RESOLUTION NO. 12-__

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GROVER BEACH
ADOPTING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR A GENERAL PLAN,
ZONING CODE & RAMONA SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT ASSOCIATED WITH
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION NO. 12-01 FOR
ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBERS 060-162-006, 018, 019, 021, & 022

WHEREAS, on December 5, 2011, the City Council directed staff to initiate the process
to amend the General Plan, Zoning Code, and Ramona Specific Plan to change the land use
designation and zoning from Parks and Recreation and Public Facilities (P-F) to Medium
Density Residential and Duplex Residential (R-2) for five lots (APNs 060-162-006, 018, 019,
021, and 022); and

WHEREAS, the City has prepared an Initial Study and Negative Declaration for the
proposed project in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and

WHEREAS, the Notice of Availability for the Negative Declaration was properly
advertised in the manner required by law; and

WHEREAS, on March 13, 2012 the Planning Commission recommended that the City
Council adopt the Negative Declaration associated with Development Permit Application No. 12-
01; and

WHEREAS, Development Permit Application No. 12-01 includes applications to amend
the General Plan, Zoning Code, and Ramona Specific Plan; and

WHEREAS, public notice has been given in the time and manner required by State law
and City code; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Grover Beach has reviewed and considered
the proposed Negative Declaration associated with Development Permit Application No. 12-01
at a Public Hearing on April 2, 2012; and

WHEREAS, there is no substantial evidence of any significant adverse effect, either
individually or cumulatively, on wildlife resources as defined by Section 711.2 of the Fish and
Game Code or on the habitat upon which the wildlife depends as a result of development of this
project; and

WHEREAS, the approval of the Amendment will not have a significant effect on the
environment; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Grover
Beach DOES HEREBY ADOPT a Negative Declaration for Development Permit Application No.
12-01.
On motion by ____________, seconded by ____________, and on the following roll-call vote, to wit:

AYES: Council Members -
NOES: Council Members -
ABSENT: Council Members -
ABSTAIN: Council Members -

the foregoing RESOLUTION NO. 12-__ was PASSED, APPROVED, and ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council on this 2nd day of April 2012.

JOHN P. SHOALS, MAYOR

Attest:

DONNA L. MCMAHON, CITY CLERK

Approved as to Form:

MARTIN D. KOCZANOWICZ, CITY ATTORNEY
CITY OF GROVER BEACH
INITIAL STUDY

1. Project Title: Ramona Specific Plan Amendment
2. Lead Agency Name & Address: City of Grover Beach
   154 South Eighth Street
   Grover Beach, CA 93433
3. Contact Person & Phone #: Bruce Buckingham
   (805) 473-4520
4. Project Location: The Amendment area is generally bounded by Ramona
   Avenue, Brighton Avenue, North 9th Street and North 10th
   Street
5. Project Sponsor's Name & Address: City of Grover Beach
   154 South Eighth Street
   Grover Beach, CA 93433
6. General Plan Designation: Parks and Recreation
7. Zoning: Public Facilities (P-F)
8. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting (Briefly describe the project's surroundings):
   The Amendment area is bordered by residential to the north
   and west and Ramona Park and the Grover Beach Library to
   the south and east.
9. Other agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or
participation agreement): None.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:
The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact
that is a "POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. X

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposal 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.

I find that 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.

Signature

Bruce Buckingham, Community Development Director

Printed Name

Date

Community Development Department

For

Evaluation of Environmental Impacts:

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

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

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

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

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.

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

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

8. The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and
   b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is an amendment to the City's Land Use Element, Zoning Code and Ramona Specific Plan (referred to as "Amendment" or "project"). The Amendment would affect five lots (reference table below) located within the Ramona Specific Plan adopted in September 2005. The proposed Amendment would revise the land use designation from Parks and Recreation to Medium Density Residential and change the Zoning Map from Public Facilities to R-2 for five lots (APNs 060-162-006, 018, 019, 021 and 022). Four of the five lots are currently developed with single family residences and one lot is used as a community garden. The proposed Amendment would allow for the potential development of two additional residences on two of the five lots (one unit on APNs 060-162-006 & 018). The current zoning could allow a range of development from one additional residence (APN 060-162-018 subject to approval of a Use Permit) to the development of public facilities, which could include public park or public facilities.

