

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section summarizes the characteristics, alternatives, environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts associated with the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program.

ES-1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED PROJECT

Project Applicant

San Luis Obispo County
Environmental Division
Department of Planning and Building
County Government Center, Room 310
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
Contact: Bill Robeson, (805) 781-5607

Project Description

The County of San Luis Obispo has existing ordinances and policies governing agricultural cluster land divisions. These ordinances and policies allow owners of eligible properties to apply for an agricultural cluster subdivision as an alternative to a conventional land division. The proposed ordinance and general plan changes will modify existing criteria and standards associated with agricultural cluster subdivisions in order to reduce environmental impacts and to protect lands for continued and enhanced agricultural production.

The proposed project consists of revisions to the Land Use Ordinance (Title 22 of the County Code), Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance (Title 23 of the County Code), and the Agriculture Element of the County General Plan.

Key components of the proposed project include:

- Allowing agricultural cluster subdivisions in the Coastal Zone, where this program does not presently exist;
- Eliminating the distinction between major and minor agricultural cluster subdivisions;
- Eliminating the residential density bonus for agricultural cluster subdivisions;
- Precluding the qualifying density for agricultural cluster subdivisions from occurring on lands protected under the Williamson Act;
- Restricting agricultural cluster subdivisions to properties located within five road miles of identified urban reserve areas;
- Increasing the minimum residential parcel size for cluster subdivisions from 10,000 square feet to 2.5 acres;



- Requiring residential cluster parcels to be designed and developed to provide for individual on-site water and wastewater systems;
- Requiring agricultural cluster subdivision design to be more compact and environmentally sensitive;
- Clarifying agricultural buffer policies;
- Expanding the application content requirements for agricultural cluster subdivisions; and
- Maintaining existing residential density standards allowing two primary residences on agricultural parcels located beyond the five road mile URL boundary.

Project Area

The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would be applied on a countywide basis (refer to Figure 2.2-1). Implementation of these revised standards and policies would affect the design of agricultural subdivisions within five road miles of the Urban Reserve Lines (URLs) of Arroyo Grande, Atascadero, San Luis Obispo, San Miguel, Nipomo, Paso Robles, and Templeton (refer to Figure 2.2-2) and the North Coast and Estero planning areas in the Coastal Zone (refer to Figure 2.2-3). Properties located in the Arroyo Grande, Cienega and Oso Flaco valleys and the Hearst Ranch (in the Coastal Zone) would not be eligible for subdivision under the proposed program and are therefore excluded from the project area (refer to Figures 2.2-4 and 2.2-5). In total, the proposed amendments would affect 222,575 acres of Agriculture-designated land, including 167,475 acres in the Inland portion of the county and 55,100 acres in the Coastal Zone.

ES-2. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

This section identifies the significant, unmitigable impacts of the proposed project. The primary purpose of an EIR is to identify any significant effects of a project, as proposed. Knowledge of the significant impacts from the proposed project guides the identification of mitigation measures and of alternatives that reduce these impacts.

This EIR includes both a “plan-to-plan” and “plan-to-ground” analysis of the proposed amendments. The plan-to-plan analysis compares the environmental effects of the existing and proposed ordinance standards, while the plan-to-ground analysis describes the physical changes to the existing environmental setting that could result from implementation of the proposed amendments. In the plan-to-plan scenario, the proposed amendments would reduce development potential in the county by 97 percent, thereby reducing potential impacts in virtually every subject area. In the plan-to-ground scenario, however, the proposed amendments would allow for the construction of up to 418 new residences within agricultural areas of the county and would precipitate additional residential development in the Coastal Zone. This development would lead to significant impacts on the existing environmental conditions in rural and agricultural areas of the county.

The proposed project would create potentially significant immitigable impacts in the subject areas of agricultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, air quality (operational emissions), and noise. The project would also create potentially significant impacts that could be reduced



to a less than significant level with mitigation incorporated in the subject areas of: air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geologic hazards, water and water quality, noise, transportation and circulation, visual resources, and water resources. All remaining impacts that are not significant would not require mitigation. Following is a summary of the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program's impacts in each subject area:

Agriculture

The agriculture analysis evaluates whether new development resulting from the proposed ordinance amendments would impact prime agricultural soils or important farmland as mapped by the State Department of Conservation (DOC) Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. This analysis also considers impacts which could result from introducing residential uses adjacent to agricultural lands in the county.

The proposed amendments could result in the conversion of between 1,045 and 2,090 acres of important farmland, a significant and unavoidable impact. Impacts related to the conversion of prime agricultural soils would be less than significant since both the existing ordinance and proposed amendments prohibit development on prime agricultural soils.

Residential development allowed under the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could conflict with adjacent agricultural operations. However, the proposed amendments include various restrictive provisions intended to minimize such conflicts. These include provisions requiring cluster lots to be physically contiguous to each other and located in a single cluster area (or two, if environmental conditions warrant). Lots interior to a cluster subdivision would therefore be sufficiently separated from adjacent agricultural uses by other residences. As a result, only the residences on the exterior of the cluster would be exposed to direct nuisance impacts from adjacent agriculture. Further, agricultural buffers would be required on residential parcels, in accordance with adopted buffer policy. Implementation of these proposed restrictive provisions and existing agricultural buffer policy would reduce potential residential/agricultural land use conflicts to less than significant levels.

Air Quality

This analysis includes consideration of short-term construction phase emissions, long-term operational emissions, and consistency with the Clean Air Plan.

Construction activities resulting from the program would generate dust and exhaust emissions of criteria pollutants and toxic air contaminants that would be likely to exceed SLOAPCD's significance threshold. Mitigation measures are recommended to reduce construction vehicle emissions, develop a Dust Control Management Plan, and reduce fugitive dust. With the implementation of these measures, construction phase impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

The County of San Luis Obispo is currently in non-attainment for the state standard for ozone precursors and fugitive particulate matter. Based on the analysis, agricultural cluster projects would be unlikely to exceed SLOAPCD's 25 lbs/day operational threshold; however, their incremental contribution to cumulative operational emissions would not be mitigated. Specifically, in the build-out scenario, the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program



would exceed SLOAPCD's 25 lbs/day operational threshold for criteria pollutants. Operational impacts would therefore remain significant and unavoidable.

Clean Air Plan policies and strategies are designed to focus new residential development within existing communities. Focusing growth towards urban areas facilitates reductions in vehicle miles traveled and increased use of public transit, thereby reducing vehicle emissions. The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program reduces the overall number of residential dwellings that could be constructed in rural areas. The result is a reduction in potential rural development, a reduction in the incentives to develop in the rural areas, a reduction in vehicles miles traveled, and further implementation of the County's existing policies which seek to encourage development in existing urban areas rather than the undeveloped countryside. As a result, the program would be consistent with the Clean Air Plan.

Biological Resources

This analysis includes consideration of potential impacts to sensitive habitat areas, special-status species, and wildlife connectivity corridors. Development approved under the program could result in potentially significant impacts to sensitive habitat areas, special-status species, and wildlife connectivity corridors. Mitigation measures are recommended to require individual projects approved under the program to submit biological assessments, as necessary, to evaluate and avoid or minimize project-specific biological impacts. The mitigation measures in this EIR identify the specific content to be included in the biological assessments and the actions that would be carried out in order to reduce project-specific biological impacts to less than significant levels. With the implementation of these measures, impacts to biological resources would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Cultural Resources

This analysis includes consideration of potential impacts to pre-historic archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources. Development approved under the program could result in potential impacts to pre-historic archaeological, historical, and paleontological resources. Mitigation measures are recommended to require individual projects approved under the program to submit archaeological and historic investigations, as necessary, to evaluate and avoid or minimize project-specific impacts to cultural resources. The mitigation measures in this EIR identify the specific contents to be included in the archaeological and historic investigations as well as the actions that would be carried out in order to reduce project-specific impacts to less than significant levels. With the implementation of these measures, impacts to cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Geologic Hazards

This analysis includes consideration of potential impacts due to seismic and soil-related geologic hazards. New residences constructed under the proposed program could potentially be located in areas with active or potentially active faults or where soil hazards exist. However, with the implementation of existing ordinance and building code requirements, impacts related to geologic hazards would be reduced to less than significant levels.



Greenhouse Gases

This analysis considers the increase in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions that would result from the proposed amendments. GHG is a principal contributor to global climate change, which can adversely impact many environmental resources, including, but not limited to, water supply, air quality, agricultural land, wildlife, and sensitive habitat. Build-out of the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would generate between .32 and 5.91 metric tons CO₂E per capita, exceeding the 4.6 metric tons threshold by up to 1.22 metric tons CO₂E. To minimize GHG emissions, mitigation measures are recommended where feasible to incorporate CAPCOA strategies, local programmatic solutions, statewide programmatic solutions, and review for compliance with the Air Pollution Control District requirements. The mitigation measures in this EIR identify the individual actions within these broader solutions that would be carried out in order to reduce project-specific impacts to less than significant levels. However, given the magnitude in which the program would exceed the 4.6 metric tons threshold, impacts are anticipated to remain significant and unavoidable.

Hydrology and Water Quality

This analysis includes consideration of potential impacts due to hydro-modification, alteration of existing drainage conditions, sedimentation and erosion, and development in flood hazard areas. The proposed amendments would allow for grading and site preparation activities for the construction of up to 418 new residences within the Inland portion of the county and additional residences in the Coastal Zone. As a result, development could alter existing drainage courses (hydro-modification) and drainage conditions. Implementation of Low Impact Development (LID) measures during CEQA review for individual projects would reduce potential hydro-modification impacts, and drainage plan review as required under existing ordinance standards would reduce potential impacts related to the alternation of existing drainage conditions. Additionally, existing ordinance requirements would reduce potential impacts related to sedimentation and erosion and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan review would address pollutant discharge impacts. With implementation of these requirements, hydrology and water quality impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Residential development allowed under the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could potentially be sited in a flood hazard area, as requirements for agricultural buffers on residential parcels and the requirement for a single clustered parcel may force residential development to occur in flood areas. Nevertheless, with implementation of existing ordinance requirements for development in flood hazard areas (LUO Chapter 22.14 / CZLUO Chapter 23.07), project-specific impacts are not anticipated to rise to a level of significance.

Noise

The noise analysis considers whether new residential development allowed under the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would substantially disturb sensitive receptors and violate local rules, standards, and/or ordinances. Construction-related noise resulting from the program could impact existing sensitive noise receptors. Future development under the program would be subject to existing ordinance requirements which restrict construction hours (7:00 a.m. to 9 p.m. on weekdays and 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on weekends) and prohibit



development in areas exposed to transportation or stationary sources which exceed 60 dBA CNEL. Projects within a projected 60 dBA noise contour would be required to submit an acoustical study prepared by a qualified acoustical engineer and to implement recommended measures in that study to mitigate any noise levels that exceed the County's standard of 60 dBA CNEL. These measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.

The proposed program would allow for residential development adjacent to agricultural operations. As a result, residences could be exposed to agricultural noise. However, implementation of existing agricultural buffer policies would ensure that residences are sufficiently spaced from agricultural operations in order to reduce potential noise impacts.

The proposed program could also increase traffic noise beyond acceptable levels (60 dBA) at existing sensitive noise receptors located along affected County roadways. The only way to mitigate this impact would be to retrofit existing sensitive receptors with noise attenuation (e.g. solid core doors, and/or double paned windows) or to construct off-site noise barriers (e.g. sound walls). These measures rely on the cooperation of off-site property owners, which cannot be assured. Impacts would therefore be significant and unavoidable.

