



**Meeting Date: 5/26/2021**  
**Item Number: 3**  
**Time Estimate: 45 Minutes**

## **PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA REPORT**

**SUBJECT:** REVIEW OF THE CITY'S DRAFT PARKS AND RECREATION BLUEPRINT FOR THE FUTURE: 2021-2041 (PARKS AND RECREATION PLAN AND GENERAL PLAN ELEMENT UPDATE) THAT WILL SUPERCEDE THE 2001 PARKS AND RECREATION MASTER PLAN AND GENERAL PLAN ELEMENT.

**PROJECT ADDRESS:** Citywide

**BY:** Shawna Scott, Senior Planner  
Phone Number: (805) 781-7176  
Email: sscott@slocity.org

**FILE NUMBER:** GENP-1942-2018;  
EID-0150-2021

**FROM:** Tyler Corey, Deputy Director of  
Community Development  
**VIA:** Greg Avakian, Parks and  
Recreation Director

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Adopt a resolution (Attachment 1), recommending the City Council approve the Draft Parks + Recreation Blueprint for the Future: 2021-2041 (Parks and Recreation Plan and General Plan Element Update) (Attachment 2) and adopt the associated Initial Study/Negative Declaration (Attachment 3).

#### **1.0 COMMISSION'S PURVIEW**

The Planning Commission will consider the Parks and Recreation Commission's recommendation regarding the Plan Update, consider the Initial Study/Negative Declaration, review the project for consistency with applicable policies and goals of the General Plan, and provide a recommendation to City Council.

#### **2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION**

The City Parks and Recreation Department has prepared the Draft Parks + Recreation Blueprint for the Future: 2021-2041 (Parks and Recreation Plan and General Plan Element Update) (Plan Update) to guide the future of parks and recreation in the City for the next twenty years. The current Parks and Recreation Master Plan and Element (2001) is proposed to be replaced in its entirety by the Plan Update. One notable and important change with the Plan Update is that the Plan addresses urban parks and recreation, and no longer includes plans or policies related to the City's Open Space, which are appropriately addressed in the City's Conservation and Open Space Element (adopted in 2006) and adopted Natural Area plans. This report provides an overview of the Plan Update, including goals, policies, and implementation.

The Draft Plan Update incorporates comments and direction from the Active Transportation Committee (ATC), the Parks and Recreation Commission (PRC), and the City Council Study Session on the Public Draft Plan Update.

The Draft Plan Update and Initial Study/Negative Declaration are provided as Attachments 2 and 3, and the Draft Plan Update is available for public review at <https://www.slocity.org/government/department-directory/parks-and-recreation/parks-and-recreation-plan-and-element-update>.

### 3.0 PROJECT ANALYSIS

#### Project Background

In 2017, the City Parks and Recreation Department initiated the update to the City's Parks and Recreation Element of the General Plan and the Parks and Recreation Plan (Plan Update). On November 7, 2017, the City Council approved the Project Plan for the Plan Update, and a consultant team led by WRT was selected in February 2018 to support staff. In April 2018, the Parks and Recreation Commission (PRC) approved the Community Engagement Plan<sup>1</sup> for the project, and the Plan Update has been informed by three years of public outreach and comment, public workshops and forums, a statistically valid survey, and focused review by Parks and Recreation and Planning staff and the PRC.

The Plan Update will be an essential guide for parks and recreation in San Luis Obispo, while also serving as the General Plan Parks and Recreation Element; goals and policies are embedded in the City's larger blueprint for future growth and change. Chapters 1, 2, 3, and 5 of the Blueprint comprise the **Parks and Recreation Plan**, and Chapter 4 is the **Parks and Recreation General Plan Element**. The Plan Update also serves to support, supplement, and advance the goals of the City's *Climate Action Plan for Community Recovery*<sup>2</sup>, *Active Transportation Plan*<sup>3</sup>, and *Recommendations to City Council for Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in the City of San Luis Obispo*<sup>4</sup>. Implementation of the Plan supports and strives to ensure that City's parks, facilities, and programs will be inclusive, safe, and accessible to all people.

#### Park and Recreation Needs

The City currently has 205.6 acres of parkland, including 99.7 acres of Community Parks, 34.7 acres of Neighborhood Parks, 7.9 acres of Mini Parks, and 63.3 acres of recreational centers and special facilities. Proposed park acreage standards require a minimum of 10 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents, including five acres of Neighborhood Parks per 1,000 residents (refer to Attachment 2, Plan Update, *Policy 1.2 Park Acreage Standards*). Looking ahead, the City would need an additional 361 acres of parkland to meet the park acreage standard for residents in 2035, inclusive of 249 acres of Neighborhood Parks, based on resident population estimates in the City's General Plan (56,686) (Attachment 2, Appendix C, *Community Needs Assessment Table 2-6, San Luis Obispo Park Acreage Standards and Level of Service*). Implementation of currently approved parks within adopted Specific and Development Plans (Avila Ranch, Orcutt Area Specific Plan, Froom Ranch Specific Plan, and San Luis Ranch Specific Plan) would provide 41 acres of

---

<sup>1</sup> Approved by the Parks and Recreation Commission in April 2018, [available here](#).

<sup>2</sup> Climate Action Plan for Community Recovery (August 2020), [available here](#)

<sup>3</sup> Active Transportation Plan (February 2021), [available here](#)

<sup>4</sup> Recommendations to City Council for Advancing DEI (January 2021), [available here](#)

parkland and several new amenities (refer to *Table 1. Specific Plan Parkland Amenities*). This will contribute to the total acreage of parkland in the City, resulting in total park acreage of 246, with a remaining gap of **320 acres** needed to serve the estimated resident population in 2035.

**Table 1. Specific Plan Parkland Amenities**

Amenity Type	Specific Plan – Planned Amenities
Diamond Athletic Fields (Youth)	1 - Avila Ranch
Rectangle Athletic Fields	3 – Orcutt Area 1 – Avila Ranch
Outdoor Basketball Court	1 – Avila Ranch (full court) 3 – Avila Ranch (half court) 2 – San Luis Ranch (half court) 1 – Orcutt Area (full court)
Tennis Court	4 – Orcutt Area 2 – Avila Ranch
Playground/Tot Lot	7 – Avila Ranch 2 - San Luis Ranch 3 - Orcutt Area
Dog Park/ Off-leash Dog Area	1 – Avila 1 – Orcutt Area
Pickleball Court	6 – Orcutt Area 2 – Avila Ranch
Group Gathering/Seating Areas	1 – Orcutt Area 1 – Avila Ranch (BBQ)

The Plan Update recognizes that park and recreational amenities are used by both the resident population and the daytime (service) population, and identifies amenity needs based on the estimated 2035 daytime (service) population of 88,286<sup>5</sup> (Attachment 2, Plan Update, *Policy 1.5 Park Amenity Standards*). The recommended park acreage and amenity standards are ambitious and aspirational, and these gaps highlight the need for multi-use, multi-generational, and multi-ability amenities within parkland and facilities, in addition to the identification of new parkland within the City.

In order to determine base needs for City park facilities and amenities, staff worked with the project consultant team (WRT and PROS) to assess the current level of service for park facilities and amenities based on the 2017 estimated resident and daytime populations, and the 2035 estimated resident and daytime populations. This assessment considered a list of key amenities based on the City's current inventory, planned amenities identified in Specific Plan areas (see *Table 1. Specific Plan Parkland Amenities*, above), input from the public and the PRC and ATC, consideration of recreational trends, and recommendations identified in the Community Needs Assessment.

In addition to overall need, the Plan Update assessed needs based on identified sub-areas within the City (refer to Attachment 2, *Figure 4-2 San Luis Obispo Sub-Areas*) that contain multiple neighborhoods, population density within residential neighborhoods, and

<sup>5</sup> Daytime (service) population identified in the Capital Facilities Development Impact Fee Nexus Study, 2018)

identification of access gaps, with a policy directive for equitable distribution of amenities through-out the City, such that every resident would be able to access no-cost key amenities via sustainable transportation including walking, biking, rolling, or transit (Attachment 2, Plan Update, *Policy 1.3 Park Access Standards* and *Policy 1.6 Park Amenities Per Area Standard*). Existing City inventory, existing needs, future needs, access gaps, and implementation timing priority are identified in *Table 2. Amenity Inventory and Current and Future Needs*.

**Table 2. Amenity Inventory and Current and Future Needs**

Amenity	Current Inventory	Current Additional Need	General Plan Build-out Total Additional Need <sup>1</sup>	Location Based on Access Gaps and Planned Amenities (Sub-area)	Priority
<b>ATHLETIC FIELDS</b>					
Diamond Athletic Fields (Youth)	4	2	3	Downtown Laguna Lake	0-10 years
Diamond Athletic Fields (Youth/Adult)	1	4	5	Downtown Meadow/Sinsheimer Righetti/Orcutt Stoneridge/Margarita Laguna Lake	0-10 years
Diamond Athletic Fields (Adult)	1	2	3	Downtown Righetti/Orcutt Stoneridge/Margarita Laguna Lake	0-10 years
Rectangle Athletic Fields	4	4	6	Downtown Meadow/Sinsheimer Laguna Lake	0-5 years
<b>SPORTS COURTS</b>					
Outdoor Basketball Court	6	6	8	Citywide	0 – 20 years
Tennis Court	8	7	10	Downtown Laguna Lake	0-5 years
Pickleball Court	3	9	12	Foothill/Anholm Downtown Meadow/Sinsheimer Laguna Lake	0 – 5 years
Sand Volleyball	8	3	5	Downtown Stoneridge/Margarita Laguna Lake	0-20 years
Roller Sports Court	1	1	2	Downtown Meadow/Sinsheimer Righetti/Orcutt Stoneridge/Margarita Laguna Lake	10-20 years

Amenity	Current Inventory	Current Additional Need	General Plan Build-out Total Additional Need <sup>1</sup>	Location Based on Access Gaps and Planned Amenities (Sub-area)	Priority
Multi-generational recreation and community center	Ludwick Center and SLO Senior Center	27,000 sf	46,000 sf	Citywide	5-20 years
Dog Park/ Off-leash Dog Area	1	6	7	Foothill/Anholm Downtown Meadow/Sinsheimer	0-5 years
Playgrounds/ Tot Lot	26	10	18	Citywide	0-20 years
Group Seating/Gathering Areas	9	6	9	Downtown Stoneridge/Margarita	0-5 years
<b>SPECIAL RECREATION FACILITIES</b>					
Disc Golf Course (18-hole)	2	0	0	N/A	N/A
Golf Course	1	0	0	Citywide	10-20 years
Swim Center	1	Expansion of existing pool	1	Citywide	5-20 years
Skate Park	1	0	1	Citywide	10-20 years
Pump Track (Bike or Skate)	0	2	3	Citywide	0-20 years

<sup>1</sup> Includes amenities identified in approved Specific Plans

### 3.0 SUMMARY OF THE PLAN UPDATE

The following discussion provides a brief guide to the structure and content of the document. The Plan is divided into five chapters:

**Chapter 1** introduces the planning process and overarching goals of the plan. The Plan includes the following six Guiding Themes, which permeate through the Plan's recommendations, goals, and policies:

- Design Excellence
- Stewardship and Sustainability
- Inclusion and Access
- Building Community
- Partnerships and Public Engagement
- Good Governance

**Chapter 2** takes a deeper look at San Luis Obispo through demographic analysis and its parks through a detailed inventory. This information was presented to the PRC and the public in a Community Needs Assessment Report, which is included in the Plan Update Appendix.

**Chapter 3** provides a summary of the extensive community engagement conducted in association with the Plan Update. This information was presented to the PRC and the public in the adopted Community Needs Assessment Report, and subsequent updates presented to the PRC.

**Chapter 4** provides the detailed policies that flow from five system-wide goals. The draft goals and policies were presented to the PRC in July 2020 and have been expanded and updated based on continued public input, continued staff review, and to maintain consistency with the adopted *Climate Action Plan* and *Active Transportation Plan* and *Recommendations to City Council for Advancing Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in the City of San Luis Obispo*. The Plan Update is intended to support and advance the goals and programs identified in these previously adopted plans.

The five goals include:

- **Build Community and Neighborhoods:** City Parks and Recreational facilities should build and connect community through inclusive and diverse amenities and programming.
- **Meet the Changing Needs of the Community:** Leverage regionalism and creatively increase the number of City parks, recreational facilities and amenities, to meet user needs.
- **Sustainability:** The City's Parks and Recreation facilities will be vibrant, resilient, and sustainable.
- **Optimize Resources:** Establish, maintain, and operate parks, facilities, and programs in a manner that is cost effective and manageable while engaging the community in a manner that optimizes involvement and support.
- **Safety:** Provide safe, accessible, inclusive, and well-maintained City parks, recreational facilities, and amenities.

**Chapter 5** provides the details around **implementation and funding strategy**, including phasing and priority projects. This chapter was informed by public comment and PRC feedback on project prioritization for the near term (0-5 year), mid-term (5-10 year), and long-term (10-20 year) timeframes. Park and facility improvements can be understood in three tiers: Tier 1, Critical Park Improvements (Maintenance); Tier 2, Strategic Park Improvements, Improvement of Existing Parks/Facilities; and Tier 3, "Visionary" Park Improvements, New Opportunities.

Tier 3 park and facility needs and priorities identified in the Plan Update are grouped by park classification (i.e., neighborhood parks, community parks) and are then presented in alphabetical order. Project opportunities are prioritized by phase (near-term, mid-term, and long-term). For quick reference, Tier 3 park and facility opportunities and priorities are also summarized in *Table 5-1* of the Draft Plan Update (Attachment 2).

### **Implementation of the Plan Update**

The Plan Update will be implemented over the next twenty years, depending on funding and staffing resources. Plan Update Chapter 5 (Implementation) is intended to be aspirational and identifies opportunities that may be appropriate for existing parks based on the wants and needs expressed by the community. As amenities and parkland are constructed, the City will need to monitor implementation of the Plan Update and track progress towards meeting service standards for both park acreage and identified amenities, equitable distribution of amenities, and resolving access gaps such that all residents will be able to enjoy parks and recreation within a ½ mile (or ten minute walk) from their home.

The Plan Update is also intended to be flexible, to enable the City to conduct focused community outreach and prepare park-specific comprehensive plans for the following existing community and neighborhood parks:

- Laguna Park (update Laguna Lake Plan)
- Meadow Park and Meadow Park Center
- Sinsheimer Park, Sinsheimer Stadium, SLO Swim Center
- Mitchell Park

In addition, as noted in the plan, **new parkland** is needed in the following areas to address population density within neighborhoods and access gaps:

- Foothill/Anholm area: in the vicinity of Grand Avenue, potentially through agreement with San Luis Coastal Unified School District;
- Downtown area: along the Johnson Avenue corridor south of the high school;
- Meadow/Sinsheimer area, potentially through expansion or amenitization of Stoneridge Park;
- Stoneridge/Margarita area: along the South Higuera corridor;
- Laguna Lake area: at the Laguna Lake Golf Course as part of potential site reuse.

Key considerations for the enhancement and redevelopment of existing parks and the development of new parkland will be striking a balance between active and passive recreational use, maintaining neighborhood character, ensuring high quality design and maintenance, and optimizing resources by incorporating multi-generational, multi-use, inclusive and accessible amenities and facilities. Incorporation of innovative universal design and continued conversations with the community will be critical to resolve and

prevent any barriers<sup>6</sup> to our community's enjoyment of the City parks, recreation amenities, public art, and programs.

The Plan Update also identifies the need for park activation and building community through site planning and provision of community gathering space and associated infrastructure (i.e., gazebo, stage, improved access); supporting and facilitating community events; incorporation of public art and cultural expression; and dynamic programming to address multi-generational and multi-ability needs of our community.

Implementation of the Plan Update would be funded by development impact fees, the general fund, grants, revenues from services, provided, and group area and facility rentals. Potential external funding sources could include grants; "friends of parks" organization(s); corporate sponsorships; crowdfunding; partnerships with other agencies; gifts from non-profit foundations; private donations; irrevocable remainder trusts; volunteerism; and fundraisers. The Plan update identifies rough lifecycle costs for key amenities, while more aspirational projects such as multi-generational center would require a specific cost and financing assessment due to the potential variables that affect construction, operation, and maintenance costs.

#### **4.0 POLICY CONTEXT AND GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY**

The recommendations of the Plan Update support and advance many of the goals, objectives, policies and programs of the City's *General Plan*, *Active Transportation Plan*, and *Climate Action Plan for Community Recovery*. The development and enhancement of accessible parks and facilities in the City would reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and related greenhouse gas emissions. Redevelopment of parks and facilities would facilitate carbon-neutrality and provide an opportunity to educate and showcase evolving technology. The Plan Update is consistent with the General Plan, and implementation of the Plan Update would advance goals and policies of the *Land Use Element*, including neighborhood connectivity and enhancement (*Policies 2.2.4 and 2.2.6*); provision and enhancement of parks within neighborhoods (*Policy 2.3.1*); and increasing green space in the Downtown (*Policy 4.11*).

#### **5.0 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

Chapter 3 of the Plan Update (*What We Heard*) summarizes the extensive public engagement conducted over the past three years pursuant to the Plan Update's Community Engagement Plan, starting with foundational stakeholder interviews in April 2018. Throughout the summer of 2018, in order to reach our community, City staff conducted over 25 "pop-up" events with the Parks and Recreation "Bright Ideas" bicycle to reach and connect with San Luis Obispo residents and visitors at parks, facilities, programs, and events. During these pop-ups, the public had an opportunity to provide comments on portable white boards and comment cards and take photos with the "Bright Ideas" bicycle for sharing on the Parks and Recreation Instagram account. A statistically valid **Needs Assessment Survey** was conducted August to October 2018, with a total of 507 respondents.

---

<sup>6</sup> Potential barriers may include, and are not limited to, ability, skill level, sense of safety, monetary limitations, knowledge and/or interest in programming and/or recreational activity.



Public Workshops and forums included the **“Bright Ideas” Public Workshop** in September 2018 to gain additional input from the community regarding existing parks and facilities and the future of parks and recreation in San Luis Obispo. A **PRC Workshop Series** was held in January, February, and March of 2019, which consisted of focused discussions and public input related to the community’s values and priorities, unmet needs, and hopes and dreams. Following the Workshop Series, a Community Needs Assessment report prepared by the consultant team was presented to the PRC and the public in May 2019, and a **Community Needs Assessment Workshop** was held in June 2019. A **Park Improvement Priorities Workshop** was held with the PRC in September 2019.

**Community Needs Assessment** report includes:

- Demographic characteristics and population trends of the community;
- Description of existing park system and comparison to benchmark cities;
- Overview of recreational trends and preferences in the U.S. and in the region;
- Summary and evaluation of existing amenities and programs; and
- Summary of themes heard during community engagement activities and the community preferences reflected in the statistically-valid survey.

Through the remainder of 2019 and 2020, the public had an opportunity to attend PRC meetings, where information was presented for public response and direction from the PRC, including draft themes, goals, and policies; lifecycle costs; and the ongoing feedback and questions provided by the public.

On March 25, 2021, a **Public Draft Plan Update Public Workshop** was held via Zoom. The Workshop included a presentation on the Plan Update, and the community was invited and encouraged to provide feedback via poll questions conducted during the workshop, use of the “chat” function, and [Open City Hall](#). The results of the public workshop are summarized in the April 5, 2021 PRC Agenda Report.<sup>7</sup> Online community engagement continues to be fostered by information updates on City social media, the project website, direct communications with staff, and the Open City Hall website.

Additional opportunities for public comment included public hearings with the ATC and Study Session with the City Council. Recommendations and direction from the PRC, ATC, and City Council have informed the current version of the Plan Update to be considered by the Planning Commission.

## **6.0 PRIOR REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **City Council Study Session, May 4, 2021**

During the City Council Study Session on the Parks + Recreation Blueprint for the Future: 2021-2041 Parks and Recreation Plan and General Plan Element Update,<sup>8</sup> the City

<sup>7</sup> Parks and Recreation Commission agenda report, dated April 5, 2021, [available here](#).

<sup>8</sup> City Council Study Session Agenda Report available online:

<http://opengov.slocity.org/WebLink/DocView.aspx?id=141546&dbid=0&repo=CityClerk>

City Council Study Session, video of meeting available online:

[https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCjSH3YJ12dVzLmQYuevI\\_sw](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCjSH3YJ12dVzLmQYuevI_sw)

Council provided directional items and suggestions for staff and PRC review and consideration. The City Council's comments and direction, including staff's response, are incorporated into the table below. Edits that have been made to the Plan Update are identified by showing deleted text in ~~strike-through~~, and added text is underlined.

**Table 2. City Council Study Session Comments**

CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION COMMENTS	REVISIONS
Further assess if use of resident or daytime population is appropriate for parkland aspirations (10 acres per 1,000 people) and/or current and future amenity needs.	The Plan Update identifies a parkland standard of 10 acres per 1,000 residents, and identifies amenity level of service based on the daytime (service) population. This approach is identified to recognize that both the resident and daytime (service) populations create demands on parks and recreational amenities and facilities. The PRC specifically recommended support for the 10 acres per 1,000 residents, and use of the daytime population to determine future amenities.
Make sure there are clear distinctions about Open Space and open public spaces/places and urban trails.	Multiple edits were incorporated into the Plan Update to ensure that the document makes the appropriate and clear distinction that the Plan Update focuses on urban parks and recreation, and does not affect or serve as a policy document or plan for the City's Open Space.
Remove reference to a second golf course.	<p>The Plan Update has been modified to remove the opportunity for a second golf course from the document:</p> <p><b>Page 84:</b> <i>Table 4-2 Park Amenity Standards</i>, do not identify a second golf course.</p> <p><b>Page 114:</b> <i>Golf Courses:</i></p> <p>"Additional Need</p> <p>San Luis Obispo would need one additional golf course by 2035 to meet standards; <u>however, two golf courses to serve the City is not needed.</u></p> <p>Access Gaps</p>

CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION COMMENTS	REVISIONS
	<p>Laguna Lake Golf Course is in Area 6 (West). <del>Any future course should be in a different part of the city.</del></p> <p>Priority</p> <p><del>Providing an additional golf course may be considered a long-term (10-20 year) priority, subject to land availability. An</del>  <u>additional golf course is not a priority for the City."</u></p>
<p>Consider dividing the Meadow/Sinsheimer sub-area into two sub areas.</p>	<p>Staff reviewed this comment and discussed with the PRC for further direction. No changes to the sub-area delineations are proposed or recommended by the PRC; however, Figure 4-2 will be amended to show the sub-area delineations and the population density and access gaps shown in Figure 5-5, Park Access Gaps and Potential Future Park Sites. The purpose of the map revision is to clarify that there are multiple factors that will drive the location of new and upgraded amenities throughout the City. A draft revised map will be presented to the Planning Commission for consideration.</p>
<p>Look for "quick build" projects as it relates to what we already have, such as a dirt pump track, dog parks, shade/cooling, lighting, gardens, and community events.</p>	<p>No changes to the Plan Update are proposed; however, the Parks and Recreation Department and Public Works Department are working to identify "quick build" projects within the context of the Capital Improvement Plan, the City's Financial Plan, grant funding, and opportunities for volunteer/community collaboration.</p>
<p>Update opportunities for Cheng Park improvements.</p>	<p>The Plan Update includes the following additional text:</p> <p><b>Page 126:</b> <i>Cheng Park, Planned Improvements</i></p> <p>Added the following two bullets:</p>

CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION COMMENTS	REVISIONS
	<p><u>+ Provide Improved cultural expression and educational opportunities</u></p> <p><u>+ Maintain cultural significance of original design</u></p>
Clarify if multi-generational center would also be a multi-cultural center.	No changes to the Plan Update are proposed, as multi-cultural programming would be provided at facilities at the existing Ludwick Community Center or a future center.
Clearly explain and clarify community engagement results summarized in the document.	<p>The Plan Update includes the following edits to clarify community engagement responses:</p> <p><b>Page 74: <i>Park Improvement Priorities Workshop, Your Neighborhood:</i></b></p> <p>“Participants were asked to state their priorities for park improvements in their neighborhood, from a list of options. Of these options, “safer access” was the highest priority, followed by walking paths, neighborhood events, and dog park. <u>“Approximately 110 participants provided responses at this workshop station, and the average ranking for each priority is identified in Figure 3-1.”</u></p> <p><b>Page 74: <i>Park Improvement Priorities Workshop, Community Parks:</i></b></p> <p>“For Laguna Lake Park, we asked participants to rank a list of 11 potential improvements. The most popular: a bike pump track, an adventure playground, a botanical garden, a walking path, an outdoor learning area, and additional picnic areas. <u>“Approximately 100 participants provided responses at this workshop station, and the average ranking for each priority is identified in Figure 3-2.”</u></p> <p><b>Page 75: <i>Park Improvement Priorities Workshop, Fields and Facilities:</i></b></p>

CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION COMMENTS	REVISIONS
	<p>“Participants were asked to rank four potential improvements to the SLO Swim Center. Of these, extended hours for recreation swim and for lap swim were the highest ranked. <u>Approximately 85 participants provided responses at this workshop station, and the average ranking for each priority is identified in Figure 3-5.</u>”</p>
Consider park ambassadors to support diversity, equity, and inclusion.	<p>No changes to the Plan Update are proposed at this time, as consideration of establishing park ambassadors at City parks would be better identified during evaluation of resources and staffing needs, are often based on a particular amenity (such as the Santa Rosa SLO Skate Park), and would need to take equity into consideration.</p>
Conduct additional focused outreach related to diversity, equity, and inclusion.	<p>The Plan Update includes the following edits to further clarify outreach efforts during park-specific and facility-specific planning:</p> <p><b>Page 103:</b></p> <p>“Next, the chapter defines three types of park improvements, and documents potential <del>improvements</del> <u>opportunities</u> at each park where “visionary” changes are needed. <u>The chapter provides the flexibility to consider identified opportunities and determine the appropriate design and amenities of our City’s parks and recreational facilities through focused community outreach and the preparation of comprehensive park-specific plans. The community engagement process will include direct contact with community groups and organizations to further advance diversity, equity, and inclusion at all City parks and facilities.</u>”</p>

CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION COMMENTS	REVISIONS
Update Table 4-2 Park Amenity Standards by deleting “Meets Standard/Needs Exist” column and replacing it with the number of additional amenities needed to serve the future daytime population.	<i>Table 4-2 Park Amenity Standards</i> has been updated by deleting “Meets Standard/Needs Exist” column and replacing it with the number of additional amenities needed to serve the future daytime population.
Note that the SLO Senior Center is an historic building.	<p>The Plan Update includes the following edits:</p> <p><b>Page 130:</b> <i>SLO Senior Center, Planned Improvements, Mid-Term (5 to 10 years):</i></p> <p>“+ Re-envision SLO Senior Center in the context of Mitchell Park through Planning process. Goals will include creating a strong linkage between the park and the center; and considering potential renovation <u>or expansion or replacement of the Senior Center relocation of programs and services</u> to achieve multi-generational use of the facility. <u>The SLO Senior Center building is a historic property, and any improvements shall be consistent with the City’s Historic Preservation Ordinance and Historic Preservation Program Guidelines.</u> <u>Increase the City’s financial and staff investment in the SLO Senior Center.</u>”</p>

### Active Transportation Committee, March 18, 2021

The Public Draft Plan was presented to the ATC on March 18, 2021. The ATC unanimously moved to recommend adoption of the Plan Update, with recommendations that were supported by the PRC. ATC recommendations are identified in the table below, and edits that have been made to the Plan Update are identified by showing deleted text in ~~strike-through~~, and added text is underlined.

**Table 3. Active Transportation Commission Recommendations**

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS	HOW ADDRESSED
<p>Address Sinsheimer Park area connectivity, including inclusive non-vehicular access both to the Sinsheimer Park area and through the park. Identify need for a paved trail connecting the Railroad Safety Trail to Sinsheimer Park.</p>	<p><b>Page 123:</b> <i>Sinsheimer Park, Planned Improvements, Near-Term (0 to 5 Years):</i></p> <p>Added bullet:</p> <p><u>+ Address Sinsheimer Park area connectivity, including inclusive non-vehicular access both to the Sinsheimer Park area and through the park. Provide for an inclusive and accessible paved trail connecting the Railroad Safety Trail to Sinsheimer Park.</u></p>
<p>Provide stronger language in <i>Policy 1.15 Sustainable Transportation Access</i> and <i>Policy 1.16 Shaded Play Areas</i>, beyond “evaluate potential...” and “strive to”.</p> <p>Specifically address Sinsheimer Park, Laguna Lake Park, and Meadow Park in Policies 1.15, 3.1, and 5.2.</p> <p>Include bicycle parking in parks, with facilities for standard and electric bicycles, and cargo bicycles.</p>	<p><b>Page 88:</b> <i>Policy 1.15, Sustainable Transportation Access.</i></p> <p>“1.15 Sustainable Transportation Access.</p> <p>Support implementation of the Active Transportation Plan and provision of sustainable access to parks and recreational facilities <u>including, but not limited to Sinsheimer Park area, Laguna Lake Park, and Meadow Park, and interconnected paths citywide. Bicycle parking should be provided in parks, recreational facilities, and community centers, and include facilities for standard, electric, and cargo bicycles.</u>”</p> <p><b>Page 88:</b> <i>Policy 1.16 Shaded Play Areas.</i></p> <p>“1.16 Shaded Play Areas.</p> <p>In addition to shading play areas—a high priority for the community—trees and shade structures can also contribute to distinctive identity and sustainability. Existing play areas will be assessed for</p>

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS	HOW ADDRESSED
	<p>need, and enhancements to both play equipment and shade will be scheduled. The City should <del>strive for</del> <u>provide</u> shaded play areas within a short walk (1/2-mile) of all residents: this should be a core feature of all parks, including mini-parks.”</p> <p>Policy 3.1 addresses new parks and facilities, not existing; therefore, no modifications are proposed related to these comments.</p> <p>Policy 5.2 states: “Create bicycle and pedestrian connections between these mainline trails and the City’s community parks (e.g. Sinsheimer, Laguna Lake, Santa Rosa, Meadow) and major recreation facilities (e.g. Damon-Garcia).” Therefore, no modifications are proposed related to these comments.</p>
<p><i>Policy 3.1 Access by Foot and Bike:</i>                  Amend title to be more inclusive of those accessing parks and facilities by alternative non-vehicular means beyond “foot and bike”.</p>	<p><b>Page 94:</b> <i>Policy 3.1 Access by Foot and Bike.</i></p> <p>“Policy 3.1 Access by Foot, <del>and</del> Bike, <u>and Roll</u>”</p> <p>New parks and facilities should be located centrally to their service population, integrated with their community context, and easily accessed on foot, <del>and</del> by bike, <u>and roll....</u>”</p>
<p>Overall, provide a more specific ties to the Active Transportation Plan.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>Suggestion to locate pump tracks on routes to schools, and locate pump tracks where it can be accessed via bicycle.</p>	<p><b>Page 114:</b> <i>Bike/<u>Roller</u> Pump Tracks</i></p> <p>“Priority</p> <p>A bike/<u>roller</u> pump track has been identified as a near-term (0-5 year) priority for the City. A second track may be considered a long-term (10-20 year) opportunity. <u>Pump tracks should be located where they can be accessed via</u></p>



ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS	HOW ADDRESSED
	<u>bicycle or roll, and along routes to schools.”</u>

#### 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

An Initial Study / Negative Declaration has been prepared for the Plan ( Attachment 3). The public review period for the Initial Study / Negative Declaration was Thursday, March 25, 2021 to Monday, April 26, 2021. The Initial Study does not identify any potentially significant impacts that would occur as a result of adoption of the Plan Update.

As a policy document, the Draft Plan Update does not authorize any physical development or improvements or provide project-specific construction details that would allow for project-level CEQA analysis; instead, it is intended to provide goals and policies, and guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City. Therefore, consistent with Section 15168(c)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the IS/ND evaluates program-level actions that describe planned park and recreation facilities and programs and focuses primarily on the Draft Plan Update’s consistency with adopted City plans, goals, objectives, and standards. Future proposed physical improvements that are subject to discretionary approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Policy Act (CEQA) and the State CEQA Guidelines.

Reference copies of the IS/ND are available on the City’s website at <https://www.slocity.org/government/departments-directory/community-development/documentsonline/environmental-review-documents>.

#### 5.0 OTHER DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

The Administrative Draft Plan Update was provided for internal review by several City departments, including Community Development, Public Works, City Administration, Utilities. The Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Task Force provided valuable review and input on the Administrative Draft Plan Update. In addition, the Plan Update was coordinated with the City Transportation Division and the Office of Sustainability to ensure the document supports and advances the goals, policies, and programs of the *Active Transportation Plan* and *Climate Action Plan*.

Other community groups have helped shape the Plan Update including Arts Council, American Youth Soccer Organization, Cal Poly (special thanks to NR 418 class, 2018), Central Coast Concerned Mountain Bikers, Central Coast Soccer, Friends of SLO City Dog Parks; Downtown SLO, History Center of San Luis Obispo County, Jack House Committee, Land Conservancy of SLO County, San Luis Coastal Unified School District, San Luis Obispo Museum of Art, SLO Baseball, SLO Pickleball Club, SLO Railroad Museum, SLO REP Theatre, SLO Rugby, SLO Senior Center, SLO Soccer Club, SLO Women’s Soccer Club, YMCA, and many other individuals.

## **6.0 ALTERNATIVES**

1. Continue review of the project with specific direction to staff on pertinent issues.
2. Recommend denial of the Plan Update, however staff does not recommend this as it would be inconsistent with the General Plan, the Active Transportation Plan, and the Climate Action Plan for Community Recovery.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Draft Resolution
2. Reading File – Draft Plan Update
3. Initial Study/Negative Declaration

**RESOLUTION NO. PC-XXXX-21****A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE PARKS AND RECREATION BLUEPRINT FOR THE FUTURE: 2021-2041 (PARKS AND RECREATION PLAN AND GENERAL PLAN ELEMENT UPDATE) (GENP-1942-2018, EID-0150-2021; CITYWIDE)**

**WHEREAS**, the Parks + Recreation Blueprint for the Future: 2021-2041 (Parks and Recreation Plan and General Plan Element Update) will be an essential guide for parks and recreation in San Luis Obispo, while also serving as the General Plan Parks and Recreation Element; Chapters 1, 2, 3, and 5 of the Parks and Recreation Blueprint for the Future comprise the Parks and Recreation Plan, and Chapter 4 is the Parks and Recreation General Plan Element; and

**WHEREAS**, the Active Transportation Committee of the City of San Luis Obispo conducted a virtual public hearing in webinar format on March 18, 2021 on the Parks + Recreation Blueprint for the Future: 2021-2041 (Parks and Recreation Plan and General Plan Element Update) (Plan Update), and recommended consideration of the Committee's comments and adoption of the Plan Update (7:0); and

**WHEREAS**, the City Council of the City of San Luis Obispo conducted a virtual public hearing Study Session in webinar format on May 4, 2021 on the Plan Update and provided comments to staff; and

**WHEREAS**, the Parks and Recreation Commission of the City of San Luis Obispo conducted a virtual public hearing in webinar format on May 12, 2021 on the Plan Update, and recommended adoption of the Plan Update with noted clarifications, recognized the Plan Update is aspirational; the Commission considered City Council Study Session comments and recommended retainment of the 10 acres per 1,000 resident parkland standard, retainment of the sub-area delineations, and clarification regarding the use of the Access Gap/Amenities map, and supported additional City Council Study Session comments (7:0); and

**WHEREAS**, notices of said public hearing were made at the time and in the manner required by law; and

**WHEREAS**, the Planning Commission has duly considered all evidence, including the testimony of the applicant, interested parties, and the evaluation and recommendations by staff, presented at said hearing.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Planning Commission of the City of San Luis Obispo as follows:

**SECTION 1. Findings.** Based upon all the evidence, the Planning Commission makes the following findings regarding the project.

1. The Parks + Recreation Blueprint for the Future: 2021-2041 (Parks and Recreation Plan and General Plan Element Update) will promote the public health, safety, and welfare of persons living and working in the City by proving a blueprint for future parks, facilities, and programs, that will be inclusive, safe, and accessible to all people.
2. The Parks + Recreation Blueprint for the Future: 2021-2041 (Parks and Recreation Plan and General Plan Element Update) supports and advances many of the goals, objectives, policies and programs of the City's Active Transportation Plan, and Climate Action Plan for Community Recovery, because the development and enhancement of accessible parks and facilities in the City would reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and related greenhouse gas emissions. Redevelopment of parks and facilities would facilitate carbon-neutrality and provide an opportunity to educate and showcase evolving technology.
3. The Parks + Recreation Blueprint for the Future: 2021-2041 (Parks and Recreation Plan and General Plan Element Update) is consistent with the City's General Plan, because implementation of the Plan Update would advance goals and policies of the Land Use Element, including neighborhood connectivity and enhancement (Policies 2.2.4 and 2.2.6); provision and enhancement of parks within neighborhoods (Policy 2.3.1); and increasing green space in the Downtown (Policy 4.11).

**SECTION 2. Environmental Review.** The Planning Commission finds that the project's programmatic Initial Study/Negative Declaration adequately evaluates potential environmental impacts of the project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

**SECTION 3. Action.** The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the Initial Study/Negative Declaration and approve the Parks + Recreation Blueprint for the Future: 2021-2041 (Parks and Recreation Plan and General Plan Element Update).

Upon motion of \_\_\_\_\_, seconded by \_\_\_\_\_,  
and on the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

The foregoing resolution was adopted this 26th day of May 2021.

---

Tyler Corey, Secretary  
Planning Commission



## **INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM**

For: Parks and Recreation Plan and General Plan Element Update  
EID-0150-2021

March 2021

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>FISH AND WILDLIFE FEES.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>STATE CLEARINGHOUSE.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>DETERMINATION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.....</b>	<b>5</b>
1. Aesthetics .....	6
2. Agriculture and Forestry Resources .....	7
3. Air Quality.....	8
4. Biological Resources.....	11
5. Cultural Resources .....	13
6. Energy.....	14
7. Geology and Soils .....	15
8. Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....	18
9. Hazards and Hazardous Materials.....	20
10. Hydrology and Water Quality.....	22
11. Land Use and Planning .....	24
12. Mineral Resources.....	25
13. Noise.....	26
14. Population and Housing .....	28
15. Public Services.....	29
16. Recreation .....	30
17. Transportation.....	31
18. Tribal Cultural Resources .....	33
19. Utilities and Service Systems.....	34
20. Wildfire.....	36
21. Mandatory Findings of Significance .....	37
22. Earlier Analyses .....	38
23. Source References.....	38

## ATTACHMENTS

- A: DRAFT PARKS AND RECREATION PLAN  
 B: NATIVE AMERICAN CONSULTATION

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AAQS	Ambient Air Quality Standards
AB	Assembly Bill
ALUP	Airport Land Use Plan
AOZ	Airport Overlay Zone
BMPs	Best Management Practices
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAP	Climate Action Plan
CCRWQCB	Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
CDFW	California Department of Fish and Wildlife
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CH <sub>4</sub>	methane
City	City of San Luis Obispo
CO	carbon monoxide
CO <sub>2</sub>	carbon dioxide
CO <sub>2</sub> e	carbon dioxide equivalent
COSE	Conservation and Open Space Element
CWPP	Community Wildfire Protection Plan
dBA	A-weighted decibel(s)
EFZ	Earthquake Fault Zone
EIR	Environmental Impact Report
EOP	Emergency Operations Plan
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
GHGs	greenhouse gas emissions
GWP	Global Warming Potential

HFCs	hydrofluorocarbons
IS/ND	Initial Study/Negative Declaration
LUE	Land Use Element
MJHMP	Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan
MRZs	Mineral Resource Zones
N <sub>2</sub> O	nitrous oxide
NO <sub>2</sub>	nitrogen dioxide
NOA	naturally occurring asbestos
NOA ATCM	NOA Airborne Toxic Control Measure
NO <sub>x</sub>	nitrogen oxides
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
O <sub>3</sub>	ozone
P	Park
Pb	lead
PCR	Post Construction Requirements
PF	Public Facilities
PFCs	perfluorocarbons
PG&E	Pacific Gas & Electric Company
PM <sub>10</sub>	particulate matter less than 10 microns in size
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size
PRC	Public Resources Code
PRE	Parks and Recreation Element
PRMP	Parks and Recreation Master Plan
PRP	Parks and Recreation Plan
REC	Recreation
SB	Senate Bill
SCCAB	South Central Coast Air Basin



SF <sub>6</sub>	sulfur hexafluoride
SGMA	Sustainable Groundwater Management Act
SLCUSD	San Luis Coastal Unified School District
SLOCAPCD	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District
SLOMC	San Luis Obispo Municipal Code
SMARA	Surface Mining and Reclamation Act
SO <sub>2</sub>	sulfur dioxide
State	State of California
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TAC	toxic air contaminant
VMT	vehicle miles traveled
VOCs	volatile organic compounds
WWME	Water and Wastewater Management Element



## INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

**For ER # EID-0150-2021**

**1. Project Title:**

San Luis Obispo Parks and Recreation Plan and General Plan Element Update

**2. Lead Agency Name and Address:**

City of San Luis Obispo  
919 Palm Street  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

**3. Contact Person and Phone Number:**

Shawna Scott, Senior Planner  
(805) 781-7176

**4. Project Location:**

Citywide

**5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:**

Parks and Recreation Department  
City of San Luis Obispo  
1341 Nipomo Street  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

**6. General Plan Designations:**

Citywide

**7. Zoning:**

Citywide

**8. Description of the Project:**

The City of San Luis Obispo's (City) current Parks and Recreation Master Plan (PRMP) and Parks and Recreation Element (PRE) was adopted in 2001. The PRMP/PRE needs to be updated to address the City's changing population and physical environment and the associated demands for new and/or improved community recreation facilities and programs. Therefore, in 2018, the City of San Luis Obispo (City) embarked on a process to update its Parks and Recreation Plan (PRP) and PRE, and the title of this update is Parks + Recreation Blueprint for the Future: 2021-2041 Parks and Recreation Plan and General Plan Element Update (Plan Update). The Draft Plan Update evaluates the condition and capacity of the City's existing parks and facilities, develops a strategy for maintaining and enhancing these facilities, and considers how new parks and facilities should be provided over the coming years. The combined Draft Plan Update revisits the City's recreational needs with fresh information about facility usage, program participation, and community priorities and preferences and then establishes goals, policies,

and implementing actions to serve as a blueprint from which to guide the City in achieving its Parks and Recreation vision.

The Draft Plan Update addresses the type, location, and timing of development of City parks and recreation facilities. Although the update retains similar policies and programs as established in the 2001 PRMP/PRE, there are also new policies and programs that address these changing conditions. Chapter 4, Goals and Policies, of the Draft Plan Update, includes over 50 policies to achieve the following five system-wide goals:

- Build community and neighborhoods;
- Meet the changing needs of the community;
- Sustainability;
- Optimize resources; and
- Safety.

Chapter 5, Implementation, of the Draft Plan Update, describes the need for recreation amenities within the City, provides a framework for locating these amenities, and identifies near-term, mid-term, and long-term projects. As a policy document, the Draft Plan Update does not authorize any physical development or improvements; instead, it is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City. Therefore, consistent with Section 15168(c)(1) of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, this Draft Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND) evaluates program-level actions that describe planned park and recreation facilities and programs and focuses primarily on the Draft Plan Update's consistency with adopted City plans, goals, objectives, and standards. Future proposed physical improvements that are subject to discretionary approval would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of the California Environmental Policy Act (CEQA) and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. The Draft Plan Update is included as Attachment A to this IS/ND. Once adopted, the Draft Plan Update will be finalized and become part of the City's General Plan.

**9. Project Entitlements:**

The Draft Plan Update would require the following entitlements:

- Review/recommendation by the City Parks and Recreation Commission and the City Planning Commission;
- Approval of the Draft Plan Update/adoption of the IS/ND by the City Council.

**10. Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:**

Policies and goals of the Draft Plan Update apply to the entire City; consequently, the project area or setting includes the entire City and parks and open space areas located outside the City limits within the City's planning area.

**11. Have California Native American tribes traditionally and culturally affiliated with the project area requested consultation pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1? If so, is there a plan for consultation that includes, for example, the determination of significance of impacts to tribal cultural resources, procedures regarding confidentiality, etc.?**

Native American Tribes were notified about the project consistent with City and State regulations including, but not limited to, Assembly Bill (AB) 52 and Senate Bill (SB) 18. No tribal representatives requested consultation or provided specific requests.

**12. Other public agencies whose approval is required: 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.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/>	Agriculture and Forestry Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	Recreation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology and Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Transportation
<input type="checkbox"/>	Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use and Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tribal Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities and Service Systems
<input type="checkbox"/>	Energy	<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Wildfire
<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology and Soils	<input type="checkbox"/>	Population and Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance

## FISH AND WILDLIFE FEES

[City to determine whether a No Effect Determination would be applicable to the project]

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

## STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

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

**DETERMINATION** (To be completed by the Lead Agency):

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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made, by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.	<input type="checkbox"/>
I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant” impact(s) or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact(s) on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed	<input type="checkbox"/>
I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.	<input type="checkbox"/>



Signature

March 23, 2021

Date

Shawna Scott

Printed Name

For Michael Codron

Community Development Director

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 19, "Earlier Analysis," as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (Section 15063 (c) (3) (D)). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they addressed site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

## 1. AESTHETICS

Except as provided in Public Resources Code Section 21099, would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	7, 13, 14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, open space, and historic buildings within a local or state scenic highway?	7, 13, 14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) In non-urbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality?	7, 13, 14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	12, 20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Evaluation

a), b), c) The City's General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE) (City of San Luis Obispo 2006a; adopted April 4, 2006, last revised December 9, 2014) identifies scenic features as creek areas, historic resources, and neighboring hillsides and surrounding mountains such as the Morros, the Santa Lucia Mountains, and the Irish Hills. Scenic corridors as identified in the General Plan include: U.S. Highway 101, South Higuera Street, Broad Street, Tank Farm Road, Johnson Avenue, Los Osos Valley Road, and Santa Rosa Street. Goals and policies in the Draft Plan Update support the preservation of scenic resources within the City, and future physical park and facility improvements envisioned by the Draft Plan Update are anticipated to enhance the existing visual character of the City through the provision of new and upgraded recreational facilities, including preserving and incorporating existing vegetation and natural features on site and, where feasible, to connect with nearby open spaces, and maintaining and providing "grand trees," or trees which cast shade and provide long-term value. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update policies are consistent with the policies within the City's General Plan Land Use Element (LUE) (City of San Luis Obispo 2014d; adopted December 9, 2014), the COSE, and the Circulation Element (City of San Luis Obispo 2014c; adopted December 9, 2014, amended October 24, 2017), which require the preservation of scenic vistas and roadways. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific aesthetic impacts and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic resources, and visual character or public views. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to scenic vistas, scenic resources, and visual character or public views, and no mitigation is required.

d) Future development envisioned under the Draft Plan Update would introduce new sources of light to the City that are typical of parks and recreational facilities (e.g., facility and security lighting). However, future projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be required to comply with the design standards related to light and glare established in both the City's General Plan and the City's Municipal Code. Specifically, future projects would be required to conform to the Night Sky Preservation Ordinance (Zoning Regulations Chapter 17.23), which establishes operational standards and requirements for lighting installations (City of San Luis Obispo 2014b). Although future development envisioned by the Draft Plan Update would introduce new sources of light that would contribute to the light visible in the night sky and surrounding area, the City is located within a highly urbanized area characterized by significant nighttime lighting. As such, any new sources of light associated with future parks and recreational facilities would be consistent with the existing urbanized character of the City. The Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City.

and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific aesthetic impacts and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts from light and glare. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to creation of new sources of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views, and no mitigation is required.

### **Mitigation Measures**

None.

### **Conclusion**

Less than significant impact.

## **2. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY 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:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	11, 12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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))?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



**Evaluation**

a), c), d), e) The City contains lands designated as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide importance (farmland). However, the City is primarily urbanized, and limited areas are used for agricultural production. Planned parks and park improvements as described in the Draft Plan Update comply with the City's General Plan LUE regarding the locations for park and recreation development, and would generally be developed within lands designated for Park (P), Recreation (REC) and Public (PUB) uses. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific farmland and agricultural resource impacts and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts on farmland and agricultural resources. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to the conversion of farmland, and no mitigation is required.

b) Although there are no existing Williamson Act contracts within the City, several undeveloped hillside parcels to the east of the City and several parcels outside the Airport Area Specific Plan (City of San Luis Obispo 2014a) are under Williamson Act contracts (City of San Luis Obispo 2014b). However, these nearby parcels under Williamson Act contracts are not planned for park and recreation development within the Draft Plan Update. Additionally, planned parks and park improvements as described in the Draft Plan Update would generally be developed within lands designated for Park (P), Recreation (REC), and Public (PUB) uses. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts related to agricultural zoning and Williamson Act contracts and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address such impacts. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to conflicts with existing zoning for agricultural use or conflicts with a Williamson Act contract, and no mitigation is required.

**Mitigation Measures**

None.

**Conclusion**

Less than significant impact.

**3. AIR QUALITY**

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	25	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) 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?	25, 26, 27, 28	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	25, 26, 27, 28, 29	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## **Evaluation**

The City of San Luis Obispo is within the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOCAPCD). The SLOCAPCD is part of the South Central Coast Air Basin (SCCAB), which includes San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara and Ventura counties. As the local air quality management agency, SLOCAPCD is required to monitor air pollutant levels to ensure that State and federal air quality standards are met and, if they are not met, to develop strategies to meet the standards. Both the State of California (State) and the federal government have established health-based Ambient Air Quality Standards (AAQS) for six criteria air pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO), ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), lead (Pb), and suspended particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>, [particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in size, and particulate matter less than 10 microns in size, respectively]). The SLOCAPCD is under State non-attainment status for ozone and PM<sub>10</sub> standards. The SLOCAPCD is classified as non-attainment for the federal ozone 8-hour standard (eastern San Luis Obispo County only).

In March 2002, SLOCAPCD adopted the 2001 Clean Air Plan (SLOCAPCD 2001). In July 2005, SLOCAPCD adopted a Particulate Matter Report (SLOCAPCD 2005), in order to update the jurisdiction's control measures for particulate matter, as required by SB 656. In 2015, SLOCAPCD adopted an Ambient Air Monitoring Network Assessment in order to identify and analyze its historic and current air monitoring sites. The most current Ambient Air Monitoring Network Assessment (SLOCAPCD 2020a) was performed in June 2020. In addition, in January 2020, SLOCAPCD adopted an Ozone Emergency Episode Plan (SLOCAPCD 2020b), in compliance with the Federal Clean Air Act, in order to provide the basis for taking action when ambient ozone concentrations reach a level that could endanger public health in San Luis Obispo County.

Naturally occurring asbestos (NOA) is identified by the California Air Resources Board as a toxic air contaminant (TAC). NOA is commonly found in ultramafic rock, including serpentine, near fault zones, and is released into the air when it is broken or crushed. This can occur when land is graded for building purposes, or at quarrying operations. Work in serpentine areas requires a pre-approved dust control plan by the SLOCAPCD, and may include asbestos air monitoring. In addition, projects located within the green "buffer" areas as designated by the SLOCAPCD NOA map would be required to comply with the provisions of the California Air Resources Board's Air Toxic Control Measure (NOA ATCM) for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations (SLOCAPCD 2021).

a) An air quality plan describes air pollution control strategies to be implemented by a city, county, or region classified as a non-attainment area. The main purpose of the air quality plan is to bring the area into compliance with the requirements of the federal and State air quality standards. As identified above, to bring San Luis Obispo County into attainment, the SLOCAPCD adopted the 2001 Clean Air Plan. The 2001 Clean Air Plan calls for building compact communities to limit urban sprawl, mix complementary land uses, such as commercial services with higher-density housing, increasing residential and commercial densities along transit corridors, and increase pedestrian-friendly and interconnected streetscapes, helping to make alternative means of transportation more convenient. Consistency with the 2001 Clean Air Plan would be achieved if a project is consistent with the land use, transportation control measures, and strategies outlined in the 2001 Clean Air Plan. Planned parks and park improvements as described in the Draft Plan Update comply with the City's General Plan LUE regarding the locations for park and recreation development, and would generally be developed within lands designated for Park (P), Recreation (REC), and Public (PUB) uses. In addition, the Draft Plan Update does not authorize development or changes to land use and zoning. Thus, implementation of the Draft Plan Update would not result in construction or operational impacts. In addition, the five goals of the Draft Plan Update (i.e., building community and neighborhoods, meeting changing needs of the community, sustainability, optimizing resources, and safety) seek to provide a park within walking distance of every neighborhood, increase trees and shade structures, implement water efficient initiatives, modify existing parks and design new parks and facilities to support and advance the City's Climate Action Plan goal for carbon neutrality, and promote non-motorized access to the City's open spaces. Because these goals are consistent with the intent of the 2001 Clean Air Plan strategies, the Draft Plan Update would be consistent with the 2001 Clean Air Plan. Further, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific air quality impacts and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts in regard to conflicts with an applicable air quality plan. For the reasons stated above, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to conflicts with or obstruction of an applicable air quality plan, and no mitigation is required.

b) Future development envisioned under the Draft Plan Update, including but not limited to planned improvements for the Ludwick Community Center, construction of a new multi-generational community center, and the construction of new parks and recreation amenities and facilities, would include a variety of grading, construction, and demolition activities, and could thereby

result in the generation of short-term construction emissions. Short-term construction emissions may include the release of particulate matter emissions (i.e., fugitive dust) generated by excavating, paving, and building activities. Short-term construction emissions from construction equipment may also include CO, nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), directly-emitted particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>), and TACs such as diesel exhaust particulate matter. The SLOAPCD CEQA Handbook identifies standard mitigation such as dust control, Best Available Control Technologies, limitations on diesel equipment idling, and other measures proven to reduce air emissions during construction. These measures would be applied to any project with the potential to exceed quantified air emissions thresholds identified by the SLOAPCD, and/or when construction would occur proximate to sensitive receptors.

Long-term operational emissions are associated with any change in permanent use of a project site by on-site stationary and off-site mobile sources that substantially increase emissions. Stationary-source emissions include emissions associated with electricity consumption and natural gas usage. Mobile-source emissions typically result from vehicle trips associated with a project. Future development envisioned under the Draft Plan Update is anticipated to aid in reducing long-term operational emissions within the City, as the Draft Plan Update establishes a policy for the evaluation of the current energy usage of existing parks and facilities and the establishment of energy management and sustainability features, where feasible (e.g., on-site renewable energy or battery storage). In addition, new parks and facilities envisioned under the Draft Plan Update would be designed to support and advance the City's Climate Action Plan goal for carbon neutrality, reduce vehicle miles traveled, and promote non-motorized access to the City's open spaces.

The Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific air quality impacts and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts in regard to a considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to criteria pollutant emissions, and no mitigation is required.

c) As described above, future development envisioned under the Draft Plan Update would include a variety of grading, construction, and demolition activities, which would generate air pollutants. Depending on the specific location, sensitive receptors may be exposed to air pollutants; as noted above, SLOAPCD standard mitigation would be required for applicable projects, such as restrictions on diesel-equipment idling to minimize exposure to diesel particulates. Further, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific air quality impacts and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts in regard to exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and no mitigation is required.

d) The Draft Plan Update would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people because it does not establish new land uses that would have the potential to generate significant odors. Individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be required to comply with the City's odor ordinance (SLOM Chapter 8.22) and SLOAPCD's Rule 402, Nuisance. Further, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific air quality impacts and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts in regard to other emissions (such as those leading to odors). Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to other emissions (such as those leading to odors), and no mitigation is required.

### **Mitigation Measures**

None.

**Conclusion**

Less than significant impact.

**4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	7, 14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	7, 14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	7, 14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	7, 14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	7, 20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	7, 12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Evaluation**

a), b), c), d) The City is primarily urbanized, and includes a mix of community parks, neighborhood parks, mini parks, and open space, in addition to a permanent open space greenbelt around the perimeter of the City. The City's General Plan LUE and COSE provide a guide for the preservation of biological resources within the City's planning area. The City's planning area includes areas within the City's sphere of influence beyond City limits. These biological resources include creeks and adjacent riparian corridors, vernal pools, marshes, special-status species, hillsides, open space and park areas, and Laguna Lake. One of the goals of the LUE is to include resource protection within the City's planning program. Resource Protection is addressed in Section 6 of the LUE. In particular, the LUE includes Policy 6.6.1 to provide recreational opportunities which are compatible with fish and wildlife habitat and Policy 6.6.2 to include lakes, creeks, and wetlands as part of a citywide and regional network of open space and parks to foster the understanding, enjoyment, and protection of the natural landscape and wildlife. The COSE's goals of maintaining sustainable natural populations of plants, fish and wildlife that inhabit the City's natural communities and in particular COSE Policies 7.3.1 and 7.3.2, which establish the protection of listed species and species of special concern, respectively, and Policy 7.3.3, which provides for the protection and preservation of wildlife habitat and wildlife corridors.

The Draft Plan Update's goal of sustainability is consistent with and supports both the City's existing LUE and COSE because it includes policies that (1) seek to integrate creeks into the parks and recreation system by providing trails along the City's creeks

while also addressing natural resource preservation, (2) focus on natural features by preserving and incorporating existing vegetation and natural features on site and, where feasible, by designing and connecting these features with larger open space systems, and (3) consider habitat value and natural influences as key factors in selecting trees at park locations. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific biological resources and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to protect those resources from both direct and indirect impacts. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to federally or State protected species, special-status or candidate species, riparian habitat or other natural communities, State or federally protected wetlands, or the movements of fish and wildlife species, and no mitigation is required.

e) As described within COSE Policy 7.5.1, significant trees that make substantial contributions to natural habitat or to the urban landscape due to their species, size, or rarity shall be protected and their removal will be subject to specific criteria and mitigation requirements. The Draft Plan Update's goal to develop sustainable parks and facilities seeks to preserve and incorporate existing vegetation, including trees. Additionally, future park and recreation projects that would result in tree removals would be required to comply with Chapter 12.24, Tree Regulations, of the City's Municipal Code, which includes requirements for tree protection measures and compensatory plantings (minimum 1:1 replacement ratio for trees replanted on site, minimum 2:1 replacement ratio for trees planted off-site). Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific biological resources and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to conflicts with local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as trees, and no mitigation is required.

f) The COSE and City's Municipal Code establish land designated for habitat conservation and specify goals and policies to preserve these conservation areas. The City has eight Open Space Conservation Plans that guide protection, access, and restoration efforts within the City's greenbelt: the Agricultural Master Plan for Calle Joaquin Reserve, the Bishop Peak Natural Reserve Conservation Plan, the Cerro San Luis Conservation Plan, the Irish Hills Conservation Plan, the Johnson Ranch Conservation Plan, the South Hills Conservation Plan, the Stenner Springs Natural Reserve Draft Conservation Plan, and the Reservoir Canyon Natural Reserve Conservation Plan (City of San Luis Obispo 2014b). Adoption of the Draft Plan Update would promote the preservation of land designated for habitat within the City. For example, three of the goals of the Draft Plan Update, in particular, would support the City's desire to promote and preserve land designated for habitat conservation and open space by focusing parks, facilities and recreation activities within the City's urban areas: build community and neighborhoods, sustainability, and optimize resources. These goals include improving existing parks, creating new parks in existing neighborhoods and specific plan areas, maintaining the City's Joint Use Agreement with the San Luis Coastal Unified School District, and coordinating with other organizations' recreation offerings to match needs and facilities/programs while not replicating services. Prioritizing the use and expansion of existing developed areas and services provided by others in order to meet the demand for new park facilities and amenities will help the City provide new and improved parks and recreation facilities within a limited footprint, which will allow for the conservation of natural areas and open space. Integrating creekside trails into the City's park system and incorporating natural features within designated parks and facilities that connect with larger open space will generate an appreciation for the City's natural areas and open space while protecting the resources by directing human activities to maintained areas. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific biological resources and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to conflicts with the City's adopted conservation plans or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to conflicts with the City's adopted conservation plans or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans, and no mitigation is required.

**Mitigation Measures**

None.

**Conclusion**

Less than significant impact.

**5. CULTURAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource pursuant to §15064.5?	7, 10, 20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	7, 9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Evaluation**

a) The City's Historic Preservation Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 14.01) and Historic Preservation Program Guidelines (City of San Luis Obispo 2010) specify regulations for special treatment of historic resources and establish local guidance for the identification and preservation of such resources. Future projects envisioned under the Draft Plan Update, such as improvements to the SLO Senior Center, a historic property located at 1445 Santa Rosa Street, would be required to be consistent with the guidelines related to historic resources established under the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance, the Historic Preservation Program Guidelines, and the General Plan. Specifically, as described in Section 3.4.2 of the Historic Preservation Program Guidelines, projects envisioned under the Draft Plan Update, which propose alterations to historically-listed buildings, would be required to retain at least 75 percent of the original building framework, roof, and exterior bearing walls and cladding, in total, and reuse original materials as feasible. Proposed alterations of greater than 25 percent of the original building framework, roof, and exterior walls will be subject to the review process for demolitions, including evaluation of potential impacts to a historic property pursuant to CEQA. Alterations do not include ordinary repair or maintenance activities that are determined to be exempt from a building permit or are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Resources. Sections 3.3 and 3.5 of the COSE also specify policies to protect significant historical and architectural resources within the City. In addition, future projects envisioned under the Draft Plan Update would be required to comply with Policy 3.5.12, which requires developments to preserve archaeological or historical resources through easements or dedications when located on parkland. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific historic resources, and would include compliance with the City Historic Preservation Ordinance and Historic Preservation Program Guidelines, and appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to historic resources. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* in regard to historic resources, and no mitigation is required.

b) The City's Archaeological Resource Preservation Program Guidelines (City of San Luis Obispo 2009) provide a guide for the identification, evaluation, and preservation of archaeological and other cultural resources within the City. These guidelines support Policy 3.5.1 of the COSE, which requires the City to protect known and potential archaeological resources. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions

of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific archaeological resources pursuant to the City's Archaeological Resource Preservation Program Guidelines and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts to archaeological resources. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* in regard to archaeological resources, and no mitigation is required.

c) As stated in Response 5 (b), above, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific cultural resources and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts to human remains. Further, any future projects envisioned under the Draft Plan Update would follow the standard procedures as outlined in Section 4.40.3.3 of the City's Archaeological Resource Preservation Program Guidelines in the event human remains are discovered during construction or excavation activities. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* in regard to impacts to human remains, and no mitigation is required.

### **Mitigation Measures**

None.

### **Conclusion**

Less than significant impact.

## **6. ENERGY**

Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	7, 15, 21	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	7, 15, 21	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Evaluation**

The City's General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE) (City of San Luis Obispo 2006a; adopted April 4, 2006, last revised December 9, 2014) establishes goals and policies to achieve energy conservation and increase use of cleaner, renewable, and locally controlled energy sources. These goals include increasing the use of sustainable energy sources and reducing reliance on non-sustainable energy sources to the extent possible and encouraging the provision for and protection of solar access. Policies identified to achieve these goals include, but are not limited to, use of best available practices in energy conservation, procurement, use and production, energy-efficiency improvements, pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly facility design, fostering alternative transportation modes, compact, high-density housing, and solar access standards.

Consistent with the City's goals and policies, in October 2018, the City Council committed to joining Central Coast Community Energy (formerly Monterey Bay Community Power), whereas up until that time, Pacific Gas & Electric Company (PG&E) was the primary electricity provider for the City. Since January 2020, Central Coast Community Energy has been the City's primary electricity provider and strives to provide 100 percent carbon-free electricity to the City by 2023 (City of San Luis Obispo 2021b). In September 2019, the City adopted the Clean Energy Choice Program for New Buildings, which encourages new buildings to be clean, efficient, and cost effective all-electric new buildings through incentives and local amendments to the California Energy Code (City of San Luis Obispo 2021b).

The City's Climate Action Plan (CAP) (City of San Luis Obispo 2020a) also identifies strategies and policies to increase use of cleaner and renewable energy resources in order to achieve the City's greenhouse gas emissions reduction target. These strategies include promoting a wide range of renewable energy financing options, incentivizing renewable energy generation in new and existing developments, and increasing community awareness of renewable energy programs.

a), b) Typical construction activities require the use of energy (e.g., electricity and fuel) for various purposes such as the operation of construction equipment and tools, as well as excavation, grading, demolition, and construction vehicle travel. Operational energy demand is typically associated with lighting, routine maintenance activities, landscaping, turf, and vehicle travel. The Draft Plan Update does not authorize any direct physical changes and would, therefore, not generate new daily vehicle trips, electricity consumption, or natural gas usage. Furthermore, the goals of the Draft Plan Update, which seek to build community and neighborhoods and increase sustainability, include policies directed at providing a park within walking distance of every neighborhood, increasing trees and shade structures, making park locations accessible by foot and bicycle, and instituting water-efficient initiatives including working landscape features to help filter pollutants, low water use plantings and xeriscaping, and gray and recycled water systems. In addition, the Draft Plan Update includes a specific policy to design and maintain parks and facilities for carbon neutrality by strategically phasing out fossil fuel use and pursuing energy management and sustainability features where feasible such as onsite renewable energy, battery storage, and public electric vehicle chargers. New buildings and facilities shall not include fossil fuels and shall be designed to support electric or alternative fueled fleet vehicles and maintenance equipment. Therefore, future development envisioned under the Draft Plan Update is not anticipated to result in increased energy demand.

As discussed above, the Draft Plan Update includes goals and policies that seek to improve the sustainability of parks and facilities, and is consistent with the strategies and policies of the City's CAP. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to energy resources and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to energy resources. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency, and no mitigation is required.

### **Mitigation Measures**

None.

### **Conclusion**

Less than significant impact.

## **7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS**

Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:					
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	6, 12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?	12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	8, 12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	6, 8	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2013), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	9	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Evaluation**

a. i) As described in the City's General Plan Safety Element (City of San Luis Obispo 2000; adopted: July 5, 2000, last revised December 9, 2014), the City is located within a geologically complex and seismically active region. The Los Osos Fault is located adjacent to the City, and is classified as an active Earthquake Fault Zone (EFZ) under the State of California Alquist-Priolo Fault Zoning Act. Other potentially active faults within the vicinity of the City include the West Huasna, Oceanic, and Edna Faults, which present moderate fault rupture hazards (City of San Luis Obispo 2014b). Since the Draft Plan Update is a policy document and does not directly authorize any physical improvements, its adoption would not result in impacts related to the rupture of a known earthquake fault as depicted on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map. Further, future individual projects envisioned under the Draft Plan Update would be required to be consistent with City policies established in the Safety Element, and would be required to be compliant with current building codes. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to geological resources and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to the rupture of a known earthquake fault. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* associated with the risk of loss, injury or death involving the rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, and no mitigation is required.

a. ii) Several faults, including the Los Osos, Point San Luis, Black Mountain, Rinconada, Wilmar, Pecho, Hosgri, La Panza, and San Andreas faults are capable of producing strong ground motion in the City. The San Andreas Fault and the offshore Hosgri Fault present the most likely source of ground shaking in the City (City of San Luis Obispo 2014b). As with most areas within the region, damage to development and infrastructure could be expected as a result of ground shaking. However, future individual projects envisioned under the Draft Plan Update would be required to be consistent with City policies established in the Safety Element, and would be required to be compliant with current building codes. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to geological resources and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to strong seismic ground shaking. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* associated with the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking, and no mitigation is required.

a. iii) The soils within the City most susceptible to ground shaking and that contain shallow groundwater are most likely to have a potential for settlement and for liquefaction (City of San Luis Obispo 2014b). Similarly to Responses 7 (a)(i) and (a)(ii), future

individual projects envisioned under the Draft Plan Update would be required to be consistent with City policies established in the Safety Element and City's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (City of San Luis Obispo 2006b), which include policies to prevent development within areas susceptible to natural hazards, and would include compliance with current building codes. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to geological resources and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* associated with the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, and no mitigation is required.

a. iv) Landslides are most common where slopes are steep, soils are weak, and groundwater is present. The City contains extensive hillsides, several of which are underlain by the rocks of the Franciscan group, which is a source of significant slope instability. However, most of the City's steep hillside areas are designated as Open Space per the City's General Plan. Because future projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would generally be developed within lands designated for Park (P), Recreation (REC), and Public (PUB) uses, landslides in these areas are unlikely to occur. In addition, future individual projects envisioned under the Draft Plan Update would be required to be consistent with City requirements established in the Safety Element and the City's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (City of San Luis Obispo 2006b), which includes policies to prevent development within areas susceptible to natural hazards, and would be required to be compliant with current building codes. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to geological resources and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to landslides. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* associated with the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides, and no mitigation is required.

b) As further discussed in Responses 10 (a), (c), and (i-v), future projects which require the preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would implement Erosion and Sediment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs) to minimize impacts related to erosion and runoff. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to geological resources and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to erosion and loss of topsoil, and no mitigation is required.

c, d) Refer to Responses 7 (a)(iv) and 7 (b) above. Future projects envisioned under the Draft Plan Update would be required to be consistent with the City Safety Element and the City's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (City of San Luis Obispo 2006b), which include policies to prevent development within areas susceptible to natural hazards. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to geological resources and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to unstable soils that could result in landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, collapse, or expansion. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to unstable soils that could result in landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, collapse, or expansion, and no mitigation is required.

e) As stated in the Final Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Land Use and Circulation Elements Update (LUCE) (City of San Luis Obispo 2014b), with implementation of existing Water and Wastewater Element policies and completion of the City's ongoing expansion of the Water Resource Recovery Facility, the City would have adequate wastewater treatment capacity to serve projected demand in addition to existing commitments, which include existing parks and recreational facility needs. Future development within the City, including projects envisioned under the Draft Plan Update, would be connected to the

municipal waste disposal system. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in *no impact* associated with soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems, and no mitigation is required.

f) The City's Archaeological Resource Preservation Program Guidelines (City of San Luis Obispo 2009) specify criteria to address the discovery of unique resources or paleontological resources during construction excavation. The Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to paleontological resources and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to paleontological resources. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features, and no mitigation is required.

### **Mitigation Measures**

None.

### **Conclusion**

Less than significant impact.

## **8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	15, 16	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	15, 16	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Evaluation**

Greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) are present in the atmosphere naturally, and are released by natural sources, or are formed from secondary reactions taking place in the atmosphere. However, over the last 200 years, human activities have caused substantial quantities of GHGs to be released into the atmosphere. These extra emissions are increasing GHG concentrations in the atmosphere, and enhancing the natural greenhouse effect, which is believed to be causing global climate change. The gases that are widely seen as the principal contributors to human-induced global climate change are: carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>); methane (CH<sub>4</sub>); nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O); hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs); perfluorocarbons (PFCs); and sulfur hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>).

Certain gases, such as water vapor, are short-lived in the atmosphere. Others remain in the atmosphere for significant periods of time, contributing to climate change in the long term. Water vapor is excluded from the list of GHGs above because it is short-lived in the atmosphere and its atmospheric concentrations are largely determined by natural processes, such as oceanic evaporation. These gases vary considerably in terms of Global Warming Potential (GWP), which is a concept developed to compare the ability of each GHG to trap heat in the atmosphere relative to another gas. GWP is based on several factors, including the relative effectiveness of a gas to absorb infrared radiation and the length of time that the gas remains in the atmosphere ("atmospheric lifetime"). The GWP of each gas is measured relative to CO<sub>2</sub>, the most abundant GHG; the definition of GWP for a particular GHG is the ratio of heat trapped by one unit mass of the GHG to the ratio of heat trapped by one unit mass of CO<sub>2</sub> over a specified time period. GHG emissions are typically measured in terms of pounds or tons of "CO<sub>2</sub> equivalents" (CO<sub>2</sub>e).

In 2012, the City established a CAP that identified measures and implementation strategies in order to achieve the City's GHG reduction target of 1990 emission levels by 2020. In 2020, the City adopted the 2020 CAP and established a goal of carbon

neutrality by 2035. The City's CAP is consistent with *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15183.5, which states that if a project is consistent with an adopted qualified GHG Reduction Strategy that meets the standards, it can be presumed that the project would not have significant GHG emission impacts. Therefore, a project's GHG emissions would not be considered a significant impact if the project is consistent with the City's CAP. The City of San Luis Obispo has also adopted its California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Thresholds and Guidance (City of San Luis Obispo 2020b), which establishes GHG emissions targets and analysis methodologies that are enforced during CEQA review with the intention of reducing GHG emissions associated with construction and operation of future projects and plans in the City.

a), b) Future development envisioned under the Draft Plan Update, including but not limited to the planned improvements for the Ludwick Community Center, construction of a new multi-generational community center, and the construction of new parks and recreation amenities and facilities, would include a variety of grading, construction, and demolition activities, and could thereby result in the generation of short-term construction GHG emissions. GHGs could be emitted through the operation of construction equipment and from worker and builder supply vendor vehicles, each of which typically use fossil-based fuels to operate. The combustion of fossil-based fuels creates GHGs such as CO<sub>2</sub>, CH<sub>4</sub>, and N<sub>2</sub>O. The SLOAPCD CEQA Handbook identifies standard mitigation such as Best Available Control Technologies and other measures proven to reduce GHG emissions during construction..

Long-term GHG emissions are typically generated from mobile, area, waste, and water sources as well as indirect emissions from sources associated with energy consumption. Mobile-source GHG emissions could include project-generated trips to and from a project site. Area-source emissions would be associated with activities such as landscaping and maintenance on a project site and operation of recreational facilities. Energy source emissions are typically generated at off-site utility providers. Waste source emissions include energy generated by land filling and other methods of disposal related to transporting and managing project-generated waste. In addition, water source emissions are generated by the pumping of water, water distribution, and wastewater treatment. Regardless, the five goals of the Draft Plan Update (i.e., building community and neighborhoods, meeting changing needs of the community, sustainability, optimizing resources, and safety) would be consistent with and further the implementation of the City's GHG reduction strategies. For example, the policies outlined in the Draft Plan Update seek to provide a park within walking distance of every neighborhood, increase trees and shade structures, make park locations accessible by foot and bicycle, implement water-efficient initiatives, low water use plantings and xeriscaping, and gray and recycled water systems. In addition, the Draft Plan Update includes a specific policy to design and maintain parks and facilities for carbon neutrality by strategically phasing out fossil fuel use and pursuing energy management and sustainability features where feasible such as onsite renewable energy, battery storage, and public electric vehicle chargers. New buildings and facilities shall not include fossil fuels and shall be designed to support electric or alternative fueled fleet vehicles and maintenance equipment. Because these goals are consistent with the strategies and policies of the City's CAP, the Draft Plan Update would be consistent with the City CAP. Further, future development envisioned under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for consistency with the City's CAP and its CEQA Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Thresholds and Guidance (City of San Luis Obispo 2020b). The Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts associated with GHG emissions and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to GHG emissions or conflicts with the City's Climate Action Plan. As such, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* associated with generation of GHGs that would have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions, and no mitigation would be required.

### **Mitigation Measures**

None.

### **Conclusion**

Less than significant impact.

## 9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	6, 14, 24	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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?	6, 14, 24	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	6, 14, 24	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	11, 20, 22	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	20, 23	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires?	6, 20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Evaluation**

a), b), c) The City's General Plan LUE (City of San Luis Obispo 2014d; adopted December 9, 2014) and Safety Element (City of San Luis Obispo, 2000; adopted July 5, 2000, last revised December 9, 2014) are the primary documents that address potential hazards and hazardous materials within the City. Specifically, Policy 5.3 of the Safety Element requires avoidance of hazardous materials to the greatest extent practical when conducting City operations, and requires health and safety practices to be followed when hazardous materials are used. In addition, the San Luis Obispo County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (MJHMP) (San Luis Obispo County 2019) identifies hazards and risks related to natural disasters and hazardous materials incidents, and includes mitigation strategies to reduce impacts associated with these risks. The Draft Plan Update is consistent with the policies within the LUE, the Safety Element, and the San Luis Obispo County MJHMP. For example, one of the goals of the Draft Plan Update is sustainability, which includes replacing chemical herbicides, pesticides, and fertilizers with non-toxic alternatives such as the use of Integrated Pest Management, which focuses on pest prevention through biological controls and the use of non-toxic cleaning products.

Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to the routine transport, use, disposal, accidental release, or emissions associated with hazardous materials. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than*

*significant impact* related to the creation of a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, disposal, accidental release, or emissions associated with hazardous materials, and no mitigation is required.

d) The Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts associated with hazards and hazardous materials and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to hazardous materials listed on sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to known hazardous materials listed on sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, and no mitigation is required.

e) The San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport is located adjacent to the southern perimeter of the City. The Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) for the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport (County of San Luis Obispo 2005) identifies policies to evaluate the compatibility of land uses and proposed local actions with the airport. The City's adopted Specific Plans, including but not limited to the Airport Area Specific Plan, Margarita Area Specific Plan, Orcutt Area Specific Plan, San Luis Ranch Specific Plan, and Froom Ranch Specific Plan, were all determined to be consistent with the effective ALUP prior to adoption by the City. Areas with the City that are located outside of Specific Plan areas are subject to Chapter 17.64 of the City's Municipal Code, which establishes an Airport Overlay Zone (AOZ) and identifies specific regulations for land uses within the AOZ. Future development envisioned under the Draft Plan Update may be located within the AOZ or located within two miles of the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport, and could introduce new sources of lighting or other potential hazards that could interfere with overflight safety requirements, or exposure park and facility staff and users to aircraft noise as established in the ALUP. However, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts associated with the project's proximity to an airport and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to safety hazards or excessive noise for people residing or working in a project area. Additionally, the Draft Plan Update is consistent with the goals of the Airport Area Specific Plan (City of San Luis Obispo 2014a), as one of the goals of the Draft Plan Update, building community and neighborhoods, includes guiding the completion of parks planned as part of adopted Specific Plans, including Avila Ranch within the Airport Area Specific Plan. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to a site's proximity to an airport facility or any airport land use plan, and no mitigation is required.

f) The San Luis Obispo County Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) (San Luis Obispo County 2016) addresses the planned response to extraordinary emergency situations associated with natural disasters, technological incidents, and national security emergencies within or affecting the County. Individual projects would be reviewed for consistency with the EOP, City Municipal Code Chapter 15.04, Construction and Fire Prevention Regulations, and other adopted emergency response and evacuation plans. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts associated with the impairment or interference with an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address such impacts. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to interference with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and no mitigation is required.

g) As described in the Safety Element, the City is considered a "community at risk" due to the threat of wildfire impacting the urban community. Policy 3.0 of the Safety Element specifies that developments will only be approved when adequate fire suppression services and facilities are available or will be made available concurrent with the proposed development. Policy 3.1 of the Safety Element also establishes policies for wildland fire safety. In addition, the Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) provides a citywide strategic planning level framework for hazardous fuel assessment and reduction, and identifies goals to improve fire prevention and suppression efforts and to restore fire-adapted ecosystems. Future development envisioned under the Draft Plan Update would be reviewed for consistency with the Safety Element, City Municipal Code Chapter 15.04, Construction and Fire Prevention Regulations, and the CWPP. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any

physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts associated with exposing people or structures to loss, injury or death involving wildland fire and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to wildland fire. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to exposure of people or structures to the risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fire, and no mitigation is required.

### **Mitigation Measures**

None.

### **Conclusion**

Less than significant impact.

## **10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	12	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:					
i. Result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site;	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite;	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Impede or redirect flood flows?	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Evaluation**

a), c) (i-iv) As a policy document, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would not result in impacts related to hydrology and water quality. One of the Draft Plan Update's goals is to develop parks and recreation facilities sustainably, which includes policies

such as incorporating working landscapes that help filter pollutants and capture stormwater and reduce the use of chemicals, which would improve water quality and the rate and volume of stormwater runoff. Future projects envisioned under the Draft Plan Update would generally be required to comply with the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Construction General Permit if construction of the project disturbs greater than 1 acre of soil. Compliance with the Construction General Permit would require preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and implementation of construction BMPs, including, but not limited to, Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs and Good Housekeeping BMPs. Any groundwater dewatering activities during excavation would be required to comply with the appropriate National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) waste discharge requirements permit, which requires testing and treatment (as necessary) of groundwater encountered during dewatering prior to its release. Additionally, the City is within the jurisdiction of the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (CCRWQCB), which has established Post Construction Requirements (PCR) for development and redevelopment projects. Chapter 12.08 of the City's Municipal Code, Urban Stormwater Quality Management and Discharge Control, also specifies requirements to prevent, control, and reduce pollution in stormwater runoff, and identifies local requirements for post-construction BMPs. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to hydrology and water quality and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, degradation of water quality, or alteration of drainage patterns. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to the violation of water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, degradation of water quality, or alteration of drainage patterns, and no mitigation is required.

b) The City is located partially within the San Luis Obispo Valley Groundwater Basin (City of San Luis Obispo 2014b). One of the Draft Plan Update's goals is to develop parks and recreation facilities sustainably, which includes policies such as preserving and incorporating existing vegetation and natural features on site, developing working landscapes, and low water use planting and xeriscaping, and gray and recycled water systems to reduce water use. These policies promote water conservation and groundwater recharge. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to groundwater and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to depletion of groundwater supplies or interference with groundwater recharge, and no mitigation is required.

d) Based on the County Tsunami Inundation Maps (California Department of Conservation 2019), the City is not located within a tsunami inundation zone. Additionally, the City does not have large bodies of standing body of water with the potential for seiches to occur. Future projects envisioned under the Draft Plan Update would be required to comply with City Municipal Code Chapter 17.78, Flood Damage Prevention, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) flood zone requirements to address impacts associated with flooding. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to water quality and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to the risk of release of pollutants in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to risk of release of pollutants in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, and no mitigation is required.

e) Refer to Responses 10 (a) and (b). One of the Draft Plan Update's goals is to develop parks and recreation facilities sustainably, which includes policies such as preserving and incorporating existing vegetation and natural features on site, developing working landscapes, and low water use planting and xeriscaping, and gray and recycled water systems to reduce water use, which are consistent with the CCRWQCB's Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coastal Basin (Basin Plan) (CCRWQCB 2019) and the sustainable groundwater management. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition,



individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to hydrology and water quality and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to conflicts with or obstruction of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to conflicts with or obstruction of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan, and no mitigation is required.

### **Mitigation Measures**

None.

### **Conclusion**

Less than significant impact.

## **11. LAND USE AND PLANNING**

Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Physically divide an established community?	14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	14	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Evaluation**

a) According to the Draft Plan Update, San Luis Obispo's Parks and Recreation Department defines its mission "to inspire happiness by creating community through people, parks, program and open space." The Draft Plan Update presents a blueprint for realizing this mission. The five goals of the Draft Plan Update (i.e., build community and neighborhoods, meet changing needs of the community, sustainability, maximize resources, and safety) embody this vision; so it could be said that the Draft Plan Update is the very antithesis of any effort to physically divide an established community, regardless of whether the "community" is defined as a neighborhood, a specific plan area, or the entire City.

In addition, the Draft Plan Update is consistent with the intent of the City's General Plan LUE (City of San Luis Obispo 2014d; adopted December 9, 2014) to set forth a pattern for the orderly development of land within the City's planning area, based on residents' preferences and on protection of natural assets unique to the planning area. Similar to the intent of the LUE, the five goals of the Draft Plan Update (i.e., build community and neighborhoods, meet changing needs of the community, sustainability, optimize resources, and safety) seek to facilitate the orderly development of future parks and recreation projects within the City, and seek to preserve and protect existing vegetation and natural features at existing parks and facilities. The Draft Plan Update was also developed in coordination with City residents through a comprehensive public engagement effort, as described in Chapter 3, What We Heard, of the Draft Plan Update. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in *no impact* related to physically dividing an established community, and no mitigation is required.

b) Planned parks and park improvements as described in the Draft Plan Update comply with the designated intent for Park (P), Recreation (REC), and Public (PUB) land uses as described in the LUE. In addition, as stated previously, the goals of the Draft Plan Update include building community and neighborhoods, meeting changing needs of the community, sustainability, optimizing resources, and safety. As stated in Response 11 (a), because the intent of the Draft Plan Update and the five goals of the Draft Plan Update (i.e., build community and neighborhoods, meet changing needs of the community, sustainability, maximize resources, and safety) are consistent with the intent of the LUE, the Draft Plan Update would be consistent with the LUE. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under

the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to land use and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to conflicts with any land use plan, policy, or regulation. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to conflicts with a land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, and no mitigation is required.

### **Mitigation Measures**

None.

### **Conclusion**

Less than significant impact.

## **12. MINERAL RESOURCES**

Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### **Evaluation**

a), b) In 1975, the California Legislature enacted the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act (SMARA), which, among other things, provided guidelines for the classification and designation of mineral lands. Areas are classified on the basis of geologic factors without regard to existing land use and land ownership. The areas are categorized into four Mineral Resource Zones (MRZs):

- **MRZ-1:** An area where adequate information indicates that no significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that little likelihood exists for their presence.
- **MRZ-2:** An area where adequate information indicates that significant mineral deposits are present, or where it is judged that a high likelihood exists for their presence.
- **MRZ-3:** An area containing mineral deposits, the significance of which cannot be evaluated.
- **MRZ-4:** An area where available information is inadequate for assignment to any other MRZ zone.

Of the four categories, lands classified as MRZ-2 are of the greatest importance. Such areas are underlain by demonstrated mineral resources or are located where geologic data indicate that significant measured or indicated resources are present. MRZ-2 areas are designated by the State of California Mining and Geology Board as being “regionally significant,” and require that a Lead Agency’s land use decisions involving MRZ-2 areas are to be made in accordance with its mineral resource management policies, and that it consider the importance of the mineral resource to the region or the State as a whole, not just to the Lead Agency’s jurisdiction.

According to the California Division of Mines and Geology Mineral Land Classification Map (California Department of Conservation 1989), the City is located within MRZ-3. There are no areas classified as MRZ-2 located within the City. Further, because the Draft Plan Update is a policy document and does not include any physical improvements, no impacts related to

mineral resources would occur with its adoption. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in *no impact* to mineral resources, and no mitigation is required.

### **Mitigation Measures**

None.

### **Conclusion**

No impact.

## **13. NOISE**

Would the project result in:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	5, 20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	5, 20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) For a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or 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?	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Evaluation**

a), b) The City's General Plan Noise Element (City of San Luis Obispo 1996; adopted May 7, 1996, last revised May 7, 1996) establishes standards and procedures for protecting noise-sensitive uses from stationary and mobile sources. Refer to Table A for the maximum noise exposure thresholds for noise-sensitive uses due to transportation noise sources, and Table B for maximum noise exposure for noise-sensitive uses due to stationary noise sources.

**Table A: Maximum Noise Exposure for Noise-Sensitive Uses Due to Transportation Noise Sources**

Land Use	Outdoor Activity Areas <sup>1</sup>	Indoor Spaces		
	L <sub>dn</sub> or CNEL, in dB	L <sub>dn</sub> or CNEL, in dB	L <sub>eq</sub> in dB <sup>2</sup>	L <sub>max</sub> in dB <sup>3</sup>
Residences, hotels, motels, hospitals, nursing homes	60	45	-	60
Theaters, auditoriums, music halls	-	-	35	60
Churches, meeting halls, office building, mortuaries	60	-	45	-
Schools, libraries, museums	-	-	45	60
Neighborhood parks	65	-	-	-
Playgrounds	70	-	-	-

Source: *General Plan Noise Element* (City of San Luis Obispo 1996).

<sup>1</sup> If the location of outdoor activity areas is not shown, the outdoor noise standard shall apply at the property line of the receiving land use.

<sup>2</sup> As determined for a typical worst-case hour during periods of use.

<sup>3</sup>  $L_{\max}$  indoor standard applies only to railroad noise at locations south of Orcutt Road.

CNEL = community noise equivalent level

dB = decibel(s)

$L_{dn}$  = day-night average noise level

$L_{eq}$  = equivalent continuous sound level

$L_{\max}$  = maximum instantaneous noise level

**Table B: Maximum Noise Exposure for Noise-Sensitive Uses Due to Transportation Noise Sources**

Duration	Day (7 a.m. to 10 p.m.)	Night (10 p.m. to 7 a.m.)
Hourly $L_{eq}$ in dB <sup>1,2</sup>	50	45
Maximum level in dB <sup>1,2</sup>	70	65
Maximum impulsive noise in dB <sup>1,3</sup>	65	60

Source: *General Plan Noise Element* (City of San Luis Obispo 1996).

<sup>1</sup> If the location of outdoor activity areas is not shown, the outdoor noise standard shall apply at the property line of the receiving land use.

<sup>2</sup> As determined for a typical worst-case hour during periods of use.

<sup>3</sup>  $L_{\max}$  indoor standard applies only to railroad noise at locations south of Orcutt Road.

CNEL = community noise equivalent level

dB = decibel(s)

$L_{eq}$  = equivalent continuous sound level

Noise attenuation measures identified in the Noise Element include land use limitations, separation between land uses (i.e., noise buffers), earth berms, and sound attenuation walls. Noise Element Policy 1.1 states that the City will work to minimize noise exposure based on the established numerical noise standards. City Municipal Code Chapter 9.12, Noise Control, prohibits operation of tools or equipment used in construction between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Monday through Saturday, or at any time on Sundays or holidays. The Municipal Code also requires that construction activities shall be conducted such that the maximum noise levels at affected properties will not exceed 75 A-weighted decibels (dBA) at single-family residences, 80 dBA at multi-family residences, and 85 dBA at mixed residential/commercial uses. The City Municipal Code (9.12.050.B.7) also addresses vibration impacts, if construction is occurring in a public space or right-of-way, by prohibiting the operation of any device that creates vibration that is above the vibration perception threshold of an individual at or beyond 150 feet from the source. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific noise-related impacts and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to an increase in noise levels or excessive groundborne vibration or noise. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to an increase in noise levels or excessive groundborne vibration or noise, and no mitigation is required.

c) Refer to Response 9 (e). Chapter 17.64 of the City's Municipal Code establishes an AOE that identifies specific regulations for land uses within the AOE, including provisions for noise sensitive land uses including neighborhood parks and playgrounds that could be affected by aircraft noise. Additionally, there are no private airstrips within the City's Urban Reserve Line. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific noise-related impacts and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to exposure of people residing or working in an area to excessive airport noise. Future development envisioned under the Draft Plan Update would also be reviewed for consistency with the ALUP and Chapter 17.64

of the City's Municipal Code. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to exposure of people residing or working in an area to excessive airport noise, and no mitigation is required.

### **Mitigation Measures**

None.

### **Conclusion**

Less than significant impact.

## **14. POPULATION AND HOUSING**

Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Induce substantial unplanned 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)?	17	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	17	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### **Evaluation**

a), b) The Draft Plan Update seeks to address existing and future parks and recreation needs for the City's growing and changing population. According to the City's existing standards, which require a minimum of 10 acres of parkland acreage per 1,000 residents, the City is currently deficient in parkland acreage. Therefore, the Draft Plan Update is responding to the needs of the City's existing and future population by planning for additional parks and facilities; it is not inducing population growth by providing parks and facilities.

The Draft Plan Update seeks to place updated and new facilities within or near either existing housing areas or within planned new housing areas. The City's approach to providing new and/or improved parks and recreation facilities is consistent with Goal 3 of the City's Housing Element, which seeks to conserve existing housing, and prevent the loss of safe housing and the displacement of current occupants, because the approach to providing new and/or improved parks and recreation facilities would not displace existing people or housing. The Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in *no impact* related to substantial unplanned population growth or the displacement of substantial numbers of existing people or housing, and no mitigation is required.

### **Mitigation Measures**

None.

### **Conclusion**

No impact.

## 15. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Would the project 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:					
Fire protection?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Schools?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parks?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Evaluation

a), b) Fire and police protection services are provided to the City by the City of San Luis Obispo Fire Department and the City of San Luis Obispo Police Department, respectively. Individual projects envisioned by the Draft Plan Update may result in a marginal cumulative increase in demand on City services, including fire and police protection. However, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to public services and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to fire and police protection. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to the provision of fire and police protection, or the construction of new or physically altered facilities, and no mitigation is required.

c) The City is located within the San Luis Coastal Unified School District (SLCUSD). As described in the Draft Plan Update, the City maintains a Joint Use Agreement with the SLCUSD, which establishes terms for both the SLCUSD's and the City's use of parks and recreational facilities at specified school sites. Future projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update could include expansion of this agreement to additional sites, hours, and uses. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to public services and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to schools. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to schools, and no mitigation is required.

d) The Draft Plan Update evaluates the condition and capacity of the City's existing parks and facilities, develops a strategy for maintaining these facilities, and considers how new parks and recreational facilities should be provided in the future. Chapter 5 of the Draft Plan Update lays out a framework for locating parks and recreation amenities in existing and future parks and also includes a park-by-park assessment, identifying the general physical condition of each site, relevant issues pertaining to site access and use, and park-specific needs and wants. This information is provided in a table, along with planned improvements for all City parks, in Appendix E of the Draft Plan Update. As stated in Response 14(a) and 14(b), the Draft Plan Update would not induce population growth within the City. Individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would provide new and upgraded parks and recreational facilities for existing and future populations, including the City's daytime population of workers and students. The individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would benefit the community by creating greater capacity through the provision of new parks and facilities, which would thereby reduce demand on existing parks and facilities. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in

accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to public services and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to existing parks. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to parks, and no mitigation is required.

e) Because the Draft Plan Update is intended to serve the parks and recreation needs of the existing community, it would not result in a direct increase in population and would therefore not result in the need to provide additional public facilities, such as expanding or building new libraries, whose construction would result in an environmental impact. Additionally, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update could result in an increase in the use of other public facilities such as roadways, bike lanes, sidewalks, and other urban paths; however, the increased use of sustainable transportation infrastructure is consistent with the City's General Plan and Active Transportation Plan.. Regardless, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to public services and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to other public facilities, including libraries and roadways. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* associated with the provision of new or altered government facilities, and no mitigation is required.

### **Mitigation Measures**

None.

### **Conclusion**

Less than significant impact.

## **16. RECREATION**

Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Evaluation**

a) The Draft Plan Update evaluates the condition and capacity of the City's existing parks and facilities, develops a strategy for maintaining these facilities, and developing new and/or improved parks and recreational facilities in the future. As future development contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would create new and/or improved parks and recreational facilities, demand on existing parks and recreational facilities would decrease, which would limit the extent of on-going physical deterioration on the existing facilities. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in *no impact* related to the accelerated use and subsequent deterioration of existing parks and recreational facilities, and no mitigation is required.

b) The Draft Plan Update evaluates the condition and capacity of the City's existing parks and facilities, develops a strategy for maintaining these facilities, and considers how new parks and recreational facilities should be provided in the future. Chapter 5 of the Draft Plan Update lays out a framework for locating parks and recreation amenities in existing and future parks and also includes a park-by-park assessment, identifying the general physical condition of each site, relevant issues pertaining to site access and use, and park-specific needs and wants. This information is provided in a table, along with planned improvements for

all City parks, in Appendix E of the Draft Plan Update. The Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to recreational facilities and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to construction, improvement, or expansion of recreational facilities. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, and no mitigation is required.

### **Mitigation Measures**

None.

### **Conclusion**

Less than significant impact.

## **17. TRANSPORTATION**

Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	13	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	18	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	6	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Evaluation**

a) The City's General Plan Circulation Element (City of San Luis Obispo 2014c; adopted December 9, 2014, amended October 24, 2017) establishes policies and programs for multi-modal management, and identifies specific goals and requirements for transit service, roadway management, bicycle transportation, and pedestrian facilities. In addition, the Draft Plan Update includes goals and policies that seek to increase sustainable transportation access to parks and recreation facilities throughout the City including providing a park within walking distance of every neighborhood, making park locations accessible by foot and bicycle, providing multi-modal access to parks and recreational facilities, and evaluating the potential for interconnected paths citywide. Because goals and policies of the Draft Plan Update are consistent with the policies and regulations of the Circulation Element and support implementation of the City's Active Transportation Plan, the Draft Plan Update would be consistent with the Circulation Element. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to transportation and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to conflicts with a plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to conflicts with a plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, and no mitigation is required.



b) The City Council adopted vehicle miles traveled (VMT) thresholds in June 2020. Per the VMT screening criteria as described in the City's Multimodal Transportation Impact Study Guidelines, local-serving public facilities, including neighborhood parks without sporting fields, may be assumed to cause a less than significant impact, and do not require a detailed quantitative VMT assessment (City of San Luis Obispo 2020d). Because the Draft Plan Update is a policy document and does not include any physical improvements, its adoption would not result in impacts associated with VMT. In addition, the Draft Plan Update includes goals and policies that seek to reduce VMT throughout the City including providing a park within walking distance of every neighborhood, making park locations accessible by foot and bicycle, and providing multi-modal access to parks and recreational facilities. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to transportation and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to emergency access. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to conflicts with the City's VMT guidelines and thresholds, and no mitigation is required.

c) Because the Draft Plan Update is a policy document and does not include any physical improvements, its adoption would not increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use. Planned parks and park improvements as described in the Draft Plan Update would generally be developed within lands designated for Park (P), Recreation (REC), and Public (PUB) uses. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to transportation and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to conflicts with the City's Circulation Element. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to an increase in hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible use, and no mitigation is required.

d) Policies 9.20 through 9.23 of the Safety Element include the safety objectives and emergency access standards considered when reviewing a development plan. Future development contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be reviewed for consistency with the Safety Element. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to transportation and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to conflicts with the City's Safety Element. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to inadequate emergency access, and no mitigation is required.

### **Mitigation Measures**

None.

### **Conclusion**

Less than significant impact.

## 18. TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, or cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, and that is:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### **Evaluation**

a), b) On January 13, 2021, local Native American tribal groups that have a cultural and traditional affiliation to the City were formally noticed that an Initial Study under CEQA was being prepared for the San Luis Obispo Parks and Recreation Plan and General Plan Element Update (see Attachment B). No tribal representatives requested consultation or provided specific requests.

Future projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be required to comply with AB 52 and Senate Bill 18 (SB 18), as applicable.

Per AB 52, Native American consultation is required for any CEQA project that has a Notice of Preparation (NOP), a Notice of Negative Declaration (ND), or a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) filed on or after July 1, 2015. The Lead Agency for the project must notify any Native American Tribes that have requested to be notified regarding projects within 14 days of either determining that a project application is complete or deciding to undertake a project (i.e., prior to the release of the environmental document). Under AB 52, Native American tribes have 30 days from the date on which they receive notification to request consultation.

As written in 2004, SB 18 addresses the potential environmental impact of projects on California Native American Cultural Places. SB 18 requires planning agencies to consult with California Native American tribes during the preparation, updating, or amendment of all General/Specific Plans proposed on or after March 1, 2005. Per SB 18, Native American tribes have 90 days from the date on which they receive notification to request consultation. The purpose of the consultation is to identify and preserve specified places, features, and objects located within the City's jurisdiction that have a unique and significant meaning to California Native Americans.

Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to tribal cultural resources and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to any known tribal cultural resources that have been listed or been found eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5024.1. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would have a *less than significant* related to tribal cultural resources, and no mitigation is required.

**Mitigation Measures**

None.

**Conclusion**

Less than significant impact.

**19. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS**

Would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction or relocation of which could cause significant environmental effects?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years?	4, 19	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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?	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Generate solid waste in excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Evaluation**

a) Future development contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be subject to review by the City Public Works Department and/or the City Utilities Department, as appropriate, to determine project-specific infrastructure needs and requirements. In addition, any utility improvements contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would consider one of the goals of the Draft Plan Update, sustainability, which includes policies aimed at reducing the use of water and energy by providing a park within walking distance of every neighborhood, increasing trees and shade structures, making park locations accessible by foot and bicycle, instituting water-efficient initiatives including working landscape features to help filter pollutants, low water use plantings and xeriscaping, and gray and recycled water systems. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to utilities and service systems and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* associated with the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment, storm drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, and no mitigation is required.

b) According to Policy A 2.2.1 of the City's Water and Wastewater Management Element (WWME) (City of San Luis Obispo 1987; adopted February 24, 1987, last revised May 15, 2018), the City utilizes multiple water resources to meet its water supply needs to avoid dependence on any one water source. The City's 2020 Water Resources Status Report (City of San Luis Obispo 2020e) states that the City maintains a robust water supply portfolio with greater than five years of water available. In addition, as also described in Response 19 (a), one of the goals of the Draft Plan Update is sustainability, which includes policies aimed at reducing the use of water by instituting water efficient initiatives including working landscape features to help filter pollutants, low water use plantings and xeriscaping, and gray and recycled water systems. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to utilities and service systems and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to water supply. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to water supply, and no mitigation is required.

c) The City's Water Resource Recovery Facility is responsible for treating all of the wastewater within the City, and treats approximately 4.4 million gallons of wastewater daily (City of San Luis Obispo 2014b). Policy B. 2.2.3 of the WWME states that new development will only be permitted if adequate capacity is available within the wastewater collection system and/or the City's Water Resource Recovery Facility. Future development contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be reviewed for compliance with Policy B. 2.2.3 of the WWME. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to utilities and service systems and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to the City's Water Resource Recovery Facility. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to the City's Water Resource Recovery Facility, and no mitigation is required.

d), e) Chapter 8.05, Construction and Demolition Debris Recycling Program, of the City's Municipal Code, requires all new development to prepare a recycling plan to reduce waste disposal at the Cold Canyon Landfill, which serves the City. One of the goals of the Draft Plan Update is sustainability, which includes policies to reduce the generation of solid waste including maintaining agreements with other providers so as not to replicate facilities and services and using recycled materials whenever possible to avoid or minimize waste when replacing park materials and equipment. In addition, the Draft Plan Update includes a policy for the provision of green waste, recycling bins and services, and signage to inform correct usage by the public. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to utilities and service systems and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to reduce a project's waste disposal needs. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to federal, State, and local solid waste standards or generation of solid waste in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, and no mitigation is required.

### **Mitigation Measures**

None.

### **Conclusion**

Less than significant impact.

## 20. WILDFIRE

If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	20, 23	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?	20	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Evaluation

a) Refer to Response 9 (f). Because the Draft Plan Update is a policy document and does not include any physical improvements, its adoption would not conflict with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The Draft Plan Update also includes a policy to incorporate adaptability in response to public emergencies when designing elements for new parks, facilities, and amenities. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to wildfire and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to the impairment of an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. Additionally, individual projects would be reviewed by City Fire and City Police for consistency with the EOP, the City Municipal Code Chapter 15.04, Construction and Fire Prevention Regulations, and other adopted emergency response and evacuation plans. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to impairments associated with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan, and no mitigation is required.

b), c), d) The Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the *State CEQA Guidelines*. In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to wildfire and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary to address impacts related to wildfire prevention or management. Additionally, individual projects would be reviewed for consistency with the Safety Element, the City Municipal Code Chapter 15.04, Construction and Fire Prevention Regulations, and the CWPP. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* associated with wildfire prevention or management, and no mitigation is required.

### Mitigation Measures

None.

### Conclusion

Less than significant impact.

## 21. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially 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, substantially 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?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
As described in Section 4, Biological Resources, Section 5, Cultural Resources, and Section 18, Tribal Cultural Resources, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the <i>State CEQA Guidelines</i> . In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for site-specific impacts to biological, cultural, and tribal cultural resources, and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary. Furthermore, the Draft Plan Update does not include any policies or programs that would conflict with City policies on protecting and enhancing biological or cultural resources or preclude the City from achieving resource protection goals. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a <i>less than significant impact</i> related to adverse impacts to biological, cultural or tribal resources. No mitigation is required.					
	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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)?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
As presented in this IS/ND, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the <i>State CEQA Guidelines</i> . In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for cumulatively considerable impacts, and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a <i>less than significant impact</i> in regard to cumulatively considerable impacts, and no mitigation is required.					
	Sources	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Draft Plan Update will help the City meet its parks and recreational facility needs, and would not create significant, adverse impacts on humans, either directly or indirectly. As presented in this IS/ND, the Draft Plan Update is a programmatic document and is intended to guide development of future parks and recreation projects within the City and does not directly authorize any physical development or improvements. Any future physical park and facility improvements would be subject to separate environmental review on a project-specific basis, in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the <i>State CEQA Guidelines</i> . In addition, individual projects contemplated under the Draft Plan Update would be evaluated for direct and indirect					

environmental effects on human beings, and would include appropriate mitigation as necessary. Therefore, adoption of the Draft Plan Update would result in a *less than significant impact* related to effects on human beings, and no mitigation is required.

## 22. EARLIER ANALYSES

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

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

## 23. SOURCE REFERENCES

1.	California Department of Conservation. 1989. Division of Mines and Geology. Mineral Land Classification Map, San Luis Obispo-Santa Barbara P-C Region.
2.	California Department of Conservation. 2019. San Luis Obispo County Tsunami Inundation Maps. Website: <a href="https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps/san-luis-obispo">https://www.conservation.ca.gov/cgs/tsunami/maps/san-luis-obispo</a> (accessed February 17, 2021).
3.	Central Coast Region Regional Water Quality Control Board (CCRWQCB). 2019. Water Quality Control Plan for the Central Coastal Basin (Basin Plan). June.
4.	City of San Luis Obispo. 1987. General Plan Water and Wastewater Management Element (adopted February 24, 1987, last revised May 15, 2018).
5.	City of San Luis Obispo. 1996. General Plan Noise Element (adopted May 7, 1996, last revised May 7, 1996).
6.	City of San Luis Obispo. 2000. General Plan Safety Element (adopted July 5, 2000, last revised December 9, 2014).
7.	City of San Luis Obispo. 2006a. General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE) (adopted April 4, 2006, last revised December 9, 2014).
8.	City of San Luis Obispo. 2006b. Local Hazard Mitigation Plan. February.
9.	City of San Luis Obispo. 2009. Archaeological Resource Preservation Program Guidelines. October.
10.	City of San Luis Obispo. 2010. Historic Preservation Program Guidelines. November.
11.	City of San Luis Obispo. 2014a. Airport Area Specific Plan. September.
12.	City of San Luis Obispo. 2014b. Final Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Land Use and Circulation Elements Update (LUCE). September 3, 2014.
13.	City of San Luis Obispo. 2014c. General Plan Circulation Element (adopted December 9, 2014, amended October 24, 2017).
14.	City of San Luis Obispo. 2014d. General Plan Land Use Element (adopted December 9, 2014).
15.	City of San Luis Obispo. 2020a. Climate Action Plan.
16.	City of San Luis Obispo. 2020b. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Thresholds and Guidance. June 22.
17.	City of San Luis Obispo. 2020c. General Plan Housing Element (adopted November 17, 2020).
18.	City of San Luis Obispo. 2020d. Multimodal Transportation Impact Study Guidelines. June.
19.	City of San Luis Obispo. 2020e. Water Resources Status Report.

20.	City of San Luis Obispo. 2021a. San Luis Obispo Municipal Code. February 2, 2021.
21.	City of San Luis Obispo. 2021b. Clean Energy Choice for New Buildings. Website: <a href="https://www.slocity.org/government/department-directory/city-administration/office-of-sustainability/climate-action/carbon-neutral-buildings#:~:text=The%20Clean%20Energy%20Choice%20Program,to%20the%20California%20Energy%20Code">https://www.slocity.org/government/department-directory/city-administration/office-of-sustainability/climate-action/carbon-neutral-buildings#:~:text=The%20Clean%20Energy%20Choice%20Program,to%20the%20California%20Energy%20Code</a> (accessed March 12, 2021).
22.	County of San Luis Obispo. 2005. Airport Land Use Plan for the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport. May 18.
23.	County of San Luis Obispo. 2016. Emergency Operations Plan. December.
24.	County of San Luis Obispo. 2019. San Luis Obispo County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan. October.
25.	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOCAPCD). 2001. Clean Air Plan. December.
26.	SLOCAPCD. 2005. Particulate Matter Report Implementation of SB 656 Requirements. July 27.
27.	SLOCAPCD. 2020a. Ambient Air Monitoring Network Assessment. June.
28.	SLOCAPCD. 2020b. Ozone Emergency Episode Plan. January 22.
29.	SLOCAPCD. 2021. Asbestos. Website: <a href="https://www.slocleanair.org/rules-regulations/asbestos.php">https://www.slocleanair.org/rules-regulations/asbestos.php</a> (accessed March 9, 2021).

## Attachments

Attachment A – Draft Parks and Recreation Plan and General Plan Element Update  
Attachment B – Native American Consultation



## **Attachment A**

### **Draft Parks and Recreation Plan and General Plan Element Update**

**Available online:**

**<https://www.slocity.org/government/department-directory/parks-and-recreation/parks-and-recreation-plan-and-element-update>**

**Attachment B**

**Native American Consultation**



## Community Development

919 Palm Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-3218  
805.781.7170  
[slocity.org](http://slocity.org)

[Address]

January 13, 2021

FROM: Shawna Scott, Community Development Department, City of San Luis Obispo  
RE: Tribal Cultural Resources under the California Environmental Quality Act, AB 52 (Gatto, 2014). Formal Notification of determination that a Project Application is Complete or Decision to Undertake a Project, and Notification of Consultation Opportunity, pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21080.3.1 (hereafter PRC).

Dear [Name of Tribal Representative]:

The City of San Luis Obispo has determined to undertake the Parks and Recreation Master Plan and General Plan Element Update, which would be applicable Citywide. Below please find a description of the proposed project and the name of our project point of contact, pursuant to PRC § 21080.3.1 (d).

### Description of the Proposed Project:

The San Luis Obispo Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update will provide a comprehensive statement of the City's goals for parks and recreation and how those goals will be achieved over the long-term. The Master Plan policies and programs will serve as a blueprint, guiding the City and its various entities in priority setting and resource allocation. It is understood that the availability of financial resources can and will affect the timing of implementation but will not change the goals and intent. The Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update considers the Parks and Recreation Department's Mission Statement, to Inspire Happiness by creating Community through People, Parks, Programs, and Open Space, and identify parks and recreation as an essential service for the community of San Luis Obispo. The Update will support and facilitate this by providing for community health, wellness, security, and safety; design excellence; and environmental stewardship. The Update shall be consistent with the City's General Plan, Active Transportation Plan, and Climate Action Plan, including but not limited to neighborhood compatibility, safe multi-modal access to parks and facilities, and maintenance and expansion of our City's urban forest. Parks, facilities, amenities, and programs should be decentralized, and provided throughout the City to serve the full community equitably. Recreational and community gathering opportunities should be located within safe walking or accessible distance of each neighborhood and promote community organization and a sense of ownership by residents.

Neighborhood parks should include amenities for both active and passive recreation, and depending on the location, include a focal gathering point such as a gazebo. Gathering spaces would provide opportunities for local-level programming, such as concerts, events, educational opportunities, fitness classes, and food trucks in collaboration with local residents, businesses, non-profits, and faith organizations. The City Parks and Recreation and Public Works Departments should have the resources and staffing, and community and corporate partnerships, sufficient to create, support, and maintain these parks, amenities, and programs. The Update considers opportunities for improvements and renovations within existing parks and facilities in the short term, while also considering long-term fiscal responsibility including economics of scale, cost/value of new land acquisition now and in the future, new sources of revenue, and community partnerships. The Update will identify the current inventory and condition of existing parks, facilities, and amenities, identify existing and future community needs and deficiencies, assess the capacity of existing parks and facilities to accommodate existing and future needs, and determine a dynamic path forward to achieve and exceed the City's identified level of service and acreage standards for parks and amenities in both the short-term (0-5 years), mid-term (5-10 years) and long-term (10-20 years).

**The Public Draft Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update will be available to the public and presented to the Parks and Recreation Commission in February 2021. Parks and Recreation Agendas and Agenda Packets can be viewed online:**

<https://www.slocity.org/government/advisory-bodies/agendas-and-minutes/parks-and-recreation-commission>

**Additional online resources:**

<https://www.slocity.org/government/department-directory/master-plan-and-element-update>

Lead Agency Point of Contact:

Shawna Scott, Senior Planner, City of San Luis Obispo

Pursuant to PRC § 21080.3.1 (b), you have 30 days from the receipt of this letter to request consultation, in writing, with the City of San Luis Obispo.

Very Respectfully,



**Shawna Scott**

Senior Planner

City of San Luis Obispo

Community Development

919 Palm Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-3218

E [sscott@slocity.org](mailto:sscott@slocity.org)

T 805.781.7176

[slocity.org](http://slocity.org)



## Community Development

919 Palm Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-3218  
805.781.7170  
[slocity.org](http://slocity.org)

January 13, 2021

(Sent Via Certified Mail and Email)

[Address]

**RE: Invitation for Tribal Consultation; GC 65352.3  
Parks and Recreation Master Plan and General Plan Element Update  
(Citywide)**

Dear [Name of Tribal Representative]:

I am contacting you on behalf of the City of San Luis Obispo concerning an invitation for Tribal Consultation pursuant to Government Code Sec. 65352.3. As you know, you have up to 90 days to respond to this request, but we hope by reaching out to you early, we could invite your participation at your earliest convenience.

**Project Description:** The San Luis Obispo Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update will provide a comprehensive statement of the City's goals for parks and recreation and how those goals will be achieved over the long-term. The Master Plan policies and programs will serve as a blueprint, guiding the City and its various entities in priority setting and resource allocation. It is understood that the availability of financial resources can and will affect the timing of implementation but will not change the goals and intent.

The Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update considers the Parks and Recreation Department's Mission Statement, *to Inspire Happiness by creating Community through People, Parks, Programs, and Open Space*, and identify parks and recreation as an essential service for the community of San Luis Obispo. The Update will support and facilitate this by providing for community health, wellness, security, and safety; design excellence; and environmental stewardship. The Update shall be consistent with the City's General Plan, Active Transportation Plan, and Climate Action Plan, including but not limited to neighborhood compatibility, safe multi-modal access to parks and facilities, and maintenance and expansion of our City's urban forest. Parks, facilities, amenities, and programs should be decentralized, and provided throughout the City to serve the full community equitably. Recreational and community gathering opportunities should be located within safe walking or accessible distance of each neighborhood and promote community organization and a sense of ownership by residents. Neighborhood parks should include amenities for both active and passive recreation, and depending on the location, include a focal gathering point such as a gazebo. Gathering spaces would provide opportunities for local-level programming, such as concerts, events, educational opportunities, fitness classes, and food trucks in collaboration with local residents, businesses, non-profits, and faith organizations. The City Parks and Recreation and Public

Works Departments should have the resources and staffing, and community and corporate partnerships, sufficient to create, support, and maintain these parks, amenities, and programs. The Update considers opportunities for improvements and renovations within existing parks and facilities in the short term, while also considering long-term fiscal responsibility including economics of scale, cost/value of new land acquisition now and in the future, new sources of revenue, and community partnerships. The Update will identify the current inventory and condition of existing parks, facilities, and amenities, identify existing and future community needs and deficiencies, assess the capacity of existing parks and facilities to accommodate existing and future needs, and determine a dynamic path forward to achieve and exceed the City's identified level of service and acreage standards for parks and amenities in both the short-term (0-5 years), mid-term (5-10 years) and long-term (10-20 years).

**The Public Draft Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update will be available to the public and presented to the Parks and Recreation Commission in February 2021.**

**Parks and Recreation Agendas and Agenda Packets can be viewed online:**

**<https://www.slocity.org/government/advisory-bodies/agendas-and-minutes/parks-and-recreation-commission>**

**Additional online resources:**

**<https://www.slocity.org/government/department-directory/master-plan-and-element-update>**

Please contact Shawna Scott, Senior Planner for additional information or to request a virtual meeting at [sscott@slocity.org](mailto:sscott@slocity.org) or (805) 781-7176.

We look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,



Shawna Scott  
Senior Planner



**CITY OF  
SAN LUIS OBISPO**

Community Development  
919 Palm Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-3218  
E [sscott@slocity.org](mailto:sscott@slocity.org)  
T 805.781.7176