List of the lots proposed to be changed to Medium Density Residential and R-2 Zoning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Property Owner</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>Existing Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>060-162-006</td>
<td>Cyril &amp; Muriel Clare</td>
<td>266 N. 9th St.</td>
<td>7,500 sq. ft.</td>
<td>One residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060-162-018</td>
<td>City of Grover Beach</td>
<td>920 Brighton Ave.</td>
<td>6,620 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Community Garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060-162-019</td>
<td>Kathleen Pritchard</td>
<td>944 Brighton Ave.</td>
<td>6,620 sq. ft.</td>
<td>One residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060-162-021</td>
<td>Ed Begovich</td>
<td>280 N. 9th St.</td>
<td>3,310 sq. ft.</td>
<td>One residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060-162-022</td>
<td>Darrell Voth</td>
<td>900 Brighton Ave.</td>
<td>3,310 sq. ft.</td>
<td>One residence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROBABLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

The following discussion addresses impacts to various environmental resources per the Environmental Checklist Form contained in Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. AESTHETICS. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? (Source #3 &amp; 13)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The Amendment area is an infill area and changes to existing views within a built environment would be insignificant. Some views from private properties could be affected by future in-fill development; however, CEQA does not generally protect private residential views. While CEQA does not define “scenic vista,” a substantial adverse impact to a scenic vista is generally considered to occur if the proposed project would significantly degrade the scenic landscape as viewed from public roads, or from other public areas. Therefore, no substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista would occur.

b. There are no state or local scenic highways or scenic resources located within the Amendment area; therefore, no impacts would occur.

c. The Amendment area is an infill area and changes to the existing visual character within a built environment would be insignificant. All future discretionary projects would be evaluated for consistency with existing General Plan policies related to site design.

d. As additional infill projects are developed, there will be an increase in lighting and glare. However, the Amendment area is surrounded by urban development and the project would not create lighting or glare that is inconsistent with surrounding uses. All future discretionary projects would be evaluated for consistency with existing General Plan policies related to lighting.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

Would the project:

(a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (Source #2) | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

(b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (Source #14) | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |
(c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? (Source #14)

(d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

(e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

The Amendment area is not designated, nor does it contain any properties under agricultural use. It also does not contain timberland or forest land.

---

**Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Source #19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source #18 &amp; 19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Source #19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**III. AIR QUALITY.** Where available, the significance criteria established by the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District may be relied upon to make the following determinations. *Would the project:*

(a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Source #19)

(b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source #18 & 19)

(c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Source #19)

(d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

(e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

The City of Grover Beach is located within the South Central Coast Air Basin (SCCAB). State air quality oversight for the basin is provided by the San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD). The air basin is in non-attainment for the 24-hour state standard for particulate matter (PM2.5) and the one and eight hour state standard for ozone (O3). The regional 2001 Clean Air Plan (CAP) prepared by the San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD) addresses the attainment and maintenance of state and federal ambient air quality standards within the South Central Coast Air Basin (SCCAB). Typical development activities would result in the creation of construction dust and short-term construction vehicle emissions (construction emissions). In addition, vehicle trips generated by future development would generate long-term vehicle emissions from future residents (operational emissions).

(a-e) The proposed Amendment would allow for the potential development of two additional residences, or approximately 20 vehicle trips per day. In regards to operational emissions, the current zoning of public facilities could generate the same or greater number of vehicle trips by developing public facilities on the five lots. Therefore, the change from public facilities to residential would not cause a significant increase in vehicle emissions. The construction of two additional residences would create dust and short-term construction vehicle emissions. The implementation of City standards for dust control would mitigate the impacts to less than significant. Therefore, the proposed Amendment would not have a significant impact on air quality.
### IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Dept. of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Dept. of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (Source #14 &amp; 15)</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (Source #27)</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a-f.** The Amendment area is an infill area in which all natural habitats have been disturbed and no biological resources have been previously identified. There is no riparian habitat, wetlands, or wildlife corridors within the Amendment area and no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan or other local, regional or state conservation plans.

### V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a-d.** A previous records search was conducted for cultural resources in 2005 by the Central Coast Information Center (CCIC) at the University of California at Santa Barbara and found no cultural resources within the Specific Plan area. There are no designated historical resources within the Amendment area.
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Source #1 &amp; 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Source #12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landslides? (Source #12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Source #25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? (Source #1 &amp; 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in the 2010 California Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property? (Source #14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? (Source #29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a(i). The project site is not located within an Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone and no active faults are located on or adjacent to the property, as identified by the U.S. Geologic Survey mapping system. Therefore, the potential for fault rupture within the project site is less than significant.

