	4,322		4,351	8,673
AM Daried NP SP	ER ER		\\/R	anna chai	Nati Abi Art de la	DM Deriod NB	SB	EB	el nej o la densito	WB		100926360000
APT PERIOD IND 30	<u> </u>		2	ì		12:00		00		72		
00:00	U 2		с р			12:00		68 68		72		
00:15	1		1			12:30		49		74		
00:45	3	6	2	14	20	12:45		71	268	69	290	558
00:10	3		2			13:00		60		62		
01:00	0		1			13:15		59		76		
01:30	0		0			13:30		68		71		
01:45	0	3	2	5	8	13:45		75	262	65	274	536
02:00	0		2			14:00		70		68		
02:15	2		1			14:15		66		83		
02:30	6		0			14:30		80		58		
02:45	0	8	1	4	12	14:45		86	302	73	282	584
03:00	0		1			15:00		89		111		
03:15	1		1			15:15		95		106		
03:30	0		1			15:30		82		98		
03:45	5	6	2	5	11	15:45		87	353	70	385	738
04:00	6		1			16:00		96		95		
04:15	11		7			16:15		89		98		
04:30	7		11			16:30		90		114		
04:45	6	30	6	25	55	16:45		89	364	83	390	754
05:00	5		0			17:00		96		90		
05:15	15		4			17:15		53		91		
05:30	24		13			17:30		87		111		
05:45	18	62	24	41	103	17:45	***	90	326	86	378	704
06:00	36		43			18:00		71		74		
06:15	40		45			18:15		65		79		
06:30	43		47	444	005	18:30		70	275	74	207	563
06:45	50	169	31	165	335	18:45		69	275	60	287	562
07:00	98		40			19:00		56		58		
07:15	82		53			19:15		60		58		
07:30	89	~ ~ ~	68	224	F74	19:30		68	210	45	207	422
07:45	/1	340	/3	234	5/4	19:45			210	40	207	923
08:00	77		52			20:00		46		44		
08:15	/1		56			20:15		29		52 40		
08:30	00 07	274	03 74	74 5	EGG	20:30		24	122	49	186	208
08:45	0/	321		243	500	20:45		23	122	11	100	500
09:00	/1		59			21:00		29		51		
09:15	00 F0		52			21:12		12		37		
09:30	00 66	263	50	211	474	21:30		16	69	23	144	213
	50	205		211	-17-1	21.10	· · · ·	15		 20		
10:00	58		21			22:00		15		11		
10:15	00 71		00 40			22,13		14		23		
10:30	42	265	-72 67	230	495	22:00		10	45		71	116
10,75		200	 E7	200		22,13		10	15	<u></u>		
11:00	50 EE		57 74			23:00		3		נ ר		
11:13	55		56			23:30		י ק		11		
11:45	53	224	69	256	480	23:45		6	23	5	21	44

Total Vol.	1697	1436	3133				2625	2915	5540
					NB	SB	EB	WB	Total
	u de la compactica de la c			Daily Totals :	0	a de la compañía	4,322	4,351	8,673
	AM						PM		
Split %	-54:2%	45.8%	36.1%	5			47,4%	52.6%	63.9%
AM				PM	-1/12/15-0				
Peak Hr.	07:00		07:00	Peak Hr.			16:00	16:00	16:00
Volume		290		Volume			364	390	754
P.HiF.	0.867	0.967	0,914	P.H.F.			0.948	0.855	0.924
7 - 9 Vol.	661	479	1140	4 - 6 Vol.			690	768	1458
Peak Hr,	07:00	07:30	07:00	Peak Hr.			16:00	16:00	-16:00
Volume	340	249	574	Volume			364	390	754
PiHiFi	0.867	0.853	0.914	P.H.F.			0.948	0.855	0,924

Prepared by	NDS/ATD	

Volumes for: Tuesda	ay, I	May 19, 20	09			City:	Nipomo	NB		Da SB	ily '	Totals EB		WB_	Total
Pomeroy I Location: Primrose I	Rd Ln	btwn Wes	it Tef	ft St &		Project:	09-7194-002	0		D		4,368		4,432	8,800
AM Period NB	SB	EB		WB			PM Period NB		SB		EB		WB		and the second
00:00		0		4			12:00				82		75		
00:15		2		5			12:15				71		77		
00:30		4		0			12:30				51		75		
00:45		2	8	1,	10	18	12:45				69	273	71	298	571
01:00		4		4			13:00				58		60		
01:15		0		0			13:15				62		78		
01:30		1		3			13:30				67		69		
01:45		1	6	1	8	14	13:45				73	260	62	269	529
02:00		3		3			14:00				71		71		
02:15		1		0			14:15				69		80		
02:30		3		0			14:30				77		57		
02:45		1	8	0	3	11	14:45				88	305	74	282	587
03:00		1		1			15:00				88		108		
03:15		0		3			15:15				97		104		
03:30		1		0			15:30				85		95		
03:45		3	5	4	8	13	15:45				88	358	73	380	738
04:00		7		0			16:00				96		104		
04:15		9		8			16:15				94		111		
04:30		9		8			16:30				93		124		
04:45		8	33	5	21	54	16:45				92	375	94	433	808
05:00		8		3			17:00				07		00		
05:15		13		6			17:15				56		104		
05:30		26		15			17:30				87		122		
05:45		16	63	23	47	110	17:45				93	333	99	423	756
06:00		33		41			19:00				74	000	76		/50
06:15		38		43			18:15				66		70 92		
06:30		41		48			18-30				71		72		
06:45		53	165	33	165	330	18:45				70	281	63	203	574
07:00		92		43	100		19:00				F0	201	61		571
07:15		95 85		52			19:00				J0 42		60		
07:30		88		67			19:10				65		40		
07:45		69	337	75	237	574	19.30				21	217	40	214	421
00:00		70	557	40	207	57 1	19.49				10	217	- 13	214	431
08:00		/0 כד		49			20:00				48		43		
00:20		7.5		53			20:15				32		53		
00:50		00 85	274	75	227	561	20:30				20	127	40	100	207
00,45			329	73	237	501	20:45				21	127	38	180	307
09:00		/0		60			21:00				31		48		
09:15		69		51			21:15				15		39		
09:30		61 CP	200	47	200	474	21:30				13		32		
09:45		65	265	48	206	4/1	21:45				15	/4	26	145	219
10:00		59		49			22:00				12		25		
10:15		66		66 #6			22:15				8		9		
10:30		68		52			22:30				11		20		
10:45		70	263	63	230	493	22:45				8	39	10	64	103
11:00		60		58			23:00				10		5		
11:15		57		73			23:15				2		3		
11:30		59	.	57			23:30				6		8		
11:45		51	227	72	260	487	23:45				4	22	3	19	41
Total Vol.			1704		1432	3136						2664		3000	5664

Total Vol.	1704	1432	3136				2664	3000	5664
					NB	SB	EB	WB	Total
				Daily Totals :	0	0	4,368	4,432	8,800
	AM						PM		
Split %	54.3%	45.7%	35.6%				47.0%	53.0%	64.4%
AM				Г— РМ	S. 20 State			Survey States	
Peak Hr.	07:00	11:45	07:00	Peak Hr.			16:15	16:00	16:00
Volume		299	- 574	Volume			376	433	808
P.H.F.	0.887	0.971	0.926	P.H.F.			0,969	0,873	0.931
7 - 9 Voli	661	474	1135	4 - 6 Vol.			708	856	1564
Peak Hr.	07:00	07:30	07:00	Peak Hr.			16:15	16:00	16:00
Volume	337	244	574	Volume			376	433	808
PiHiFi	0.887	0.813	0,926	P.H.F.		in i carea	0.969	0.873	0,931

	Prepared by NDS/ATD																	
Volumes	for:	Wedn	iesda	iy, Ma	y 13, 2	2009	City:	Nipo	mo	NB		D SB	aily To	otals EB	S WB Tc 0 1/ WB 6			
Location	Osa	ige St	bty	wn Ca	mino (Caballo &	Project	: 09-7194	1-003	631		590		0	0	1.221		
AM Period	NB		SB		EB	WB		PM Period	NB		SB		FR	14	/R			
00:00	0		1					12:00	<u> </u>		9		<u> </u>					
00:15	0		0					12:15	14		7							
00:30	0		0	-		÷	~	12:30	7		3							
01:00			1				2	12:45	11	38	9	28			-/	66		
01:00	0		1					13:00	11 7		7 8							
01:30	1		ō					13:30	10		17							
01:45	0	1	0	1			2	13:45	8	36	11	43				79		
02:00	0		0					14:00	18		8							
02:15	0		0					14:15	11		14							
02:30	0 10		1	1			1	14:30	12	40	14	47				05		
03/00	0 0		0	<u>+</u>			1	15:00	11	40	16	-47				95		
03:15	0		õ					15:15	42		18							
03:30	2		1					15:30	18		16							
03:45	0	2	1	2			4	15:45	11	82	16	66				148		
04:00	0		0					16:00	10		7							
04:15	0		0					16:15	8		14							
04:30	0		2	2			2	16:30	4	40	19	50				00		
05:00	1		 				Σ	17:00	7	40	- 10	50			·····	90		
05:15	0		1					17:00	12		0 9							
05:30	0		1					17:30	1		8							
05:45	0	1	0	2			3	17:45		27	13	38				65		
06:00	0		0					18:00	4		8							
06:15	7		1					18:15	11		13							
06:30	9	74	5 2	8			37	18:30	6 0	20	5	22				<i>c</i> 2		
07:00	8		<u>-</u>					10,43	5		12					03		
07:15	14		1					19:00	3		6							
07:30	13		8					19:30	2		10							
07:45	12	47	12	23			70	19:45	5	15	1	29				44		
08:00	8		8					20:00	2		8							
08:15	8		10					20:15	6		1							
08:30	24 50	90	30	78			168	20:30	4	12	8	22				25		
09:00	20	50	9	/0			100	20.93	5		 							
09:15	17		13					21:15	6		11							
09:30	5		2					21:30	5		4							
09:45	9	51	7	31			82	21:45	2	18	5	24				42		
10:00	7		4					22:00	2		1							
10:15	4		8					22:15	3		2							
10:30	2	25	9	22			47	22:30	2 1	8	2	7				15		
11:00	11		3					23:00	1	0	 1			····				
11:15	6		13					23:15	1		2							
11:30	9		9					23:30	0		0							
11:45	/	33	3	28			61	23:45	0	2	0	3	4			5		
Total Vol.		274		200	0.0100.0000	tegine de cara	474	11. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.		357		390				747		
										NB		SB		EB	WB	Total		
								Daily To	tals :	631		590		0	0	1,221		
Split 04		57.00		47.70		4171	20.00/			47.00/		E0 20/-		M				
AM		07:070		-74,270			20,0%	Md		7/50%		32.2%	to de la calendaria Calendaria			61,2%		
Peak Hr.		08:30		08:30			08:30	Peak Hr.		15:00		15:00				15:00		
P.H.F		111		82 0.682			193	Volume		82		66				148		
7 - 9 Vol.		137		101			238	4 - 6 Vol.		67		-0.917 				155		
Peak Hr.		08:00		08:00	576.0	2 10 20 10	08:00	Peak Hr.		16:30		16:15				16:00		
Volume		90		78 0 c r o			168	Volume		41		51				90		
and Collection of the second		.U.HDU		± 01020		<u>(1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</u>	0,525	#P.H.F.		- U.569	20. S.	- <u>0.67</u> 1				0,804		

