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with the construction of the Prado Road interchange.

However, an initial study for the Fugazi Development Program determined the project has the potential to significantly impact aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, and transportation and traffic. An Environmental Impact Report is required.

The vision for the Fugazi Development Program is illustrated through a detailed site plan, sections/elevations, perspectives, and a three-dimensional model. The development program is intended to be an up-scale luxury resort destination set in a lush attractive environment on 45 acres in San Luis Obispo. It includes 150 hotel suites, a 120 seat restaurant, day spa, conference facility, welcome center, creek side event area, organic, farm and natural gardens. It promotes tourism with a welcome center that includes wine tasting and local information about San Luis Obispo. It supports the City by bringing in a ten percent transient occupancy tax, uses reclaimed water for landscaping, and contributes its fair share for the Prado Road interchange.
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Introduction

The City Council has directed staff to evaluate the Sunset Drive-In site’s development feasibility, considering a range of different development scenarios. The different scenarios will enable the City to select a preferred development option based on fiscal, aesthetic, cultural and environmental criteria, possibly resulting in amending the general plan and rezoning to encourage private land assembly and development.

This report details the feasibility for a Tourist Commercial Center including a 150-room hotel, 24,000 square foot conference/banquet facility that includes a great hall and smaller break-out venues, and 64-seat restaurant with kitchen, storage and support facilities, and large outdoor patio, meeting and event area for events like open air concerts, wine-maker dinners, business fairs, fundraisers and weddings, and 2400 square foot Central Coast “Welcome” center with lobby and display area, office and restrooms.

The Sunset Drive-in site is a 45 acre infill site bounded by Elks Lane, Prado Road, and San Luis Obispo Creek, and adjacent to U.S. Highway 101. The City’s regional shopping area is across the highway to the west of the site and includes the Madonna plaza, S.L.O. Promenade, and future Dalidio marketplace.

The proposed full interchange at Prado Road and the planned relocation of State Highway 227 to Prado Road will provide good accessibility to the site, the Mid-Higuera Enhancement Area and the Margarita Area to the east will accommodate much of the City’s future growth and the site is a gateway to San Luis Obispo. These opportunities make the site an ideal candidate for a tourist commercial center.
Chapter One: Site Analysis

1.1 Overview

The Sunset Drive-In property is an infill site in the City of San Luis Obispo. The project site encompasses 45 acres located between Prado Road, Elks Lane, and San Luis Obispo Creek, neighboring the City’s Water Reclamation Facility (WRF), and adjacent to U.S. Highway 101. Existing uses comprise miscellaneous service commercial on Prado Road, a mobile home park with 24 units, U-Haul rental facility, temporary Cal Trans parking, and small scale agricultural uses but the area is best known for the Sunset Drive-In Theater. North of the project site are the San Luis Cemetery and Elks Lodge and to the south are the WRF, the Prado Day Center, and a mix of service commercial uses along South Higuera Street. Development to the east is a mix of service commercial, office, and residential uses and farther east is the Margarita Area. West of the project site is U.S. Highway 101 and regional shopping centers including the Madonna Center, San Luis Obispo Promenade, and the proposed Dalidio project.

![Map Image]

Figure 1-1 Location Map
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The project site is currently zoned interim open space, commercial services, and office and consists of ten parcels with eight different owners. Most of the project site has been a 100-year floodplain but with improvements made to San Luis Creek north and south of the project site it is anticipated that the project site no longer falls within a 100-year floodplain. Other important characteristics of the site include high tension power lines which bisect the site, located in the (S-1b) Airport safety area, and the proposed widening of Prado Road and new highway interchange (to accommodate designation of State Highway 227) which must be addressed in the development plans.

Figure 1-2 Land Use Map
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Figure 1-3
1.2 Site Characteristics

1.2.1 Physical Factors

A. Soils:

The United States Department of Agriculture soils survey of San Luis Obispo County indicates the project site is composed of Salinas silty clay loam with 0-2 percent slopes. Salinas silty clay loam is well drained, has moderately slow permeability, and the water capacity is high or very high. Surface runoff is slow and the hazard of water erosion is slight, but excavation and construction activities have the potential to substantially increase the possibility of erosion onsite. This soil type has low strength and moderate shrink swell potential and therefore the design of roads, buildings, and other structures need to be properly examined.

B. Flooding:

The project site previously was within a 100-year flood hazard area but with restoration and rehabilitation to San Luis Obispo Creek to the north and south of the project site flooding in the area has declined. It is anticipated that the project site will no longer be designated a flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary, Flood Insurance Rate Map, or other flood hazard delineation map.

C. Creeks:

The project’s eastern boundary is San Luis Obispo Creek. (see Figure 1-4) Flowing northeast to southeast through San Luis Obispo, the creek is about 15 miles long, 1 to 20 feet wide, with water levels fluctuating from 1 - 3 inches during the summer to 1 - 2 feet during non-flood winter conditions. The watershed feeding the creek incorporates 84 square miles of the coastal slope of the Santa Lucia Mountains, and its eleven tributaries include: Brizziolari, Stenner, Reservoir Canyon, Prefumo, East Fork, Castro, Davenport, Froom, and See Canyon Creeks. The City’s Water Reclamation Facility releases effluent into San Luis Creek just south of the project site.

D. Wildlife & Sensitive Species:

No endangered, threatened or other protected species have been reported on the project site but San Luis Obispo creek supports many types of wildlife due to the wide variety of habitat types offered by the creek system. Native fish such as steelhead trout, speckled dace, prickly sculpin, threespine stickleback and pacific lamprey inhabit parts of the creek and the riparian vegetation plays host to a wide variety of birds including; red-shouldered hawk, western bluebirds, yellow-rumped warbler and white-crowned sparrow.
E. Air quality

San Luis Obispo County is designated as a non-attainment area for Particulate Matter 10 (PM10) and in 2006 San Luis Obispo rarely experienced PM10 exceedences and air quality on the project site is very good according to the San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District. (see figure 1-5) Prevailing southeasterly winds prevent stagnation and reduce the likelihood of offensive odors from the neighboring Water Reclamation Facility to the south, but may become an issue during construction related activities.

![Figure 1-5 Very good air quality](image)

1.2.2 Legal & Property Ownership

A. Current Ownership:

The site includes 10 parcels with 8 different owners. Appendix H contains more information about ownership and assessor information.

B. Liens & Easements:

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) has an 80-foot wide easement across the southern part of the site. A 115 kilovolt (kV) transmission line and two tower structures are included in the easement on this site. Southern California Gas Company has a high pressure natural gas pipeline that runs parallel to the site along Elks Lane; the Gas Company is responsible for maintaining this pipeline. There is also an abandoned sewer main that runs north/south through the middle of the site with a maintenance easement on file at the City of San Luis Obispo Community Development Department.
1.2.3 Land Use & Zoning

A. Land Use Designation & Zoning:

The project site includes three land use designations: Interim Open Space, Office, and Services and Manufacturing. The zoning is Conservation Open Space (C/OS), Office Planned Development (O-PD), and Service Commercial with special considerations (C-S-S).

B. Historic designation:

No structure located within the project’s boundary has been identified as a Master List or Contributing Historical Resource by the City of San Luis Obispo. The Sunset Drive-In Theater has been called a threatened historical resource by the Cultural Heritage Committee and may be considered a historical use but the City does not preserve historical uses, only historical structures. (see figure 1-6)

![Figure 1-6 Sunset Drive-In Theater](image-url)

C. Special Development Restrictions or Entitlements

Development of the project would require review and entitlements by other agencies including: Air Pollution Control District, State Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Game, U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Airport Land Use Commission, California Department of Transportation, and Pacific Gas & Electric Company. Development of larger sites is reviewed by the Air Pollution Control District because San Luis Obispo County is a non-attainment area for PM 10. The City of San Luis Obispo would like to designate Prado Road as State Highway 227 and provide a full interchange at U.S. Highway 101 and Prado Road, therefore the California Department of Transportation must be consulted. The proximity of the site to San Luis Obispo Creek will require review and approval from the State Water Quality Control Board, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, both of which monitor State and U.S. waters and related environmental resources, and the Department of Fish and Game which manages the State’s fish wildlife, plant resources, and their habitats. The project site is located within Airport Safety Area
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S-1b and all new development requires approval from the Airport Land Use Commission. Lastly, since high voltage power lines cross the site, Pacific Gas & Electric will need to be consulted to establish an adequate utility easement.

D. Applicable Development Standards & Design Guidelines:

Any development in the City of San Luis Obispo must be consistent with development standards in the City’s Zoning Regulations, adopted International Building Codes, and the City’s General Plan. Development must also demonstrate conformity to standards contained within the Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) which regulates uses and densities in Airport Safety Areas. The City’s Community Design Guidelines will be applied to the project which intend to describe, and inform developers of the City’s expectations and preferences for the quality and character of new development. The Architectural Review Commission considers the guidelines in the review process to evaluate the suitability and compatibility of the project’s design to help achieve an attractive and environmentally sensitive development. Projects that are consistent with the guidelines are more likely to move quickly through the design review process.

E. Special Assessment Zone or Improvement District:

The project site has been identified by the City’s General Plan to be further developed only if flooding can be mitigated without significant harm to San Luis Obispo Creek. Development will also have to contribute its “fair share” for a full interchange at Prado Road and U.S. Highway 101 and the widening of Prado Road.

F. Special Hazard Areas:

The project is located within Airport Safety Area S-1b and subject to development standards contained in the ALUP. (see figure 1-7) The purpose of the ALUP is to provide for the orderly development of the area surrounding the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport so that new development is not likely to cause restrictions to be placed on flight operations from the airport and to protect public health, safety, and welfare. The ALUP accomplishes this by regulating density and types of uses. Development of the project site will require review from the Airport Land Use Commission.

G. Future Uses:

The project site is located within an built urban setting but some of the surrounding areas have been identified to accommodate future development. The Margarita and Airport Area are expansion areas which will accommodate much of the City’s future growth. The 420-acre Margarita Area east of the project site is bounded by South Higuera Street, Broad Street, Tank Farm Road, and the ridge of the South Street Hills and the Airport Area includes 1,500 acres of land adjacent to the San Luis Obispo Regional Airport. Both areas will accommodate a mix of housing and support services and provide for areas of industrial development, business parks, open space and agriculture. West of the project site on the opposite side of U.S. Highway 101 is the Madonna and San Luis Obispo Promenade shopping centers and the proposed Dalidio property which will include a business park, a large retail center, recreation areas, agriculture and some residential. North of the site the City plans to enhance the Mid-Higuera Street Area which intends to expand opportunities for retail and office uses and create new recreational opportunities along San Luis Obispo Creek.
1.2.4 Environmental

A. Soil contamination & the Presence of Hazardous Materials:

Soil contamination has not been reported on the site but historical and present agricultural activities, an abandoned sewer main, and surrounding industrial activities of the area may have released hazardous materials into the environment which may have involved the leaking of underground or aboveground storage tanks or pipelines or other similar events from this and/or other nearby properties that store or handle hazardous or toxic materials. Additionally, the Sunset Drive-In Theater may have released automobile related soil contaminates during operation.

B. Sensitive habitat & Local Species of Concern:

The project site is adjacent to San Luis Obispo Creek which supports many types of wildlife and a variety of habitats including riparian areas and wetlands. (see Figure 1-8) These habitats function as a wildlife corridor and are therefore sensitive to urban development because noise, light, and pollution can
affect the ecology and health of habitats. Some local species of concern live in areas of the creek’s riparian habitats, such as Prickly Sculpin, Yellow-Rumped Warbler, Sparrows, and Monarch Butterflies may be affected by urbanization of the site. The City’s General Plan does not show that there are any species of local concern located on the project site, however to the north along the creek are two areas identified to contain Rayless Ragwort and Monarch Butterflies.

C. Noise levels

According to the City’s General Plan Noise Element, the proposed project is located in an area that is predicted to be exposed to buildout traffic noise levels of 60 dB and parts of the site will be exposed to projected 65 and 70 dB buildout noise contour lines. (see Figure 1-9) The project site is also located within the projected 55 dB average airport noise contour illustrated in the ALUP and a single event noise contour of 65 dB at ground level. The City’s Noise Element and ALUP limits all outdoor use areas to a maximum average noise level of 60 dB and interior noise exposure to an average of 45 dB and a single event maximum of 50 dB. “Moderately noise sensitive” land uses and are compatible inside the 60 dB airport noise contour with mitigation and the required single event interior degree of noise attenuation of 15 dB is assumed to be achieved with normal construction techniques.
1.2.5 Behavioral

A. Site Uses:

The site includes a mix of Service Commercial uses along Prado Road such as automotive shops and salvage yards, agricultural uses, a small 24 unit mobile home park on Elks Lane, and the Sunset Drive-In Theater. Additionally, the California Department of Transportation operates a satellite parking lot and U-Haul owns a storage facility for its trucks.

B. Traffic:

The existing roadway network that surrounds or serves the project site include Prado Road, South Higuera Street, Elks Lane, U.S. Highway 101, and Madonna Road.

- Prado Road is a minor east-west two lane collector street that starts at U.S. Highway 101 with a partial interchange (northbound movements only) and terminates east of South Higuera Street. The City plans to extend Prado Road east to Broad Street and westward to Madonna Road with a full interchange at U.S. Highway 101. The City would also like to designate Prado Road as State Highway 227 and therefore Prado Road will become a major east-west arterial roadway.

- South Higuera Street is four lane north-south road. It connects downtown San Luis Obispo to current and future residential, office, retail, and industrial uses in the Margarita, Airport, and Madonna areas.

- Elks Lane is a minor north-south street that stretches from the interchange at Prado Road to South Higuera Street.

- US Highway 101 is a major regional north-south roadway. In the vicinity of the project it is a four lane separated highway. Access to the project site is provided with full interchanges at Madonna Road and Los Osos Valley Road and a partial interchange at Prado Road.

- Los Osos Valley Road and Tank Farm Road are two other major roadways that serve the project site.

Traffic operations around the project site have been estimated using am and pm peak hour turning movement counts conducted by DKS Associates, the City of San Luis Obispo, and PacTrans. Traffic volumes of 10 study area intersections are shown in Figure 1-10. The level of service (LOS) evaluation of the intersections was completed using the planning method of analysis presented in the Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report 209, Transportation Research Board, 1985. Table 1-1 shows the LOS versus stopped

| Table 1-1 Signalized Intersection LOS Criteria |
|----------------------|----------------------|
| Level of Service     | Stopped Delay per Vehicle (sec) |
| A                    | < 5.1                 |
| B                    | 5.1 to 15.0           |
| C                    | 15.1 to 25.0          |
| D                    | 25.1 to 40.0          |
| E                    | 40.1 to 60.0          |
| F                    | > 60.0                |

Source: Pacific Traffic & Transportation Engineers, Traffic Impact Analysis for the Proposed Regional Center at 40 Prado Rd, 1992
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24,900 (480)</td>
<td>24,500 (450)</td>
<td>48,000 (920)</td>
<td>48,700 (880)</td>
<td>48,000 (920)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(401,255) (460,95)</td>
<td>(401,255) (460,95)</td>
<td>(401,255) (460,95)</td>
<td>(401,255) (460,95)</td>
<td>(401,255) (460,95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 (92)</td>
<td>5,000 (92)</td>
<td>5,000 (92)</td>
<td>5,000 (92)</td>
<td>5,000 (92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,130 (450)</td>
<td>2,130 (450)</td>
<td>2,130 (450)</td>
<td>2,130 (450)</td>
<td>2,130 (450)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,030 (450)</td>
<td>21,030 (450)</td>
<td>21,030 (450)</td>
<td>21,030 (450)</td>
<td>21,030 (450)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9,101) (90)</td>
<td>(9,101) (90)</td>
<td>(9,101) (90)</td>
<td>(9,101) (90)</td>
<td>(9,101) (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,160 (90)</td>
<td>1,160 (90)</td>
<td>1,160 (90)</td>
<td>1,160 (90)</td>
<td>1,160 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 S. Higuera St - Los Osos Valley Rd</td>
<td>7 Los Osos Valley - US 101 NB Ramps</td>
<td>8 Los Osos Valley - US 101 SB Ramps</td>
<td>9 S. Higuera St - Tank Farm Rd</td>
<td>10 S. Higuera St - Elks Ln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(472,33) (21,50)</td>
<td>(472,33) (21,50)</td>
<td>(472,33) (21,50)</td>
<td>(472,33) (21,50)</td>
<td>(472,33) (21,50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224,600 (450)</td>
<td>224,600 (450)</td>
<td>224,600 (450)</td>
<td>224,600 (450)</td>
<td>224,600 (450)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(460,95) (21,50)</td>
<td>(460,95) (21,50)</td>
<td>(460,95) (21,50)</td>
<td>(460,95) (21,50)</td>
<td>(460,95) (21,50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503,600 (450)</td>
<td>503,600 (450)</td>
<td>503,600 (450)</td>
<td>503,600 (450)</td>
<td>503,600 (450)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(460,95) (21,50)</td>
<td>(460,95) (21,50)</td>
<td>(460,95) (21,50)</td>
<td>(460,95) (21,50)</td>
<td>(460,95) (21,50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230,400 (450)</td>
<td>230,400 (450)</td>
<td>230,400 (450)</td>
<td>230,400 (450)</td>
<td>230,400 (450)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(460,95) (21,50)</td>
<td>(460,95) (21,50)</td>
<td>(460,95) (21,50)</td>
<td>(460,95) (21,50)</td>
<td>(460,95) (21,50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,210 (130)</td>
<td>2,210 (130)</td>
<td>2,210 (130)</td>
<td>2,210 (130)</td>
<td>2,210 (130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,050 (90)</td>
<td>1,050 (90)</td>
<td>1,050 (90)</td>
<td>1,050 (90)</td>
<td>1,050 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427 (90)</td>
<td>427 (90)</td>
<td>427 (90)</td>
<td>427 (90)</td>
<td>427 (90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
<td>(011,202) (460,95)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PACTRANS**

**Peak Hour Traffic Volumes:**

*Existing*

**Figure 1-10**
delay per vehicle for signalized intersections and Table 1-2 illustrates the relationship of LOS to reserve capacity for unsignalized intersections.

Three intersections were found to operate at LOS E or worse (San Luis Obispo defines traffic operations which exceed LOS D as unacceptable).

- Madonna Road/Highway 101 southbound ramps
- Madonna Road/ South Higuera Street
- Los Osos Valley Road/Highway 101 southbound ramps

Table 1-3 presents the results of the LOS analysis at critical intersections in the study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Peak Delay (sec)</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>PM Peak Delay (sec)</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madonna Rd/Higuera St</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madonna Rd/US 101 NB ramps</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madonna Rd/US 101 SB ramps</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elks Ln/S. Higuera St</td>
<td>206.0</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>130.0</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prado Rd/US 101 NB ramps</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prado Rd/S. Higuera St</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank Farm Rd/S. Higuera St</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Osos Valley Rd/US 101 NB ramps</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Osos Valley Rd/US 101 SB ramps</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Osos Valley Rd/S. Higuera St</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pacific Traffic & Transportation Engineers, Traffic Impact Analysis for the Proposed Regional Center at 40 Prado Rd, 1992
* = V/C ratio greater than 1.00 = LOS F
I = Minor street STOP controlled intersection • Reserve Capacity

C. Land Use Conflicts:

The project site is primarily zoned Interim Open Space which is not conducive to most types of development. The City of San Luis Obispo has used this designation because it has not decided the best eventual use for this area. The site is located within a 100-year flood plain and the Interim Open Space designation will be changed to an urban classification only when the conditions necessary for development can be satisfied (an environmentally acceptable reduction of flood hazards) and a certain type of development is approved. It is anticipated that the site is no longer within a 100-year flood plain.
1.3 Site Constraints

1.3.1 Neighbors

The project site is adjacent to the San Luis Cemetery, the Prado Day Center for the homeless, and the WRF, none of which are desirable neighbors for tourist commercial uses. (see Figure 1-11) Water treatment facilities typically are thought to be dirty, unsightly, and odorous, while cemeteries and the homeless have an unfavorable aura. The San Luis Cemetery, the Prado Day Center, and WRF can negatively impact the success of a resort on the project site.