a(ii-iv). The City of Grover Beach, along with all of Southern California and the Central Coast, is within Seismic Zone 4 and subject to seismic ground shaking from faults in the region. Secondary seismic hazards result from the interaction of ground shaking with existing soil conditions, and include liquefaction, settlement, and landslides. Due to the relatively flat topography of the project site, impacts associated with landslides are not anticipated. According to the City’s General Plan Safety Element (2000), the project site is located in an area that would be subject to moderate liquefaction potential in the event of a major earthquake. The Safety Element indicates that the presence of a high water table and potential for granular sediments in the project vicinity could amplify ground shaking and result in liquefaction and settlement. A seismic hazard cannot be completely avoided. However, its effect can be minimized by implementing seismic requirements specified by the California Building Code (incorporates the International Building Code) and the California Division of Mines and Geology Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, Special Publication 117 (revised 2008), which includes design and construction requirements related to fire and life safety and structural safety. Therefore, all future development would be required to meet building code requirements that would address potential geologic conditions and incorporate required mitigation. This would result in impacts related to seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction to be less than significant.

b. The primary soil type found on-site is Oceano sand, 0 to 9 percent slopes. While the risk of water erosion for this soil is slight, the risk of wind erosion is high (Natural Resources Conservation Service, 2010). During construction, soil may erode due to wind entrainment and sediment may travel into storm drainage facilities. However, all proposed construction activities would be required to comply with California Building Code Chapter 70 standards, which are designed to ensure implementation of appropriate measures during grading and construction to control erosion and storm water pollution. In addition, the Amendment area is developed with the exception of one vacant lot. All future development will require the
preparation and approval of a grading and erosion control plan prior to construction, and site inspections to verify compliance, which would assure that potential soil loss or erosion impacts would be less than significant.

c. As discussed in section (a) above, according to the City's General Plan Safety Element, the proposed project is located in an area with moderate liquefaction and settlement potential. As previously mentioned, the Safety Element includes standards to minimize impacts due to liquefaction. The proposed project would be designed in accordance with these standards, as well as standards set forth in the California Building Code and the California Division of Mines and Geology Guidelines for Evaluating Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California. Therefore, impacts related to seismic related ground failure, including liquefaction would be less than significant.

d. According to the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS, 2010), the shrink-swell potential for Oceano sand with 0-9 percent slopes is low. Therefore, the Amendment area would not be located on expansive soil, and impacts would be less than significant.

e. The Amendment area will be connected to the City's sewer system, and will not require the use of septic tanks. Therefore, no impacts would result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (Source #18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a-b. In California, the main sources of Greenhouse Gases (GHGs) are from the transportation and energy sectors. According to the California Air Resources Board, approximately 39 percent of GHG emissions result from transportation and 25 percent result from electricity generation. GHGs remain in the atmosphere for periods ranging from decades to centuries; the main GHGs emitted by human activities include CO₂, methane (CH₄), nitrous oxide (N₂O), hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs), perfluorocarbons (PFCS), and sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆).

A warming trend of approximately 1.0 to 1.7 degrees Fahrenheit occurred during the 20th Century. It is generally agreed that human activity has been increasing the concentration of GHGs in the atmosphere, mostly CO₂ from the combustion of coal, oil and gas (NCDC 2008). The effect of each GHG on climate change is measured as a combination of the volume or mass of its emissions, and the potential of a gas or aerosol to trap heat in the atmosphere (global warming potential), and is expressed as a function of how much warming would be caused by the same mass of CO₂.

The potential effects on future climate change on California resources include increases of air temperature, sea level rise, reduced water resources and changed flood hydrology, changed forest composition and productivity, increased wild fires, changed habitats and ecosystems, changed crop yields and increased irrigation demands, and increased smog and public health issues.

The APCD has no authority to require implementation of GHG reduction measures, as no applicable standard or threshold has been established which could be applied to the project. However, CEQA requires the Lead Agency (City) to implement any feasible alternatives or mitigation measures which would substantially lessen significant environmental effects of a project prior to agency approval (Public Resources Code Section 21002). Standard APCD GHG reduction measures are recommended to reduce any GHG impacts consistent with LU-27.4 to the maximum extent feasible, and include the following:

**Construction Measures**

- The project plans and specifications shall include a statement that construction equipment shall be shut off when not in use and shall not idle for more than five minutes.
- The project plans and specifications shall include a statement that queuing of trucks on and off site shall be limited to periods when absolutely necessitated by grading or construction activities.
- The project plans and specifications shall include a statement that, to the extent feasible, all diesel- and gasoline-powered construction equipment shall be replaced with equivalent electric equipment.
- The project plans and specifications shall include policies and procedures for the reuse and recycling of construction and demolition waste (including, but not limited to, soil, vegetation, concrete, lumber, metal, and cardboard).
- The project plans and specifications shall include education for construction workers about reducing waste and available recycling services.
Operational Measures