Values Gar, Thueday, May 24, 2009 City Night Carine Carine Cable 8 Project: 09-7194-003 Night Cathe 8 VB Total AD Reide NB SB EB WB Project: 09-7194-003 50 EB WB 50 618 53 EB WB 50 50 60 50 <th></th> <th colspan="12">Prepared by NDS/ATD</th>		Prepared by NDS/ATD															
Control Canada St. BANN Canada Cabable & Project 109-72.94-003 G13 23.6 0 2,15.4 AM Parkod NB SB EB WB PM Parkod NB SB EB WB 00:00 0 12215 7 6 6 66 00:00 0 12215 7 6 66 66 00:00 0 12215 7 6 66 66 00:00 0 1220 14 13 22 66 00:01 0 13215 12 9 14 79 01:05 0 1 1 1055 8 19 41 79 02:05 0 0 14055 11 20 79 79 02:06 0 155 11 20 79 79 02:07 0 2 155 11 79 79 02:08 0 0 155 11 <th colspan="5">Volumes for: Thursday, May 14, 2009</th> <th>City:</th> <th>Nipon</th> <th>10</th> <th>NB</th> <th></th> <th>Da SB</th> <th>nily To</th> <th>otals EB</th> <th>WB</th> <th>Total</th>	Volumes for: Thursday, May 14, 2009					City:	Nipon	10	NB		Da SB	nily To	otals EB	WB	Total		
PM Felicit NB SB EP VB PM Period NB SB PP VB 0000 0 0 0 12.00 9 10 0	Location:	Osa	ge St	btv	vn Camii	10 Caba	allo &	Project	09-7194	-003	618		536		0	0	1.154
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	AM Period	Galí NB	nino f	SB	E	B	WB		PM Period	NB		SB		FB	WB		
00:15 0 12:15 7 6 00:30 0 1 12:15 7 6 00:45 0 0 13:0 13 32 68 01:50 0 0 13:05 12 9 68 01:15 0 0 13:15 12 9 7 01:15 0 0 13:15 12 9 7 01:15 0 0 14:00 13 14 79 02:15 0 0 14:45 7 6 70 70 02:16 0 0 14:45 7 6 70 70 03:16 1 0 15:15 38 20 70 70 70 03:20 1 0 15:05 11 11 11 70 04:50 2 0 2 15:05 14 8 39 32 32 3	00:00	0		0					12:00	9		10					3
600:96 3 1 2 12.30 14 13 00:96 3 1 2 5 12.26 6 36 3 3 1 68 01:00 0 0 13:00 1 7 7 7 7 01:15 0 0 1 1 13:30 11 15 9 01:20 0 0 1 1 13:30 11 15 7 7 01:20 0 0 14:00 13 14 70 70 01:20 0 0 14:00 13 14 43 70 01:20 0 0 15:00 11 12:00 11 124 10 10 10	00:15	0		0					12:15	7		6					
-0.069 3 2 3 2 3 2 63 32 63 64 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11 12 11 12 11 12 11 12 11 12 11 12 11	00:30	0	2	1	2			r	12:30	14	20	13	22				~
Barry Book Description Description <thdescription< th=""> <thdescription< th=""></thdescription<></thdescription<>	01:00		3	<u>1</u>				3	12:45		30	3	32				68
01:55 0 1 1 1330 11 15 00:56 0 1 1 12345 8 80 10 14 79 00:50 0 0 1 1600 13 14 70 70 00:50 0 0 1630 2 9 70 70 70 00:50 0 0 1630 11 20 70 70 70 00:50 0 0 1500 11 20 70 70 70 70 70 00:50 0 0 10 1500 11 20 70	01:00	0		0					13:15	12		9					
Onces 0 1 1 1 1 1 345 8 38 10 41 79 02:00 0 0 14:45 7 6 100	01:30	0		0					13:30	11		15					
02:00 0 14:00 13 14 02:15 0 0 14:30 2 9 02:00 0 0 11 20 70 03:00 0 0 11 20 70 03:00 0 0 15:00 11 20 70 03:00 0 0 15:00 11 20 70 03:00 0 0 15:00 11 11 70 03:00 0 0 16:00 8 14 124 04:00 0 0 16:00 8 14 124 04:00 0 0 16:00 8 14 124 04:00 1 10 17:05 10 21 124 05:00 0 0 17:05 10 21 124 05:00 1 11 17:05 11 20 14:15 16 05:00 1 11 20 18:20 11 28 9 47	01:45	0		1	1			1	13:45	8	38	10	41				79
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	02:00	0		0					14:00	13		14					
a_{245} 0 0 1 20 14 43 70 a_{350} 0 0 1500 11 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 20 1 21 1 11 </td <td>02:15</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>14:15</td> <td>7</td> <td></td> <td>6</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	02:15	0		0					14:15	7		6					
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	02:45	õ		õ					14:45	5	27	14	43				70
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	03:00	0		0			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		15:00	11		20					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	03:15	1		0					15:15	38		20					
0:450 0 2 1:545 7 67 6 57 124 0:400 0 0 1:500 8 14 0 1:24 1:40 0:415 1 0 1:500 8 8 8 9 9 0:450 0 2 0 2 1:500 8 9 9 0:450 0 1 1:715 10 21 10 10 10 0:550 1 4 2 4 8 177:0 8 9 7 75 0:563 3 4 2 4 8 177:0 8 9 47 75 0:565 1 3 11 30 18:30 11 8 65 65 0:705 2 4 11:50 3 16 30 16 30 16 30 16 30 16 30 17 16 30 16 30 30 30 30 30 30 30	03:30	1	-	0					15:30	11		11					
04:00 0 0 0 1603 8 14 04:15 1 0 16:15 8 8 9 04:30 1 0 2 0 2 16:45 9 9 05:00 0 0 17:45 10 21 10 10 10 05:30 1 1 17:45 3 28 9 47 75 05:30 1 1 17:45 3 28 9 47 75 05:30 8 2 18:30 11 8 66:60 21 75 05:30 8 2 18:30 11 8 66:5 6 9 3 11 30 18:45 4 26 4 39 65 65 67:30 16 65 65 67:30 16 72 72 72 49 49 20:50 20:30 6 3 65 67:30 16 37 37 65 37 65 37 65 <	03:45		2	0				2	15:45	/	6/	6	57				124
04:30 1 0 2 16:30 10 9 04:35 0 2 0 2 16:45 17 43 6 39 62 05:00 0 1 17:00 6 9 . <th< td=""><td>04:00</td><td>1</td><td></td><td>0</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>16:00</td><td>8 8</td><td></td><td>14 8</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>	04:00	1		0					16:00	8 8		14 8					
0+45 0 2 0 2 1645 17 43 8 39 82 05:00 0 0 17:00 8 9 - <td>04:30</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>õ</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>16:30</td> <td>10</td> <td></td> <td>9</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	04:30	1		õ					16:30	10		9					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	04:45	0	2	0				2	16:45	17	43	8	39				82
0515 0 1 17.15 10 21 0530 1 1 17.30 7 8 0549 3 4 2 4 1800 8 11 0649 3 2 1815 3 16 10 10 0649 6 19 3 11 30 1944 4 26 4 39 65 0740 5 2 1900 4 7 77 70 77 70 77 70 77 70 77 70 77 70 77 70	05:00	0		0					17:00	8		9					
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	05:15	0		1					17:15	10		21					
office 2 4 0 </td <td>05:30</td> <td>1 3</td> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> <td>4</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>8</td> <td>17:30</td> <td>/ 3</td> <td>28</td> <td>8 Q</td> <td>47</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>75</td>	05:30	1 3	4	1	4			8	17:30	/ 3	28	8 Q	47				75
06:15 3 2 18:15 3 16 06:30 8 2 18:30 11 8 06:45 6 19 3 11 30 18:30 11 8 06:45 6 19 3 11 30 18:45 4 26 4 39 65 07:00 5 2 19:00 4 7	05:00	2		<u>-</u> 4					18:00		40	11	-1/		**************************************		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	06:15	3		2					18:15	3		16					
06:45 6 19 3 11 30 18:45 4 26 4 39 65 07:00 5 2 19:00 4 7	06:30	8		2					18:30	11		8					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	06:45	6	19	3	11			30	18:45	4	26	4	39	····			65
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	07:00	5		2 4					19:00	4		7					
07:45 11 55 9 22 77 19:45 7 22 7 27 49 08:00 16 6 20:00 5 3 <td>07:15</td> <td>25 14</td> <td></td> <td>7</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>19:15</td> <td>о З</td> <td></td> <td>5 8</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	07:15	25 14		7					19:15	о З		5 8					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	07:45	11	55	9	22			77	19:45	7	22	7	27				49
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	08:00	16		6					20:00	5		3					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	08:15	8		8					20:15	2		4					
05:45 43 91 20 33 150 20:45 6 21 6 16 37 09:00 11 5 21:00 6 3 90:15 7 6 21:00 6 3 90:15 7 6 21:15 4 1 90:00 10 6 21:30 3 8 90:45 17 41 6 19 60 21:45 6 19 6 18 37 10:00 6 8 22:00 1 0 10:15 3 6 22:30 2 2 14 11:15 10:15 3 6 22:30 2 2 14 11:15 13 7 14 11:15 13 7 14 11:15 13 7 14 11:15 13 7 14 11:15 13 7 14 11:15 13 7 14 11:15 14 15 14:15	08:30	24 42	01	25	FO			150	20:30	6	24	3	16				77
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	00:00	43	91	<u>20</u>	_ 39			150	20:45	<u> </u>	- 21	2	10		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		3/
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	09:00	7		6					21:00	4		1					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	09:30	6		2					21:30	3		8					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	09:45	17	41	6	19			60	21:45	6	19	6	18				37
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	10:00	6		8					22:00	1		0					
10:30 5 22 4 22:30 2 7 1 10:45 5 22 4 22:45 0 7 2 7 14 11:00 7 4 23:00 1 2 1 11 1 11 1 11 1 1 11:10 1 <td>10:15</td> <td>3</td> <td></td> <td>6 1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>22:15</td> <td>4</td> <td></td> <td>3</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	10:15	3		6 1					22:15	4		3					
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	10:30	5	22	4	22			44	22:30	2	7	2	7				14
11:15 13 7 23:15 1 0 11:30 11 1 1 23:30 0 0 11:45 12 43 15 27 70 23:45 0 2 1 3 5 Total Vol. 282 167 449 336 369 705 NB SB EB WB Total AM PM Split % 62:8% 37.2% 38:9% 47.7% 52.3% 61.1% Volume 91 59 150 PM PM Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 08:00 14:45 14:45 Volume 91 59 150 Volume 67 65 130 P.H.F. 0.529 0.590 0.595 P.H.F. 0.441 0.813 0.560 7.9 Vol: 146 81 227 4.* 6 Vol. 71 86 157 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 Volume	11:00	7		4					23:00	1		2	-				
11:30 11 1 23:30 0 0 11:45 12 43 15 27 70 23:45 0 2 1 3 5 Total Vol. 282 167 449 336 369 705 NB SB EB WB Total Daily Totals : 618 536 0 0 1,154 PM Split % 62:8% 37.2% 38:9% 47.7% 52.3% 61:1% AM PM PM PM PM PM PM PA Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 14:45 14:45 Volume 91 59 150 Volume 67 65 130 P.H.F. 0.529 0.590 0.595 P.H.F. 0.441 0.813 0.560 7 - 9 Vol. 146 81 227 <td>11:15</td> <td>13</td> <td></td> <td>7</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>23:15</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	11:15	13		7					23:15	1		0					
11:45 12 43 15 27 70 23:45 0 2 1 3 5 Total Vol. 282 167 449 336 369 705 NB SB EB WB Total Daily Totals : 618 536 0 0 1,154 PM PM PM PM PM PM PM Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 PM Peak Hr. 15:00 14:45 14:45 Volume 91 59 150 PM Peak Hr. 0.813 0.560 7 - 9 Vol: 146 81 227 4 - 6 Vol. 71 86 157 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 08:00 08:00 16:30 16:30 16:30 Volume 91 59 150 Volume 47 92 Volume 91 59 150 Volume 47 92 Volume 91 59 150 Volume 47 92	11:30	11		1					23:30	0	_	0	_				_
Total Vol. 282 167 449 336 369 705 NB SB EB WB Total Total Total AM Total AM Total AM PM Pack Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 PM 15:00 14:45 14:45 14:45 14:45 14:45 14:45 14:45 14:45 14:45 14:45 14:45 15:00 14:45 14:45 14:45 14:45 14:45 14:45 14:45 14:45 14:45 15:00 14:45 15:00 14:45	11:45	12	43	15				70	23:45	0	2	1	3				5
AM PM SB EB WB Total Split % 62:8% 37.2% 38:9% 47.7% 52:3% 61.1% AM PM PM 14:45 14:45 14:45 14:45 Volume 91 59 150 Volume 67 65 130 P.H.F. 0.529 0.590 0.595 P.H.F. 0.441 0.813 0.560 7 - 9 Vol. 146 81 227 4 - 6 Vol. 71 86 157 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 08:00 16:30 16:30 Volume 91 59 150 Volume 67 65 130 P.H.F. 0.529 0.590 0.595 P.H.F. 0.441 0.813 0.560 7 - 9 Vol. 146 81 227 4 - 6 Vol. 71 86 157 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 92 150 Volume 4	Total Vol.		282		167			449			336		369			generation and the	705
AM PM Split % 62:8% 37.2% 38:9% 47.7% 52:3% 61.1% AM PM PM PM 14:45 14:45 14:45 Volume 91 59 150 Volume 67 65 130 P.H.F. 0.529 0.590 0.595 P.H.F. 0.441 0.813 0.560 7 - 9.Vol. 146 81 227 4 - 6 Vol. 71 86. 157 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 08:00 16:30 16:30 16:30 Volume 91 59 150 Volume 45 47 92											NB		SB		EB	WB	Total
Split % 62:8% 37:2% 38:9% 47:7% 52:3% 61:1% AM P PM P 14:45						-			Daily To	als :	618		536		0	0	1,154
AM PM PM Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 Peak Hr. 15:00 14:45 14:45 Volume 91 59 150 Volume 67 65 130 P.H.F. 0.529 0.590 0.595 P.H.F. 0.441 0.813 0.560 7 - 9 Vol. 146 81 227 4 - 6 Vol. 71 86 157 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 Peak Hr. 16:30 16:30 Volume 91 59 150 Volume 45 47 92	Split %		67.8%		37.2%	ויית		38.9%			47.7%		52 3%	ſ	1/1		61 1%
Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 Peak Hr. 15:00 14:45 14:45 Volume 91 59 150 Volume 67 65 130 P.H.F. 0.529 0.590 0.595 P.H.F. 0.441 0.813 0.560 7 - 9 Vol. 146 81 227 4 - 6 Vol. 71 86 157 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 Peak Hr. 16:30 16:30 16:30 Volume 91 59 150 Volume 45 47 92	AM								PM								
P.H.F. 0.529 0.590 0.595 P.H.F. 0.441 0.813 0.560 7 - 9 Vol. 146 81 227 4 - 6 Vol. 71 86 157 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 Peak Hr. 16:30 16:30 16:30 Volume 91 59 150 Volume 45 47 92	Peak Hr.		-08:00		08:00			08:00	Peak Hr.		15:00		14:45				14:45
7 - 9 Vol. 146 81 227 4 - 6 Vol. 71 86 157 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 08:00 16:30 16:30 16:30 Volume 91 59 150 Volume 45 47 92	P.H.F.		0,529		0.590			0.595	PiHiFi		0/		0.813				0,560
Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 Peak Hr. 16:30 16:30 16:30 Volume 91 59 150 Volume 45 47 92	7 - 9 Voli		146		81			227	4 - 6 Vol.				86				157
volume 45 4/ 92	Peak Hr.		08:00		08:00			08:00	Peak Hr.		16:30		16:30				16:30
P.H.F. 0.529 0.590 0.742	PiH.F.		0.529		0.590			0,595	P.H.F.		0.662		0.560				92 0.742