Figure 1-11 Neighboring cemetery

1.3.2 Onsite Uses

The project site includes several properties under multiple ownerships and a variety of uses which are not compatible with tourist commercial uses. Some of these uses include agriculture, a mobile home park, U-haul trucks storage, and assorted automotive and service commercial uses. (see Figure 1-12) The Sunset Drive-In Theater located within the project’s boundaries is not listed as a Master List or Contributing Historical Resource, but it is one of a few hundred remaining in the United States and has been identified by the Cultural Heritage Committee as a potentially historic resource; it is also likely to be highly valued by the community.

The existing uses are not well suited to the proposed resort and it would be best if they were removed/relocated. However, removing the existing development will be difficult because it is very difficult to remove mobile home parks since it is some of the most affordable housing in San Luis Obispo and the Sunset Drive-In Theater has high sentimental value. Furthermore, the site has eight different owners which all need to be in agreement with the proposed program for development to occur.

Figure 1-12 Volle Vista Trailer Park
Sunset Drive-In Constraints
Figure 1-13

- Site has multiple parcel ownership
- Current zoning is C/OS
- Airport Safety S-IB restricts density

- Drive In has Community Value
- Existing Commercial
- Water Treatment Plant
- Creek Rehabilitation Needed
- Creek Setback & Cultural Resources
- Limited Pedestrian Access
- Existing Commercial
- Overhead Power Lines
- Mobile Homes
- Disconnected from rest of site
- Neighborhood Cemetery
1.3.3 Development Regulations

The project site has a number of development restrictions that will have to be overcome. Two of the major development constrains are the present zoning of C/OS and O-PD and its proximity to the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport. The project lies within Airport Safety Area S-1b which limits non-residential densities and further regulates allowed uses. Non-residential development is limited to 40 persons per acre, and C/OS and O-PD designations do not allow for the development of the proposed tourist commercial uses and will have to be rezoned. Rezoning the property can be achieved through a General Plan amendment and the project will require review by the Airport Land Use Commission.

1.3.4 San Luis Obispo Creek

San Luis Obispo Creek borders the northern and eastern edges of the site; the City of San Luis Obispo strictly regulates development adjacent to creeks. San Luis Obispo Creek has also been identified as a burial sensitivity area due to the likelihood of archaeological resources along the banks. Development will have to be sensitive to potential archaeological resources and creek setbacks. The creek can be used to enhance the proposed development of the site, but it needs to be rehabilitated to prevent further erosion and damage to the project site. (see figure 1-14)
1.3.5 Other

Other constrains associated with the project site include flooding, high voltage power lines, future road improvements, noise, and wind. Portions of the site are located within a 100 year floodplain; issues related to flooding must be overcome before development can occur. The location of the power lines will affect the development of the site due to safety concerns about exposure to electromagnetic fields and access for maintenance. (see Figure 1-15) The City’s plan to extend Prado Road across U.S. Highway 101 and construct a new interchange must be accounted for in the development of the site and since the site is adjacent to the highway, development will have to properly mitigate noise impacts to acceptable levels identified in the City’s Noise Element. The preferred alignment of the Prado Road interchange, the abandonment of Elks Lane, and widening of Prado Road to a four lane arterial road will require some of the site to be dedicated to the City, and lastly, a strong northwesterly wind consistently blows through the site requiring extra planning to mitigate. However, the northwesterly wind will reduce the effects of offensive odors from the WRF.
Sunset Drive-In Opportunities

Figure 1.16

- Site acts as gateway to SLO
- Easy access to Hwy 101
- Possible graywater use for site
- Riparian Habitat
- Proposed bike lanes through site
- Site is relatively flat
- North of site is undeveloped
- Silty-clay loam, good for agriculture
- Close to downtown
- Attractive locations, along creek
- Wetlands opportunity for eco-tourism
- Very close to shopping
- Great views
- Prado Rd. extension
- Existing infrastructure to site
1.4 Opportunities

1.4.1 Accessibility and Circulation

Potential accessibility is a key opportunity that makes this site desirable for development. The proposed Prado Road interchange providing highway access from the north and south, the City’s plans to extend Prado Road west towards Madonna Road and east towards Broad Street, and the City’s desire to relocate State Highway 227 to Prado Road will provide good accessibility to the site from major roadways.

The site also has the potential for good accessibility from alternative forms of transportation. SLO Transit operates two bus lines on Prado Road and South Higuera Street and there are existing and proposed bike lanes on South Higuera Street and Prado Road. Elks Lane is designated as a bike route and a section of the Bob Jones City to the Sea Bike Trail is planned to run through or adjacent to the site.

1.4.2 Site Characteristics

The site has scenic views of the South Hills and Irish Hills, is flat (0 – 2 percent slopes), and is partially undeveloped. (see Figure 1-17) The site’s soil is Salinas silty clay loam, well drained, and the hazard of water erosion is slight, which is good for agriculture but also suitable for development. It is an infill site, therefore the site is served through existing infrastructure, and it has the potential to utilize non-potable or recycled water for irrigation.

Figure 1-17 Scenic views & level site
1.4.3 San Luis Obispo Creek

One of the main features of the site is San Luis Obispo Creek. The site is bordered on the northern and eastern edges by the creek and rehabilitation and enhancement of the creek will provide an attractive setting for a variety of different uses and activities. The creek’s riparian habitat and seasonal wetlands can be integrated into an eco-tourist attraction and/or be a scenic backdrop for walking and bike trails. (see Figure 1-18)

![Figure 1-18 Creek provides an attractive setting](image)

1.4.4 Location

The location of the site and its proximity to surrounding businesses and centers further increases the desirability for developing the site. The Madonna Plaza and the San Luis Obispo Promenade are located on the opposite side of US Highway 101 providing a range of shopping opportunities and Madonna Road offers a mix of restaurants. The proposed Dalidio Marketplace project is located across the highway as well which will offer more shopping options. East of the site is the Margarita Area which will accommodate a significant amount of the City’s residential growth. North of the site are the unique eateries and boutiques of Downtown San Luis Obispo and the Mid-Higuera Street Enhancement Area which is an area the City plans to revitalize because it is a gateway corridor to the downtown as is the project site.

1.5 Conclusion

The site has many opportunities, but the constraints need to be taken into consideration and planned for in order to design a successful development. Overall, the opportunities provide a favorable situation for many different development programs. A tourist commercial center will likely be a very successful and profitable project on the Sunset Drive-In property.
Chapter 2: Case Studies

2.1 Wine and Roses Resort Restaurant Spa

Wine and Roses (W&R) is located in Lodi, California in the middle of Lodi wine country. W&R sits on a seven acre site and is known throughout the region as the premier location for weddings and large events.

Lodging

W&R boasts a 52 room hotel with construction underway for more. There is a variety of individually designed hotel rooms in different themed buildings including the Historic Inn, the Garden Rooms, modern style spa rooms, and the Signature Suites. The hotel buildings are tucked away in a canopy of ancient trees which provide a quiet, relaxing environment for hotel guests and visitors illustrated in Figure 2-1.

Dining

Award winning cuisine can be found at the restaurant onsite. The restaurant offers patio dining surrounded by the colorful gardens and fountains and the menu is designed and flavored to the tastes and ingredients of the particular season providing a very elegant meal. Weddings and receptions are often held in one of many outdoor grassy areas are catered by the W&R restaurant. (see Figure 2-2).

Wellness Center

Another feature of W&R is the day spa, located in a state-of-the-art 5,600 square foot facility. Many services are available at the spa including body treatments, facials, and various salon services. The spa facility has natural rock-walled steam rooms, showers, locker rooms, and a secluded courtyard with a glowing fireplace, a gurgling fountain, and gentle flowing waterfalls.
Visitor Center

W&R’s Lodi Wine and Visitor Center allows visitors to learn from interactive exhibits, such as the Lodi Appellation exhibit, and sip local wines at the wine tasting bar. (see Figure 2-3)

Comparison Points

W&R offers many positive aspects that can be applied to the client’s program. The architecture theme throughout the entire project creates a distinguished identity for the space and the building heights and massing create a well defined community space. This unique project provides a peaceful, relaxed environment that guests will remember and cherish. W&R also has lush landscapes with many green trees, colorful plants and flowers, soft grass, and fountains along the walkways providing an aesthetically pleasing setting like the one in shown in Figure 2-4. The Lodi Visitors Center is a landmark for the site and can be used as an example for the clients program.

Lessons Learned

Although W&R provides many great concepts and examples that can be used in the client’s program, there are some differences that need to be accounted for when planning and designing the Sunset Drive-In site. One difference is the neighborhood contexts of the two sites, W&R is located on the outskirts of Lodi while the Sunset site is located adjacent to U.S. Highway 101 and the proposed location of State Highway 227. W&R is surrounded mostly by residential uses and a neighborhood park while the Sunset site is not. Furthermore, W&R is only 5 acres while the client’s site is 45 acres. These factors will result in differences in site layout and design and the relationship between onsite uses. However, many of the concepts seen at W&R can be applied to the client’s program.
2.2 Bacara Resort

Bacara Resort is located on the bluffs and beaches of the Central California coast. "Resembling a Mediterranean village, Bacara sprawls over 78 pristine beachfront acres, nestled between the Pacific Ocean and the Santa Ynez mountains. Located just ten minutes from Santa Barbara airport, the resort's terra cotta tile roofs, covered archways and wooden trellises lend it the understated, relaxed appeal of a true classic California resort, yet our guests have at their fingertips the most advanced modern conveniences and cutting edge technologies." (Bacara, 2008; see Figure 2-5)

Lodging

The resort houses a total of 360 luxurious guest rooms, 49 of which are specialty suites. The resort has a 2 mile white sand beach (See Figure 2-6), 3 zero-edge heated swimming pools with 33 private cabanas (see Figure 2-7), and 225 fireplaces.

Dining

Bacara has three signature restaurants with a variety of Mediterranean and Californian cuisine, a world-class wine cellar, and a 24-hour personal concierge services.

Wellness Center

The spa at Bacara is 42,000 square feet and promises to be the "ultimate in indulgence and rejuvenation." There are 36 individual treatment rooms, including four private treatment suites, private sunbathing, indoor and outdoor massage, a 3,500 square foot cardiovascular and strength-training center, a heated lap pool, café, spa shop, and a full-service beauty salon.

Recreation

Bacara Resort provides many recreational opportunities including a 1,000 acre ranch, one ocean-side and one mountainside 18-hole golf course, tennis center, hiking and horseback riding, cycling and mountain biking, vineyard tours and wine tasting, wine maker dinners, sailboat and yacht excursions, scuba, snorkeling, surfing, wind surfing and kayaking.
Business

Bacara also provides conference facilities designed to cater to the social and business needs of the for any clientele. It offers a 220 seat screening room with 25,500 square feet of conference space and six outdoor event terraces, an 11,300 square foot Spanish-colonial style ballroom, which can be subdivided into 3 distinctive areas, and 7 private meeting rooms. An executive chef and kitchen are dedicated to serving banquets at this facility.

Comparison Points

Bacara Resort is very exclusive and serene making it an attractive place to visit or stay. Bacara Resort’s site is nearly double that of the Sunset site (excluding the 1,000 acre ranch), but many features can be used in the client’s program. The hotel lobby and entryway are grand entrances so guests immediately know they are at a luxurious resort. The rooms are comfortable and spacious an the complimentary valet and shuttle services cater to guests’ every whim, making them feel like royalty. The site’s landscaping is lush and green with punches of brightly colored flowers along the resort pathways, providing for enjoyable walks. All these aspects make for a perfect resort destination.

Lessons Learned

Bacara Resort is a larger project than the clients program. Bacara has a handful of restaurants and a very large organic farm that provides fruits and vegetables to each. Bacara is also able to provide many amenities that are complimentary to guests mainly due to the high end overnight rates. The clients program will have to complete a feasibility and needs assessment for its market to determine if such amenities will be applicable for the project.
2.3 Sycamore Mineral Springs

Sycamore Mineral Springs is a resort hotel located in Avila Valley which offers luxurious relaxation on 120 acres. The main attraction of the resort is its natural spring hot tubs located within a picturesque, natural environment. The resort includes a wellness center, restaurant, and banquet and event facilities in addition to the nearby natural gardens, hiking, and biking trails.

Lodging

Sycamore Mineral Springs has 65 rooms which vary in size and accommodations. The resort offers rooms with private spas and luxury suites along San Luis Obispo and See Canyon Creeks. (see Figure 2-8) More suites are located along the hillsides which include mineral spring spas and Sycamore Mineral Springs also offers a 3,000 square foot 3 bedroom cottage, perfect for VIP guests, family reunions, corporate retreats, or weddings. (see Figure 2-9)

Wellness Center

The wellness center at Sycamore Springs offers a variety of treatments to its guests including massage therapy and skin care treatments. The wellness center also provides numerous mineral spring spas to relax and naturally heal visitors.

Dining

The Gardens of Avila is an award winning restaurant offering an intimate setting, and featuring a cozy fireside lounge, elegant dining room, and a century-old stone patio with al fresco dinning. (see Figure 2-10) The restaurant seats 68 and also caters to the banquet and event facilities.
Events

Sycamore Mineral Springs offers four banquet and meeting rooms totaling more than 2,200 square feet, providing unique environments for conferences, banquets, receptions, family reunions, corporate retreats, rehearsal dinners and other social events. The resort also has an outdoor venue for weddings with a garden gazebo, surrounded by lush floral landscape. The gazebo lawn and garden can seat up to 100 guests for a beautiful, sunlit ceremony as illustrated in Figure 2-11.

![Outdoor Dining](image1.png)

**Figure 2-10: Outdoor Dining**

![Gazebo lawn and garden](image2.png)

**Figure 2-11: Gazebo lawn and garden**

Comparison Points

Sycamore Mineral Springs includes many of the desired features and accommodation identified in the client’s program: hotel, banquet facilities, restaurant, and event areas and the location of the resort provides a beautiful natural landscapes for guest to enjoy during their stay. The client’s program and Sunset Drive-In Theater can also be set in a picturesque natural environment since it borders San Luis Creek and has views to the surrounding Irish and South Hills.

Lessons Learned

While the site Sycamore Mineral Springs is much larger than the Sunset site, the facilities are smaller in scale. The number of hotel rooms, event areas, and banquet facilities are smaller at Sycamore Mineral Springs. The restaurant is comparable in size and could be beneficial in determining operating costs. The operating and maintenance costs for the gardens and grounds can also be used to estimate similar costs on the Sunset site.
2.4 Cal Poly’s Leaning Pine Arboretum

The Leaning Pine Arboretum is a collection of natural gardens that is located on the Cal Poly campus. The garden collections are grouped by the garden’s native region, though each collection is well suited to a Mediterranean climate. The gardens display hundreds of unique and intriguing plants from: Australia, California, Chile, the Mediterranean basin, and South Africa. The arboretum also has a New Zealand garden, a Dwarf and Unusual Conifer garden, a Formal garden, and displays of cycads, palms, and numerous succulents. It features a diverse array of trees, shrubs, and other landscape plants appropriate for California’s Central Coast area. (see Figures 2-12 and 2-13)

Comparison Points

The Leaning Pine Arboretum natural garden designs could be integrated to the client’s program. This would create a relaxing environment for visitors and guests to experience.

Lessons Learned

The Leaning Pine Arboretum utilizes environmentally sound landscaping to provide a natural looking garden while using plants native to Mediterranean climates that require less maintenance and water than plants from other climate regions. However, a garden this large still requires a significant amount of upkeep and needs to be considered in the financial feasibility of the client’s program.
Chapter 3: Design Process

3.1 Case Study Influence

The case studies contributed many ideas to the Fugazi Development Program (FDP). Sycamore Mineral Springs, W&R, and Bacara Resort were chosen because they were similar to the client's program for the Sunset site. They each had luxury accommodation including wellness centers, restaurants, and banquet facilities and each were set in an attractive natural setting. The Leaning Pine Arboretum was used because it was a good example of using native species to create an attractive natural looking garden.

Sycamore Mineral Springs was chosen because it provides a local example of a small resort and it too is located along a creek. While the site of Sycamore Mineral Springs is much larger than the FDP site, its accommodations are comparable to the client’s program and helped provide a sense of the scale the FDP should take.

Wine and Roses, a small resort located in Lodi, most influenced the welcome center of the FDP. There are many wineries near San Luis Obispo and the idea of a wine and visitor center such as the one at W&R could be a desirable use to integrate into the FDP. W&R is a successful center that promotes tourism in the Lodi area.

Bacara is a very upscale resort and though it is not comparable in size it contributed to many aspects of the FDP. The business center, ranch that provides seasonal produce, and valet service were just a few things that were integrated into the FDP.
3.2 Concept Diagram 1 and Rationale

Concept One focused on maximizing the natural appeal of San Luis Obispo Creek. Hotel suites were divided among three hotel buildings, each along the creek. A restaurant placed along the creek could include outdoor dining, a spa with creek views would enhance the relaxing experience, and the creek would be a scenic backdrop for an outdoor event area. Pedestrian trails could be located along the creek as well.

The business center was located along Elks lane, to provide highway visibility and its outdoor patio would open to the natural gardens. The wine and visitor center was located at the intersection of Elks Lane and Prado Road to have the greatest visibility and access from the highway to encourage passers-by to stop and discover all things San Luis Obispo. Small areas for vineyards were set aside to provide a full wine tasting educational experience.

A small farm was located on the northwestern part of the site to provide fresh produce to the restaurant since it is not a noise sensitive use.
3.3 Concept Diagram 2 and Rationale

![Concept Diagram 2](image)

Figure 3-2 Concept Diagram 2

The power lines bisect the site into uneven sections which influenced Concept Two. The hotel component of the program was placed together on the northern section of the site, while the commercial elements were placed on the southern section. The hotel was separated from the other uses in order to provide privacy for the resort guests. The hotel component required the larger section because it included a lobby, multiple hotel buildings, a day spa, natural gardens, and an outdoor event area. The northern section also has a greater creek frontage which could provide an attractive, relaxed setting for the resort, as observed in the Sycamore Mineral Springs case study. The hotel buildings are spread out to integrate lush native landscaping into the program, a concept seen at the Cal Poly Leaning Pine Arboretum.

The southern section of the site includes a visitor center, conference center, restaurant, and small retail shops. Accessibility to the site provided by Prado Road and the future interchange at U.S. Highway 101 was utilized in order to accommodate the traffic that would be generated by these uses. Each use bubble on the south section of the site includes parking for that particular use.

The northwestern portion of the site is separated from the rest of the site by Elks Lane and is located in the 70 dB buildout noise contour line. This limits the feasibility of placing noise sensitive uses in this area. A gas station would be an appropriate use here and benefit from highway visibility. It would also generate revenue for the site.
3.4 Final Concept and Rational

The Final Concept is a culmination of Concept One and Two and a better understanding of relationships between buildings. Hotel buildings were located north of the power lines and away from commercial uses in order to create a private peaceful setting for hotel guests. The hotel buildings were split up and separated to integrate native landscaping, natural gardens, and pedestrian pathways between.