Transportation and Circulation

The transportation and circulation section analyzes the potential traffic and circulation impacts associated with the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program. The proposed amendments would allow for the construction of up to 418 new residences within agricultural areas of the county and would precipitate additional residential development in the Coastal Zone. The additional vehicle trips resulting from these new residences could potentially lead to significant impacts if they require the use of impacted roadways or intersections. These impacts would be addressed during the review of individual projects, with potential mitigations including payment of road impact fees and/or construction of road improvements, and would therefore be less than significant.

New development under the program could also lead to hazardous road conditions related to sight distance and secondary access. However, with review of individual projects by Public Works and Cal Trans, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. Additionally, due to the rural location of cluster development, the proposed program is not expected to place demands on public transit or other alternative transportation systems.

Visual Resources

The visual resources section considers whether the residential development allowed under the program would substantially change the landscape of the rural areas. Additionally, this section evaluates potential impacts to important scenic resources, scenic vistas, and the Highway 1 viewing corridor. The proposed amendments would allow for the construction of up to 418 new residences within agricultural areas of the county and would precipitate additional residential development in the Coastal Zone. These residences could conflict with the character of the surrounding rural agrarian landscape, impact scenic vistas and viewsheds, and introduce night lighting into dark night skies. Cluster projects would be subject to existing highway corridor design standards and outdoor lighting standards, as well as proposed restrictive provisions intended to reduce visual impacts. Cluster development in the Coastal Zone would



be subject to a proposed restriction requiring residences to be sited in areas where they would not be visible from Highway 1 or any other public road. With implementation of these standards and recommended mitigation measures visual impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels.

Water Resources

This section analyzes the potential water resource impacts associated with the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program. New residential development approved under the program would place additional demands on existing water basins, potentially impacting supplies for existing and future agricultural operations. Under the existing agricultural cluster subdivision ordinance, an agricultural cluster subdivision may only be approved where the Review Authority finds that there are sufficient water resources to support existing agricultural operations, future potential agricultural operations, and the proposed residential development. In order to make this finding, the Review Authority must essentially affirm that there is a sufficient, long-term, sustainable water source. This finding is being retained in the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program. Additionally, the proposed amendments would require that all applications be accompanied with a site-specific hydrogeologic analysis. This analysis will largely be the basis for evidence supporting a finding of water resource sufficiency. Therefore, with implementation of these proposed standards, project-specific impacts on water supplies would be reduced to a less than significant level. Nevertheless, individual projects could contribute to cumulatively considerable impacts on agricultural water supplies. Mitigation measures are proposed to reduce this impact to a less than significant level.

ES-3. ALTERNATIVES

This EIR examines a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program that could feasibly achieve similar objectives. The discussion focuses on alternatives that may be able to reduce some of the potentially significant effects of the proposed program. The alternatives are listed below:

- **Alternative 1: No Project Alternative.** State CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an EIR's alternatives analysis consider a "no project" alternative. This alternative assumes that the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program is not implemented. This means that agricultural cluster subdivisions may still proceed in accordance with existing County policies and ordinance standards.
- **Alternative 2: Change in Locational Criteria.** This alternative assumes that the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program will be implemented as proposed; however, this alternative also assumes that the locational criteria for agricultural cluster subdivisions would be modified. This alternative presents two options for applying locational criteria to the Inland portion of the project area and one option for the Coastal Zone. This alternative was set up with options to provide additional locational criteria in the Inland portion of the project area and to introduce locational criteria to the Coastal Zone. Each of these sub-alternatives can stand alone, but only one of the two Inland options can be selected.



- **Alternative 2(a): Two Road Miles (Inland).** Agricultural cluster subdivisions may be allowable within two, rather than five, road miles of identified URLs.
- **Alternative 2(b): Two Straight Miles (Inland).** Agricultural cluster subdivisions may be allowable within two *straight* miles of identified URLs, rather than five *road* miles.
- **Alternative 2(c): Establish Locational Criteria in the Coastal Zone.** Agricultural cluster subdivisions in the Coastal Zone would be restricted to locations within two road mile of the following URLs: Cambria, Cayucos, Morro Bay, and Los Osos.
- **Alternative 3: Reducing Residential Parcel Size.** This alternative assumes that the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program will be implemented as proposed; however, this alternative also assumes that residential parcel sizes can be reduced down to 10,000 square feet in the Inland area where a community water system is provided.
- **Alternative 4: Reducing Residential Density on Existing Agricultural Parcels.** This alternative assumes that the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program will be implemented as proposed; however, this alternative also assumes that Agriculture Element Policy 5 and Section 22.30.480 of the Land Use Ordinance would be modified to allow only one, rather than two, single family residences per existing parcel in the Agriculture land use category. Provisions allowing additional residences to be constructed as farm support quarters would remain unchanged.
- **Alternative 5: Basing Density on Underlying Parcels in the Inland Portion of the County.** This alternative assumes that the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program will be implemented as proposed; however, this alternative also assumes that the number of residential parcels that can be created would be equal to the number of underlying parcels (Inland portion of the county). Under this alternative, the program to be established in the Inland portion of the County would use the same base density methodology as the program proposed for the Coastal Zone. Under this alternative, no new parcels could be created, but existing parcels could be reconfigured to accommodate residential development.

As proposed, the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program is anticipated to result in significant and unavoidable environmental effects (Class I impacts) related to agricultural resources, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and noise. Alternative 2(a) and 2(b) (Modifying Locational Criteria in the Inland Area) would reduce impacts in virtually all subject areas. Alternative 4 (Reducing Residential Density) would partially offset, but not reduce, the project's significant effects. Alternative 5 (Basing Residential Density on Underlying Parcels) is anticipated to have similar impacts as the proposed project. Alternative 1 (No Project) would increase impacts in virtually all subject areas. Alternative 2(c) (Establishing Locational Criteria in the Coastal Zone) would increase impacts in the subject areas of agricultural resources, biological resources, cultural resources, geologic hazards, hydrology/water quality, visual resources, water resources, and land use policy consistency. Alternative 3 (Reducing Minimum



Residential Parcel Size) would increase impacts in the subject areas of agricultural resources, visual resources, and policy consistency, while slightly reducing impacts related to the reliability of water service.

ES-4. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Tables ES-1, ES-2, and ES-3 identify project environmental impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and residual impacts. Table ES-4 follows to identify cumulative impacts resulting from build-out of the proposed program in conjunction with the approved and pending cumulative development throughout the county. Impacts are organized by classes. Each bolded impact listing also contains a statement of the significance determination for the environmental impact as follows:

Class I. Significant and Unavoidable: An impact that cannot be reduced to below the threshold level given reasonably available and feasible mitigation measures. Such an impact requires a Statement of Overriding Considerations to be issued if the project is approved per §15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Class II. Significant but Mitigable: An impact that can be reduced to below the threshold level given reasonably available and feasible mitigation measures. Such an impact requires findings to be made under §15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Class III. Not Significant: An impact that may be adverse, but does not exceed the threshold levels and does not require mitigation measures. However, mitigation measures that could further lessen the environmental effect may be suggested if readily available and easily achievable.

Refer to Section 4.13 of this EIR for a discussion of additional effects found not to be significant. Issue areas with effects found not to be significant include: agriculture, air quality, biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, mineral resources, population and housing, public services/utilities, transportation, and water.



This page intentionally left blank.



Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Unavoidable (Class I) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
Agricultural Resources		
<p>Impact AG-1: Development under the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could convert up to between 1,045 and 2,090 acres of Important Farmland, as mapped by the California Department of Conservation, in areas currently designated Agriculture to residential and non-agricultural uses.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>No mitigation measures are available to reduce this impact (i.e. eliminate the loss of Important Farmland). Compared to existing baseline conditions, impacts would be Class I, <i>significant and unavoidable</i>.</p>
Air Quality		
<p>Impact AQ-2: Long-term operational emissions under the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could exceed SLOAPCD's 25 lbs/day threshold for Ozone Precursors and Fugitive Particulate Matter (PM10).</p>	<p>AQ-2(a) Application of Standard Operational Mitigation. Projects which individually do not exceed the 25 pound-per-day threshold for both ozone precursors (ROG and NO_x) and fugitive particulate matter (PM₁₀) do not require operational mitigation. Projects which exceed one or both of these thresholds shall have the following mitigation measures applied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects generating 25-29 lbs/day of ozone precursors or fugitive particulate matter shall select and implement at least eight of the mitigation measures listed in Table 3-5 of the Air Pollution Control District's 2009 CEQA Air Quality Handbook. • Projects generating 30-34 lbs/day of ozone precursors or fugitive particulate matter shall select and implement at least 14 of the mitigation measures listed in Table 3-5 of the Air Pollution Control District's 2009 CEQA Air Quality Handbook. • Projects generating 35-50 lbs/day of ozone precursors or fugitive particulate matter shall select and implement at least 18 of the mitigation measures listed in Table 3-5 of the Air Pollution Control District's 2009 CEQA Air Quality 	<p>The County of San Luis Obispo is currently in non-attainment for the state standard for ozone precursors and fugitive particulate matter. Based on the analysis, agricultural cluster projects would be unlikely to exceed SLOAPCD's 25 lbs/day operational threshold; however, their incremental contribution to cumulative operational emissions would not be mitigated. Specifically, in the build-out scenario, the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would exceed SLOAPCD's 25 lbs/day operational threshold for criteria pollutants. Operational impacts would therefore remain Class I, <i>significant and unavoidable</i>.</p>



Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Unavoidable (Class I) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>Handbook.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Projects generating more than 50 lbs/day of ozone precursors or fugitive particulate matter shall implement all feasible mitigation measures listed in Table 3-5 of the Air Pollution Control District’s 2009 CEQA Air Quality Handbook. 	
Greenhouse Gas Emissions		
<p>Impact GHG-1: Greenhouse gas emissions under the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could exceed the 4.6 metric tons CO₂e/year per capita threshold compared to existing conditions.</p>	<p>GHG-1(a) CAPCOA Strategies. Agricultural cluster subdivisions shall apply all applicable and feasible strategies identified by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association in their publication CEQA and Climate Change in order to reduce their project-specific greenhouse gas impacts or contribution towards a cumulative impact to a level of insignificance. If the Air Pollution Control District has developed more specific strategies to replace the CAPCOA strategies, such strategies shall be preferred. Appropriate measures may include, but not be limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>LEED Certification</i> – Require compliance with Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) criteria, which incorporate sustainable site development, water savings, energy efficiency, materials selection, and environmental quality requirements. <i>Green Building Materials</i> – Use materials which are resource efficient, recycled, have a long life cycle, and are managed in an environmentally friendly way. <i>Landscaping</i> – Use of drought-resistant native trees, trees with low emissions and high carbon sequestration potential, and planting of trees to create shade. <i>Facilities</i> – Projects shall use high-efficiency pumps, natural gas or electric stoves (i.e. no wood-burning), solar water heaters, and energy star appliances. <i>Roofing</i> – Roofing shall be energy star compliant, 	<p>Mitigation Measure GHG-1 would reduce GHG emissions the extent feasible. However, due to the extent to which project emissions exceed the 4.6 metric tons CDE/year per capita threshold of significance (by up to 1.8 metric tons), this measure would not be expected to reduce GHG emissions below the threshold of significance when compared to existing conditions. This impact would therefore remain Class I, <i>significant and unavoidable</i>.</p>



Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Unavoidable (Class I) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>vegetated (i.e. green roof), or light-colored and highly emissive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>On-Site Renewable Energy</i> – Provide an on-site renewable energy system. • <i>Exceed Energy Requirements</i> – Exceed Title 24 (California Code of Regulations) energy requirements by 20 percent. • <i>Solar Orientation</i> – Orient buildings to face either north or south, provide roof overhands, and use landscaping to create shade. • <i>Shading</i> – Install energy-reducing shading mechanisms for windows, porches, patios, walkways, etc. • <i>Ceiling Fans</i> – Install energy reducing ceiling fans. • <i>Programmable Thermostats</i> – Install energy reducing programmable thermostats that automatically adjust temperature settings. • <i>Passive Heating and Cooling</i> – Install passive heating and cooling systems. • <i>Day Lighting</i> – Install energy reducing day lighting systems (e.g. skylights, light shelves, transom windows). • <i>Local Building Materials</i> – Use locally made building materials for construction projects and related infrastructure. • <i>Recycle Demolished Construction Materials</i> – Recycle or reuse demolished construction material. • <i>Off-Site Mitigation Fee</i> – Provide or pay into an off-site mitigation fee program, which focuses primarily on reducing emissions from existing development and buildings. • <i>Offset Purchase</i> – Provide or purchase offsets for additional emissions by acquiring carbon credits or engaging in other market “cap and trade” systems. 	



Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Unavoidable (Class I) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>GHG-1(b) Local Programmatic Solutions. The County has committed to implementing programmatic solutions over time. While not all of the implementing regulations are presently in place, it is anticipated that implementation will occur within the next three years. The County intends to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from land use sources through the following programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Cal Green Code</i> - The Cal Green Code was put into effect in January 2011. Compliance with this code is required for all new building permits. The code requires consideration of energy and water efficiency in building design. Compliance would reduce electricity consumption beyond what would otherwise be required. The County is also considering crafting a local-based green code to tailor specifications and requirements to our own County's needs. • <i>Climate Action Plan</i> - In April 2011, the County released a draft Climate Action Plan, referred to as the "EnergyWise Plan." The Climate Action Plan includes a number of implementing actions that the County and private sector will need to undertake in order to curb the growth in greenhouse gas emissions. Examples include policies encouraging energy conservation, use of renewable energy, reduction of solid waste, strategic implementation of land use and transportation plans, water conservation, and improvement of agricultural practices. The plan will be implemented over time through the adopting of specific implementing ordinances. Because agricultural cluster subdivisions would be developed over a 20 or more year time span, it is likely that most projects would be subject to these provisions. <p>GHG-1(c) Statewide Programmatic Solutions. In order to fulfill explicit mandates from Assembly Bill 32 and Senate Bill</p>	



Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Unavoidable (Class I) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>375, the state has had to embark on a number of plans to reduce greenhouse gas emissions on a statewide level. Again, not all of these plans have been completed, but most are underway. Because of the very strict timelines established in Assembly Bill 32, it is reasonable to conclude that new regulations will be forthcoming to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the state. It is anticipated that individual cluster subdivision projects occurring as a result of the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would also be subject to one or more state programs to reduce greenhouse gas generation and emission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS)</i> - The renewable portfolio standard (RPS) is a standard specifying which percentage of electricity should come from renewable sources by a target date. AB 32 initially set this standard at 20 percent renewable energy by 2012. In April 2011, Governor Jerry Brown signed SB2X into law, which re-establishes California’s RPS at 33 percent renewable energy by 2030. This mandate applies to all public and private electricity providers in the state. • <i>Assembly Bill 32 Scoping Plan</i> - The California Air Resource Board (CARB) is presently developing scoping plan to focus California’s actions on reducing greenhouse gas emissions in order to achieve the goals established in Assembly Bill 32 and clarified in Senate Bill 375. Some of the programs proposed for implementation under this draft scoping plan include, but are not limited to, the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Developing a cap and trade system linked to cap and trade systems in other western state and provincial governments. ○ Reducing emissions from passenger vehicles by: 1) reducing greenhouse gas emissions; 2) reducing carbon content in fuel; and 3) reducing vehicle miles 	



Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Unavoidable (Class I) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>traveled.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increasing energy efficiency requirements for buildings, appliances, and new technologies. ○ Increasing the Renewable Portfolio Standard to 33 percent (already in effect). ○ Developing and adopting a low-carbon fuel standard. ○ Developing greenhouse gas emission reduction targets on a regional basis. ○ Increasing the efficiency of light-duty vehicles. ○ Increasing efficiency of movement of goods, such as requiring ships to use port electricity. ○ An incentive program for solar roofs. ○ Increasing the efficiency of medium and heavy duty vehicles. ○ Inventory and control greenhouse gas emissions from industrial operations. ○ Support a statewide high speed rail network. ○ Expand the use of green building practices. ○ Limit use of high Global Warming Potential (GWP) gases, such as fluorocarbons. ○ Reduce methane emissions from landfills by increasing waste diversion, reuse, and commercial recycling. ○ Preserve forests for the value in carbon sequestration; consider forests as a source of biomass for energy generation. ○ Encourage efficient use of water. ○ Consider requiring the use of manure digesters or other forms of methane capture for livestock industries. 	



Table ES-1: Summary of Significant Unavoidable (Class I) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Create incentive programs and encourage voluntary reduction. <p>GHG-1(d) Review for Compliance with Air Pollution Control District (APCD). The Air Pollution Control District has not yet adopted CEQA thresholds for greenhouse gas emissions. Adoption of such thresholds is, however, anticipated in the next few years. As each agricultural cluster subdivision goes through the discretionary review process, referrals will be provided to the Air Pollution Control District. Once the thresholds are formally established, the District will be able to identify if a project exceeds impact thresholds for greenhouse gas emissions and recommend mitigation strategies accordingly to reduce impacts as much as practicable. The County continues to use Bay Area Air Quality Management District thresholds in the interim. It is anticipated that the bulk of development that could occur under the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program will not be acted on by a Review Authority until the final APCD thresholds are in place. In either circumstance, each project may be evaluated and mitigation may be applied as part of the project-specific environmental review process based on either threshold.</p>	
Noise		
<p>Impact N-2 Long-term traffic generated as a result of the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could incrementally increase noise to unacceptable levels at existing receptors located adjacent to County roadways.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>The only way to mitigate this impact would be to retrofit existing sensitive receptors with noise attenuation (e.g. solid core doors, and/or double paned windows) or to construct off-site noise barriers (e.g. sound walls). These measures would rely on the cooperation of off-site property owners, which cannot be assured. Impacts would therefore be Class I, <i>significant and unavoidable</i>.</p>



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
Air Quality		
<p>Impact AQ-1: Construction activities resulting from the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would generate ozone precursors (ROG + NOx) and fugitive particulate matter, and would potentially result in human exposure to Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA), a toxic air contaminant.</p>	<p>AQ-1(a) Construction Phase Mitigation. Individual agricultural cluster subdivision projects which could result in the construction of more than 30 units per year shall be subject to the following mitigation measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain all construction equipment in proper tune according to manufacturer’s specifications; • Fuel all off-road and portable diesel powered equipment with ARB certified motor vehicle diesel fuel (non-taxed version suitable for use off-road); • Use diesel construction equipment meeting ARB's Tier 2 certified engines or cleaner off-road heavy-duty diesel engines, and comply with the State off-Road Regulation; • Use on-road heavy-duty trucks that meet the ARB’s 2007 or cleaner certification standard for on-road heavy-duty diesel engines, and comply with the State On-Road Regulation; • Construction or trucking companies with fleets that do not have engines in their fleet that meet the engine standards identified in the above two measures (e.g. captive or NOx exempt area fleets) may be eligible by proving alternative compliance; • All on and off-road diesel equipment shall not idle for more than 5 minutes. Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas and or job sites to remind drivers and operators of the 5 minute idling limit; • Diesel idling within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors is not permitted; • Staging and queuing areas shall not be located within 1,000 feet of sensitive receptors; • Electrify equipment when feasible; 	<p>Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would reduce Ozone Precursors and Fugitive Particulate Matter (PM₁₀) below SLOAPCD’s thresholds for individual projects which result in the construction of more than 30 units per year. Under a likely 20-year build-out scenario, the proposed program would result in the construction of 21 new units per year. Therefore, with implementation of standard APCD mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substitute gasoline-powered in place of diesel-powered equipment, where feasible; • Use alternatively fueled construction equipment on-site where feasible, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane or biodiesel; and • If the estimated ozone precursor emissions from the actual fleet for a given construction phase are expected to exceed the APCD threshold of significance after the standard mitigation measures are factored into the estimation, then BACT needs to be implemented to further reduce these impacts. <p>The following mitigation measures are required to reduce the proposed program’s contribution to cumulative impacts relative to PM₁₀ emissions:</p> <p>AQ-1(b) Dust Control. The following measures shall be implemented to reduce PM₁₀ emissions during construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible; • Use water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Water shall be applied as soon as possible whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed (nonpotable) water should be used whenever possible; • All dirt-stock-pile areas shall be sprayed daily as needed; • Permanent dust control measures shall be identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans and implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities; • Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading shall be sown with a fast-germinating native grass seed and watered until vegetation is established; 	



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation shall be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the APCD; • All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc., to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used; • Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site; • All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil or other loose materials shall be covered or shall maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with CVC Section 23114; • Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site; and • Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water shall be used where feasible. <p>The above measures shall be shown on development plans.</p> <p>Plan Requirements and Timing. Conditions shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods for all project components. Prior to issuance of grading permits, applicants shall include, as a note on a separate informational sheet to be recorded with any map, the aforementioned dust control requirements. All requirements shall be shown on grading and building plans. Monitoring. Planning and Building inspectors shall perform periodic spot checks during grading</p>	



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>and construction. APCD inspectors shall respond to nuisance complaints.</p> <p>AQ-1(c) Cover Stockpiled Soils. If importation, exportation, or stockpiling of fill material is involved, soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting material shall be tarped from the point of origin.</p> <p>Plan Requirements and Timing. Conditions shall be adhered to throughout all grading and construction periods for all project components. Monitoring. Planning and Building inspectors shall perform periodic spot checks during grading and construction. APCD inspectors shall respond to nuisance complaints.</p> <p>AQ-1(d) Dust Control Monitor. The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust emissions and enhance the implementation of the measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints, reduce visible emissions below 20% opacity, and to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress.</p> <p>Plan Requirements and Timing. The name and telephone number of dust monitor(s) shall be provided to the APCD Compliance Division prior to the start of any grading, earthwork, or demolition. The dust monitor shall be designated prior to approval of a Land Use Permit.</p> <p>Monitoring. Planning and Building shall contact the designated monitor as necessary to ensure compliance with dust control measures.</p>	