Prepared	by	NDS/ATD
----------	----	---------

Decknown Camina Caballa & Project 09 794-003 600 597 0 0 1,2237 All fead No Sil EB WB PRI Period. NB Sil Sil FB WB 90:00 0 0 1245 11 7 0 <t< th=""><th>Volumes</th><th>for:</th><th>Tueso</th><th>iay, I</th><th>May 19, 200</th><th>9</th><th>City:</th><th>Nipol</th><th>mo</th><th>NB</th><th></th><th>D SB</th><th>aily To</th><th>als FB</th><th>W/R</th><th>Total</th></t<>	Volumes	for:	Tueso	iay, I	May 19, 200	9	City:	Nipol	mo	NB		D SB	aily To	als FB	W/R	Total	
And fields (2000) Column (2001) Column (2001) <thcolumn (2001)<="" th=""> Column (2001) Colum</thcolumn>	Location:	Osa	ige St	btv	vn Camino (Caballo &	Project:	09-7194	4-003	640		597		<u> </u>	0	1 227	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	AM Period	Cali NB	nino i	Koble SB	EB	WB		PM Period	NB		SB		FB	WB		47257	
00:30 0 2 12:35 11 7 00:30 0 1 3 12:25 11 7 00:30 0 1 3 12:26 4 36 5 29 65 01:30 0 1 13:15 6 8 4 4 65 01:30 0 1 13:15 6 8 4 4 65 01:30 0 1 13:15 6 8 4 4 64 01:30 0 1 14:15 6 15 6 1 64 13 44 84 64 02:30 0 0 15:00 14 29 163 6 13 60:30 0 1 16:00 9 13 6 14 17 57 98 163 163 163 163 163 163 165 163 165 163	00:00	0		0				12:00	5		9						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	00:15	0		2				12:15	11		7						
	00:30	U O		0	3		з	12:30	16 4	36	8	20				C.F.	
cut13 0 13415 6 0 cut30 0 1 2 2 1385 3 6 cut30 0 0 1 2 2 1385 2 18 13 43 61 cut30 0 0 14405 8 8 8 7 </td <td>01:00</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td>12,75</td> <td>7</td> <td></td> <td> 16</td> <td>29</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>05</td>	01:00			1			5	12,75	7		 16	29				05	
01.350 0 1.300 3 6 01.45 0 1 2 2 3345 2 18 13 43 61 02.15 0 0 1440 18 8 6 15 61 02.15 0 0 1440 7 8 7 8 7 02.55 0 0 14530 7 8 7 8 7 02.05 0 0 1550 14 20 7 81 13 84 84 03.15 1 0 1550 17 82 7 83 9 80 85 14 90 13 145 14 14 14 14 14 15 14 14 15 14 16 15 14 16 15 14 16 15 14 16 15 16 16 15 16 16 15 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 </td <td>01:15</td> <td>Õ</td> <td></td> <td>Ô</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>13:15</td> <td>6</td> <td></td> <td>8</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	01:15	Õ		Ô				13:15	6		8						
0.0450 0 1 2 2 138 43 43 61 0240 0 0 1445 6 15 13 43 61 02430 0 0 1445 6 15 13 44 64 02450 0 0 1445 9 40 13 44 64 02450 0 0 15515 40 20 15 44 64 03450 0 2 0 2 155515 17 22 15 12 63 9 80 1653 0450 0 1 1 165515 14 14 17 57 58 06500 0 0 17/15 14 14 16 55 10 55 10 55 101 14 16 2 16 15 17/15 18 64 16 16 16 16 <td>01:30</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>13:30</td> <td>3</td> <td></td> <td>6</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	01:30	0		0				13:30	3		6						
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	01:45	0		1	2		2	13:45	2	18	13	43				61	
$a_{11}a_{12}$ $a_{$	02:00	0		0				14:00	18 6		8						
0.2656 0 1445 9 40 13 44 84 6300 0 1500 12 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 1000 100 100 <	02:15	0		õ				14:15	0 7		15						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	02:45	0		0				14:45	9	40	13	44				84	
00:15:1 1 0 15:35 40 20 00:30 1 0 15:30 17 22 15:30 17 22 09:45:0 0 1 16:00 9 13 9 80 16:3 04:10:0 1 16:00 9 13 14 14 14 04:10:0 1 0 2 3 16:15 14 14 17 57 98 06:00 0 0 17:00 17 18 13 101 100 101 100 101 100 101 100 101 100 101 100 101 100 101 100 101 100 101 101 100 101 101 100 110 101 <td>03:00</td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>15:00</td> <td>14</td> <td></td> <td>29</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	03:00	0		0				15:00	14		29						
03:86 0 1536 17 22 03:86 0 0 1 1500 9 13 04:00 0 1 1500 9 13 04:00 0 1 1515 14 14 04:00 0 0 1633 7 13 04:00 0 0 1633 7 13 04:00 0 0 1700 17 17 04:00 0 0 1775 14 16 05:00 0 0 1775 14 16 05:01 1 1 1 2 1775 6 45 10 56 05:00 1 1 1 2 1775 6 45 10 56 101 06:01 1 1 10 18:00 14 12 60 56 101 06:02 13 3 7 20 18:45 6 35 5 101 101 101 101 <td>03:15</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>15:15</td> <td>40</td> <td></td> <td>20</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	03:15	1		0				15:15	40		20						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	03:30	1	2	0			n	15:30	17	07	22	90				163	
0+15 0 1 1615 14 14 0+30 1 0 2 3 1645 7 13 0+45 0 1 0 2 3 1645 14 17 57 98 0500 0 0 1715 14 16	04.00	_0		1		- 47. VA II	2	15:00	12		12	60				163	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	04:15	õ		1				16:15	14		13 14						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	04:30	1		0				16:30	7		13						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	04:45	0	1	0	2		3	16:45	11	41	17	57				98	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	05:00	0		0				17:00	17		17						
0545 1 1 1 1 2 17.45 6 45 10 55 101 0645 1 1 18:00 14 12 101 101 0645 2 13 3 7 20 18:15 7 9 6 6 15 0746 12 1 19:00 6 15 6 7 6 7 6 7 7 9 0730 12 1 19:00 6 15 15 7 7 9 6 6 15 7 7 9 6 6 15 7 9 100 10	05:15	0		0				17:15	14 o		16						
06:00 1 1 16:00 14 12 10:0 10:0 06:00 1 18:00 14 12 12 10:0	05:45	i	1	1	1		2	17:50	о б	45	13	56				101	
66:15 4 2 18:15 7 9 06:30 6 1 18:30 6 8 6 06:30 6 1 19:00 6 15 6 07:00 12 1 19:00 6 15 7 67 07:30 22 7 19:30 8 5 7 51 07:45 20 66 10 22 88 19:45 5 1 08:00 18 5 20:15 5 1 9 6 9 08:15 9 7 20:30 7 6 6 9 16 10 10	06:00	1		1				18:00	14		12				****		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	06:15	4		2				18:15	7		9						
06:45 2 13 3 7 20 18:45 6 33 5 34 67 07:00 12 1 19:00 6 15 15 15 07:15 12 4 19:15 8 6 15 15 07:45 20 66 10 22 88 19:45 2 24 1 27 51 08:00 18 5	06:30	6		1	_			18:30	6		8						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		2	13	3	7		20	18:45	6	33	5	34				67	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	07:00	12		1				19:00	6		15						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	07:30	22		7				19:15	8		5						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	07:45	20	66	10	22		88	19:45	2	24	1	27				51	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	08:00	18		5				20:00	3		9						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	08:15	9		7				20:15	5		1						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	08:30	19		27				20:30	7		6						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	00:00	42	00	2/	00	×	154	20:45		16	2	18				34	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	09:00	8		2				21:00	9 5		6 2						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	09:30	7		9				21:30	8		3						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	09:45	4	26	8	22		48	21:45	2	24	3	14				38	
10:15 11 3 22:15 3 2 10:30 10 11 22:30 3 1 10:45 4 32 8 29 61 22:45 8 19 2 12 31 11:00 7 5 23:00 1 3 11:15 6 6 23:15 2 1 11:30 5 7 23:30 4 4 4 16 16 11:30 5 7 23:30 4 4 4 16 16 11:30 5 7 23:30 4 4 4 16 16 11:45 6 24 3 21 45 23:45 1 8 8 9 Total Vol. 253 175 428 387 422 809 7 16 PM 53 175 428 387 422 809 Otal Vol. 253 175 428 387 422 809	10:00	7		7				22:00	5		7		_				
10:30 10 11 22:30 3 1 10:45 4 32 8 29 61 22:45 8 19 2 12 31 11:00 7 5 23:00 1 3 1 31 31 11:15 6 6 23:00 1 3 1 1 31 31 31 11:15 6 6 1 23:30 4 4 4 16 16 11:30 5 7 23:30 4 4 4 16 16 Total Vol. 253 175 428 387 422 809 NB SB EB WB Total Paily Totals : 640 597 0 1,237 PM Split %o 59.1% 40.9% 34.6% 47.8% 52.2% 65.4% A 15:00 14:45 14:45 PM 15:00 14:45 14:45 <	10:15	11		3				22:15	3		2						
11:00 7 5 23:00 1 3 11:15 6 6 23:00 1 3 11:15 6 6 23:15 2 1 11:30 5 7 23:30 4 4 11:45 6 24 3 21 45 23:45 1 8 0 8 16 Total Vol. 253 175 428 387 422 809 NB SB EB WB Total O 0 34.6% 47.8% 52.2% 65.4% PM Split % 59.1% 40.9% 34.6% 47.8% 52.2% 65.4% M PM PM Volume 83 84 164 P.H.F. 0.524 0.611 0.558 P.H.F. 0.519 0.724 0.683 <td co<="" td=""><td>10:30</td><td>4</td><td>32</td><td>8</td><td>29</td><td></td><td>61</td><td>22:30</td><td>3</td><td>19</td><td>1</td><td>17</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>21</td></td>	<td>10:30</td> <td>4</td> <td>32</td> <td>8</td> <td>29</td> <td></td> <td>61</td> <td>22:30</td> <td>3</td> <td>19</td> <td>1</td> <td>17</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>21</td>	10:30	4	32	8	29		61	22:30	3	19	1	17				21
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	11:00	7		5			V 4	23:00	1		3					31	
11:30 5 7 23:30 4 4 11:45 6 24 3 21 45 23:45 1 8 0 8 16 Total Vol. 253 175 428 387 422 809 Daily Totals : 040 59 0 0 1,237 MB SB EB WB Total Daily Totals : 640 597 0 0 1,237 PM PM PM PM PM PM PM Split % 59.1% 40.9% 34.6% 47.8% 52.2% 655.4% 65.4% Volume 88 66 154 Volume 83 84 164 P.H.F. 0.524 0.611 0.558 P.H.F. 0.519 0.724 0.683 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 86 113 199 Peak Hr, 08:00 08:00 08:00 08:00 08:00 16:45 16:30 16:45 16:45 16:30	11:15	б		6				23:15	2		1						
11:45 6 24 3 21 45 23:45 1 8 0 8 16 Total Vol. 253 175 428 387 422 809 NB SB EB WB Total Daily Totals : 640 597 0 0 1,237 AM PM PM PM PM Figure 83 84 14:45 14:45 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 83 84 16 Peak Hr. 0524 0.611 0.558 P.H.F. 0.519 0.724 0.6833 7 - 9 Vol 154 88 242 86 113 199 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 08:00 08:00 14:45 16:45 16:45 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 86 113 199 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 08:00 08:00 <	11:30	5		7				23:30	4		4						
Total Vol. 253 175 428 387 422 809 NB SB EB WB Total Daily Totals : 640 597 0 0 1237 AM Pack Hr. 08:00 08:00 PM PM Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 Peak Hr. 15:00 14:45 14:45 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 83 84 164 P.H.F. 0.524 0.611 0.558 242 4*6 Vol. 86 113 199 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 08:00 08:00 16:45 16:45 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 50 63 13 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 50 63 13 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 50 63 13 Volume	11:45	6	24	3	21		45	23:45	1	8	0	8				16	
NB SB EB WB Total Daily Totals : 640 597 0 0 1,237 AM PM PM PM PM PM PM Peak Hr, 08:00 08:00 Peak Hr, 15:00 14:45 14:45 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 83 84 164 P.H.F. 0.524 0.611 0.558 P.H.F. 0.519 0.724 0.683 7 - 9 Vol. 154 88 242 4 - 6 Vol. 86 113 199 Peak Hr, 08:00 08:00 09:00 Peak Hr. 16:45 16:45 16:45 Volume 88 66 04:00 90:00 90:00 90:00 90:00 90:00 16:45 16:45 16:45 Volume 88 66 04:00 90:00 90:00 90:00 90:00 90:00 90:00 90:00 90:00 90:00 90:00	Total Vol.		253		175		428			387		422				809	
AM PM Split % 59.1% 40.9% 34.6% 47.8% 52.2% 65.4% AM Peak Hr. 08:00 9eak Hr. 15:00 14:45 14:45 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 83 84 164 P.H.F. 0.524 0.611 0.558 P.H.F. 0.519 0.724 0.683 7 - 9 Vol. 154 88 242 4 - 6 Vol. 86 113 199 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 16:45 16:45 16:45 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 86 113 199 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 08:00 16:45 16:45 16:45 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 50 63 113 P.H.F. 0.524 0.611 0.558 P.H.F 0.735 0.926 113										NB		SB		B	WB	Total	
Alti PM Split % 59.1% 40.9% 34.6% 47.8% 52.2% 65.4% AM Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 Peak Hr. 15:00 14:45 14:45 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 83 84 164 P.H.F. 0.524 0.611 0.558 P.H.F. 0.519 0.724 0.683 7 - 9 Vol. 154 88 242 4 - 6 Vol. 86 113 199 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 Peak Hr. 16:45 16:45 16:45 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 50 63 13 P.H.F. 0.524 0.611 0.558 P.H F. 0.735 0.016								Daily To	tals :	640		597		0	0	1,237	
AM PM PA/10/70 52/270 65/4% Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 Peak Hr. 15:00 14:45 14:45 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 83 84 164 P.H.F. 0.524 0.611 0.558 P.H.F. 0.519 0.724 0.683 7 - 9 Vol. 154 88 242 4~6 Vol. 86 113 199 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 Peak Hr. 16:45 16:45 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 50 63 113 P.H.F. 0.524 0.611 0.558 P.H.F. 0.724 0.603 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 50 63 113 P.H.F. 0.524 0.611 0.558 P.H.F. 0.735 0.936	Snlit %		59 104		40.9%	M(!)	34 60/-			47:00/-		F2 20/	- PV	1		CE AN	
Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 Peak Hr. 15:00 14:45 14:45 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 83 84 164 P;H.F. 0.524 0.611 0.558 P.H.F. 0.519 0,724 0.683 7 - 9 Vol. 154 88 242 4 - 6 Vol. 86 113 199 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 08:00 Peak Hr. 16:45 16:30 16:45 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 50 63 113 P.H.F. 0.524 0.611 0.558 P.H.F. 0.735 0.936 133	AM		55.170		1912/19		J4.070	PM		<u>-7/.0%</u>		32.270				05.4%	
Volume 65 66 154 Volume 83 84 164 P.H.F. 0.524 0.611 0.558 P.H.F. 0.519 0.724 0.683 7 - 9 Vol. 154 88 242 4 - 6 Vol. 86 113 199 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 98:00 Peak Hr. 16:45 16:30 16:45 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 50 63 113 P.H.F. 0.524 0.611 0.558 P.H.F. 0.735 0.976 0.976	Peak Hr,		08:00		08:00		08:00	Peak Hr.		15:00		14:45				14:45	
7 - 9 Vol. 154 88 242 4 - 6 Vol. 86 113 199 Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 Peak Hr. 16:45 16:30 16:45 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 50 63 113 P.H.F. 0.524 0.611 0.558 P.H.F. 0.735 0.016 103	P.H.F.		0:524		0.611		154 0.558	Volume P.H.F		83 0 5 10		84 0.724				164	
Peak Hr. 08:00 08:00 Peak Hr. 16:45 16:30 16:45 Volume 88 66 154 Volume 50 63 113 P.H.F. 0.524 0.611 0.558 P.H.F. 0.735 0.016 103	7 - 9 Vol.		154	<u>.</u>	88		242	4 - 6 Vol.		86		113				199	
volume 88 66 154 Volume 50 63 113 PiHiFi 0.524 0.611 0.558 PiH F 0.735 0.016 0.016	e Peak Hr.		08:00		08:00		08:00	Peak Hr.		16:45		16:30				16:45	
	P.H.F.		0.524		0.611		154	VOIUME				63 0 014				113	

PINNACLE TRAFFIC ENGINEERING

330 Tres Pinos Road • Suite B2-12 • Hollister, CA 95023

(831) 638-9260 • FAX (831) 638-9268

PinnacleTE.com

Nipomo Community Park Master Plan EIR; San Luis Obispo County, CA

Intersection: Pomeroy Road and Camino Caballo

Weather: Clear & Dry

Date: 5/19/09 (Tue.)

Count Conducted By: Mike Shire

Beginning	Inters	ection	Turnin	ig Mov	ement	- Direc	ction /	Turnin	g Mov	ement			Totals	
Time	No	rthbou	ind	W	estbou	nd	So	uthbou	ind	Ea	astbou	nd		
of Count	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	15-Min.	Hourly
Direction	LT	ТН	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	TH	RT	LT	ТН	RT		
4:00-4:15 PM	20	66	1	2	0	0	0	75	4	3	0	22	193	
4:15-4:30 PM	33	75	5	1	0	0	2	75	1	1	0	21	214	
4:30-4:45 PM	26	73	4	1	0	0	2	82	5	0	1	18	212	
4:45-5:00 PM	38	87	4	1	0	1		71	2	2	0	16	222	841
5:00-5:15 PM	31	81	4	0	0	1	0	64	3	4	0	17	205	853
5:15-5:30 PM	23	72	6	5	0	0	1	70	3	3	0	16	199	838
5:30-5:45 PM	28	70	7	1	0	2	2	80	4	- 2	1	12	209	835
5:45-6:00 PM	20	96	4	1	0	1	0	69	3	5	0	24	223	836
2 Hour Totals :	219	620	35	12	0	5	7	586	25	20	2	146		

					Pea	k Perio	d						
Direction	NBLT	NBTH	NBRT	WBLT	WBTH	WBRT	SBLT	SBTH	SBRT	EBLT	EBTH	EBRT	Total
4:15-5:15 PM	128	316	17	3	0	2	4	292	11	7	1	72	853

PM PEAK HOUR FACTOR = 853 / 4 x 222 = 0.96



National Data & Surveying Services

TMC Summary of West Tefft St/Pomeroy Rd

Project #: 09-7193-001



CONTROL: Signalized

AM PEAK HOUR	<u>0 AM</u>
Noon Peak Hour	0 AM
PM PEAK HOUR	415 PM

Prepared by: National Data & Surveying Services

N-S STREET:	West T	efft St			DATE:	05/19/	L9/2009 LOCATION: City of					of Nipomo		
E-W STREET:	Pomero	oy Rd			DAY:	TUESD	AY		PRO.	JECT#	09-7193	3-001		
	NC	ORTHBO	JND	S	OUTHBO	UND	E	ASTBOL	IND	V	VESTBOL	IND		
LANES:	NL 1	NT 2	NR 0	SL 0	ST 2	SR 0	EL 1	ET 0	ER 1	WL 0	WT 0	WR 0	TOTAL	
1:00 PM 1:15 PM 1:30 PM 1:45 PM 2:00 PM 2:15 PM 2:30 PM 2:45 PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 3:45 PM 4:00 PM 4:15 PM 4:30 PM 4:45 PM 5:00 PM 5:15 PM 5:30 PM 5:45 PM 6:30 PM 6:30 PM	15 35 37 26 27 38 34 22	104 108 118 100 112 69 103 95			125 131 134 150 145 139 145 105	74 82 66 96 88 75 69 89	63 53 62 57 52 56 51 55		24 43 32 24 31 30 39 33				405 452 449 453 455 407 441 399	
VOLUMES =	NL 234	NT 809	NR 0	SL 0	ST 1074	SR 639	EL 449	ET 0	ER 256	WL 0	WT 0	WR 0	TOTAL 3461	
PM Pea	ık Hr Be	gins at:	415	PM										
Peak Volumes =	125	438	0	0	560	332	224	0	130	0	0	0	1809	
PEAK HR. FACTOR:		0.908			0.907			0.922			0.000		0.994	

CONTROL: Signalized



National Data & Surveying Services

TMC Summary of West Tefft St/Orchard Rd

SOUTHBOUND APPROACH LANES Ν 1 1 1 West Tefft St TOTAL 405 215 99 405 99 215 δ NOON 0 0 0 Æ **Orchard Rd** ο 0 0 **Orchard Rd** Ē (average J EASTBOUND APPROACH LANES WESTBOUND APPROACH LANES TOTAL AM NOON PM AM NOON **P**M TOTAL 0 30 0 0 30 0 1 0 183 183 1 0 6 0 6 0 0 8 0.5 8 205-74-4-0 4 0 0 4 200 ia: 0.5 0 0 71 71 1 P CALIFICATION OF CONTRACT 340 δ 2 4 NOON 0 0 Q TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT A Q 0 0 West Tefft St / Orchard Rd West Tefft St (Intersection Name) TOTAL 36 2 4 1 1 1 5/19/09 Tuesday Date Day NORTHBOUND APPROACH LANES COUNT PERIODS am noon 4:00 PM -6:00 PM pm

CONTROL: Signalized

AM PEAK HOUR 0 AM NOON PEAK HOUR 0 AM PM PEAK HOUR 415 PM

Project #: 09-7193-002

National Data & Surveying Services

N-S STREET:	West 1	Fefft St			DATE:	05/19/3	2009		LOC	ATION:	City of	Nipomo	
E-W STREET:	Orchai	rd Rd			DAY:	TUESD	AY		PRO.	DECT#	09-719	3-002	
	N	ORTHBO	UND	SC	DUTHBO	UND	[ASTBOU	ND	W	/ESTBOl	JND	·
LANES:	NL 1	NT 1	NR 1	SL 1	ST 1	SR 1	EL 0	ET 1	ER 0	WL 0.5	WT 0.5	WR 1	TOTAL
1:00 PM 1:15 PM 1:30 PM 2:00 PM 2:15 PM 2:30 PM 2:45 PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 3:45 PM 4:00 PM 4:15 PM 4:30 PM 4:45 PM 5:00 PM 5:15 PM 5:30 PM 5:45 PM 6:00 PM 6:15 PM 6:30 PM	0 3 0 1 0 1 0	80 65 103 82 90 58 86 76	10 13 26 11 20 15 17 18	52 51 55 59 50 60 47	92 105 94 94 112 97 116 86	6 21 19 13 13 14 12 9	4 11 10 4 5 10 9 2	1 1 1 2 1 2 1	3 1 1 1 2 0 0	25 22 16 21 12 18 20 15	2 2 4 0 3 4 1	35 55 45 41 37 42 36	310 350 372 333 347 305 369 291
TOTAL VOLUMES =	NL 5	NT 640	NR 130	SL 424	ST 796	SR 107	EL 55	ET 11	ER 9	WL 149	WT 18	WR 333	TOTAL 2677
PM Pe	ak Hr Be	egins at:	415	PM									
Peak Volumes =	4	340	70	215	405	66	30	6	4	71	8	183	1402
PEAK HR. FACTOR:		0,802			0.969			0.769			0.829		0.942
CONTROL:	Signali	ized											

Intersection Turning Movement

National Data & Surveying Services

TMC Summary of West Tefft St/Existing Park Access Rd

.