The hotel lobby is located on Prado Road to provide easy access to and from U.S. Highway 101. Bacara’s lobby is located separate from its hotel room and provides a complimentary valet and shuttle service to its guests which was incorporated into the FDP. Adjacent to the lobby is the conference center so guests arriving for an event can be check in at the lobby. This allows the lobby to be the main entrance for Fugazi Resort.

Next to the conference center is Fugazi’s restaurant located along the creek. The creek provides an attractive setting for outdoor dining and locating the restaurant so close to the conference facility allows the restaurant to easily cater to any event held there. The small farm from Concept One was kept in the same location because that particular part of the site is heavily impacted by traffic noise and not suitable for noise sensitive uses.

The day spa and outdoor event area were located along the creek to take advantage of the natural beauty of San Luis Obispo Creek. The creek will provide a scenic backdrop for spa treatments and private events such as weddings. These components are also located far enough away from the highway to reduce noise impacts.
Chapter 4: Development Plan

4.1 Site Plan Design

Fugazi is intended to be an up-scale luxury resort destination set in a lush attractive environment. The primary goal was to place the hotel within a natural garden and instead of proposing one large hotel building, six smaller structures allow for increased flexibility in suite sizes and configurations as well as varying levels of luxury. Using six buildings also helps define the extent of the gardens while shielding the interior gardens, pool area, and creek event area from a persistent northwesterly wind. The hotel pool is centrally located in the center of the gardens and is partially enclosed by cabanas. The gardens provide a natural setting for recreation or relaxation, but also can function as retention ponds to store water run-off or berms to block noise impacts, and can be irrigated with non-potable water from the WRF.

The configuration of the hotel buildings open towards the east and the outdoor creek event area. San Luis Obispo Creek provides scenic backdrop for events and it is located far enough away from noise impacts caused by U.S. Highway 101. Next to the creek event area is a secluded private pool and jacuzzi, available for upscale parties and gatherings. Fugazi’s day spa is located along the creek as well to further enhance the sensual healing arts offered at the spa.

The welcome center is located nearest the Prado Road interchange for increased visibility from the highway. It is set back far enough from the proposed alignment of the Prado Road interchange. While the embankment for the interchange will somewhat hide the welcome center the use of flags could be used to signify it. However the interchange embankment will shield the welcome center’s illustrative vineyards and an outdoor patio for wine tasting from wind and traffic noise.

Fugazi’s restaurant is located adjacent to the conference facility so it can easily cater events there. The restaurant has the facilities to cater any event at Fugazi. It too is located along the creek, with outdoor dining, and will likely be the setting for intimate meals. Fresh seasonal produce is supplied to the restaurant from the two acre organic farm at the northern end of the site.

The lobby is located along Prado and incorporates 4,000 square feet of the business center, an employee area, and electric cart storage. A small maintenance facility for the electric carts is located on the farm. Next to the lobby is the conference facility and business center. The conference facility includes a large outdoor pavilion that opens towards the creek and the business center offers outdoor patios for some of the meeting rooms.

Meandering trails provide circulation throughout the site while vehicular traffic is restricted to the perimeter of the site. An access road allows vehicles to drop off supplies at event areas and doubles as a walking trail along the creek. Electric golf carts utilize the trails as they shuttle guest from the lobby to their hotel rooms.

The small mobile home park is proposed to be removed which requires a Mobile Home Impact Report. If it is determined that it is infeasible to remove and/or relocate the mobile home park it
can be retained in its current location by reducing the size of the nearest parking lot and providing a landscaped buffer.

Parking is provided in three surface lots, one just for the restaurant, and guests can take advantage of Fugazi's complimentary valet service. The FDP provides 588 parking spaces but requires more than 700. To remedy this situation the program suggests providing off-site parking at the Madonna Shopping Center or Elks Lodge with a free shuttle service when accommodating large events. If the organic farm is failing it can be converted to a parking lot to provide additional spaces.

The proposed Prado Road interchange includes the abandonment of Elks Lane. It will terminate at the parking lot nearest the lobby and no longer connect directly to Prado Road. However, since Elks Lane is a bike route the FDP extends a bike path from end of Elks, through the vineyards, and connects to the bike lanes on Prado Road at the main entrance to Fugazi. This provides a connection to existing bike paths and the Bob Jones City to the Sea Bike Trail.

Prado Road is widened to a four lane arterial roadway as part of the City’s plan to extend Prado east towards Broad Street and west towards Madonna. Other offsite improvements include new bus stop and turn out on the project’s frontage along Prado Road and a pedestrian bridge across the creek aligned with Margarita Avenue.

---

**Figure 4-1 Section elevation**
Figure 4-1a Detailed site plan
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4.1.1 Square Footage

Table 4-1 illustrates individual square footage for each use and the total square footage for Fugazi Resort. Consistent with the Zoning Regulations for the C-T zone, the ratio of gross building floor area to site area (FAR) does not exceed 2.5, lot coverage is less than 75 percent, buildings do not exceed 45 feet, and commercial buildings do not exceed 45,000 square feet of gross total floor area. The site is 45 acres (1,960,200 square feet) and with 369,200 square feet of building floor area the FAR is 0.19 and lot coverage is 8.3 percent. The combined hotel building floor area is 264,000 square feet but the six hotel buildings are 44,000 square feet each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Total sq ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 restaurant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120 seats</td>
<td>3100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bar/lounge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banquet rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitchen/prep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other/storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 conference facility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>24000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 welcome center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 hotel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>150 rooms</td>
<td>26400 (600-1000 per suite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lobby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 creek event area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 day spa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 farm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2800 (2 acres arable land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electric cart maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-1 Square footage table and location map for Fugazi Resort
4.1.2 Parking Calculations

Parking calculations are based on Table 6, Parking Requirements by Use contained within the Zoning Regulations. Table 4-2 illustrates the required parking for Fugazi Resort based on use. The conference facility, business center, and outdoor creek event area are the most parking intensive use, (public assemble facility) and requires a significant amount of parking. As part of the proposed PD overlay zone, the FDP is requesting reduced parking requirements through various means. First the Program proposes to calculate parking for the conference facility and creek event area at 50 percent public assembly facility and 50 percent special event. (Parking requirements for special event are significantly less than public assembly facility.) Next a 10 percent shared parking reduction was applied since more than two uses share the parking lots. Lastly the FDP proposes to utilize offsite parking at the Madonna Shopping Center and/or Elks Lodge when the resort is accommodating large events. A complimentary shuttle service will transport guest to and from their vehicle.

The FDP provides 588 parking spaces, 35 motorcycle spaces, and 35 bicycle spaces. Long term bicycle storage is proved inside the lobby, restaurant, and conference facility, and short term spaces are the City preferred U-rack or peak rack design located near the main entrance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Parking Requirement</th>
<th>Total parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 restaurant</td>
<td>120 seats</td>
<td>1 per 60 sq ft</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bar lounge</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 per 60 sq ft</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banquet rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 per 60 sq ft</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kitchen/prep</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 per 100 sq ft food prep</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other/storage</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 conference facility</td>
<td>.5 @ 1 per 40 sq ft/.5 @ 1/500sq ft</td>
<td>318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting rooms</td>
<td>.5 @ 1 per 40 sq ft/.5 @ 1/500sq ft</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patio</td>
<td>1 per 500 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 welcome center</td>
<td>1 per 300 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 hotel</td>
<td>150 rooms</td>
<td>1 per room</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lobby</td>
<td>1 per 300 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pool</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 creek event area</td>
<td>1 per 500 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private pool</td>
<td>1 per 500 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 day spa</td>
<td>1 per 200 sq ft</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 farm</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| electric cart maintenance | 1 per 500 sq ft |                     | 781           

Table 4-2 Parking calculations for Fugazi Resort

703 w/ 10% reduc
588 provided
35 Motorcycle spaces
35 bicycle spaces
7 short term
28 long term
4.2 Program Elements

4.2.1 Restaurant

The restaurant is located adjacent to San Luis Obispo Creek with access from Prado Road and its own parking lot. It is a one story, 9,000 square foot building with a height of 20 feet. It seats 120 which includes outdoor dining tables along the creek. There is an 800 square foot bar and lounge, 800 square foot banquet room, and 2,500 square feet of kitchen preparation and storage areas. The restaurant utilizes the organic farm on site for fresh seasonal fruits and vegetables and caters to the conference facility and event areas. It also sponsors wine maker dinners to showcase gourmet dinners and fine wine. (see Figure 4-2)

4.2.2 Conference Facility

The main conference facility is a one story, 24,000 square foot building with an additional 5,000 square feet of business meeting rooms. (see Figure 4-3) There is an additional 4,000 square foot outdoor pavilion that opens up to San Luis Obispo Creek. The configuration of the building shields the pavilion from the north westerly winds. Private rooms as small as 250 square feet up to the entire facility can be rented out for a variety of events such as small business meetings, open air concerts, wine-maker dinners, business fairs, fund raisers and weddings. The restaurant is available to cater food and drinks for any event held in the conference center. Figure 4-4 shows how close the restaurant is to the conference facility.
4.2.3 Welcome Center

The welcome center is a two story, 7,000 square foot building with an outdoor patio looking out on a three quarters of an acre vineyard. (see figure 4-5 and 4-6) The patio and vineyard play in to the welcome center’s wine tasting bar. The center provides information about San Luis Obispo attractions, lodgings, maps, local places of interests, and wineries. It also offers interactive and educational exhibits such as grape growing and wine making, sponsors hiking and bicycling tours, and includes a gift shop with unique products and giftware.

4.2.4 Hotel

The hotel includes six buildings that are two stories each with a height of 40 feet. (see figure 4-7) There are 150 up-scale suites with layouts that range from 600 to 1,000 square feet each. The buildings are oriented so that the suites have views to the natural gardens, the South Hills to the northeast, or the Irish Hills to the southwest. The hotel buildings are set within the 12 acre natural gardens on the site surrounding the pool area creating a central location for hotel guests and visitors as shown in Figure 4-8.

A. Lobby

The lobby complex is a one story, 9,500 square foot building. The 4,500 square foot lobby includes the hotel valet service, guest check in counter, waiting
lounge, full service bar, and an electric cart storage area. Employee bicycle storage, showers, and personal lockers are provided in this building. The building also incorporates 5,000 square feet of the business center.

B. Pool

The resort includes a centrally located 3,000 square foot guest pool. The 13,000 square foot pool area is enclosed by a security gate, which requires a key card to enter, and features 24 private cabanas, a 700 square foot pool side bar with snacks and drinks, towel hut, and outdoor showers, illustrated in Figure 4-10.

4.2.5 Creek Event Area

The creek event area comprise a 20,000 square foot grassy area and small gazebo along San Luis Obispo Creek. This area can host events such as open air concerts, wine-maker dinners, business fairs, fund raisers and weddings. (see figure 4-11) Next to the creek event area is a secluded 3,800 square foot private pool facility featuring a 1,800 square foot pool and jacuzzi and 350 square foot club house. This private pool can be rented separately or in conjunction with the creek event area.
4.2.6 Day Spa

The one story day spa is a 5,000 square foot facility located along the creek. (see Figure 4-12) The facility includes its own outdoor pool and features locker rooms with showers, sauna, and steam rooms. It offers a range of healing arts including massage therapy, herbal therapy, aromatherapy, and hydrotherapy.

4.2.7 Farm

There is a two acre organic farm on the northwest side of the site. This section of the site is disconnected from the rest of the site due to the right-of-way for Elks Lane and is directly next to U.S. Highway 101, therefore experiences high traffic noise and is not suited for noise sensitive development. The farm has a variety of trees and row crops in order to supply a range of seasonal produce to the restaurant. (see Figure 4-13) A 4,900 square foot one story structure houses farm equipment, storage areas, and a 2,100 square foot electric cart maintenance facility which services the electric shuttles used in day-to-day operation at the resort.

4.2.8 Natural Gardens

Fugazi’s natural gardens encompasses 12 acres of the Sunset site and utilizes Mediterranean landscapes which do well in the Central Coast and provides a relaxing setting for the resort. (see Figure 4-14) Trees provide shaded areas and shield southern facing facades from the sun. The garden’s design can further be refined to function as retention ponds, rain gardens, or noise attenuating berms due to its size and relationship to the buildings and parking lots. Irrigation of the gardens is from recycled water.
4.2.9 Fugazi Resort

Arrive at Fugazi Resort and immediately be welcomed by a grand lobby and courtyard. The valet will greet you and take care of your vehicle and luggage. The lobby has a luxurious lounge where you can sit back and relax and a full service bar to grab a drink while you get checked into your room. Once checked in, an electric cart will shuttle you to your room or any other destination onsite. If you are joining us for business, get checked in at the lobby and be shuttled to your meeting or conference room.

If you are staying the night, get comfortable in one of the 150 luxurious suites offered at Fugazi. Each suite is furnished with lush bedding, open balconies or patios, and warm fireplaces. Wake up to views of the South Hills, the Irish Hills, or San Luis Obispo Creek and take a stroll through the natural gardens to the restaurant for breakfast. Find yourself relaxing at the resort pool with a cool beverage in a poolside cabana, where all day lounging is encouraged. Remember to save time to visit the day spa for a sensual message by the creek, but don’t worry if you forget because there is always tomorrow. Spend the afternoon exploring the city’s outdoor recreation or unique shops of the Downtown and finish a good day with a great dinner at the restaurant.

Fugazi’s restaurant offers an elegant dining experience with both indoor and al fresco dining on a creekside terrace. The wine list boasts local wines and the menu features Central Coast inspired cuisine. Only the freshest ingredients are used in seasonal dishes, highlighting regionally and locally grown produce and herbs. The combination of the unique dishes, local wines, and exceptional service provides
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customers an unforgettable meal.

Weddings are our specialty here at Fugazi. We can host everything from an intimate sunlit ceremony to a fully catered reception for you and 1,000 of your closest friends. Let us orchestrate a wedding that you will remember forever. And of course, after your big day, you may choose to retreat to one of our romantic suites, perfect for a honeymoon.

Just visiting? The visitor center offers information about San Luis Obispo’s attractions, lodgings, maps, local places of interests, and wineries. It also has educational exhibits and sponsors hiking and bicycling tours. There is a wine tasting bar featuring a wide selection of regional wines, interactive and educational exhibits on grape growing and wine making held in our own vineyard, and a gift shop featuring handcrafted products and San Luis Obispo gift ware.
4.3 Traffic Projections

4.3.1 Trip Generation

Using trip generation rates from *Trip Generation, 6th edition*, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1997 it was determined that the proposed project would generate 2,060 daily trips, 91 a.m. peak hour trips and 159 p.m. peak hour trips. Table 4-3 illustrates trip generation rates for the project and Table 4-4 shows projected traffic counts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>8.2 TE/Rooms</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>92.2 TE/KSF</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Trip Generation, 6th edition*, Institute of Transportation Engineers 1997
Notes: TE = Trip End
KSF = 1,000 square feet of gross building area
Hotel use includes conference facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Daily</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2080</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *Trip Generation, 6th edition*, Institute of Transportation Engineers 1997

4.3.2 Traffic Analysis

An analysis of existing condition traffic volumes indicated that three intersections in the surrounding area currently exceed the acceptable level of service criteria (LOS D or better) for the City of San Luis Obispo. *(Traffic Impact Analysis for the Proposed Regional Center at 40 Prado Road, 1992)* They are:

- Madonna Road/Highway 101 southbound ramps,
- Madonna Road/ South Higuera Street, and
- Los Osos Valley Road/Highway 101 southbound ramps

In a traffic impact analysis prepared by Pacific Traffic and Transportation Engineers in 1992 for a project proposed on the Sunset Drive-In site the report calculated comparable traffic projections to the FDP. In the prior report, the addition of the project traffic would cause the Elks Lane approach to the Elks Lane/South Higuera Street intersection to operate at an unacceptable LOS E. Since the FDP is projected to generate 250 more daily trips it is likely the LOS at Elks Lane/South Higuera Street will also operate at LOS E. Possible mitigation would require the installation of a traffic signal, but the report notes that discussions with City staff suggest this is an infeasible mitigation measure. However, proposed traffic impacts did not cause any of the other ten study area intersections that were not already operating at unacceptable LOS to operate at unacceptable levels with the construction of the Prado Road interchange.
4.3.3 Prado Road

The Circulation Element of the City General Plan identifies Prado Road as an essential primary road system that will be needed to accommodate development within the project area and surrounding growth areas of the City. The Margarita Area Specific Plan/Airport Area Specific Plan (MASP/AASP) EIR determined a primary traffic mitigating feature of the MASP is the Plan’s requirement that Prado Road be extended easterly, from its current terminus just east of South Higuera Street, to Broad Street, thus providing a new divided 4-lane east-west, cross-town arterial connector in the southern area of San Luis Obispo. The City also plans to extend Prado Road west of South Higuera Street to Madonna Road with a full interchange at Highway 101.

Traffic projections included in the MASP/AASP EIR anticipated Prado Road’s average daily traffic (ADT) at the intersection of South Higuera Street would be 37,000 and traffic in the area will not exceed an acceptable LOS except at the Prado Road/South Higuera Street intersection, show in Table 4-5. Resolution 9726 (2005 series) adopted by the City Council August 23, 2005, determined potential and proposed development circumstances had changed sufficiently enough that the LOS at the intersection of Prado Road and South Higuera Street would decline from LOS D to LOS E. Additional mitigation required by the resolution for development within the Airport and Margarita Areas should be applied to this project to help reduce the project’s traffic impacts. This mitigation requires Transportation Demand Management (TDM) requirements shall be applied to employers with 25 or more employees.

Recommended TDM mitigation for the proposed project includes: a bus stop on Prado Road, bicycle storage lockers, showers and lockers, and a pedestrian connection to the existing office park on South Higuera Street. The proposed development provides a bus turn-out on the projects frontage and bus stops both sides of Prado Road, short term bicycle racks and long term indoor bicycle storage, employee locker and shower accommodations, and a pedestrian bridge and pathway through the office park on South Higuera Street to the Margarita Street/South Higuera Street intersection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Average Daily Traffic (ADT)</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Traffic</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prado Road/S. Higuera Street</td>
<td>37,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tank Farm Rd/S. Higuera St</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Osos Valley Rd/US 101 NB ramps</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Osos Valley Rd/US 101 SB ramps</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Osos Valley Rd/S. Higuera St</td>
<td>13,400</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N/A = not available

4.3.4 Findings

The project incorporates recommended TDM mitigation measures to reduce traffic impacts and projected traffic impacts for the proposed project will not cause intersections in the study area to operate at unacceptable LOS except for three intersections that were found to already be operating at an unacceptable LOS (Madonna Road/Highway 101 southbound ramps, Madonna Road/ South Higuera Street, and Los Osos Valley Road/Highway 101 southbound ramps) with the construction of the Prado Road interchange.
4.4 Airport Land Use Plan

4.4.1 Scope of the Airport Land Use Plan

The purpose of the ALUP is to promote the safety and well being of the public by ensuring adoption of land use regulations which minimize exposure of persons to hazards associated with the operation of the San Luis Obispo Regional Airport and to provide a set of policies and criteria to assist the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) in evaluating the compatibility of proposed local actions on the part of referring agencies and in determining the consistency of the proposed local action with the ALUP. The ALUP applies to new development within the Planning Area and general plan amendments require review by the ALUC.