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
Biological Resources		
<p>Impact BR-1: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would modify the County's current development standards, leading to a potential change in development patterns and a change in physical impacts to grasslands, oak woodlands, and other sensitive plant habitat areas within the project area.</p>	<p>BR-1(a) Sensitive Habitat Survey and Restoration Plan. During environmental review for future agricultural cluster subdivision projects processed under the proposed ordinance amendments, the County shall require project applicants within potentially sensitive areas and habitats as determined by the County based upon review of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) to contract with a County approved biologist to survey for sensitive habitats as defined by the County or appropriate state or federal regulatory agencies. If sensitive habitats are found onsite, the applicant shall make all efforts to fully avoid impact to these areas. Where impacts cannot be avoided, the applicant shall contract with a County-approved biologist to develop a Sensitive Habitat Restoration Plan that provides specific measures to enhance and maintain the remaining on-site occurrences of sensitive habitats or to provide off-site mitigation where on-site mitigation cannot fully offset the impact. The Plan shall include the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide an up-to-date inventory of on-site sensitive habitat(s); • Define attainable and measurable goals and objectives to achieve through implementation of the Plan; • Provide site selection and justification; • Detail restoration work plan including methodologies, restoration schedule, plant materials (seed), and implementation strategies; • Where off-site mitigation is necessary, establish a ratio for off-site restoration and a mechanism for preservation; • Provide a detailed maintenance plan to include weeding and or spot spraying to keep non-native plant species from further reducing the extent of this habitat type on 	<p>With implementation of Mitigation Measure BR-1, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>the property over time. This approach would also have the residual benefit of providing wildland fire protection. Enhancement and maintenance options shall employ recent techniques and effective strategies for increasing the overall area of the sensitive habitats on-site and shall include but not be limited to reseedling or stock container planting disturbed areas with an appropriate native plant palette;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define performance standards. Either in a County approved mitigation site within the proposed development site or in a County approved off site area, the total restored and/or created area shall include a minimum replacement ratio of 2:1 (sensitive habitat restored and/or created: sensitive habitat impacted) with at least 50% cover of native shrubs. Acreage may vary depending on the location of the mitigation site and restoration effort. The County may require additional acreage for off-site mitigation; and • Provide a monitoring plan to include methods and analysis of results. Also, include goal success or failure and an adaptive management plan and suggestions for failed restoration efforts. <p>BR-1(b) Wetland Delineation. During environmental review for future agricultural cluster subdivision projects processed under the proposed ordinance amendments, the County shall require project applicants whose land is in potentially sensitive areas as determined by the County to contract with a County approved biologist to conduct a formal wetland delineation. The delineation shall use methodologies accepted by the Corps and CDFG, and as defined by the County or appropriate state or federal regulatory agencies. The biologist shall determine the location and extent of jurisdictional waters of the U.S. and State on the sites.</p>	



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>A Mitigation Plan shall be developed and implemented for areas of disturbance to riparian habitat and other potential wetland areas. The plan shall be prepared by a qualified biologist who is familiar with current Corps and CDFG restoration and mitigation techniques. County required compensatory mitigation shall occur on-site using regionally collected native plant material at a minimum ratio of 2:1 (habitat created to habitat impacted). The resource agencies may require a higher mitigation ratio as a result of the permitting processes.</p> <p>The plan shall include the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description of the impact site (i.e., location, responsible parties, jurisdictional areas to be filled/impacted by habitat type); • Goal(s) of the compensatory mitigation project (type(s) and area(s) of habitat to be established, restored, enhanced, preserved, and/or created, specific functions and values of habitat type(s) to be established, restored, enhanced, preserved, and/or created (any lost wetland habitat shall be replaced on-site using regionally collected native plant material at a minimum ratio of 2:1); • Description of the proposed compensatory mitigation-site (location and size, ownership status, existing functions and values of the compensatory mitigation-site); • Implementation plan for the compensatory mitigation-site (rationale for expecting implementation success, responsible parties, schedule, site preparation, planting plan); • Maintenance activities during the monitoring period (activities, responsible parties, schedule); • Monitoring plan for the compensatory mitigation-site 	



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>(performance standards, target functions and values, target hydrological regime, target jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional acreages to be established, restored, enhanced, and/or preserved, annual monitoring reports);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completion of compensatory mitigation (notification of completion, agency confirmation); • Contingency measures (initiating procedures, alternative locations for contingency compensatory mitigation, funding mechanism); • Identification of potential pollutant sources, that may affect the quality of the discharges to stormwater; • The proposed design and placement of structural and non-structural BMPs to address identified pollutants; • A proposed inspection and maintenance program; • A method of ensuring maintenance of all BMPs over the life of the project; • Long term protection, such as through means of an open space easement; • A proposed plan for construction worker education; and • A proposed plan for erosion and sedimentation control. 	
<p>Impact BR-2: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would modify the County’s current development standards, leading to a potential change in development patterns and a change in physical impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species.</p>	<p>BR-2(a) Seasonally-Timed Rare Plant Surveys. During environmental review for future agricultural cluster subdivision projects processed under the proposed ordinance amendments, the County shall require project applicants to submit seasonally timed floral surveys conducted by a County-approved botanist per the requirements of the County or appropriate state or federal regulatory agencies for projects with the potential to impact special-status plant species. The floral surveys shall be based on the target list of plant species identified by the County based upon review of the California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) to be completed during the appropriate season to determine the</p>	<p>With implementation of Mitigation Measure BR-2, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>presence or absence of these species. Up to three separate survey visits may be required to capture the flowering period of all target species. The location and extent of any rare plant occurrences observed on a site shall be documented in a report and accurately mapped onto site-specific topographic maps and aerial photographs. If special-status plant species are identified, the approved botanist shall submit written proof that the county and CDFG have been contacted. If federally-listed plant species are identified, then the USFWS must also be contacted.</p> <p>BR-2(b) Special-Status Plant Buffer. If State or Federally listed plant species are found as a result of appropriate plant surveys, site development plans shall be modified as feasible prior to approval of grading or land use permits to avoid such occurrences with a minimum buffer of 50 feet. The applicant shall establish conservation easements for such preserved areas, prior to issuance of the first grading permit. The proposed agricultural cluster subdivision shall be amended at that time to place these areas formally into open space.</p> <p>BR-2(c) Special-Status Plant Species Mitigation Plan. If total avoidance of the special-status species occurrences (if any) is economically infeasible or impractical as determined by the Environmental Coordinator, a mitigation program shall be developed prior to approval of grading or land use permits by a qualified botanist under contract with the applicant in consultation with CDFG as appropriate. A research study to determine the best mitigation approach for each particular species to be salvaged shall be conducted to adequately prepare the plan for species that have not been subject to mitigation requirements previously. The special-status plant species mitigation program shall include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall goal and measurable objectives of ensuring a viable core population of special-status species in the 	



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>mitigation and monitoring plan;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County required compensatory mitigation shall occur on-site using regionally collected native plant material at a minimum ratio of 2:1 (habitat restored and/or created to habitat impacted). The County may require additional acreage for off-site mitigation. The resource agencies may require a higher mitigation ratio as a result of the permitting processes. Potential sites for mitigation would be any suitable site within proposed open space, depending on the species, that is appropriately buffered from development; • Specific habitat management and protection concepts to be used to ensure long-term maintenance and protection of the special-status plant species. (i.e., annual population census surveys and habitat assessments; establishment of monitoring reference sites; fencing of special-status plant species preserves and signage to identify the environmentally sensitive areas; a seasonally-timed weed abatement program; and seasonally-timed seed and/or topsoil collection, propagation, and reintroduction of special-status plant species into specified receiver sites); • Success criteria based on the goals and measurable objectives to ensure a viable core population(s) on the project site in perpetuity; • Reporting requirements to ensure consistent data collection and reporting methods used by monitoring personnel; and • The County may require the applicant to provide the funding for a County Environmental Monitor to oversee and monitor compliance with the mitigation plan. The Environmental Monitor shall assist the County in condition compliance and mitigation monitoring for all 	



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>applicable construction, operational, and decommissioning stages of the project, as specified in a scope of work, and as approved by the County Department of Planning and Building. The Environmental Monitor shall be under contract to the County of San Luis Obispo, and the entire expense of retaining and supervising the Environmental Monitor, including the County's administrative and overhead fees, shall be paid by the Applicant. The Applicant shall also be responsible for funding work required by mitigation measures requiring use of individuals with special expertise (e.g., botanist, wildlife biologist). The County's Environmental Monitor will coordinate with specialists to ensure their availability at appropriate times (prior to issuance of construction permits, during construction or post-approval).</p> <p>BR-2(d) Special-Status Plant Monitoring. If monitoring is necessary, then monitoring shall occur annually and shall last at least five years to ensure the successful establishment of a viable core population of special-status species in the mitigation and monitoring plan. In the case of annual plants it is difficult to determine whether a viable core population has been established in a five year period. Therefore, an important component of the mitigation and monitoring plan shall be adaptive management. The adaptive management program shall address both foreseen and unforeseen circumstances relating to the preservation and mitigation programs. The plan shall include follow up surveys and remedial measures to address negative impacts to the special-status plant species and their habitats (i.e., removal of weeds, additional seeding/planting efforts) if the species or its habitat have not been successfully established at the time of the follow up surveys.</p>	



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>BR-2(e) Wildlife Surveys and Mitigation. For individual projects within sensitive areas as determined by the County, a wildlife survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to approval of grading permits or land use permits for proposed development areas that may contain sensitive wildlife as defined by the County or appropriate State or federal regulatory agencies. Such surveys shall be required prior to potential development. Appropriate mitigation measures shall be identified by a qualified biologist, and may include one of more of the following measures, as applicable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Pet Brochure.</u> Applicants of residential projects adjacent to open space or other habitat areas shall be required to prepare a brochure that informs prospective homebuyers about the impacts associated with non-native animals, especially cats and dogs, and other non-native animals, to sensitive habitat areas. The brochure shall also describe measures homeowners can take to minimize impacts of pets on wildlife. Similarly, the brochures shall inform potential homebuyers of the potential for coyotes or other wildlife to prey on domestic animals in areas where appropriate. • <u>Relocation.</u> As determined by a qualified biologist in coordination with the appropriate resource agencies, sensitive species shall be relocated from development areas prior to ground disturbing activities. • <u>Wildlife Habitat Buffer.</u> Wherever site development is proposed adjacent to wildlife habitat an appropriate buffer of native vegetation shall remain or be established between the habitat area and the proposed development, as identified by a qualified biologist. <p>BR-2(f) Bird Pre-Construction Survey. In order to avoid impacts to nesting raptors and other avian species, which could result in take that is prohibited under CDFG Code 3503</p>	



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>and 3503.5 and the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, construction activities for projects within areas that include trees or other sites that could include bird nests should be conducted between September 1st and February 1st outside of the peak breeding season. If construction in such areas is to be initiated between February 1st and September 1st, a pre-construction survey should be conducted for nesting avian species (including raptors) within 300 feet of proposed construction activities. If nesting raptors (or any other nesting birds) are identified during pre-construction surveys, an appropriate buffer; to be determined by a County-approved biologist in coordination with the California Department of Fish and Game, should be imposed within which no construction activities or disturbance should take place. If nests are identified, work may only proceed prior to September 1st if a County-approved biologist conducts periodic nest checks and confirms that the nest is no longer active (i.e. the young have fledged) and work re-initiation has been specifically authorized by the appropriate regulatory agency.</p> <p>BR-2(g) Minimize Road Widths. Roadway widths adjacent to open space/agricultural areas shall be reduced to the minimum width possible, while maintaining Fire Department Requirements for emergency access, with slower speed limits introduced.</p> <p>BR-2(h) Permits and Agreements. In the event that State listed species would be impacted as a result of development, developers shall submit signed copies of an incidental take permit and enacting agreements from the CDFG regarding those species as necessary under Section 2081 of the California Fish and Game Code prior to the initiation of grading or construction activities. If a species that is listed under the Federal Endangered Species Act is identified,</p>	



