



**CITY OF
SAN LUIS OBISPO**

**Addendum to the Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration for the
Motel Inn Project (PR-0113-2015)**

1. Project Title:

Motel Inn Project

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

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

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Shawna Scott, Senior Planner
805-781-7176

4. Project Location:

2223 Monterey Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

5. Project Applicant and Representative Name and Address:

Motel Inn, L.P.
PO Box 12910
San Luis Obispo, CA 93406

Covelop Holdings, LLC
PO Box 12910
San Luis Obispo, CA 93406

Studio Design Group
Tim Ronda, Principal Architect
Ariana Melendez, Project Architect
762 Higuera Street, Suite 212
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

6. General Plan Designation:

Tourist Commercial

7. Zoning:

C-T-S (Tourist Commercial with “Special Consideration” Overlay due to San Luis Creek and residential neighborhood bordering the property)

8. Description of the Project:

The previously approved Motel Inn project consisted of a 55-unit hotel including guestrooms and bungalow units, a restaurant, 26 Airstream trailers (for guests), and one Airstream spa trailer (ARCH-3741-2016 and USE-0580-2017). The proposed project consists of a modification to the previously approved Motel Inn project, and would consist of 29 bungalow guestroom buildings. Four accessory structures, consisting of restroom and housekeeping/maintenance buildings, are proposed. The project does not propose any changes to the previously approved restaurant building, which incorporates the remaining portions of the Master List Historic Motel Inn, and would include a restaurant and lobby for guests.

9. Project Entitlements Requested:

Design Review

10. Setting and Surrounding Land Uses:

The approximately 4.2-acre site is located at the northeast end of Monterey Street, immediately south of Highway 101. San Luis Creek and the San Luis Drive residential neighborhood are located to the south. The Apple Farm Inn and restaurant are located to the southwest, and the La Cuesta Inn is located to the northwest. The project site is nearly level to gently sloping, and is accessed directly from Monterey Street, near the Highway 101 on- and off-ramp. The project site is included in the City’s Master List of Historic Resources.

11. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.):

Construction within California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) right-of-way would require an encroachment permit.

12. Previous Environmental Review

On March 23, 2016, the Planning Commission adopted an Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the Motel Inn project. On September 27, 2017, the Planning Commission considered and approved a modification to the Motel Inn project (specific to the substitution of the recreational vehicle spaces with Airstream trailers), and found the modification consistent with the adopted IS/MND (Resolution No. PC-1010-17). All adopted mitigation measures remain in effect and will apply to the proposed project.

Section 15164 of the State *CEQA Guidelines* allows a lead agency to prepare an addendum to an IS/MND when “minor technical changes or additions” have occurred in the project description since the IS/MND was adopted. In addition, the lead agency is required to explain its decision not to prepare a subsequent EIR pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, which requires subsequent EIRs when proposed changes would require major revisions to the previous EIR “due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.”

The evaluation below discusses the issue areas covered by the Motel Inn IS/MND and concludes that in each case no new environmental effects are created and that there is no increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

Environmental impacts associated with the Motel Inn project were evaluated in the adopted IS/MND. As addressed below, the proposed modifications would not result in any new impacts not previously disclosed in the adopted IS/MND and would not increase the severity of any impact identified in the adopted IS/MND.

Aesthetics

No significant aesthetic impacts were identified in the adopted IS/MND. The proposed modifications would not increase the height or massing of the project, and would not adversely affect any scenic vistas. Site development would occur consistent with development and lighting standards, and design criteria identified in Ordinance 1651 (associated with the “Special Consideration” overlay). Therefore, the project would not create any new impacts, and impacts would remain less than significant.

Agricultural Resources

No impacts to agricultural resources were identified in the adopted IS/MND. Based on the location of the project, underlying zoning, and lack of Farmland, no impact would occur.

Air Quality

The adopted IS/MND identified potentially significant impacts related to the construction and operational phases of the project, and the proximity of sensitive receptors. At the time, the project was reviewed by the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) and mitigation measures recommended by the APCD were incorporated into the adopted Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. Construction-related impacts would be similar to the previously-approved project. The proposed project would increase the total lodging units by only two (from 81 to 83), and would therefore not result in an increase in operational emissions. All adopted mitigation measures will be applied to the proposed project (Mitigation Measure AQ-1). Therefore, the project would not create any new impacts, the project would not increase the severity of any impact, and impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Biological Resources

San Luis Creek runs through the eastern edge of the project site, and proposed project complies with the required 20-foot creek setback (applicable to structures) identified in Ordinance 1651. Conditions within the upland portion of the project site (where development is proposed) has not changed, and continues to lack any biologically sensitive or jurisdictional habitats. The adopted IS/MND identified construction-related impacts associated with machinery and sedimentation, and a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required (Mitigation Measure BIO-1), which would mitigate the impact to less than significant. In addition, a creek restoration and enhancement plan, including the removal of non-native vegetation and replacement with native trees, shrubs, and groundcovers is required (Mitigation Measure BIO-2), which would enrich the creek habitat. As the proposed project does not increase the size or intensity of the previously-approved project, would continue to provide a minimum 20-foot creek setback, and would comply with adopted mitigation measures, the proposed project does not create any new impacts or increase the severity of any previously identified impact, and impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Cultural Resources

The proposed project is located on a site which is designated locally as a Master List Historic property. The Master List Historic Motel Inn (Milestone Mo-Tel) was constructed in the 1924-1925 timeframe and was constructed in a Mission Revival architectural style. Building permits issued under previous entitlements removed many of the non-historic structures on the site and the remaining historic portions of the Motel Inn include the main lobby building of the original Motel Inn, and a portion of the façade remaining from the original restaurant building. The previously approved building at the entrance to the property contains the two significant historic elements of the old Motel Inn including portions of the historic lobby building with the three-tiered bell tower and a portion of the façade from the original restaurant building. This portion of the project will not change.

The project proposes construction of 29 bungalow guestroom buildings. A restroom building and three accessory housekeeping and maintenance buildings are proposed southeast and southwest of the existing remnants of the Motel Inn and previously approved restaurant building and would be constructed with a Mission Revival style similar to the previously approved project. The primary changes, as compared to the previously proposed project, are the elimination of a 2-story lobby building with guest rooms, to be replaced by five new two-story bungalow guestroom buildings, and elimination of a 23-space recreational vehicle park at the eastern portion of the site, to be replaced with 14 one-story bungalow guestroom buildings. The bungalow guestrooms would be approximately 15 feet in height (one-story buildings) and 25 feet in height (two-story buildings). Proposed materials include plaster siding, red clay tile roofing, exposed timber decorative features, and wrought iron railings and trim. The guestroom buildings would be located south and southeast of the restaurant building. A recreational area with swimming pool, spa, and garden patio would be located between the restaurant and guestrooms.

The style and materials proposed for the guestroom buildings reflect those of the original Motel Inn's Mission Revival architectural style, achieving consistency with the property's historical character. These buildings are located behind the future restaurant/lobby building which

incorporates the only remaining historically significant components of the original Milestone Motel, and are set back from the structure across pedestrian pathways. The proposed architectural style of the accessory restroom and housekeeping buildings, which would be located to the southeast and southwest of the remaining historic features and future building, also incorporates Mission Revival features which are complementary to the original Motel Inn architectural style. Based on the location and scale of the proposed structures, the proposed project would not block views towards, nor visually distract from the remaining historic features to be incorporated into the future lobby and restaurant building.

The new construction would not destroy any of the character defining features of the existing historic elements of the approved building, and because they are designed in a compatible Mission Revival style and at a modest scale, the buildings would not detract from the original motel setting or its historic building elements. The continuation of a tourist-oriented use is consistent with the historic, visitor-serving purpose of the property. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource, would not create any new impacts to historical resources, and would not increase the severity of any identified impact.

Regarding archaeological resources, an Extended Phase 1 Testing Report (Bertrando & Bertrando, January 2002) prepared for the previous project concluded that no archaeological deposits were identified; however, it is possible that resources could be uncovered during project excavation and grading. The adopted IS/MND identifies a potentially significant impact related to resource discovery, and Mitigation Measure CR-1 requires preparation and implementation of an archaeological monitoring plan. As the proposed project would not increase the area of depth of ground disturbance, and compliance with Mitigation Measure CR-1 is required, no new impacts would occur, and the project would not increase the severity of any identified impact.

Potential impacts would remain less than significant with required mitigation.