CONTROL: 1-Way Stop (EB)

AM PEAK HOUR	0 AM
Noon peak hour	0 AM
PM PEAK HOUR	445 PM

National Data & Surveying Services

N-S STREET:	West ⁻	Tefft St	St DATE: 05/19/2009 LOCATION: City of Nipomo)					
E-W STREET:	Existin	ig Park Ai	ccess R	d	DAY:	: TUESD	AY		PRO	JECT#	09-7193	3-003	
]	[N's 8	k OUT	's onl	v					
	N	ORTHBO	UND	S	OUTHBC	UND	E	ASTBO	JND	٧	VESTBOL	IND	·
LANES:	NL 1	NT 1	NR 0	SL 0	ST 1	SR 1	EL 0	ET 1	ER 0	WL 0	WT 0	WR 0	TOTAL
1:00 PM 1:15 PM 1:30 PM 1:45 PM 2:00 PM 2:15 PM 2:30 PM 2:45 PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 3:45 PM 4:00 PM 4:15 PM 4:30 PM 4:45 PM 5:15 PM 5:30 PM 5:15 PM 5:30 PM 6:45 PM 6:45 PM	10 11 5 11 7 12 11 6	34)				$ \begin{array}{c} 11 \\ 20 \\ 12 \\ 8 \\ 13 \\ 14 \\ 20 \\ 12 \\ \hline 5 \\ 3 \end{array} $	12 12 10 14 7 9 13 18		6 6 4 22 12 10 14 12				39 49 31 55 39 45 58 48
TOTAL VOLUMES =	NL 73	NT 0	NR 0	SL 0	ST 0	SR 110	EL 95	ET 0	ER 86	WL O	WT 0	WR 0	TOTAL 364
PM Pea	ak Hr Be	egins at:	445	PM									
PEAK Volumes = Peak Hr. Factor:	41	0 0.854	0	0	0 0.688	55	43	0 0.701	58	0	0 0.000	0	197 0.849
CONTROL:	1-Way	Stop (EB	3)										



National Data & Surveying Services

TMC Summary of Juniper St/Existing Park Access Rd/Pomeroy Rd

Project #: 09-7193-004



CONTROL: 2-Way Stop (NS)

•

AM PEAK HOUR	0 AM
NOON PEAK HOUR	<u>0 AM</u>
PM PEAK HOUR	430 PM

National Data & Surveying Services

N-S STREET:	Junipe Access	r St/Exis Rd	ting Par	k	DATE:	05/19/	2009		LOC/	ATION:	City of	Nipomo		
E-W STREET:	Pomer	oy Rd			DAY:	TUESD	AY		PRO:)ECT#	09-719	3-004		
<u></u>	N	ORTHBO	UND	SC	DUTHBOU	JND	E	ASTBOL	IND	v	VESTBOL	JND		-
LANES:	NL 0	NT 1	NR 0	SL 0	ST 1	SR 0	EL 0	ET 1	ER 0	WL 0	WT 1	WR 0	TOTAL	
1:00 PM 1:15 PM 1:30 PM 1:45 PM 2:00 PM 2:15 PM 2:30 PM 2:45 PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 3:45 PM 4:00 PM 4:15 PM 4:30 PM 4:45 PM 5:00 PM 5:15 PM 5:30 PM 5:45 PM 6:00 PM 6:15 PM	2 2 4 2 3 2 3 2	3 0 1 1 3 0 0 1	7 8 5 5 4 8 3	1 4 2 3 2 4 5 3	1 2 1 3 3 1 0	8 9 21 17 22 17 16 16	14 6 13 10 4 6 6 12	76 91 84 72 73 86 80 81	10 3 6 5 6 4 5 2	5 8 16 12 10 14 14 6	79 99 74 106 88 90 84 94	5 6 5 4 5 8 5 4	211 238 236 238 224 238 227 224	-
6:30 PM 6:45 PM	1	5	26	1	- je	Ġq	33	320	7 <i>a</i> s	46	367	20	936	
Total Volumes =	NL 20	NT 9	NR 48	SL 24	ST 13	SR 126	EL 71	ET 643	ER 41	WL 85	WT 714	WR 42	TOTAL 1836	
PM Pe	ak Hr Be	egins at:	430	PM										
Peak Volumes =	11	5	22	11	9	77	33	315	21	52	358	22	936	
PEAK HR. FACTOR:		0.731			0.898			0.896			0.885		0.983	
CONTROL:	2-Way	Stop (NS	5)											



National Data & Surveying Services

TMC Summary of Post Office Driveway/Existing Park Access Rd

Project #: 09-7193-005



CONTROL: No Control

AM PEAK HOUR 0 AM NOON PEAK HOUR 0 AM PM PEAK HOUR 500 PM

National Data & Surveying Services

N-S STREET:	Post Of	fice Driv	veway		DATE:	·05/19/2	2009		LOC/	ATION:	City of	Nipomo	
E-W STREET:	Existing) Park A	ccess Ro	t.	DAY:	TUESD	AY		PRO.	JECT#	09-719	3-005	
	NC	RTHBO	UND	SC	OUTHBO	UND	E	ASTBOU	ND	M	/ESTBOL	JND	
LANES:	NL 0	NT 0	NR 0	SL 0	ST 1	SR 0	EL 0	ET 1	ER 0	WL 0	WT 1	WR 0	TOTAL
1:00 PM 1:15 PM 1:30 PM 1:45 PM 2:00 PM 2:15 PM 2:30 PM 2:45 PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 3:45 PM 4:00 PM 4:15 PM 4:30 PM 4:45 PM 5:00 PM 5:15 PM 5:30 PM 6:00 PM 6:15 PM				5 11 12 12 6 13 15 19		1 8 2 3 4 5 8	4 3 2 3 0 2 1 3					3 3 5 5 8 6	13 25 19 23 14 24 29 36
6:30 PM 6:45 PM イントラー	5:15	pM=	⇒ (41) ((b)	8					\bigcirc	
TOTAL VOLUMES =	NL 0	NT 0	NR 0	_SL 93	ST 0	SR 34	EL 18	ET O	ER 0	WL 0	WT 0	WR 38	TOTAL 183
PM Pe	ak Hr Be	gins at:	500	PM									
peak Volumes =	0	0	0	53	0	20	6	0	0	0	0	24	103
PEAK HR. FACTOR:		0.000			0.676			0.500			0.750		0.715
CONTROL:	No Con	trol											

Intersection Turning Movement

National Data & Surveying Services

TMC Summary of West Tefft St/Pomeroy Rd



CONTROL: Signalized

AM PEAK HOUR	<u>0 AM</u>
NOON PEAK HOUR	0 AM
PM PEAK HOUR	415 PM

National Data & Surveying Services

N-S STREET:	West T	efft St			DATE:	5/19/20	109		LOCA	TION:	City of N	lipomo	
E-W STREET:	Pomero	oy Rd			DAY:	TUESD/	٩Y		PROJ	ECT#	09-7193	RTOR-	001
				R	ight T	urns	<u>on R</u>	ed					
	NC	ORTHBO	UND	SC	DUTHBOU	JND	E	ASTBOUN	1D	W	/ESTBOU	ND	
LANES:	NL 1	NT 2	NR 0	SL 0	ST 2	SR 0	EL 1	ET 0	ER 1	WL 0	WT 0	WR 0	TOTAL
1:00 PM 1:15 PM 1:30 PM 1:45 PM 2:00 PM 2:15 PM 2:30 PM 2:45 PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 3:45 PM 4:00 PM 4:15 PM 4:30 PM 4:45 PM 5:00 PM 5:15 PM 5:30 PM 5:45 PM 6:30 PM 6:45 PM		·				30 32 22 34 22 21 21 20			13 25 19 13 18 19 21 17				43 57 41 47 40 40 42 37
Total Volumes =	NL 0	NT 0	NR 0	SL 0	ST 0	SR 202	EL O	ET O	ER 145	0 VL	WT 0	WR 0	TOTAL 347
PM Pe	ak Hr Be	gins at:	415	PM									
peak Volumes =	0	0	0	0	0	110	0	0	75	0	0	0	185
PEAK HR. FACTOR: Right Turns	on Red	0.000 include	d in ge	nerai	0.868 count.			0.700			0.000		0.825

CONTROL: Signalized

Intersection Turning Movement

National Data & Surveying Services

TMC Summary of West Tefft St/Orchard Rd



CONTROL: Signalized

AM PEAK HOUR		0 AM
NOON PEAK HOUR		0 AM
PM PEAK HOUR	•	415 PM

Prepared by: National Data & Surveying Services

N-S STREET:	West T	efft St			DATE:	05/19/2	2009		LOC	ATION:	City of	Nipomo	
E-W STREET:	Orchar	d Rđ			DAY:	TUESD	AY		PRO.	JECT#	09-719	3RTOR-	002
				R	iaht 1	lurns	on R	ed					
	NC	ORTHBO	UND	S	OUTHBO	UND	E	ASTBOU	ND	W	/ESTBOI	JND	
LANES:	NL 1	NT 1	NR 1	SL 1	ST 1	SR 1	EL 0	ET 1	ER 0	WL 0.5	WT 0.5	WR 1	TOTAL
1:00 PM 1:15 PM 1:30 PM 1:45 PM 2:00 PM 2:15 PM 2:30 PM 2:45 PM 3:00 PM 3:15 PM 3:30 PM 3:45 PM 4:00 PM 4:15 PM 4:30 PM 4:45 PM 5:15 PM 5:30 PM 5:45 PM 6:00 PM 6:15 PM 6:30 PM			6 10 15 5 9 6 9 8			3 5 7 4 2 4 4 0			3 1 1 1 1 0 0 0			29 44 39 34 37 25 29 30	41 60 62 44 49 35 42 38
TOTAL VOLUMES =	NL 0	NT 0	NR 68	SL 0	ST 0	SR 29	EL O	ET 0	ER 7	WL 0	WT 0	WR 267	TOTAL 371
PM Pe	ak Hr Be	gins at:	415	PM									
Peak Volumes =	0	0	39	0	0	18	0	0	4	0	0	154	215
PEAK HR. FACTOR:		0.650	م الم		0.643	_		1.000			0.875		0.867

Right Turns on Red included in general count.

CONTROL: Signalized

The ability of a highway system to carry traffic is expressed in terms of its "service Level" at critical locations, usually intersections. Service levels are defined as follows:

- "A" Conditions of free unobstructed flow, no delays and all signal phases sufficient in duration to clear all approaching vehicles.
- "B" Conditions of stable flow, very little delay, a few phases are unable to handle all approaching vehicles.
- "C" Conditions of stable flow, delays are low to moderate, full use of peak direction signal phase(s) is experienced.
- "D" Conditions approaching unstable flow, delays are moderate to heavy, significant signal time deficiencies are experienced for short durations during the peak traffic period.
- "E" Conditions of unstable flow, delays are significant, signal phase timing is generally insufficient, congestion exists for extended duration throughout the peak period.
- "F" Conditions of forced flow, travel speeds are low and volumes are well above capacity. This condition is often caused when vehicles released by an upstream signal are unable to proceed because of back-ups from a downstream signal.

LEVELS OF SERVICE DESCRIPTION

Engineering

PINNACLE

TRAFFIC

930 Son Benito Street - Hollister, CA 95023 (831) 638-9260 / FAX (831) 638-9268 South County Traffic Model Update

2006 Annual Report and Fifth Year Update

Final Report

Prepared For San Luis Obispo County





LEVEL-OF-SERVICE METHODOLOGY

Traffic operations have been quantified through the determination of "Level of Service" (LOS). Level of Service is a qualitative measure of traffic operating conditions, whereby a letter grade "A" through "F" is assigned to an intersection or roadway segment representing progressively worsening traffic conditions.

Roadway Segments

Roadway segment Levels-of-Service were estimated using Highway Capacity Manual 2000 (HCM-200) methodologies. For standard-sized roadways (e.g. urban arterials), LOS were estimated utilizing Average Daily Traffic (ADT)-based LOS thresholds. Table 1 shows the ADT-based roadway segment LOS thresholds utilized in this study.

However, the rural nature of the study area introduces the problem of roadways with non-standard characteristics, e.g. roadway lane widths less than 12 feet wide per lane, shoulders less than six feet wide, rough pavement, grade. Non-standard characteristics typically reduce roadway capacity from the traffic thresholds calculated for standard roadways. For the South County Nipomo planning area, non-standard roadways are limited to two-lane collector/local streets and two-lane arterials. The ADT-based roadway segment LOS thresholds presented in Table 1 for two-lane roadways include traffic volume ranges that take into account capacity reductions resulting from non-standard roadway features.

		TABLE 1								
LEVEL-	DF-SERVICE (LOS) CRITERIA FOR ROADWAY SEGMENTS Total Two-way Average Daily Traffic (ADT)									
Roadway Segment 1 ype	LOS "A"	LOS "B"	LOS "C"	LOS "D"	LOS "E"					
4-Lane Divided Freeway	28,000	43,200	61,600	74,400	80,000					
2-Lane Rural Highway	2,400	4,800	7,900	13,500	22,900					
6-lane Divided Expressway (with left-turn lanes)	35,500	42,200	46,200	55,800	60,000					
6-Lane Divided Arterial (with left-turn lane)	32,000	38,000	43,000	49,000	54,000					
4-Lane Divided Arterial (with left-turn lane)	22,000	25,000	29,000	32,500	36,000					
4-Lane Undivided Arterial (no left-turn lane)	18,000	21,000	24,000	27,000	30,000					
2-Lane Arterial (with left-turn lane)	11,000	12,500	14,500	16,000	18,000					
2-Lane Arterial (no left-turn lane)	1,000 - 9,000	2,000 - 10,500	3,500 - 12,000	6,500 - 13,500	7,500 - 15,000					
2-Lane Collector/Local Street	1,000 - 6,000	2,000 - 7,500	3,000 - 9,000	3,000 - 10,500	5,000 - 12,000					

Note: 1. Based on "Highway Capacity Manual", Transportation Research Board, 2000.

2. All volumes are approximate and assume ideal roadway characteristics. Actual threshold volumes for each Level of Service listed above may vary depending on a variety of factors including (but not limited to) roadway curvature and grade, intersection or interchange spacing, driveway spacing, percentage of trucks and other heavy vehicles, travel lane widths, signal timing characteristics, on-street parking, volume of cross traffic and pedestrians, etc.

Roadway Type	LOS A	LOS B	LOS C	LOS D	LOS E
8 Lane Freeway	51,000	79,000	112,000	136,000	146,000
6 Lane Freeway	39,000	59,000	85,000	102,000	110,000
4 Lane Freeway	26,000	40,000	57,000	69,000	74,000
8 Lane Expressway	35,000	54,000	75,000	90,000	98,000
6 Lane Expressway	28,000	42,000	56,000	67,000	74,000
4 Lane Expressway	18,000	27,000	36,000	45,000	50,000
8 Lane Divided Arterial (with Left-Turn Lanes)	40,000	47,000	54,000	61,000	68,000
6 Lane Divided Arterial (with Left-Turn Lanes)	32,000	38,000	43,000	49,000	54,000
4 Lane Divided Arterial (with Left-Turn Lanes)	22,000	25,000	29,000	32,500	36,000
4 Lane Undivided Arterial (with Left-Turn Lanes)	19,000	22,000	25,500	28,000	31,500
4 Lane Undivided Arterial (without Left-Turn Lanes)	16,000	19,000	22,000	24,000	27,000
2 Lane Arterial (with Left-Turn Lanes)	11,000	12,500	14,500	16,000	18,000
2 Lane Arterial (without Left-Turn Lanes)	8,000	9,500	10,500	12,000	13,500
2 Lane Rural Highway	4,000	8,000	12,000	17,000	25,000
2 Lane Collector	6,000	7,500	9,000	10,500	12,000
2 Lane Local	1,200	1,400	1,600	1,800	2,000

Source data contained in the Highway Capacity Manual (2000HCM)



LEVEL OF SERVICE 24 HOUR ADT VOLUME THRESHOLD CRITERIA 330 Tres Pinos Road, Ste. B2-12 - Hollister, CA 95023 (831) 638-9260 / FAX (831) 638-9268



TWO-WAY STOP SIGN CONTROLLED INTERSECTIONS

LANIDIT 17-2. LEVEL-UF-SERVICE CRITERIA FUR TWSC INTERSECTIONS					
Level of Service	Average Control Delay (s/veh)				
A	0–10				
В	> 10–15				
C	> 15–25				
D	> 2535				
E	> 35–50				
F	> 50				

ALL-WAY STOP SIGN CONTROLLED INTERSECTIONS

The level-of-service criteria are given in Exhibit 17-22. The criteria for AWSC intersections have different threshold values than do those for signalized intersections primarily because drivers expect different levels of performance from distinct types of transportation facilities. The expectation is that a signalized intersection is designed to carry higher traffic volumes than an AWSC intersection. Thus a higher level of control delay is acceptable at a signalized intersection for the same LOS.