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>developers seeking entitlements shall provide proof of compliance with the Federal Endangered Species Act, inclusive as necessary of signed copies of incidental take permit and associated enacting agreements.</p>	
<p>Impact BR-3: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would modify the County’s current development standards, leading to a potential change in development patterns and a change in physical impacts to wildlife movement corridors.</p>	<p>BR-3(a) Migration Corridors. During environmental review for future agricultural cluster subdivision projects processed under the proposed ordinance amendments, the County shall require project applicants to contract with a County-approved biologist to survey for migration corridors. If migration corridors are found onsite or adjacent to the project site, the subdivision, grading and site development shall be designed to accommodate wildlife passage.</p> <p>BR-3(b) Fencing Plan. For individual projects in areas determined to contain wildlife migration corridors, project applicants shall submit to the Department of Planning and Building for review and approval a fencing plan that accommodates for the passage of the identified wildlife species. The plan shall apply to existing rang fences that may not be removed as part of the project and any future fencing proposed in areas within or outside of the residential development area. The intent of the plan is to ensure that any existing and future fencing has been developed to allow for movement of the identified wildlife species through the project site. The plan shall include, at a minimum, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of maintained likely and feasible movement pathways; • Removal of non-essential interior fencing; • Incorporation of measures to increase visibility of the fence; • Incorporation of alternatives to wire fencing, such as wooden rail fences with occasional dropped rails for 	<p>With implementation of Mitigation Measure BR-3, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>wildlife access or adjustable fencing to allow for seasonable wildlife passage;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporation of fencing modifications designed to enable movement by identified wildlife species through the designed movement pathways on the project site; and • Placement of wildlife crossing signs at specific locations along major transportation corridors in the project vicinity to alter drivers of the potential to encounter wildlife crossing the road. 	
Cultural Resources		
<p>Impact CR-1: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would modify the County's current development standards, leading to a potential change in development patterns and a change in physical impacts to identified or unrecognized historic resources.</p>	<p>CR-1(a) Historical Resource Survey. During environmental review for future agricultural cluster subdivision projects processed under the proposed ordinance amendments, the County shall require an historical resource survey, conducted by a qualified professional (archaeologist, historian or historic architect as appropriate based on the resource) approved by the Environmental Coordinator, that assesses the potential impacts of all ground disturbing activities (e.g. access roads, driveways, residences, utility trenches) on those parcels that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are located within an Historic combining designation; • Contain a designated historic site; • Are located in an area of known historic resources; or • Contain structures greater than 50 years old. <p>Should the historical resource survey identify significant resources, the mitigation measures recommended by the qualified professional shall be implemented by the project applicant. These measures shall be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and could include, but not necessarily be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoidance of significant historical resources; 	<p>Compliance with Land Use Ordinance Section 22.14.080 and Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance Sections 23.07.100 through 23.07.102, in addition to Mitigation Measure CR-1, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.</p>



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graphic documentation (photographs, drawings, etc.); • Prohibition of demolition of buildings and structures; and/or • Restoration, stabilization, repair, and reconstruction. 	
<p>Impact CR-2: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would modify the County’s current development standards, leading to a potential change in development patterns and a change in physical impacts to identified and previously unidentified pre-historic archeological resources.</p>	<p>CR-2(a) Archaeological Surface Survey. During environmental review for future agricultural cluster subdivision projects processed under the proposed ordinance amendments, the County shall require an archaeological surface survey, conducted by a qualified archaeologist approved by the Environmental Coordinator, that assesses the potential impacts of all ground disturbing activities (e.g. access roads, driveways, residences, utility trenches) on those parcels that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are located within an Archaeological Sensitive Area (AS) combining designation; • Contain known archaeological sites, as recorded by the Central Coast Information Center at UC Santa Barbara; • Are located in an area identified by the County of San Luis Obispo Planning and Building Department as archaeologically sensitive (e.g. Nipomo, Santa Margarita, Salinas River area); or, • Contain physical features on-site that may indicate the presence of archeological resources (e.g. springs, creeks, rock outcrops). <p>Should the archaeological surface survey identify significant resources, the applicant shall avoid the resource if feasible. Should avoidance be infeasible, the following mitigation measure shall be required:</p> <p>CR-2(b) Data Recovery Excavation. If avoidance of an archaeological site(s) is not possible, data recovery excavation shall be completed prior to issuance of grading permits. A data recovery plan shall be submitted by a qualified</p>	<p>Compliance with LUO Section 22.10.040/CZLUO Section 23.07.104 and Title 19 Section 19.02.070, in addition to Mitigation Measure CR-2, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.</p>



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>archaeologist for review by the County Environmental Coordinator. Data recovery shall be funded by the applicant, shall be performed by a County-qualified archaeologist, and shall be carried out in accordance with a research design consistent with the requirements of the California Office of Historic Preservation Planning Bulletin 5, Guidelines for Archaeological Research Design. At a minimum, data recovery shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mapping of site boundaries and the distribution of surface remains; • Surface collection of artifacts; • Excavation of a sample of the cultural deposit to characterize the nature of the site and retrieve a representative sample of artifacts and other remains within the proposed impact area; • Monitoring of excavations at Native American sites by a tribal representative; • Technical studies and analysis of the recovered sample, including radiocarbon dating, typological and technical analysis of tools and debris, identification and analysis of preserved faunal and floral remains, and other studies appropriate to the research questions outlined in the research design; • Cataloguing and curation of all artifacts and records detailing the results of the investigations at a County-approved curation facility; • Submission of a final technical report detailing the results of the investigations; and • Preparation of an interpretive report suitable for distribution to the general public. <p>CR-2(c) Archaeological Resource Construction Monitoring. At the commencement of construction on sites that have</p>	



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>been identified as having the potential to support cultural resources based on mitigation measure CR-1(a), a qualified archaeologist shall prepare an archaeological monitoring plan for the review and approval of the County. The monitoring plan shall include involvement of a Native American representative and shall include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration of an understanding of all applicable State and County regulations, policies and standards in regards to archaeological resources; • An orientation for construction workers to describe site avoidance requirements, the possibility of exposing unexpected archaeological resources, and the steps to be taken if such a find is encountered; • Monitoring of earth moving activities within native soil; • Provisions for the event that archaeological remains are encountered during construction including halting all work in the vicinity of the find until such time as the find is evaluated by a qualified archaeologist and appropriate mitigation, if necessary, is implemented; • Provisions for curation and preservation of any discovered resources, and • Provisions for a follow up report summarizing the results of the monitoring activities and any necessary mitigation. 	
<p>Impact CR-3: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would modify current development standards, leading to physical impacts. If development occurs in fossil-bearing strata, significant fossil materials could be damaged or destroyed.</p>	<p>CR-3(a) Paleontological Surface Survey. During environmental review for future agricultural cluster subdivision projects processed under the proposed ordinance amendments, the County shall require a paleontological surface survey, conducted by a qualified paleontologist approved by the Environmental Coordinator, that assesses the potential impacts of all ground disturbing activities (e.g. access roads, driveways, residences, utility trenches) on those parcels that are located within an area:</p>	<p>With implementation of Mitigation Measure CR-3, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overlying a geologic formation known to be paleontological sensitivity or fossil bearing; • Containing known paleontological sites; • Determined by the County of San Luis Obispo Planning and Building Department to be paleontologically sensitive; or • Containing physical features on-site that may indicate the presence of paleontological resources (as determined by rock type, past history of the rock unit in producing fossil materials, and fossil sites that are recorded in the unit). <p>Should the paleontological surface survey identify significant resources, the applicant shall avoid the resource if feasible. Should avoidance be infeasible, the following mitigation measure shall be required.</p> <p>CR-3(b) Preparation of a Paleontological Resource Monitoring Plan. At the time of application for construction and/or grading permits, applicants for projects where paleontological sensitivity is moderate to very high, as determined by the paleontological surface survey, shall retain a qualified accredited paleontologist to prepare a Paleontological Resource Monitoring Plan based on the specific construction plans. The monitoring plan shall detail the procedures for monitoring construction in areas of high or unknown sensitivity, collecting fossil remains and relevant geographic and stratigraphic data, stabilizing and preserving recovered specimens, and cataloguing and curating the collection. The monitoring plan shall include provisions for collecting a representative sample of invertebrates prior to construction, documenting the site according to the standards developed by the National Research Council (1987), and assessing the potential of this site to contain significant vertebrate remains.</p>	



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>CR-3(c) Paleontological Monitoring. A qualified paleontological monitor shall observe any initial excavation, grading, or other ground disturbance which extends below the upper soil layers in in situ sedimentary rock where paleontological sensitivity is high. Paleontologists who monitor excavations must be qualified and experienced in salvaging fossils and authorized to temporarily divert equipment while removing fossils. They must be properly equipped with tools and supplies to allow for rapid removal and preparation of specimens, and trained in safe practices when working around construction equipment. If multiple pieces of heavy equipment are in use simultaneously at diverse locations during construction, each location may be monitored individually.</p> <p>CR-3(d) Treatment of Paleontological Remains Discovered During Monitoring. If paleontological resources are found during excavations or other ground disturbance, work shall cease temporarily in the immediate area of the discovery. Ground disturbance may be redirected to another area so that the significance of the fossil find may be assessed. If an accredited paleontologist is not already on-site, a vertebrate paleontologist with regional experience will be contacted to inspect the excavation, assess the significance of the fossil find, recover any exposed fossils of significance, and recommend additional mitigation measures, if necessary.</p> <p>A standard sample (3 to 12 cubic meters) of matrix from each site will be taken for identification of microvertebrates (rodents, birds, rabbits), especially when the potential for microvertebrates is high. The monitors also will determine whether the fossils are part of an archaeological deposit. If the fossils are found with cultural material, the site then will be considered an archaeological discovery and treated according to the procedures specified in CR-2(b)</p>	



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>(Archaeological Resource Construction Monitoring).</p> <p>Significant fossils found during construction shall be preserved by prompt removal whenever feasible. Due to the potential for rapid deterioration of exposed surface fossils, preservation by avoidance is not an appropriate measure. When a significant fossil cannot be removed immediately, stabilization is needed to prevent further deterioration prior to removal. The fossil location must be stabilized under the direction of a professional paleontologist.</p> <p>At the time of collecting, each specimen or group of specimens will be clearly located and plotted on a USGS topographical quadrangle map. Field methods, other excavation activities, and working conditions during monitoring of the paleontological resources will be recorded in a field notebook or on a paleontological resources record or worksheet such as those developed by the National Research Council (1987).</p> <p>Recovered specimens will be stabilized and prepared for identification. Sedimentary matrix with microfossils will be screen washed and sorted to identify the contained fossils. Removal of excess matrix during preparation reduces long-term storage requirements. Competent qualified specialists will classify individual specimens to the lowest identifiable taxon, typically to genus, species, and element. Batch identification and batch numbering (e.g., "mammal, 25 specimens") should be avoided.</p> <p>Paleontological specimens will be cataloged according to current professional standards, and a complete list of collected specimens must be prepared. A complete set of field notes, geologic maps, and stratigraphic sections must accompany the fossil collections.</p> <p>All fossil remains recovered during construction and</p>	