Geology and Soils

The adopted IS/MND did not identify any significant geology or soils impacts. The proposed project would not increase the size or intensity of development, and would be required to comply with applicable Building Codes. Therefore, the project would not result in any new impacts, and would not increase the severity of any identified impact, and impacts would remain less than significant.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Construction-related greenhouse gas emissions would be similar (or less than the previously-approved project, due to the modular nature of the A-frame units). The proposed project would reduce the total lodging units from 81 to 76, and would therefore not result in an increase in operational greenhouse gas emissions. All adopted mitigation measures will be applied to the proposed project (Mitigation Measure AQ-1), which would reduce potential emissions. Therefore, the project would not create any new impacts, would not increase the severity of any impact, and impacts would remain less than significant.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The adopted IS/MND identified a potentially significant impact due to the potential for underground storage tanks. This impact would be mitigated to less than significant by compliance with recommendations identified in a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, and remediation of any potential contamination to the satisfaction of the City Fire Chief (Mitigation Measure HAZ-1). The proposed project would not increase the area of disturbance or include any elements that require the use or storage of hazardous materials beyond standard, legal use. Therefore, the proposed project would not create any new impacts, would not increase the severity of any impact, and impacts would remain less than significant with required mitigation.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Similar to the previously-approved project, the proposed revised project is required to comply with the City's Drainage Design Manual of the Waterway Management Plan, Post Construction Requirements for stormwater, and Floodplain Management Regulations (Zoning Regulations Chapter 17.78). The proposed project would result in a marginal increase in the total number of lodging units from 81 to 83, and would not increase water demand compared to the previously approved project. Therefore, based on compliance with existing regulations, the proposed project would not create any new impacts, would not increase the severity of any impact, and impacts would remain less than significant.

Land Use and Planning

The proposed project remains consistent with the General Plan, as the site is designated for tourist commercial land uses, the proposed use of the property would not change (lodging), and the project would not physically divide an established community. Therefore, the proposed project would not create any new impacts, would not increase the severity of any impact, and impacts would remain less than significant.

Mineral Resources

No mineral resources are present onsite. Therefore, the proposed project would not create any new impacts, would not increase the severity of any impact, and no impact would occur.

Noise

The project site is located south of Highway 101 and immediately east of the Monterey Street/U.S. 101 ramps. Noise sensitive uses (single-family residential neighborhood) are present to the south, across San Luis Creek. The proposed project remains a lodging project, with most of the proposed guestroom buildings located behind the future "restaurant" building, and 14 of the buildings behind a sound wall to be located along the northern property boundary. The total number of proposed units would marginally increase from 81 to 83, and consistent with Ordinance 1651, no balconies, outdoor use areas, or operational windows would face the creek corridor and adjacent residential neighborhood. Therefore, the proposed project would not create any new impacts, would not increase the severity of any impact, and impacts would remain less than significant.

Population and Housing

Similar to the previously approved, project, the proposed project consists of a similar use (lodging) and would not induce growth nor displace existing house. Therefore, the proposed project would not create any new impacts, would not increase the severity of any impact, and no impact would occur.

Public Services and Recreation

The proposed project would marginally increase the total number of lodging units from 81 to 83, and would be adequately served by municipal services. Therefore, the proposed project would not create any new impacts, would not increase the severity of any impact, and no impact would occur.

Transportation/Traffic

The proposed project would marginally increase the total number of lodging units from 81 to 83, and payment of Transportation Impact Fees is required. Similar to the previously approved project, access to the site would be provided from Monterey Street, and a roadway channelization project (subject to approval by both the City and Caltrans) is required to be completed by the applicant to address geometric concerns related to the proximity of the project access point and the U.S. 101 on- and off-ramps (Mitigation Measure TT-1). Therefore, based on compliance with the adopted mitigation measure, the proposed project would not create any new impacts, would not increase the severity of any impact, and impacts would remain less than significant with mitigation.

Utilities and Service Systems

The proposed project would marginally increase the total number of lodging units from 81 to 83. Since the project was initially approved, the City has initiated the expansion of and improvements to the Water Resource Recovery Facility (WRRF). The WRRF is designed for an average dry-weather flow of 5.1 million gallons per day (mgd) and treated an average of 2.9 mgd during 2020. The average dry weather flow of wastewater is expected to reach 5.4 mgd at the WRRF once the City reaches its 2035 build-out population identified in the General Plan. Upon completion in 2024, the WRRF modifications will increase treatment capacity at the facility to 5.4 mgd, which is planned to accommodate wastewater flows in the City under full buildout of the General Plan. The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation and would be adequately served by City sewer infrastructure and the WRRF.

Regarding water, the City maintains adequate, diverse water supply (and excess supply) to meet Citywide water demands during single- and multiple-dry years through 2035 (build-out of the General Plan). The proposed project is consistent with the General Plan land use designation and would be adequately served by City water infrastructure and water supply.

The proposed project reduces the number of lodging units, and would be adequately served by the Cold Canyon Landfill, which serves the area, and has a remaining capacity of 13,000,000 cubic yards (maximum permitted capacity is 24,000,000 cubic yards).

Therefore, the proposed project would not create any new impacts, would not increase the severity of any impact, and impacts would remain less than significant.

DETERMINATION

In accordance with Section 15164 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the City of San Luis Obispo has determined that this addendum to the adopted IS/MND for the Motel Inn project is necessary to document changes or additions that have occurred in the project description since the IS/MND was adopted. The preparation of a subsequent environmental document is not necessary because:

1. None of the circumstances included in Section 15162 of the CEQA Guidelines have occurred which require a subsequent environmental document:
 - a. The project changes do not result in new or substantially more severe environmental impacts.
 - b. The circumstances under which the project is undertaken will not require major changes to the IS/MND.
 - c. The modified project does not require any substantive changes to previously approved mitigation measures.

Attachment:

1. Motel Inn Project Initial Study/Negative Declaration



**City of San Luis Obispo
INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
USE-1035-2015 (PR-0113-2015)**

February 24, 2016

1. Project Title: Motel Inn & RV Park

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:

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

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:

Marcus Carloni, Associate Planner
(805) 781-7176
mcarloni@slocity.org

4. Project Location:

2223 Monterey Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Motel Inn L.P.
P.O. Box 12910
San Luis Obispo, CA 93406

6. General Plan Designation:

Tourist Commercial

7. Zoning:

C-T-S (Tourist Commercial with "Special Consideration" Overlay due to the San Luis Creek and residential neighborhood bordering the property.)

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ER # 2363-2015					

8. Description of the Project:

The proposal is to construct a new motel with a total of 55 rooms spread across a main hotel/lobby building and 12 detached “bungalow” units. A recreational vehicle (RV) park (23 spaces) is also proposed on the easterly portion of the project site. The property address is 2223 Monterey Street. The vicinity map is shown on the right. Total floor area for the buildings will be approximately 34,500 square feet. The property is approximately 4.19 acres in area and is situated at the northerly terminus of Monterey Street. The project site also includes remnants of the Historic “Motel Inn” which includes a façade and portions of the original lobby. Portions of the original historic Motel Inn are under construction and will be incorporated into an already approved building which was issued a building permit under prior entitlements, and is not a part of the current project under evaluation.



9. Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:

- North: Highway 101
- East: San Luis Creek
- West: Apple Farm Inn Motel
- South: San Luis Creek and San Luis Drive residential neighborhood

10. Project Entitlements Requested:

The project requires environmental review (this document), architectural review and approval by the Architectural Review Commission (ARC), and the issuance of a use permit from the Planning Commission.

11. Other public agencies whose approval is required: None

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER # 2363-2015	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

FISH AND GAME FEES

	The Department of Fish and Game has reviewed the CEQA document and written no effect determination request and has determined that the project will not have a potential effect on fish, wildlife, or habitat (see attached determination).
X	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 Game for review and comment.

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

X	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 Game, Department of Housing and Community Development). The public review period shall not be less than 30 days (CEQA Guidelines 15073(a)).
---	--

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ER # 2363-2015					

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



 Signature

February 24, 2016

 Date

Doug Davidson, Deputy Director

 Printed Name

For: Michael Codron

 Community Development Director

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ER # 2363-2015					

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

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER # 2363-2015	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:					
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	2			X	
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?	2			X	
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	1,2			X	
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	1			X	

Evaluation

a), b) The proposed buildings are situated in a previously developed area and are low scale that will not exceed two stories (structure height of approximately 32 feet). The proposed project does not have the potential to adversely affect scenic vistas and the project will not affect scenic resources such as trees or rock outcroppings.

c) The project site is located in an area zoned for commercial development and was previously disturbed with buildings and site development associated with the Historic Motel Inn. The project proposal will be reviewed by the Architectural Review Commission for conformance with the City of San Luis Obispo Community Design Guidelines which address compatibility of proposed development on the site and in relation to surroundings. Additionally, the Planning Commission will review the project for compatibility through requirements of Ordinance No. 1130. In 1989, commercial properties on the east side of Monterey Street (including this property) were rezoned to include the “S”, Special Consideration, overlay district. The implementing ordinance, Ordinance No. 1130, contains specific design criteria for new development on sites within the S district overlay. Aspects of site development that could potentially affect neighborhood compatibility and environmental quality are addressed in the design criteria. The design criteria include specifications which limit building openings onto the creek and address lighting, screening between land uses, riparian corridor protection, building height and grading limitations and drainage control.

d) New sources of lighting will be evaluated as part of the review of ordinance No. 1130 to ensure that lighting remains on-site and does not produce glare that could affect neighboring properties. The project will also be reviewed by the ARC and at the time of building permit submittal for compliance with the City’s Night Sky Ordinance (SLOMC 17.23) which contains provisions to minimize glare and protect the natural environment from excessive and/or misdirected light and glare.

