

WOODLANDS TRACT MAP & DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Environmental Impact Report Addendum

August, 2002

Prepared by:
County of San Luis Obispo
Planning and Building Department
Environmental Division

WOODLANDS TRACT MAP & DEVELOPMENT PLANS

Environmental Impact Report Addendum

August, 2002

Tract 2341, ED01-699

Phase 1A Development Plan D990195D, ED01-704

Golf Course Development Plan D990194D, ED01-705

WOODLANDS EIR ADDENDUM

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Background

On December 15, 1998, an EIR was certified for the Woodlands Specific Plan. The Specific Plan and EIR are intended to provide the framework for an orderly development of the Woodlands property consistent with the County of San Luis Obispo General Plan.

The Woodlands is a 957-acre, mixed-use project located on the Nipomo Mesa approximately two miles west of the community of Nipomo, on the east side of Highway One, and approximately ½ mile south of Willow Road. The Specific Plan includes the following types of development: residential, commercial, resort, business park, golf courses, open space, trails, and a public park. The residential component of the project ranges in density types from single family residential lots of up to one acre to multi-family residential development at 20 units per acre. The maximum number of dwelling units is 1,320. Approximately 62 acres of commercial uses are proposed, consisting of about 12 acres of commercial retail uses in a village center; a 28-acre resort hotel (up to 500 rooms), conference facilities and a restaurant; and about 22 acres for a business park development. The Specific Plan designated approximately 587 acres for parks, buffers and open space, including the following: approximately 300 acres designated for two and one-half golf courses, a 10-acre public park, 27 acres of neighborhood play areas and open spaces between residential lots, 11 acres are to be set aside for Monarch Butterfly over-wintering, 76 acres designated for open space buffers along the perimeter of the site, and 93 acres remaining in natural condition. A network of pedestrian, bicycle and equestrian trails is also included under the proposed project.

A supplement to the Specific Plan EIR was certified on January 8, 2002, to amend the Growth Management Ordinance to allow for the implementation of the Woodlands Specific Plan within a 10-15 year time period.

Proposed Projects

Tiering from the approved Specific Plan, the applicant is seeking the following actions:

- A. Approval for a tentative Tract Map for the entire development, to be recorded in multiple phases;
- B. Approval for Phase 1A development that covers 417 acres, which consists of 447 single-family residential units; one 18-hole

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Environmental Analysis	3
3.0 Environmental Issues	9
4.0 Conclusion	14
Appendix A - Graphics	
Appendix B - Agency Letters	

golf course; infrastructure for a 19 acre business park, a 14 acre village center (including a 1.8 acre park) and a 5.7 acre multi-family parcel; other project infrastructure improvements including: a wastewater treatment plant; a water distribution system; four temporary dwellings for initial construction activities; on-site roads; and off-site road improvements, including Albert Way and Via Concha (from the project to Willow Road), and Mesa Road (from the project to Tefft Street).

Subsequent land use permits and environmental review will be required for: commercial development within the village center and the business park; development of the resort; multi-family development; additional temporary housing; and grading, tree removal and residential development for future phases.

Proposed Environmental Determination

Upon review and comparison of the proposed project and the approved Specific Plan several minor modifications and refinements have been made to the project. Therefore, this Environmental Impact Report Addendum (Addendum) to the Woodlands Specific Plan has been prepared by the San Luis Obispo County (Department of Planning and Building), pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15164 et seq., to address these changes. The proposed changes would not result in any changes to the conclusions reached from the previously certified EIR or EIR Supplement, nor would there be a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects. Also, no new information of substantial importance is known to exist that was not known or could not have been known at the time of the previous EIR or Supplemental EIR.