- The applicant shall demonstrate that the design of the proposed buildings or structures exceeds Title 24 requirements by a minimum of 20 percent.
- The applicant shall demonstrate that the design of the proposed buildings or structures incorporates basic or enhanced insulation such that heat transfer and thermal bridging are minimized.
- Limit air leakage through the structures or within the heating and cooling distribution systems to minimize energy consumption.
- The applicant shall demonstrate that the design of the proposed buildings or structures incorporates Energy Star-rated windows or better.
- The applicant shall demonstrate that the design of the proposed buildings or structures incorporates Energy Star-rated space heating and cooling equipment or better.
- The applicant shall demonstrate that the design of the proposed buildings or structures incorporates Energy Star-rated light fixtures or better.
- The applicant shall demonstrate that the design of the proposed buildings or structures includes consideration of installation/operation of renewable electric generation systems.
- The applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed building or structure designs incorporate energy-efficient hot water systems.
- The applicant shall demonstrate that the landscape plan for the proposed buildings or structures incorporates water-efficient irrigation systems and devices; such as soil moisture-based irrigation controls or irrigation controls that account for actual weather conditions.
- The applicant shall demonstrate that the landscape plan for the proposed structures uses reclaimed water for landscape irrigation, including the infrastructure to deliver and use reclaimed water. (Note that the City of Grover Beach does not have a reclaimed water program and this measure is not implementable.)
- The applicant shall demonstrate that the design of the proposed buildings or structures includes measures to be water-efficient, such as water-efficient fixtures and appliances.
- The applicant shall demonstrate that all interior building lighting supports the use of compact fluorescent light bulbs or equivalently efficient lighting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Gov. Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (Source #21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

(h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (Source #5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The Amendment does not propose the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Therefore, no associated hazards to the public or environment would occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No storage, use or transport of hazardous materials is proposed as part of the Amendment. Based on the proposed residential land use, the potential of a significant upset or accident condition involving hazardous materials would be minimal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The project area is within one quarter mile of an existing school. However, no storage, use or transport of hazardous materials is proposed as part of the Amendment. Based on the proposed residential land use, the potential for hazardous emissions would be minimal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The project site is not located on a known hazardous materials site. No impacts would occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-f. The project site is not located within the Oceano Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) or within the vicinity of a private airstrip.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. The project site is within a built environment that has existing public streets to provide emergency access. The project would not conflict with any regional evacuation or emergency response plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. The proposed project is in an urban setting, and is not in a high fire risk area. The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of fire. Impacts would be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

(a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

(b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (Source #30)

(c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

(d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

(e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

(f) Otherwise substantially degrade water?
**IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:**

| (g) | Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (Source #17) | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| (h) | Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? (Source #17) | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| (i) | Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (Source #12) | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| (j) | Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? (Source #7) | □ | □ | □ | □ |

a. All future development within the Amendment area would be served by City water and wastewater systems, which have adequate capacity to serve the project's needs (refer to Section XVII, Utilities and Service Systems, below, for additional information). No violations of any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements are expected. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. The proposed project would utilize City water supplies, which are estimated to be sufficient to meet project demands (refer to Section XVII, Utilities and Service Systems, below). No depletion of groundwater supplies or effects on groundwater recharge is expected. Impacts would be less than significant.

c-d. There is one lot that is currently vacant. Future development would not alter existing drainage patterns or water courses. All future development would be required to retain runoff onsite, through utilization of above or below ground retention basins as required by the City's Engineering Standards and Specifications. With implementation of existing City standards for run-off, impacts would be less than significant.

e-f. With implementation of (d) above, no other impacts to water quality are expected to occur. Impacts would be less than significant.

g. The project location is not within FEMA's 100-year flood hazards area. No impacts would occur.

h. The project location is not within the FEMA 100-year flood hazard area, and would not redirect or impede any flood flows. No impacts would occur.

i. The project does not place structures or people in a high flood hazard area and is not within the Lopez Dam Inundation Area. No impacts would occur.

j. The project is not proposed in an area subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow hazards. No impacts would occur.

**X. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:**

| (a) | Physically divide an established community? | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| (b) | Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (Source #11 & 15) | □ | □ | □ | □ |
| (c) | Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? (Source #27) | □ | □ | □ | □ |

a. The project involves minor modifications to land use in the center of Grover Beach. The project will not divide an...
established community.

b. While CEQA requires a discussion of consistency with applicable plans and policies, 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. It is the responsibility of the City, as the CEQA Lead Agency, to make the final decision regarding consistency issues.

The Amendment would change the land use designation from Parks and Recreation to Medium Density Residential and the zoning from Public Facilities to R-2 for five lots. However, four of the five lots are currently developed with residential uses because historically the Amendment area was designated for residential uses. The current land use and zoning were not adopted to avoid or mitigate an environmental effect.