Conclusion: a-d) Less than significant impact.

2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. Would the project:					
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?					X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?					X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?					X

a),b),c) The Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency designates this property as Urban Land. There is no Williamson Act contract in effect on the project site. Redevelopment of the site will not contribute to conversion of farmland, and may relieve pressure to develop similar land outside of the City’s Urban Reserve Line. No impacts to existing on site or off site agricultural resources are anticipated with the project.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ER # 2363-2015					

Conclusion: a-c) No Impact.

3. AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	3,4,5		X		
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			X		
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	4, 5		X		
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	4, 5		X		
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X		

a-e) The proposed project was reviewed by the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (APCD). The APCD is a commenting agency to assess air pollution impacts from both construction and operational phases of the project. The APCD found potential impacts associated with operational and construction phase impacts unless recommended mitigation measures are incorporated into the project. The APCD provided a letter dated November 17, 2015 (Appendix C) which included recommended mitigations to address construction impacts, operational phase impacts, and sensitive receptors. With incorporation of all mitigation measures and recommendations provided by APCD, impacts to air quality will be less than significant. Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Conclusion: a-e) Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Prior to issuance of building permits, all mitigations and recommended actions from the November 17, 2015 APCD letter commenting on the Motel Inn project shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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?	6		X		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect, on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	6		X		
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	7, 8,				X
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?	6		X		
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or	3				X

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER # 2363-2015	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

ordinance?					
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?					X

(a-d) The proposed project complies with required setbacks from the creek bank and C/OS portion of the site. South-Central California Coast Steelhead, District Population Segment (*Onchorynchus mykiss*) are known to occur in San Luis Obispo Creek in the vicinity of the area of the project and have been documented upstream of the project site. The City’s Natural Resources Manager has visited the site and confirmed that no riparian or otherwise biologically sensitive habitat or wetlands or wildlife corridors are associated with the portion of the site impacted by the proposed project. However, due to the proximity of development to the creek channel and downward slope of the site, there is the potential for construction-related impacts associated with machinery and sedimentation which could enter the natural area. A **mitigation measure (BIO-1)** has been recommended to ensure that proper erosion control measures for work in and around the riparian corridor are utilized under a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWWP).

San Luis Creek runs through the eastern edge of the site, and is subject to protective standards adopted with Ordinance 1130 (1989 Series) for the C-T-S and C/OS-5 zones at this location. On its western bank (on the project site) the creek channel is vegetated by a mixture of native and non-native trees and groundcovers. All proposed structures and other improvements are above the established top of bank. Residential properties across the creek to the east encroach to the top of bank or overhang the creek channel with decorative landscaping and decking. Despite these encroachments, the creek has retained its value as a significant biological corridor. Its condition could be enhanced with the proposed project development if a robust restoration and enhancement plan is implemented, as required by Ordinance 1130 (1989 Series), criterion No. 3. The City’s Natural Resources Manager has reviewed the project plans and has recommended **mitigation measures (BIO-2)** requiring a planting plan which would retain existing native vegetation along the banks and channel and replacement of non-native plantings with appropriate trees, shrubs and groundcover to enrich the creek habitat by providing additional shade cover and food sources for South-Central California Coast Steelhead, District Population Segment (*Onchorynchus mykiss*) and a more diverse, complex tree canopy that will be attractive to various bird species.

(e-f) No heritage trees or significant native vegetation exist on the portion of the site to be developed. It is not anticipated that any areas meeting the criteria for jurisdictional wetlands will be disturbed by the project and the project site is not part of a local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Less than significant impact.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: The project shall include a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWWP) to address erosion control and shall also incorporate the following measures for work in and around the riparian corridor:

- a. No heavy equipment should enter flowing water.
- b. Equipment will be fueled and maintained in an appropriate staging area removed from the riparian corridor.
- c. Restrict all heavy construction equipment to the project area or established staging areas.
- d. All project related spills of hazardous materials within or adjacent to the project area shall be cleaned up immediately. Spill prevention and clean up materials should be onsite at all times during construction.
- e. All spoils should be relocated to an upland location outside the creek channel area to prevent seepage of sediment in to the drainage/creek system.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Plans submitted for Building Permit Application shall include a creek restoration and enhancement plan identifying the removal of non-native vegetation within the creek bank and replacement with appropriate native trees, shrubs and groundcovers.

Conclusion: a-f) Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource as defined in §15064.5.	10, 11,			X	
--	------------	--	--	---	--

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER # 2363-2015	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5)	12, 13				
	14		X		
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	13		X		
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	13		X		

Historic Resources

The proposed project is located on a site which is designated locally as a Master List Historic property. The Master List Historic Motel Inn was constructed in the 1924-1925 timeframe and was constructed in a Mission Revival architectural style. The Motel Inn is significant historically since it is associated with events that made a broad contribution to California’s history and cultural heritage. This is the first location to use the word “motel” and the first business to employ motoring comfort accommodations which represented a shift away from auto camps and cabins. Building permits issued under previous entitlements removed many of the non-historic structures on the site and the remaining historic portions of the Motel Inn include the main lobby building of the original Motel Inn, and a portion of the façade remaining from the original restaurant building. That said, these remaining building remnants from the historic Motel Inn are not a part of the currently proposed project and will be incorporated into a building which is currently under construction pursuant to building permits issued under previous entitlements.

a) The proposed project includes the construction of a lobby building with 12 attached hotel rooms, a mix of one and two story detached bungalows with a total of 40 hotel rooms, and a 1.6 acre site with 25 RV hookups. Due to the fact that the applicant has a current, approved building permit regarding partial construction of those elements of the project which are of historic value, no further evaluation is required for that part of the project. However, the Cultural Heritage Committee (CHC) will still need to review the remaining components of the project to insure that the entire project is consistent with the Historic Preservation Guidelines of the City and the Secretary of the Interior (SOI) Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The proposed development requires an evaluation of the projects compatibility with the remaining character defining elements of the historic Motel Inn which are incorporated into the previously approved restaurant building which is under construction. The project’s compatibility with the approved restaurant building (including the remaining historic lobby building and façade of the original structure) will be evaluated by the City’s Cultural Heritage Committee for conformance with relevant City of San Luis Obispo Historic Preservation Guidelines and Secretary of Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. An evaluation has been provided by City Staff for review by the Cultural Heritage Committee which finds that the proposed new construction will not detract from the historic significance of the remaining historic features to be incorporated into the previously approved restaurant building. Proposed development will be located approximately 20-feet behind the previously approved restaurant building (which includes the historic features) and the scale of the lobby building and bungalow units will not block views, nor overwhelm or detract from the remaining historic features. The proposed architectural style of the new development incorporates Mission Revival features which are complementary to the original Motel Inn architectural style. The new work will not detract or destroy any of the character defining features of the existing historic elements of the approved restaurant building and the proposed structures will preserve the essential form and integrity of the historic property. The RV portion of the property is of a relatively low intensity with only 25 potential RV spaces on the site plan. The parking of vehicles, including recreational vehicles, will not detract from the original motel setting, or its historic building elements. The continuation of a tourist-oriented use is consistent with the historic, visitor-serving purpose of the property. Less than significant impact.

Archaeological Resources

b-d) The project site is considered an archaeologically “sensitive area” because it is within 200 feet of the top of the bank of San Luis Obispo Creek. In January, 2002, Bertrando & Bertrando prepared an Extended Phase I Testing report, which is attached to this initial study as Appendix F. No archaeological deposits were identified. While no archaeological resources were discovered in the test trenches, it is possible that resources could be uncovered with project excavation and grading. The Phase I testing report found that in order to reduce potential impacts to cultural resources which could be impacted during ground disturbance activities that monitoring should be conducted. Less than significant impact with mitigation

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ER # 2363-2015					

incorporated.