The ALUP regulates types of uses, densities, and noise exposure in the Planning Area and the severity of the regulation is related to the proximity of the airport. The Sunset Drive-In site falls within the Planning Area of the ALUP which is divided into Airport Safety Sub-Areas. The project site is located in Safety Area S-1b (illustrated in Fig. 4-15) which is an area within gliding distance of prescribed flight paths for aircraft operations at less than 500 feet above ground level, plus sideline safety areas, and inner turning zones and outer safety zones for each runway. Aviation safety hazards of concern in this zone include mechanical failures, fuel exhaustion, stall/spin incidents, loss of control during missed approach procedures, and midair collisions.

4.4.2 Land Use Compatibility

According to the Land Use Compatibility Table of the ALUP (Appendix D), all but one use proposed by the FDP are allowed, so long as the maximum non-residential density is limited to the non-residential density (persons per gross acre) as shown in Figure 6 of Appendix D, if specific noise mitigation measures required by the ALUP are incorporated into the design, and if it qualifies as infill development under the criteria specified by Section 4.3.2.3 as follows:

a. The proposed development area is bounded on all sides by uses similar to those proposed because west and northwest of the site is the Madonna Inn and Embassy Suites which include hotel, and conference/banquet facilities (moderately noise sensitive uses), and to the south and east are residential uses (extremely noise sensitive uses).
b. The proposed development does not extend the perimeter of the area already developed with noise sensitive uses because there are noise sensitive uses surrounding the site, therefore it does not extend the perimeter of the area developed with noise sensitive uses.

c. Increased intensity and/or incompatibility of noise-sensitive use is not permitted through use permits, density transfers, or other strategies. The site has been identified by the City’s General Plan to accommodate future growth once development constraints (flooding) can be overcome. The City intends to rezone the site from Interim Open Space so that it can accommodate future development now that issues of flooding have been resolved. The proposed uses of the FDP are consistent with the City’s Tourist Commercial zoning designation and do not increase intensity or incompatibility of noise-sensitive uses through use permits or density transfers.)

d. Other applicable development conditions are met since the FDP is consistent with applicable noise, density, and use development regulations contained within the ALUP.

The ALUP prohibits high intensity land uses in the S-1b Safety Area, which includes the conference facility and outdoor event area. However the ALUC may allow development or intensity of a land use which would otherwise be inconsistent with the ALUP with the inclusion of appropriate safety features such as an Airport Compatible Open Space Plan (ACOS).

The City of San Luis Obispo prepared an ACOS plan in 2005 to allow for increased development potential within each of the Aviation Safety Areas defined by the ALUP. Such adjustments are available if advanced levels of planning analysis are performed. The City’s ACOS plan has been prepared to achieve density adjustments, as provided for in Table 7 of Appendix D. The plan was prepared to be consistent with the ACOS requirements contained in Sections 4.4.6.2 and 4.4.6.4 of the ALUP.

The nearest ACOS to the Sunset site is the Dalidio Open Space located 1,500 feet to the southwest shown in Figure 4-16. The 52 acre reserve space is within Airport Safety Area S-1b, 1.9 miles northwest of the airport under the major flight corridor for Runway 11-29. It is flat agricultural land that is actively cultivated and irrigated and is intended to remain as open space. The area includes portions of the Madonna Gap property and the McBride property that are designated on the City’s General Plan as permanent open space, therefore no future development within this area is anticipated.

Even with an approved ACOS, high intensity land uses are regulated in Airport Safety Area S-1b, but projects that demonstrate

Figure 4-16 City of San Luis Obispo Dalidio ACOS
consistency with density requirements and other applicable development conditions may be permitted by the ALUC. The FDP is consistent with non-residential densities in Airport Safety Area S-1b with an approved ACOS.

4.4.3 Noise Sensitive Land Uses

Proposed uses in the FDP include moderately noise sensitive uses and extremely noise sensitive uses. The conference and business center facility and the hotel are moderately noise sensitive because while their activities may be disrupted by airport operations, mitigating noise impacts are feasible. Moderately noise sensitive uses are allowed with mitigation. The restaurant and visitor center which include outdoor eating and drinking areas and the outdoor creek event area are extremely noise sensitive uses because their activities may be disrupted to a significant degree by aviation noise impacts and sufficient mitigation to ensure compatibility with current or future airport operations is not feasible. Extremely noise sensitive uses are permitted on this site because it is located between the 55 and 60 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) contour lines and it qualifies as infill development, consistent with the ALUP.

The ALUP requires up to 15 dB of interior noise attenuation from Single Event Noise Exposure Level (SENEL) for uses proposed by the FDP, as shown in Table 4 in the Appendix D. Normal construction techniques are assumed to provide 15 dB of noise attenuation.

The City’s Noise Element requires noise mitigation for noise sensitive uses as well. Most of the site lies within the projected 60 dB buildout noise contour line and parts within the projected 65 and 70 dB buildout noise contour lines shown in Figure 4-17. The City’s Noise Element limits all outdoor use areas to a maximum average noise level of 60 dB and interior noise exposure to an average of 45 dB and a single event maximum of 50 dB. Three hotel buildings are located within the 65 dB noise contour line and would require 20 dB of noise attenuation, more than what normal construction techniques are assumed to provide. The visitor center which is an extremely noise sensitive use lies within the 65 dB noise contour line as well, but the embankment for the interchange should shield the center’s outdoor patio from road noise. However, a noise study needs to prepared by
a qualified acoustical expert to ensure noise exposure will not exceed City thresholds and development should be permitted only after noise mitigation has been designed as part of the project to reduce noise exposure to the levels specified by the Noise Element.
4.5 Feasibility

4.5.1 Financial Feasibility

Financial feasibility was conducted as part of this development program. Informational resources include PAM Development based in Lodi California, Rosetti Realty and Stafford & McCarty Realty from San Luis Obispo, and Hotel Online. Table 4-6 illustrates a breakdown of construction costs for each component of the project. The estimated cost of construction for the entire project is $26,670,000 and land acquisition is estimated to be $33,102,000 (an average from two sources). The total cost of development is estimated to be $59,799,000.

The feasibility and success of the project depends on the profitability of Fugazi Resort and its ability to recover 60 million dollars in development cost. A more in-depth pro forma will better determine the financial feasibility for Fugazi Resort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-6 Project Feasibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>size</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hotel rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conference facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>event patio area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>day spa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parking lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gardens*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>welcome center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Construction Cost Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soft Costs (14%)</th>
<th>Construction (70%)</th>
<th>FF&amp;E costs (16%)</th>
<th>Construction Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2,205,000</td>
<td>$11,025,000</td>
<td>$2,520,000</td>
<td>$15,750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>$480,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>$315,000</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$504,000</td>
<td>$2,520,000</td>
<td>$576,000</td>
<td>$3,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td>$28,000</td>
<td>$6,400</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$168,000</td>
<td>$840,000</td>
<td>$192,000</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$126,000</td>
<td>$630,000</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$123,480</td>
<td>$617,400</td>
<td>$141,120</td>
<td>$882,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,600</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
<td>$14,400</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$107,800</td>
<td>$539,000</td>
<td>$123,200</td>
<td>$770,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,737,580</td>
<td>$18,687,900</td>
<td>$4,271,520</td>
<td>$26,697,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Price per Acre</th>
<th>Total Acres</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosetti Realty</td>
<td>$600,000.00</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$27,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford and McCarty Realty</td>
<td>$871,200.00</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$39,204,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>$735,600.00</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$33,102,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cost $59,799,000

Source: PAM Development, Rosetti Realty, Stafford & McCarty, and Hotel Online

* Creek event area included in estimate for gardens
4.5.2 Environmental Initial Study

An initial was prepared for the FDP to identify potential impacts to the environment and aid in the environmental determination for the project. In order to accurately determine potential impacts further studies are required, such as Phase I and II Archaeological Survey, biological resources, hydrology, and noise studies, geology and soils report, and Mobile Home Conversion Impact Report.

The initial study’s analysis of Fugazi Resort identified eight environmental factors that would be a “Potential Significant Impact.” Potential significant issues for the FDP include:

1. Aesthetics: The project will create a new source of light or glare which would adversely affect nighttime views in the area.

2. Air Quality: The project may violate air quality standards or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Luis Obispo Clean Air Plan, and/or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

3. Cultural Resources: The FDP will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource (Sunset Drive-In Theater), and may disturb human remains/cultural resources due to the proximity of San Luis Obispo Creek.

4. Hazards & Hazardous Materials: The projects may result in a airport safety hazard for the people residing or working in the project area since one of its proposed uses is a high intensity land use, and the project may create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the transportation or disposal of hazardous materials, through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, and/or expose people or structures to existing sources of hazardous emissions or hazardous or acutely hazardous materials during construction related activities.

5. Land Use & Planning: The project conflicts with applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. The current zoning will not allow for the proposed uses of the FDP and will not be changed until issues of flooding have been resolved.

6. Noise: The project will expose people to “unacceptable” noise levels as defined by the San Luis Obispo General Plan Noise Element unless mitigation incorporated.

7. Population & Housing: The Valle Vista Trailer Park is proposed to be removed which will displace existing housing and people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.
8. Transportation & Traffic: Traffic associated with Fugazi Resort will cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of Prado Road, and cumulatively exceed a level of service standard established by the City for designated roads and highways (Prado Road/ South Higuera Street intersection projected to operate at LOS E).

These potential significant impacts may be mitigated to a less than significant impact but without sufficient information the extent of the impacts is unknown, therefore the initial study determined an environmental Impact Report would be required. A copy of the initial study is provided in Appendix C.
Chapter 5: Implementation

5.1 Development Phases

Phase 1: Feasibility and Needs Assessment

A project concept is developed in this phase. The preliminary project proposal created by the development staff is discussed with the planning staff. The development staff would ask any questions on standards, regulations, or needed permits for the site and type of development. The planning office reviews the development ideas and provides information that the developer needs. The developer also evaluates the wants and needs of the public for the project in order to determine if the project will be successful. The developer then assesses the problems and needs of the project and decides if the project is worth developing.

Phase 2: Land Acquisition and Financing

After the developer collects the necessary funds through loans and investors, a land purchase negotiation with the site’s multiple owners will be discussed. All parties involved need to come to a purchase agreement for the developer to move forward.

Phase 3: Development Entitlements

A. Application

The developer needs to submit a complete application which includes a description of the proposed use, project statement, multiple plan sets, waterways management plan compliance, materials sample board, inclusionary housing proposal, public art proposal, and any other documents that planning staff requires. The application package should also include a statement describing how the project is consistent with the General Plan, a list of other public agencies who must approve or grant a permit for this project, department of fish and game fee, information from soils engineering reports, noise studies, and/or archaeological resources studies to assist the planner make an environmental determination, and a title report of all parcels with a legal description.

B. Initial Staff Review

Staff will determine that all required materials are included in the project application and that the project is consistent with development regulations. Staff will also ask for comment from other City departments and applicable outside agency review authorities.

C. Environmental Determination

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review is an important part of planning and implementation; it points out environmental impact information to decision makers. The first step is to prepare an initial study to determine potential impacts of development and decide if the project requires an environmental
impact report, mitigated negative declaration, or a negative declaration. The initial study will address how the project will affect air quality, biological resources, archaeological resources, geology and soils, land use and planning, noise, traffic, and City infrastructure.

D. Mobile Home Conversion

The purpose of the Mobile Home Park Conversion Process is to ensure that a proposed conversion of an existing mobile home park to any other use is preceded by adequate notice, that the social and fiscal impacts of the proposed conversion are adequately defined prior to consideration of a proposed conversion, and that relocation and other assistance is provided to park residents, consistent with the provisions of Sections 65863.7 and 66427.4 of the California Government Code.

A report on the impact of the conversion, closure, or cessation of use upon the displaced residents of the proposed mobile home park to be converted or closed is required by State law. In determining the impact of the conversion, closure, or cessation of use on displaced mobile home residents, the report shall address the availability of adequate replacement housing in mobile home parks and relocation costs. (California Government Code 65863.7)

E. Staff and Public Agency Development Review and Action

The project site plan and site design are submitted to the Planning Department and reviewed. During the process, the Planning Department reviews everything about the proposed development from gates, fences, and landscaping, to building exterior design, interior floor plans, exterior features such as pools, open space, roadways, etc. Staff prepares reports with a recommended action for development review authorities while public notices and legal advertising are prepared. The staff report for the project is distributed to the appropriate review authorities and made available to the public to comment on the project at public hearings where final action on the project is determined.

Phase 4: Final Design and Construction

Once the project receives approval, final design plans need to be submitted. The plans are reviewed for a final time by City staff. Construction starts after final plan approval. Throughout the construction process, certain building requirements need to be met at different stages of construction. Once the entire project is constructed and all required mitigations are met, a certificate of occupancy is acquired and the project is allowed to be used and occupied.

Phase 5: Mitigation Monitoring

A mitigation monitoring program is needed for any project approved for which mitigation measures have been adopted. It is not only intended to assure that mitigation measures are implemented, but also to create a feedback loop which lead agencies can use to gauge and improve the effectiveness of such measures over time. A mitigated negative declaration or an environmental impact report will identify the mitigation measures for the project and prescribe a monitor program for each mitigation. (Planning Center Mitigation Monitoring, 1998)
5.2 Planned Development Zoning

This development program proposes a Planned Development (PD) overlay zone. The PD overlay zone is intended to provide for flexibility in the application of zoning standards and to allow consideration of innovation in site planning and other aspects of project design. The City of San Luis Obispo expects each planned development project to be of significantly higher design quality, including more effective and attractive pedestrian orientation, environmental sensitivity, energy efficiency, and the more efficient use of resources, than would be achieved through conventional design practices and standards.

The project incorporates three of four mandatory features to qualify for a PD overlay zoning under San Luis Obispo Municipal Code sections 17.50.060, and these are:

1. The project will achieve greater energy efficiency than standard developments through the incorporation of green building techniques, scoring at least a silver rating on the LEED or other equivalent rating system, or achieving a minimum of 30 percent greater energy efficiency than the minimum required by California Code of Regulation Title 24. The development program will be required to achieve a minimum of 30 percent or greater energy efficiency than the minimum required by California Code of Regulation Title 24 as a condition of approval for a PD overlay zone. The City’s Building Department will review the project plans to ensure compliance before a building permit is issued.

2. The project will preserve, enhance, and/or create a significant natural feature with a minimum area of one-half acre. The development program proposes to create natural gardens with native vegetation encompassing a total of 20 acres (about 44% of the total site) in addition to the rehabilitation of San Luis Obispo Creek. Conditions of approval for the PD overlay zoning will ensure the gardens and creek area shall be preserved as a natural feature through a conservation easement or development agreement.

3. The project will provide a substantial public amenity, for example, a significant public plaza, a public park, or a similar improved open space feature, including provisions for guaranteed long-term maintenance not at the expense of the City. The project includes development of multi-use paths and habitat enhancement as a part of development project. Public benefits will increase from the project’s preservation of natural creek channels largely in their natural form and location and introduction of paths to allow public access to these areas.

**Required findings for approval**

The review authority may approve a rezoning to apply the PD overlay zoning district only after first making all of the following findings:

1. The project is consistent with the General Plan and the applicable Airport Land Use Plan, and the proposed land use is allowed within the proposed applicable primary zoning district. The project has been evaluated for consistency with the General Plan as illustrated in (General Plan Consistency Matrix).
2. The project complies with all applicable provisions of these Zoning Regulations other than those modified by the PD rezoning.

3. The approved modifications to the development standards of these Zoning Regulations are necessary and appropriate to accommodate the superior design of the proposed project, its compatibility with adjacent land uses, and its successful mitigation of environmental impacts, because doing so enables the preservation of a larger percent of the site as open space to maintain and enhance the natural qualities of the site.

4. The project complies with all applicable City Design Guidelines and provides additional parameters to ensure development is respectful of the natural setting and adjacent neighborhoods.

5. All affected public facilities, services, and utilities are adequate to serve the proposed project. As part of the permitting process, project plans shall be evaluated by staff from the City’s Public Works and Utilities Department to determine if the City can serve the project with all required utilities and services.

6. The location, size, site planning, building design features, and operating characteristics of the project are highly suited to the characteristics of the site and surrounding neighborhood, and will be compatible with the character of the site, and the land uses and development intended for the surrounding neighborhood by the General Plan because the design is respectful of adjacent, established development and the proposed buildings do not “tower” over adjacent development because buildings are setback from the property lines. Furthermore the site is a gateway to San Luis Obispo and closely located to shopping areas on Madonna Road and in the Downtown, providing a desirable location for conference and visitor serving facilities.

7. The site is adequate for the project in terms of size, configuration topography, and other applicable features, and has appropriate access to public streets with adequate capacity to accommodate the quantity and type of traffic expected to be generated by the use since the flat (0-2% slopes), 45 acre site is appropriate for conference and visitor serving facilities. Additionally, the project includes the widening of Prado Road and contribution of impact fees for the Prado Road interchange to accommodate the quantity and type of traffic expected by the use and surrounding Margarita and Airport Areas as prescribed in the Margarita Area Specific Plan and Airport Area Specific Plan EIR.

8. The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the proposed project will not, in the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity of the proposed use, or detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the City because the project will provide tourist commercial services appropriate for the location and will be developed in a manner that is consistent with all City building codes and other safety related requirements.
5.3 General Plan Consistency Matrix

The Fugazi Development Program (FDP) is consistent with many policies contained within San Luis Obispo General Plan. Appendix B is the General Plan Consistency Matrix which lists all the policies the FDP follows and below is a brief summary.

Land Use

One of the FDP’s main goals is creek preservation and restoration. City tourism is promoted by the FDP’s resort and welcome center. The proposed uses are compatible with neighboring and promotes walking and biking by incorporating a pedestrian bridge connecting the Margarita Area and bike lanes in and around the site.

Circulation

FDP incorporates Transportation Demand Management mitigation measures to reduce traffic impacts. These include bus stops, bike lockers, and off site pedestrian access. The project connects City bike routes and expands the Bob Jones trail.

Conservation and Open Space

The San Luis Obispo Creek wildlife habitat will be preserved and revitalized. The 12 acre natural gardens includes native plant species, many of the building roofs are south facing providing the best possible angle for absorption of solar energy, and lighting on site operates at appropriate levels and times and avoids spillage into neighboring areas.

Water and Wastewater

Fugazi Resort will use reclaimed water from the WRF across Prado Road to irrigated its landscaped areas to reduce consumption of drinking water.
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Appendix A: Presentation Posters
### Fugazi Resort

#### Location Map

#### Table: Fugazi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Total sq ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120 seats</td>
<td>3100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar/lounge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banquet rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen/pastry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference facility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>24000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome center</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>150 rooms</td>
<td>264000 (600-1000 per suite)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creek event area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day spa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2900 (2 acres arable land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric cart maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure A: Aerial view looking to the north.

Figure B: Aerial view looking to the south.

Figure C: Aerial view looking east.

Figure D: Aerial view looking to the west.