In addition, the City's Parks and Recreation Element establishes a goal of five acres of parkland per 1,000 residences. The elimination of 0.15 acres of community garden (6,620 square feet) could be considered inconsistent with the goal. However, this is a policy decision and the potential loss of a community garden consisting of 0.15 acres is not a significant impact as defined by CEQA.

c. The project area is not within a habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Source #3)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan? (Source #15)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The Amendment area is in an existing developed area that does not contain significant amounts of any known mineral resources. Even if mineral resources were present, extraction would not be feasible at this location in a developed urban area. No impact would occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The project site is not designated on any local or regional plan as a locally-important mineral resource recovery site. No impact would occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XII. NOISE. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Source #8 &amp; 14)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Source #21)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? □ □ □ ❌

a. Residential uses typically do not generate noise levels that exceed the City's adopted noise ordinance. However, all future construction would need to comply with the City's noise ordinance. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

b-d. Future construction of residences would include the use of small tractors, backhoes, etc., and would not involve large earth moving equipment; therefore, project construction would not generate excessive levels of groundborne vibration. Future construction activities could cause a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. However, all construction activities are required to meet the City's noise ordinance. Therefore, construction activities could generate a temporary increase in noise in the site vicinity, but would not have a significant impact on the environment.

e-f. The Plan area is located outside the Oceano Airport Land Use Plan area and would not affect airport land use policies. The project site is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The proposed Amendment could potentially add two additional residences not contemplated as part of the Land Use Element Update, which would not induce substantial population growth. Impacts would be less than significant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b-c. The proposed Amendment would not displace a substantial amount of housing or people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Fire Protection?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Police Protection?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Schools?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Parks?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Other public facilities?</td>
<td>❌</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The project site is currently served by the Five Cities Fire Authority. The nearest fire station is located at 701 Rockaway Avenue. The site is approximately one quarter mile from the fire station. Future development of two residences would have minimal impacts to fire service and would not result in significant additional demand for fire protection services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
addition, future development would be required to be designed and constructed according to Fire Department and California Building Code standards. Compliance with these existing requirements would prevent fire hazards. As such, the proposed project would not result in the provision of or need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts related to fire protection services would be less than significant.

b. The project site is currently served by the City of Grover Beach Police Department. The nearest police station is located at 711 Rockaway Avenue. The project site is located approximately one quarter mile from the police station. Future development of two residences would not result in significant additional demand for police protection services. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the provision of or need for new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. Impacts related to police protection services would be less than significant.

c-e. Future development would have the potential to add two additional residences and therefore, only a few additional residents. Because the demand for schools, parks, and other public facilities is driven by population, the proposed project would not increase demand for those services. As such, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts on these public services.

### XV. RECREATION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The proposed Amendment would not have a significant increase in population based on the proposed land use changes; therefore, it would not result in increased demand on existing city recreational facilities. However, the proposed Amendment could eliminate the existing community garden lot consisting of 6,620 square feet (0.15 acres). This would not result in an impact to the environment as analyzed under CEQA. However, the elimination of the community garden is a policy decision.

b. The project does not propose the construction or expansion of any new or existing recreational facilities, the development of which may result in adverse environmental impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

### XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? (Source #10)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? □ □ □ ◓

(d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? □ □ □ ◓

(e) Result in inadequate emergency access? □ □ □ ◓

(f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? □ □ □ ◓

a-b. The Amendment could add two additional residences or approximately 20 vehicle trips per day. All surrounding streets including West Grand Avenue are projected to operate at Level of Service (LOS) C at buildout. The additional trips would not conflict with existing circulation policies because the amount of additional vehicle trips would not have a significant impact to existing traffic load or capacity of the street system or other modes of transportation.

c. There would be no change to air traffic.

d-e. The project would not alter the existing grid street pattern or change emergency access.

f. The project would have no effect on public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting information Sources):</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Central Coast Region Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>◓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) 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?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>◓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>◓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (Source #30)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>◓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? (Source #28)</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>◓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>◓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>◓</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The San Luis Obispo County Department of Environmental Health and the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) are the local agencies responsible for wastewater treatment standards. These agencies ensure that proposed projects conform to all applicable local standards. Future development would be required to comply with all applicable RWQCB permit requirements. Impacts would be less than significant.

