

## **CHAPTER 2.0 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS**

### **2.1 PROPOSED PROJECT**

The proposed project (Project) is located within unincorporated southern San Luis Obispo County immediately north and adjacent to the Santa Maria River, west of U.S. Highway 101, and to the south/southwest of the U.S. Highway 101/State Route 166 interchange. The property is located at 2280 Hutton Road, approximately 1,000 feet south of Cuyama Lane, in the South County Planning Area. The Project is considered to be two-fold, including: 1) General Plan Amendment (GPA); and 2) concurrent Conditional Use Permit (CUP) request should the GPA be approved. The proposed project includes the following:

#### Land Use Ordinance/Land Use Element (LUO/LUE) Amendment

The project involves an LUO/LUE amendment to change the land use designation of approximately 54 acres within the South County Planning Area to meet the following County objectives:

- 1) Allow for industrial-related land uses to take place within the approximately 44.7-acre area currently zoned as Commercial Service;
- 2) Allow for industrial-related land uses to take place within the approximately 9.3-acre area currently zoned as Residential Suburban; and,
- 3) Encourage better consistency of land use within the area below the bluff top edge, based on existing uses within the area.

#### Conditional Use Permit Request

The project will install a portable stand-alone asphaltic concrete plant, capable of using recycled asphalt products as required by Caltrans and other public agencies, and producing rubberized asphalt for commercial and public applications. The applicant's objectives of the project are as follows:

- 1) Allow for the installation and operation of a portable stand-alone asphaltic concrete plant with a capacity to produce 400,000 tons of asphaltic concrete per year using recycled asphalt products as required by Caltrans and other public agencies;
- 2) Provide a centrally-located facility to meet the local demand for asphaltic concrete;
- 3) Supply the community with high quality asphaltic concrete at a competitive price;
- 4) Divert recyclable materials from local sanitary landfills, including asphalt, concrete, rubble, and recycled rubber (e.g., tires) thereby extending County landfill capacity and longevity, and reducing the number of landfill-related truck trips;
- 5) Provide local employment opportunities; and,

- 6) Realize an economic return on the capital investment of equipment and material.

## **2.2 AREAS OF CONTROVERSY**

Section 15132 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the summary section of an EIR to include "Areas of Controversy known to the Lead Agency." Areas of Controversy identified during preparation of the Draft EIR include potential impacts to aesthetics, air quality (e.g., emissions that contribute to local air quality degradation), geology and soils, land use, public services/utilities, and transportation/circulation (e.g., additional truck trips on Highway 101).

## **2.3 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED**

Section 15132 of the CEQA Guidelines requires the summary section of an EIR to identify any "issues to be resolved including the choice among alternatives and how to mitigate significant effects." Summary of the alternative evaluation is presented below.

## **2.4 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS**

CEQA does not require that the alternatives analysis evaluate modification of internal components or phases of a proposal. However, the County formulated a number of alternatives that would meet objectives of the project, while minimizing impacts to area resources. Four alternatives are examined in this EIR:

**Alternative 1:** No Project Alternative

**Alternative 2:** Reduced Processing Rate Project Alternative

**Alternative 3:** Modified Land Use Ordinance Amendment Alternative

**Alternative 4:** Fully Mitigated LUO/LUE Amendment Alternative

**Alternative 5:** Fully Mitigated Asphalt Plant Alternative

These alternatives were formulated by the County to provide a reasonable range of scenarios that could reduce the level of impact from that anticipated with implementation of the proposed project. Each of these alternatives is described in greater detail in Chapter 6, the Alternatives Analysis.

Alternative 1 (No Project) would have no short-term or long-term impacts, but would not allow the construction and operation of an asphaltic concrete plant in south San Luis Obispo County, nor would it allow future industrial development to take place within the LUO amendment area. Alternative 2 would have the same impacts due to construction of the plant as the proposed project, but some of the impacts due to operations would be less. This alternative would involve production of only 200,000 tons of asphalt per year; thus, the number of truck trips generated during operations would be reduced by 50%. Under Alternative 3, the LUO amendment would not include parcels 090-302-034 and 090-302-035. Alternative 4 would involve construction and operation of the proposed asphaltic concrete plant and amendment to the LUO ordinance as described in the proposed project; however, this alternative would include all of the mitigation

measures prescribed in Chapter 5.0 to reduce all impacts to a level of less-than-significant. As such, this alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative. It would also meet the objectives of the proposed project, as described in Section 3.3.

## **2.5 MITIGATION MONITORING PROGRAM**

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires the adoption of a "reporting or monitoring plan" for the changes to the project, which the agency has adopted, or for the mitigation measures adopted as conditions of approval. The Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) will be prepared in conjunction with the Final EIR.

## **2.6 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Table 2-1 provides a summary of the level of significance for each impact discussed in this EIR. Project level impacts are categorized as Significant and Unavoidable (1), Significant but Mitigable (2), Less than Significant (3), and Beneficial (4). In addition, instances where project level impacts would contribute to a cumulative regional impact are identified as Significant Cumulative (SC).

Significant Unavoidable (Class 1) impacts are those impacts that would be significant at the project level. The project may propose mitigation, or recommended measures may be identified in the EIR, but despite the implementation of such measures, the potentially significant impact has not been reduced to less than significant levels and still achieve the project objectives.

Significant but Mitigable (Class 2) impacts are those impacts that would be significant if allowed to occur without mitigation. However, sufficient mitigation measures have been identified that would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels if implemented.

Less than Significant (Class 3) impacts are those impacts that would be less than significant without mitigation after project implementation.

Beneficial Impacts (Class 4) would result in net positive affects to a given resource category.

Table 2-1 provides a comprehensive summary of the impacts and mitigation measures presented in this EIR.