Tourist Commercial Program
Appendix B: General Plan Consistency Matrix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.7.6</td>
<td>wildlife habitat</td>
<td>continuous wildlife habitat shall be preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0.1</td>
<td>slope</td>
<td>commercial uses should be developed in appropriate areas where the natural slope of the land is less than 10 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0.2</td>
<td>access</td>
<td>commercial uses should have access from arterial and collector streets and should be designed and located to avoid increasing traffic on residential streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0.3</td>
<td>residential areas</td>
<td>expansion of commercial uses into residential areas is prohibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The City should be an attractive place for short-term stays, as well as an attractive destination for long-term visitors. The City should base its attraction on the character of the community, its natural qualities, and its educational and cultural facilities. The City should emphasize conference and visitor-serving facilities which have a low impact upon the environment and upon existing land forms and landscapes, and which provide low-impact visitor activities and low-impact means of transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.1</td>
<td>basis for tourism</td>
<td>Visitor-serving uses should be integrated with other types of uses, including overnight accommodations downtown, near the airport, and near the train station; small-scale facilities (such as hostels or bed-and-breakfast places) may be located in Medium-High Density Residential and High-Density Residential Districts, where compatible. Visitor-serving uses are especially appropriate where such uses have already concentrated: along upper Monterey Street; at the Madonna Road area; at certain freeway interchanges; and in the downtown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.2</td>
<td>location</td>
<td>Tourist Commercial uses are those which primarily serve the traveling public. Tourist Commercial areas should accommodate motels, restaurants, service stations, recreational uses, and minor retail sales for the convenience of travelers. To assure adequate space for visitor-serving uses, areas designated Tourist Commercial should not include offices, general retail stores, auto repair, or business services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.3</td>
<td>appropriate uses</td>
<td>Site planning, building design, and types of activities for new tourist-commercial development adjacent to residential areas should be carefully reviewed by the Architectural Review Commission, the Planning Commission, or both, to assure compatibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.4</td>
<td>residential neighbors</td>
<td>The ratio of building floor area to site area shall not exceed 2.5. The Zoning determine a project’s realized building intensity, to reflect existing or desired architectural character in a neighborhood. When dwellings are provided in Tourist Commercial districts, they shall not exceed 12 units per acre. Regulations will establish maximum building height and lot coverage, and minimum setbacks from streets and other property lines, as well as procedures for exceptions to such standards in special circumstances. Architectural review will determine a project’s realized building intensity, to reflect existing or desired architectural character in a neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5.5</td>
<td>building intensity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Mixed Uses</td>
<td>Compatible mixed uses in commercial districts should be encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.9</td>
<td>Noise Control</td>
<td>Zoning Regulations and Architectural Review Guidelines will include measures such as the following to prevent unacceptable noise exposure for residential areas or other noise-sensitive uses: location and shielding of mechanical equipment; location of truck loading, trash collection areas, and loudspeakers; landscaped setbacks or noise attenuation walls along property lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9.11A</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Encourage sufficient conference and meeting space to accommodate the demand for medium size conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.4</td>
<td>Interim Open Space</td>
<td>The General Plan Land Use Element Map shows desired future uses for most land within the urban reserve line. However, the City has not decided the best eventual use for some areas. Such areas are designated Interim Open Space, indicating that they will be suitable for urban development when certain conditions are satisfied. Examples of such conditions include demonstrated need for further urban development that cannot be satisfied on already urbanized land, provision of proper access and utility service, and environmentally acceptable reduction of flood hazards. The Interim Open Space designation is to be changed to an urban classification only when the conditions necessary for development can be satisfied and a certain type of development is approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.3</td>
<td>Amenities and Access</td>
<td>New public or private developments adjacent to the lake, creeks, and wetlands must respect the natural environment and incorporate the natural features as project amenities, provided doing so does not diminish natural values. Developments along creeks should include public access across the development site to the creek and along the creek, provided that wildlife habitat, public safety, and reasonable privacy and security of the development can be maintained, consistent with the Conservation and Open Space Element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4.5</td>
<td>Porous Paving</td>
<td>The City encourages the use of porous paving to facilitate rainwater percolation. Parking lots and paved outdoor storage areas shall, where practical, use one or more of the following measures to reduce surface water runoff and aid in groundwater recharge: porous paving, ample landscaped areas which receive surface drainage and which are maintained to facilitate percolation; drainage detention basins with soils that facilitate percolation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Airport Land Use Plan</td>
<td>Development should be permitted only if it is consistent with the San Luis Obispo County Airport Land Use Plan. Prospective buyers of property which is subject to airport influence should be so informed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Circulation

| 2.0.3 | worked trip based reduction | Employers should participate in trip reduction programs. | The development program incorporates transportation demand management; mitigation measures to reduce traffic impacts. These include bus stops, bike lockers, and off-site pedestrian access. |
| 3.0.7 | transit service access | new development should be designed to facilitate access to transit service. | The development program incorporates a bus stop on Prado Road. |
| 4.0.1 | bicycle use | Bicycle transportation should be encouraged. | Bicycle transportation is encouraged. There is both temporary and long-term bike storage on site. |
| 4.0.3 | Continuous Network | The City shall complete a continuous network of safe and convenient bikeways that connect neighborhoods with major activity centers and with county bike routes as specified by the Bicycle Transportation Plan. | The site connects City bike routes and expands the Bob Jones Trail. |
| 4.04 | new development | New development should provide bikeways, secure bicycle storage, parking facilities and showers, consistent with City plans and standards. | Bike ways, secure bicycle storage, parking facilities and showers are all provided in the project. |
| 4.06.8 | bikeway development | Bikeways designated in the Bicycle Transportation Plan should be established when: The street section is being changed as part of a development project; | Bike way connections will be established. |
| 4.07 | arterial streets | All arterial street projects should provide bicycle lanes. Residential arterials may or may not be able to accommodate bike lanes; the evaluation of bike lanes on these streets will consider the neighborhood context. | The Prado Road expansion incorporates bike lanes in both directions. |
| 5.0.3 | new development | new development shall provide sidewalks and pedestrian paths consistent with City policies, plans, programs and standards. | Sidewalks and pedestrian paths will be provided on Prado Road and in the site. |
| 5.05 | pedestrian crossings | To improve pedestrian crossing safety at heavily used intersections, the City should institute the following: Install crossing controls, where warranted, that provide adequate time for pedestrians to cross the street. On Arterial Streets, Parkways or Regional Routes with four or more travel lanes, install medians at pedestrian crossings where roadway width allows. | The main entrance to the site on Prado Road will be made into a full intersection with adequate pedestrian crosswalks. |
| 8.0.4 | driveway access | Driveway access from development fronting arterial streets should be minimized wherever possible. | There are only two entrances to the site from Prado Road. |
| 9.0.6 | project implementation | Street projects should be implemented as development occurs. | Street improvements will be made as or before the site is developed. |

---

**Sunset Drive-In Theater Area**

This 25-acre area should be further developed only if flooding can be mitigated without significant harm to San Luis Obispo Creek. Until flood hazards are mitigated, continued agricultural use and low-intensity recreational use are appropriate. Any use drawing substantial regional traffic also depends on providing a full interchange at Prado Road and extending Prado Road to connect with Madonna Road. Once flooding and access issues are resolved, and agricultural preservation requirements are met, the area would be suitable for government agencies' regional offices (see also policy 5.1.6). Flood hazards will be mitigated, Prado Road interchange and extension will be completed, and agriculture preservation requirements will be met.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1.10</td>
<td>Streetscapes and major roadways. In the acquisition, design, construction or significant modification of major roadways (highways/ regional routes and arterial streets), the City will promote the creation of “streetscapes” and linear scenic parkways or corridors that promote the City’s visual quality and character, enhance adjacent uses, and integrate roadways with surrounding districts. The Prado Road expansion incorporates a tree lined median and trees along both sides of the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.0.3</td>
<td>Development along scenic routes. Development along scenic roadways should not block views or detract from the quality of views. Development will not detract from the view of the natural surroundings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>New Development Design and Transportation Noise Sources. New noise-sensitive development shall be located and designed to meet the maximum outdoor and indoor noise exposure levels. Development meets the maximum outdoor and indoor noise exposure levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation and Open Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5.1</td>
<td>Solar Access Standards. To encourage use of solar energy, reasonable solar access shall be provided and protected. The majority of the building roofs are south facing providing potential solar access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3.3</td>
<td>Wildlife habitat and corridors. Continuous wildlife habitat, including corridors free of human disruption, shall be preserved and where necessary, created by interconnecting open spaces, wildlife habitat and corridors. The riparian habitat along the creek will be rehabilitated and revitalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5.2</td>
<td>Use of native California plants in urban landscaping. Landscaping should incorporate native plant species, with selection appropriate for location. The development program includes 12 acres of native plant landscaping on site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.7.9</td>
<td>Creek Setbacks. As further described in the Zoning Regulations, the City will maintain creek setbacks to include an appropriate separation from the physical top of bank, the appropriate floodway as identified in the Flood Management Policy, native riparian plants or wildlife habitat and space for paths called for by any City-adopted plan. The creek setbacks will be maintained with an appropriate separation from the physical top of bank and floodway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2.3</td>
<td>Outdoor Lighting. Outdoor lighting shall avoid: operating at unnecessary locations, levels, and times; spillage to areas not needing or wanting illumination; glare (intense line-of-site contrast); and frequencies (colors) that interfere with astronomical viewing. The development program incorporates lighting that operates at appropriate levels and times, avoids spillage into other areas, and includes down facing directional lighting along paths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Wastewater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17.2</td>
<td>Uses of Reclaimed Water. The City will make available reclaimed water to substitute for existing potable water uses as allowed by law and to supply new nonpotable uses. When deemed appropriate by the Utilities Director, new development shall be equipped with dual plumbing to maximize the use of reclaimed water for nonpotable uses. The development program’s landscaping and toilets will use reclaimed water.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DRAFT
INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM
For Sunset Drive-In Redevelopment

1. **Project Title:** Fugazi Resort

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** City of San Luis Obispo
   919 Palm Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

3. **Contact Person:** Jeremiah Robbins
   Joseph Michael

4. **Project Location:** 255 Elks Lane, San Luis Obispo, CA (Main address)

5. **Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:** City of San Luis Obispo
   919 Palm Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

6. **General Plan Designation:** Interim Open Space, Office, Services and Manufacturing

7. **Zoning:** C/OS, O-PD, C-S-S

8. **Description of the Project:**

   The applicant is proposing to develop 45 acres with a tourist commercial center including a hotel and pool, day spa, conference/banquet facility, restaurant, outdoor patio and event areas, small organic farm, natural gardens, and a welcome center. The hotel includes a total of 150 suites in six separate buildings set within a 12 acre of natural garden. The 5,000 sq ft day spa is located along San Luis Creek and the 7,000 sq ft welcome center is located along Prado Road. The 120 seat restaurant with creekside dining is adjacent to the conference facility and lobby with a combined 34,000 sq ft of space for conferences, banquets, business fairs, etc., and includes a large outdoor patio area. A small 2 acre organic farm provides fresh food to the restaurant and 588 parking spaces are provided in three surface lots. Walking paths are provided throughout the natural gardens and along San Luis Obispo Creek including a small pedestrian bridge providing access from Margarita Street.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:**

   The subject site is 45 acres located between Prado Road, Elks Lane, and San Luis Obispo Creek, neighboring the City’s Water Reclamation Facility, and adjacent to Highway 101. Existing uses comprise miscellaneous service commercial and small scale agricultural uses but the area is best known for the Sunset Drive-In. North of the project area is the San Luis Cemetery and the Elks Lodge and to the south is the Water Reclamation Facility, the Prado Day Center, and a mix of service commercial uses along South Higuera Street. Development to the east is a mix of service commercial, office, and residential uses and farther east is the Margarita Area. West of the project area is Highway 101 and regional shopping centers including the Madonna Center and the proposed Dalidio project.
The project area is currently zoned interim open space, commercial services, and office and consists of nine parcels with seven different owners. Most of the project site has been a 100-year floodplain but with improvements made to San Luis Creek north and south of the project area it no longer is a 100-year floodplain. Other important characteristics of the site includes high tension power lines which bisect the site, the property is in the (S-1b) Airport safety area, and the proposed widening of Prado Road and new highway interchange (to accommodate designation of State Highway 227) must be addressed in the development plans.

10. **Project Entitlements Requested:**

The project requires a General Plan amendment and rezone, Planned Development overlay, architectural review of development plans, environmental review, street abandonment, and a voluntary lot merging.

11. **Other public agencies whose approval is required:**

Air Pollution Control District  
Water Quality Control Board  
California Department of Fish and Game  
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Airport Land Use Commission  
California Department of Transportation
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Geology/Soils</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural Resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Hydrology/Water Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Transportation &amp; Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Land Use and Planning</td>
<td>Utilities and Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Energy and Mineral Resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Population and Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FISH AND GAME FEES

There is no evidence before the Department that the project will have any potential adverse effects on fish and wildlife resources or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. As such, the project qualifies for a de minimis waiver with regards to the filing of Fish and Game Fees.

| X | The project has potential to impact fish and wildlife resources and shall be subject to the payment of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Code. This initial study has been circulated to the California Department of Fish and Game for review and comment. |

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

This environmental document must be submitted to the State Clearinghouse for review by one or more State agencies (e.g. Cal Trans, California Department of Fish and Game, Department of Housing and Community Development). The public review period shall not be less than 30 days (CEQA Guidelines 15073(a)).
**DETERMINATION:**

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made, or the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet(s) have been added and agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant” impact(s) or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact(s) on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (1) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (2) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR of NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Signature  
Date

---

Deug Davidson, Deputy Director, Development Review  
John Mandeville, Community Development Director for

---
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EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the analysis in each section. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g. the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g. the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts. The explanation of each issue should identify the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question.

3. "Potentially Significant Impact' is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect is significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.

4. "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section 17, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).

5. Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (D) of the California Administrators Code. Earlier analyses are discussed in Section 17 at the end of the checklist.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g. general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion. In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
   a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
   b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on earlier analysis.
   c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, open space, and historic buildings within a local or state scenic highway?</td>
<td>2, 6, 23</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>10, 23, 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>6, 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation**

a) The primary scenic value from within and around the project site is the view to the north and northeast of the South Hills and to the west and southwest of the Irish Hills. The project site is located on Prado Road, which according to the City’s Conservation Open Space Element, has moderate scenic value. Since the project is designed with street setbacks, a campus-like design, and the buildings are less than 45 ft in height the impact to views in the area will be less than significant.

b) The project site is not along or near a designated local or state scenic highway. Therefore, there is no impact to visual resources along these routes. However, the project area is adjacent to San Luis Obispo Creek and it is an objective of the City to protect natural habitats, including creeks, wetlands, and corridors between these habitats. Project’s plans show buildings, parking lots, and pedestrian trails outside of creek setback, therefore impacts to scenic resources are less than significant.

c) According to the Margarita Area Specific Plan and Airport Area Specific Plan EIR the existing visual character or quality of the surrounding area to the east will change from semi-rural to urban developed as a result of urbanization of the Margarita Area. The project site however, is located within the City’s boundaries in an urban setting, and the project will be required to comply with City codes and standards some of which impact aesthetics and ultimately the project will require the review and approval of the Architectural Review Commission (ARC) to ensure consistency with the City’s Community Design Guidelines. This project will not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, thus the impact is less than significant.

d) The City’s guidelines for lighting prohibit light in excess of one foot-candle from spilling over the property line. Glare resulting from proposed lighting would be reduced by implementation of standard requirements to shield lights and recess light sources within fixtures. The new light source subject to mitigation will not adversely affect day or nighttime views in the urbanized area. Impacts from new sources of light or glare will be less than significant with mitigation as specified by the City of San Luis Obispo to be implemented through compliance with the Lighting and the lighting standards contained in the San Luis Obispo Community Design Guidelines. Building and parking lot lighting for the project would also be reviewed and approved by the ARC.

**Mitigation**

1. Prior to issuance of construction permit, the applicant shall submit an exterior lighting plan ensuring that exterior lighting associated with the project shall not spill over the property line in excess of one foot-candle. Glare light shall be reduced by shielding lights and recessing light sources within fixtures.

**Conclusion**

Implementation of the proposed project would result in potentially significant impacts including the addition of new night lighting. These impacts can be reduced to less than significant with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>6, 9, 11, 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6, 9, 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation

a), b) According to the City’s General Plan the project area does not contain any lands in the stated categories as shown on the maps pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. The project will not cause the conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to any non-agricultural use or conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use. While half of the project area is being used for agricultural use the zoning of the site is Interim Open Space meaning development is contingent on prerequisites, such as overcoming a flood zone, and is not intended to preserve agricultural use. There is no impact.

c) Land in the vicinity of the project site is either already developed or has been identified by the City for eventual non-agricultural use. The impacts of conversion of these lands to non-agricultural uses have already been evaluated in the environmental documents for the City’s Land Use and Circulation Elements, therefore the impact is less than significant.

Conclusion

The project’s impacts on agricultural resources are less than significant.

3. AIR QUALITY. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</th>
<th>8, 13, 14</th>
<th>X</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>8, 13, 14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>8, 13, 14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed qualitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>13, 14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a), b), c) The Clean Air Plan (CAP) for San Luis Obispo County was developed and adopted by the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) and is a comprehensive planning document designed to reduce emissions from traditional industrial and commercial sources, as well as from motor vehicle use. According to the Air Pollution Control District’s (APCD) “CEQA Air Quality Handbook,” land uses that cause the generation of 10 or more pounds per day (PPD) of reactive organic gases (ROG), oxides of nitrogen (NOx), sulfur dioxide (SO2), or fine particulate matter (PMx) have the potential to affect air quality significantly. A 160 room hotel would generate 25 lbs of emissions per day, therefore the proposed 150 room hotel would generate approximately 25 lbs of emissions per day and therefore require review by the APCD. Land Use Element Policy 1.18.2 states that the City will help the APCD implement the Clean Air Plan which is occurs during the City’s review of the project.

California’s major initiatives for reducing climate change or greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions are outlined in Assembly Bill 32 (signed into law 2006), 2005 Executive Order and a 2004 ARB regulation to reduce passenger car GHG emissions. These efforts aim at reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 - a reduction of about 25 percent, and then an 80 percent reduction below 1990 levels by 2050. As part of the development of the site the applicant is requesting a Planned Development (PD) overlay rezone and incorporates three of four mandatory features to qualify for a PD overlay zone one of
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which is to achieve greater energy efficiency than standard developments through the incorporation of green building techniques, scoring at least a silver rating on the LEED or other equivalent rating system, or achieving a minimum of 30 percent greater energy efficiency than the minimum required by California Code of Regulation Title 24. Required as a condition of approval, the project shall demonstrate a minimum of 30 percent greater energy efficiency than the minimum required by California Code of Regulation Title 24 consistent with AB 32.

d) The project will not create objectionable odors under normal operation.

e) San Luis Obispo County is a non-attainment area for the State PM\textsubscript{10} (fine particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter) air quality standards. State law requires that emissions of non-attainment pollutants and their precursors be reduced by at least 5% per year until the standards are attained. During project construction there will be increased levels of fugitive dust associated with construction and grading activities, as well as construction emissions associated with heavy-duty construction equipment. Construction-related emissions would primarily be dust (particulates) generated from soil disturbance and combustion emissions generated by construction equipment. Such dust generation could be potentially a short-term significant impact on air quality that could lead to exceedances of established state and federal thresholds for regional or local air quality or otherwise conflict with City and County air quality plans or program. The City has addressed these construction related impacts through standards in the Grading Ordinance and compliance with these standards is monitored during the building permit plan check process and by field inspections conducted by Building Division inspectors.

Long-term ("operation") air quality impacts could result from on-going emissions generated by project-related vehicular trips and development resulting in additional natural gas combustion for space and water heating and additional fuel combustion at power plants for electricity consumption. Further study of the projects potential impacts to air quality should be investigated.

\textsuperscript{1} Emissions are defined as one of either, ROG, NO\textsubscript{x}, or PM\textsubscript{10}.