b. The City is responsible for wastewater collection within the city to the sewer trunk line maintained by the South San Luis Obispo County Sanitation District. The South San Luis Obispo County Sanitation District is responsible for the treatment of sewage and wastewater in Grover Beach, Arroyo Grande and Oceano. The District's treatment facility is located on a 7.6 acre site south of the city, between the Oceano Airport and the Arroyo Grande Creek Channel. The District has the
capacity to process five million gallons of wastewater per day. In 2000, the average daily flow was 2.9 million gallons or 81 gallons per person. Projected population growth for Grover Beach, Arroyo Grande and Oceano indicates that, at build out of these three communities, the average daily flow will equal approximately 75 percent of the system's capacity (SWCA 2010). The existing system has the capacity to accommodate demand associated with the future development of the proposed Amendment, and the District continues the process of upgrading and replacing system infrastructure and utilities. Impacts would be less than significant.

c. Future development would be required to retain all stormwater onsite through the use of above and below-ground storage basins, sized to comply with City standards. Based on the implementation of the existing City standards, impacts would be less than significant.

d. Future development would utilize city water supplies through hookup to the existing system. In 2010, total system per capita water use averaged 138.6 gallons per day. The recently updated Land Use Element estimates a population of 16,150 living in 6,825 households with an average household size of 2.5 persons in 2030 (SWCA 2010). The Land Use Element_MASTER_EIR determined that the city has sufficient capacity to meet this demand at total build out. Increased impacts from future development of the Amendment would be less than significant.

e. Refer to (b), above. Impacts would be less than significant.

f. The collection and disposal of solid waste in Grover Beach is managed by the San Luis Obispo County Integrated Waste Management Association. Garbage and recycling is collected by South County Sanitary Service, and all of the city’s waste is taken to Cold Canyon Landfill. Cold Canyon is located approximately six miles northeast of Grover Beach on State Route 227. Total capacity at the landfill is 10.9 million cubic yards, and the County is currently conducting environmental review for a proposal to expand the existing facility and services. Currently, about 75 percent of the landfill's capacity is filled. However, the future development’s impact on total capacity would be minimal and the landfill is expected to be able to meet the additional demand. Impacts would be less than significant.

g. Future development would comply with all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste; impacts would be less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues (and Supporting Information Sources):</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

(b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

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

(a) The proposed project would not degrade or threaten the quality of the environment, habitat or populations of any fish or wildlife species, or important examples of California history or prehistory. Refer to Sections IV, Biological Resources, and V, Cultural Resources, above. There would be no impacts from the project.

(b) The project would have a minimal effect, individually and cumulatively, based on the limited amount of increased development potential for the proposed Amendment. As discussed, the Amendment would have a potential to add two additional residences and impacts are considered to be less than significant.
The project does not have environmental effects that could cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. Project impacts are limited and incorporated of existing state, regional and City standards would reduce any potential impacts to a less than significant level.
SOURCES & REFERENCES

3. California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology. Special Report 162: Mineral Land Classification of Portland Cement Concrete Aggregate and Active Mines of All Other Commodities in the San Luis Obispo-Santa Barbara Production Consumption Region. 1989
RESOLUTION NO. 12-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GROVER BEACH
APPROVING A GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE LAND USE DESIGNATION
FROM PARKS AND RECREATION TO MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL
ASSOCIATED WITH DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION NO. 12-01 FOR
ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBERS 060-162-006, 018, 019, 021, & 022

WHEREAS, on December 5, 2011, the City Council directed staff to initiate the process to
amend the General Plan, Zoning Code, and Ramona Specific Plan to change the land use
designation and zoning from Parks and Recreation and Public Facilities (P-F) to Medium Density
Residential and Duplex Residential (R-2) for five lots (APNs 060-162-006, 018, 019, 021, and 022); and

WHEREAS, in February 2010, the City Council adopted an update to the Land Use Element of
the City’s General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the General Plan is a long range, comprehensive document that serves as a
guide for the orderly development of the City of Grover Beach; and

WHEREAS, by its very nature, the General Plan Land Use Element will be updated and
refined periodically to account for current and future needs of the community; and

WHEREAS, on March 13, 2012 the Planning Commission recommended that the City Council
amend the General Plan Land Use Element from Parks and Recreation to Medium Density
Residential and the Zoning Map from Public Facilities to R-2 for five lots (APNs 060-162-006, 018,
019, 021, and 022); and

WHEREAS, Development Permit Application No. 12-01 includes applications to amend the
General Plan, Zoning Code, and Ramona Specific Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City has prepared an Initial Study and Negative Declaration for the project in
compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and

WHEREAS, public notice has been given in the time and manner required by State law and
City code; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Grover Beach has reviewed and considered the
proposed General Plan Amendment associated with Development Permit Application No. 12-01 at a
Public Hearing on April 2, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the City Council for the City of Grover Beach makes the following findings:

1. The amendment to the General Plan Land Use Element is in the best interests of the
   community and will continue to promote orderly development of the City.