Mitigation Measure CR-1:

Prior to issuance of construction permits a monitoring plan in conformance with requirements of City Archaeological Preservation Program Guidelines shall be submitted and approved by the Community Development Director. The monitoring plan shall be submitted by a City approved subsurface archaeologist and all monitoring and construction work shall be carried out consistent with the approved monitoring plan. In the event excavations or any ground disturbance activities encounter significant paleontological resources, archaeological resources, or cultural materials, then construction activities, which may affect them, shall cease until the extent of the resource is determined and the Community Development Director approves appropriate protective measures or mitigation in conformance with Archaeological Resource Preservation Program Guidelines section 4.60. If pre-historic Native American artifacts are encountered, a Native American monitor should be called in to work with the archaeologist to document and remove the items. Disposition of artifacts shall comply with state and federal laws. A note concerning this requirement shall be included on all relevant sheets with ground disturbance activities with clear notes and callouts.

Conclusion: a-d) Less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated

6. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury or death involving:				X	
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.	16			X	
II. Strong seismic ground shaking?	16			X	
III. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	16			X	
IV. Landslides?	16			X	
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	17			X	
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?	16,17			X	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 1802.3.2 of the California Building Code (2007), creating substantial risks to life or property?	17			X	
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?	17				X

a) San Luis Obispo County, including San Luis Obispo is located within the Coast Range Geomorphic Province, which extends along the coastline from central California to Oregon. This region is characterized by extensive folding, faulting, and fracturing of variable intensity. In general, the folds and faults of this province comprise the pronounced northwest trending ridge-valley system of the central and northern coast of California.

Under the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone Act, the State Geologist is required to delineate appropriately wide special studies zones to encompass all potentially and recently-active fault traces deemed sufficiently active and well-defined as to constitute a potential hazard to structures from surface faulting or fault creep. In San Luis Obispo County, the special Studies Zone includes the San Andreas and Los Osos faults. The edge of this study area extends to the westerly city limit line, near Los Osos Valley Road. According to a recently conducted geology study, the closest mapped active fault is the Los Osos Fault, which runs in a northwest direction and is about one mile from the City's westerly boundary. Because portions of this fault have displaced sediments within a geologically recent time (the last 10,000 years), portions of the Los Osos fault are

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ER # 2363-2015					

considered “active”. Other active faults in the region include: the San Andreas, located about 30 miles to the northeast, the Nacimiento, located approximately 12 miles to the northeast, and the San Simeon-Hosgri fault zone, located approximately 12 miles to the west.

Although there are no fault lines on the project site or within close proximity, the site is located in an area of “High Seismic Hazards,” specifically Seismic Zone D, which means that future buildings constructed on the site will most likely be subjected to excessive ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. Structures must be designed in compliance with seismic design criteria established in the Building Code. To minimize this potential impact, the California Building Code and City Codes require new structures be built to resist such shaking or to remain standing in an earthquake. No mitigation measures are necessary. Less than significant impact.

b) The site is already partially developed and is an infill site located in an urbanized area. The project will not result in loss of topsoil to a level that would be considered significant.

c), d) A soils engineering report will be required by the Building Division at the time of submittal for building and grading permits. The soils report will require data regarding the nature, distribution and strength of the existing soils, and conclusions and recommendations for grading and construction. Grading and building techniques must be designed in compliance with the report. To ensure the proposed project does not pose a risk to occupants and structures the construction plans submitted to the building division for review and approval shall be consistent with recommendations of the soils engineering report.

e) The proposed project will be required to connect to the City’s sewer system. Septic tanks or alternative wastewater systems are not proposed and will not be used on the site.

Conclusion: a-e) Less than Significant impact

7. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	5			X	
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	5			X	

a), b) In addition to the criteria pollutants discussed in the above air quality analysis, the state of California recently passed Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solution Act of 2006 and California Governor Schwarzenegger Executive Order S-3-05 (June 1, 2005), both require reductions of greenhouse gases in the State of California. The proposed project will result in infill development, located in close proximity to transit, and to the amenities of the City. The project is consistent with City policies for infill development and efficient use of existing infrastructure. As discussed in the above air quality analysis, the APCD has provided comments on the project to address construction and operational phase impacts of the project (Appendix C). Compliance with recommended mitigation measure AQ-1 also includes measures to reduce the production of greenhouse gas emissions which are also produced with operational and construction phase emissions discussed in the Air Quality analysis. These characteristics of the proposal coupled with the requirement to address APCD comments finds the project consistent with efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and will result in less than significant impacts.

Conclusion: a, b) Less than significant impact.

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?					X
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?			X		

ATTACHMENT 1

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER # 2363-2015	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?					X
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?					X
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?					X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?					X
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?					X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	19,20			X	

a) The proposed hotel and RV park use would not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. No Impact.
 b) A Phase I environmental site assessment was prepared by Ceres Associates and is attached as Appendix G. Recommendations are included in the report which will require certain actions. Since the site previously had a service station use there may be underground tanks remaining in place. As an example, the site assessment recommends that ground penetrating radar (GPR) be utilized to determine if any underground tanks exist, and that sampling be conducted to assess if asbestos is contained in the remaining building on-site. Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1:

The applicant shall comply with the recommendations contained in the Phase I environmental site assessment prepared by Ceres Associates to confirm that any contamination issues have been adequately addressed prior to site development. All contamination issues must be resolved to the satisfaction of the Fire Chief prior to construction.

c), d) The proposed project is not within one quarter mile of an existing school and the project would not involve the use, transportation, disposal, or emission of hazardous materials. The site is not on a list of hazardous materials sites. No Impact.

e), f), g) The project site is not within an airport land use plan and is not within two miles of a public airport or private airstrip. The project has been reviewed by the City Fire Department and would not interfere with emergency response plans or evacuation plans. No Impact.

i) The project site is not located within the wildland interface zone. Less than significant impact.

Conclusion: a & c-h) Less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?					X
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local					X

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER # 2363-2015	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

groundwater table level (e.g. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?					
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site?				X	
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site?	20,21			X	
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	20,21			X	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X	
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X	
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X	
i) Expose people or structures to significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X	
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?					X

a), b) The project site is located within the San Luis Obispo Creek watershed area. Due to its size and location, the project is subject to the Drainage Design Manual (DDM) of the Water Way Management Plan (WWMP) and newly adopted Post Construction Requirements for storm water control. The project will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Site redevelopment will be served by the City's sewer and water systems and will not use or otherwise deplete groundwater resources. The existing on-site water well is proposed to be removed but could be used for landscape irrigation. No significant change is expected to the local groundwater table. The well site is down gradient from the rural upstream properties that rely on groundwater. No impact.

c), d), e), f) Physical improvement of the project site will be required to comply with the drainage requirements of the City's Waterways Management Plan. This plan was adopted for the purpose of ensuring water quality and proper drainage within the City's watershed. The Waterways Management Plan requires that site development be designed so that post-development site drainage does not exceed pre-development run-off and the proposed project does not increase impervious surface area. If applicable, plans submitted for a building permit application will be evaluated by the Public Works Department and must be designed in a manner that is consistent with the requirements of the Waterways Management Plan. The project will be subject to the Post Construction Stormwater Regulations. These regulations address both water quantity and water quality. The project will be required to retain and/or treat the runoff from the impervious surfaces including parking areas, drive aisles, and roofs. A water quality upgrade is expected from this previously developed site. City Engineering Standards address point source controls for solid waste and materials storage areas. Less than significant impact.

g), h), i) The project site is located within the 100-year flood zone per the Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map as is the majority of the downtown area. The project is therefore subject to showing compliance with the Waterway Management Plan Drainage Design Manual. Per section 3.0 of the Waterways Management Plan, new development projects and redevelopment projects within the FEMA designated 100-year floodplain that are not located within the Mid-Higuera or special Floodplain Management Zone have no significant effects on flood elevations provided design criteria of the plan are met. Furthermore, the project is subject to the Floodplain Management Regulations (flood ordinance). The engineer of record has modeled the project to show that the structures are located outside the SFHA and that the project will not impact adjoining properties. A Letter of Map Change will be processed as a condition of building permits. The project will be required to have a finished floor elevation of at least 1-foot above the defined 100-year flood elevation at the time, or for

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER # 2363-2015	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

commercial buildings within the central business district the building can be built at present grade with incorporation of FEMA “flood-proofing” measures to the satisfaction of the City Engineer. The new structures and improvements will be located away from the top of creek bank in accordance with the Creek Setback Ordinance. Less than significant impact.

Conclusion: Less than significant impact.

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?					X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	19,22				X
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	19,22				X

Evaluation

a), b), c) The proposed infill development project is consistent with the General Plan since the site is designated for Tourist Commercial land uses by the General Plan which the proposed visitor-serving development is consistent. The project will not physically divide an established community or conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plans. No Impact.

Conclusion: No Impact.

11. MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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?					X
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?					X

a), b) No known mineral resources are present at the project site. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource. The project site is not designated by the general plan, specific plan, or other land use plans as a locally important mineral recovery site.

