General Public Comments and Responses

Code	Agency	Page #
BL	Brooks, Lea	D-1
BJ	Buckingham, Jeff	D-4
DGC	Dave Garth Consulting	D-6
DW	Digital West	D-8
FGR	Flores, G.R.	D-10
HCU	Hall, Clayton U.	D-12
HDC	Hoffman, Douglas C.	D-15
JEH	Jud, Eugene H.	D-18
LD	Legg, Dawn	D-21
STT	Safreno, Ty and Trudie	D-23
SES	SESLOC Federal Credit Union	D-33
SSA	Souza, Steve A.	D-36
SPJ	Spatafore, John	D-38
SUJ	Summer, John	D-40
TE	Thoma Engineering	D-42
TAJ	Thomas, Alan J.	D-45
VBM	Vujovich-La Barre, Mila	D-51
WS	White, Stacey	D-59

From: Lea Brooks
1130 Islay St.
San Luis Obispo CA 93401
805/547-1026

To: Phil Dunsmore, Associate Planner
City of San Luis Obispo
Community Development Department
919 Palm St.
San Luis Obispo CA 93401-3218

Aug. 5, 2013

Re: Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Chevron Tank Farm Remediation and Development Project (State Clearinghouse #2009031001, City File: 92-08, County File #'s LRP 2008-00001, SUB 2008-00004 & ED 08-0119)

Mr. Dunsmore:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Chevron Tank Farm Remediation and Development Project Draft Environmental Impact Report. I am a member of the San Luis Obispo Bicycle Advisory Committee, which reviewed the draft EIR at its July 18 meeting, but am submitting these comments as an individual. These comments are in addition to those I made at the Planning Commission's July 24 meeting, including concern that the document does not address the impact on bicyclists and pedestrians of adding traffic and turn lanes to intersections; how constructing additional traffic lanes and adding lanes to intersections meet the city's policy of reducing automobile use and emphasizing alternative forms of transportation; and the lack of mitigations aimed at the general public to take transit, bicycle or walk to reduce traffic and greenhouse gases that contribute to global warming. BL-1

On page 4.3-13, the draft EIR says: Once extended, Prado Road would serve as the primary vehicle connection between the Margarita Area and the rest of the community. There is no mention of bicyclists, pedestrians, transit or complete streets. BL-2

I agree with Commissioner Eric Meyer's comment that the EIR look at the larger picture of the need for four traffic lanes on Tank Farm, Buckley and Prado roads; and that a bicycle/pedestrian crossing of Tank Farm Road needs to be addressed. BL-3

A mitigation for employers should be added to limit vehicle parking in parking lots and prohibit parking on roads within the project site for bicyclist safety unless the roadway is wide enough to allow on-street parking along with a buffer to keep bicyclists out of the door zone. Examples of roads that are not wide enough include Buckley Road in front of Shopatron in the unincorporated county area and on Industrial Way in front of the Salvation Army in the city. Parked vehicles on these roads force bicyclists into the traffic lane to prevent them from being doored. In addition, motorists at both locations tend to BL-4

pull into the traffic lane without looking for bicyclists. Businesses within the project area should have parking lots large enough to accommodate employees, visitors and delivery vehicles. BL-5

There is a mitigation measure that requires shower stalls and locker facilities to encourage employees to bike and/or walk to work, but it doesn't address how the requirement to provide showers to accommodate disabled individuals makes this mitigation so expensive that only one shower for men and women to share may be provided. Some bicyclists and pedestrians may be intimidated by sharing a shower. BL-6

On page 4.3-24, there is a discussion about two proposed driveways that should also include why one access would reduce conflicts with bicyclists and pedestrians. BL-7

On pages 4.3-25 (On-site Circulation) and 4.3-37 (T-1 No. 3), there should be requirements that they be reviewed by the Bicycle Advisory Committee. BL-8

###

Lea Brooks
Response to Comments

Comment #	Response
BL-1	The potential impacts of intersection widening on pedestrians were included in the analysis by adjusting the amount of time needed for pedestrians to cross the wider street cross section. The Circulation Element includes level-of-service standards, which were referenced when to identify impacts and mitigation measures. The project would provide transit facilities and pedestrian connections to support transit use, and would provide extensive bicycle and pedestrian facilities in accordance with the City's BTP.
BL-2	The Prado Road extension would be designed to accommodate all modes of travel, providing on-street bike lanes and a path separated from vehicular traffic by a parkway per the Margarita Area Specific Plan.
BL-3	The bicycle and pedestrian crossings of Tank Farm Road would occur at the Santa Fe Road roundabout. The number of lanes along Tank Farm Road, Buckley Road, and Prado Roads are specified in the AASP and MASP, and evaluation of these plans is outside the purview of this EIR.
BL-4	On-site circulation and parking is subject to review by City staff before permits are issued. These issues will be reviewed at that time in the context of the City's Engineering Standards, Municipal Code, and BTP.
BL-5	The project is required to provide parking per the City's Municipal Code. It will be necessary for the project to show conformance with the Code before receiving occupancy permits.
BL-6	The issue of the cost of providing showers for disabled individuals is not germane to the EIR.
BL-7	T-3b has been updated to note that one access would also reduce conflicts with cyclists and pedestrians.
BL-8	The City Public Works Department is responsible for the review and approval of the construction management plan.

From: Jeff Buckingham [mailto:jeff@blueroostertelecom.com]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 4:46 PM
To: Dunsmore, Phil
Cc: MAGGIE COX
Subject: Opposition to Roundabout for Tank Farm Road

Phil,

I am writing to express my concerns about the roundabout proposed for Tank Farm Road.

At this point I oppose the roundabout for several reasons.

1. I don't believe we should try out a solution like this on such a busy intersection. Our population is not used to roundabouts and Tank Farm Road is too important to experiment with. BJ-1

2. I believe bikes have a more difficult time navigating roundabouts.

3. I believe the additional cost and requirements on the developer are not warranted for this project.

Thanks for listening to my concerns. Please feel free to contact me at 545-5100 or the e-mail below for further clarification.

Thanks,

Jeff Buckingham
President
Blue Rooster Telecom
(805) 545-5100
jeff@blueroostertelecom.com
www.blueroostertelecom.com

Jeff Buckingham
Response to Comments

Comment #	Response
BJ-1	When roundabouts are first introduced to the public, educational outreach will be provided in order to reduce issues associated with motorist's unfamiliarity with a new traffic control device. The safety of bicyclists in roundabouts has been discussed in comment responses above, and it is believed that bicyclists will have no more difficulty navigating the roundabout, especially with the provided mixed-use path adjacent to the roadway, than they would with a traffic signal. The total cost for the roundabout is estimated to be $140,000 less than the single-eastbound-left-turn traffic signal, and $490,000 less than the dual-eastbound-left-turn traffic signal. Copies of the cost estimates for the roundabout can be obtained from the City of San Luis Obispo Community Development Department.

Dave Garth Consulting

OFFICE
2046 San Luis Dr.
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

PHONE
805-441-8448

EMAIL
dave@davegarth.com

WEB
www.davegarth.com

July 30, 2013

Phil Dunsmore
Senior Planner,
City of San Luis Obispo VIA email: pdunsmore@slocity.org

Dear Phil:

I wanted to take this opportunity to more fully explain my comments made at last week's Planning Commission meeting about the Chevron project and its EIR.

Over my almost 40 years as President/CEO of the Chamber of Commerce, I saw dozens of projects come before the City. Some were totally out of synch with community values, and there were no regrets when these projects eventually bit the dust.

But other projects came forth that almost everyone said they really wanted. These would have provided real community benefit--socially, economically and environmentally. Many of these projects never came to be because of over-reaching by planners and politicians. Especially when the applicants were perceived as having "deep pockets," there seemed to be an almost irresistible urge to require just one more "nice to have." At some point the applicants just felt taken advantage of, and walked away. DGC-1

My fear is that the Chevron project, one of the most important opportunities of our time, may end up with that same fate. Please keep this undesirable possibility in mind as you review this project.

Sincerely,

Dave Garth

David Garth Consulting
Response to Comments

Comment #	Response
DGC-1	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.

DIGITAL WEST

Digital West Networks. Inc. 3620 Sacramento Dr. #102 888.781.9378 TEL
www.digitalwest.net San Luis Obispo, CA 93401 805.781.9379 FAX

August 5, 2013

To: City of San Luis Obispo
Planning Department

Re: Chevron EIR

I am writing to address the Draft EIR for the Chevron project at Tank Farm. I am supportive of the project, of the efforts in Chevron has taken to support the City in it's infrastructure efforts for this region, and the project balance of open space, bike paths and commercial space that is needed in our community. DW-1

While I am in escrow to purchase a 5-acre commercial parcel in this area (directly adjacent to the Chevron property) and hope to help develop in this area, I am particularly interested in the proposed roundabout on Tank Farm Road at Santa Fe.

I have several objections to this proposed roundabout. In reading more about the safety, cost, traffic flow and general unfamiliarity of our community with this type of intersection, the negatives stack up very quickly. Each of these above concerns could stand alone as a key reason to reconsider this proposed element. DW-2

However, the key concern that I will note today is how this requirement will surely impact the ability to quickly develop the other projects in this area. One requirement of the proposed intersection states that Chevron must obtain the needed right-of-way from the owner adjacent to Tank Farm Road in order to accomplish this larger footprint intersection. Several elements of my project currently before City planning involve this same adjacent property. This requirement of Chevron will undoubtedly cause delays, and most likely impasses that will ultimately impact the completion of my project, among others. The uncertainty of their negotiation outcome puts direct project delays in place for our plans.

I appreciate that planning must play a big part in working through a large project like the Chevron proposal. I also appreciate that delays to my project as a result may not be a big factor in reconsidering an intersection. But since there are so many items that could quickly and inexpensively be resolved by sticking with a traditional signaled intersection, it makes no sense to me to move forward with the roundabout in this area of town that has such great potential. DW-3

Please consider removing the roundabout intersection requirement.

Tim Williams
Founder/CEO – Digital West Networks, Inc.

Connectivity Colocation Cloud Services

Digital West
Response to Comments

Comment #	Response
DW-1	With respect to safety, traffic flow, and driver familiarity, these issues will be, as previously discussed in above comment responses, handled by proper engineering in the roundabout's design, and with public outreach to educate motorists unfamiliar with the traffic control device. In terms of cost, the roundabout is estimated to be $140,000 less than the single-eastbound-left-turn traffic signal, and $490,000 less than the dual-eastbound-left-turn traffic signal. In terms of right-of-way requirements, the roundabout design is estimated to require 115,000 square feet or right-of-way compared to 143,600 square feet for the signalized intersection control option with a single eastbound left turn lane and 189,500 square feet for the dual eastbound left turn lane traffic signal option. Copies of the cost estimates for the roundabout can be obtained from the City of San Luis Obispo Community Development Department.
DW-2	As noted above, a signal would cost more than a roundabout at this location.
DW-3	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.

G.R. Flores
P.O. Box 14016
San Luis Obispo
California
93406

CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO
JUL 29 2013
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

July 23, 2013

Phil Dunsmore
City Of San Luis Obispo
Community Development Department
919 Palm Street
San Luis Obispo
California

To Phil Dunsmore,

San Luis Obispo has suffered every negative aspect of overdevelopment and poor city planning : over crowded/ghettoized neighborhoods, traffic/congestion, thick layer of smog, crime. The Chevron Corporation, which has moved into the real estate business, has proposed a development project that will add to this negativity. Chevron is proposing a project on petroleum damaged farmland/wetlands in a airport flight path. This petroleum damage being brought to the surface. During San Luis Obispo's recent waste water pipeline project along Tank Farm Road. Even at 45 m.p.h., the petroleum stench was overwhelming. Which was reinforced by the visual, of the excavation crew wearing chemical respirators. Respirators similar to the respirator's used in the automotive paint trade. FGR-1

This proposed project not only, making San Luis Obispo a more undesirable place to live. Will potentially set up San Luis Obispo for numerous lawsuits : petroleum damage liability, destruction of farmland/wetlands, dangers associated with building in a airport flight path. But, San Luis Obispo seems really intent on repeating the mistakes of other municipalities.

Thank you for your time,
G.R. Flores
G.R. Flores

G.R. Flores
Response to Comments

Comment #	Response
FGR-1	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.

Clayton U. Hall
660 Rancho Oaks Drive
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
(805) 503-9612

August 2, 2013

Transmitted via E-Mail and U.S. Mail
Mr. Phil Dunsmore
Senior Planner
City of San Luis Obispo
919 Palm Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-3218

Re: **San Luis Obispo Tank Farm Road Project (Chevron)**

Dear Mr. Dunsmore:

I am a member of a parent group that has been in discussions with Bill Almas of Chevron with regards to the development of baseball/softball fields on part of the subject property. We have been involved in those discussions with Mr. Almas since 2007. Chevron has provided a conditional letter of commitment to us supporting the development of those fields. As you may be aware, there is a significant shortage of youth baseball/softball facilities within the San Luis Obispo area.

The purpose of this letter is to strongly urge that the City expedite the development agreement process, EIR certification, and the logical annexation of the Chevron property into the City of San Luis Obispo. The City has an opportunity to help realize a long-term community vision for the airport area, including the development of needed recreational facilities for the youth of our community. The Chevron property on Tank Farm Road represents the largest remaining piece of undeveloped property adjacent to the City. We need to get this plan approved and the project on track as soon as possible. I believe that it is absolutely vital to the feature of San Luis Obispo and, in our case, its youth. HCU-1

As noted above, Chevron has generously provided our group a conditional letter of commitment to allow for the development of baseball and softball facilities for the benefit of the youth of our community. While we recognize that this is a multi-faceted and multi-phased project, we are ready, willing and able to proceed with the development in conjunction with Chevron's overall development plans. HCU-2

Now is the time to make this happen. While we recognize that our children's children may be the future beneficiaries, we must act now to get this project rolling.

HCU-2 continued

I thank you for your anticipated assistance in pushing forward with this project for the benefit of the youth of our community.

Very truly yours,

CLAYTON U. HALL

Clayton U. Hall
Response to Comments

Comment #	Response
HCU-1	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
HCU-2	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.

Phil,

I greatly enjoyed your presentation this past Wednesday. I have an information request which – hopefully – you can assist me with.

Can the Engineering Dept. generate a color map with major dimensioning for that part of Tank Farm Road from its intersection with Broad Street / Hwy 227 westward to just west of the proposed intersection with the straightened Santa Fee Road? Printed or – preferred – as an printable e-document would be most appreciated.

My personal concern is with all that will happen on and to Tank Farm Road over the next two to five years:

- The MindBody campus and parking garage with its unsignalized intersection with Tank Farm,
- The City's apparent requirement that MindBody install a raised median to better demark left turn and straight through lanes west from its parking garage intersection to just before or just past the present driveway into United Rentals
- And some, most or all of the planned intersection of Tank Farm and realigned Santa Fee. HDC-1

Here at San Luis Paper Co. (625 Tank Farm Road), we receive between one and five or more large trucks (stretch conventional cab with jumbo sleeper and 56 foot trailer) daily conveying inbound freight vital to my company's operations.

Presently, these trucks strongly prefer to arrive at our driveway west bound on TFR and make a wide left turn into our facility. Making a right turn into our driveway from the current east bound TFR lane is very difficult because of the tight driveway entrance (a lovely "grandfather" from the County) and the need to clear the fencing installed by Souza Construction with the rear of the trailer.

When departing our facility after unloading, these same trucks currently must make a left hand exit turn into the west bound TRF lane to clear other beside the drive way obstacles. I am a former teamster with a lot of long truck experience. With the cooperation of many truck operators, we have tried but can't make a right hand turn onto TFR east bound without putting

the tractor all the way over into the west bound lane because of property corners signs and a well loaded PG&E power pole.

Customers visiting our front desk for “Will Call” are faced with the same problems of entry and exit throughout the day. To date, both San Luis Paper and our customers have been very lucky that no collisions have happened. There have been a number of very close calls and at least one “mirror clicking” event.

HDC-1 continued

As for my delivery fleet, we deliberately route our trucks for a right turn exit to east bound TFR and a right turn entrance from the east bound TFR.

Phil, the requested “map” will be very helpful in keeping my landlord and our many neighbors apprised of plans as they develop. My emphasis will be encouraging their rational input to the planning process along with increasing their “No Big Surprises” knowledge level.

Finally, please feel free to contact me at any time by phone (office: 544-5656, cell: 431-3697) by fax (544-5680) or by e-mail (slpaper@slpaper.com). I do want to be a positive force out here “in the sticks” as TFR grows and matures during the coming years.

Yours,

Douglas C. Hoffman
President & Owner
San Luis Paper Co., Inc.

Douglas C. Hoffman
Response to Comments

Comment #	Response
HDC-1	The proposed roundabout design will accommodate trucks with sleeper cabins and 56-foot trailers. Although not a roundabout-related issue, the inbound and outbound truck turning issues described in the comment will be aided by the widening of Tank Farm Road from 2 to 4 lanes. The proposed improvements will have a beneficial effect on this nearby driveway, rather than deleterious effect. The issues raised related to other development projects to the east are outside the purview of this EIR.

From: Eugene H. Jud [mailto:ejud@calpoly.edu]
Sent: Thursday, August 01, 2013 12:15 PM
To: Dunsmore, Phil
Subject: Statements about the DEIR of the Chevron Project on Tank Farm Road

Dear Mr. Dunsmore,

We take the liberty to comment as follows:

1. **Remediation Project**
For hauling contaminated soil away consider use of *rail*. JEH-1

2. **Development Project**
2.1. Traffic Model

Attitudes towards traffic are changing nationwide. For example teenagers get their driver's licenses later and buy cars later, and traffic volumes are not growing in many locations, even after the recession. The existing city traffic model appears to be a "pre-recession" model and may produce traffic projections which are too high. The proposed land uses for buildings will produce relatively high volumes of vehicular traffic. JEH-2
The level of service calculations should be *multi-modal* and include pedestrians, bicycles, and transit.

2.2. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) under Air Quality section 6b

We propose the following changes: JEH-3
Under section a) The correct wording would be *electric* vehicle charging station

Under section c) add:
(10) Offer minimal amount of parking spaces with possibility of expanding later when needed (*deferred infrastructure*);
(11) *Biennial monitoring of traffic volumes* and mode choice during the duration of the project, equipping vital intersections with traffic counters; JEH-4
(12) Mandatory *TDM plans for special events*;
(13) Remain open to *ideas of Cal Poly students* studying transportation;
(14) *Guaranteed ride home program*, used as a "safety valve" in case of an emergency at home;

Under section i) advocate *RIDE-ON* services, especially a lunch time shuttle
Under section j) offer also on-site *automatic banking* JEH-5
Under section k) ...improve the pedestrian/*bicycle* environment

Thank you for considering our comments

Eugene Jud FITE, Michael Falcone EIT at Cal Poly

Eugene Jud, Fellow Institute of Transportation Engineers ITE
Jud Consultants
665 Leff St., San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
Phone: (805) 549-8185;
E-mail: jud4eugene@aol.com or ejud@calpoly.edu
www.judcons.com, http://ceenve3.calpoly.edu/jud

Michael Falcone
2102 Loomis Dr. San Luis Obispo, CA 93405
Phone: (661) 993-4798
Email: mjfalcon@calpoly.edu

Eugene H. Jud
Response to Comments

Comment #	Response
JEH-1	Comment suggests using rail to haul contaminated soil. Because no rail line serves the site, it would still be necessary to truck contaminated soil to the nearest rail depot. This would not reduce or eliminate the impacts identified in the EIR.
JEH-2	Comment refers to the City's traffic model and notes that it may produce traffic volumes which are too high. The City's Transportation Demand Model is a locally calibrated, validated model developed to meet or exceed industry standards, and is therefore an appropriate tool for forecasting travel.
JEH-3	The wording has been changed to "electric vehicle charging station" in mitigation measure AQ-6b(a).
JEH-4	The items requested have not been added to the mitigation measure AQ-6b. The deferred infrastructure would have to be determined by the City or County as specific development projects are proposed. The traffic monitoring requirement would be met by the City/County as part of their ongoing traffic monitoring programs. The TDM plan for special events would be dealt with as part of any permit needed for special events. The last two items would not serve to reduce air emissions.
JEH-5	On-site automatic banking has been added to the mitigation measure AQ-6b(e). The mitigation measure already has a requirement for a lunch time shuttle. The word "bicycle" has been added to the mitigation measure AQ-6b(g).

To: City of San Luis Obispo, Planning Department
Attn: Phil Dunsmore

Dear Phil,

I would like to put in writing the public comment I made on July 24th regarding the Chevron Project.

My message was a reminder to the commissioners that development projects mixed with environmental protections can be done successfully, when undertaken in a timely fashion. LD-1

After listening to other testimonies that evening, I heard members of our community concerned about bicycle path protections and accessibility. As Tank Farm Road is a major thoroughfare for SLO City, I would agree that a separate and safe cycle road is a very important feature. However, any cycling road enhancement to the existing plan must not require excessive time or investment to incorporate. LD-2

A greater concern is that if the process becomes too cumbersome and delayed, the applicant may just walk away. That means the cyclists and the rest of the community would be stuck without any improvements or expansion.

As a community liaison for a large project that impacts the community where it is being built, I strongly believe in the importance of listening and addressing all concerns. With that being said, there are situations which require the larger goal of project completion, for the benefit of the many. The years of collaborative efforts undertaken by applicant need to be recognized as well as the financial constraints that all projects must live within. LD-3

In actuality, the Chevron project can truly offer something for everyone – the city can incorporate the project area, we can seize the opportunity to obtain the infrastructure necessary to enhance this critically important corridor for all modes of transportation. Again, if approved in a timely manner, the Chevron project will keep the city's economic momentum going resulting in jobs, beautifully restored open space and more of the smart growth for which our community is known. LD-4

Sending best wishes to city staff and planning commission to keep up the good work and move us forward.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Dawn Legg
2480 Parkland Terrace
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Dawn Legg
Response to Comments

Comment #	Response
LD-1	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
LD-2	Comment refers to bicycle paths, and the desire that the improvements must not require excessive time or investment to incorporate lest the applicant walk away. The provision of bicycle facilities as proposed by the project have been reviewed in the context of the City's Bicycle Transportation Plan, which has solicited input on a regular basis from interested cyclists and reflects their desires. The mitigation measures were developed to achieve the goals of the BTP.
LD-3	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
LD-4	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.

CHEVRON TANK FARM ROAD EIR COMMENTS

Aug 5, 2013

City of San Luis Obispo
c/o Phil Dunsmore
Community Development
990 Palm
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Dear Phil,

This letter extends several pages and covers a few topics, because of this, and assuming there are many letters of this nature being received on the Chevron Project, I decided to break it into sections. The *Executive Summary* outlines our family's position and thoughts, the *Supporting Data* gives you the background, and the *Closing* is more of the traditional letter summary. At the bottom of the letter are the references used for the data in my supporting data section. If there are any further questions of my Wife, Trudie Safreno or myself, Ty Safreno, please call us during work hours. Ty Safreno's direct number 548-1213, Trudie Safreno's direct number 548-1224.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Trudie and I support the Chevron Tank Farm Road DEIR in all aspects except the addition of the Roundabout on the intersection of Tank Farm Road and the Santa Fe Road realignment. The roundabout is of specific concern to us; our 610 Tank Farm property has 90 degrees of the roundabout passing thru it. Although evidence of roundabout safety and cost was presented by the City Planner on this project, my research shows discrepancies and limited effort to present a balanced and fair assessment to the Planning Commission. Research shows roundabouts do reduce fatal accidents, however in double lane roundabouts my research shows a significant increase in rear-end, side swipe, and median collisions. Pedestrian and Bike accidents also increase in double lane roundabouts due to the unpredictability of inside lane drivers quickly exiting the traffic pattern. I also have personal experience in Pleasanton where my father had his first accident in 20 years on a new roundabout. Due to the frequency of accidents on the roundabouts, the city of Pleasanton reversed its position and within 2 years, at their cost, they replaced all the roundabouts, and put in a traditional traffic regulation system. When estimated costs for ROW and wet land mitigation are included, the roundabout costs will add up to be $1,100,000 dollars more than a traditional traffic signal. STT-1

SUPPORTING DATA

Trudie and I own the 610 Tank Farm Road lot located to the East of the Phase 1 aspect of the Chevron project. The property was purchased in 2005 for a new Trust Automation facility. We are the owners and founders of Trust Automation which just received the Small Business Administration's Central STT-2

California Business of the Year Award. We needed to expand and wanted to own our new facility instead of rent. The 610 Tank Farm property was well suited for an owner builder with a lean budget. A couple years into the project we abandoned the idea of building our new 100,000sf high tech manufacturing facility on the lot and instead rented the building we now occupy on 143 Suburban Road. What killed the project was an increase in construction fees that added 20% to the cost of the facility. This fee increase occurred, against our wishes, when the lot was annexed into the City of San Luis Obispo against our wishes. The above does not directly relate to this letter or the EIR, but it is a plea to not burden the Chevron Project with lots of "Want to Haves", but instead stick to "Need to Haves". As results of the cities want to have, this property will remain vacant and used as a storage yard for the foreseeable future. STT-2 continued

Even though our 610 Tank Farm property has the North East 90 degree quadrant of the roundabout going thru it, we never had anyone from the planning department reach out to us to discuss. It was not until a letter circulating thru the business community about the Chevron DEIR and the roundabout that I became aware that the roundabout on Tank Farm and Santa Fe Road had been included again as part of the intersection design. In 2006 when our offsite improvement project was working thru the planning process with the County, the roundabout was pushed as the future solution for the intersection. After many discussions with the County Planning department it was finally decided a Traffic Light intersection would be a better fit and we built the existing road width and sidewalk, curb, and gutter improvements for a Traffic Light Intersection. My surprise at a roundabout once again being considered at this intersection prompted my comments at the August Planning Commission meeting, and this letter reinforcing that we are not welcoming a loss in our property size nor do we support the ROW needed for the roundabout traffic metering approach. STT-3

It was determined during our original County Planning process for this intersection that a roundabout in a two lane industrial connector where many Tractor Trailer WB-50+ Trucks will need to make what amounts to a 270 degree turn, East on Tank Farm from 101 to North on Santa Fe Road was not a suitable solution to this intersection. I now realize after doing research on roundabouts, and in particular double lane roundabouts that only a roundabout of a much greater size would be feasible in this location. A double lane modern roundabout designed for Tractor Trailer traffic of WB-50 to WB67 length must be significantly larger than 210 feet in diameter to be safe[Note 1]. The prior referenced information uses the 206 foot in diameter Arizona Happy Valley roundabout case study. The proposed Tank Farm roundabout is approx. 200 feet in diameter. Further, the Happy Valley study points out that trucks in the WB-50 to WB-67 class had many tip over accidents [Note 1]. STT-4

> Trucks have sometimes tipped at a very low speed (10–15 miles per hour), and the physics are not due to a single radius but a combination of speed, mass, center of gravity and successive curves rocking the suspension at a critical frequency [Note 1]

To accommodate a roundabout of an appropriate size for the double lanes and the heavy Tractor Trailer traffic a larger ROW will be needed on our 610 Tank Farm property. The same study outlined the consequences of the 210 foot roundabout.

ten months of crash data showed increased crash rates (259 percent in the east roundabout and 55 percent in the west roundabout), including five overturned trucks. (see "truck overturns" for several possible explanations.) injuries per year (seven) also doubled, although severity was low. in 2007, the arizona department of transportation directed a study to evaluate the interchange [Note 1].

STT-4 continued

During the August Planning Commission meeting there were many slides presented, including slides added to the presentation on the last day which the public did not have a chance to review. These slides showed the wonderful benefits of modern roundabouts. I asked for the data to support these slides and Phil Dunsmore was very helpful in sending the supporting data to me the next day. When I opened his email I was shocked to find that all the cities data was from one You-Tube video by the FHWA produced in 2010. What was presented was a classic example of statistics at work without the data to validate interpretation, or what is known as proofiness. I believe it is true that modern roundabouts reduce the number of fatal accidents in community and possibly heavy truck traffic intersections, however in many documented examples they increase non-fatal accidents significantly, and are only effective when made of sufficient size for the traffic they are managing.

From the Times Union

Although the rotaries are built to ease congestion and lessen serious injuries, data obtained by the Times Union show the number of Collisions increased after most of the roundabouts opened in the Capital Region.

STT-5

Aggressive drivers are speeding through rotaries and failing to yield the right of way, said Mark Kennedy, director of traffic and safety for the state Department of Transportation in the Capital Region. "We have found that single-lane roundabouts definitely reduce accidents," he said, referring to the state rotaries. "With Multi-lane roundabouts, some are better, some are worse. There are two that are somewhat problematic.

In Malta, the roundabout at Route 9, Route 67 and Dunning Street went from an average of 7.8 crashes a year before the rotary to 45.7 a year afterward. In Bethlehem, the number of accidents at the New Scott Road and route 140 jumped from an average of 9.6 a year to 38.3.

Two years ago, the state changed the signs and pavement markings at the Malta roundabout to help lessen the number of accidents.

"Those measures were not effective," Kennedy said.

Accidents in roundabouts tend to be less severe that at intersections with traffic lights. Rather than crash into each other head on or smack in a T-bone crash, as drivers make lefts at conventional traffic lights do, drivers in roundabouts tend to sideswipe and rear-end each other. Note 2

From New Berlin Now

Are roundabouts dangerous? So far, yes

"I don't like them," he said. "They're not as safe as they wanted them to be. People don't know if they should yield or go, and that creates a hazard.

In fact, new figures from the city show that drivers were more likely to have a crash in the Moorland Road/Rock Ridge roundabout last year than at any other major intersection in New Berlin.

He said the number of accidents at the Rock Ridge/Moorland Road roundabout is significantly higher than what it was at the two intersections with traffic lights in that section of the road that were replaced by the roundabout. Note 3

From Herald-Tribune

Confused in roundabouts? So is law enforcement.

Sousa is not the only driver who has suffered from this paradox. On March 29, the FHP cited a school bus driver under almost identical circumstances. There are undoubtedly more, although no one has accident statistics for the intersection since the roundabout was installed. Note 4

STT-5 continued

Wisconsin TOPS, Traffic Operations and Safety Laboratory

While roundabouts are still fairly new in the U.S. and Wisconsin, their safety benefits have been studies with varied results.

For all injury (A, B, and C) crashes, the number of locations with a reduction in these crash types were greater than the number of locations with increases in these crash types.

When examining crash type, researchers found that roundabouts changed the crash types that occur at intersections from more severe crash types like angle and head-on to less severe crash types such as sideswipe and single vehicle crashes. Note 5

Transport Canada, Government of Canada

2.2 Road User Challenges

From a safety, mobility and emissions perspective roundabouts are highly beneficial for light vehicle motorists. However, their continuous flow can present challenges for pedestrians, especially blind pedestrians and bicyclists. Pedestrians can be accommodated easily at single-lane roundabouts, where safety is improved because of the splitter island that allows pedestrians to deal

with crossing one direction of traffic at a time. However multi-lane facilities require careful placement of crosswalks and design of signals. Signals should use offset phases to avoid traffic backing up into a circulatory roadway. Note 6

STT-5 continued

From Lincoln Journal Star, Roundabout could be top crash site for 2012

The 14th and Superior Street roundabout will likely land in the top spot for crashes in 2012. Note 7

Closer to home for both the City of San Luis Obispo, and for myself personally, Pleasanton California removed roundabouts from a new road connecting a new development with the city of Pleasanton. My father was one of the accidents involved on these roundabouts which served as a connection from his street to the new artillery road. It was these types of accidents and concern for public safety that prompted the removal of newly installed roundabouts. It is also important for the City of San Luis Obispo to understand the removal and conversion of these intersections to traditional traffic management system was now the city of Pleasanton's expense since the developer had fulfilled their original obligation of putting in the roundabouts.

STT-6

From Contra Costa Times, Pleasanton to remove some roundabouts

Jun 28 – Prompted by traffic accidents and numerous complaints from residents, Pleasanton will remove the concrete roundabouts on Vineyard Avenue and Thiessen Sreet this summer.

The city is getting rid of the circles in favor of traditional traffic calming methods – Stop Signs and, if needed later, traffic signals. Note 8

CLOSING

Tank Farm is an industrial connector with high tractor trailer traffic, WB-50+ size vehicles. For industrial traffic and especially Tractor Trailer traffic a roundabout not only takes more space than a traditional Traffic light, but with the Class 1 or 2 bike path planned thru that intersection increases the likely hood of congestion or accidents. The large vehicles serving the airport area businesses from the 101 corridor will also soon support the new manufacturing and business park lots proposed by the Chevron EIR and approved for our 610 Tank Farm Lot. A roundabout at the Tank Farm Road and Santa Fe Road realignment intersection, as currently designed, or if designed to a practical size, is not appropriate for this intersection.

STT-7

A Multi-Lane roundabout would be safe for pedestrians and bicyclists only with significant changes to the current design resulting in major ROW requirements for Chevron and likely causing the project to be unfeasible. The town of San Luis Obispo should support Chevron in the development of this area to encourage High Tech companies to move and build in the city and not outside in the county which is currently the trend.

My wife and I, who are stake holders, because of our 610 Tank Farm property and its proximity to the Tank Farm and Santa Fe road roundabout, do not support this type of traffic regulating system. The original design for a signal at this intersection is what is needed and appropriate and the current offsite infrastructure we installed was done with a signal in mind. Now is not the time for San Luis Obispo to experiment with a roundabout in a high traffic location in the hopes of showing how it can be done. This makes this intersection a social experiment and a "Want to Have" not a "Need to Have". STT-7 continued

We do support the development of the Chevron Property and its phased implementation. The Tank Farm corridor has needed improvement for many years and their willingness to "pay it forward" in this area is a great benefit to the city and future businesses. STT-8

Sincerely,

Ty and Trudie Safreno
28 year residents of San Luis Obispo and Owners of 610 Tank Farm Road

Note 1: Trucks in Roundabouts: Pitfalls in Design and Operation, ITE Journal February 2009.

Note 2: Times Union, Monday, June 27, 2011, Tim Obrien staff writer

Note 3: New Berlin Now, September 1st, 2009. Are Roundabouts dangerous? So far, yes

Note 4: Herald-Tribune, Thursday May 17th, 2012, Eric Ernst writer

Note 5: Comprehensive Evaluation of Wisconsin Roundabouts Volume 2: Traffic Safety. Wisconsin TOPS, Traffic Operations and Safety Laboratory.

Note 6: Government of Canada, Transport Canada, Study of Environmental, Enconomic, Safety & Social Benefits of Roundabouts.

Note 7: Lincoln Journal Star, Government and Politics, January 6, 2013, Nancy Hicks staff writer.

Note 8: Contra Costa Times (Walnut Creek, CA) June 28, 2006, Malaika Fraley writer.

Ty and Trudie Safreno
Response to Comments

Comment #	Response
STT-1	As referenced in the comment, research indicates a reduction in fatal and injury accidents following the installation of a roundabout. Research also indicates, contrary to the comment, a reduction in total collisions for all roundabouts, including multi-lane roundabouts. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), for example, published Roundabouts: An Informal Guide, in which statistics indicated that roundabout installation led to a 37% reduction in total collisions for multi-lane roundabouts, and a 31% reduction in fatal or injury collisions for multi-lane roundabouts (Exhibit 5-9, page 112). The FHWA publication acknowledges that multi-lane roundabouts increase vehicular conflict points over single-lane roundabouts. However, as stated on page 108, "the most severe vehicular crossing conflicts are eliminated and replaced by less severe merging conflicts. The additional conflicts unique to multilane roundabouts are generally low-speed sideswipe conflicts that typically have low severity. Therefore, although the number of conflict points increases at multilane roundabouts when compared to single lane roundabouts, the overall severity of conflicts is generally less than alternative intersection control." The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS) published Crash Reductions Following Installation of Roundabouts in the United States indicates a 15% reduction in collisions at multi-lane roundabouts. They also conclude that "multilane roundabouts do seem to be effective in eliminating most incapacitating injury crashes". With respect to bicycles and pedestrians, bicyclists will be provided the option to enter the roundabout as a vehicle or to divert from the Class II bike lane prior to entering the roundabout, onto a mixed use path, to navigate the roundabout as a pedestrian would. Less experienced bicyclist will follow the signage to exit the roundabout and navigate as a pedestrian on the mixed-use path, where conflict points are reduced in a multi-lane roundabout in comparison to a stop-controlled or signalized intersection.
STT-2	Comment refers to the desire to not burden the applicant with 'lots of "Want to Haves"' instead of "Need to Haves". The project has been reviewed in the context of applicable City policy documents, and mitigations are identified accordingly.
STT-3	The roundabout design is estimated to require 115,000 square feet or right-of-way compared to 143,600 square feet for the signalized intersection control option with a single eastbound left turn lane and 189,500 square feet for the dual eastbound left turn lane traffic signal option. The roundabout option also allows more flexibility in locating the actual intersection, since the design can be shifted a certain amount in any direction to avoid critical right-of-way intrusions. With a signalized intersection on this major east/west roadway, the intersection can only be shifted east or west, as any shift north or south would skew the intersection.

STT-4	Excessive speed issues, visibility issues, and truck maneuverability issues are not controlled by roundabout diameter so much as they are by proper roundabout design. The comment cites the Happy Valley roundabouts in Arizona as an example of a 210' diameter roundabout that did not operate properly, and produced collisions and truck overturns. The roundabouts at Happy Valley were later redesigned, but the improperly engineering of the old design was not related to roundabout diameter. The corrected new design maintains the same diameter, but re-engineered many of the roundabout features to increase safety, as shown in the figures below. *Old Design (not-to-scale)* *New Design (not-to-Scale)*
STT-5	In the cited article from the Times-Union, the article's author states that single-lane roundabouts definitely reduce accidents, and that some multi-lane roundabouts are better, and some are worse. This anecdotal evidence runs contrary to studies by FHWA and IIHS that state multi-lane roundabouts reduce the number of and severity of collisions. Proper engineering design for multi-lane roundabouts is critical to creating a safe traffic control. Public outreach to inform a public unfamiliar with roundabouts on proper navigation is also important to reducing a spike in collisions immediately following the installation of a roundabout. Furthermore, although the article cites two locations where total crashes increased a year after the roundabout was installed, the article concedes that roundabout collisions are less severe than signalized intersections. A reduction in fatality and injury collisions should still be considered a net safety benefit, even if there is an interim increase in non-injury collisions while drivers acclimate to a traffic control device they are not yet familiar with. In the cited article from New Berlin Now, an unattributed quote states that the roundabout installed at a particular location is unsafe because people don't know if they should yield or go. The article also indicates that collisions have increased at the roundabout location compared to the two traffic signals it replaced. It is unclear however if those collisions were more or less severe than previously. In the cited Herald-Tribune article, it is stated that law enforcement is confused about roundabouts but it is not clear for what reason. The article also

	indicates that accident statistics for the intersection have not been collected since the roundabout was installed. The cited article from Wisconsin TOPS, Traffic Operations and Safety Laborator, indicates that injury crashes have been reduced at more locations that they have increased, because of the shift from angle and head-on collisions at traffic signals to sideswipes and single vehicle crashes. This evidence supports the increased safety provided by roundabout control. The cited article from Transport Canada indicates that safety, mobility and emissions are improved with roundabouts. However, the article states that single-lane roundabouts increase pedestrian safety, but that in multi-lane roundabouts, careful design, including placement of crosswalks, is required. The proposed roundabout will be designed properly to safely handle pedestrian traffic, which is relatively low in the study area. Lastly, the article from Lincoln Journal Star indicates that a particular roundabout in town would likely land the top spot for crashes in 2012. However, no context is given to this quote as to whether the collisions at the intersection were higher or lower with a signalized intersection, or whether the collisions were non-injury in nature versus injury or fatal. Overall, while it is understood that roundabouts, especially when improperly engineered, can be associated with temporary spikes in non-injury collisions and that installing a roundabout will not necessarily reduce collisions to levels lower than all other intersections in a particular area, it is also known that the safety increases of roundabouts versus signals is well documented in quantitative studies. The safety of a roundabout is also not tied to the diameter of the roundabout so much as it is dependent on proper engineering of modern roundabout design features. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), for example, published Roundabouts: An Informal Guide, in which statistics indicated that roundabout installation led to a 51% reduction in total collisions (37% reduction for multi-lane), and a 73% reduction in fatal or injury collisions (31% for multi-lane). The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS) published Crash Reductions Following Installation of Roundabouts in the United States indicates a 15% reduction in collisions at multi-lane roundabouts. They also conclude that “multilane roundabouts do seem to be effective in eliminating most incapacitating injury crashes”.
STT-6	The comment cites personal anecdotal evidence indicating that roundabouts in the City of Pleasanton were unsafe, leading to their removal. The cited article indicates that the roundabouts were removed also due to complaints from residents. However, no statistics are provided indicating that collisions increased. Historical imagery on Google Earth reveals that the roundabouts in question were single-lane traffic circles and not roundabouts as they lacked the design features of a properly-engineered modern roundabout. One such feature is the

	deflection at the entry to slow entering traffic. The comment is acknowledged but does not appear relevant to the proposed roundabout.
STT-7	The comment states that the roundabout must be larger than a traffic signal in order to support circulation of WB-50, or larger, trucks. However, as previously stated, the roundabout design is estimated to require less right-of-way than either of the signalized intersection alternatives. The multi-lane roundabout, as proposed, does not require any changes to design to safely accommodate pedestrian and bicycle traffic.
STT-8	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.

SESLOC
FEDERAL CREDIT UNION

Post Office Box 5360
San Luis Obispo, CA 93403-5360
805.543.1816

July 31, 2013

CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO
JUL 31 2013
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Eric Meyer, Planning Commission Chair
c/o Phil Dunsmore, Senior Planner
City of San Luis Obispo Engineering
919 Palm Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-3271

Subject: Tank Farm Area Traffic Circulation

Dear Mr. Meyer and Mr. Dunsmore,

I am writing on behalf of the Board of Directors and Management of SESLOC Federal Credit Union regarding the proposal detailed at the July 24, 2013, San Luis Obispo Planning Commission meeting regarding Chevron's draft EIR for the Tank Farm area. Our concern stems from the City's recommendation to install a multi-lane roundabout at the intersection of Tank Farm Road and Santa Fe Road. Our concern further expands to traffic control on Tank Farm Road beyond the Chevron project and extends to the total traffic flow pattern at Tank Farm and Broad.

SESLOC Federal Credit Union commenced physical construction of a 44,000 square foot administration center and credit union branch on the lots at 3807 and 3855 Broad Street (at Industrial) on June 24, 2013. Occupancy is scheduled for August of 2014. The credit union will have approximately 80 employees on site at occupancy, along with approximately 22,000 member visits monthly. Tank Farm Road is a major west-east arterial for our members and employees and is already identified on City maps as the designated truck route for the southern portion of San Luis Obispo. SES-1

SESLOC is concerned about the safety and congestion the roundabout will cause. The Chevron development calls for 800,000 square feet of commercial and light industrial development to provide the income offset for the environmental remediation and improvements. Light industrial business will attract even more trucks for the transport of products and merchandise; this will result in a higher degree of visibility-impacting vehicles in the circular flow of a roundabout.

The traffic on Tank Farm must be considered in a global view. SESLOC has also heard unofficially that there is some momentum for a signal to be placed by the MindBody development between Santa Fe Road and Broad. SESLOC opposes any consideration the City might give to this request. Our permitting has required the credit union to design and build 50% of a private road on the back portion of our property. This road will move visitors to our developed parcels and provide easier in and out from the development without causing significant impact to the corner of Tank Farm and Broad. In discussions with the City during the planning phase, SESLOC was advised the exit on Tank Farm would be a "right-in, right out" access. This road has been specified by the City as a *private* road and it is built to private road standards (likened to the boulevard running between Home Depot and New Frontiers) The installation of a signal at Tank Farm effectively makes it a public road connecting motorists to Industrial Way and significantly increases the potential daily trips, the potential for accidents, and SESLOC's liability. SES-2

Many of the public comments at the Planning Commission meeting expressed concern about safe crossings for both bicyclists and pedestrians midway on Tank Farm. It appears that a signal at Santa Fe Road would address many issues. It would move traffic congestion further away from Broad, and would allow employees in the new MindBody development on Tank Farm approaching east to west to make a safe U-turn on an arrow and an easy right turn into their new location. It would allow pedestrians and bikers a dedicated time to cross safely while traffic is stopped. And it would allow large impact trucks the ability to move without blocking other vehicles in a roundabout. SES-3

We urge the City to make thoughtful and appropriate decisions for traffic along Tank Farm, and one that includes a signal at Santa Fe Road.

If you would like to discuss this further, please feel free to call me at 543-1818 x201.

Sincerely,

Geri LaChance
President/CEO

SESLLOC Federal Credit Union
Response to Comments

Comment #	Response
SES-1	The proper design of the roundabout will ensure that trucks will be able to safely and efficiently navigate the intersection. As discussed in previous comment responses above, the safety benefits of a properly-engineered roundabout are documented.
SES-2	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
SES-3	The safety of pedestrians and bicyclists in roundabouts versus signals is increased due to the reduction of conflict points with motorists in the intersections. With respect to westbound U-Turns at the traffic signal being "safe", it will be statistically safer to perform that same U-Turn movement in the proposed roundabout due to the reduction in conflict points through the intersection, and the reduced chance of collisions, especially injury and fatality collisions, documented in roundabout intersections (as discussed in previous comment responses above).

From: Steve Souza [mailto:ssouza@souzaconstructioninc.com]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 3:37 PM
To: Dunsmore, Phil
Subject: Tank Farm Road Roundabout

Dear Mr. Dunsmore:

As a property owner adjoining the Chevron Project, and whose frontage on Tank Farm Road at Santa Fe will be impacted by the roadway improvements contained in the Draft EIR, we have some serious concerns regarding the construction of a roundabout on Tank Farm Road. We will argue that this roundabout should not be a part of the only arterial roadway serving the airport area. We own the 6.9 acres on the corner of Tank Farm and Santa Fe Roads, and operate our business from this property. Large semi-trucks travel in and out of our yard (office) all day long. I cannot imagine that a roundabout in this location would not further degrade the flow of traffic in and out of the airport area. We have been hoping to see an upgraded circulation element that would benefit the long term transportation needs in the airport area, which would include an efficient connection to Highway 101. We believe that bike lanes are important and should be provided for in all projects where appropriate, however, Tank Farm Road should remain an arterial roadway. SSA-1

We will strongly oppose the current design of the future Tank Farm-Santa Fe intersection if a roundabout is included.

Sincerely:

Steve A. Souza
President
Souza Construction, Inc.
P.O. Box 3810
San Luis Obispo, CA 93403
Office: (805) 546-8288
Fax: (805) 546-8287
ssouza@souzaconstructioninc.com

Steve A. Souza
Response to Comments

Comment #	Response
SSA-1	Rather than degrade traffic flow, as indicated in the comment, the roundabout will improve traffic flow over a stop-controlled or signalized intersection, by maintaining continuous flow at most times of the day, and reducing delay and queuing during peak hours. The comment appears to indicate that roundabouts are inconsistent with arterial roadway designations, which is not the case. Roundabouts are commonly installed on arterial roadways in order to maintain traffic flow at acceptable levels where an otherwise much larger signalized intersection would be required.

-----Original Message-----
From: John A. Spatafore [mailto:jasspat@charter.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 30, 2013 9:57 AM
To: Dunsmore, Phil
Subject: Annexation

I fully support the annexation of the Chevron property. It will benefit SLO in many ways for years to come. SPJ-1

As I stated at the Planning Commission meeting please include the studies related to the Prado road extension which will enhance safety response time in that area and mitigate the impact with the annexation. Furthermore annexation will allow an orderly and natural migration of light industrial uses from the Broad/Victoria area to the new commercial sites. This will also allow the creation of more pedestrian, neighborhood and retail commercial friendly applications on Broad/Victoria streets. SPJ-2 SPJ-3

Thank you for your kind consideration.

John Spatafore

John Spatafore
Response to Comments

Comment #	Response
SPJ-1	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
SPJ-2	The Prado Road Extension is discussed in Section 4.3, Traffic and Circulation. The City's plan for the Prado Road extension is to build it concurrently with development of the Margarita Area. The respective properties would dedicate all right-of-way for the road in fee and also dedicate access control at the time of development. During initial development of the Margarita Area, the developers would construct or fund the construction of the two lanes of roadway, one bike path, and one sidewalk with street lighting. Because the City can only ask for "fair share" funding from the Applicant for this Project, it is unknown whether funding from other developers the Margarita Area developers would be available in a timeframe that would allow this road extension to be implemented as part of the Phase I Project development. Mitigation Measure T-5a through T-5i adequately mitigates this projects fair share of this cumulative impact.
SPJ-3	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.

From: John Summer [mailto:jsummer@taylorfrigon.com]
Sent: Monday, August 05, 2013 12:01 PM
To: Dunsmore, Phil
Subject: Tank Farm proposal

Hi Phil. Hope I'm getting this to you in time regarding the Tank Farm proposal. Here's my take:

When I arrived in San Luis Obispo nearly 20 years ago, one of the first streets I traversed town on was something called "Tank Farm Road". I thought it odd then… as I do today, that such a vast and largely unattractive region was left to languish. I learned its history and understand the reasons why the Tank Farm district has presented somewhat of a conundrum for development, but the time has come to take action.

As a father of three and coach of many others in various sports, it's always seemed strange that a community that prides itself on being "family friendly" has never taken Grand Steps to address the lack of sporting fields in the area. True, the Garcia soccer fields adjacent to Tank Farm were a start. But being blessed with the climate and amenities that draw visitors from all of the less fortunate regions that surround us, it seems that we are presented with a huge opportunity in Chevron's Tank Farm Project. And the recreational opportunities are but one aspect of how this land can best serve us. SUJ-1

The Chevron proposal adds a multitude of benefits for our community… with very little downside. Chevron is committed to cleaning it up, but obviously any development project of this scale must be economically viable as well. That is why time wasted now lessens the likelihood that Chevron, or any entity would move forward. And then we're faced with the prospect that this "vast and largely unattractive (and unused!) region"… will remain so. And generations to follow will wonder why no one took action to change that, when the opportunity was presented.

Many thanks for listening. John

John C. Summer
Director of Business Development
Portfolio Manager
Taylor Frigon Capital Management LLC
656 Santa Rosa St. 3B. San Luis Obispo, CA. 93401

TAYLOR FRIGON
CAPITAL MANAGEMENT LLC

Central Coast / Silicon Valley / San Francisco
805.226.0280 / fax: 650.242.4220
jsummer@taylorfrigon.com

John C. Summer
Response to Comments

Comment #	Response
SUJ-1	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.

August 1, 2013

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

Attn: Phil Dunsmore – Senior Planner

Re: Chevron Tank Farm Remediation and Development Project EIR Comments

Dear Mr. Dunsmore:

The Chevron property has long been a topic for discussion and has been in a planning process for over 30 years. The existing General Plan has been debated for many years, encourages and embraces a remediation and development project to move forward within the City limits. This property is within the City's Urban Reserve Line and has been designated for much needed area improvements along with some development. This property has been identified by the City and the Chamber of Commerce as well as a majority of City residents as being prime for improvements to area roadways, recreational facilities, business park/industrial and commercial economic conditions. Bringing this property and the proposed project into the City will be of great benefit to the City for a number of reasons. It will represent a strong tax base that will be received by the City, the goals of increasing the number of head of household jobs, improved transportation corridors, adding recreational assets, bike trails, walking trails and improved wildlife habitat and restoration of habitat. It also implements an infill need and supports the concept of "Compact Urban Form". TE-1

The Chevron approach to this project has been extremely thoughtful, carefully orchestrated over many years of being good neighbors in this City and respecting the needs of the community. That said, the project must make economic sense to Chevron or the developer and risk taker for the project. TE-2

It is our opinion that the City could not be luckier than to have an organization with such concern for the City, community and environment that would be willing to undertake such an endeavor. The enhancement that these improvements would provide to the City are unparalled. We fully support the Chevron proposal and we support the City and Chevron's desire to enter into a development agreement (DA) that will annex this property into the City. If this development were to occur in the County, the citizens of this community will have some of the benefits of the project, but would not reap the tax benefits that would help pay for and support other overall improvements needed within our City, such as transportation, sewer, water, fire services, police services. TE-3

This property is surrounded by the City of San Luis Obispo and is clearly logical to be a part of the City and developed to SLO City standards, which are admittedly high, but representative of our community's desire for quality. We support the applicant's desire to make the project economically feasible at 803,000 sq. ft. of commercial improvements (not the 562,000 sq. ft. alternative). We support the applicants desire to remediate 1.7 to 1 ratio of wetlands and not any greater. The biological resources section of EIR recommends 2:1 remediation ratios. This higher degree of remediation is uncalled for and is not justified. TE-4 TE-5

3562 Empleo, Ste.C - P.O.Box 1167
San Luis Obispo, California 93406
(805) 543-3850 FAX (805) 543-3829
E-mail – bthoma@thomaelec.com

We are adamantly against the creation of a traffic circle and roundabout on Tank Farm Road. This feature, as described on page 10 is a danger, a congestion problem and generally undesirable. This transportation feature identified in the EIR has no merit and will be opposed by all who use area roadways for daily transportation needs. We are solidly against such a transportation feature in this location. Signalized intersections as necessary will service the traffic patterns within this area most efficiently and effectively. TE-6

In conclusion, over 20 years of planning by the applicant, with tremendous input from the community and general compliance with the City's existing General Plan as well as the one making its way through the process for updates are all reasons to certify an EIR with findings that the application and DA proposed are compatible, consistent with City policy and very desirable for some of the reasons stated in my letter to you. We as a City will be lucky to see this project move forward in partnership with the applicant. We ask that the Planning Commission and the City council move quickly to avoid missing this opportunity to implement our General Plan goal and in a way that reflects our City's character. TE-7

Sincerely,

William A. Thoma, P.E.'
President
Thoma Electric, Inc.
T:\BILL THOMA\Chevron Tank Farm Remediation and Development_2013-7-30.DOC

William A. Thoma, P.E.
Response to Comments

Comment #	Response
TE-1	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
TE-2	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
TE-3	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
TE-4	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
TE-5	The comment supports no more than the 1.7:1 replacement ratio of wetlands. The EIR preparers have discussed wetland replacement ratios with the USFWS and the CDFW and have changed the language in Mitigation BIO-3b to require a replacement ratio of 1:1 for short-term impacts to wetlands.
TE-6	The comment states that a traffic circle and roundabout is a danger, a congestion problem, generally undesirable, and that it has no merit. The proposed roundabout, as discussed in previous comments, should increase safety and reduce congestion. These attributes of the proposed intersection control should increase the roundabout's general desirability and merit. The roundabout will service traffic patterns in the area as, if not more, efficiently and effectively than a traffic signal, as indicated by quantitative level-of-service and queuing analysis. In SIDRA, the roundabout LOS is B during the PM peak hour and the worst-case queue is 207 feet on the eastbound approach. Comparatively, in Synchro, with dual eastbound left turn lanes, a signalized intersection would achieve LOS C with a worst case queue of 445 feet on the eastbound approach.
TE-7	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.

DATE: August 5, 2013
TO: Phil Dunsmore, City of San Luis Obispo Planning Dept.
FROM: Alan Thomas, 1680 Encino Court, SLO, CA 93401
RE: Comments on the Chevron Tank Farm Remediation and Development Project DEIR

I applaud Chevron for their efforts to improve the Tank Farm Road contamination site. I have the following comments about the public DEIR and proposed Tank Farm Road Remediation and Development Project:

1. Class I Impacts to traffic and circulation in the airport area during the remediation period are NOT adequately addressed.

TAJ-1

a. The DEIR states: "there are no unavoidable Class I impacts to traffic and circulation from the remediation component of the project." I strongly disagree.

TAJ-2

b. According to the proposal, Tank Farm Road will remain a two-lane road for years to come. This will cause significant negative impacts on traffic and air quality. During the remediation period, for example, it is proposed that a traffic signal be installed at the midway point between Broad and Higuera to allow construction traffic to cross Tank Farm Road. Given the number of daily truck trips estimated in the DEIR, the mitigation that this activity be restricted to off-peak hours will not be sufficient to eliminate the traffic failure that is likely to occur on Tank Farm Road, as well as a number of surrounding streets and intersections. The accompanying pollutants generated by idling vehicle engines would also add to these negative impacts.

TAJ-3

c. Alternate routes that would reduce traffic and circulation impacts, such as connecting Hwy 101 and Higuera to Buckley Road, will not be in place prior to the remediation. This timetable should be accelerated.

TAJ-4

d. The vague requirement that the applicant submit a traffic management plan prior to various phases of the project provides the public with little or no specific information at this point about how traffic and air quality impacts will actually be mitigated.

TAJ-5

e. In short, The DEIR does not provide sufficient details/alternatives related to the traffic and air quality impacts from thousands of truck trips carrying cap material across Tank Farm Road during remediation, as well as truck traffic carrying nearly 800,000 cubic yards of contaminated soil to various dump sites over a three to five year period.

2. The proposed set-aside of 15 acres of park and recreation space is NOT adequate to meet future community needs.

TAJ-6

a. Under the proposal, only about 4% of the 332 acres will useable by the public for recreation, while over 70% will be designated as open space with little or no access by the public. The DEIR does not adequately explain the reasons for these

restrictions. References to ALUP requirements related to land use restrictions in the airport area are not provided in adequate detail to support the conclusion in the DEIR that over 250 acres must remain severely restricted. TAJ-6 continued

b. The DEIR does not address county or city target ratios for recreation acreage per 1000 residents and how this will be met in the future. For example, as the Margarita area is developed with over 900 new housing units, additional acres of new park and recreation space should be designated and properly remediated NOW for future use along the northern border of the tank farm property, and adjacent to the Damon Garcia Sports Complex. TAJ-7

c. Access to the proposed parks and recreation space by potential users, and connections to the nearby Margarita housing developments and the Damon Garcia Sports complex, are not adequately addressed in the DEIR. Locating recreation spaces closer to the Damon Garcia Sports complex and the Margarita development would seem like a superior alternative. TAJ-8

d. There is an APPARENT CONFLICT between the DEIR and statements made publicly by Chevron representatives regarding land use restrictions in the open space areas. The DEIR states: "Some open space areas would have levels of contamination remaining even after remediation that would not be suitable for some forms of recreational use." A Chevron representative stated at an overview presentation of the project on July 8, 2013, that the remediation methods being proposed would NOT in any way be the cause of land use restrictions in the open space areas (paraphrased). This apparent difference of opinion must be clarified since it goes to the heart of the open question: how will the proposed remediation impact future land use, and should additional remediation steps be taken to insure public safety. TAJ-9

3. The proposed development of approximately 803,000 square feet of commercial space should be reduced.

a. I support the "reduced development" alternative described in the DEIR as the environmentally superior alternative. This calls for a 30 percent reduction in floor space, including removal of the proposed development on the western portion of the site north of Tank Farm Road. TAJ-10

b. Given the number of significant Class I and Class II impacts that can be mitigated or eliminated, scaling back the proposed development by at least 30% would clearly be in the best interest of the SLO community. TAJ-11

c. While I understand the goal of the applicant to "develop an economically viable commercial project" (i.e., a project that essentially pays for the infrastructure required) I feel the overall environmental interests of the SLO community must take precedence over the increased costs to the applicant. TAJ-12

d. I would also add that the positive public relations value that would be enjoyed by the applicant by making the best interests of the local community their top priority, would more than compensate for additional project costs due to the reduction of the development component. TAJ-13

Sincerely,

Alan J. Thomas
1680 Encino Ct.
San Luis Obispo, 93401
805-801-9908

Alan J. Thomas
Response to Comments

Comment #	Response
TAJ-1	The analysis of remediation traffic indicates that the roadway network has adequate capacity to accommodate the forecast truck traffic during this stage of the project.
TAJ-2	Tank Farm Road would have adequate capacity to accommodate remediation traffic with its current two-lane configuration. Impact AQ.1 provides a discussion of the air emissions that would be associated with the remediation project, including the offsite traffic. With the proposed mitigation measures the emissions would be below the air emission thresholds established by the SLO County APCD.
TAJ-3	Mitigation measure T-1 requires the preparation of a construction traffic management plan identifying haul routes for materials hauling and equipment deliveries. This plan would ensure that construction traffic use appropriate facilities. The Buckley Road extension is not germane to this specific project.
TAJ-4	Mitigation T-1a and T-4 specify the items that must be included in the construction management plan. Remediation and construction activities would be monitored to ensure they conformed to the management plan.
TAJ-5	Section 4.3.4 of the EIR discusses remediation traffic in detail. The highest intensity of truck traffic would occur during months 21 and 22 of the remediation process, and would result in 311 daily passenger car equivalent daily trips. This is significantly lower than the trip generation associated with the development of the project, and would not result in impacts beyond those identified in the EIR.
TAJ-6	The open space areas contain sensitive biological resources including, wetlands and vernal pool fairy shrimp (VPFS), which is a federally listed species. These sensitive biological resources could be impacted if portions of the open space were open to public access. The locations of these sensitive biological areas are provided in Section 4.2 (Biological Resources). Both CDFW and USFWS have stated that these wetland and sensitive biological areas need to remain protected and are not suitable for public recreational areas. The open space is within the runway protection zone of the SLOCRA, and areas of the site are used for airport equipment. Public access to these open space areas could conflict with airport operations and represent a hazard to the public and airport operations. All of the open space would be part of the Reserve Space that is required by the Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) to allow for increased development within the Cluster Development Zone (CDZ) of the City's Airport Area Specific Plan (AASP). In addition, some of the open space would have to be set aside as Reserve Areas, per the ALUP. The ALUP limits the types of development and activities that can occur with Reserve Areas and Reserve Space. Information on the Reserve Areas and Reserve Spaces is provided in Chapter 2 of the EIR.

	Some open space areas would have levels of contamination remaining even after remediation that would not be suitable for some forms of recreational use, as described in Section 4.11 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials). The issue of public access to open space is discussed in the Executive Summary as a issue of controversy.
TAJ-7	The proposed development would include a 15 acre baseball park that would provide recreational opportunities for the public. This would represent a net recreational benefit to the community. The City ratio for parkland per 1,000 residents is discussed in Section 4.14, Recreation. However, for purposes of analyzing typical development project impacts on recreation, only residential projects are usually considered potentially impactful since employees of businesses are not expected to utilize recreational facilities as frequently or for extended periods of time as residents would. In addition, the increase in daytime population as a result of the presence of construction workers is temporary in nature and varies due to the type of construction activities being conducted (i.e., site grading construction of structures, or infrastructure improvements). Although construction workers could use recreational facilities in the area, typically construction activities do not contribute to the use or affect parks and recreational facilities. The Project would not develop any residential units and as such would not increase the use or demand for parks or other recreational opportunities, nor accelerate deterioration of such facilities.
TAJ-8	Moving the recreational areas to the northwest corner of the site, where they would be closer to the Damon Garcia Sports Complex would require placing some of the proposed development footprint within the runway protection zone, which is not allowed. The layout of the site in terms of development and recreational areas had to be done to assure consistency with the Airport Land Use Plan as well as biological constraints on the site.
TAJ-9	During the 7/8/13 presentation, a statement was made that the public would be able to use designated areas of the site but public access to the Open Space would be restricted. This originated from a requirement to prevent public entry into the Open Space requested by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and other resource agencies with the intent of protecting existing sensitive resources in the Open Space (wetlands, creeks, riparian areas, Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp habitat, etc.) as well as areas where activities will be underway to restore habitat. The Chevron representative was clarifying that the public access restrictions were proposed for the protection of habitat and sensitive species, not for human health concerns. The Human Health Risk Assessment report shows a cancer risk of $4x10^{-6}$ for the Open Space Recreator, which is heavily influenced by maximum detections of carcinogenic PAHs detected in a sample collected at 0.5 feet below the ground surface. This risk is at the low end of the USEPA and CalEPA risk management range of 10^{-6} to 10^{-4}, below the California

	Proposition 65 significant risk level of 1×10^{-5}, and within an acceptable risk range typically used for recreational and commercial receptors. Chevron will remove soil in the area associated with the sample driving this risk (S-63-0.5). Removal of this sample results in an Open Space Recreator risk of less than 1×10^{-4}.
TAJ-10	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
TAJ-11	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
TAJ-12	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
TAJ-13	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.

Date: July 31, 2013

To: Mayor Jan Marx, San Luis Obispo City Council Members

Phil Dunsmore – SLO City Planning Department

990 Palm Street

San Luis Obispo, California 93401

From: Mila Vujovich-La Barre

650 Skyline Drive

San Luis Obispo, California 93405

Re: Chevron Remediation and Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) - Comments

---

As a community resident and a proponent of "smart growth," I have had the opportunity to follow community development for the past several years. Fortunately, I had the opportunity to tour part of the site of the remediation with Chevron personnel, including Bill Almas last fall. I offer these observations and concerns for your perusal. As you can note from my property address, I do not live in the vicinity of this remediation, nor do I own any property near the site under discussion. As a dedicated teacher with over 30 years of experience, I am passionate about preserving what is best about our city and enhancing areas that need improvement for current residents and tourists and for the next generation.

After reviewing the Draft EIR, I view the proposed Chevron remediation as a proverbial stepping stone to developing and beautifying a blighted portion of our wonderful town. VBM-1

1) Extraction vs. Capping

a) It appears from the Draft EIR that Chevron will be extracting more toxic land than initially presented to a group of us on tour last fall with Chevron Director Bill Almas. This is great news! It appeared to me that Chevron was initially going to just "cap" a significant portion of the toxic area rather than extract and relocate the damage. Having seen an overview of the "pros and cons" of both methods it does seem to me that a high percentage of the contamination should be extracted. VBM-2

b) Having reviewed the lengthy "Health and Human Risk Assessment" in the Draft EIR, it seems that it would be wise after the extraction and capping for there to be another analysis completed prior to construction of any commercial or residential buildings, recreation areas and bike paths. VBM-3

c) In regard to extraction and capping, I question, at what point does Chevron cease to have responsibility if the land is annexed into the City of San Luis Obispo? If there are VBM-4

problems in the future with claims of toxic water, land or air particles whose responsibility is it to come to the proverbial rescue? The concern is based on the fact that there have been lawsuits in other locations where there was remediation and then local homeowners had health problems that they sued the city for. In San Luis Obispo, where will "the line be drawn"? Chevron has stated that "no residential development" is in this remediation plan, which there is not. However, will there be any health hazards to residents in the adjacent neighborhoods of the Margarita Area Specific Plan and others planned for the land of the Damon and Garcia families? VBM-4 continued VBM-5

d) Also of concern, is the ground water in the creeks. How will that water be affected by the capping and extraction? Will it be tested upon the conclusion of the remediation prior to the construction of any commercial buildings or the recreation fields? VBM-6

2) Open Space

a) Since approximately 70% of the land is being donated as "Open Space" due to the fact that it is either toxic or has environmentally sensitive materials/plant life and animals on it, will Chevron be able to beautify it with creative placement of boulders, additional plants and/or solar light fixtures? VBM-7

b) Will any of the areas in the "Open Space" area be capped to be able to provide further protection to the public? VBM-8

c) Having been on a tour of a portion of the property, it seems that some scenic, rock and or tile enhanced walls would beautify the area for people on the proposed bike and walking paths. VBM-9

d) It seems that elevated bike paths or walking paths would be a fine addition to the City of San Luis Obispo and the circulation element; however I reiterate that I remain concerned about the airborne carcinogenic substances throughout that designated "Open Space" referred to in the "Human Health Risk Assessment" report. It appears in the data that there are some concerns about arsenic and other substances. The percentages and actual threat is unclear to the layperson. VBM-10

e) In the event that there is a threat to the residents post extraction and capping, maybe the area should just be secured with fencing to prohibit entry and beautified for passers-by on both sides of Tank Farm Road. VBM-11

3) Recreation Land - Location and uses

Reference slide 2-71 from the Project Description of the Draft EIR.

a) The proposed recreation space that is currently slated for being on Tank Farm Road recreation space should be pulled up to the far northeast corner of the development near the Damon-Garcia Sports Fields. That adjustment will provide for a "Central Park- like environment" for that area of town. That switch would increase the expanse of green in that area of town, given the South Hills Open Space and the adjacent 23.5 acres of Damon-Garcia Sports Fields land. Again, only 16 acres of the VBM-12

Damon-Garcia Sports Fields purchased land have been utilized since there are 7.5 acres that have set aside for a possible roadway. VBM-12 continued

b) The change in the location of the proposed Chevron recreation land would also have the children using the sports-fields farther away from the flight path, given the Airport Area Specific Plan and publicized airport expansion information. It would also put athletes farther away from the land to the west that is being left as "Open Space" that may contain contaminants. VBM-13

c) The "teacher in me" prefers the proposed future Chevron recreation area to not be limited to Cal Ripkin sponsored fields, as to my knowledge most Cal Ripkin teams do not include females. VBM-14

4) Bike paths on the southern end of the property and throughout the development

a) Including more Class-1 bike paths and walking paths for residents and tourists is a benefit. I appreciate the fact that Chevron has included this use on their plan to promote alternative transportation, delight athletes and recreational bikers and to combat childhood obesity. VBM-15

b) Hopefully the bike paths will be crafted out of a substance like TREX or other composite that will endure weather conditions and any other substances that may be a by-product of the Airport Area or the Chevron land remediation. VBM-16

c) An emergency phone or two should be placed somewhere on that southeast portion of the Chevron property. VBM-17