2. The City has prepared an Initial Study and Negative Declaration in compliance with
   California Environmental Quality Act and determined in their independent judgment that
   the Amendment will not have a significant impact on the environment.

3. This Amendment shall take effective 30 days after the adoption of this resolution.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Grover Beach DOES HEREBY APPROVE a General Plan Amendment associated with Development Permit Application No. 12-01 amending the Land Use Element Map as set forth in the attached Exhibit "A."

On motion by ____________, seconded by ____________, and on the following roll-call vote, to wit:

AYES: Council Members -
NOES: Council Members -
ABSENT: Council Members -
ABSTAIN: Council Members -

the foregoing RESOLUTION NO. 12-__ was PASSED, APPROVED, and ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council on this 2nd day of April 2012.

Attest:

DONNA L. MCMAHON, CITY CLERK

Approved as to Form:

MARTIN D. KOCZANOWICZ, CITY ATTORNEY
General Plan Amendment to change the Land Use Designation of the highlighted area from Parks and Recreation to Medium Density Residential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Assessor's Parcel Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>900 Brighton Avenue</td>
<td>060-162-022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>920 Brighton Avenue</td>
<td>060-162-018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>944 Brighton Avenue</td>
<td>060-162-019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>280 North 9th Street</td>
<td>060-162-021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>266 North 9th Street</td>
<td>060-162-006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ORDINANCE NO. 12-__

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GROVER BEACH
AMENDING ARTICLE IX, PLANNING AND ZONING REGULATIONS,
CHAPTER 1 OF THE GROVER BEACH MUNICIPAL CODE AMENDING THE ZONING MAP
ASSOCIATED WITH DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION NO. 12-01
FOR ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBERS 060-162-006, 018, 019, 021, & 022

WHEREAS, on December 5, 2011, the City Council directed staff to initiate the process to
amend the General Plan, Zoning Code, and Ramona Specific Plan to change the land use
designation and zoning from Parks and Recreation and Public Facilities (P-F) to Medium Density
Residential and Duplex Residential (R-2) for five lots (APNs 060-162-006, 018, 019, 021, and 022); and

WHEREAS, on March 13, 2012 the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing for
Development Permit Application No. 12-01 and recommended that the City Council amend the
General Plan Land Use Element from Parks and Recreation to Medium Density Residential for five
lots (APNs 060-162-006, 018, 019, 021, and 022); and

WHEREAS, Development Permit Application No. 12-01 includes applications to amend the
General Plan, Zoning Code, and Ramona Specific Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City has prepared an Initial Study and Negative Declaration for the project in
compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and

WHEREAS, public notice has been given in the time and manner required by State law and
City code; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Grover Beach has reviewed and considered the
proposed Zoning Code Amendment associated with Development Application No. 12-01 at a Public
Hearing on April 2, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Grover Beach makes the following findings:

1. The amendment to the Zoning Code to change the Zoning Map to R-2 for five lots (APNs
   060-162-006, 018, 019, 021, and 022) is consistent with the Land Use Element Map
   change to Medium Density Residential.

2. The City has prepared an Initial Study and Negative Declaration in compliance with
   California Environmental Quality Act and determined in their independent judgment that
   the Amendment would not have a significant impact on the environment.

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GROVER BEACH does hereby ordain as follows:

PART 1. Article IX Planning and Zoning Regulations, Chapter 1, Section 9102.3 Zoning Map is
hereby amended as shown on the attached Exhibit A.

PART 2: If any section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph, sentence, clause, or phrase of this
Ordinance or any part thereof is for any reason held to be in violation of the law, such decision shall
not affect the validity of the remaining portion of this Ordinance or any part thereof. The City Council
hereby declares that it would have passed each section, subsection, subdivision, paragraph,
sentence, clause, or phrase thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections,
subsections, subdivisions, paragraphs, sentences, clauses or phrases be declared in violation of the law.

PART 3: This Ordinance amending the Zoning Map shall become effective thirty (30) days after the date of its adoption by the City Council. Within fifteen (15) days after adoption by the City Council, the Ordinance shall be published once, together with the names of the Council Members voting thereon, in a newspaper of general circulation within the City.