Conclusion: No Impact.

12. NOISE. Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	23,24			X	
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground-borne vibration or ground-borne noise levels?	23,24			X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				X	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	23,24			X	

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER # 2363-2015	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?					X
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?					X

a), b) The site is located adjacent to Highway 101, the principal noise source affecting existing and future noise conditions in the vicinity. Due to existing noise from Highway 101, the project site is exposed to noise levels in the 60-70dB range. The General Plan Noise Element lists the acceptable range of noise as up to 60 db without the need for any specific noise studies or mitigation. Hotels and motels are noise sensitive uses as designated in the Noise Element of the General Plan. The Noise Element indicates that noise levels of 60 decibels (dB) are acceptable for outdoor activity areas and 45 dB is acceptable for indoor areas. Outdoor noise levels in the 60-70 dB range are classified as “conditionally acceptable”. This means that development may be permitted provided it is designed to meet acceptable (for the proposed land use) noise exposure levels.

Due to existing and projected noise levels emanating from Highway 101, in previous approvals for the site, the applicant was required to prepare a noise study to evaluate mitigation strategies for meeting interior and exterior noise standards. The noise study was prepared for a similar, but somewhat different hotel use, by Donald Asquith, PhD, and is attached as Appendix H. The study notes how the freeway noise source varies in elevation above the site from west to east. The northbound on-ramp from Monterey Street is approximately 5 feet higher at the westerly end of the site, increasing to 15 feet at the easterly end. While noise exposure from the highway is still significant, this grade differential from the noise source does reduce the traffic noise levels from what they would otherwise be if the noise source was at the same elevation as the project site.

Outdoor spaces that are created within the project site should be designed to consider the freeway noise and exposure of visitors to the noise. For outdoor areas, similar to previous approvals, proposed buildings are sited such that outdoor areas are situated on the opposite side of proposed structures which will attenuate freeway sound levels to acceptable outdoor noise levels. Complying noise levels for interior spaces can be achieved through standard building techniques for the motel units, according to the noise study and consistent with the City Noise Guidebook. City staff also visited the project site on December 17, 2015, measured noise from the freeway with a sound meter and found the noise levels to be consistent with the prior Asquith study. Recreational vehicle parks are not listed in the General Plan Noise Element as Noise Sensitive uses. For the RV park portion of the project it can be anticipated that recreational vehicle travelers would anticipate freeway noise at this location as it is somewhat common that RV parks are located adjacent to freeways and major roadways. It is not anticipated that RV travelers would have the same expectation of interior noise reduction or quiet outdoor or indoor noise levels as motels or hotel accommodations. Less than significant impact.

Noise increases resulting from the proposed project

c), d) The hotel and RV park uses are not anticipated to produce sound levels which would exceed thresholds of the General Plan noise element or Noise Ordinance. To a considerable degree, it can be anticipated that proposed structures will help buffer Highway 101 noise from the yards of the neighbors across San Luis Creek. In addition, parking areas for the motel use and RV parking are between 120 feet to 150 feet from the nearest residence on San Luis Drive, and further buffered by San Luis Creek and a heavily vegetated riparian corridor. In addition, Ordinance 1130 contains specific provisions to ensure compatible noise levels with residential uses across the riparian corridor which will be reviewed for conformance by the City Planning Commission.

Construction activities generate noise, and may temporarily raise the ambient noise levels above acceptable levels for the duration of construction, including groundborne vibration and noise. Construction noise is regulated by the City’s Noise Ordinance, which regulates time of construction and maximum noise levels that may be generated. The project would be required to meet the noise standards contained in the Ordinance, which includes limitations on the days and hours of construction. Less than significant impact.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER # 2363-2015	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

e), f) The project site is not located within an airport land use plan, is not located within two miles of a public use airport, and is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact.

Conclusion: Less than significant impact.

13. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?					X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?					X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?					X

a) The project is proposed in an already urbanized area with existing roads and other infrastructure. The project would not induce substantial population growth in the area directly or indirectly. Less than significant.

b), c) The project would not displace any existing housing or substantial numbers of people. No Impact.

Conclusion: No Impact

14. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of 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:

a) Fire protection?					X
b) Police protection?					X
c) Schools?					X
d) Parks?					X
e) Other public facilities?					X

The proposal is for a tourist-oriented land use which will not require the provision of public facilities such as parks or schools. There is also adequate capacity of water, sewer, police and fire protection to service the proposed development. The development will be subject to the standard traffic and water impact fees.

Conclusion: No impact.

15. RECREATION.

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?					X
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?					X

a), b) The project does not include permanent residential units and the transitory nature of the hotel guests and RV park use should not place an additional substantial burden on nearby residential facilities such that substantial physical deterioration would be accelerated. No Impact

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER # 2363-2015	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Conclusion: No impact

16. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?			X		
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X		
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?					X
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	27		X		
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?					X
f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	25, 26,27			X	

Project Traffic Impact

a), b) The General Plan Circulation Element identifies Monterey Street as an arterial road and adopts level of Service D (LOS D) as the maximum acceptable level of traffic congestion during PM peak hour conditions outside the downtown. The Circulation Element does not prescribe any modifications to Monterey Street northeast of its intersection with Grand Avenue.

Higgins Associates prepared a traffic impact study (TIS) on the more intensive but similar motel project at this site, approved in 2003. (See Appendix I, attached.) The TIS evaluated how traffic from the project would affect the operation of nearby intersections. According to the report, full development of the motel would generate approximately 1,148 vehicle trips per day, with 29 trips entering the project site and 52 trips departing during the AM peak hour, and 39 trips entering and 35 trips departing during the PM peak hour. The TIS forecasted how this additional traffic would be distributed to the following intersections and evaluated its impact on the traffic level of service (LOS). (The traffic impacts of the current, proposed project will be significantly less based on an average daily trip generation of 475 trips, according to the Omni Means draft Technical Memorandum dated November, 2015. See Appendices, attached.)

1. Monterey Street & U.S. 101 NB On/Off Ramps at Project Driveway
2. Monterey and Garfield
3. Monterey Street and Buena Vista
4. Buena Vista and Garfield
5. Buena Vista and U.S. 101 Southbound Off Ramp
6. Monterey Street at Apple Farm Inn Driveway
7. Monterey Street at La Questa Motor Inn Driveway

The TIS concluded that under “existing + Project” conditions, area intersections will operate at acceptable levels of service (generally at LOS C or better), in compliance with Circulation Element standards.

Conclusion: Less than significant impact.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ER # 2363-2015					

Cumulative Traffic Impacts:

The prior traffic impact study also considered the prior project’s contribution to cumulative traffic volumes at build-out of the City’s general plan land uses. Under cumulative conditions, the analysis showed that intersections 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7 listed above will continue to operate at acceptable levels of service (LOS D or better) during AM and PM peak hours. For intersection 2 (Garfield @ Monterey), the Garfield approach to Monterey would operate at LOS F during the PM peak hour, without that project’s traffic being added. The TIS concluded that signalization would not meet Caltrans warrants but that actual conditions should be monitored as traffic conditions change to determine the future need for a signal, or possibly all-way traffic controls.

Under build-out conditions, the Buena Vista approach to the southbound U.S. 101 off ramp (intersection 5, above) would operate at LOS E during the PM peak hour, without project traffic being added. The TIS concluded that signalization of this intersection does not meet Caltrans warrants, but like the Garfield intersection, monitoring should be undertaken and signalization may be warranted in the future.

Conclusion: Less than significant impact. (Note: This project will pay city Transportation Impact Fees as required by ordinance. Revenues from these fees are used to pay for mitigating area-wide traffic conditions as those mitigations become necessary. Payment of the fee constitutes this project’s fair share contribution toward mitigating potential, future substandard traffic conditions.)

Traffic Geometrics Concerns

d) Access to the Motel Inn site is challenging due to its immediate proximity to the northbound on ramp and southbound off-ramp of Highway 101. Therefore, a traffic study was conducted by Omni-Means (November, 2015) to evaluate potential impacts of the proposed new traffic to the area and identify the most reasonable measures to mitigate road and driveway geometric issues. The study was conducted in partnership with Caltrans. The study recommends: (1) restricting southwest (SW) left turns for approximately 120 feet of the Northbound (NB) 101 off ramp; (2) providing a west-bound (WB) left turn refuge/acceleration lane for hotel traffic; (3) realigning the Monterey Street curb line; and (4) making minor adjustment to affected motel driveways along Monterey Street. A conceptual graphic of the recommended mitigation is shown below.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ER # 2363-2015					



Source: Omni-Means

Mitigation Measure: MM-1

Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall construct the roadway channelization project as recommended in the traffic study which is depicted above, and as approved by the City and Caltrans.