EXHIBIT 17-22.	LEVEL-OF-SERVICE	CRITERIA FOR AWSC	INTERSECTIONS
----------------	------------------	-------------------	----------------------

Level of Service	Control Delay (s/veh)				
А	0–10				
B	> 1015				
С	> 15–25				
D	> 2535				
E	> 35–50				
F	> 50				

SIGNALIZED INTERSECTIONS

The average control delay per vehicle is estimated for each lane group and aggregated for each approach and for the intersection as a whole. LOS is directly related to the control delay value. The criteria are listed in Exhibit 16-2.

EXHIBIT 16-2.	LOS CRITERIA	FOR SIGNALIZED	INTERSECTIONS
---------------	--------------	----------------	----------------------

LOS	Control Delay per Vehicle (s/veh)
A	≤ 10
В	> 10–20
C	> 20–35
D	> 35–55
E	> 55–80
	> 80
PINNACLE LEVEL O TRAFFIC VEHICLE DELAY	F SERVICE Y RELATIONSHIPS MATERIAL
ENGINEERING 930 San Benito Stree (831) 638-9260 / 1	et - Hollister, CA 95023 FAX (831) 638-9268

	٨	→	-	×.	\$	4	
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR	
Lane Configurations	ሻ	^	<u></u> ተኑ		ሻ	7	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	0.95	0.95		1.00	1.00	
Frt	1.00	1.00	0.94		1.00	0.85	
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	3539	3342		1770	1583	
Flt Permitted	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)	1770	3539	3342		1770	1583	
Volume (vph)	125	438	560	332	224	130	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	
Adj. Flow (vph)	147	515	659	391	264	153	
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	115	0	0	115	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	147	515	935	0	264	38	
Turn Type	Prot					Perm	
Protected Phases	7	4	8		6		
Permitted Phases						6	
Actuated Green, G (s)	7.8	33.1	21.3		13.6	13.6	
Effective Green, g (s)	7.8	33.1	21.3		13.6	13.6	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.14	0.61	0.39		0.25	0.25	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	252	2142	1301		440	394	
v/s Ratio Prot	c0.08	0.15	c0.28		c0.15		
v/s Ratio Perm						0.02	
v/c Ratio	0.58	0.24	0.72		0.60	0.10	
Uniform Delay, d1	21.9	5.0	14.2		18.1	15.8	
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	3.4	0.1	1.9		2.2	0.1	
Delay (s)	25.3	5.0	16.1		20.4	15.9	
Level of Service	С	А	В		С	В	
Approach Delay (s)		9.6	16.1		18.7		
Approach LOS		А	В		В		
Intersection Summary							
HCM Average Control D	Delay		14.6	ŀ	ICM Le	vel of Ser	vice B
HCM Volume to Capaci	ty ratio		0.66				
Actuated Cycle Length ((s)		54.7	S	Sum of I	ost time ((s) 12.0
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		55.5%	le	CU Lev	el of Serv	ice B
Analysis Period (min)			15				
c Critical Lane Group							

•

	۶	-	$\mathbf{\hat{v}}$	¥	∢	×.	1	t	1	\$	Ļ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻ	Ŷ	۴	ኘ	∱	1		đ	۴	10 Contraction	<u>ф</u>	<u></u>
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	
Frt	1.00	1.00	0.85	1.00	1.00	0.85		1.00	0.85		0.98	
Fit Protected	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.95	1.00		0.97	
Satd: Flow (prot)	1770	1863	1583	1770	1863	1583		1779	1583		1780	
Flt Permitted	0.46	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.95	1.00		0.97	
Satd. Flow (perm)	864	1863	1583	1770	1863	1583		1779	1583		1780	
Volume (vph)	2	361	70	220	457	9	71	4	183	9	4	2
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
Adj. Flow (vph)	2	425	82	259	538	11	84	5	215	11	5	2
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	59	0	0	5	0	0	119	0	2	ō
Lane Group Flow (vph)	2	425	23	259	538	6	0	89	96	Ō	16	ŏ
Turn Type	Perm		Perm	Prot		Perm	Split		om+ov	Split		
Protected Phases		4		3	8		2	2	3	6	6	
Permitted Phases	4		4			8			2			
Actuated Green, G (s)	18.6	18.6	18.6	12.1	34.7	34.7		17.1	29.2		1.3	
Effective Green, g (s)	18.6	18.6	18.6	12.1	34.7	34.7		17.1	29.2		1.3	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.19	0.53	0.53		0.26	0.45	•	0.02	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	247	532	452	329	993	844		467	710		36	
v/s Ratio Prot		c0.23		c0.15	0.29			c0.05	0.03		c0.01	
v/s Ratio Perm	0.00		0.01			0.00			0.04			
v/c Ratio	0.01	0.80	0.05	0.79	0.54	0.01		0.19	0.14		0.45	
Uniform Delay, d1	16.6	21.5	16.9	25.3	10.0	7.1		18.6	10.5		31.5	
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	0.0	8.2	0.0	11.8	0.6	0.0		0.9	0.1		8.5	
Delay (s)	16.7	29.7	16.9	37.0	10.6	7.1		19.5	10.6		40.1	
Level of Service	В	С	В	D	В	А		В	В		D	
Approach Delay (s)		27.6			19.0			13.2			40.1	
Approach LOS		С			В			В			D	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control D	elay		20.8	Н	CM Lev	el of Se	rvice		С			<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>
HCM Volume to Capacit	y ratio		0.57									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		65.1	S	um of lo	ost time	(s)		16.0			
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		48.7%	IC	CU Leve	el of Serv	vice		А			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

,	۶	-	←	×	\$	4	
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR	
Lane Configurations	۲	ŕ	†	1	Y		
Sign Control		Free	Free		Stop		
Grade		0%	0%		0%		
Volume (veh/h)	31	410	481	49	23	34	
Peak Hour Factor	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	36	482	566	58	27	40	
Pedestrians							
Lane Wight (it)							
Percent Blockade							
Right turn flare (veh)							
Median type					None		
Median storage veh)					None		
Upstream signal (ft)			186				
pX, platoon unblocked	0.81				0.81	0.81	
vC, conflicting volume	624				1121	566	
vC1, stage 1 conf vol							
vC2, stage 2 conf vol							
vCu, unblocked vol	536				1149	465	
tC, single (s)	4.1				6.4	6.2	
tC, 2 stage (s)							
tF (s)	2.2				3.5	3.3	
p0 queue free %	96				84	92	
cM capacity (veh/h)	837				170	485	、 、
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	WB 2	SB 1		
Volume Total	36	482	566	58	67		
Volume Left	36	0	0	0	27		
Volume Right	0	0	0	58	40		
CSH ()	837	1700	1700	1700	278		
Volume to Capacity	0.04	0.28	0.33	0.03	0.24		
Queue Length 95th (ft)	3	0	0	0	23		
Control Delay (s)	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.0		
Lane LUS	A 0.7		0.0		00.0		
Approach LOS	0.7		0.0		22.0		
	- v - kiliku kuliku k	11. 2. 1990 - 19 - 10			C	1.12. 1	
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			1.5				
Analysis Period (min)	ilization		35.8% 15	IC	CU Leve	el of Serv	rice A

Page 1

	۶	\rightarrow	•	†	ţ	4					
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR					
Lane Configurations	Y		ሻ	^	\$			<u></u>			<u> Milite Mars</u>
Sign Control	Stop			Free	Free						
Grade	0%			0%	0%						
Volume (veh/h)	10	17	43	402	337	16					
Peak Hour Factor	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85					
Hourly flow rate (vph)	12	20	51	473	396	19					
Pedestrians											
Lane Width (ft)											
Walking Speed (ft/s)											
Percent Blockage											
Right turn flare (veh)											
Median type	None										
Median storage veh)											
Upstream signal (ft)				1278							
pA, platoon unblocked	000	400	445								
vC, connicting volume	980	406	415								
vC1, stage 1 conf vol											
VC2, stage z coni voi	000	400	445								
tC single (c)	900	400	415								
tC_1 single (s)	0.4	0.2	4.1								
(0, 2 staye(5))	25	22	<u></u>								
n (s) ní queue free %	0.0	07	2.2								
cM canacity (veh/h)	265	97 645	1144								
	200	040	1144								
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	NB 1	NB 2	SB 1							
Volume Total	32	51	473	415							
Volume Left	12	51	0	0		•					
Volume Right	20	0	0	19							
CSH Maharata Caraalta	421	1144	1700	1700							
Volume to Capacity	0.08	0.04	0.28	0.24							
Queue Length 95th (It)	6	3	0	0							
Control Delay (s)	14.2	8.3	0.0	0.0							
Lane LUS	44 O	A		~ ~							
Approach LOS	14.Z	0.8		0.0							
Approach 205	В										
Intersection Summary											
Average Delay			0.9								
Intersection Capacity Utilization 35.			35.4%	IC	CU Leve	el of Servic	e		А		
Analysis Period (min)			15								

Existing PM
Page 1

	¥	*	1	1	\$	Ļ					
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT				Net de la composición Versa de la composición de	
Lane Configurations	¥		4		3	1		<u> </u>			
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free					
Grade	0%		0%			0%					
Volume (veh/h)	19	69	392	20	33	334					
Peak Hour Factor	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85					
Hourly flow rate (vph) Pedestrians	22	81	461	24	39	393					
Lane Width (ft)											
Walking Speed (ft/s)											
Percent Blockage											
Right turn flare (veh)											
Median type	None										
Median storage veh)											
Upstream signal (ft)											
pX, platoon unblocked											
vC, conflicting volume	944	473			485						
vC1, stage 1 conf vol											
vC2, stage 2 conf vol											
vCu, unblocked vol	944	473			485						
tC, single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1						
tC, 2 stage (s)		~ ~									
t⊢ (s)	3.5	3.3			2.2						
p0 queue free %	92	80 504			90 4079						
civi capacity (ven/n)	281	591			1078						
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1	SB 2							
Volume Total	104	485	39	393							
Volume Left	22	0	39	0							
Volume Right	81	24	0	0							
cSH	477	1700	1078	1700							
Volume to Capacity	0.22	0.29	0.04	0.23							
Queue Length 95th (ft)	20	0	3	0							
Control Delay (s)	14.6	0.0	8.5	0.0							
Lane LOS	В		A				•				
Approach Delay (s)	14.6	0.0	0.8								
Approach LOS	В										
Intersection Summary											
Average Delay			1.8								
Intersection Capacity U	tilization		39.4%	10	CU Leve	el of Servic	e		А		
Analysis Period (min)			15								

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 6: Camino Caballo & Pomery Road

	≯	• 🗕	\rightarrow	1	-		1	†	1	× .	↓	-
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4			\$		ኻ	4			4	
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Free			Free	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			Ó%	
Volume (veh/h)	7	1	72	3	0	2	128	316	17	4	292	11
Peak Hour Factor	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
Hourly flow rate (vph)	8	1	85	4	0	2	151	372	20	5	344	13
Pedestrians												
Lane Width (ft)												
Walking Speed (ft/s)		·										
Percent Blockage												
Right turn flare (ven)		N			N							
iviedian type		None			None							
Inetroom olanet (ff)												
nX nietoon unblockod												
VC conflicting volume	1035	1052	350	1128	1040	382	356			303		
vC1_stare 1 conf vol	1000	1002	000	1120	1043	502				<u>197</u>		
vC2_stage 2 conf vol												
vCu_unblocked vol	1035	1052	350	1128	1049	382	356			392		
tC. single (s)	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2	4.1			4.1		
tC, 2 stage (s)		0.0	Q .2		0.0	0.12	** *					
tF (s)	3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3	2.2			2.2		
p0 queue free %	96	99	88	98	100	100	87			100		
cM capacity (veh/h)	189	197	693	143	198	665	1202			1167		
Direction Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	NB 2	SB 1				Nelson (n. 1944) References (n. 1944)			ada ta t
Volume Total	94	6	151	392	361						netheren i de la rese	ward ward i
Volume Left	8	4	151	0	5							
Volume Right	85	2	0	20	13							
cSH	548	208	1202	1700	1167							
Volume to Capacity	0.17	0.03	0.13	0.23	0.00							
Queue Length 95th (ft)	15	2	11	0	0							
Control Delay (s)	12.9	22.8	8.4	0.0	0.1							
Lane LOS	В	С	А		А							
Approach Delay (s)	12.9	22.8	2.3		0.1							
Approach LOS	В	С										
Intersection Summary												i de la composición d La composición de la c
Average Delay 2.			2.7									·
Intersection Capacity Utilization			48.8%	10	CU Leve	l of Ser	vice		А			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 3: Tefft Street & NB Off-ramp

Existing PM HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

	٭	->	$\mathbf{\hat{v}}$	1	+	×.	1	1	1	\$	ţ	4
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻ	ተተ			朴		ሻ	4				
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0			4.0		4.0	4.0				
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	0.95			0.95		0.95	0.95				
Frt	1.00	1.00			0.98		1.00	0.93				
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00			1.00		0.95	0.98				
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	3539			3479		1 681	1598				
Flt Permitted	0.95	1.00			1.00		0.95	0.98				
Satd. Flow (perm)	1770	3539			3479		1681	1598				
Volume (vph)	241	461	0	0	471	60	388	2	128	0	0	0
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.9Ź	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	262	501	0	0	512	65	422	2	139	0	0	0
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	0	0	14	0	0	44	0	0	0	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	262	501	0	0	563	0	283	236	0	0	0	0
Turn Type	Prot						Prot					
Protected Phases	7	4			8		5	2				
Permitted Phases							-					
Actuated Green, G (s)	14.2	33.6			15.4		23.4	23.4				
Effective Green, g (s)	14.2	33.6			15.4		23.4	23.4				
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.22	0.52			0.24		0.36	0.36				
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0			4.0		4.0	4.0				
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0			3.0		3.0	3.0				
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	387	1829		-	824		605	575				
v/s Ratio Prot	c0.15	0.14			c0.16		c0.17	0.15				
v/s Ratio Perm												
v/c Ratio	0.68	0.27			0.68		0.47	0.41				
Uniform Delay, d1	23.3	8.8			22.6		16.0	15.6				
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00			1.00		1.00	1.00				
Incremental Delay, d2	4.6	0.1			2.4		0.6	0.5				
Delay (s)	27.9	8.9			24.9		16.6	16.1				
Level of Service	· c	A			C		B	B				
Approach Delay (s)		15.5			24.9		-	16.3			0.0	
Approach LOS		В			C			B			A	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control D	elay		18.6		ICM Le	vel of Se	rvice		В			
HCM Volume to Capacit	ty ratio		0.59						-			
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		65.0	S	Sum of l	ost time	(s)		12.0			
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization	3	35.4%		CU Leve	el of Ser	vice		 Н			
Analysis Period (min)		-	`15									
c Critical Lane Group												
HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 1: Tefft Street & SB Off Ramp

Existing PM HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis

			\rightarrow	¥	+	×.	•	†	1	× 🖌	Ļ	4
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		<u></u> ↑₽		ኻ	ተተ			4			4	۴
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0		4.0	4.0			4.0			4.0	4.0
Lane Util. Factor		0.95		1.00	0.95			1.00			1.00	1.00
Frt		0.99		1.00	1.00			0.89			1.00	0.85
Flt Protected		1.00		0.95	1.00			0.99			0.98	1.00
Satd. Flow (prot)		3511		1770	3539			1648			1833	1583
Fit Permitted		1.00		0.95	1.00			0.99			0.98	1.00
Satd. Flow (perm)		3511		1770	3539			1648			1833	1583
Volume (vph)	0	760	42	111	655	0	55	0	198	95	195	405
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92	0.92
Adj. Flow (vph)	0	826	46	121	712	0	60	0	215	103	212	440
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	166	0	0	0	291
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	867	0	121	712	0	0	109	ō	Õ	315	149
Turn Type				Prot			Split			Split		Perm
Protected Phases		4		3	8		2	2		6	6	
Permitted Phases												6
Actuated Green, G (s)		19.9		6.0	29.9			17.0			16.0	16.0
Effective Green, g (s)		19.9		6.0	29.9			17.0			16.0	16.0
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.27		0.08	0.40			0.23			0.21	0.21
Clearance Time (s)		4.0		4.0	4.0			4.0			4.0	4.0
Vehicle Extension (s)		3.0		3.0	3.0			3.0			3.0	3.0
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		933		142	1413			374			392	338
v/s Ratio Prot		c0.25		c0.07	0.20			c0.07			c0.17	
v/s Ratio Perm												0.09
v/c Ratio		0.93		0.85	0.50			0.29			0.80	0.44
Uniform Delay, d1		26.8		34.0	16.9			24.0			28.0	25.6
Progression Factor		1.00		1.00	1.00			1.00			1.00	1.00
Incremental Delay, d2		15.0		36.0	0.3			2.0			15.9	41
Delay (s)		41.8		70.0	17.2			25.9			43.9	29.7
Level of Service		D		Е	В			С			D	C
Approach Delay (s)		41.8			24.9			25.9			35.6	0
Approach LOS		D			C			C			D	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control De	elay		33.3	H	CM Lev	el of Se	rvice		C			·
HCM Volume to Capacity	ratio		0.70						-			
Actuated Cycle Length (s	5)		74.9	S	um of lo	ost time	(s)		16.0			
Intersection Capacity Util	ization		72.6%	Ī	CU Leve	l of Sen	/ice		C.			
Analysis Period (min)			15						Ŭ			
c Critical Lane Group			-									