Several of the environmental measures approved as a part of the Specific Plan are performance standards that require the applicant to submit project-specific information (e.g., drainage plans, landscape plans, conservation plans, etc.) for review prior to approval of discretionary permits (such as the proposed development plans and tentative tract). The applicant has provided preliminary plans with sufficient detail to show that feasible mitigation will be used to comply with the performance standard and reduce impacts to the extent required. However, these plans will be further refined prior to map recordation or project commencement which in turn will require additional details to be provided relating to the specific respective environmental mitigation measures. According to the *Guide to the California Environmental Quality Act* (Remy, 1999 Edition) it is acceptable to defer the formulation of specific mitigation strategies until after project approval: “[This] is permissible where the adopted mitigation measure (i) commits the [county] to a realistic performance standard or criterion that will ensure the mitigation of the significant effect, and (ii) disallows the occurrence of physical changes to the environment unless the performance standard is or will be satisfied.” (Remy, pg. 425) Also see CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.4(a)(1)(B) and *Gentry v. City of Murietta* (4th Dist. 1995).

2.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS OF MINOR PROJECT MODIFICATIONS

In developing the tentative tract and refining the development plan designs, several minor modifications were made to the project by the applicant. The following analysis identifies those minor changes, when the project is compared to the approved Specific Plan, and explains why the change is considered minor.

Modification #1: One road access entry into the northeast section of the project has been added onto Camino Caballo near Sun Dale Way . This impact would occur as a part of Phase 1B. Please refer to Exhibit A-1, Development Plan.

Analysis #1: The additional entry provides for streets that will be considered “functionally equivalent” to improving Camino Caballo from Viva Way to Via Concha, and functionally equivalent to Viva Way from Camino Caballo to Mesa Road. This was generally called out as a condition of the approved Specific Plan. This design will divert a small portion of project traffic onto these roadways. However, due to 1) the lack of improved roads in this area, and 2) shorter and quicker alternative roads throughout the development that will be available at buildout, the amount of vehicles at this location will be very small and will have no significant effect on the existing acceptable level service. The overall traffic impacts and traffic patterns will remain unchanged from what was approved for the Specific Plan. Providing this additional project access point will also slightly improve emergency and police vehicle accessibility for this northeastern section of the development.

Modification #2: Several cul-de-sacs have been eliminated or shorten, and additional bicycle and pedestrian easements proposed. See Exhibit A-2, Bicycle and Pedestrian Easements.

Analysis #2: These circulation features will slightly shorten the length and/or number of internal vehicle trips between the residences and the commercial components of the project, such as the village center. This, in turn should slightly improve air quality and traffic conditions when compared to the approved Specific Plan.

Modification #3: Some residential lots were relocated closer to the business park.

Analysis #3: The original Specific Plan did not include residences within close proximity of the business park. The original tract submittal located 17 residential lots just east of the business park. This was identified as a potential conflict, so the number of lots near the business park has been reduced to eight. The following reasons describe why these eight parcels will not conflict with the business park development: sufficient area is proposed between the business park and residential lots to provide effective landscape screening; residential lot grading shall include berming near the lot perimeter nearest the business park lots to substantially reduce noise pollution from delivery/service vehicles; and each business park lot will

be subject discretionary review and must be designed to avoid significant noise impacts to the nearby residential neighborhood. A number of existing noise attenuating “tools” are available that would be applied at such time that can reduce noise levels to less than significant levels (if it is determined that any of the noises would otherwise exceed acceptable noise thresholds). Also, the Specific Plan limits many of the potentially louder uses for the commercial service area as not being allowed. Therefore, potential impacts associated with residential uses in closer proximity to the commercial lots, such as noise, glare, and vibration, can be reduced to acceptable levels with Land Use Ordinance requirements or standard mitigation measures found in the Noise Element.

Modification #4: Changes to the shape of the butterfly habitat area.

Analysis #4: The 11-acre monarch butterfly habitat area has changed slightly in shape along its southerly buffer. However, there have been no changes to the actual overwintering site, which will remain protected. The reconfiguration was reviewed by a qualified entomologist familiar with monarch butterflies (Kingston Leong, PhD.), who was also the one who originally established the boundaries. He determined that it closely resembled the previously-approved habitat buffer area and the change would not result in an adverse impact to the existing overwintering site. (See attached Leong letter; June 11, 2002).

Modification #5: An on-site composting facility has been added to the project.