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>operation must be curated by a recognized, nonprofit paleontological specimen repository with a permanent curator, such as a museum or university. Specimens must be stored in a fashion that allows researchers to retrieve specific individual specimens in the future. In addition to the LACM and UCMP, qualified research facilities include California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo; the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History; or Santa Barbara City College.</p> <p>The project paleontologist will complete a final report summarizing findings, describing important fossil localities (vertebrate, megainvertebrate, or plant) discovered in the project area, and explaining any mitigation measures taken. The report will include a summary of the field and laboratory methods, site geology and stratigraphy, an itemized inventory of recovered specimens, faunal lists, and site records. The report also should discuss the importance of the recovered fossil materials. The reports will be prepared by a professional paleontologist and distributed to the appropriate agencies, museums, colleges, or universities.</p>	
Geologic Hazards		
<p>Impact G-1: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would modify current land division and development standards. As a result, development could be located in areas affected by active or potentially active fault zones.</p>	<p>G-1(a) Project-specific Geologic Evaluation. Individual agricultural cluster subdivision applications require discretionary approval and are therefore subject to individual environmental determinations. In reviewing individual projects, the County shall consider the location of proposed development relative to existing faults, and shall require engineered grading plans, prepared by a civil engineer, and an engineering geology report and geotechnical (soils) engineering report for projects involving site development which can be affected by active or potentially active faults zones. The geologic reports shall be reviewed by the County Geologist and/or plans examiners, as applicable, and individual projects shall be conditioned to comply with the</p>	<p>Compliance with LUO Section 22.14.070 /CZLUO Section 23.07.080, in addition to Mitigation Measure G-1, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.</p>



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>recommendations of the geologic reports.</p> <p>G-1(b) Fault Line Setbacks. If development is proposed within an Alquist-Priolo Zone, a geologic study shall be conducted to determine the location of the fault trace. Based on the findings in the geologic study, all structures for human occupancy shall be setback a minimum of 50-feet from the fault trace.</p>	
<p>Impact G-2: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would modify current development standards. As a result, development could be located in areas where soil related hazards (e.g. expansive soils, erosive soils, subsidence and settlement, landslide, and liquefaction) occur.</p>	<p>G-2(a) Soils/Foundation Report. Upon implementation of the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program, individual property developers proposing development of new structures shall submit a soils/foundation report as part of the application for any proposed building permit (s). To reduce the potential for foundation cracking, one or more of the following shall be implemented and/or as recommended by a qualified engineer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use continuous deep footings (i.e., embedment depth of 3 feet or more) and concrete slabs on grade with increased steel reinforcement together with a pre-wetting and long-term moisture control program within the active zone. • Removal and recompaction of loose soils. • Removal of the highly expansive material and replacement with non-expansive compacted import fill material. • The use of specifically designated drilled pier and grade beam system incorporating a structural concrete slab on grade supported approximated 6 inches above the expansive soils • Chemical treatment with hydrated lime to reduce the expansion characteristics of the soils. • Where necessary, construction on transitional lots shall include over excavation to expose firm sub-grade, use of 	<p>Compliance with LUO Section 22.14.070 /CZLUO Section 23.07.080, in addition to Mitigation Measure G-2, would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.</p>



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	post tension slabs in future structures, or other geologically acceptable method.	
Hydrology and Water Quality		
<p>Impact HWQ-1: Development resulting from the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could alter drainage conditions, such as volume, velocity, direction, peak flow, soil absorption. Alteration of drainage conditions could result in physical alteration of drainage courses (“hydromodification”).</p>	<p>HWQ-1(a) Project-Specific Review for Low Impact Development. All agricultural cluster subdivision projects will be subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review. As part of the CEQA review process, projects shall be reviewed to ensure appropriate Low Impact Development (LID) measures and techniques, also known as Best Management Practices (BMPs), have been incorporated to avoid hydromodification impacts. Examples of LID measure to be considered include, but are not limited to: rain gardens, vegetated swales, bio-retention systems, infiltration planters, soil amendments, down-spout connections, reduced roadway surface (where permitted), porous paving systems, open-cell block pavers, porous turf pavement, and rain water harvesting.</p>	<p>With the implementation of Mitigation Measure HWQ-1, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>
Noise		
<p>Impact N-1: The proposed program could lead to residential development in rural and agricultural areas of the county. Such development could expose sensitive receptors to short-term construction–noise and vibration.</p>	<p>N-1(a) Noise Reduction Plan. At the time of application for subdivision improvement plans or grading permits, the applicant shall submit a Noise Reduction Plan prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant for review and approval by the County Department of Planning and Building. The Noise Reduction Plan shall include but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limit all phases of construction to the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. Monday through Friday as required by County Land Use Ordinance Section 22.10.120(A)(4); • Regular notification of all existing and future residences within 1,000 feet of the site boundary concerning the construction schedule; • Shield especially loud pieces of stationary construction 	<p>With the implementation of Mitigation Measure N-1(a), impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>equipment;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locate portable generators, air compressors, etc. away from sensitive noise receptors; • Limit grouping major pieces of equipment operating in one area to the greatest extent feasible; • Place heavy traffic areas such as the maintenance yard, equipment, tool, and other construction oriented operations, in locations that would be the least disruptive to surrounding sensitive noise receptors; • Conduct worker-training meetings to educate and encourage noise awareness and sensitivity. This training should focus on worker conduct while in the vicinity of sensitive receptors (i.e. minimizing and locating the use of circular saws in areas adjacent to sensitive receptors and being mindful of shouting and the loose use of attention drawing language); and • Notify surrounding residences in advance of the construction schedule when unavoidable construction noise and upcoming construction activities likely to produce an adverse noise environment are expected. Noticing shall provide phone number of project monitor, County inspector, construction foreman, etc. This notice shall be given one week in advance, and at a minimum of one day in advance of anticipated activities have changed. Project representatives shall verbally notify all surrounding residential owners. 	
<p>Impact N-3: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could place noise-sensitive receptors in areas exposed to nuisance noise levels.</p>	<p>N-3(a) Reduction of Nuisance Noise. For any noise sensitive development proposed within projected 60 dBA noise contours, the applicant shall prepare a site-specific acoustical study by a qualified acoustical engineer and shall implement any recommendations of that study; this study shall contain recommendations to mitigate any noise levels</p>	<p>With the implementation of Mitigation Measure N-3(a), impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>that exceed the County’s standard of 60 dBA CNEL. Options could include one of more of the following approaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of a berm or wall; • Design of individual homes such that structures block the line-of-sight from useable backyards to the noise source; • For homes with backyards not blocked by intervening structures, backyard fencing of sufficient height to block line-of-sight to the noise source; • Placement of windows and balconies away from the noise source, as applicable. • Within residences, bathrooms and kitchens should be located toward the noise source, while bedrooms should be located away from the noise source; or • Development should follow normal construction practices and building code requirements. Use of noise reducing building materials, such as double paned windows, shall be used to further reduce indoor noise levels by insulating against outdoor noise sources. 	
Transportation and Circulation		
<p>Impact T-1: Development resulting from the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program may impact county roadways and intersections.</p>	<p>T-1(a) Traffic Study and Facility Improvements. In certain cases, projects with the potential to significantly affect the County’s roadway system may need to provide a traffic study prepared by a qualified consultant. Projects will be referred to the Department of Public Works for consideration, and the Director of Public Works, or their designee, shall have the authority to request such reports. Once reviewed and approved, the recommended measures identified in the traffic study shall be incorporated into the project design. Appropriate measures incorporated through a traffic study or through individual review of the project may include, but are not limited to the following:</p>	<p>With the implementation of Mitigation Measure T-1(a), impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payment of a County road impact fee; • Payment of a road impact fee for a nearby city; • Contributing funds towards a regional intersection or interchange improvement; and/or • Constructing additional road improvements, such as widening, channelization, adding a turn lane, etc. 	
<p>Impact T-2: Development resulting from the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program may affect sight distance on public and private roads.</p>	<p>T-2(a) Roadway Safety Analysis. Projects shall be referred to the Department of Public Works and/or Cal Trans for review. If either agency identifies concerns with respect to safety, the project applicant will be required to provide a roadway safety analysis prepared by a qualified traffic engineer. The engineer shall provide recommendations in accordance with County Policy (Reso 2008-152), which would be required to be reviewed by the Department of Public Works and/or Cal Trans and incorporated into the project. Such recommendations could include road improvements such as widening, signage, landscape design, and acceleration/deceleration lanes.</p>	<p>With the implementation of Mitigation Measure T-2(a), impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>
Visual Resources		
<p>Impact VR-1: Development resulting from the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program may alter scenic vistas in rural/agricultural areas of the county.</p>	<p>VR-1(a) Project-Specific Consideration of Scenic Resources. Individual agricultural cluster subdivision projects would require conditional use permit/development plan and tentative map approval, and would be subject to individual environmental determinations. During environmental review, agricultural cluster subdivision applications shall be considered for consistency with thresholds of significance for aesthetics and visual resources in accordance with Appendix G of the State CEQA Guidelines. Review of agricultural cluster subdivision projects shall consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of trees or visually dominant vegetation shall be avoided to the extent feasible. When possible, development shall be sited to use existing mature 	<p>With the implementation of existing ordinance standards, proposed restrictive revisions, and Mitigation Measure VR-1(a), impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>vegetation as visual screening.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed structures and retaining walls shall be constructed using colors and materials that blend with the existing natural terrain and visual setting of the project site and surrounding landscape. • Driveways or access roads and their associated cut and fill slopes shall be located to minimize visibility from major public roadways. • Water tanks, propane tanks, and other infrastructure shall not be placed in visually prominent locations. • Graded slopes shall be blended with surrounding natural contours. • Proposed landscaping shall be blended with surrounding natural vegetation. • Appropriate mitigation measures shall be discussed in the Initial Study for projects which have the potential to impact scenic resources. <p>VR-1(b) Architectural and Landscape Guidelines. Applications for agricultural cluster subdivisions shall include draft architectural and landscape guidelines, which include the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tract landscaping shall consist of native drought-tolerant species and shall emulate and be compatible with the surrounding natural environment. • Individual house landscape plans shall be prepared by a qualified landscape architect or other qualified professional and shall be designed to screen and blend the development into the surrounding area while preserving identified viewsheds. Individual lot landscaping plans shall incorporate plants consistent with the San Luis Obispo County Approved Plant List. • Development plans shall include earth-tone colors on 	



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>structure roofing and other on-site features to reduce potential visual contrast between the structures and natural terrain and backdrop. Natural building materials and colors compatible with surrounding terrain (earth-tones and non-reflective paints) shall be used on exterior surfaces of all structures, including fences.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understories and retaining walls higher than six feet shall be in tones compatible with surrounding terrain using textured materials or construction methods which create a textured effect. <p>VR-1(c) Site Work in Scenic Areas. Grading, vegetation removal, and other landform alterations shall be minimized on sites located within areas determined by the Director to be a major public viewing corridor from collector or arterial roads.</p> <p>VR-1(d) Grading. Grading should preserve hillsides and natural topography to the maximum extent feasible. Grading transitions should be gentle rather than abrupt.</p>	
<p>Impact VR-2: Development resulting from the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program may adversely affect scenic resources within the viewshed of Highway 1, a state scenic highway.</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measure VR-1.</p>	<p>With the implementation of existing ordinance standards and Local Coastal Plan policies, proposed restrictive provisions in the coastal version of the program, and Mitigation Measure VR-1, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>
<p>Impact VR-3: Development resulting from the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program may conflict with the existing visual character or quality of rural and agricultural areas of the county, including community separators.</p>	<p>Refer to Mitigation Measure VR-1.</p>	<p>With the implementation of existing ordinance standards in conjunction with Mitigation Measure VR-1, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>
<p>Impact VR-4: Development resulting from the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision</p>	<p>VR-4(a) Lighting Standards. In addition to standard ordinance requirements, individual agricultural cluster</p>	