•

	۶	->	4	•	1	4					
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR					880.804 880.804
Lane Configurations	ሻ	个个	<u></u>		ሻ	<u>// //////////////////////////////////</u>		i e legende de las ser la		<u></u>	<u></u>
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900					
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0					
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	0.95	0.95		1.00	1.00					
Frt	1.00	1.00	0.94		1.00	0.85					
Fit Protected	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.95	1.00					
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	3539	3339		1770	1583					
Fit Permitted	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.95	1.00					
Satd. Flow (perm)	1770	3539	3339		1770	1583					
Volume (vph)	131	458	590	358	234	133					
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85					
Adj. Flow (vph)	154	539	694	421	275	156					
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	120	0	0	117					
Lane Group Flow (vph)	154	539	995	0	275	39					
Turn Type	Prot					Perm		- 10			
Protected Phases	7	4	8		6						
Permitted Phases						6					
Actuated Green, G (s)	8.0	34.3	22.3		14.1	14.1					
Effective Green, g (s)	8.0	34.3	22.3		14.1	14.1					
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.14	0.61	0.40		0.25	0.25					
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0					
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0					
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	251	2152	1320		443	396					
v/s Ratio Prot	c0.09	0.15	c0.30		c0.16			•			
v/s Ratio Perm						0.02					
v/c Ratio	0.61	0.25	0.75		0.62	0.10					
Uniform Delay, d1	22.7	5.1	14.7		18.8	16.3					
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00					
Incremental Delay, d2	4.4	0.1	2.5		2.7	0.1					
Delay (s)	27.1	5.2	17.2		21.5	16.4					
Level of Service	С	А	В		С	В					
Approach Delay (s)		10.1	17.2		19.6	7					
Approach LOS		В	В		В						
Intersection Summary										NA SANTA TANA NA SANTANA AM	
HCM Average Control E)elay		15.4	H	ICM Le	vel of Servi	ce	E	3		
HCM Volume to Capacit	ty ratio		0.69								
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		56.4	S	um of l	ost time (s)		12.0)		
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		58.0%	10	CU Leve	el of Service	e	E	3		
Analysis Period (min)			15								
c Critical Lane Group											

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 2: Tefft Street &

	الر		\mathbf{F}	4	+	×	1	1	~	1	ţ	4
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ኻ	†	1	٢	†	7		र्भ	1		÷	۴
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00
Frt	1.00	1.00	0.85	1.00	1.00	0.85		1.00	0.85		1.00	0.85
Fit Protected	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.97	1.00		0.97	1.00
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	1863	1583	1770	1863	1583		1808	1583		1812	1583
Fit Permitted	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.79	1.00		0.81	1.00
Satd. Flow (perm)	1770	1863	1583	1770	1863	1583		1478	1583		1511	1583
Volume (vph)	68	346	66	221	418	69	63	41	184	48	37	58
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
Adj. Flow (vph)	80	407	78	260	492	81	74	48	216	56	44	68
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	55	0	0	45	0	0	109	0	0	48
Lane Group Flow (vph)	80	407	23	260	492	36	0	122	107	0	100	20
Turn Type	Prot		Perm	Prot		Perm	Perm		pm+ov	Perm		Perm
Protected Phases	7	4		3	8			2	3		6	
Permitted Phases			4			8	2		2	6		6
Actuated Green, G (s)	3.1	17.0	17.0	11.4	25.3	25.3		17.1	28.5		17.1	17.1
Effective Green, g (s)	3.1	17.0	17.0	11.4	25.3	25.3		17.1	28.5		17.1	17.1
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.05	0.30	0.30	0.20	0.44	0.44		0.30	0.50		0.30	0.30
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	95	551	468	351	820	697		440	895		449	471
v/s Ratio Prot	0.05	c0.22		c0.15	0.26				0.02			
v/s Ratio Perm			0.01			0.02		c0.08	0.04		0.07	0.01
v/c Ratio	0.84	0.74	0.05	0.74	0.60	0.05		0.28	0.12		0.22	0.04
Uniform Delay, d1	27.0	18.2	14.5	21.7	12.2	9.2		15.5	7.8		15.2	14.4
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00
Incremental Delay, d2	45.7	5.1	0.0	8.2	1.2	0.0		1.6	0.1		0.3	0.0
Delay (s)	72.7	23.4	14.5	29.8	13.4	9.3		17.0	7.8		15.5	14.4
Level of Service	E	С	В	С	В	A		В	A		В	В
Approach Delay (s)		29.2			18.1			11.2			15.0	
Approach LOS		С			В			В			В	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control D	elay		19.9	ŀ	ICM Le	vel of Se	ervice		В			
HCM Volume to Capacit	iy ratio		0.57									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		57.5	9	Sum of I	ost time	: (s)		12.0			
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		52.8%	10	CU Lev	el of Sei	rvice		А			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

	•	-+	\rightarrow	✓	+	×.	1	Ť	1	×	Ļ	-
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4			\$		ኻ	4		۲	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	<u>۴</u>
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0			4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0
Lane Util. Factor		1.00			1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00
Frt		0.94			0.90		1.00	0.99		1.00	1.00	0.85
Fit Protected		0.98			0.99		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	1.00
Satd. Flow (prot)		1712			1666		1770	1850		1770	1863	1583
Flt Permitted		0.86			0.93		0.54	1.00		0.47	1.00	1.00
Satd. Flow (perm)		1504			1560		1000	1850		881	1863	1583
Volume (vph)	29	5	26	17	9	69	67	386	18	33	322	43
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
Adj. Flow (vph)	34	6	31	20	11	81	79	454	21	39	379	51
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	27	0	0	70	· 0	0	2	0	0	0	15
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	44	0	0	42	0	79	473	0	39	379	36
Turn Type	Perm			Perm			Perm			Perm		Perm
Protected Phases		4			8			2			6	
Permitted Phases	4			8			2			6		6
Actuated Green, G (s)		6.8			6.8		34.4	34.4		34.4	34.4	34.4
Effective Green, g (s)		6.8			6.8		34.4	34.4		34.4	34.4	34.4
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.14			0.14		0.70	0.70		0.70	0.70	0.70
Clearance Time (s)		4.0			4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0
Vehicle Extension (s)		3.0			3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		208			216		699	1293		616	1303	1107
v/s Ratio Prot								c0.26			0.20	
v/s Ratio Perm		c0.03			0.03		0.08			0.04		0.02
v/c Ratio		0.21			0.20		0.11	0.37		0.06	0.29	0.03
Uniform Delay, d1		18.8			18.8		2.4	3.0		2.3	2.8	2.3
Progression Factor		1.00			1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00
Incremental Delay, d2		0.5			0.4		0.1	0.2		0.0	0.1	0.0
Delay (s)		19.3			19.2		2.5	3.2		2.4	2.9	2.3
Level of Service		В			В		А	А		Α	А	А
Approach Delay (s)		19.3			19.2			3.1			2.8	
Approach LOS		В			В			А			А	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control De	elay		5.4	Н	CM Lev	el of Se	ervice		A			
HCM Volume to Capacity	<i>r</i> atio		0.34									
Actuated Cycle Length (s	;)		49.2	S	um of lo	ost time	(s)		8.0			
Intersection Capacity Util	ization	4	12.5%	IC	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice		А			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized	Intersection Capacity Analysis
6: Camino Caballo	& Pomery Road

	۶	-+	\mathbf{F}	¥	4	×.	*	†	*	\ \	Ļ	-
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4) Cton			¢		۲	4	a 1995 (1992) - 19		4	
Grade		5.0p			Stop			Free			Free	
Volume (veh/h)	7	078	76	3	0%	2	121	228	17	4	200	
Peak Hour Factor	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
Hourly flow rate (vph)	8	1	89	4	0	2	154	386	20	5	364	13
Pedestrians										-		
Lane Width (ft)												
Walking Speed (ft/s)												
Right turn flore (vob)												
Median type		None			None							
Median storage veh)		Rone			None							
Upstream signal (ft)								490				
pX, platoon unblocked	0.99	0.99		0.99	0.99	0.99		100		0.99		
vC, conflicting volume	1076	1094	370	1174	1090	396	376			406		
vC1, stage 1 conf vol												
vC2, stage 2 conf vol	4070	4004										
tC single (s)	1076	1094	370	11/5	1091	392	376			402		
tC, single (s)	1.1	0.0	0.2	1.1	0.0	6.2	4.1			4.1		
tF (s)	3.5	4 0	33	3.5	40	33	22			22		
p0 queue free %	95	99	87	97	100	100	87			100		
cM capacity (veh/h)	175	184	676	130	185	652	1182			1149		
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	NB 2	SB 1							
Volume Total	99	6	154	406	381							<u>965 m 1999 - 1</u>
Volume Left	8	4	154	0	5							
Volume Right	89	2	0	20	13							
CSH Volumo to Concellu	532	191	1182	1700	1149							
Oucle Longth 05th (ft)	0.19	0.03	0.13	0.24	0.00							
Control Delay (s)	13.3	24 5	85	0	01							
Lane LOS	но.о В	24.0 C	0.5 A	0.0	0.1 A							
Approach Delay (s)	13.3	24.5	2.3		0.1							
Approach LOS	В	С										
Intersection Summary										243403	entes	iya ku
Average Delay			2.7								<u></u>	<u></u>
Intersection Capacity Uti Analysis Period (min)	lization		50.5% 15	IC	CU Leve	l of Ser	vice		A			

	۶	-	-	×.	\	4	
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR	
Lane Configurations	ሻ	个	仲		ሻ	7	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	0.95	0.95		1.00	1.00	
Frt	1.00	1.00	0.94		1.00	0.85	
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	3539	3340		1770	1583	
Flt Permitted	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)	1770	3539	3340		1770	1583	
Volume (vph)	131	455	586	353	231	133	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	
Adj. Flow (vph)	154	535	689	415	272	156	
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	119	0	0	117	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	154	535	985	0	272	39	
Turn Type	Prot					Perm	
Protected Phases	7	4	8		6		
Permitted Phases						6	
Actuated Green, G (s)	8.0	33.9	21.9		14.0	14.0	
Effective Green, g (s)	8.0	33.9	21.9		14.0	14.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.14	0.61	0.39		0.25	0.25	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	253	2146	1309		443	396	
v/s Ratio Prot	c0.09	0.15	c0.29		c0.15		
v/s Ratio Perm						0.02	
v/c Ratio	0.61	0.25	0.75		0.61	0.10	
Uniform Delay, d1	22.5	5.1	14.7		18.6	16.1	
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	4.1	0.1	2.5		2.5	0.1	
Delay (s)	26.6	5.2	17.2		21.1	16.2	
Level of Service	С	А	В		С	В	
Approach Delay (s)		10.0	17.2		19.3		
Approach LOS		А	В		В		
Intersection Summary							
HCM Average Control D)elay		15.3	Η	ICM Lev	el of Ser	vîce B
HCM Volume to Capacit	ty ratio		0.68				
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		55.9	S	um of le	ost time (s) 12.0
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		57.6%	IC	CU Leve	el of Serv	ice B
Analysis Period (min)			15				
c Critical Lane Group							

.

	٦	->	¥	¥		۰.	1	1	1	1	ţ	4
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL.	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻ	Ŷ	ሻ	ሻ	†	7		4	*	·	ې لې	. 1
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00
Frt	1.00	1.00	0.85	1.00	1.00	0.85		1.00	0.85		1.00	0.85
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.97	1.00		0.97	1.00
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	1863	1583	1770	1863	1583		1806	1583		1808	1583
Fit Permitted	0.48	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.79	1.00		0.81	1.00
Satd. Flow (perm)	901	1863	1583	1770	1863	1583		1480	1583		1502	1583
Volume (vph)	63	346	66	221	418	64	63	37	184	46	31	51
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
Adj. Flow (vph)	74	407	78	260	492	75	74	44	216	54	36	60
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	56	0	0	34	0	0	101	0	0	42
Lane Group Flow (vph)	74	407	22	260	492	41	0	118	115	0	90	18
Turn Type	Perm		Perm	Prot		Perm	Perm		pm+ov	Perm		Perm
Protected Phases		4		3	8			2	3		6	
Permitted Phases	4		4			8	2		2	6		6
Actuated Green, G (s)	15.9	15.9	15.9	11.1	31.0	31.0		17.1	28.2		17.1	17.1
Effective Green, g (s)	15.9	15.9	15.9	11.1	31.0	31.0		17.1	28.2		17.1	17.1
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.20	0.55	0.55		0.30	0.50		0.30	0.30
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	255	528	449	350	1029	875		451	909		458	483
v/s Ratio Prot		c0.22		c0.15	0.26				0.03			
v/s Ratio Perm	0.08		0.01			0.03		c0.08	0.05		0.06	0.01
v/c Ratio	0.29	0.77	0.05	0.74	0.48	0.05		0.26	0.13		0.20	0.04
Uniform Delay, d1	15.7	18.4	14.6	21.2	7.6	5.8		14.7	7.4		14.4	13.7
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00
Incremental Delay, d2	0.6	6.9	0.0	8.3	0.4	0.0		1.4	0.1		0.2	0.0
Delay (s)	16.3	25.3	14.7	29.4	8.0	5.8		16.1	7.5		14.6	13.7
Level of Service	В	С	В	С	Α	A		В	A		В	В
Approach Delay (s)		22.6			14.5			10.5			14.3	
Approach LOS		С			В			В			В	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control D	Delay		16.2	F	ICM Le	vel of S	ervice		В			
HCM Volume to Capaci	ty ratio		0.57									
Actuated Cycle Length ((s)		56.1	5	Sum of I	ost time	e (s)		12.0			
Intersection Capacity U	tilization		52.6%	ļ	CU Lev	el of Sei	rvice		A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

	٦	→	\rightarrow	4	←	۸.	•	†	1	\	Ļ	-
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4			4		۲	4		ሻ	4	*
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0			4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0
Lane Util. Factor		1.00			1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00
Frt		0.94			0.90		1.00	0.99		1.00	1.00	0.85
Flt Protected		0.98			0.99		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	1.00
Satd. Flow (prot)		1716			1666		1770	1850		1770	1863	1583
Flt Permitted		0.87			0.94		0.53	1.00		0.46	1.00	1.00
Satd. Flow (perm)		1528			1578		991	1850		866	1863	1583
Volume (vph)	23	5	20	17	9	69	62	386	18	33	321	38
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
Adj. Flow (vph)	27	6	24	20	11	81	73	454	21	39	378	45
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	20	0	0	68	0	0	2	0	0	0	15
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	37	0	0	44	0	73	473	0	39	378	30
Turn Type	Perm			Perm			Perm			Perm		Perm
Protected Phases		4			8			2			6	
Permitted Phases	4			8			2			6		6
Actuated Green, G (s)		8.3			8.3		34.0	34.0		34.0	34.0	34.0
Effective Green, g (s)		8.3			8.3		34.0	34.0		34.0	34.0	34.0
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.17			0.17		0.68	0.68		0.68	0.68	0.68
Clearance Time (s)		4.0			4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0
Vehicle Extension (s)		3.0			3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		252			260		670	1250		585	1259	1070
v/s Ratio Prot								c0.26			0.20	
v/s Ratio Perm		0.02			c0.03		0.07			0.05		0.02
v/c Ratio		0.15			0.17		0.11	0.38		0.07	0.30	0.03
Uniform Delay, d1		18.0			18.0		2.9	3.5		2.8	3.3	2.7
Progression Factor		1.00			1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00
Incremental Delay, d2		0.3			0.3		0.1	0.2		0.0	0.1	0.0
Delay (s)		18.2			18.4		2.9	3.7		2.8	3.4	2.7
Level of Service		В			В		Α	А		А	А	А
Approach Delay (s)		18.2			18.4			3.6			3.3	
Approach LOS		В			В			А			А	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control De	elay		5.6	Н	CM Lev	el of Se	ervice		A			
HCM Volume to Capacity	y ratio		0.34									
Actuated Cycle Length (s	s)		50.3	S	um of lo	ost time	(s)		8.0			
Intersection Capacity Uti	lization		40.9%	IC	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice		A			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 6: Camino Caballo & Pomery Road