**Mitigation**

1. Increase building efficiency rating by 30% above what is required by Title 24 requirements.
2. Shade tree planting along southern exposures of buildings.
3. Increased street tree and parking lot tree planting.
4. Use low energy parking lot and street lights.
5. Improve public transit accessibility by providing transit turnouts.

**Conclusion**

The project may exceed APCD thresholds and air quality mitigation measures shall be required as conditions of approval which the project plans must demonstrate before a building permit is issued. The City’s Grading Ordinance includes dust control measures that will apply to the construction of the project.

**4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or indirectly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>6, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect, on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>6, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (e.g. Heritage Trees)?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?

e) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

f) Have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation**

a), b), d), f) No endangered, threatened or other protected species have been reported on the project site but an extensive biological resource impact analysis has not been conducted. This analysis should include potentially adverse effects on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species, riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities, and protected wetlands, as well as possible mitigation measures.

c), e) There are no local ordinances or habitat conservation plans that affect the property or identify the site as a potential habitat for any protected plant or animal species.

**Conclusion**

The project may have the potential to significantly impact biological resources and further study is required.

**5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:**

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource? (See CEQA Guidelines 15064.5)</td>
<td>9, 16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource? (See CEQA Guidelines 15064.5)</td>
<td>6, 8, 9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>6, 9, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>6, 17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation**

a) The project area includes the Sunset Drive-In Theater and is not listed as a Master List or Contributing historical resource, but the Cultural Heritage Committee (CHC) has identified the theater as a threatened cultural resource. The project will require review by the CHC to determine if the removal of the Sunset Drive-In Theater is a significant issue and applicable mitigation measures before development can proceed.

b) A Phase I archaeological resources inventory report has not been prepared, however general standards of the City’s Municipal Code will apply, requiring that in the event archaeological resources are unearthed or discovered during any grading or construction activities all work shall cease, and the City of San Luis Obispo Community Development Department and/or the County Coroner shall be notified so that the extent and location of discovered materials may be recorded by a qualified archaeologist, and disposition of artifacts may be accomplished in accordance with state and federal law.

c) The project site is located in an area that does not contain any unique geological feature and possesses no known unique paleontological resources.

d) The project may have the potential to disturb human remains since the project area is adjacent to San Luis Obispo Creek, which has been identified by the General Plan as a burial sensitivity area, and is just south of the City’s cemetery. A Phase I archaeological resources inventory will better identify potential impacts and necessary mitigation measures.
Conclusion

The project is required to be reviewed by the CHC to determine potential impacts to cultural resources and identify mitigation measures before a building permit is issued and development can proceed.

6. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?
   
   b) Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?
   
   c) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the State?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6, 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9, 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation

a), b) Development on the site must comply with the policies contained in the General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element, which states that, "New development will be encouraged to minimize the use of conventional energy for space heating and cooling, water heating, and illumination by means of proper design and orientation including the provision and protection of solar exposure." The City implements energy conservation goals through enforcement of the California Energy Code, which establishes energy conservation standards for residential and nonresidential construction and the project is subject to Architectural Review that will ensure consistency with City energy conservation goals, policies, and regulations. The project is also required to achieve greater energy efficiency than standard developments through the incorporation of green building techniques, scoring at least a silver rating on the LEED or other equivalent rating system, or achieving a minimum of 30 percent greater energy efficiency than the minimum required by California Code of Regulation Title 24 as part of the requested Planned Development overlay rezone. The City's Building Department will review the project plans to ensure compliance before a building permit is issued, thus the impact is less than significant.

c) There are no known mineral resources on the project site that would be of value to the region or the State

Conclusion

Architectural Review will ensure consistency with the City's energy policies but mitigation may be required beyond compliance with established energy conservation standards and all applicable State requirements to reduce the project's impact on energy consumption. The development program will be required to achieve a minimum of 30 percent or greater energy efficiency than the minimum required by California Code of Regulation Title 24 as a condition of approval for a PD overlay zone.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury or death involving:
   
   I. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated in the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?
   
   II. Strong seismic ground shaking?
   
   III. Seismic related ground-failure, including liquefaction?
   
   IV. Landslides or mudflows?
   
   b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?
   
   c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?
   
   d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

Evaluation

a) Active faults in the region include: the San Andreas, the Nacimiento, the San Simeon-Hosgri fault zone, and portions of the Los Osos fault. While there are no fault lines on the project site or within close proximity, the site is located in an area of “High Seismic Hazards,” meaning that future buildings constructed on the site will most likely be subjected to excessive ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. Structures must be designed in compliance with seismic design criteria established in the California Building Code. To minimize this potential impact, the Uniform Building Code and City Codes require new structures be built to resist such shaking or to remain standing in an earthquake.

The final grading plan of the proposed project shall be in accordance with the Geotechnical Engineer's recommendations and the California Building Code adopted by the City and modified by City regulations. Thus, the project impact is less than significant.

b) The United States Department of Agriculture Soils survey of San Luis Obispo County indicates the project site is composed of Salinas silty clay loam, 0-2 percent slopes. With this soils type the design of roads, buildings, and other structures need to consider the low strength and moderate shrink swell potential. Salinas silty clay loam is well drained, has moderately slow permeability, and the water capacity is high or very high. Surface runoff is slow and the hazard of water erosion is slight, but excavation and construction has the potential to substantially increase erosion potential on site. Prior to site disturbance, the applicant shall prepare a sedimentation and erosion control plan that shall be prepared and signed by a City Engineer. The plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following measures:

1) Slope surface stabilization: Temporary mulching, seeding or other suitable stabilization measures approved by the City Engineer shall be used to protect all exposed erodible areas. Earth interceptors and diversions shall be installed at the top of cut or fill slopes where there is a potential for erosive surface runoff.

2) Erosion and sedimentation control devices: In order to prevent sedimentation discharges, erosion and sediment control devices shall be installed as necessary for all grading and filling. Control devices and measures may include, but are not limited to, energy absorbing structures or devices to reduce the velocity of runoff water.

3) Control of off-site effects: All grading activity shall be conducted to prevent damaging effects of erosion, sediment production and dust on the site, the creek, and adjoining properties.

c), d) The Safety Element of the General Plan indicates that the project site has a high potential for liquefaction, which is true for most of the City. However the risk of ground-failure for new construction can be reduced to an acceptable level through careful site preparation and proper foundation design. The risks of settlement and liquefaction needs to be identified by investigation by a qualified professional and a soils engineering report will be required to be submitted as part of the building permit process to ensure the integrity of the structures and infrastructure and recommendations included in the report are sufficient to mitigate potential hazards from building in these areas.

Conclusion

Development will be required to comply with the Uniform Building Codes and City Codes which require new structures to be built to resist such shaking or to remain standing in an earthquake, and include proper documentation of soil characteristics for designing structurally sound buildings. The Building Division of the Community Development Department routinely reviews project for their compliance with the recommendations of the soils engineering report for the site.

8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment though the routine use, transport or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Issues</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?</td>
<td>22, 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST 2008
environment?

- c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

- d) Expose people or structures to existing sources of hazardous emissions or hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste?

- e) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, it would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

- f) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for the people residing or working in the project area?

- g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, the adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of lose, injury, or death, involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residents are intermixed with wildlands?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation

a), b), d) Historical agricultural activities and surrounding industrial activities of the Margarita Area may have released hazardous materials into the environment which may have involved leaking underground or aboveground storage tanks or pipelines, or similar events from other nearby properties that store or handle hazardous or toxic materials. Construction-related and ground disturbing activities may involve the use of materials that could contaminate nearby soils and water resources in the project area. Existence of such potential hazards could cause construction workers and other people to be exposed to dust or emissions containing such hazardous materials or to pesticides, herbicides, and other hazardous materials. Other impacts related to development of the project could be operations-related short-term surface water quality degradation and accidental release of hazardous materials during construction; areas of concern include San Luis Obispo Creek. Three (3) mitigation measures that would reduce such impacts to less than significant:

HAZ-1: Implement a construction-related hazardous materials management plan

HAZ-2: If presence of hazardous materials is suspected or encountered during construction-related activities, conduct a Phase I and possibly Phase II Environmental Site Assessment to determine soil or groundwater contamination.

HAZ-3: Implement an operations-related hazardous materials management plan.

If the project uses hazardous materials in sufficient quantities it will be required to file a report with the Fire Department, as required by the California Health and Safety Code.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) has an 80-foot wide easement across the southern part of the site. A 115-kilovolt (kV) transmission line and two tower structures are included in the easement on this site. High-voltage power lines generate electric and magnetic fields (EMF) and the strength of the field is dependent on the amount of current flow and distance from the source. The amount of current flow is dependent on energy consumption, and therefore varies with the seasons and time of day.

Some studies have found correlations between exposure to EMF and disease (usually cancer) while others show no association therefore the scientific community has not established any precise threshold for safe exposure to EMF. The City has not adopted standards for safe exposure levels or appropriate setbacks from power lines but a recommended mitigation measure based on what some studies describe as a safer level of exposure requires that all buildings on a site be located where
Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources
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an EMF reading of 1.0 milligauss (mG) or less occurs. Based on information regarding the typical strengths of fields expected from a 115 kV power line it is suggested that the 1.0 mG standard would occur at a distance between 100 and 150 feet from the power lines, however an on site study needs to be performed to accurately determine where a 1.0 mG reading occurs.

c), e) The project site is not located within a one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school and the site is not on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5.

f) The project site is located within the Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) area S-1B which limits the densities of non-residential uses to 40 persons per acre and a maximum of 75 person per acre with an Airport Compatible Open Space Plan (ACOS). The ALUP also regulates high intensity land uses, such as the proposed conference facility, in the S-1B Airport Safety Area. However, the ALUP includes language that allows “density adjustment” with the approval of an ACOS; density adjustments include permitting high intensity land uses in otherwise prohibited safety areas. The City of San Luis Obispo and Airport Land Use Commission adopted an ACOS Plan which allows development within the City at the greater densities contained in Table 7 of the ALUP. The project must demonstrate that the project will not exceed a non-residential density of 3,375 persons (45 acres * 75 persons) in order to comply with the ALUP. The Airport Land Use Commission shall be consulted to determine consistency with the ALUP to secure development approval and plans submitted to the City’s Building Department must illustrate compliance with ALUP development standards before a permit is issued.

g) The project has not yet been reviewed by the Fire Marshall to assure compliance with adopted fire/emergency-related codes. The project should be reviewed by the Department to ensure that it will not conflict with any emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

h) The Safety Element of the General Plan identifies the site as having a low potential for impacts from wildland fires.

Mitigation

1. Mitigation Measures HAZ-1, 2, and 3 described above.
2. Determine the distance where a 1.0 mG reading occurs and locate structures beyond that distance from the power lines.

Conclusion

The project does have the potential to have significant impacts from hazardous materials but can be mitigated to less than significant. The project must demonstrate consistency with the Airport Land Use Plan before a building permit is issued.

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (eg. The production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>7, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm-water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.</td>
<td>8, 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation onsite or offsite?</td>
<td>8, 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial flooding onsite or offsite?</td>
<td>8, 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>9, 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>9, 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Will the project introduce typical storm water pollutants into ground or surface waters?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Will the project alter ground water or surface water quality, temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation

a) Grading and construction activities have the potential to discharge incidental sediment and construction related pollutants, such as petroleum products, into San Luis Obispo Creek. Development associated with the project will require issuance of an NPDES general construction activity storm water permit by the Central Coast RWQCB. Completion of this project would ensure that construction-related discharges are limited or adequately accommodated by properly engineered infrastructure design. Thus, the impact is considered less than significant.

b) The City currently has water to allocate, and does so on a “first-come, first-served” basis. Water is allocated at the time building permits are issued and the Water Impact Fee is paid. Water will need to be provided by the City’s Utilities Department and it must be shown that supplying the project will not use or otherwise deplete groundwater resources or interfere with groundwater recharge. An analysis of the project’s water and wastewater needs and a will serve letter from the City’s Utility Department are required prior to completion of the environmental determination or project approval.

c), d), e) The proposed development of the site will increase the amount of impervious surfaces on the site and affect the absorption rate, drainage patterns, and the amount and rate of surface runoff. Site drainage will be evaluated with the grading plans as part of the Building Permit process and the project is subject to the revised City Storm Drain Master Plan/Waterway Management Plan that discusses the necessary improvements that would ensure adequate transmission and detention of storm water flow created by any new development. The capacity of the storm drains in the area shall be evaluated for their ability to handle the change in site drainage. The report should outline the necessary upgrades to accommodate runoff of future development at the 100-year recurrence intervals, while releasing the pre-developed flow. To ensure that runoff levels will be equal to or less than existing levels, all storm water runoff should be contained in detention basins and drained at a rate not to exceed the 2-year undeveloped flow rate.

d), g) The project site previously was recently within a 100-year flood hazard area but with restoration and rehabilitation to San Luis Obispo Creek to the north and south of the project area flooding in the area has declined and it is anticipated that the site will not be in a flood zone when the new FIRM maps are releases. Additionally, the proposed project intends to rehabilitate the section of San Luis Obispo Creek located on site.

No housing is included as part of the project, and thus not subject to a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, however conditions of approval are recommended to avoid potential impacts, requiring that:

1. Any proposed stormwater detention facilities take into consideration the effects on the 100-year floodplain as mapped on the FEMA FIRM Panel prior to ground disturbing activities.
2. Stormwater facilities be in compliance with City Waterways Management Plan requirements for Special Floodplain Management Zone.
3. The design of the stormwater facilities will be required to be such that it resolves historical flooding in this location of the site with no net loss of floodplain storage.

h), i) The project could potentially introduce typical storm water pollutants into ground or surface waters during construction activities and as a result of ongoing use of the project area. As a result, the development would require issuance of an NPDES general construction activity permit by the Central Coast RWQCB. Completion of this permit process would ensure that
construction-related discharges were limited. Additionally, ongoing use of the project area for commercial uses would also increase the potential for discharge of chemicals, oils and fuels, and waste into waterways including the San Luis Obispo Creek and wetlands, the requirement for the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) must be established to reduce the potential for unwanted runoff.

Conclusion

No significant impacts have been identified with respect to water quality or hydrology, but a drainage and hydrology report needs to be prepared to ensure that potential drainage impacts are minimized to a level of insignificance. Development of the site is required to be designed to meet all applicable City codes, including City grading and drainage standards, as described in the San Luis Obispo Building and Construction Code and Storm Drain Master Plan/Waterway Management Plan.

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>1, 9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>9, 10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plans?</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation

a) The project is located in an area zone Interim Open Space and Office and the proposed development would require a rezone and an amendment to the General Plan to be consistent. Interim Open Space land use designation is applied to land with development constraints such as being located in a flood zone. The project site is located in a flood zone but with improvements made to San Luis Obispo Creek north and south of the project site it is anticipated that the project will not be in a flood zone, or at least only a smaller portion of the site would fall within a flood zone.

In 1992 part of the project site was rezoned Office with a Planned Development Overlay (O-PD) as an expansion area for the City's tri-polar policy. This policy was derived from the three geographical areas the City identified as being appropriate for the Civic Center (City and County offices), the Health Care Area (near French Hospital on Johnson Avenue), and the Social Services Area (South Higuera Street/Prado Road Area). The proposed project is not consistent with the current zoning designation and would require a rezone and an amendment to the General Plan's Land Use Map to be consistent. The proposed change in land use will reduce the amount of land area available for the expansion of social services and City decision makers must determine if the proposed rezone is a significant impact in terms of accommodating the future space needs of governmental offices.

b), c) The project will not physically divide an established community since the project is an infill development in an already established community. The project will not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans, thus no impact.

Conclusion

An amendment to the General Plan is required before development can proceed and the City must evaluate the future space needs of social services in the South Higuera Street/Prado Road area. The project does not conflict with applicable ALUP density regulations but requires review by the Airport Land Use Commission.

11. NOISE. Would the project result in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of people to or generation of “unacceptable” noise levels as defined by the San Luis Obispo General Plan Noise Element, or general noise levels in excess of standards established in the Noise Ordinance?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) A substantial temporary, periodic, or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

\[ \text{Sources: 4} \quad \text{Potentially Significant Issues:} \quad \text{Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation incorporated:} \quad \text{Less Than Significant Impact:} \quad X \]

\[ \text{Sources: 4, 21} \quad \text{Potentially Significant Issues:} \quad \text{Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation incorporated:} \quad \text{Less Than Significant Impact:} \quad X \]

Evaluation

a) According to the City's General Plan Noise Element, the proposed project is located in an area is predicted to be exposed to traffic noise levels that exceed standards. The project site is located adjacent to Highway 101 and most of the site is within the projected 60 dB buildout noise contour line and parts of the site within the projected 65 and 70 dB buildout noise contour lines. The Noise Element limits outdoor activity area noise exposure to 60 dB. The project plans show outdoor activity areas are within the projected 60 dB buildout noise contour line, but since portions of the site are within 65 and 70 dB noise contour lines and hotels and meeting places are considered noise sensitive development should be permitted only after noise mitigation has been designed as part of the project, to reduce noise exposure to the levels specified by the Noise Element. The project is required to be consistent with standards contained in the City's General Plan Noise Element for road noise mitigation and outdoor noise reduction including consulting a qualified acoustical expert.

b), c) Site development will result in increases in ambient noise levels but not to significant levels because policies in the City's Noise Element regulate potential noise impacts. Noise increases that would affect ambient levels are to be reduced to thresholds determined to be acceptable in residential areas. Construction activities also generate noise, and may temporarily raise the ambient noise levels above acceptable levels for the duration of construction, including groundborne vibration and noise. Construction noise is regulated by the City's Noise Ordinance, which regulates time of construction and maximum noise levels that may be generated. The project would be required to meet the noise standards contained in the Ordinance, which includes limitations on the days and hours of construction.

d) The project is located within the projected 55 dB average airport noise contour indicated by the Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) and a single event noise contour of 65 dB at ground level. The City's Noise Element limits all outdoor use areas to a maximum average noise level of 60 dB and interior noise exposure to an average of 45 dB and a single event maximum of 50 dB. The ALUP designates hotels and meeting halls as "moderately noise sensitive" land uses and are compatible inside the 60 dB airport noise contour with mitigation. The ALUP also indicates that the single event interior degree of noise attenuation required for the project is 15 dB (65-50) and that normal construction techniques are assumed to provide adequate noise attenuation at this degree. Conditions of approval require that measures contained in the City's Noise Guidebook and as determined by the qualified acoustic consultant shall be incorporated into the design of the buildings to ensure that noise impacts are reduced to achieve the performance thresholds set forth in the City's Noise Element.

Conclusion

Mitigation measures specified in the City's Noise Element, the ALUP, and in a noise study prepared by a qualified expert are required to ensure noise exposure will not exceed City thresholds.

12. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example by proposing new homes or businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

\[ \text{Sources: 23, 25} \quad \text{Potentially Significant Issues:} \quad \text{Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation incorporated:} \quad \text{Less Than Significant Impact:} \quad X \]

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

\[ \text{Sources: 23, 26} \quad \text{Potentially Significant Issues:} \quad \text{Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation incorporated:} \quad \text{Less Than Significant Impact:} \quad X \]

Evaluation

a) The project does not include any housing and will not indirectly induce growth with the widening of Prado Road. The impacts associated with the extension and widening of Prado Road have been identified in other documents including the
Margarita Area Specific Plan and Airport Area Specific Plan EIR, thus impacts associated with this project are less than significant.

b) The project site contains a small mobile home park with twenty four (24) units and is proposed to be removed. Mobile home parks are some of the City’s most affordable housing and while a substantial number of people will not be displaced, the project needs to adequately address the impacts of displacing existing affordable housing and people. A report on the impact of the conversion, closure, or cessation of use upon the displaced residents of the proposed mobile home park to be converted or closed is required by State law. In determining the impact of the conversion, closure, or cessation of use on displaced mobile home residents, the report shall address the availability of adequate replacement housing in mobile home parks and relocation costs. (California Government Code 65863.7) The purpose of the Mobile Home Park Conversion Process is to ensure that a proposed conversion of an existing mobile home park to any other use is preceded by adequate notice, that the social and fiscal impacts of the proposed conversion are adequately defined prior to consideration of a proposed conversion, and that relocation and other assistance is provided to park residents, consistent with the provisions of Sections 65863.7 and 66427.4 of the California Government Code.

Conclusion

The project will displace people and requires a report addressing the impacts of removing the mobile home park which the City must determine to have included adequate notification and mitigation before approval is granted.

13. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision, or need, of new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Fire protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Roads and other transportation infrastructure?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Other public facilities?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation

a), b), d), e), f) Impacts related to any of the above-listed services can be off-set through the City’s Development Impact Fee program. The project is subject to City’s established Development Impact Fees that are charged in conjunction with approval of development projects to offset costs associated with increases in demand of public services. However, the project will need to be evaluated by the City’s Fire Marshall, Chief Building Official, Public Works Department, the Parks and Recreation Department, the Natural Resources Department, the Transportation Department, and Utilities Department prior to project approval and the issuance of construction permits. The input from these departments may identify impacts requiring mitigation.

c) The school districts in the state have the authority to collect fees at the time of issuance of building permits to offset the costs to finance school site acquisition and school construction, and are deemed by State law to be adequate mitigation for all school facility requirements. Any increases in demand on school facilities caused by the project are considered to be mitigated by the district’s collection of adopted fees at the time of building permit issuance.

Conclusion

It is expected that the project will have a less than significant impact on the City’s ability to provide public services. Full review of the project is still required by the appropriate City Departments.
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation**

a) Development will contribute to the construction of public park facilities through the payment of City Park Improvement Fees to offset costs associated with increases in demand and services related to maintaining City-wide public park areas, therefore impacts are less than significant.

b) The project does include the construction of a pedestrian walkway along San Luis Obispo Creek but the project will be required to comply with City codes and standards and ultimately the project will require the review and approval of the Architectural Review Commission (ARC), and Planning Commission (PC) to ensure consistency with the City’s General Plan and Zoning Regulations and to limit impacts on the environment.

**Conclusion**

Park and recreation impacts are less then significant due to City Park Improvement Fees, and compliance with the City’s General Plan and Zoning Regulations.

**15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a)</th>
<th>b)</th>
<th>c)</th>
<th>d)</th>
<th>e)</th>
<th>f)</th>
<th>g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2, 25, 27</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>2, 25, 27</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 25, 27</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1, 2, 20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>21, 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation**

a), b) The Circulation Element of the City General Plan identifies Prado Road as an essential primary road system that will be needed to accommodate development within the project area and surrounding growth areas of the City. The Margarita Area Specific Plan/Airport Area Specific Plan (MASP/AASP) EIR determined a primary traffic mitigating feature of the MASP is the Plan’s requirement that Prado Road be extended easterly, from its current terminus just east of South Higuera Street, to Broad Street, thus providing a major new divided 4-lane east-west cross town arterial connector in the southerly area of San Luis Obispo. The City also plans to extend Prado Road west of South Higuera Street to Madonna Road with a full interchange at Highway 101. Conditions of approval are recommended that would require improvements to Prado Road west of South Higuera Street to accommodate future traffic impacts identified by the MASP/AASP EIR. The project will be conditioned to contribute its fair share either through adopted Traffic Impact Fees, assessments, and/or dedications to Prado Road and other roadway improvements.

The project will increase traffic in the area, but will not exceed established acceptable level of service (LOS) threshold (adopted at LOS “D” by the City General Plan) for San Luis Obispo, except for the Prado Road/South Higuera Street intersection. Resolution 9726-2005 Series, adopted by the City Council August 23, 2005, determined potential and proposed development circumstances had changed sufficiently in the Airport Area since the adoption of the Margarita Area Specific Plan, such that Level of Service (LOS) at the intersection of Prado Road and South Higuera Street would decline from LOS
"D" (as found in the MASP/AASP EIR) to LOS "E". Additional mitigation was required by the resolution for development within the Airport and Margarita Areas which does not apply to this project but may help reduce the projects traffic impacts. This mitigation requires that Transportation Demand Management (TDM) requirements shall be applied to employers with 25 or more employees. It is appropriate therefore, that this mitigation measure should apply to this development to contribute to the mitigation of traffic impacts at the intersection of Prado Road and South Higuera Street. Since the MASP/AASP EIR address cumulative traffic impacts in the area and the project is required to contribute its fair share towards roadway improvements, the impacts associated with this project are considered to be mitigated to a less than significant.

c), d) The City will require that the project provides roadways that are designed and development in accordance with adopted city standards thereby assuring predetermined standards necessary to limit safety hazards and provide adequate emergency access.

e) Parking for the project is provided based on the provisions of the Zoning Regulations. The project provides 588 spaces with a 10% shared parking reduction. In accordance with City standards, short-term bicycle racks and long-term bicycle storage shall be provided.

f) Secondary impacts to pedestrians and bicyclists could result from road improvements needed to achieve vehicular flow along Prado Road and at the intersection of Prado Road and South Higuera Street. Such secondary impacts relate to increased crossing distances from road widening at intersections and introducing conflicts at intersections with multiple turning lanes. Such impacts can be adequately avoided by implementation of mitigating design features which, incorporate the following:

1. Crosswalks (pursuant to the City's adopted “Pedestrian Crosswalk Guidelines-2000”) at new and reconstructed intersections.
2. Pedestrian signals at all new and reconstructed signalized intersections.
3. Class II bike lanes on Prado Road and Elks Lane per the City Bicycle Transportation Plan.

Payment of City adopted Traffic and Development Impact Fees will contribute to the construction intersection improvements at a later time to be determined by the City.

g) The project will not conflict with the San Luis Obispo County Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) regarding development density standards, however the project must demonstrate consistency with the ALUP to the satisfaction of the Airport Land Use Commission before development can proceed.

Conclusion

The project will cumulatively increase traffic but is not substantial in relation to the projected traffic load associated with development in the Airport and Margarita Areas. However, mitigation measures identified in the MASP/AASP EIR and contribution to City Traffic Impact Fees will reduce the significance of this impact. Additionally the Prado Road/South Higuera Street intersection will exceed a level of service standard established by the City for designated roads and highways and is considered a significant and unavoidable impact and a Statement of Overriding Conditions was prepared addressing this impact. Review is required by the Airport Land Use Commission to address potential traffic and air safety impacts since the project falls within with the ALUP.

16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7, 8, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Require or result in the construction or expansion of new water treatment, wastewater treatment, or storm drainage facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7, 8, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new and expanded water resources needed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand and addition to the provider’s existing commitment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation

a), b) Implementation of the project will not result in any significant impacts related to delivery of domestic water, wastewater collection or treatment, or storm water drainage/retention. The project proposes to provide all water, sewer, and storm drain facilities necessary to adequately serve the project, including distribution, collection and other infrastructure capacity as required by the City’s Storm Drain Master Plan/Waterway Management Plan. The project is also subject to City Development Impact Fees that are charged in conjunction with approval of development projects to offset costs associated with off-site city-wide utility system impacts related to needed periodic maintenance and upgrades.

c) Provisions in the City General Plan ensure that an adequate quantity of water will exist before any development is allowed. The City has also adopted the Water Allocation Regulations to insure that increased water use by new development will not cause inadequate water service to existing and future customers. Section 17.89.030 of the Water Allocation Regulation states that a water allocation permit shall be required to obtain a connection to the city water system for a structure or facility not previously connected. This project is also subject to citywide water impact fees which were adopted to ensure that new development pays its share of constructing additional infrastructure needed to support additional facilities.

d) The City wastewater treatment plant has sufficient capacity to serve the project site and existing and proposed sewer lines in the vicinity and within the project site will be required to provide sufficient capacity as part of the permitting process. The developer will be required to construct on-site sewer facilities according to the Uniform Plumbing Code standards. Impact fees are also collected when building permits are issued to pay for capacity at the City’s Water Reclamation Facility. The fees are set to offset potential impacts associated with increases in demand and use by each new residential unit in the project.

e), f) Solid waste collection within the City will be provided by a private operator under a City franchise and disposal is expected to continue at Cold Canyon Landfill until 2018. The project must be consistent with the City’s Source Reduction and Recycling Element which requires that recycling facilities be accommodated on the project site and a solid waste reduction plan for recycling discarded construction materials must be submitted with the building permit application. The project is also required by the ordinance to include facilities for recycling to reduce the waste stream generated by the project. The project will fully comply with existing federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Conclusion

No significant impacts have been identified relative to utilities or service systems.

17. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project is consistent with the MASP. The MASP/AASP EIR address cumulative impacts resulting from the implementation of both specific plans and noted that with the application of proposed mitigation measures impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level for all environmental resources except for land use. A Statement of Overriding Considerations addresses significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the MASP.
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of the past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)

The project is consistent with the MASP. The MASP/AASP EIR address cumulative impacts resulting from the implementation of both specific plans and noted that with the application of proposed mitigation measures impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level for all environmental resources except for land use. A Statement of Overriding Considerations addresses significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the MASP.

The project is consistent with the MASP. The MASP/AASP EIR address cumulative impacts resulting from the implementation of both specific plans and noted that with the application of proposed mitigation measures impacts would be reduced to a less-than-significant level for all environmental resources except for land use. A Statement of Overriding Considerations addresses significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the MASP.

18. EARLIER ANALYSES.

Earlier analysis may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063 (c) (3) (D). In this case a discussion should identify the following items:

a) Earlier analysis used. Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.

In 2004 the City of San Luis Obispo certified an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Margarita Area Specific Plan (MASP), the Airport Area Specific Plan (AASP) and the related Facilities Master Plan. The prior MASP/AASP EIR, certified by the City Council along with the adoption of the MASP and Facilities Master Plan on October 12, 2004, by Resolution No. 9615 (2004 Series), contained a variety of mitigation measures to be incorporated as discrete components of the MASP or as policies or development standards to be implemented through site specific development proposals. Further on August 23, 2005, by Resolution No. 9726 (2005 Series), the City Council re-certified, with additional mitigation, the MASP/AASP EIR for the Airport Area Specific Plan (AASP), and adopted the Plan. The subject project lies just outside the boundaries of the MASP, but mitigation measures for traffic impacts will also reduce impacts associated with the subject project. The environmental analyses above for this project take into account the environmental conclusions of the MASP/AASP EIR as they are applicable to the proposed site specific project.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) allows Lead Agencies (the City) to use the analysis of general matters contained in a broader EIR, such as for a general or specific plan, with later EIRs or Negative Declarations on narrower projects; incorporating by reference the general discussions from the broader EIR, and concentrating the later EIR or Negative Declaration solely on the issues specific to the later project. The environmental assessment approach is referred to as “tiering”.

The Airport Area and Margarita Area Specific Plans and Related Facilities Master Plans and Final Program EIR is available for review at the City of San Luis Obispo Community Development Department, 919 Palm Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93402.

b) Impacts adequately addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

The MASP/AASP EIR was certified by the City Council on October 12, 2004, thereby determining that the EIR adequately analyzed the impacts listed in Column No. 1 and that mitigation was required for certain identified impacts, as noted. Column No. 2 indicates whether mitigations were required due to the impact being significant. Column No. 3 indicates status of impact after mitigation specified in the prior EIR.
### MASP/AASP EIR-Identified Areas of Potential Cumulative Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.) Traffic and Circulation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>L-T-S</td>
<td>SU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase in traffic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- LOS at Prado/South Higuera exceeds LOS “D”</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: SU=Significant & Unavoidable (Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted), L-T-S=Less than Significant

### 19. SOURCE REFERENCES

1. City of SLO General Plan Land Use Element, April 2006
2. City of SLO General Plan Circulation Element, April 2006
3. City of SLO General Plan Housing Element, April 2006
5. City of SLO General Plan Safety Element, July 2005
6. City of SLO General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element, April 2006
7. City of SLO Water and Wastewater Element, April 2006
8. City of San Luis Obispo Municipal Code
9. City of San Luis Obispo, Land Use Inventory Database
10. Site Visit
11. US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Soils survey of San Luis Obispo County 1968
13. Clean Air Plan for San Luis Obispo County, Air Pollution Control District, 2001
14. CEQA Air Quality Handbook, Air Pollution Control District, 2003
15. City of San Luis Obispo, Archaeological Resource Preservation Guidelines, on file in the Community Development Department
16. City of San Luis Obispo, Historic Site Map
17. City of San Luis Obispo Burial Sensitivity Map
18. City of San Luis Obispo, Historic Resource Preservation Guidelines, on file in the Community Development Department
19. San Luis Obispo Quadrangle Map, prepared by the State Geologist in compliance with the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, effective January 1, 1990
20. City of San Luis Obispo Community Design Guidelines
21. Airport Land Use Plan
22. Project file for PD 1517 (40 Prado Road) on file at the Community Development Department
23. Fugazi Development Program
24. City of San Luis Obispo Source Reduction and Recycling Element, June 1994
25. Margarita Area Specific Plan / Airport Area Specific Plan, and Final EIR
26. California Mobile Home Residency Law
REQUIRED MITIGATION AND MONITORING PROGRAMS

1. AESTHETICS MITIGATION

   Reduction of Light and Glare

   In order for MASP/AASP EIR Mitigation Measure I.U.-7.1 as implemented by the MASP to be carried through to lot-specific development stage, a lighting plan that demonstrates compliance with Community Design Section 3.3 Lighting requirements of the MASP shall be submitted with other required plans for both the residential and commercial components of the project to the review and approval of the Architectural Review Commission (ARC). The lighting plan shall propose specific measures to limit the amount of light trespass associated with development within the project area including shielding and/or directional lighting methods to ensure that spillover light does not exceed 0.5 foot-candles at adjacent property lines.

   • Monitoring Program:

   The ARC will review development plans for the project. City staff, including Planning and other departments, will review plans to assure that all of the ARC’s requirements related to lighting and compliant with the MASP provisions have been incorporated into working drawings. City building inspectors will be responsible for assuring that all lighting is installed pursuant to the approved lighting plan.

2. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS MITIGATION


   As stipulated in the MASP/AASP EIR, this would be a plan identifying, when they are known, site/ development-specific construction activities that will involve the hazardous materials. The plan shall be prepared before construction activities begin that involve hazardous materials and shall discuss proper handling and disposal of materials used or produced onsite, such as petroleum products, concrete, and sanitary waste. The plan will also outline a specific protocol to identify health risks associated with the presence of chemical compounds in the soil and/or groundwater and identify specific protective measures to be followed by the workers entering the work area. If the presence of hazardous materials is suspected or encountered during construction-related activities, the project proponent will cause Mitigation Measure HAZ-1.2 to be activated. Mitigation Measure HAZ-1.2 states:

   “The project proponent will complete a Phase I environmental site assessment for each proposed public facility (e.g., streets and buried infrastructure). If Phase I site assessments indicate a potential for soil and/or groundwater contamination within or adjacent to the road or utility alignments, a Phase II site assessment will be completed. The following Phase II environmental site assessments will be prepared specific to soil and/or groundwater contamination.

   a. Soil Contamination. For soil contamination, the Phase II site assessment will include soil sampling and analysis for anticipated contaminating substances. If soil contamination is exposed during construction, the San Luis Obispo Fire Department (SLOFD) will be notified and a work plan to characterize and possibly remove contaminated soil will be prepared, submitted and approved.

   b. Groundwater Contamination. For groundwater contamination, the Phase II assessment may include monitoring well installation, groundwater sampling, and analysis for anticipated contaminating substances. If groundwater contaminated by potentially hazardous materials is expected to be extracted during dewatering, the SLOFD and the Central Coast RWQCB will be notified. A contingency plan to dispose of contaminated groundwater will be developed in agreement with the SLOFD and Central Coast RWQCB."
• Monitoring Program:

The “Construction-Related Hazardous Materials Management Plan” will be required to be submitted to the City Community Development Department and Fire Department for review prior to commencement of any site preparation or construction work involving hazardous materials. No site preparation or construction work may commence before said plan has been approved by the City. Any site work commenced without City approval of said Plan will be subject to “Stop Work” (cease and desist) orders as may be issued under the authority of the City Fire Department.


As stipulated in the MASP/AASP EIR, this would be a plan prepared by a project proponent identifying hazardous materials management practices as might be required by state and local laws and regulations regarding delivery, use, manufacture, and storage of any such regulated materials might be present on site for any operations-related activities. This plan would identify the proper handling and disposal of materials uses or produced onsite, such as petroleum products, concrete, and sanitary waste. By the filing of said Plan, the City Fire Department will be on notice to provide regular and routine fire and life-safety inspections to determine compliance with applicable health and safety codes.

• Monitoring Program:

The “Operations-Related Hazardous Materials Management Plan” will be required to be submitted by a project proponent to the City Community Development Department and City Fire Department for review prior to the establishment of any operations-related activities.

3. EMF

A report prepared by a qualified project proponent will determine at what distance a 1.0 mG reading occurs. The report shall be submitted to the Community Development Director detailing the measurements and recommended distance building should be setback from the power lines.

• Monitoring Program:

The EMF report will be required to be submitted by a project proponent to the City Community Development Department for review prior to issuance of a building permit.

3. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC MITIGATION

Preparation and Implementation of “Traffic Reduction Program”

In order for MASP/AASP EIR Mitigation Measure T-2.1 adopted with the certification of the MASP/AASP EIR in conjunction with the approval of the AASP in August, 2005 (Ref. City Council Resolution No. 9726, 2005 Series) to be brought forward to this site specific project stage, a transportation demand management program that demonstrates reduction of peak period travel by single-occupant vehicles shall be required of any employer within the subdivision with 25 or more employees. Said program shall incorporate all reasonably feasible measures or techniques, including those listed in the MASP/AASP EIR/General Plan Circulation, that encourage alternate modes other than single-occupant vehicles as the primary mode of transportation to the workplace and to travel during non-peak times.
- Monitoring Program:

Each business owner, upon employment of 25 or more employees, shall immediately prepare and submit, obtain approval from the City Public Works Director and implement the provisions of a Traffic Reduction Plan which demonstrates reduction of peak period travel consistent with requirements of the City General Plan Circulation Element Policies and Programs. City Staff shall periodically inspect the business to observe and assure that reduction techniques approved by the City are in place and adhered to by the business. Staff shall take any corrective or enforcement actions authorized by law to achieve compliance.
Appendix D: San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport Land Use Plan
AIRPORT NOISE CONTOURS

Data from noise study by
Brown, Bums & Associates
April, 2001
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Airport Noise Contours are projected to runway capacity
SINGLE EVENT NOISE CONTOURS

Outer Contour represents 65 dB(A) at ground level
Middle Contour represents 75 dB(A) at ground level
Inner Contour represents 85 dB(A) at ground level

Reference event is the arrival and departure of a regional airline jet aircraft at the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport. The noise impact of a 1970s to 1980s-era business jet or of an airliner suitable to cross-country operations would be substantially greater.
### TABLE 4: MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE INTERIOR NOISE EXPOSURE FROM AVIATION-RELATED NOISE SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single Event Noise Level</th>
<th>Degree of Noise Attenuation Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dB LAmax</td>
<td>85 dB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential dwellings</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels and motels – sleeping rooms</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sleeping areas</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants, bars, taverns, and like uses</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary sleeping quarters for air crews and other employees in transit</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices, office buildings</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals, nursing homes, residential care facilities and other medical facilities offering 24-hour care – sleeping rooms</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-sleeping areas</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches, synagogues, temples, monasteries and convents</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortuaries, funeral parlors</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor theatres, music halls, meeting halls, and other indoor public assembly facilities</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studios – radio, television, recording, rehearsal, and performance facilities</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools and day care centers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries (excluding aviation-oriented libraries)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums (excluding air museums)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The reference event for determination of required single event noise mitigation shall be the straight-in arrival of a regional airline jet landing on Runway 29 and the straight-out departure of a regional airline jet from Runway 29. Measurements are to be of the maximum noise level, are to be A-weighted, and are to be obtained using a Fast response time.