Analysis #5: The applicant has added a 1.3-acre composting facility within and adjacent to the area designated for the wastewater treatment plant. This facility is in response to Specific Plan mitigation measure 4-7.6a (Specific Plan, Appendix E), which requires a compost management plan be prepared that includes the handling of project-generated green waste on site. The proposed 1.3 acre addition would provide ample room at the treatment facility site to accommodate the composting station that could handle all of the project-generated green waste. The general size and design of the station has been reviewed and found acceptable by the County’s Solid Waste Coordinator. Access to the station would be from internal streets and the nearest residence would be more than 300 feet away. Providing such a facility will reduce truck trips that would otherwise go to Cold Canyon landfill which would include an associated reduction of air emissions. Maintaining the greenwaste on-site will also increase life of the landfill.

Modification #6: The existing 9 acres of Central Coast Scrub is proposed to be replaced off-site.

Analysis #6: Specific Plan mitigation measure 4.4-1a provides two options for mitigating the potential loss of the 9 acres of Central Coast Scrub (See Exhibit A-3, Central Coast Scrub Area.): 1) redesign the project to avoid the habitat or 2) re-establish the habitat elsewhere. The applicant has chosen to pursue reestablishing the habitat off-site. The county has been provided information (refer to attached Land Conservancy letter; July 17, 2002) about several “candidate” locations currently available for reestablishment, where Central Coast Scrub habitat exists in a very degraded state, or previously existed,

and are owned or controlled by resource protection groups whose ultimate intent is restoring this habitat. Based on preliminary information costs associated with off-site reestablishment of this habitat would be around \$45,000/ acre. For 9 acres, at least \$405,000 would need to be set aside for such off-site restoration. This provision would need to be completed either prior to recording the final map or issuance of any permits relating to removal of this habitat, whichever comes first.

As a separate but related mitigation measure, the silvery legless lizard that may exist within this coastal scrub habitat is required to be protected. Given that the existing habitat will be removed and would otherwise displace or kill any such species, the existing habitat shall remain until such time as one of the following occur: 1) a biological survey of the undisturbed scrub is conducted for the legless lizard, and the survey determines this species is not present; or 2) the 9-acre scrub habitat area shall remain undisturbed until such time that the off-site restoration area has been restored to the extent that would be able to support the legless lizards; the existing lizards would then be collected and moved by a qualified biologist from the 9-acre scrub area to the restored area. A detailed plan of how this would be accomplished, using Department of Fish and Game protocol, as appropriate, would be provided either prior to recording the final map or issuance of any permits relating to removal of this habitat, whichever comes first. These measures are not considered new mitigation measures, but logical extensions of the previously required measures, based on more specific information.

Modification #7: 93 acres of “natural area” have been included as part of the golf course ownership.

Analysis #7: The Specific Plan identifies approximately 300 acres for the 45 holes of golf. However, the tentative map shows 393 acres for golf course parcels. Staff has reviewed this “discrepancy” and has determined that 1) the current layout of the golf courses substantially conform to the layout shown in the Specific Plan 2) and the Specific Plan states that 93 acres will remain as “natural areas”(excluding monarch butterfly habitat). The Specific Plan does not specify the ownership of the natural areas, which are currently proposed to be mostly owned by the golf course operators, with some smaller holdings by the “master” homeowner’s associations or other entities. The EIR recognized the existing Eucalyptus groves, while not native to the area, as acceptable vegetation in these “natural areas”. There are many areas where portions of these groves will be preserved.

In addition, for some areas where grading will occur and the eucalyptus trees will be removed, the applicant proposes to establish “Woodland Planting Zones” throughout the development and along the golf course fringes, which include a large percentage of species native to California. These areas, once established, would actually be considered much more “native” or “natural” than the eucalyptus groves being removed and would serve under the “natural area” definition. At least 93 acres will be set aside and maintained by the golf course and/or the master homeowner’s association, either with existing

eucalyptus groves or newly created “planting zones”. Therefore, the proposed development will comply with this requirement.

Modification #8: The estimated scope of work for grading has increased.

Analysis #8: The Woodlands proposes to balance the cut and fill from grading on site, which means there will be no need to import or export soil to or from the site. Although the general footprint of the development has not significantly changed, after preparation of a more detailed grading plan by the applicant's civil engineers, the estimates for grading and site disturbance have increased from the time the specific plan was approved. The specific plan process is a first-tier approach that looks at most issues in a broader context, then the next tier of approvals, such as the tract map or development plan, provide more specific details about how the generally approved development will actually "fit" onto the site. Therefore, grading and site disturbance statistics on a large project are likely to change. It can be particularly challenging to prepare a preliminary grading estimate on a site like the Woodlands because of the heavy tree cover.

Grading can be characterized both in terms of area of disturbance and cubic yards of soil moved. The specific plan identified 770 acres of use areas that would most likely be graded for development. The other 187 acres consist of the 11 acre butterfly preserve, a 7 acre passive-use park, 76 acres of open space buffers and the 93 acres of natural areas within and near the golf courses. During the EIR analysis, the estimated cubic yards of grading ranged from 0.75 million cubic yards (mcy) of cut material to 1.05 mcy of cut material. The current estimates are 813 acres of site disturbance and 2.6 mcy of cut material. The increase in the area of disturbance can mostly be attributed to changes within the 93 acres of natural areas where site disturbance will occur to remove trees that will be replaced with native plants as described above in Modification #7. Regarding the depth of cut, each foot of soil cut across the area of disturbance is equal to 1.3 mcy of cut material, therefore the refined grading estimates approximately equal 1 foot, 5 inches more in cut material over the 813 acres.

The study issues addressed in the EIR that may be affected by grading are air quality, archaeology, drainage, erosion and sedimentation.

Air Quality - Grading activities will result in air pollutant emissions from two different sources: fugitive dust generation and equipment exhaust emissions. The generation of fugitive dust (PM_{10}) is based on area of disturbance rather than the cubic yards of grading. The fugitive dust analysis (EIR Appendix D) assumed that 574 acres of site disturbance would occur over the entire project with grading to be completed in four phases. Phase 1A grading of 242 acres would be done in 9 months, Phase 1B grading of 121 acres, Phase 2A grading of 112 acres and Phase 2B grading of 99 acres would be done at separate times with each phase taking 6 months to complete. In no case did the amount of dust generation for each phase exceed the Air Pollution Control District's threshold of 2.5 tons of PM_{10} per quarter based on 40 pounds of PM_{10} being generated per acre per day. The Air Pollution Control District APCD has reviewed the proposed development plans and makes a series of recommendations (see APCD letter;

July 18, 2001) that are prerequisite to map recordation or beginning of any tree clearing or grading, including: an APCD-approved Construction Management Plan (including a Dust Control Program), and an APCD-approved Diesel Combustion Emissions Control Plan. A construction management plan will be completed prior to issuance of any grading permit or beginning of tract improvements that will show the daily amount of grading work will not exceed the APCD threshold for fugitive dust. In addition, a new PM₁₀ analysis was conducted for the refined grading plan based on 813 acres of site disturbance and using the current, and more conservative, APCD standard of 50 pounds per acre per day. The new analysis concludes that each phase of grading can occur, as proposed, without exceeding APCD standards for PM₁₀ and that emissions from construction equipment can also meet APCD standards.

Drainage, Erosion and Sedimentation - The project site is located in an area of the Nipomo Mesa where all storm water must be retained on site. County Public Works has reviewed the conceptual drainage plan and has determined that the general information is sufficient to be able to support the general design and layout of the proposed project. Detailed plans will need to be submitted prior to map recordation or issuance of any tree clearing or grading permits. As discussed in the EIR, the temporary sedimentation basins that will need to be shown on these plans and established prior to any other tree clearing or grading activities to catch all runoff from these areas, will also adequately serve the project with the additional grading.

Archaeology - The archaeological resources will not be affected by the revised scope of work because the known archaeological site is to be avoided and will not be developed or graded.

Modification #9: Additional tree removal in Phase IIB is proposed along the southerly project edge.

Analysis #9: An east-westerly ridge runs through the middle of the site with the area south of this ridge being visible to Highway One and the Santa Maria valley below. In an effort to minimize visual impacts, the Specific Plan limited tree removal in some areas along the southern half of the site (which corresponds with Phase IIB of the development). The intent of this effort was to provide sufficient windrows or groupings of existing trees staggered on this slope to screen most of the otherwise visible development. Other areas with no existing trees would be planted to supplement this provision.

The applicant's preliminary tree retention plan submitted with the tentative map application shows more tree removal and relies more on replanting in Phase IIB than anticipated by the Specific Plan. The additional proposed tree removal areas are mainly within the golf course areas between the fairways and residential lots. The proposed business park and wastewater treatment plant (part of Phase 1A) are very similar to what was approved for the Specific Plan. The residential lotting pattern of the subdivision is also generally similar to the footprints shown for the Specific Plan, and therefore the tract map application

is generally consistent with the tree removal previously expected for this portion of the development.

At this time, none of the pending permits propose tree removal or grading in Phase IIB. A subsequent Development Plan will be required for final approval of the golf course layout. Given that this tentative map will be recorded in phases, approval or further consideration of detailed grading plans for this southern portion of the tract can be deferred until such time that this phase plans to record the lots. At such time more specific tree clearing is proposed, county staff will work with the applicant to meet the intent of providing adequate screening for Highway 1 views. As determined necessary, possible measures include: install retaining walls to protect more trees; reduce fairway widths at certain locations; develop a phased tree removal/replanting program where new trees become well established before certain eucalyptus are removed; require dark exterior colors and/or limit heights of new structures, etc. Please refer to attached Exhibit A-4, Tree Retention Plan.

Modification #10: The residential multi-family lot near the village center is 5.70 acres rather than 4.0 acres.

Analysis #10: Regardless of the size of the lot, the Specific Plan identifies a maximum of 80 multi-family dwellings allowed in Woodlands and the maximum density is 20 units per acre. Therefore, the proposed larger lot is still considered consistent with these Specific Plan parameters. The larger parcel will allow for more design flexibility or a possible future Specific Plan amendment to allow more multi-family units. However, the maximum number of dwellings for the entire project cannot exceed 1,320, whether they are single family, multi-family or secondary dwellings.

Modification #11: Addition of sound walls for the rear or side yards for 36 lots along Mesa Road (within the project).

Analysis #11: The amount of on-site traffic on Mesa Road and Via Concha warranted an acoustical study to determine potential impacts from traffic noise along these roads. To meet the requirements of the county's Noise Element, the acoustical study (URS Corporation, December, 2000) recommends a six foot sound wall for residences that have outside use areas adjacent to Mesa Road (projected noise on Via Concha did not exceed Noise Element standards). There is a potential negative aesthetic impact associated with long sound walls. In this case, there is ample room to set the walls back from the roadway so landscape features such as berms, vines and dense vegetation can be used to avoid visual impacts. Wall design, materials and colors can also soften and "break up" the look of the sound walls. See Exhibit A-5, Sound Wall Locations.

Modification #12: All of the village center has been forwarded to Phase 1A.

Analysis #12: Section 5.3.3 of the Specific Plan allows the applicant to request that non-residential portions of the project be advanced to earlier phases. All required infrastructure and mitigation measures must be completed with the advanced project features. At this time, the village center will involve tree removal, grading, infrastructure, and the information center. Individual uses will require future land use permit approval. The inclusion of the additional village center acreage with Phase 1A will insignificantly increase grading and tree removal for the first phase. The applicable mitigation measures are either being addressed with the overall phase 1A project or are meant to be addressed with future use permits. The traffic impacts associated with bringing this component forward will not result in the need to change the approved schedule of off-site road improvements.

Modification #13: The applicant has changed the proposed haul routes for tree removal.

Analysis #13: The EIR states that 2,000 truck trips will be required to haul logs and an additional 250 truck trips for chipped material. It was anticipated that most of the truck trips would travel north on Highway One through Arroyo Grande to Highway 101. The current project description identifies the trucks heading south to Guadalupe to Highway 166 on to Highway 101 and then south towards the Los Angeles area. This route would reduce the number of trips that might otherwise have used Nipomo Mesa roads, such as Willow Road or Tefft Street. The main entrance at Highway One is required to be improved with left and right turn lanes prior to tree removal, regardless of the preferred haul direction. Caltrans will require that a traffic management plan be prepared for this portion of the project, in addition to the standard encroachment permit. This plan shall be prepared and then approved by the Environmental Coordinator (in consultation with County Public Works and Caltrans), prior to issuance of any permit related to large-scale tree removal.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

A. Water Resources - Domestic water for the project will be supplied by on-site wells. The water will be delivered to three on-site storage tanks for distribution throughout the project. A separate irrigation system is proposed for the golf courses with one source being groundwater and the second source being reclaimed water from the wastewater treatment plant. Certification of the 1998 EIR resulted in four mitigation measures for water resources. No new mitigation measures were required with the 2001 Supplemental EIR. Three of the four mitigation measures focus on water conservation and the fourth required a survey of nearby wells that could be affected by water level interference due to pumpage by the Woodlands development.

Measure 4.1-6a requires the applicant to participate in a toilet retrofit program on a 1:1 basis or propose

a comparable water saving program. The only existing toilet retrofit program on the Nipomo Mesa is run by the Nipomo Community Services District. However, it is for properties within the services district and not available to the applicant, as well as having a limited inventory of pre low-flow toilets available for retrofitting. Therefore, the applicant has developed a preliminary water savings program that is estimated to save about 81 acre feet of water per year (afy). By comparison, retrofitting 1,320 toilets in the NCSD program would receive a credit of approximately 165 afy (based on staff's phone conversation with the NCSD general manager). Whereas, the City of San Luis Obispo would give a credit of approximately 79.2 afy for 1,320 toilets (source: City of San Luis Obispo Toilet Retrofit Certificate). The applicant's proposal (see the applicant's draft Conservation Master Plans, on file with the Department of Planning and Building) includes water savings from using mulch obtained from the on-site composting facility (2.9 afy), use of soil moisture sensors for commercial and common area landscapes (16.2 afy), water system leak prevention system (49.2 afy after an initial 10 year period), irrigation pond monitoring (5.7 afy after an initial 10 year period), increase the restriction on turf for commercial and multi-family projects from 20% to 10% of the landscape area (7.2 afy), and a water conservation education program (77.2 afy). However, a water conservation education program is required by mitigation measure 4.1-6b and therefore cannot be counted here. While implementation of these proposed measures will reduce water consumptive practices, additional measures will need to be provided to demonstrate how an annual saving of 165 afy will be achieved. This shall be completed prior to recording the first final map or any site disturbing activities, whichever occurs first. These measures shall show they are in addition to the water saving requirements of other mitigation measures.

Measure 4.1-6b requires the applicant to develop a master water conservation education program. It is estimated that this effort could save as much as 77.2 afy. The applicant has prepared a preliminary water conservation education program including informational handouts, checklists for builders, demonstration gardens, and regular communication from the homeowner's association for long-term efforts. As with the water savings program, this program will need refinements prior to recording the first final map or site disturbing activities (whichever occurs first), and expand to all aspects of the development (e.g., commercial, business park, etc.).

Measure 4.1-6c requires the project to use low water usage techniques in landscapes, including drip systems, use of native plants, limiting turf, selecting golf course turfs that have low water needs. The preliminary landscape plan incorporates many of these features. In addition, a condition of approval will need to be added that requires the use of warm weather turf (e.g., bermudagrass) for the golf course. This will result in at least a 20% reduction in water consumption, when compared to cooler weather grasses (e.g., fescues). Based on the EIR's estimate of 791 afy needed for golf course irrigation, this would result in a savings of approximately 158 afy.

Measure 4.1-6d requires a survey of surrounding wells that may be affected by the Woodlands' on-site well water pumpage. The survey has been completed. The applicant is required to implement means to allow for the continued production of potable water from these wells under drought conditions to the satisfaction of the county, should the Woodland's wells adversely affect these surrounding wells.

- B. Traffic and Circulation** - There are seven access points proposed for the Woodlands. The main entrance will be at Highway One that will provide access to the north and south. Both Albert Way and Via Concha will provide northerly access to Willow Road. The extension of Willow Road to Highway 101 and an interchange will be necessary to accommodate Stage II (Phases IIA and IIB) development. Mesa Road will be improved to handle most of the easterly traffic to Nipomo. The project will connect to Eucalyptus Road, which will also provide easterly access to Nipomo. The sixth entry is a secondary access to the business park and wastewater treatment facility from Highway One. The seventh access point that connects to Camino Caballo is discussed above in Section 2.0.

All internal roads directly connecting with these access roads will need to meet Specific Plan standards. The off-site mitigation measures will be completed commensurate with each phase of development, as previously approved through the Specific Plan. In addition to these off-site road improvements, other circulation-related provisions shall be required, such as: provisions for future transit service, improvement of perimeter roads or their functional equivalent, construction of various on-site trails and pathways for alternative modes of transportation, and the payment of road improvement fees. Also, a traffic management plan (approved by Caltrans) shall be prepared to address traffic safety for trucks involved with the mass tree removal operation.

- C. Air Quality** - Fourteen mitigation measures were developed by the Air Pollution Control District. Most of these pertain to dust control and reduction of emissions during project construction. In reviewing the tentative map and development plans, the APCD is proposing refinement to the dust control plan and minor modifications to measure 4.3-1a due to technological advancements (see APCD letter July 6, 2001). As required by measure 4.3-2b modifications were made in the project design to improve pedestrian and bicycle connections within the project. Measure 4.3-2a requires coordination with transit authorities to expand service to the project. At this time, transit service is not available to this portion of South County, nor is it envisioned in the near future. However, as this area develops in the future, transit service will likely expand to this area. Therefore, the applicant has provided locations throughout the project where transit and park and ride facilities can be easily installed.

- D. Biological Resources** - The project site is mostly covered with eucalyptus trees. There are other open

areas consisting of Central Coast Scrub and grasslands. Eleven acres of the eucalyptus will be preserved for monarch butterfly habitat, and 9 acres of Central Coast Scrub must be preserved or successfully reestablished elsewhere. Other mitigation measures were developed for monitoring construction activities, protecting sensitive areas of the site, establishing native vegetation with golf course development, and operational standards for the golf courses. Refer to Modification #6 on the details related to removal and reestablishment of the Central Coast Scrub (and silvery legless lizard). All Specific Plan mitigation measures can and will be implemented as a part of the proposed subdivision and development plans.

E. Noise - The primary noise sources will be from traffic, the wastewater treatment plant, and certain uses or activities within the Business Park and commercial Village areas. In addition to Modifications #3 and #11 previously discussed, the mitigation measures approved for the Specific Plan are still adequate to mitigate the project's noise impacts. Examples of these measures include: limitations on construction hours, notification to neighbors of certain construction activities, partial or complete funding of sound walls for some pre-existing residences along certain roads that will experience an increase of traffic noise due to the buildout of the Woodlands and other area projects.

F. Aesthetics - The most prominent visual component of site are the large groves of eucalyptus trees. These currently contribute significantly to the surrounding rural character of the area. The project will be very visible as seen from the moderately-traveled Highway One. As required through the Specific Plan, a perimeter buffer of trees shall remain, with limited tree removal allowed for the most visible southerly half of the project. Please refer to Modification #9 for further discussion on minor changes being made to this provision. Other aesthetic mitigation measures relate to exterior lighting and can be adequately addressed with building permit review or other subsequent land use permits.

G. Public Services and Utilities

1) Fire Safety - The California Department of Forestry (CDF/County Fire) will provide fire protection to the Woodlands. The nearest station is about three miles to the northwest on Highway One. The mitigation measures identified in the Specific Plan, including fire sprinklers for buildings, vegetation clearance, emergency access and an adequate water system will be met with plan implementation. Revisions to the applicant's Vegetation Management Plan will be needed prior to map recordation or site disturbing activities (whichever occurs first) to fully meet CDF needs, as well as comply with other measures indirectly related (e.g., preserving critical viewshed trees, etc.). In response to project referrals, CDF has reviewed the specific development and has made a few additional recommendations that should be added as conditions of approval (see CDF letters; March 8, 2000; March 21, 2002).

- 2) **Sheriff** - The Woodlands is currently patrolled by the South Patrol Station in Arroyo Grande. The applicant has stated that they will be providing a site within the village center for use as a future substation. The Sheriff's Department has reviewed the tentative map for public safety issues and did not identify any significant issues. Commercial and multi-family projects must be reviewed for crime prevention measures at the time the specific development is proposed (see Sheriff's letter; May 1, 2001).
- 3) **Schools** - The applicant and Lucia Mar School District have reached an agreement for the payment of fees for the full mitigation of impacts to schools (see the Lucia Mar School District letter; March 15, 2001). The possibility will still exist for the proposed public park to also accommodate a future elementary school should the District, County Parks and applicant wish to pursue this option.
- 4) **Water and Sewer Services** - Preliminary water and wastewater master plans for the distribution of water, and the collection and processing of wastewater have been submitted for review. These plans will need refinement prior to recording the final map or issuance of construction permits, whichever occurs first. The State Regional Water Quality Control Board has issued waste discharge requirements for the Woodlands development (RWQCB Order Number 00-139).
- 5) **Solid Waste and Recycling** - Solid waste will be collected by Nipomo Garbage and will be disposed of at Cold Canyon Landfill. County Public Works and the State Integrated Waste Management Agency have reviewed the applicant's preliminary composting plan for handling 100% of the project's green waste on-site and determined this preliminary plan to be reasonable (see also Modification #5 for on-site composting of greenwaste). More specific details on overall volumes and composting techniques will be provided prior to map recordation which may result in minor revisions to the preliminary plan.

- H. **Archaeology** - The cultural resource surface survey prepared for the Specific Plan identified several historic and prehistoric archaeological sites on the subject property and measures to minimize impacts. These measures will be completed as a part of the development. Due to limited visibility for a couple of potentially sensitive areas, subsurface work will need to be completed for these areas when vegetation has been removed but prior to any grading.
- I. **Agricultural Resources** - The nearest agriculture operation is on the west side of Highway One. The tentative map has been reviewed by the County Agricultural Commissioner's Office and no impacts on agriculture were identified.
- J. **Hazardous Materials** - Mitigation measures pertaining to minimizing the need for pesticides, preparing

an Integrated Pest Management Program, and proper handling and storage of hazardous materials were developed primarily for golf course operation. Preliminary plans have been developed for pest management and handling of hazardous materials. The details of these plans can and will be completed with plan implementation, prior to issuance of construction permits for golf course facilities or recordation of the final map, because they affect the operation of the project rather than the design of the subdivision or golf course and they must satisfy applicable county, state and federal laws.

- K. Drainage, Erosion and Sedimentation** - Drainage from storm water run-off must be retained on site and cannot be directed off site, especially toward the mesa bluff that is just off site along the southerly property line. Preliminary drainage plans have been reviewed County Public Works (see Public Works memorandum of June 26, 2002).

4.0 CONCLUSION

Based on the above discussion, the proposed mitigation measures or minor changes are not considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR, nor would they substantially reduce or change the conclusions. The applicant will be incorporating these and other required environmental measures into the project. Therefore, a subsequent or supplemental EIR is not considered necessary, and the EIR addendum is appropriate.

G:\Envdiv\STAFF\JMCK\PROJECTS\South County\WOODLAND\ADDENDUM\Addendum11.wpd