	۶	-	\mathbf{r}	¥	←	•	*	Ť	1	1	Ļ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations Sign Control Grade		t top 0%			↔ Stop 0%	2 200 mB, (12,21, 12,11)	Ţ	⊅ Free 0%		<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	↔ Free 0%	<u></u>
Volume (veh/h) Peak Hour Factor Hourly flow rate (vph)	7 0.85 8	1 0.85 1	75 0.85 88	3 0.85 4	0 0.85 0	2 0.85 2	130 0.85 153	325 0.85 382	17 0.85 20	4 0.85 5	306 0.85 360	11 0.85 13
Lane Width (ft) Walking Speed (ft/s) Percent Blockage Right turn flare (veh)												
Median type Median storage veh) Upstream signal (ft)		None			None			490				
pX, platoon unblocked	0.98	0.98		0.98	0.98	0.98				0.98		
vC, conflicting volume vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol	1066	1084	366	1163	1081	392	373			402		
vCu, unblocked vol	1068	1086	366	1166	1082	379	373			390		
tC, single (s) tC, 2 stage (s)	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2	4.1			4.1		
tF (s)	3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3	2.2			2.2		
p0 queue free %	95	99	87	97	100	100	87			100		
civi capacity (ven/n)	1/5	184	679	130	185	654	1186			1145		
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	NB 2	SB-1							
Volume Total	98	6	153	402	378							
Volume Lett	8	4	153	0	5							
	00 522	ے 101	1106	20	13							
Volume to Canacity	0.18	191	0 13	0.24	0.00							
Queue Length 95th (ft)	17	2	0.10	0.24	0.00							
Control Delay (s)	13.3	24.4	8.5	0.0	0.1							
Lane LOS	В	С	A		A							
Approach Delay (s) Approach LOS	13.3 B	24.4 C	2.3		0.1							
Intersection Summary			14.040.49 14.1 <u>.200</u> .8									An the sti Geologie
Average Delay			2.7									
Intersection Capacity Uti Analysis Period (min)	lization	:	50.2% 15	IC	CU Leve	l of Ser	vice		А			

	٦	->	-	•	×		
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR	
Lane Configurations	ሻ	<u>^</u>	4ħ	-	ሻ	1	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	0.95	0.95		1.00	1.00	
Frt	1.00	1.00	0.95		1.00	0.85	
Fit Protected	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	3539	3370		1770	1583	
Fit Permitted	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)	1770	3539	3370		1770	1583	
Volume (vph)	208	514	817	381	264	155	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	
Adi, Flow (vph)	245	605	961	448	311	182	
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	69	0	0	140	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	245	605	1340	0	311	42	
Turn Type	Prot					Perm	
Protected Phases	7	4	8		6		
Permitted Phases						6	
Actuated Green, G (s)	12.7	45.9	29.2		16.2	16.2	
Effective Green, g (s)	12.7	45.9	29.2		16.2	16.2	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.18	0.65	0.42		0.23	0.23	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	321	2317	1404		409	366	
v/s Ratio Prot	c0.14	0.17	c0.40		c0.18		
v/s Ratio Perm						0.03	
v/c Ratio	0.76	0.26	0.95		0.76	0.11	
Uniform Delay, d1	27.3	5.0	19.8		25.1	21.3	
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	10.3	0.1	14,4		8.1	0.1	
Delay (s)	37.6	5.1	34.2		33.2	21.4	
Level of Service	D	А	С		С	C	
Approach Delay (s)		14.5	34.2		28.9		
Approach LOS		В	С		С		
Intersection Summary							
HCM Average Control D	elay		27.2	ŀ	ICM Le	vel of Servi	fice C
HCM Volume to Capaci	ty ratio		0.86				
Actuated Cycle Length ((s)		70.1	S	Sum of I	ost time (s)) 12.0
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		70.9%	I	CU Lev	el of Servic	ce C
Analysis Period (min)			15				
c Critical Lane Group							

	٨	→	\mathbf{F}	¥	←	×.	1	Ť	1	4	Ļ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻ	ŕ	۲	ካ	ł	4		آ نه	۴		\$	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	
Frt	1.00	1.00	0.85	1.00	1.00	0.85		1.00	0.85		0.98	
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.96	1.00		0.97	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	1863	1583	1770	1863	1583		1781	1583		1780	
Flt Permitted	0.41	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.96	1.00		0.97	
Satd. Flow (perm)	761	1863	1583	1770	1863	1583		1781	1583		1780	
Volume (vph)	2	427	87	297	573	9	45	4	344	9	4	2
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
Adj. Flow (vph)	2	502	102	349	674	11	53	5	405	11	5	2
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	72	0	0	5	0	0	225	0	2	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	2	502	30	349	674	6	0	58	180	0	16	0
Turn Type	Perm		Perm	Prot		Perm	Split		pm+ov	Split		
Protected Phases		4		3	8		2	2	3	6	6	
Permitted Phases	4		4			8			2			
Actuated Green, G (s)	19.1	19.1	19.1	12.1	35.2	35.2		17.1	29.2		1.3	
Effective Green, g (s)	19.1	19.1	19.1	12.1	35.2	35.2		17.1	29.2		1.3	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.18	0.54	0.54		0.26	0.45		0.02	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	222	542	461	326	1000	849		464	705		35	
v/s Ratio Prot		c0.27		c0.20	0.36			0.03	c0.05		c0.01	
v/s Ratio Perm	0.00		0.02			0.00			0.07			
v/c Ratio	0.01	0.93	0.06	1.07	0.67	0.01		0.12	0.26		0.46	
Uniform Delay, d1	16.5	22.6	16.8	26.7	11.0	7.1		18.5	11.4		31.8	
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	0.0	21.9	0.1	69.8	1.8	0.0		0.6	0.2		9.2	
Delay (s)	16.5	44.5	16.9	96.6	12.8	7.1		19.1	11.6		41.0	
Level of Service	В	D	В	F	В	А		В	В		D	
Approach Delay (s)		39.7			41.0			12.5			41.0	
Approach LOS		D			D			В			D	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control D	elay		34.4	Н	ICM Lev	vel of Se	ervice		С			
HCM Volume to Capacil	ty ratio		0.72									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		65.6	S	um of l	ost time	(s)		16.0			
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		57.1%	10	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice		В			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

Cumulative PM
Page 1

	٭	->	+	•	1	1	
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR	
Lane Configurations	ሻ	ħ	Ŷ	1	Y	<u></u>	
Sign Control		Free	Free		Stop		
Grade	04	0%	0%	10	0%		
Volume (ven/n)	31	493	5/1	. 49	23	34	
Hourly flow rate (upb)	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	
Pedestrians	30	000	072	00	21	40	
Lane Width (ft)							
Walking Speed (ft/s)							
Percent Blockage							
Right turn flare (veh)							
Median type					None		
Median storage veh)							
Upstream signal (ft)			186				
pX, platoon unblocked	0.73				0.73	0.73	
vC, conflicting volume	729				1325	672	
vC1, stage 1 confivol							
vCu_unblocked vol	631				1113	552	
tC. single (s)	4.1				64	62	
tC, 2 stage (s)					0.1	0.2	
tF (s)	2.2				3.5	3.3	
p0 queue free %	95				73	90	
cM capacity (veh/h)	698				101	391	
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	WB 2	SB 1		
Volume Total	36	580	672	58	67		
Volume Left	36	0	0	0	27		
Volume Right	0	0	0	58	40		
CSH Volumo to Consolitu	698	1700	1700	1700	181		
Queue Longth 05th (ft)	0.05	0.34	0.40	0.03	0.37		·
Control Delay (s)	10 4	0	0	0	40 36 0		
Lane LOS	10.4 B	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.0 F		
Approach Delay (s)	0.6		0.0		360		
Approach LOS			010		E		
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			2.0				
Intersection Capacity Uti	ilization		40.1%	IC	CU Leve	l of Serv	rice A
Analysis Period (min)			15				

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 4: Park Rd. & Pomery Rd.

	٦	\rightarrow	1	1	Ļ	4				
Movement	EBL	EBR	NBL	NBT	SBT	SBR				
Lane Configurations Sign Control Grade	₩ Stop 0%	<u> </u>	٢	∱ Free 0%	≎ Free 0%				<u></u>	••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
Volume (veh/h)	10	17	43	518	431	16				
Peak Hour Factor	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85				
Hourly flow rate (vph) Pedestrians Lane Width (ft) Walking Speed (ft/s) Percent Blockage Right turn flare (veh)	12	20	51	609	507	19				
Median type	None									
Median storage veh) Upstream signal (ft) pX, platoon unblocked		- / -		1278						
vC, conflicting volume vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol	1227	516	526							
vCu, unblocked vol	1227	516	526							
tC, single (s) tC, 2 stage (s)	6.4	6.2	4.1							
tF (s)	3.5	3.3	2.2							
p0 queue free %	94	96	95							
cM capacity (veh/h)	187	559	1041							
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	NB 1	NB 2	SB 1						
Volume Total	32	51	609	526						
Volume Left	12	51	0	0						
Volume Right	20	0	0	19						
cSH	322	1041	1700	1700						
Volume to Capacity	0.10	0.05	0.36	0.31						
Queue Length 95th (ft)	8	4	0	0						
Control Delay (s)	17.4	8.6	0.0	0.0						
Lane LOS		A								
Approach Delay (s) Approach LOS	17.4 C	0.7		0.0						
Intersection Summary					<u>Bangaan</u> se					
Average Delay Intersection Capacity Ut Analysis Period (min)	ilization		0.8 40.3% 15	IC	CU Leve	el of Servic	e	A		

	¥	×.	1	1	\$	Ļ	
Movement	WBL	WBR	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	
Lane Configurations	Y		4		ሻ	Ŷ	
Sign Control	Stop		Free			Free	
Grade	0%		0%			0%	
Volume (veh/h)	20	136	516	12	109	427	
Peak Hour Factor	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	
Hourly flow rate (vph)	24	160	607	14	128	502	
Pedestrians							
Lane Width (ft)							
Walking Speed (ft/s)							
Percent Blockage							
Right turn flare (ven)	Nono						
Median type	None						
Upstroom signal (ft)							
nX platoon upblocked							
vC. conflicting volume	1373	614			621		
vC1_stage 1 conf vol	10/0	014			021		
vC2_stage 2 conf vol							
vCu, unblocked vol	1373	614			621		
tC. single (s)	6.4	6.2			4.1		
tC, 2 stage (s)				•			
tF (s)	3.5	3.3			2.2		
p0 queue free %	83	67			87		
cM capacity (veh/h)	139	492			960		
Direction, Lane #	WB 1	NB 1	SB 1	SB 2			
Volume Total	184	621	128	502			
Volume Left	24	0	128	0			
Volume Right	160	14	0	0			
cSH	371	1700	960	1700			
Volume to Capacity	0.49	0.37	0.13	0.30			
Queue Length 95th (ft)	66	0	12	0			
Control Delay (s)	23.8	0.0	9.3	0.0			
Lane LOS	C	• •	A				
Approach Delay (s)	23.8	0.0	1.9				
Approach LOS	C						
Intersection Summary							
Average Delay			3.9				
Intersection Capacity Ut	tilization		53.4%	IC	CU Leve	el of Serv	vice A
Analysis Period (min)			15				

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 6: Camino Caballo & Pomery Road

.

	≯	-	\rightarrow	1		•	1	Ť	1	¥	Ļ	-
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4			ф		ኻ	Þ			4	
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Free			Free	
Grade		0%			0%			0%			0%	
Volume (veh/h)	10	1	105	5	0	5	155	477	20	5	426	15
Peak Hour Factor	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
Hourly flow rate (vph)	12	1	124	6	0	6	182	561	24	6	501	18
Pedestrians												
Lane Width (ft)												
Walking Speed (ft/s)												
Percent Blockage	•											
Right turn flare (veh)												
Median type		None			None							
Median storage ven)												
Upstream signal (It)												
pA, platoon unblocked	1 A E A	4 4 7 4	E40	4504	4400	670	E40			505		
vC, conflicting volume	1404	1471	510	1004	1400	5/3	519			585		
vC1, stage 1 contivol												
VCz, stage z com vol	1454	1/71	510	1584	1468	573	510			595		
tC single (s)	7 1	65	62	7 1	65	62	11			J00 // 1		
tC, 2 stare (s)	7.1	0.0	0.2	1.1	0.0	0.2	4.1			4.1		
tF (s)	35	4.0	33	3.5	40	33	22			22		
n0 queue free %	87	99	78	90	100	99	83			99		
cM capacity (veh/h)	92	104	563	59	105	519	1047			990		
nullin hereiten	 	- • • • • • • •		ND 0				an da ang is		age e age	gan tre tre trejt	di sata si
Unection, Lane #	426		110	NB Z	SBI							
Volume Loft	130	12	102	000	525							
Volume Leit	12	0	102	0	10							
	201	105	1047	4700	000							
Volume to Canacity	0.36	0.11	0.17	0.34	0.01							
Oueue Length 95th (ft)	40	0.13 Q	16	0.04	0.01							
Control Delay (s)	19.6	434	92	nň	0.2							
Lane LOS	10.0 C	-0 F	Δ	0.0	0.2 A							
Annroach Delay (s)	196	434	22		02							
Approach LOS	10.0 C	F	<i>6</i>		0.2							
	• •	 The second s	Standar	1949 karotan		LINNAL IN DISAN		HTT. SHE COMMAN	n la françanti à s	the second second	a la stala a stala tra	ndina Ro
intersection Summary										662.202		
Average Delay	1:		3.4	5.		1.00			~			
Intersection Capacity Uti	ization	1	07.1%](U Leve	ei or Ser	VICE		C			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

	٦	-+	\mathbf{F}	¥	-	*	1	†	1	1	¥	4
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	۴	朴		ሻ	朴			4	ť		4	*
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0			4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	0.95		1.00	0.95			1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00
Frt	1.00	0.97		1.00	0.98			1.00	0.85		1.00	0.85
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00			0.97	1.00		0.97	1.00
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	3450		1770	3482			1815	1583		1812	1583
Flt Permitted	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00			0.83	1.00		0.82	1.00
Satd. Flow (perm)	1770	3450		1770	3482			1552	1583		1529	1583
Volume (vph)	68	429	87	298	574	69	45	41	345	48	37	58
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
Adj. Flow (vph)	80	505	102	351	675	81	53	48	406	56	44	68
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	30	0	0	16	0	0	0	100	0	0	47
Lane Group Flow (vph)	80	577	0	351	740	0	0	101	306	0	100	21
Turn Type	Prot			Prot			Perm		pm+ov	Perm		Perm
Protected Phases	7	4		3	8			2	3		6	
Permitted Phases							2		2	6		6
Actuated Green, G (s)	3.1	15.1		12.0	24.0			17.1	29.1		17.1	17.1
Effective Green, g (s)	3.1	15.1		12.0	24.0			17.1	29.1		17.1	17.1
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.06	0.27		0.21	0.43			0.30	0.52		0.30	0.30
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0	•	4.0	4.0			4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0			3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	98	927		378	1487			472	932		465	482
v/s Ratio Prot	0.05	c0.17		c0.20	0.21				c0.07			
v/s Ratio Perm								0.07	0.12		0.07	0.01
v/c Ratio	0.82	0.62		0.93	0.50			0.21	0.33		0.22	0.04
Uniform Delay, d1	26.3	18.0		21.7	11.7			14.5	7.9		14.6	13.8
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00			1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00
Incremental Delay, d2	38.7	1.3		28.6	0.3			1.0	0.2		0.2	0.0
Delay (s)	65.0	19.4		50.3	12.0			15.6	8.1		14.8	13.8
Level of Service	E	В		D	В			В	A		В	В
Approach Delay (s)		24.7			24.1			9.6			14.4	
Approach LOS		С			С			А			В	
Intersection Summary											Line en e	
HCM Average Control D	elay		20.6	4	ICM Le	vel of Se	ervice		С			
HCM Volume to Capacit	ty ratio		0.60									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		56.2	S	Sum of I	ost time	(s)		12.0			
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		52.5%	l	CU Leve	el of Sei	vice		А			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

	۶	>	-►	•	\ >	4	
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR	
Lane Configurations	ሻ	† †	<u>ቀ</u> ኑ		ሻ	7	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	0.95	0.95		1.00	1.00	
Frt	1.00	1.00	0.95		1.00	0.85	
Fit Protected	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	3539	3367		1770	1583	
Fit Permitted	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)	1770	3539	3367		1770	1583	
Volume (vph)	214	534	848	407	274	158	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	
Adj. Flow (vph)	252	628	998	479	322	186	
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	74	0	0	142	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	252	628	1403	0	322	44	
Turn Type	Prot					Perm	
Protected Phases	7	4	8		6		
Permitted Phases						6	
Actuated Green, G (s)	12.9	46.1	29.2		16.6	16.6	
Effective Green, g (s)	12.9	46.1	29.2		16.6	16.6	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.18	0.65	0.41		0.23	0.23	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	323	2308	1391		416	372	
v/s Ratio Prot	c0.14	0.18	c0.42		c0.18		
v/s Ratio Perm						0.03	
v/c Ratio	0.78	0.27	1.01		0.77	0.12	
Uniform Delay, d1	27.5	5.2	20.8		25.3	21.3	
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	11.5	0.1	26.3		8.7	0.1	
Delay (s)	39.1	5.3	47.0		34.0	21.4	
Level of Service	D	А	D		С	С	
Approach Delay (s)		15.0	47.0		29.4		
Approach LOS		В	D		С		
Intersection Summary							
HCM Average Control D	elay		34.0	Н	CM Lev	el of Ser	vice C
HCM Volume to Capacit	iy ratio		0.89				
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		70.7	S	um of le	ost time (s	s) 12.0
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		73.5%	IC	CU Leve	el of Servi	ce D
Analysis Period (min)			15				
c Critical Lane Group							*