Conclusion: Less than significant with mitigation.

- c) The project would not have any effect on air traffic patterns. No Impact.
- e) The site has been reviewed by City emergency services and found to comply with requirements for emergency access. No impact.

17. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?					X
b) Require or result in the construction or expansion of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	28			X	
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				X	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new and expanded entitlements needed?	28			X	
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to				X	

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER # 2363-2015	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

the provider's existing commitments?					
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	29			X	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X	

a) b) c) The City Water Resource Recovery Facility and existing sewers in the vicinity have sufficient capacity to serve the project site. The developer will be required to construct private sewer laterals to convey wastewater to the sewer main that parallels the project's western property line. All on-site sewer facilities will be required to be constructed according to the standards in the Uniform Plumbing Code. Sewer impact fees are collected at the time building permits are issued to pay for capacity at the City's Water Resource Recovery Facility. The fees are set at a level intended to offset the potential impacts of future development. The site includes existing public water and sewer mains in easements along the northern and western property lines. This water main is the transmission water main from Reservoir 1. Proposed development at the site shall be sited outside of these easements. Storm drainage facilities in the vicinity are adequate to serve the proposed project and no expansion is required which could result in significant environmental effects. Less than significant impact.

d) Water demand from the project was anticipated as part of General Plan build out. Future site development is subject to water impact fees which were adopted to ensure that new development pays its fair share of the cost of constructing the water supply, treatment and distribution facilities that will be necessary to serve it. Less than significant impact.

e) f) g) Background research for the Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (AB939) shows that Californians dispose of roughly 2,500 pounds of waste per month. Over 90% of this waste goes to landfills, posing a threat to groundwater, air quality, and public health. Cold Canyon landfill is projected to reach its capacity by 2018. The Act requires each city and county in California to reduce the flow of materials to landfills by 50% (from 1989 levels) by 2000. To help reduce the waste stream generated by this project, consistent with the City's Source Reduction and Recycling Element, recycling facilities must be accommodated on the project site and a solid waste reduction plan for recycling discarded construction materials must be submitted with the building permit application. The project is required by ordinance to include facilities for recycling to reduce the waste stream generated by the project, consistent with the Source Reduction and Recycling Element. Less than significant impact.

Conclusion: Less than significant impact

18. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

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

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 the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				X	
--	--	--	--	---	--

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

ATTACHMENT 1

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ER # 2363-2015					

indirectly?					
-------------	--	--	--	--	--

19. 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.
None.
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.

20. SOURCE REFERENCES.	
1.	City of San Luis Obispo Ordinance 1130, 1989
2.	Project Plans
3.	Municipal Code
4.	Response Letter from Air Pollution Control District (APCD), 2015
5.	APCD's CEQA Air Quality Handbook
6.	Ecological Analysis of Apple Farm II, 8/20/02, Levine-Fricke
7.	City of San Luis Obispo Creek Setback ordinance (Section 17.16.025 of the Zoning Regulations)
8.	City of San Luis Obispo Conservation and Open Space Element, 2006
9.	City of San Luis Obispo Historic Resources Inventory, December, 1983
10.	City of San Luis Obispo Historical Preservation Guidelines, 2010
11.	Historical Resources Inventory of Property, Bertrando, September 2000
12.	Historic American Building Survey (HABS) of the Motel Inn, August 2004
13.	Archaeological Report, Bertrando & Bertrando, January 2002
14.	City of San Luis Obispo Archaeological Resource Preservation Guidelines, 1995
15.	Extended Phase I Testing Report, Bertrando, 2002
16.	San Luis Obispo Quadrangle Map, State Geologist (Alquist-Priolo Map), 1990
17.	Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, U.S. Soil Conservation Service, 1984
18.	Phase I Environmental Site Assessment by Ceres Associates, October, 1999
19.	City of San Luis Obispo Land Use Element, 2014
20.	FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (Community Panel 0603100005C)
21.	Preliminary Storm Water Control Plan, Above Grade Engineering, San Luis Obispo, November 2015
22.	City of San Luis Obispo Zoning Regulations
23.	City of San Luis Obispo Noise Element & Guidebook
24.	Noise Investigation , Donald Asquith, PhD, March, 2001

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources ER # 2363-2015	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
---	---------	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

25.	Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 9 th Edition, 2012
26.	Motel Inn Traffic Analysis, Higgins Associates, March 2002
27.	Traffic Report, Omni-Means, November 2015
28.	City of San Luis Obispo Water Allocation Regulations
29.	City of San Luis Obispo Source Reduction and Recycling Element, 1994
Note	All of the above reference sources that are not attached as appendices to this Initial Study are available upon request in the Community Development Department, City of San Luis Obispo

ATTACHMENTS:

- Appendix A: Project Plans
- Appendix B: Not Used
- Appendix C: Air Pollution Control District Letter Dated November 17, 2015
- Appendix D: Ecological Analysis of San Luis Obispo Creek, Levine-Fricke, May 2002 and USFWS Protocol Survey, Levine-Fricke, June 2003
- Appendix E: Historic American Building Survey of Former Motel Inn, 2004 (with limited attachments)
- Appendix F: Archaeological Report, Extended Phase I Report, Bertrando & Bertrando, 2002
- Appendix G: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Ceres Associates
- Appendix H: Noise Study, Donald Asquith, PhD, March, 2001
- Appendix I: Traffic Impact Study, OMNI-MEANS, Nov. 2015 & Higgins Associates, 2002; (with limited attachments)

MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Prior to issuance of building permits, all mitigations and recommended actions from the November 17, 2015 APCD letter commenting on the Motel Inn project shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director.

- Monitoring Program AQ-1: All mitigation measures shall be shown on grading and building plans. In addition, the contractor shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust off site. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the APCD, Community Development and Public Works Departments prior to commencement of construction.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: The project shall include a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWWP) to address erosion control and shall also incorporate the following measures for work in and around the riparian corridor:

- a. No heavy equipment should enter flowing water.
 - b. Equipment will be fuelled and maintained in an appropriate staging area removed from the riparian corridor.
 - c. Restrict all heavy construction equipment to the project area or established staging areas.
 - d. All project related spills of hazardous materials within or adjacent to the project area shall be cleaned up immediately. Spill prevention and clean up materials should be onsite at all times during construction.
 - e. All spoils should be relocated to an upland location outside the creek channel area to prevent seepage of sediment in to the drainage/creek system.
- Monitoring Plan, BIO 1: All mitigation measures shall be shown on grading and building plans and be clearly visible to contractors and City inspectors. Erosion control measures shall be reviewed by the City’s Community Development and Public Works Departments, and the City’s Natural Resources Manager. City staff will periodically inspect the site for continued compliance with the above mitigation measures.

Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources	Sources	Potentially Significant Issues	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ER # 2363-2015					

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Plans submitted for Building Permit Application shall include a creek restoration and enhancement plan identifying the removal of non-native vegetation within the creek bank and replacement with appropriate native trees, shrubs and groundcovers.

- **Monitoring Plan, BIO 2:** Final plans shall be reviewed by the City’s Natural Resources Manager as part of the Building Permit application package, who shall require modifications to the creek restoration and enhancement plan as necessary to ensure that an appropriate mix of plantings, in type, size and quantity is proposed, and that best practices are utilized while working within the creek corridor.

Mitigation Measure CR-1: Prior to issuance of construction permits a monitoring plan in conformance with requirements of City Archaeological Preservation Program Guidelines shall be submitted and approved by the Community Development Director. The monitoring plan shall be submitted by a City approved subsurface archaeologist and all monitoring and construction work shall be carried out consistent with the approved monitoring plan. In the event excavations or any ground disturbance activities encounter significant paleontological resources, archaeological resources, or cultural materials, then construction activities, which may affect them, shall cease until the extent of the resource is determined and the Community Development Director approves appropriate protective measures or mitigation in conformance with Archaeological Resource Preservation Program Guidelines section 4.60. If pre-historic Native American artifacts are encountered, a Native American monitor should be called in to work with the archaeologist to document and remove the items. Disposition of artifacts shall comply with state and federal laws. A note concerning this requirement shall be included on all relevant sheets with ground disturbance activities with clear notes and callouts.

- **Monitoring Plan, CULT 2:** All mitigation measures and the monitoring plan shall be shown on grading and building plans and be clearly visible to contractors and City inspectors. The name and contact information for the monitor shall be clearly indicated within construction plans. City staff will periodically inspect the site for continued compliance with the above mitigation measure.

Mitigation Measure HAZ-1: The applicant shall comply with the recommendations contained in the Phase I environmental site assessment prepared by Ceres Associates to confirm that any contamination issues have been adequately addressed prior to site development. All contamination issues must be resolved to the satisfaction of the Fire Chief prior to construction.