INTRODUCED at a regular meeting of the City Council held April 2, 2012 and PASSED, APPROVED and ADOPTED by the City Council on ___________, 2012 on the following roll call vote, to wit:

AYES: Council Members -
NOES: Council Members -
ABSENT: Council Members -
ABSTAIN: Council Members -

Attest:

DONNA L. MCMAHON, CITY CLERK

Approved as to Form:

MARTIN D. KOCZANOWICZ, CITY ATTORNEY
Zoning Code Amendment to change area from Public Facilities (P-F) to Duplex Residential (R-2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Assessor's Parcel Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>900 Brighton Avenue</td>
<td>060-162-022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>920 Brighton Avenue</td>
<td>060-162-018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>944 Brighton Avenue</td>
<td>060-162-019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>280 North 9th Street</td>
<td>060-162-021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>266 North 9th Street</td>
<td>060-162-006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION NO. 12-__

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF GROVER BEACH
APPROVING A RAMONA SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT
TO CHANGE TEXT AND FIGURES CONSISTENT WITH THE ASSOCIATED
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION NO. 12-01 FOR
ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBERS 060-162-006, 018, 019, 021, & 022

WHEREAS, on December 5, 2011, the City Council directed staff to initiate the process to
amend the General Plan, Zoning Code, and Ramona Specific Plan to change the land use
designation and zoning from Parks and Recreation and Public Facilities (P-F) to Medium Density
Residential and Duplex Residential (R-2) for five lots (APNs 060-162-006, 018, 019, 021, and 022); and

WHEREAS, on March 13, 2012 the Planning Commission recommended that the City Council
amend the General Plan Land Use Element from Parks and Recreation to Medium Density
Residential and the Zoning Map from Public Facilities to R-2 for five lots (APNs 060-162-006, 018,
019, 021, and 022); and

WHEREAS, the City has prepared an Initial Study and Negative Declaration for the project in
compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and

WHEREAS, public notice has been given in the time and manner required by State law and
City code; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Grover Beach has reviewed and considered the
proposed Ramona Specific Plan Amendment associated with Development Application No. 12-01 at a
Public Hearing on April 2, 2012; and

WHEREAS, Development Permit Application No. 12-01 includes applications to amend the
General Plan, Zoning Code, and Ramona Specific Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Grover Beach makes the following findings:

1. The amendment to the Ramona Specific Plan to change the text and figures is consistent
with the General Plan Land Use Element Amendment and Zoning Code Amendment for
five lots (APNs 060-162-006, 018, 019, 021, and 022) associated with Development Permit
Application No. 12-01.

2. The City has prepared an Initial Study and Negative Declaration in compliance with
California Environmental Quality Act and determined in their independent judgment that
the Amendment will not have a significant impact on the environment.

3. This Amendment shall take effective 30 days after the adoption of this resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Grover Beach DOES
HEREBY APPROVE a Ramona Specific Plan Amendment associated with Development Permit
Application No. 12-01 revising text and figures as set forth in the attached Exhibit "A."

On motion by ____________, seconded by ____________, and on the following roll-call vote,
to wit:
AYES: Council Members -
NOES: Council Members -
ABSENT: Council Members -
ABSTAIN: Council Members -

the foregoing RESOLUTION NO. 12-__ was PASSED, APPROVED, and ADOPTED at a regular meeting by the City Council on this 2nd day of April 2012.

Attest:

____________________________
DONNA L. MCMAHON, CITY CLERK

Approved as to Form:

____________________________
MARTIN D. KOCZANOWICZ, CITY ATTORNEY
EXHIBIT A

The following paragraph on Page 25 is amended as follows:

The parcels fronting Brighton Avenue between Eighth and Ninth Streets are zoned R-2. Rezoning these parcels to P-F was discussed in the public workshops, but it was decided to continue the residential zoning given the relatively good condition of the homes. The existing homes on the south side of Brighton between Ninth and Tenth Streets will continue to be non-conforming uses with the potential that those properties could be acquired in the future and consolidated with Ramona Park were rezoned in April 2012 from P-F to R-2.

Figure 7 illustrates the physical pattern of development permitted in the Specific Plan Area, as well as the proposed land uses.

**Figure 7 - Proposed Land Use and Zoning is amended as follows:**

![Diagram illustrating land use and zoning changes](image)

**General Plan Amendment to change area from the land use designation of Parks and Recreation to Medium Density Residential & Zoning Code Amendment to change area from Public Facilities (P-F) to Duplex Residential (R-2)**

The following paragraph on Page 27 is amended as follows:

**Additional Park Area.** The Specific Plan will include the future conversion of the following parcels into public park land: 254 N. Ninth Street, 266 N. Ninth Street, and 944 Brighton Avenue. One of the two lots located on Ninth Street is owned by the City and is designated Public Facilities. It is currently being utilized as a residence. Conversion of these lots from their current uses will help to offset the net loss of "park" space to parking and bus use.
Figure 9 – Conceptual Plan is amended as follows: