DEIR Workshop Comments and Responses

Code	Agency	Page #
ALUCW	Airport Land Use Commission	E-1
BACW	City Bicycle Advisory Committee	E-3
CHCW	City Cultural Heritage Committee	E-5
PCW	City Planning Commission	E-7
PW	Draft EIR Public Workshop	E-17

County of San Luis Obispo
Airport Land Use Commission
Chevron Tank Farm Public Draft EIR Workshop
July 31, 2013
Summary of Comments

We reviewed the Chevron DEIR with the Airport Land Use Commission today and here's a summary of their comments:

1. Commissioner Tefft felt the DEIR was deficient in 2 areas; 1. The proposed recreation zone/facility was not endorsed by the FAA; and 2: the biologist and or biological analysis did not appear to be endorsed by the FAA in accordance with 150-5200/36. ALUCW-1

2. Also Commissioner Settle noted he was in favor of a 1:1 wetland replacement to avoid significant impact. ALUCW-2

3. The Commissioner asked if their comments would be considered as official comments on the DEIR. ALUCW-3

Since the item was informational no action was taken and the ALUC would take action on the land use amendments and other entitlements following publication of the FEIR.

Comment #	Response
ALUCW-1	Section 4.11, Hazards and Hazardous Materials discussed the potential need for FAA review and the form "Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration". As discussed in the Hazards Section of the EIR, The FAA has reviewed the recreational facility and issued determinations of "No Hazard to Air Navigation" for each structure in the ball field complex. This review by the FAA was done prior to the issuance of the DEIR. FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-36 describes the qualifications for wildlife biologists who conduct Wildlife Hazard Assessments (WHA) for airports certificated under 14 CFR Part 139 and at non-certificated airports funded by the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) or Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) Program. Addresses the minimum wildlife hazard management curriculum for the initial and recurrent training of airport personnel who implement an FAA-approved Wildlife Hazard Management Plan (WHMP). On January 31, 2012 the FAA cancelled 150/5200-36 and replaced it with 150/5200-36a. This document describes the qualifications for wildlife biologists who conduct Wildlife Hazard Assessments (WHA) for airports certificated under Title 14, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 139 (14 CFR Part 139), and at non-certificated airports funded by a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Airport Improvement Program (AIP) or Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) Program. Since the EIR was not prepared for the airport, or the FAA, the use of a qualified FAA biologist was not required. In addition, the EIR did not involve the development of a wildlife hazard assessment for the SLO County Regional Airport, and did not involve training of airport personnel. Therefore, a FAA qualified biologist was not required for preparation of the EIR. The EIR needed biologists who were knowledgeable on the various special status species that are located on the Tank Farm site.
ALUCW-2	The comment supports the 1:1 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.
ALUCW-3	The comments by the APLUC are part of the official comments on the DEIR.

City of San Luis Obispo
Bicycle Advisory Committee
Chevron Tank Farm Public Draft EIR Workshop
July 18, 2013
Summary of Comments

1. Timing for installation of bike paths: Install all required paths prior to occupancy of Phase 1 development; ensure that bike routes are not interrupted during remediation and install continuous class 2 paths along Tank Farm road upon completion of remediation. BACW-1
2. Maintain a north/south class 1 pathway to connect to southerly property consistent with intent of bike plan. Conceptual central location on property appears ok. BACW-2
3. Maintain planned path alignment along fork of San Luis Creek on Airport/County property- BAC acknowledged this path would not be built with project. BACW-3
4. Ensure all class 1 and class 2 paths link and integrate and appropriately transition with off-site locations (i.e. Damon Garcia, Prado Road, east and west ends of Tank Farm Road) BACW-4

Comment #	Response
BACW-1	Mitigation T-3a requires the installation of bike paths prior to occupancy of Phase 1 development. Mitigation T-4 ensures that the duration of construction and associated disruptions is minimized.
BACW-2	Mitigation T-3a specifies the installation of a north/south Class I path.
BACW-3	Mitigation T-3a specifies the installation of Class I paths in accordance with the BTP.
BACW-4	Mitigation T-3a specifies the installation of Class I paths in accordance with the BTP, including connectivity to other facilities and destinations.

City of San Luis Obispo
Cultural Heritage Committee
Chevron Tank Farm Public Draft EIR Workshop
July 29, 2013
Summary of Comments

The Cultural Heritage Committee received a presentation last night on the Chevron project. Carole Denardo provided an in-depth presentation of the cultural resource findings and mitigation measures following my brief introduction. There were no comments from the public, however the CHC commented on the proposed mitigation measure CR-2f: Committee members wanted surety that there would be more than a simple plaque to recognize the scale and significance of the former oil facility. It was suggested that a kiosk on both the north and south sides of the property supply information and graphics that help to visualize the significance of the facility and the disaster. The committee also stressed the importance of access to the site to assist with the visual understanding/interpretation of the site.

CHCW-1

CHCW-2

Comment #	Response
CHCW-1	Mitigation measure CR-2f has been modified to addresses the requirement for display kiosks on both the north and south side of Tank Farm Road.
CHCW-2	The site would have limited access via a network of bicycle/pedestrian trails. Mitigation measures T-3a provides a list of the types and location of the trails that would provide access to the site. The final location and type of trails must be approved by the City.

Chevron Tank Farm Remediation and Restoration Project
Draft Environmental Impact Report

City of San Luis Obispo Planning Commission DEIR Questions and Comments
July 24, 2013
6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Planning Commission

1. Commissioner Multari:

a) Is the Development Agreement part of DEIR Project Description? He stated he is concerned that if it is not properly characterized it could result in the need for additional CEQA compliance (e.g., SEIR, EIR Addendum). PCW-1

b) Can the open space areas not proposed for restoration, be used for restoration? PCW-2

c) Requested the possibility of accelerating bike related improvements as a means of reducing traffic impacts. PCW-3

2. Commissioner Meyer:

a) Provided an overview of the five goals of the City and, per #3, felt the bike path portion of the project should be expanded. PCW-4

b) The EIR treats bikes solely as recreation when they should be considered transportation. History of contract management issues PCW-5

c) Appendix D, page 61 identifies the project as having significant impacts. PCW-6

d) How to eliminate significant impacts: Provide protected bike paths. PCW-7

e) The proposed plan for bike circulation does not look good and should be revised to be made more consistent with the Bicycle Transportation Plan. PCW-8

f) There should be a protected north-south bike path connecting the Margarita Area Specific Plan area to the Bob Jones Bike Path. PCW-9

g) There should be a round-a-bout (RAB) at the intersection of Tank Farm Road (TFR) and Santa Fe Road (SFR). PCW-10

h) Emergency services impacts associated with the project can be solved by creating better connectivity, not by building more facilities. PCW-11

3. Commissioner Stevenson:

a) Stated he's concerned as to the appropriateness of the TFR/SFR RAB. PCW-12

b) What type of wastewater disposal system would work best on the County Development Plan given the known constraints associated with the project site (e.g., high groundwater table, slow percolation, etc.)? PCW-13

c) Good job on the EIR, excellent document. PCW-14

4. Commissioner Fowler:

a) If groundwater is contaminated under the County Development Plan, what is Plan B? PCW-15

b) He is concerned there are no Class I cultural resources impacts. PCW-16

c) He is concerned the long-term plan for the open space is not more clearly spelled-out. PCW-17

d) How will cyclists and pedestrians cross TFR? PCW-18

e) Likes the buffer for bikes that has been proposed. PCW-19

5. Commissioner Larson:

a) He wanted to know why, after SERRT coordinating on the project for several years, it was still unknown as to why the applicant proposed mitigation ratio of 1:1.7 would not be acceptable. PCW-20

Public Comment

1. Dan Sutton:

a) The project is an opportunity for the youth of the community. PCW-21

2. John Spatafore:

a) The project brings great opportunities, commercial, sports, etc. PCW-22

b) If Prado Road is built it will increase emergency responsiveness to the Project. PCW-23

3. Doug Hoffman:

a) The location of his business is currently near where the TFR/(SFR RAB will be located. He thinks a RAB is only one of several possible solutions. PCW-24

4. Dan Rifoure:

a) He is the Executive Director of the Bike Coalition. He stated project needs are as follows:

1) TFR: Class II bike lanes, both directions, light physical barrier, built during Phase I; PCW-25

2) TFR Instead of the Class I on the northern parcel, there should be a Class I running north-south, across both parcels, consistent with the City's Bicycle Transportation Plan (BTP); PCW-26

5. Dave Garth:

a) The project is a great opportunity. PCW-27

b) He is concerned after reading the Executive Summary that economic impacts are not addressed. PCW-28

c) Project would provide head of household jobs. The project is better-off located in the City. PCW-29

d) He warned the City Planning Commission of past land use blunders where there were "public-private partnerships" and not to mess this one up. PCW-30

6. Ken Kenough:

a) He would like to see the project include a protected Class II bike lane along TFR and the proposed east-west Class I moved to be a north-south route consistent with the City BTP. PCW-31

City of San Luis Obispo Planning Commission DEIR Questions and Comments
July 24, 2013
6:00 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

7. Leah Brooks:

a) She is a member of the City Bicycle Committee speaking as a private citizen. She stated the DEIR, Transportation section, is deficient in that it recommends adding lanes. This will contribute to San Luis Obispo looking like Sacramento. PCW-32

b) The Air Quality mitigation measures are good. PCW-33

c) The DEIR has too much emphasis on cars and not enough on bike safety. PCW-34

d) A mitigation measure needs to be added for public education to promote bike use; PCW-35

e) The Class I along TFR is duplicative and should be a north-south route, connecting to the Bob Jones trail. PCW-36

f) All bike improvements should be completed before development occurs. PCW-37

8. Myron Armstrong:

a) He is a former member of the City of Sacramento bike committee. He stated the project is going to turn TFR into a major transportation expressway. PCW-38

b) Need to deal with complete streets (i.e., don't allow the project to develop streets and paths in a piecemeal fashion. PCW-39

c) He stated that he felt the remediation component of the project was good and that there needs to be caution taken because of the possibility of volatiles in the groundwater due to the 1926 fire. PCW-40

9. Eugene Jud:

a) He stated he liked the TFR/SFR RAB and agrees with all previous bike related comments. PCW-41

b) He cautioned that big commercial projects can be money losers for a jurisdiction. PCW-42

c) If you implement transportation demand management (TDM) strategies you will reduce project traffic by 30 percent. PCW-43

d) After review of Appendix E of the DEIR, he finds that bicycle parking is not addressed. PCW-44

10. Ty Saffrino:

a) He owns the land to the east of the project site, north of TFR.

b) He requested data the City is using on RAB and stated his personnel experience with RAB's is they're not good for aging populations (e.g., the City of Pleasanton removed theirs due to difficulty for senior citizens to navigate); PCW-45

c) A RAB would be contradictory to industrial type traffic. PCW-46

11. Tim Walters:

a) He is a Principal with RRM Design Group and is part of the Chevron Project Team. He stated that the project as proposed, including a signalized intersection at TFR/SFR, is consistent with the Airport Area Specific Plan (AASP) and that the AASP identifies a signal at this intersection as the ultimate long-term solution. PCW-47

b) He stated a signal at this intersection would be 1.1 million dollars cheaper than a RAB and based this number on AASP "backbone" studies. PCW-48

c) He stated there is another RAB in the City of Morro Bay and when you use it you are taking your life into your own hands. PCW-49

12. Irmina Kareem:

a) She spoke representing the Chamber of Commerce and urged the City to enter into a feasible Development Agreement with the Applicant. PCW-50

13. Deborah Hoffman:

a) She spoke in favor of the project. PCW-51

b) She expressed concern over the City mitigation requiring a RAB, specifically the ability of a RAB to handle p.m. peak hour traffic. PCW-52

c) Currently the speed at the TFR/SFR intersection is too high, warranting concern over a RAB. PCW-53

d) A RAB could cause gridlock. PCW-54

e) The bike lanes as proposed by the Applicant are excellent. PCW-55

14. Dawn Legg:

a) She encouraged the City to act quickly on approval of the project. PCW-56

15. Neil Havlick:

a) He stated he is supportive of the project and glad the Unocal Collector is no longer part of the project. PCW-57

b) He is dismayed after reading page ES-20 which states that at the time of preparation of the DEIR, "it was unclear what the Applicant was proposing to do with the portion of the Project Site that would not be developed." He felt the City and Chevron were further along than what this statement implies. PCW-58

Comment #	Response
PCW-1	The Development Agreement is discussed in Section 2.6.1.7 of the EIR. While the Development Agreement is discussed in the EIR, it has still not been finalized. The EIR has to be completed before the Development Agreement could be finalized since some of the mitigation measures needed to be incorporated in the agreement. For example, the recommended street improvement identified in the EIR are critical to the Development Agreement. The Development Agreement deals with mainly financial obligations that would be placed on the Applicant, to cover their fair share of the various City infrastructure improvements, and the ongoing costs for permit review and approval. It is possible that items could be placed in the Development Agreement that would require additional environmental review under CEQA. However, based upon the current status of the Development Agreement it does not appear that additional environmental review would be required. The text in Section 2.6.1.7 has been modified to better reflect the interaction between the EIR and the Development Agreement. Text has also been added to the Executive Summary on the Development Agreement.
PCW-2	Any part of the open space could be used for restoration. However, some of the areas where restoration would not occur are areas that contain sensitive species so the Applicant has not proposed disturbances in these areas. A mitigation measure (BIO-1a) requires that the Applicant prepare and submit a final restoration plan to the San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning and Building, City of San Luis Obispo, Department of Natural Resources, USFWS, USACE, and CDFW for review and approval. This plan would layout the final areas that are proposed for restoration. As part of the review of this plan the City, or any of the other agencies, could require restoration of any parts of the open space.
PCW-3	The bicycle improvements are required prior to the occupancy of Phase 1, per Mitigation T-3a.
PCW-4	Mitigation T-3a has been expanded to specify Class I paths within the north-west, north-east, and southern portions of the project.
PCW-5	Bicycle transportation is considered as both recreation and transportation. The project has been reviewed in the context of the BTP, which plans facilities for all types of cyclists.
PCW-6	The impacts identified on page 61 Appendix D are addressed in Mitigation T-3.
PCW-7	Bike paths are required consistent with the BTP, per Mitigation T-3a.
PCW-8	Mitigation T-3a specifies changes to bicycle circulation to achieve consistency with the BTP. The final alignment of facilities will be subject to the review and approval of the Community Development and Public Works Directors.

Comment #	Response
PCW-9	Mitigation T-3a has been developed in accordance with the BTP, which serves as the policy document related to bicycle facilities. It is outside the purview of this EIR to recommend facilities beyond those included in the BTP.
PCW-10	Comment affirms decision to install a roundabout at the proposed location.
PCW-11	The EIR identifies a number of road improvements (T.5a through T.5i) that would serve to improve connectivity and possibly response times for emergency services. At the request of the City the EIR did evaluate a fire training facility as one of the possible land uses for the development project.
PCW-12	Comment expresses concern for the appropriateness of a roundabout at the proposed location. Based on the level-of-service calculations and queuing analysis of a roundabout the proposed location, a roundabout is appropriate at the proposed location. The roundabout is consistent within the context of the proposed location, including its ability to safely and efficiently handle vehicle traffic, truck traffic, pedestrian traffic, and bicycle traffic.
PCW-13	Appendix A.2 provides a detailed feasibility assessment of the wastewater treatment and disposal facility. Two disposal options were evaluated that involved tertiary treatment of the wastewater. One was the use of polishing wetlands, where the effluent would flow into the existing on-site wetland, into Tank Farm Creek and ultimately be discharged into the upper East Fork of the San Luis Obispo Creek (i.e., south of the Project Site where the two creeks converge). The other option was direct discharge into the upper East Fork of the San Luis Obispo Creek just south of the proposed wastewater plant along the eastern boundary of the Project Site. The EIR found that the direct discharge option was preferred for the County development option.
PCW-14	The City and County staff worked hard to develop an EIR that provided useful information to the public and the decision makers and was easy to understand.
PCW-15	The RWQCB in their comment letter on the Draft EIR made the case that all of the data collected to date would indicate that contamination would not move from the shallow groundwater to the deep groundwater where the wells would be located under the County development option. In the unlikely event that contamination did occur, the RWQCB has stated that the reduction/removal of organic constituents via treatment by passing the water through adsorptive carbon canisters is a proven technology that is widely accepted by regulatory agencies and used by many water users. RWQCB staff is aware that the City of San Luis Obispo implemented such technology on select supply wells in the early 1990s to reduce concentrations of chlorinated hydrocarbons to acceptable regulatory drinking water standards. The RWQCB recommend the DEIR indicate that such treatment is a potential mitigation measure to allow continued use of the onsite supply wells. This mitigation has been added to the FEIR as part of mitigation measure WR-9a.
PCW-16	Section 4.9.4 states that all impacts to cultural resources are Class II *less than*

Comment #	Response
	significant with mitigation (Class II).
PCW-17	Mitigation measure BIO-1a requires a conservation easement for the open space that will likely be turned over to the City of San Luis Obispo. The City has been in discussions with Chevron about the possible transfer of the open space. The EIR mitigation requires that all of the open space be protected in perpetuity. The Project Description, Chapter 2.0 states, "*A conservation easement will transfer surface rights to open space property to the City, the County, or an appropriate land conservancy organization with a restrictive covenant limiting future uses. The conveyance would be made after the remediation of the open space property has been accepted by the appropriate agencies and an endowment or other funding mechanism is in place for future maintenance.*"
PCW-18	Cyclists and pedestrians will cross Tank Farm Road at the roundabout at Santa Fe Road. Crosswalks will be provided on all four legs of the intersection. Cyclists will have the option of riding through the roundabout like a vehicle, or dismounting and crossing like a pedestrian. Transition ramps will be provided for cyclists exiting the bike lanes and crossing as pedestrians.
PCW-19	Comment supports the buffer for bikes as proposed.
PCW-20	The focus of the SERRT was on developing the health and ecological risk assessment and the associated Risk Management Summary and Feasibility Study that looked at how best to remediate the site. The work was not focused on the restoration of the site. Based upon further discussions with the USFWS, CDFW, City and County the EIR is recommending a mitigation ratio of 1:1 for wetland habitat disturbed as part of the remediation process. This level of restoration is with an understanding that the open space will be protected in perpetuity under a conservation easement or similar legal instrument.
PCW-21	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
PCW-22	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
PCW-23	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
PCW-24	The roundabout is the preferred control type identified in the AASP and detailed analysis has shown it will perform well in this location. Other alternatives have been reviewed and were found to be inferior to the roundabout.
PCW-25	Mitigation T-3a requires Class II bike lanes along Tank Farm Road prior to the occupancy of Phase 1.
PCW-26	Mitigation T-3a requires Class I paths running north-south on the north-east, north-west, and southern portions of the property, consistent with the BTP.

Comment #	Response
PCW-27	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
PCW-28	CEQA does not require an EIR to address the economic issues of a project. In evaluating mitigation measures and alternatives, the EIR ***may*** consider economic issues. For this EIR, the City will address economic issues are part of the hearing process.
PCW-29	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
PCW-30	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
PCW-31	Mitigation T-3a requires Class II bike lanes along Tank Farm Road, as well as Class I paths for north-south traffic consistent with the BTP.
PCW-32	The mitigations in the EIR were developed in the context of the City's adopted Circulation Element, which establishes level-of-service standards for vehicular travel. In some cases, additional lanes are needed to maintain the prescribed level-of-service.
PCW-33	The air quality mitigation measures address a range of impacts. Comment noted.
PCW-34	Mitigations T-3a and T-4 address potential safety issues for cyclists, by minimizing the duration of construction and providing additional bike facilities to serve cyclists.
PCW-35	The BTP includes policies for cyclist education and promotion. The project would not conflict with these policies, and payment of City Traffic Impact Fees would support these policies.
PCW-36	The Class I path along Tank Farm Road is included in the BTP and the AASP, and is therefore included in Mitigation T-3a. North-south routes are also included in Mitigation T-3a.
PCW-37	Mitigation T-3a specifies that bicycle and pedestrian improvements shall be in place prior to the occupancy of Phase 1 of the project.
PCW-38	The AASP and Circulation Element classify Tank Farm Road as a parkway arterial, defined as high-capacity facilities intended for mobility for all modes of travel. Section 6.4.2.1 of the AASP specifies that Tank Farm Road will have a continuous, four-lane cross-section.
PCW-39	Mitigation T-4 requires that adjacent segments of infrastructure be constructed at the same time to avoid network discontinuities and minimize disruption to all modes of travel. The project includes improvements for all modes of travel consistent with the applicable City policies.
PCW-40	Groundwater contamination at the site has been thoroughly characterized and continues to be monitored. Currently, wells are monitored semi-annually with

Comment #	Response
	all samples analyzed for TPH C10-C40 (with no silica gel clean-up comparison is conducted); a subset of samples are analyzed for TPH-g and BTEX. During the most recently reported monitoring event (September 2011), the depth to groundwater ranged from 5.75 feet (MW-39) to 21.51 feet (MW-46) below the top of the casings, with groundwater calculated to flow generally toward the southwest (Padre 2011d). Only TPH (C10-C40) was detected above laboratory reporting limits, with detections in nine of the 24 groundwater samples analyzed ranging from 530 µg/L (SLOW-12) to 3,600 µg/L (SLOW-18). Groundwater will continue to be monitored to prevent migration and exposure to contaminated groundwater.
PCW-41	Commenter agrees with the roundabout at Tank Farm Road/Santa Fe Road.
PCW-42	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
PCW-43	The project will be required to implement TDM strategies, which may reduce traffic generation below the levels projected in the EIR. In this case, the EIR analysis would be conservative and the mitigation measures would still be adequate.
PCW-44	The project is required to provide bicycle parking per the City's Municipal Code. It will be necessary for the project to show conformance with the Code before receiving occupancy permits.
PCW-45	The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS) published Crash Reductions Following Installation of Roundabouts in the United States indicates that their research has shown no problems with respect to elderly populations and roundabouts. On page 10 they state that while "some have expressed concern that older drivers may have difficulties adjusting to roundabouts […] the average age of crash-involved drivers did not increase following the installation of roundabouts, suggesting that roundabouts do not pose a problem for older drivers." Left-turn movements are typically the most troublesome for elderly populations, as they require judgment of acceptable gaps in approaching traffic. Roundabouts eliminate conflicting left turn movements.
PCW-46	The comment indicates that a roundabout would be incompatible with industrial traffic, however the proposed design was specifically engineered to handle truck traffic appropriate with the industrial context.
PCW-47	With respect to the ultimate intersection control identified in the Airport Area Specific Plan (AASP), a roundabout is included as an ultimate intersection control option at the Tank Farm Road/Santa Fe Road intersection. Table 6.2 of the AASP indicates that the Circulation System Improvements for the Tank Farm Road/Santa Fe Road intersection are to "install roundabout and add lanes as shown in the EIR to the approval of the Public Works Director". The proposed roundabout design is not an interim intersection control, and would be designed to accommodate cumulative conditions traffic volumes.

Comment #	Response
PCW-48	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.
PCW-49	It is unclear for what reason the commenter believes entering the Morro Bay roundabout constitutes “taking one’s life into one’s own hands”. Comment is acknowledged, noting the previously discussed safety benefits associated with roundabouts.
PCW-50	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
PCW-51	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
PCW-52	The proposed roundabout has been designed to handle PM peak hour traffic acceptably. 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.
PCW-53	The proposed roundabout design will in fact slow traffic at the Tank Farm Road/Santa Fe Road intersection, whereas traffic signals have been shown to increase travel speeds as motorists attempt to “beat the red” light.
PCW-54	The proposed roundabout design has been designed to work efficiently and effectively handle peak hour volumes, as opposed to “creating gridlock”.
PCW-55	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
PCW-56	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
PCW-57	This comment does not deal with the adequacy of the EIR so no further response is required.
PCW-58	Mitigation measure BIO-1a requires a conservation easement for the open space that will likely be turned over to the City of San Luis Obispo. The City has been in discussions with Chevron about the possible transfer of the open space. The EIR mitigation requires that all of the open space be protected in perpetuity. The Project Description, Chapter 2.0 states, “*A conservation easement will transfer surface rights to open space property to the City, the County, or an appropriate land conservancy organization with a restrictive covenant limiting future uses. The conveyance would be made after the remediation of the open space property has been accepted by the appropriate agencies and an endowment or other funding mechanism is in place for future maintenance.*”

Chevron Tank Farm Public Draft EIR Workshop
July 8, 2013
Summary of Comments

1. 250 acres of open space, what can be done with it? | PW-1
2. Limited to Class I bikeways /paths, etc. | PW-2
3. Who owns property when done? | PW-3
4. Transport of material via rail? | PW-4
5. Traffic on Tank Farm Road and crossing of Tank Farm Road, avoid peak hour trips | PW-5
6. Why are road improvements done in phases and not all at once? | PW-6
7. Climate Action Plan. | PW-7
8. Public transportation, more efficient system. | PW-8
9. Is more recreation possible? | PW-9
10. Traffic circle (roundabout). | PW-10
11. Hazardous materials getting to the lower aquifer? No evidence. | PW-11

Comment #	Response
PW-1	The open space would be protected in perpetuity as conservation land for the protection of the wetlands and sensitive plant and animal species. This is one of the major requirement of CDFW and USFWS. The open space would have a number of bicycle/pedestrian trails for public access.
PW-2	The mitigations require conformance with the City's Bicycle Master Plan, which includes Class I, II, and III facilities.
PW-3	The developed property could be owned by the developer or some other entity. Mitigation measure BIO-1a requires a conservation easement for the open space that will likely be turned over to the City of San Luis Obispo. The City has been in discussions with Chevron about the possible transfer of the open space. The EIR mitigation requires that all of the open space be protected in perpetuity. The Project Description, Chapter 2.0 states, "*A conservation easement will transfer surface rights to open space property to the City, the County, or an appropriate land conservancy organization with a restrictive covenant limiting future uses. The conveyance would be made after the remediation of the open space property has been accepted by the appropriate agencies and an endowment or other funding mechanism is in place for future maintenance.*"
PW-4	There are no rail line in the vicinity of the Tank Farm site so this is not an option. Contaminated soil from the Tank Farm site would be taken to the Santa Maria Landfill for use in their Non Hazardous Impacted Soil (NHIS) landfill closure program.
PW-5	The Construction Traffic Management Plan required in Mitigation T-1 would address the timing of construction traffic to minimize operations during peak hours.
PW-6	The applicant proposed road improvements occurring in phases as the project phases are developed. Mitigation T-4 requires that the applicant submit a revised phasing plan minimizing the duration of construction and ensuring that adjacent sections of infrastructure are modified at the same time to minimize disruption of travel.
PW-7	Climate Action Plans are typically prepared by regulatory agencies such as the City and County. The City adopted a Climate Action Plan in July 2012. The CAP includes a series of steps accomplished from 2010 thru 2012 including research, outreach, local policy audit, and strategy review. Research includes review of climate science, climate planning guidance documents, climate policy enacted in other jurisdictions, and existing local policies and programs already serving to reduce GHG emissions. Community strategies for climate change adaptation and reduction of GHG emissions include strategies related to (1) Buildings; (2) Renewable Energy; (3) Transportation & Land Use; (4) Water; (5) Solid Waste; and (6) Parks & Open Space. Strategies are also included that help reduce GHG emissions associated with City Government Operations. The City and County CAPs are discussed in Section 4.1, Air

	Quality and Greenhouse Gases. Development at the Tank Farm site would have to comply with the applicable provisions of the City's CAP. The EIR included building energy improvements to reduce GHG emissions from the project. The project would also have to comply with Title 24, which is the building energy efficiency standards that are in effect at the time the building are constructed. The EIR analysis is based upon the 2008 Title 24 standards. In July 2014 the 2013 Title 24 standards take effect, which would reduce GHG emissions from building by about 25 percent compared with the 2008 standards.
PW-8	Section 4.3, Traffic and Circulation discusses the public transportation system, and provide a number mitigation measures (T-3a) for the project to improve reliance on the public transportation system.
PW-9	The proposed development would include a 15-acre recreational area that could be used for baseball fields. The project would also provide a number of bicycle/pedestrian trails across both the north and south section of the Tank Farm site. The remainder of the open space would be protected in perpetuity as conservation land for the protection of the wetlands and sensitive plant and animal species. This is one of the major requirement of CDFW and USFWS.
PW-10	The roundabout is the preferred intersection control in the AASP and provides acceptable operations for all modes of travel.
PW-11	Groundwater contamination at the site is contained in a shallow perched aquifer. There is no connection between this shallow perched aquifer and deeper groundwater. To date, there is no evidence that contamination has migrated deeper than the shallow aquifer. See Impact WR-9 discussion for further information on the deep versus shallow aquifer. Also see comment RWQCB-2 that provides additional information on the connection between the deep and shallow aquifer.