- **Monitoring Plan, HAZ-1:** All mitigation measures including the recommendations in the Phase I ESA shall be shown on grading and building plans and be clearly visible to contractors and City inspectors. Any contaminations issues must be presented to the Community Development Director and Fire Chief before further action.

Mitigation Measure: TT-1: Prior to the issuance of a certificate of occupancy, the applicant shall construct the roadway channelization project as generally described above (Transportation & Traffic Section #16 of the Initial Study), and as approved by the City and Caltrans.

- **Monitoring Plan, TT-1:** All mitigation measures including the recommendations of the Omni Means Report (November 2015) shall be included in construction plans and be clearly visible to contractors and City inspectors. Compliance with the Omni Means Report and roadway design will be verified through the building permit process and with final inspections by City staff.

Historic American Building Survey of the Motel Inn (Milestone Mo-Tel)

2223 Monterey St., San Luis Obispo CA

1. Architectural History
2. Reproductions of Historic Photos
3. Photo-documentation of Existing Conditions
4. As-Built Drawings (24 x 36 on mylar)



King
ARCHITECTS
2001 Fresno Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
909-966-5444
Fax 909-966-9277
e-mail: king@kingarch.com

. k h
NORTH HALL ARCHITECT
208 Pierre Street
San Luis Obispo
California 93401
Telephone 805/841-8160
Fax 805/841-9814

Historic Documentation

Significance

In 1982, the Motel Inn was recorded as Number 0138-03C as part of the historic resources inventory of the City of San Luis Obispo. At the time, only the restaurant/lobby building was considered, and it was found to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places [City of San Luis Obispo 1983]. Further research conducted as part of a restoration and reconstruction project (slated to begin in 2003), assigned the property a State Historic Resources Number (P-40-041013) and included the bungalow units behind the main building [Bertrando and Bertrando 2000].

On the basis of standard criteria for cultural resource significance [Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 CCR Section 4852], the Motel Inn is significant because it:

- 1) is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California history and cultural heritage. The Motel Inn was the first venue to combine the automotive convenience of the auto camps, courts, and cabins with amenities of the hotel, thus creating the concept of the motel. The Motel Inn was also the first to use the word motel, coined from motor and hotel.
- 2) is associated with the lives of persons important in our past. Arthur Heineman, the Pasadena architect and developer of the Motel Inn, was a contemporary of Greene and Greene, and was well known for his Craftsman Style residences and as an early developer of the bungalow court concept.
- 3) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic value. The Motel Inn combines classic features of a Spanish Colonial/Mission Revival Style with the bungalow court concept. Although not a sterling example of period architecture, it is distinctive, and it represents the beginning of the use of flamboyant and colorful architecture to attract the attention of the touring motorist.

History

For a general history of the Motel Inn property, including a discussion of the development of the motel concept, refer to the Historic Resource Inventory Report filed by Betsy and Ethan Bertrando on September 2000.

Architectural History

Charles Hamilton of the Hamilton Hotel chain originally hired Arthur and Alfred Heineman to design a new motor hotel based on the bungalow court concept. The development was financed by Harry Elliot, who partnered with Hamilton, the Heineman brothers, and attorney John H. Alvord to create the Milestone Interstate Corporation, which was to develop a series of motels in California [Krieger 1988]. The Milestone Mot-tel was designed by Arthur Heineman, in association with his brother Alfred Heineman. The Heineman brothers came to California from Chicago in 1894, and became involved in architecture primarily as developers. Although neither had any real training in architecture, they became designers and builders of housing in Southern California. Although Arthur became a registered architect, the unofficial designer was Alfred; the brothers became known as Arthur S. Heineman, architect, and Alfred Heineman, Associate. [Bertrando and Bertrando 2000:12]. The draftsman of the project was Roy Sutherland, the engineer was Bill Morris [Henry 1957]. The General Contractor on the project was Maino Construction, plumbing was

by Union Hardware and Plumbing Company, electrical was by Valley Electric (15,000 feet of conduit was installed). Project landscaper was Shurragar, the "well-known firm of florists and landscapers" [Daily Telegram 1925]. At the time, A.W. Shurragar had a florist shop at 1416 Monterey Street [Bertrando and Bertrando 2000: 14]. The Milestone Mo-Tel opened on December 12, 1925 at a construction cost of \$80,000 [Jackson 1993], but was not completely finished until fall of 1926 [Krieger 1988].

The Milestone Motel was the first and only motel built out of a proposed chain of eighteen, spaced along the California coast a day's drive apart. These motels were to be an entirely new form of accommodation, featuring the motoring convenience of the automobile camp with amenities of the hotel, including "free maid service, and restaurant and commissary," along with new amenities such as "laundry and dry yard, private garage for each car, "fix-it" garage and racks, and children's playgrounds" [Milestone Interstate Corporation 1925: 2]

As originally built, the Milestone Mo-Tel consisted of a lobby and restaurant connected by a covered walkway. The lobby contained a large fireplace and a desk made of copper bound by wrought iron straps to simulate a Spanish chest [Daily Telegram 1925].

Between the main building and the creek, 15 bungalow units were clustered around a courtyard. The original courtyard was planted with grass and featured a palm frond-covered walkway connecting the restaurant and lobby with the bungalow nearest the creek (see photo Motel Inn Bungalow Court 1926). Each bungalow consisted of 4 standard units that could be paired into a "sitting room apartment" for two couples (see Bungalow Plans 4 of 6). Each unit had a shower or bathtub, a toilet, a washbasin, a phone connected to a switchboard in the lobby, and central heat. The bungalows were constructed of 4" gypsum blocks (known as "key tile") and plaster, with wood framing of flat roofs. The bungalows also featured clay tile trim, "little Spanish lanterns" by each door, and wood sash windows with iron grille work. Most bungalows also had one or two attached shed-roof garages (see attached 1926 Bungalow Court photos) [Sanborn 1926; Daily Telegram 1925].

Two "deluxe" apartments were situated on a second floor above the lobby and restaurant respectively. In back of the bungalows, along the creek, were a series of "hotel rooms" primarily for "motel aids and chauffeurs", now offices for the adjacent Apple Farm. The eastern end of the hotel unit building was occupied by laundry and linen storage, while further east was a repair garage, now used for storage. Two long garages for additional cars were located along the creek west of the "hotel rooms" [Sanborn 1926; Daily Telegram 1925]. To further cater to the motoring tourist, the Milestone Mo-Tel had its own gas station situated east of the restaurant in what is now a parking lot [Sanborn 1926].

Other amenities added in the 1920s included a miniature golf course along the creek east of the bungalows (see attached Miniature Golf photo ca. 1930) and a riding stable [Stephens 1985; Read 1988]. The restaurant was enlarged and bathrooms added [see Construction History Drawing].

In 1932, the Milestone Interstate Corporation made a large addition to the restaurant, expanding part of the ramada toward Monterey Street to create a lounge [see Construction History Drawing]. This addition was undoubtedly made to accommodate the growing popularity of the restaurant. Unfortunately, by August of that year, the Milestone Interstate Corporation was bankrupt, and the Milestone Mo-Tel was lost to foreclosure. It remained closed until 1937 [Ceres 1999:9; Peters 1991].

In 1937, the property was purchased by the Motel Inn Corporation, and in 1938 the Motel Inn was listed as such, along with the Motel Service Station, at 2125 and 2145 Monterey

Street respectively [Ceres 1999:9]. The Motel Inn was sold again in 1939 to Joseph and Lilyan Raphael, and in 1942 to Richard Guest and Violet Peck Guest [Peters 1991]. After the Guests purchased the property, they made some changes. They filled in the rest of the ramada between the main building wings to create a larger lounge and expanded restaurant, probably due to growing demand from Camp San Luis (see Motel Inn Construction History Drawing).

In 1944, the Motel Inn was sold to George H. Jovick, and in 1947 it was sold to John W. and Lurene Fisher, who kept the property until 1955 [Peters 1991]. Despite the continuous ownership during this period, an ad in the San Luis Obispo Telegram-Tribune in 1949 stated that the Motel Inn Dining Room would be closed for four days for redecoration and would open the next week under new management [San Luis Obispo Telegram-Tribune 1949:5]. This may refer to the expansion of the restaurant area to include Bungalow K [Sanborn 1954]. In addition to this mystery, *Polk's Business Directory* of 1950 listed the Motel Inn at 2125 Monterey and "Tessyman's Motel Inn" at 2145 Monterey Street [Ceres 1999: 10].