	الر	-	¥	4	+	K	1	1	1	1	Ļ	4
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻ	ŕ	7	ĥ	1	1		ب ا ا	7		4	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	
Frt	1.00	1.00	0.85	1.00	1.00	0.85		1.00	0.85		0.95	
Fit Protected	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.97	1.00		0.98	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	1863	1583	1770	1863	1583		1815	1583		1732	
Flt Permitted	0.33	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.97	1.00		0.98	
Satd. Flow (perm)	606	1863	1583	1770	1863	1583		1815	1583		1732	
Volume (vph)	68	429	87	298	574	69	45	41	345	48	37	58
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
Adj. Flow (vph)	80	505	102	351	675	81	53	48	406	56	44	68
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	76	0	0	43	0	0	235	0	33	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	80	505	26	351	675	38	0	101	171	0	135	0
Turn Type	Perm		Perm	Prot		Perm	Split		pm+ov	Split		
Protected Phases		4		3	8		2	2	3	6	6	
Permitted Phases	4		4			8			2			
Actuated Green, G (s)	19.1	19.1	19.1	12.0	35.1	35.1		17.0	29.0		10.8	
Effective Green, g (s)	19.1	19.1	19.1	12.0	35.1	35.1		17.0	29.0		10.8	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.26	0.26	0.26	0.16	0.47	0.47		0.23	0.39		0.14	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	155	475	404	284	873	742		412	613		250	
v/s Ratio Prot		c0.27		c0.20	0.36			0.06	c0.04		c0.08	
v/s Ratio Perm	0.13		0.02			0.02			0.06			
v/c Ratio	0.52	1.06	0.06	1.24	0.77	0.05		0.25	0.28		0.54	
Uniform Delay, d1	23.9	27.9	21.1	31.5	16.6	10.8		23.7	15.8		29.8	
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	2.9	59.1	0.1	132.7	4.3	0.0		1.4	0.2		2.4	
Delay (s)	26.8	87.0	21.2	164.2	20.9	10.9		25.1	16.0		32.1	
Level of Service	С	F	С	F	С	В		С	В		С	
Approach Delay (s)		70.2			65.6			17.8			32.1	
Approach LOS		E			E			В			С	
Intersection Summary					in a single part of the second se							
HCM Average Control E	Delay		54.8	F	ICM Le	vel of Se	ervice		D			
HCM Volume to Capaci	ty ratio		0.78									
Actuated Cycle Length ((s)		74.9	S	Sum of I	ost time	(s)		16.0			
Intersection Capacity U	ilization		63.9%](CU Lev	el of Sei	rvice		В			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

	٠		\rightarrow	4	+	*	▲	t	1	· 🖌	Ļ	-
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4			\$		ሻ	\$		۲	Ť	*
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0			4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0
Lane Util. Factor		1.00			1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00
Frt		0.94			0.89		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	0.85
Fit Protected		0.98			0.99		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	1.00
Satd. Flow (prot)		1712			1646		1770	1857		1770	1863	1583
Flt Permitted		0.83			0.95		0.45	1.00		0.36	1.00	1.00
Satd. Flow (perm)		1455			1578		836	1857		672	1863	1583
Volume (vph)	29	5	26	20	9	136	67	511	10	109	416	43
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
Adj. Flow (vph)	34	6	31	24	11	160	79	601	12	128	489	51
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	25	0	0	130	0	0	1	0	0	0	20
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	46	0	0	65	0	79	612	0	128	489	31
Turn Type	Perm			Perm			Perm			Perm		Perm
Protected Phases		4			8			2			6	
Permitted Phases	4			8			2			6		6
Actuated Green, G (s)		7.6			7.6		24.5	24.5		24.5	24.5	24.5
Effective Green, g (s)		7.6			7.6		24.5	24.5		24.5	24.5	24.5
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.19			0.19		0.61	0.61		0.61	0.61	0.61
Clearance Time (s)		4.0			4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0
Vehicle Extension (s)		3.0			3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		276			299		511	1135		411	1138	967
v/s Ratio Prot								c0.33			0.26	
v/s Ratio Perm		0.03			c0.04		0.09			0.19		0.02
v/c Ratio		0.17			0.22		0.15	0.54		0.31	0.43	0.03
Uniform Delay, d1		13.6			13.7		3.4	4.5		3.7	4.1	3.1
Progression Factor		1.00			1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00
Incremental Delay, d2		0.3			0.4		0.1	0.5		0.4	0.3	0.0
Delay (s)		13.9			14.1		3.5	5.0		4.2	4.4	3.1
Level of Service		В			В		А	А		А	А	А
Approach Delay (s)		13.9			14.1			4.8			4.2	
Approach LOS		В			В			А			Α	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control D	elay		6.1	H	ICM Le	vel of Se	ervice		А			
HCM Volume to Capacil	ty ratio		0.46									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		40.1	S	Sum of I	ost time	(s)		8.0			
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		53.7%	10	CU Lev	el of Sei	rvice		А			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

Pinnacle Traffic Engineering

	۶	->	\mathbf{F}	¥	4	۰.	4	†	1	\$	Ļ	4
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations Sign Control Grade		↔ Stop 0%			↔ Stop 0%		٦	₽ Free 0%		, (* 1997), gargeren er er	↔ Free 0%	
Volume (veh/h) Peak Hour Factor Hourly flow rate (vph)	10 0.85 12	1 0.85 1	109 0.85 128	5 0.85 6	0 0.85 0	5 0.85 6	158 0.85 186	489 0.85 575	20 0.85 24	5 0.85 6	443 0.85 521	15 0.85 18
Pedestrians Lane Width (ft) Walking Speed (ft/s) Percent Blockage Right turn flare (veh)												
Median type Median storage veh) Upstream signal (ft)		None			None			490				
pX, platoon unblocked	0.88	0.88		0.88	0.88	0.88		100		0.88		
vC, conflicting volume vC1, stage 1 conf vol vC2, stage 2 conf vol	1495	1512	530	1629	1509	587	539			599		
vCu, unblocked vol	1563	1583	530	1716	1579	530	539			544		
tC, single (s) tC, 2 stage (s)	7.1	6.5	6.2	7.1	6.5	6.2	4.1			4.1		
tF (s)	3.5	4.0	3.3	3.5	4.0	3.3	2.2			2.2		
p0 queue free %	83	98	77	85	100	99	82			99		
cM capacity (veh/h)	68	78	549	41	78	482	1030			902		
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	NB 2	SB-1							
Volume Total	141	12	186	599	545							
Volume Left	12	6	186	0	6							
volume Right	128	5	1020	1700	18							
Volume to Canacity	0.42	70 0.16	0.18	0.35	902							
Queue Length 95th (ft)	0.42 51	13	16	0.55	0.01							
Control Delay (s)	23.5	62.0	9.3	0.0	0.2							
Lane LOS	C	F	A	0.0	Ā							
Approach Delay (s) Approach LOS	23.5 C	62.0 F	2.2		0.2							
Intersection Summary												
Average Delay			4.0									
Intersection Capacity Uti Analysis Period (min)	lization	I	68.8% 15	10	CU Leve	el of Ser	vice		С			

	۶	-		•	1	4	
Movement	EBL	EBT	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR	
Lane Configurations	ኻ	个个	朴		ሻ	7	
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	0.95	0.95		1.00	1.00	
Frt	1.00	1.00	0.95		1.00	0.85	
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	3539	3368		1770	1583	
Fit Permitted	0.95	1.00	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)	1770	3539	3368		1770	1583	
Volume (vph)	214	531	843	402	271	158	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	
Adj. Flow (vph)	252	625	992	473	319	186	
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	73	0	0	142	
Lane Group Flow (vph)	252	625	1392	0	319	44	
Turn Type	Prot					Perm	
Protected Phases	7	4	8		6		
Permitted Phases						6	
Actuated Green, G (s)	12.8	46.0	29.2		16.5	16.5	
Effective Green, g (s)	12.8	46.0	29.2		16.5	16.5	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.18	0.65	0.41		0.23	0.23	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	321	2309	1395		414	370	
v/s Ratio Prot	c0.14	0.18	c0.41		c0.18		
v/s Ratio Perm						0.03	
v/c Ratio	0.79	0.27	1.00		0.77	0.12	
Uniform Delay, d1	27.5	5.2	20.6		25.2	21.3	
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	11.9	0.1	23.5		8.6	0.1	
Delay (s)	39.4	5.2	44. 1		33.8	21.4	
Level of Service	D	А	D		С	C	
Approach Delay (s)		15.1	44.1		29.3		
Approach LOS		В	D		С		
Intersection Summary							
HCM Average Control D)elay		32.5	H	ICM Lev	vel of Ser	rvice C
HCM Volume to Capacil	ty ratio		0.89				
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		70.5	S	um of le	ost time ((s) 12.0
Intersection Capacity Ut	ilization		73.0%	IC	CU Leve	el of Serv	ice D
Analysis Period (min)			15				
c Critical Lane Group							

	الر	→	$\mathbf{\hat{v}}$	4	-	•	•	1	1	1	ţ	4
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻ	朴诤		ሻ	朴		<u></u>	4	1		ب اً	۴
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0			4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	0.95		1.00	0.95			1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00
Frt	1.00	0.98		1.00	0.99			1.00	0.85		1.00	0.85
Fit Protected	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00			0.97	1.00		0.97	1.00
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	3453		1770	3486			1813	1583		1808	1583
Flt Permitted	0.37	1.00		0.95	1.00			0.83	1.00		0.82	1.00
Satd. Flow (perm)	682	3453		1770	3486			1550	1583		1519	1583
Volume (vph)	63	429	83	298	576	64	45	37	345	46	31	51
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
Adj. Flow (vph)	74	505	98	351	678	75	53	44	406	54	36	60
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	29	· 0	0	15	0	0	0	63	0	0	42
Lane Group Flow (vph)	74	574	0	351	738	0	0	97	343	0	90	18
Turn Type	Perm			Prot			Perm	_	pm+ov	Perm		Perm
Protected Phases	_	4		3	8			2	3	_	6	~
Permitted Phases	4						2		2	6		6
Actuated Green, G (s)	14.5	14.5		12.0	30.5			17.1	29.1		17.1	17.1
Effective Green, g (s)	14.5	14.5		12.0	30.5			17.1	29.1		17.1	17.1
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.26	0.26		0.22	0.55			0.31	0.52		0.31	0.31
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0			4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0			3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	178	901		382	1912			477	942		467	487
v/s Ratio Prot		c0.17		c0.20	0.21				c0.08			
v/s Ratio Perm	0.11							0.06	0.14		0.06	0.01
v/c Ratio	0.42	0.64		0.92	0.39			0.20	0.36		0.19	0.04
Uniform Delay, d1	17.0	18.2		21.3	7.2			14.2	7.8		14.2	13.5
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00			1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00
Incremental Delay, d2	1.6	1.5		26.5	0.1			1.0	0.2		0.2	0.0
Delay (s)	18.6	19.7		47.8	7.3			15.2	8.0		14.4	13.5
Level of Service	В	B		D	A			В	A		B	В
Approach Delay (s)		19.6			20.2			9.4			14.0	
Approach LOS		В			С			A			В	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control E	Delay		17.4	ŀ	ICM Le	vel of S	ervice		В			
HCM Volume to Capaci	ty ratio		0.62									
Actuated Cycle Length ((s)		55.6	S	Sum of I	ost time	: (s)		12.0			
Intersection Capacity UI	tilization		52.1%	ŀ	CU Lev	el of Sei	rvice		А			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

	٭	-+	\mathbf{i}	1	-	•	•	1	1	1	Ļ	-
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL.	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		\$			4		ኻ	\$		ሻ	¥	7
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		4.0			4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0
Lane Util. Factor		1.00			1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00
Frt		0.94			0.89		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	0.85
Fit Protected		0.98			0.99		0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	1.00
Satd. Flow (prot)		1716			1646		1770	1857		1770	1863	1583
Fit Permitted		0.85			0.95		0.45	1.00		0.36	1.00	1.00
Satd. Flow (perm)		1494			1582		837	1857		673	1863	1583
Volume (vph)	23	5	20	20	9	136	62	511	10	109	416	38
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85	0.85
Adj. Flow (vph)	27	6	24	24	11	160	73	601	12	128	489	45
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	19	0	0	130	0	0	1	0	0	0	17
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	38	0	0	65	0	73	612	0	128	489	28
Turn Type	Perm			Perm			Perm			Perm		Perm
Protected Phases		4			8			2			6	
Permitted Phases	4			8			2			6		6
Actuated Green, G (s)		7.6			7.6		24.7	24.7		24.7	24.7	24.7
Effective Green, g (s)		7.6			7.6		24.7	24.7		24.7	24.7	24.7
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.19			0.19		0.61	0.61		0.61	0.61	0.61
Clearance Time (s)		4.0			4.0		4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	4.0
Vehicle Extension (s)		3.0			3.0		3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	3.0
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		282			298		513	1138		412	1142	970
v/s Ratio Prot								c0.33			0.26	
v/s Ratio Perm		0.03			c0.04		0.09			0.19		0.02
v/c Ratio		0.13			0.22		0.14	0.54		0.31	0.43	0.03
Uniform Delay, d1		13.6			13.8		3.3	4.5		3.7	4.1	3.1
Progression Factor		1.00			1.00		1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00
Incremental Delay, d2		0.2			0.4		0.1	0.5		0.4	0.3	0.0
Delay (s)		13.8			14.2		3.4	5.0		4.2	4.4	3.1
Level of Service		В			В		А	Α		А	Α	А
Approach Delay (s)		13.8			14.2			4.8			4.2	
Approach LOS		В			В			А			А	
Intersection Summary												
HCM Average Control Delay			6.0	Н	CM Lev	el of Se	ervice		A			
HCM Volume to Capacity ratio			0.46									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)		40.3			Sum of lost time (s)				8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization		:	53.7% ICU Level of Serv			vice		А				
Analysis Period (min)			15									

	٭	-	$\mathbf{\tilde{v}}$	¥	-+	×.	4	1	1	4	Ļ	4
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations Sign Control Grade		⇔ Stop 0%			t top 0%		٢	î⊧ Free 0%			↔ Free 0%	
Volume (veh/h) Peak Hour Factor Hourly flow rate (vph) Pedestrians Lane Width (ft)	10 0.85 12	1 0.85 1	108 0.85 127	5 0.85 6	0 0.85 0	5 0.85 6	157 0.85 185	486 0.85 572	20 0.85 24	5 0.85 6	440 0.85 518	15 0.85 18
Percent Blockage Right turn flare (veh) Median type Median storage veh)		None			None			400				
vC1, stage 2 conf vol	0.88 1485	0.88 1503	526	0.88 1619	0.88 1500	0.88 584	535	490		0.88 595		
vCu, unblocked vol tC, single (s) tC, 2 stage (s)	1552 7.1	1572 6.5	526 6.2	1704 7.1	1569 6.5	526 6.2	535 4.1			539 4.1		
tF (s) p0 queue free % cM capacity (veh/h)	3.5 83 69	4.0 99 79	3.3 77 551	3.5 86 41	4.0 100 79	3.3 99 485	2.2 82 1033			2.2 99 904		
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	WB 1	NB 1	NB 2	SB 1							
Volume Total Volume Left Volume Bight	140 12	12 6	185 185	595 0	541 6				<u>' i m transmittan</u>			
cSH Volume to Capacity Queue Length 95th (ft)	336 0.42 50	76 0.15 13	1033 0.18 16	1700 0.35 0	904 0.01 0							
Control Delay (s) Lane LOS Approach Delay (s) Approach LOS	23.1 C 23.1 C	60.5 F 60.5 F	9.2 A 2.2	0.0	0.2 A 0.2							
Intersection Summary Average Delay Intersection Capacity Uti Analysis Period (min)	lization		3.9 38.4% 15	IC	CU Leve	l of Ser	vice		С			

TRAFFIC CONDITIONS POUT

California MUTCD (FHWA's MUTCD 2003 Revision 1, as amended for use in California)

Page 4C-10







Chapter 4C – Traffic Control Signal Needs Studies Part 4 – Highway Traffic Signals

. .

September 26, 2006