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
<p>Program may increase glare and ambient lighting in rural and agricultural areas with dark night skies.</p>	<p>subdivision projects shall comply with the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All exterior lighting shall be designed as part of the overall architectural concept. Fixtures, standards and all exposed accessories shall be harmonious with the building design, the lighting design and hardware of the public spaces, and the overall visual environment of the County. • Light fixtures with exposed light bulbs shall generally be avoided, but in no case shall be visible from off-site locations. • All light fixtures shall be shielded to confine the spread of light within the 5 percent residential development area. • Upward directed lighting for landscaping shall not be allowed. 	
Water Resources		
<p>Impact WR-1: Residential development resulting from the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program will require a long-term sustainable water source, which could create impacts in areas with known resource capacity issues.</p>	<p>WR-1(a) Consideration of cumulative impacts as part of the project-specific environmental review process. The Initial Study prepared for any and all proposed agricultural cluster subdivisions shall consider and address any potential cumulative impacts on water resources that could result from the proposal. Such consideration shall also take into account water existing and future extraction from uses not presently regulated by the County (e.g. agricultural water demand). Appropriate, feasible mitigation measures to offset the project’s contribution towards an impact shall be provided. Such measures may include, but are not necessarily limited to the following measures, which would be presumably implemented for all uses (e.g. not just agricultural cluster subdivisions) basin-wide where cumulative impacts are anticipated, in order to effectively mitigate those cumulative effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groundwater Management Plan Requirements. 	<p>The Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program will largely be self-mitigating, as all individual proposals will be required to supply a hydrogeologic analysis and such analysis will be used as a basis in determining whether or not the Review Authority has substantial evidence to make a finding affirming the adequacy of water resources and consistency with the General Plan. Nevertheless, individual cluster projects would incrementally contribute to cumulatively significant impacts to water supplies. Mitigation Measures WR-1(a) through WR-1(c) would reduce this cumulative impact to a less than significant level.</p>



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>Compliance with measures in an established groundwater management plan that are intended to address cumulative basin-wide impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance with any applicable requirements from Title 8 of the County Code. In areas where groundwater resources are limited, the County may establish water fixture retrofit programs. Such programs are presently in place in the Nipomo Mesa Management Area and in the Los Osos area. Applicants seeking to develop may be required to offset net increases in non-agricultural water by retrofitting a specified number of fixtures based on an established ratio. • Compliance with landscaping ordinances. In certain areas, the County may require low-water-use landscaping. When implemented basin-wide, this can substantially reduce residential water demand. • Best Management Practices. To address cumulative impacts, a project may be required to have all residential development comply with the California Urban Water Conservation Council (CUWCC)'s Best Management Practices for residential development and landscaping. The practices require water-efficient landscaping, low-flow fixtures, and water-efficient appliances. • Purchasing water offsets. If such a program should be developed to address cumulative effects in a groundwater basin, an applicant may be required to purchase surface water allocations (e.g. State Water Project, Nacimiento Lake, Lopez Lake) to be dedicated to uses within urbanized areas in order to allow a commensurate reduction in municipal pumping from that basin. <p>WR-1(b) Offset non-agricultural water use. Where resulting residential development would conflict with agricultural</p>	



Table ES-2: Summary of Significant but Mitigable (Class II) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
	<p>water demands, agricultural cluster subdivision projects shall be required to offset net increases in non-agricultural water demand. Mitigation measures that will offset the net increases shall be discussed and fully evaluated in a project-specific Initial Study. Measures offsetting non-agricultural water demand may include, but are not limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributing proportionally towards an existing water mitigation program covering the underlying groundwater basin. • Purchasing off-site water allocations (e.g. surface water allocations from Nacimiento Lake or the State Water Project) to be directed towards the agricultural use and subsidized by the residential development. • Other feasible and suitable means identified by the Environmental Coordinator which would effectively negate any new conflicts in water demand brought about by residential development <p>WR-1(c) Evaluation of the feasibility of water offset mitigation measures. The hydrogeologic analysis supplied with each agricultural cluster subdivision project shall consider and evaluate proposed mitigation measures to offset non-agricultural water use. Such evaluation shall consider both enforceability and nexus. Measures must be fully enforceable and able to be monitored without undue burden on County staffing or funding sources. Preference shall be given to mitigation by design over mitigation by policy. With respect to nexus, water offsets must have a direct relationship to impacts caused by net increases in non-agricultural water demand. As such, offsets would need to occur in the same basin or sub-basin where the identified availability constraints and impacts are being experienced.</p>	



Table ES-3: Summary of Less than Significant (Class III) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
Agricultural Resources		
Impact AG-2: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could result in the conversion of prime agricultural soils in areas currently designated Agriculture to residential and non-agricultural uses.	None.	Since existing ordinance standards would prohibit residential development on prime agricultural soils, impacts will not be significant.
Impact AG-3: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could result in impacts related to agricultural/urban land use conflicts.	None.	With proposed design standards and buffer requirement clarifications in the proposed ordinance, impacts will not be significant.
Impact AG-4: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could result in development that may be inconsistent with policies in the Agriculture Element (AE) and Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE) of the County General Plan.	None.	Since the proposed program revisions would improve consistency with the key Agriculture Element and COSE policies, impacts will not be significant.
Air Quality		
Impact AQ-3: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program may be inconsistent with applicable provisions of the Clean Air Plan.	None.	The proposed program is consistent with the Clean Air Plan as it would require agricultural cluster development to be located closer to existing urban areas consistent with Clean Air Plan goals to reduce development in rural areas of the county.
Hydrology and Water Quality		
Impact HWQ-2: Development resulting from the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could alter drainage conditions. These altered drainage conditions could result in physical effects on down-gradient properties.	None.	Drainage impacts are addressed through the County's Drainage Plan review process in accordance with Land Use Ordinance Chapter 22.52 / Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance Chapter 23.05). Implementation of these existing ordinance standards would reduce



Table ES-3: Summary of Less than Significant (Class III) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
		impacts to less than significant levels.
<p>Impact HWQ-3: Development resulting from the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could cause erosion and ultimately lead to sedimentation of water courses.</p>	None.	<p>Erosion and sedimentation impacts are already addressed through the County’s review of an erosion and sedimentation control plan. Additionally, both the County and State are involved in oversight of Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans for larger projects. Implementation of these existing requirements would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.</p>
<p>Impact HWQ-4: Design and location requirements established in the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could result in residential development occurring in flood hazard areas. Compared to the existing ordinance, the program would reduce the potential to occur in flood hazard areas.</p>	None.	<p>Flood hazard concerns are already addressed through the standards established in Chapter 22.14 of the Land Use Ordinance and Chapter 23.07 of the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance. Additionally, engineered Drainage Plan review and approval will be required for projects in flood prone areas. Implementation of these existing requirements would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.</p>
<p>Impact HWQ-5: Residential development resulting from the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could discharge both stormwater and non-stormwater pollutants into area watercourses.</p>	None.	<p>Stormwater discharges are addressed through existing SWPPP and SWQP requirements. The County is also required, and has committed, to adopt an illicit discharge ordinance to address non-stormwater discharges. This ordinance is presently undergoing environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). These regulations will address pollutant discharges into watercourses as a result of both construction-phase and operational (i.e. post-construction) use. Implementation of these existing requirements would reduce impacts to less than significant levels.</p>



Table ES-3: Summary of Less than Significant (Class III) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
<p>Impact HWQ-6: The Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program will require active agricultural production in order to qualify for subdivision. This may incentivize expansion of agricultural production. Agricultural uses can result in this discharge of pollutants into watercourses.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>The impact will not be significant. Discharges of agriculturally related pollutants are already regulated by the SWRCB through the irrigated agricultural discharge waiver.</p>
Noise		
<p>Impact N-4: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could lead to residential development in rural/agricultural areas of the county. Such development could expose sensitive receptors to stationary noise levels from agricultural operations, resulting in a direct long-term noise impact.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>Implementation of existing agricultural buffer policies will ensure that agricultural-related noise impacts will not be significant. The proposed ordinance amendments would clarify these existing requirements and would establish larger minimum parcel sizes to accommodate the required buffers.</p>
Public Services/Utilities		
<p>Impact PS-1: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could change where septic systems treat wastewater, resulting in health hazards and/or impacts to water quality. Compared to the existing ordinance, cluster parcels would be more appropriately sized for on-site septic systems.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>Future development in areas where development would not be serviced by a community sewer system, wastewater treatment systems would be required to comply with Title 19 of the County Code (Sections 19.07.022 and 19.07.023) to ensure septic system design and capacities are adequate. Compliance with these requirements would ensure less than significant impacts.</p>
<p>Impact PS-2: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could increase County population by up to 969 residents. This may incrementally increase demands on the San Luis Obispo County Sherriff</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>Impacts resulting from the construction of new or physically altered emergency service facilities would be considered during the project-level environmental review for individual agricultural cluster projects. At this time, however, no</p>



Table ES-3: Summary of Less than Significant (Class III) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
<p>Department, Cal Fire, and other emergency service providers.</p>		<p>meaningful information is available regarding the exact location of these projects or the scope of improvements which would be necessary to maintain or achieve acceptable levels of service. Impacts are therefore too speculative for evaluation. As required under existing ordinance provisions, individual cluster projects would pay public facilities fees and prepare a fire safety plan showing compliance with existing fire code requirements. No additional mitigation measures beyond existing requirements are necessary.</p>
<p>Impact PS-3: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could increase County population by up to 969 residents. This may incrementally increase demands on San Luis Obispo County parks, recreational services, and libraries.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>Payment of required public facilities fees and Quimby Fees are already required by County ordinance. These existing measures serve to mitigate each project’s individual contribution towards significant impacts on parks/recreational facilities and libraries. No additional mitigation measures beyond existing requirements are necessary.</p>
<p>Impact PS-4: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could increase County population by up to 969 residents. This additional population may incrementally increase demands placed on existing County schools.</p>	<p>None.</p>	<p>Individual projects reviewed under the proposed amendments would be required to pay development impact fees to the school district in which the project is located. These fees would contribute funding for new school facilities for the students potentially generated by the proposed program. Pursuant to Section 65995 (3)(h) of the California Government Code (Senate Bill 50, chaptered August 27, 1998), the payment of statutory fees “...is deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act, or both, involving, but not limited to, the planning, use, or</p>



Table ES-3: Summary of Less than Significant (Class III) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
		development of real property, or any change in governmental organization or reorganization. Although it has been acknowledged that build-out of the agricultural cluster program may have incremental impacts on existing school services, it is speculative to determine the nature of future site specific impacts that may be a secondary effects of this project (<i>CEQA Guidelines Section 15145</i>).
<p>Impact PS-5: Development resulting from the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could place demands on landfill capacities. Compared to the existing ordinance, the program would reduce demands on landfill capacities.</p>	None.	No mitigation is required beyond standard County ordinance requirements. Compliance with current county ordinance for recycling of construction waste and the county’s land fill capacity to accommodate solid waste makes impacts to solid waste/landfills less than significant.
Transportation/Circulation		
<p>Impact T-3: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would lead to residential development in rural/agricultural areas of the county. Such development could affect conditions for secondary emergency access, such as topography, road width, and dead-end road width.</p>	None.	Projects are required to comply with CalFire/County Fire’s Standard for “Access Roads and Driveways” requirement which sets parameters for maximum slope, minimum width, and maximum dead-end road length. Implementation of these existing requirements would reduce impacts to a less than significant level.
<p>Impact T-4: The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would lead to residential development in rural/agricultural areas of the county. Such development could not be adequately served by alternative transportation means.</p>	None	Based on the proposed standards, cluster development would occur in rural areas of the county at low residential densities. As a result, the program is not anticipated to increase demands on public transit or to provide opportunities for alternative transportation means.