In 1955, the Fisher's conveyed 2/3 interest of the property to Courtney and Eleanor Moore, and 1/3 to Volney P. Bell and Hope Bell. The following year, all interest in the property passed to the Moore's. During the Moore's ownership, many changes were made to the Motel Inn. The service station was torn down, the miniature gold course and riding stables were removed, and a swimming pool was added to the courtyard [Bertrando 2000:14; Peters 1991; Reed 1988:np]. By 1957, the apartment in the northwest corner of the property had been converted into a radio station for KVEC, and the restaurant building had absorbed Bungalow L as well as K to create conference, meeting, and banquet facilities (see Motel Inn Construction History Drawing) [Ceres 1999:10; Bertrando 2000:14]. It is also likely that the shed garages attached to some of the bungalows were taken down during this time, since a few (but not all) are shown on the Sanborn Fire Insurance Map of 1954.

In 1959, the Moore's conveyed a portion of their interest in the Motel Inn to Allen and Margaret Calkins [Peters 1991]. In the 1960s, the Calkins placed their stamp on the Motel Inn with addition of extensive signage, neon, (see Motel Inn 1960s brochure), and the development of a lunch patio by the pool, featuring a curvy fiberglass roof with tear-drop shaped edges [Giovanni 1987:17]. By 1970, both Courtney Moore and Allan Calkins had died, leaving the Motel Inn in the ownership of Margaret Calkins and Crocker-Citizen National Bank [Peters 1991]. By 1974, a storage shed had been built in the southwest corner of the property, the area in back of the lounge and lobby had been filled in to expand the lounge area (see Motel Inn Construction History Drawing), and the KVEC radio station had relocated elsewhere [Bertrando 2000:14; Ceres 1999:11].

Changes to the Motel Inn under the Calkins were the last major architectural changes made. In 1974, Margaret Calkins died and her interest was sold to Stanley A. Genest and V.E. Genest. In 1980, Crocker-Citizens Bank sold their interest to the Genests, and the following year the property was sold to Milton E. and Betty R. Grau, the last owners to actually operate the Motel Inn, which finally closed in 1990 [Bertrando 2000:14; Ceres 1999:12; Peters 1991].

Current Conditions

The Motel Inn was built in a Spanish Colonial Style with Mission Revival elements, featuring plaster walls and red tile roof. The most dominant design attribute is a large tower with a copper dome. This tower, along with the a smaller "bell tower" and the short arcade in front of the lobby, recall the Mission Santa Barbara and other California missions. Design details included plaster scroll work on the towers, and at some of the windows and entrances.

The roof line of the main restaurant/lobby building is very complex, consisting of multiple gables and parapets generated by the somewhat organic growth of the building over time. The associated bungalows have flat roofs with some tile mansard edges, and are built of an unusual building material called "key tile." Key tile consists of 4" cube blocks of gypsum, which were stacked like bricks to create the structural walls. No reinforcement was used, and in many cases no mortar was even used. The cubes were stacked not in a running bond like brick, but in simple linear columns. Although most of the wood and wrought iron work present during the historic period are long gone, a few of these original details remain. Remaining details include the wrought iron at the Manager's Apartment and some of the wooden brackets the bungalow entries. Unfortunately, almost all of the original wood-frame divided casement windows have been replaced by picture windows or jalousie windows.

Although some of the existing shrubs and trees predate the 1950s, little if any of the original 1920s landscaping remains [Bertrando and Bertando 2000:14; Foote 2000]. The earliest reports of the Motel Inn describe a "center park of lawn and shrubs" shown in the 1926 photos [Daily Telegram 1925]. Later references mention citrus and kumquat trees [Dart 1978], but the exact dates of planting are unknown. The existing citrus tree all appear to be too small to have been planted in the 1920s or 1930s [Foote 2000]. Some newspaper stories about the Motel Inn in 1970s and 1980s mention arbors overgrown with ivy, while other describe the grounds as planted with oleander, hydrangeas, banana trees, oaks, citrus, and kumquats [Bertrando and Bertrando 2000:14]. Photographs of the poolside area in the 1960s show a decidedly tropical theme with ferns, banana trees, and papyrus (see attached photos 1960s).

Structurally, the bungalows are in very poor condition, lacking reinforcement, ties to foundation or in some cases any foundation at all. The flat roofs have leaked, damaging the woods framing and causing the collapse of much interior plaster. Structural problems are also apparent at the lobby, with exposed decayed beams and bowed exterior walls.

References Cited and Consulted

Anonymous

- 1925 "Guests Welcomed at Milestone Inn: Motel Opens for Service to the Motor Public." *San Luis Obispo Daily Telegram*, December 12, 1925, pp. 1,4. Copy on file, King Ventures, San Luis Obispo.

Anonymous

- 1925 "Guests Welcomed at Milestone Inn: Motel Opens for Service to the Motor Public." *San Luis Obispo Daily Telegram*, December 12, 1925, pp. 1,4. Copy on file, King Ventures, San Luis Obispo.

Automobile Club of Southern California

- 1927 *Auto Camps, Courts, and Camp Grounds of California*. Automobile Club of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Belasco, Warren James

- 1979 *Americans on the Road from Autocamp to Motel, 1910-1945*. M.I.T. Press, Cambridge.

Bertrando, B. and E. Bertrando

- 2000a Historical Resource Inventory for 2223 Monterey Street, San Luis Obispo, CA. The Motel Inn Complex (P-40-041013) (Milestone Mot-tel). On file, King Ventures, San Luis Obispo and Central Coast Information Center, Santa Barbara.
- 2000b Primary Record P-40-041013 On file, King Ventures, San Luis Obispo and Central Coast Information Center, Santa Barbara.

Ceres Associates

- 1999 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Apple Farm Inn, 21015-2223 Monterey Street, San Luis Obispo, California. On file, King Ventures, San Luis Obispo.

Dart, Louisiana Clayton

- 1978 *Vignettes of History in San Luis Obispo*. San Luis Obispo County Historical Society, San Luis Obispo.

Foote, David

- 2000 Inventory and Evaluation of Existing Trees at the Motel Inn Site. Report on file, King Ventures, San Luis Obispo.

Giovanni, Joseph

- 1987 "The First Haven for Man and His Auto," *New York Times*, Home Section, July 9, 1987, p. 17. Copy on file, King Ventures, San Luis Obispo.

Heineman, Arthur

- 1925 The Milestone Marks the End of a Perfect Day. Prospectus for the Milestone Interstate Corporation, National City Bank Building, Los Angeles. On file, B. Bertrando, San Luis Obispo.

Henry, Bill

- 1957 "By the Way with Bill Henry." *Los Angeles Times*, June 11, 1957, np. Copy on file, King Ventures, San Luis Obispo.

Jackson, Kristin

- 1993 "The World's First Motel Rests Upon Its Memories." *The Seattle Times*, April 25, 1993, pp. K1, K10. Copy on file, King Ventures, San Luis Obispo.

Krieger, Dan

- 1988 "Times Past: Mot-Tel, San Luis Obispo's Motel Inn May Have Been First." *The Telegram-Tribune*, October 22, 1988, p. 23 (Focus Section). Copy on file, King Ventures, San Luis Obispo.

Milestone Interstate Corporation

- 1925 The Milestone Marks the End of a Perfect Day. Prospectus, Milestone Interstate Corporation, Los Angeles

Patton, Phil

- 1986 "America's Home Away From Home is Still a Good Motel." *Smithsonian*, March 1988, pp. . Copy on file, King Ventures, San Luis Obispo.

Peters, Nick (Subdivision Manager, Cuesta Title)

- 1991 Chain of Title of the Motel Inn. On file, King Ventures, San Luis Obispo and Cuesta Title, San Luis Obispo.

Reed, Christopher

- 1988 "Motoring Milestone." *London-Manchester Guardian*, January, 1988, np.. Copy on file, King Ventures, San Luis Obispo.

Roth, Matthew W.

- 2000 "Roadside Dream: The World's First Motel Opened a New Chapter in California Car Culture." *Westways*, May/June, 2000, 16.. Copy on file, King Ventures, San Luis Obispo.

Sanborn Insurance Co.

- 1926 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. On file, Bertrando and Bertrando, San Luis Obispo and King Ventures, San Luis Obispo.
- 1954 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. On file, Bertrando and Bertrando, San Luis Obispo and King Ventures, San Luis Obispo.

San Luis Obispo, City of.

- 1983 Completion Report: Historic Resources Survey, Vols. 1,2, and 3. On file, Planning Department, City of San Luis Obispo, CA and Kennedy Library, California Polytechnic, San Luis Obispo.

Stephens, Dan

- 1985 "The First Motel Marks Sixtieth Year." *The Telegram-Tribune*, December 12, 1985, pp. A1, A3. Copy on file, King Ventures, San Luis Obispo.

Warnack, James

- 1925 "Hostelry Chain for Motorists." *Los Angeles Times*, January 18, 1925, np Copy on file, King Ventures, San Luis Obispo.