5) Commercial Development on Chevron Land

a) For a layperson, it is good to note that the size and scale the SLO County Government Center on the corner of Santa Rosa and Monterey is just over 90,000 square feet. VBM-18

b) Chevron is proposing over 800,000 square feet of commercial development phased in over a period of time on the corner of Tank Farm Road and the aligned and improved Santa Fe Road.

c) SLO City has included a proposal in this Draft EIR to reduce that amount of Chevron commercial development to 440,000 square feet.

d) Given the expansion of community partner MindBody on the corner of Tank Farm Road and Broad Street, and the new construction of SESLOC at Industrial and Broad, one needs to wonder what square footage of another commercial development will complement the "neighborhood character" of that commercial area. My estimate is that Chevron's commercial development should be limited to no greater than 360,000 square feet. VBM-19

6) Traffic Circulation

a) The traffic during remediation will be immensely improved if Tank Farm Road is expanded to four-lanes with a Class-1 bike lane prior to the overall remediation. VBM-20

b) Similar to some metropolitan areas, with the remediation traffic trips hauling hundreds of pounds of toxic substances out of the site, the trips should take place between the hours of 7PM and 6AM. That way, residents will not be so inconvenienced, especially those that use Tank Farm Road for their daily travel. VBM-21

c) The traffic post-remediation will be significantly improved if Tank Farm Road is indeed expanded to four lanes as is proposed on the City plan. VBM-22

d) For overall traffic circulation, I am very excited about the impact of the destruction of "Flower Mounds." The "Flower Mounds" are the tiny hills that are adjacent to the Damon-Garcia Sports Fields. In the Draft EIR it shows that the "Flower Mounds" will quickly be nearly level with the surrounding land and will supply a significant amount of rock and gravel for the actual remediation. Since the mounds will be taken down to a 3% grade, according to Bill Almas last fall, this opens up possibilities for the Northern Alignment of Prado Road and the extension of Santa Fe Road in the area. VBM-23

e) If one stands on top of the "Flower Mounds" now and looks directly east, there is a "straight shot" to the already signalized Industrial Way. It should be clarified whether it is Chevron's intent to have the small finger of a road that is on the remediation map near the extension of Santa Fe Road to connect with Industrial Way. In a meeting with Community Development Director Derek Johnson last year, it was indicated that the SESLOC construction on the corner of Broad Street and Industrial Way, may prohibit the connection of Industrial Way to that finger of a street that is on the plan. It would be wise to evaluate the current reality prior to the remediation. VBM-24

f) The plans of the remediation by Chevron show in maps, and reference in language, the adjacent commercial and residential development in the Margarita Area and the Airport Area Specific Plan. Not discussed is the additional proposed development in both the Broad Street corridor and the Orcutt Area. It seems that post-remediation, all of these areas should be well connected by a functional road, in addition to a widened Tank Farm Road. It continues to be my request that a comprehensive EIR of Prado Road be done from Broad Street to Madonna Road now. Prado Road has been on the City plans since 1960. It should not be "segmented" or "piecemealed." If that EIR for Prado Road can be executed soon, a well-crafted Prado Road would undoubtedly unburden Chevron during and after the remediation, and ease traffic congestion for Los Verdes Park residents and the residents in the neighborhoods East of Broad Street, including the Arbors. The information revealed from a comprehensive EIR of Prado Road would also serve current residents, developers, city planners and others. If Prado Road is to be a 4-lane truck highway, with round-a-bouts, as it was designated in the Land Use Circulation Element (LUCE) committee meetings, it makes perfect sense to be transparent and to examine the best course and the true costs for this East-West connection. It also makes sense to figure out now, how it is VBM-25 VBM-26

going to be paid for given the potential costly Prado Road overpass and/or interchange. VBM-26 continued

In closing, on a positive note, this catastrophe occurred in 1926, and there have been nearly 90 years of advancements in technology and innovations for constituents to benefit from. Since more oil was lost during this explosion and fire than the British Petroleum spill in the Gulf of Mexico a few years back, it is critical to make this remediation be the best it can be. It is vital for the health and safety of our community and the prosperity and well-being of the next generation! VBM-27

Respectfully,

Mila Vujovich-La Barre

Mila Vujovich-La Barre

Mila Vujovich-La Barre
Response to Comments

Comment #	Response
VBM-1	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
VBM-2	A significant portion of the existing contamination will be excavated and removed. Areas that would be capped are in areas where excavation would be difficult and where no threat to groundwater occurs.
VBM-3	The results of the Health and Human Risk Assessment (HHRA) are premised on the site being remediated according to the performance standards in the remediation plan. Site remediation will need to meet or exceed the proposed cleanup levels and containment performance standards. Site cleanup will be monitored to document cleanup levels and whether or not the site met the performance standards. In the event the cleanup does not meet the various cleanup and performance standards, a new HHRA would be required to determine if the residual levels would be acceptable for the proposed land use.
VBM-4	Chevron would retain all future liability and responsibility for site contamination issues regardless of whether or not the properties are annexed by the City, and regardless of future owners.
VBM-5	Deed restrictions will be placed on each parcel to assure that only appropriate land uses occur. There would be no adverse health impacts to surrounding residences.
VBM-6	Section 4.5, Water Resources discuss the impacts that remediation and capping could have on surface water. The capping effects on surface water is specifically discussed in Impact WR.4. Impact WR.5 provides detailed information on how the grading and recontouring of the site as part of the remediation project could affect surface water. Part of the proposed project is long-term monitoring of the project site. Current site activities include environmental monitoring. These activities include an ongoing program to monitor surface water and groundwater. As part of the long-term monitoring activities that are proposed as part of the project surface waters would continue to be monitored.
VBM-7	The EIR requires the development of a restoration plan for the areas of the open space that will be impacted by remediation activities. This plan would have to be approved by a number of regulatory agencies. The plan would include a wide range of plants and could include the placement of boulders. However, lighting is not likely to be included due to impacts on nighttime wildlife.
VBM-8	Many of the areas identified as open space would be excavated and capped to a depth to prevent both ecological and human exposure. Capped areas will be of sufficient depth to prevent burrowing animals from reaching areas with residual contamination.
VBM-9	See response to comment VBM-7.
VBM-10	Under the Development Plan, the total cancer risk for recreational use of Open

	Space is $4x10^{-6}$, which exceeds the low end of the USEPA risk management range. The Open Space recreational cancer risk would result primarily from incidental ingestion of and dermal contact with PAHs in soil. This risk is still considered less than significant based on the Air Pollution Control District's health risk criteria. The maximum recreational risk in open space is also heavily influenced by one sample near Reservoirs 5 and 6. All other areas would have a total cancer risk of less than $1x10^{-6}$. Recreational use of the Recreation/Public Facility (REC) results in a cancer risk of $3x10^{-7}$, which is below the low end of the USEPA risk management range. The HHRA identified areas where certain land uses would not be appropriate, such as some active recreation. The proposed development project does not include any recreational land uses in areas where the potential exposure to residual contamination would be considered unacceptable. The EIR notes where these potential conflicts could occur if the actual development deviated from the proposed project description and required administrative controls (deed restrictions) to prevent inappropriate recreational uses. The EIR also included administrative controls to prevent high intensity recreational development from occurring in areas where there would be an increased risk of an aircraft strike associated with the adjacent San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport (SLOCRA).
VBM-11	In the event that there is a threat to the residents post extraction and capping, additional cleanup measures would be required.
VBM-12	Moving the recreational areas to the northwest corner of the site would require placing some of the proposed development footprint within the runway protection zone, which is not allowed. The layout of the site in terms of development and recreational areas had to be done to assure consistency with the Airport Land Use Plan as well as biological constrains on the site.
VBM-13	The ball fields are an allowed use in the area they are proposed under the Airport Land Use Plan. The health risk assessment included in the EIR determined that placement of the ball fields in this location would not represent an unacceptable level of public health risk.
VBM-14	The EIR looked at a Cal Ripkin designed field. Applications for the ball fields would have to be processed through the City or County. There is no guarantee that the final ball fields would be Cal Ripkin. It is also our understanding based upon information on Cal Ripkin baseball that girls can play.
VBM-15	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
VBM-16	The bike paths would be constructed in accordance with the City's Bicycle Transportation Plan, which notes that the pavement surface of bikeways shall be smooth and free of potholes (section 1.33).
VBM-17	The installation of any emergency phones would have to be worked out by the City or County as part of the final design for the bike paths. However, with the

	high use of cell phones, there may not be a need for emergency phones.
VBM-18	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
VBM-19	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
VBM-20	Tank Farm Road would have adequate capacity to accommodate remediation traffic with its current two-lane configuration.
VBM-21	Mitigation measure T-1 (4) requires the preparation of a construction traffic management plan including a scheduling plan showing hours of operation to minimize traffic congestion during peak hours and special events.
VBM-22	The project proposes to widen Tank Farm Road to four lanes, which would provide acceptable traffic operations along the corridor under Cumulative Conditions.
VBM-23	The Cumulative Conditions analysis assumes that Prado Road is extended to Broad Street, consistent with the Margarita Area Specific Plan.
VBM-24	The Prado Road extension is planned to intersect with Broad Street between Industrial Way and Capitolio Way. This is consistent with the alignment shown in the Margarita Area Specific Plan.
VBM-25	The Cumulative conditions forecasts were prepared using the City's Travel Demand Model, which includes planned development throughout the City, including the Broad Street and Orcutt areas.
VBM-26	Comment refers to the desire for a comprehensive EIR for the Prado Road extension to Broad Street. This comment is not germane to this EIR.
VBM-27	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.

Mr. Dunsmore -

I'm writing this email to enthusiastically support the annexation of the Chevron Property along/around Tank Farm into the City limits. This key circulation corridor has and will have a great influence on the circulation patterns, resources, and future development of our City. The combination of space types currently included in the proposed project of infrastructure improvements, open space, active recreation, and commercial office seems appropriate to support the needs of our community. I enthusiastically support the addition of pedestrian and bike transportation appropriate infrastructure in this area, as currently no viable pathways exist. WS-1

Thank you for your consideration,

Stacey White

Stacey White
Response to Comments

Comment #	Response
WS-1	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.