Table ES-3: Summary of Less than Significant (Class III) Impacts for the Proposed Project

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Residual Impacts
Water Resources		
<p>Impact WR-2: The Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program will preclude the establishment of small community water systems to serve residential cluster parcels. As a result, new residential development will need to obtain water service from on-site wells. This may reduce the reliability of water service to the residential parcels.</p>	None	The impact will not be significant.
<p>Impact WR-3: Residential water quality may be affected by adjacent agricultural uses.</p>	None	The impact will not be significant.



This page intentionally left blank.



Table ES-4: Summary of Cumulative Environmental Impacts

Agricultural Resources
<p>Cumulative development throughout San Luis Obispo County would gradually convert agricultural land to non-agricultural use. The Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would incrementally contribute to this substantial change. Full development potential under the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would be 418 new residential units, with the potential conversion of Important Farmland ranging between 1,045 and 2,090 acres. The program would also allow for the reconfiguration of legally established underlying lots in the Coastal Zone to accommodate residential development; however, given the relatively small number of verified underlying lots in the Coastal Zone and the fact that many of these lots could already be developed in their current configuration with few restrictions, the program is not anticipated to result in a significant number of new cluster lots in the Coastal Zone. Nevertheless, implementation of the program could result in the conversion of Important Farmland to residential and non-agricultural uses in the Coastal Zone.</p> <p>Although compared to countywide Important Farmland, the total acreage converted under the program would be a relatively small percentage, the potential development of 418 new residences and associated conversion of farmland would still be considered a Class I, <i>significant and unavoidable</i>, impact (refer to Impact AG-1). Therefore, the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program’s contribution to cumulative agricultural land conversion would be cumulatively considerable. In addition, individual development projects in the region would have the potential to create compatibility conflicts relating to the interface of historic agricultural uses and new urban development. However, such conflicts would be addressed on a case-by-case basis, and assuming that conflicts can be resolved through the proper use of buffers and appropriate design, significant cumulative land use compatibility conflicts are not anticipated.</p>
Air Quality
<p>The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could lead to the construction of up to 418 new single family residences within five miles of the identified URLs, as well as additional residences in the Coastal Zone. When considered together with the cumulative projects listed in Table 3.3-1, the proposed program’s contribution to construction phase air quality impacts would be cumulatively considerable. However, with implementation of the mitigation measures described under Impact AQ-1, the program’s incremental contribution to these emissions would be reduced to less than significant levels. Cumulative impacts related to construction phase emissions would therefore be Class II, <i>significant but mitigable</i>.</p> <p>When considered together with the cumulative projects listed in Table 3.3-1, the proposed program’s contribution to long-term operational impacts would be cumulatively considerable. Operational impacts occurring at build-out are expected to result in threshold exceedences for ozone precursors and diesel particulate matter. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-2 would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level for individual projects exceeding SLOAPCD’s 25 lbs/day threshold for Ozone Precursors and Fugitive Particulate Matter. However, since future agricultural cluster projects would be unlikely to individually exceed this threshold, their incremental contribution to cumulative operational air quality impacts would go unmitigated. Therefore, under build-out of the program, cumulative impacts would remain Class I, <i>significant and unavoidable</i>.</p>
Biological Resources
<p>Cumulative projects located throughout the project area would have the potential to result in impacts to oak woodlands and other sensitive natural communities, special-status plant and wildlife species, and wildlife migration corridors. For example, several cumulative projects listed in Table 3.3-1 are large developments in previously undeveloped areas that would have the potential to result in disturbance to sensitive habitats and special-status species. The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could lead to between 1,045 and 2,090 acres of site disturbance for the construction of up to 418 new single family residences within five miles of the identified URLs and additional site disturbance resulting from the reconfiguration of existing underlying lots in the Coastal Zone. Construction, grading, and site preparation activities authorized under the proposed program could potentially impact sensitive habitat areas, special-status plant and wildlife species, and wildlife migration corridors in undeveloped areas in the county. When considered together with the effects of other</p>



current and future projects within five miles of the identified Inland URLs and eligible areas of the Coastal Zone, the proposed program's incremental effects on sensitive habitat areas, special-status plant and wildlife species, and wildlife migration corridors would be cumulatively considerable. Compliance with the identified mitigation measures and proposed restrictive provisions intended to minimize impacts to biological resources is foreseeable to reduce impacts to a less than significant level for subsequent projects processed under the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program. Although biological resource thresholds would be exceeded cumulatively, the project's incremental contribution to the impact would not be significant with the implementation of these mitigation measures, which include specific performance measures. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be considered Class II, *significant but mitigable*, when compared to existing baseline conditions.

Cultural Resources

Cumulative development throughout the greater San Luis Obispo County area would have the potential to disturb identified and unidentified cultural resources. For example, several cumulative projects listed in Table 3.3-1 are large agricultural cluster developments in previously undeveloped areas that would have the potential to impact cultural resources. The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could lead to between 1,045 and 2,090 acres of site disturbance for the construction of up to 418 new single family residences within five miles of the identified URLs in the Inland portion of the county and additional site disturbance resulting from the reconfiguration of existing underlying lots in the Coastal Zone. Construction, grading, and site preparation activities authorized under the proposed program could potentially impact known and unidentified historic, archaeological, and paleontological resources. When considered together with the effects of other current and future projects within five miles of the identified Inland URLs and eligible areas of the Coastal Zone, the proposed program's incremental effects on cultural resources would be cumulatively considerable. Compliance with the identified mitigation measures and existing ordinance standards is foreseeable to reduce impacts to a less than significant level for subsequent projects processed under the proposed program. The project's incremental contribution to the impact would therefore be insignificant with the implementation of these mitigation measures, which include specific performance measures. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be considered Class II, *significant but mitigable*, when compared to existing baseline conditions.

Geologic Hazards

Future development in accordance with the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program, together with other cumulative projects proposed throughout the project area, could potentially expose people and property to soil-stability related hazards. The magnitude of geologic hazards for individual projects would depend upon the location, type, and size of development and the specific hazards associated with individual sites. Any geologic issues present on an individual development site would be limited to that site and would not contribute to any cumulative impacts to the rest of the community. For example, the discovery of landslide concerns on two individual sites one mile apart would not create a cumulative issue in which one condition adds to the other. Rather, any specific geologic hazards associated with each individual site would be limited to that site without affecting other areas. Therefore, cumulative geologic impacts would not occur. New development within the county would be required to comply with the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Hazard Zone Act and the Uniform Building Code, as well as additional mitigation measures and recommendations pertaining to fault location investigations, building envelope setbacks, grading and erosion. These measures would reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, the project's contribution to the cumulative increase in exposure of people to geologic hazards would be considered Class III, *less than significant*.

Greenhouse Gases

The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Ordinance would have Class I, *significant and unavoidable*, impacts when compared to existing conditions. Cumulative impacts would therefore also be Class I, *significant and unavoidable*.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Development designed in compliance with the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could result in changes in drainage patterns and discharges of stormwater and non-stormwater pollutants. Existing policies and



programs are already in place to address these changes on a case-by-case basis. These include County requirements for drainage plan and erosion and sedimentation control plan review, and State-level oversight afforded through the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting process. As a result, the cumulative impact resulting from the Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would not be expected to be cumulatively significant.

Noise

The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could lead to the construction of up to 418 new residences in the Inland portion of the county and would facilitate residential development that otherwise wouldn't occur in the Coastal Zone. When considered together with the cumulative projects in Table 3.3-1, development resulting from the proposed program could incrementally increase traffic levels along major County roadways. Future agricultural cluster development would be consistent with the build-out potential anticipated under the County's General Plan. As a result, operational noise impacts resulting from the program would not necessarily be greater than what could currently occur without the proposed project. Nevertheless, the proposed program could increase noise beyond acceptable levels at existing sensitive receptors (primarily residences) located along affected roadways. Cumulative impacts would therefore be Class I, *significant and unavoidable*.

Public Services/Utilities

The proposed program could increase population by up to 969 additional residents in the Inland portion of the County and would generate new residents in the Coastal Zone. This additional population together with residents from other past and future projects (refer to Table 3.3-1) in the county would incrementally increase demands on county law enforcement, fire protection, and other emergency service facilities, as well as parks, recreational facilities, schools, and landfill capacities. Cumulative impacts to these facilities would be addressed through the payment of development impact fees by individual agricultural cluster projects in accordance with adopted fee programs. Impacts would therefore be Class III, *less than significant*.

Transportation and Circulation

The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program could lead to 4,180 ADT on County roadways and intersections, including 334 a.m. and 418 p.m. peak hour trips. When considered together with the effects of other current and future projects in the county, the proposed program's incremental impacts on County roadways and intersections would be cumulatively considerable. Individual projects located within a road fee area would be required, as a condition of approval, to pay road impact fees to fund their fair share of necessary road improvements. Projects with the potential to significantly impact the County's roadway system would also be required to comply with the mitigation measures identified in Section 4.10.2(b) to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The proposed program's incremental contribution to cumulative impacts on County roadways and intersections would therefore be considered Class II, *significant but mitigable*.

Visual Resources

Future development in accordance with the proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program, together with the cumulative projects listed in Table 3.3-1 would introduce residential and other non-agricultural land uses into a predominately rural/agricultural area. Such development could impact scenic views throughout the county, including along Highway 1, a designated scenic highway, and could use architectural colors and materials which would conflict with the rural agrarian character of the project vicinity. However, with the incorporation of the mitigation measures provided in Section 4.11, Visual Resources, the contribution of individual projects towards a cumulative impact would be reduced on a project-by-project basis. Each individual project, under the proposed amendments, would be subject to project-specific environmental review. Appropriate mitigation measures will be incorporated into the individual projects as part of the environmental review process. Cumulative impacts would therefore be Class II, *significant but mitigable*, when compared to existing conditions.



Water Resources

The proposed Agricultural Cluster Subdivision Program would allow the creation of approximately 418 new residential parcels on agricultural lands in the Inland portion of the County. Within the Coastal Zone, new parcels may not be created under the program, but may be reconfigured to better accommodate residential development. When considered cumulatively with the residential build-out of agricultural lands, this program is anticipated to result in cumulatively significant, but mitigable, impacts to water resources. These impacts are more thoroughly discussed as part of Impact WR-1.