2. Normal construction techniques are assumed to provide adequate noise attenuation.

3. Not including facilities utilized exclusively by pilots' organizations, airport or airline employees, or other airport related groups.

4. Not including flight schools, aviation mechanics training schools, airline orientation facilities or other institutions offering instruction only in aviation-related fields.
### Table 7: Planning requirements and density adjustments for Land Uses Within the Aviation safety Areas for the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aviation Safety Area</th>
<th>Maximum Building Coverage</th>
<th>Maximum Density of Use (Non-Residential) persons/acre</th>
<th>Maximum Density of Residential Development d. u./acre</th>
<th>Special Function Land Uses Allowed</th>
<th>High Intensity Land Uses Allowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Runway Protection Zone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Safety Area 1a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With approved ACOS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Safety Area 1b</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With approved ACOS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Safety Area 1c</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With approved ACOS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With approved ACOS and Detailed Area Plan (DAP)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within CDZ specified by an approved ACOS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within CDZ specified by approved ACOS and DAP</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Safety Area 2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With approved ACOS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With approved ACOS and Detailed Area Plan</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within CDZ specified by an approved ACOS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within CDZ specified by approved ACOS and DAP</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>Unlimited</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Refers to the maximum number of persons that a development may be expected to attract during the course of normal operations.
2. Refers to the maximum number of dwellings (as defined by this ALUP) per acre of gross land area allowable on any parcel under the terms of a proposed project or local action.
3. Requires that the development be controlled by a Detailed Area Plan that has been developed in consultation with the ALUC and has been reviewed by the ALUC and has been determined to be consistent with the ALUP after the date of adoption of this amendment.
4. Location and type of Special Function and/or High Intensity land uses shall be designated by Detailed Area Plan and shall be subject to ALUC approval.
5. Although a maximum residential density of up to 18 d.u./acre may be allowed for designated parcels within the Detailed Area Plan, the Detailed Area Plan must also provide for areas of lesser allowable densities, so that the maximum number of dwelling units which can be established within the Detailed Area Plan, under conditions of maximum build-out, will not exceed 15 d.u./acre.
6. Except that, in those portions of Safety Areas S 1b and S 1c which are a distance of 1 km or greater from the end of any active runway, a maximum non-residential density of up to 75 persons/acre will be allowed.

**Abbreviations:**
- ACOS – Airport Compatible Open Space plan – See Sections 4.4.6.2 and 4.4.6.5 for additional information.
- CDZ – Clustered Development Zone – See Section 4.4.6.4 for additional information.
Figure 5: Allowable Densities
Aviation Safety Area S-1a

Figure 6: Allowable Densities
Aviation Safety Area S-1b

Figure 7: Allowable Densities
Aviation Safety Area S-1c

Legend for Figure 5:
- (1) Allowable with No Density Adjustments
- (2) Allowable with approved ACOS
- Prohibited

Legend for Figure 6:
- (1) Allowable with No Density Adjustments
- (2) Allowable with approved ACOS
- Prohibited

Legend for Figure 7:
- (1) Allowable with no density adjustments
- (2) Allowable with approved ACOS
- (3) Allowable in Clustered Development Zones of an approved ACOS
- (4) Allowable in Clustered Development Zones of an approved ACOS, with Detailed Area Plan
- Prohibited

Note: The densities indicated for areas with an approved Detailed Area Plan represent the maximum which could be permitted. The actual density that will be allowed on any particular parcel will be specified by the Detailed Area Plan, and may be substantially lower than the range indicated in this figure.
5.2 **LAND USE COMPATIBILITY TABLE: Key to Symbols**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Indicates that the land use is Prohibited in the specified noise exposure zone or aviation safety zone. No action can be taken by the Airport Land Use Commission that will render Prohibited uses permissible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Indicates that the land use is Allowed in the specified noise exposure zone or aviation safety zone. Allowed land uses are, nonetheless, subject to the requirements noted in Section 5.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Indicates that the land use may be developed in the specified noise exposure zone only if it qualifies as an infill development under the criteria specified by ALUP Section 4.3.2.3 and has been designated as infill development by the ALUC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Indicates that the land use may be developed in the specified noise exposure zone only if the specific noise mitigation measures required by ALUP Table 6 are incorporated into the referral. Refer to ALUP Section 4.3.3, ALUP Table 6, and ALUP Figure 2 for specific mitigation requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>Indicates that the land use is Allowed in the indicated Aviation Safety Area, provided that the maximum non-residential density of use is limited to the values specified in Table 7 and in Figure 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR6</td>
<td>Indicates that the land use is Allowed in the indicated Aviation Safety Area, provided that the maximum non-residential density of use is limited to the values specified in Table 7 and in Figure 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR7</td>
<td>Indicates that the land use is Allowed in the indicated Aviation Safety Area, provided that the maximum non-residential density of use is limited to the values specified in Table 7 and in Figure 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR8</td>
<td>Indicates that the land use is Allowed in the indicated Aviation Safety Area, provided that the maximum non-residential density of use is limited to the values specified in Table 7 and in Figure 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>Indicates that the land use is Allowed in the indicated Aviation Safety Area, provided that the maximum density of residential development of use is limited to the values specified in Table 7 and in Figure 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>Indicates that the land use is Allowed in the indicated Aviation Safety Area, provided that the maximum density of residential development of use is limited to the values specified in Table 10 and in Figure 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>Indicates that the land use is Allowed in the indicated Aviation Safety Area, provided that the maximum density of residential development of use is limited to the values specified in Table 10 and in Figure 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>Indicates that the land use is Allowed in the indicated Aviation Safety Area, provided that the maximum density of residential development of use is limited to the values specified in Table 7 and in Figure 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Indicates that the listed land use is designated as a High Intensity Land Use by the ALUP, and is prohibited in the specified aviation safety area unless the proposed development is controlled by both an approved Airport Compatible Open Space Plan (ACOS) and a Specific Plan which has been determined to be consistent with the ALUP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Indicates that the listed land use is designated as a Special Function Land Use by the ALUP, and is prohibited in the specified aviation safety area unless the proposed development is controlled by both an approved Airport Compatible Open Space Plan (ACOS) and a Specific Plan which has been determined to be consistent with the ALUP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5.3 LAND USE COMPATIBILITY TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agricultural Uses</th>
<th>Airport Noise Exposure (dBA CNEL)</th>
<th>Aviation Safety Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 60</td>
<td>55 to 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural processing</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal raising and keeping</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop production (except staked crops) and grazing</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm equipment and supplies - sales</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm support quarters</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenhouses, nursery specialties</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized animal facilities</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vineyards and other staked crops</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communications Uses</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antennas, repeater stations, etc. - unmanned</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio, television, recording, or rehearsal studios</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Cultural, Educational, and Recreational Uses | | |
|---------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Amusement arcades | A | A | A | P | NR5 | NR6 | NR7 | NR8 |
| Amusement parks, fairgrounds | A | A | A | P | P | P | P | P |
| Bars, taverns with outdoor eating/drinkining areas | P | I | A | P | NR5 | NR6 | NR7 | NR8 |
| Bars, taverns without outdoor serving areas | M | M | A | P | NR5 | NR6 | NR7 | NR8 |
| Campgrounds, outdoor sleeping facilities | P | I | A | P | NR5 | NR6 | NR7 | NR8 |
| Cemeteries, mausoleums, columbariums | A | A | A | P | A | A | A | A |
| Churches | M | M | A | P | NR5 | NR6 | NR7 | NR8 |
| Day-care facilities for children, other | M | M | A | P | P | P | P | P |
| Day-care facilities for adults | M | M | A | P | P | P | P | P |
| Convention/exhibit centers, major auditoriums | M | M | A | P | P | P | P | P |
| Drive-in or other outdoor theatres | P | I | A | P | NR5 | NR6 | NR7 | NR8 |
| Libraries and museums | M | M | A | P | NR5 | NR6 | NR7 | NR8 |
### 5.3 LAND USE COMPATIBILITY TABLE (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Airport Noise Exposure (dB CNEq)</th>
<th>Aviation Safety Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 60</td>
<td>65 to 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Cultural, Educational, and Recreational Uses (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Description</th>
<th>More than 60</th>
<th>65 to 60</th>
<th>Less than 60</th>
<th>BP2</th>
<th>S-1a</th>
<th>S-1b</th>
<th>S-1c</th>
<th>S-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership organizations, meeting rooms, and small auditoriums</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>NR6</td>
<td>NR7</td>
<td>NR8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor sports and recreation</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural recreation and picnicking (no camping)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>NR6</td>
<td>NR7</td>
<td>NR8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools – Specialized training and education</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>NR6</td>
<td>NR7</td>
<td>NR8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools – Colleges, universities, adult schools</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>NR6</td>
<td>NR7</td>
<td>NR8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools – Pre-school through high school</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports stadiums, racetracks, fairgrounds</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>HI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pools, public</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>NR6</td>
<td>NR7</td>
<td>NR8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary events</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>HI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Manufacturing and Processing Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Description</th>
<th>More than 60</th>
<th>65 to 60</th>
<th>Less than 60</th>
<th>BP2</th>
<th>S-1a</th>
<th>S-1b</th>
<th>S-1c</th>
<th>S-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous, corrosive, or flammable chemicals</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical generating plants</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum refining or bulk storage</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other manufacturing and processing</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>NR6</td>
<td>NR7</td>
<td>NR8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Residential Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Description</th>
<th>More than 60</th>
<th>65 to 60</th>
<th>Less than 60</th>
<th>BP2</th>
<th>S-1a</th>
<th>S-1b</th>
<th>S-1c</th>
<th>S-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caretakers or employees residences</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>R7</td>
<td>R8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dormitories</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>R7</td>
<td>R8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm support quarters</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>R7</td>
<td>R8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity or sorority houses</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>R7</td>
<td>R8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-occupancy residential use</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>R7</td>
<td>R8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5.3 LAND USE COMPATIBILITY TABLE (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Uses (continued)</th>
<th>Airport Noise Exposure (dBA CNEL)</th>
<th>Aviation Safety Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 60</td>
<td>55 to 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless shelters</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home occupations</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile homes, mobile home parks</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily dwellings</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing, residential care, personal care facilities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization houses</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary dwelling units</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single family residential</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary dwellings</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Resource Extraction Uses     |                  |                  |                  | A   | A   | A   | NR5 | NR6 | NR7 | NR8 |
| Petroleum extraction         |                  |                  |                  | A   | A   | A   | P   | P   | P   | SF  |

| Retail Trade Uses            |                  |                  |                  | M   | M   | A   | P   | NR5 | NR6 | NR7 | NR8 |
| Restaurants, without outdoor seating areas | P | I | A | P | NR5 | NR6 | NR7 | NR8 |
| Restaurants, with exterior seating areas | P | I | A | P | NR5 | NR6 | NR7 | NR8 |
| Retail sales - fuels, lubricants, propane, etc. | A | A | A | P | P | P | P | SF |
| Retail sales, other than listed above | A | A | A | P | NR5 | NR6 | NR7 | NR8 |

| Service Uses                 |                  |                  |                  | P   | I   | A   | P   | R5  | R6  | R7  | R8  |
| Correctional institutions    | P             | I        | A              | P   | R5   | R6   | R7   | R8   |
| Health services, ambulatory  | M             | M        | A              | P   | NR5  | NR6  | NR7  | NR8  |
### 5.3 LAND USE COMPATIBILITY TABLE (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Uses (continued)</th>
<th>More than 60</th>
<th>S5 to 60</th>
<th>Less than 55</th>
<th>S1a</th>
<th>S1b</th>
<th>S1c</th>
<th>S-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals, acute or convalescent</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices, office buildings</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>NR6</td>
<td>NR7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other personal, consumer, or business services</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>NR6</td>
<td>NR7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transient Lodgings</th>
<th>More than 60</th>
<th>S5 to 60</th>
<th>Less than 55</th>
<th>S1a</th>
<th>S1b</th>
<th>S1c</th>
<th>S-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bed and breakfast facilities</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>NR6</td>
<td>NR7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee sleeping rooms</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>NR6</td>
<td>NR7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homestays</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>R7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels and motels</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>NR6</td>
<td>NR7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational vehicle parks</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>NR6</td>
<td>NR7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary employee trailer parks</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R5</td>
<td>R6</td>
<td>R7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Uses</th>
<th>More than 60</th>
<th>S5 to 60</th>
<th>Less than 55</th>
<th>S1a</th>
<th>S1b</th>
<th>S1c</th>
<th>S-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airfields, landing strips, heliports, helipads</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High voltage transmission lines</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipelines, above ground, flammable liquids</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipelines, above ground, non-flammable liquids</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck stops</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>NR6</td>
<td>NR7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle, freight, and transit terminals</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>NR6</td>
<td>NR7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wholesale Uses</th>
<th>More than 60</th>
<th>S5 to 60</th>
<th>Less than 55</th>
<th>S1a</th>
<th>S1b</th>
<th>S1c</th>
<th>S-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>NR6</td>
<td>NR7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesaling and distribution</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>NR5</td>
<td>NR6</td>
<td>NR7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction
On July 21, 2004, the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) voted to amend the SLO County Regional Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP). The amendments to the plan are comprehensive and were intended to address concerns expressed by the City of San Luis Obispo, and by the development community in general, that amendments to the Airport Land Use Plan adopted in 2002 were too restrictive. The 2002 amendments included rigid standards for residential and non-residential density that were inconsistent with the City’s General Plan goals for housing production and job creation.

In order to address this situation the new amendment to the ALUP provide the ability for density adjustments, which allow for increased development potential within each of the Aviation Safety Areas defined in the Plan. Such adjustments are available if advanced levels of planning analysis are performed. This Airport Compatible Open Space (ACOS) plan has been prepared to achieve density adjustments, as provided for in Table 10 of the ALUP. This Plan was prepared consistent with the ACOS requirements contained in Sections 4.4.6.2 and 4.4.6.4 of the ALUP. Each open space area meets the definition of Reserve Space provided in Table 8 and Section 4.4.2.3 of the ALUP.

Purpose and Intent
The purpose of this Draft Airport Compatible Open Space plan (ACOS) is to evaluate the City’s extensive open space resources under the standards provided in the ALUP for reserve space. The plan describes each of the ACOS areas shown on the Overview Map (Appendix A) and includes details about their location, size, current use, reserve space suitability and constraints. The ACOS also includes an action plan with milestones indicating the process and timeframe for implementation. If the draft ACOS is supported in concept by the City Council and Airport Land Use Commission, a final version will be presented to the ALUC. If the ALUC approves the final ACOS, it is intended that density adjustments would immediately go into effect for the entire Airport Land Use Plan area that lies within the City limits and expansion areas.

What is Airport Compatible Open Space?
Airport Compatible Open Space, also referred to as Reserve Space, improves airport safety by allowing for more intense development of urban areas, while keeping certain land adjacent to the airport free and clear from obstruction or from buildings and uses where people congregate. The areas identified as Reserve Space in this plan include land that is close to the airport, in-line with the main airport runway, or along an over-flight area where aircraft typically operate at lower altitudes. Each of the areas identified serve multiple open space functions, including recreation, scenic vista preservation, agricultural preservation, greenbelt preservation and drainage functions. Identification of these areas in this ACOS plan simply adds airport safety to the list of reasons why these lands should not be developed. Each open space area map outlines the proposed reserve space, and indicates two areas within the reserve space that comply with progressively restrictive standards. Reserve Area B is a 100’ x 60’ area that includes no streets, parking lots, fences, light poles, trees or fixed athletic equipment. Reserve Area C is 800’ x 30’ area that further prohibits staked crops and headstones. The identification of these areas on these maps simply illustrates the ability of each reserve space to meet the minimum requirements, but does not require that these areas be identified in any particular way on the ground. The written description provided in the ACOS plan for each reserve space area describes the site, current ownership and development status, implementation opportunities and constraints, and provides a conclusion. This is a plan that is intended to be implemented over time in order to insure the ongoing safety of airport operations as the urban area is developed to greater and greater intensity, consistent with the City of San Luis Obispo’s General Plan.
**Brughelli Ranch Easement**

**Site Description**

*Location and Size*
The Brughelli Ranch is located south of Buckley Road, immediately southwest of the airport. The portion of the ranch identified as reserve space includes approximately 100 acres of open space and agricultural land.

*Natural Features*
The reserve space is predominantly characterized by flat, agricultural land. Tank Farm Creek bisects the reserve space, but does not encroach on either of the more restrictive reserve areas identified on the map.

*Current Use*
Portions of the property north of East Branch SLO Creek are actively cultivated. South of the creek is natural open space land.

*Relationship to ALUP Safety Policies*
The Brughelli Ranch is located in both the S-1b and the S-2 Aviation Safety Areas. Proposed restrictive reserve space areas are located north of the creek and entirely within the S-1b safety area.

**Current Ownership and Development Status**
The property is owned by the Brughelli family and cultivated portions are leased to other area farmers. Development on the property is limited to farm houses and accessory buildings. Within the reserve area there is no physical development of any kind.

**Implementation**

*Opportunities*
The Brughelli Ranch is currently contracted for agricultural use under the Williamson Act. This guarantees that the land will not be developed for any other purpose during the life of the contract. If the property owner chooses to opt out of the contract, conversion of the land could occur only after a 10-year waiting period. In addition to Williamson Act restrictions, the City of San Luis Obispo is currently pursuing a conservation easement over the land, consistent with the City’s Greenbelt policies, that would completely eliminate the possibility of urban development.

*Constraints*
There is a possibility that future agricultural operations on the property, such as grape vines or pea stakes, would not be compatible with ACOS requirements.

**Conclusion**
The Brughelli reserve space presently meets ACOS requirements. Because the City is pursuing a conservation easement over the land for open space purposes, the site is likely to continue to be compatible with airport operations for the foreseeable future. Additional restrictions to ensure that agricultural operations remain compatible with the ACOS designation may be necessary.
Laguna Lake Park

Site Description

Location and Size
The Laguna Lake Park reserve space is located approximately 2.75 miles northwest of the airport, in line with Runway 11 and Runway 29. The property includes over 300 acres of open space, parkland and lake, with 23 acres identified as Reserve Space.

Natural Features
The reserve space is characterized by flat, low level grass land. The reserve space is bordered by the lake to the west and hillsides with steep slopes to the east. There are some wetland areas within the reserve space and some areas used for tar plant relocation and rehabilitation, a mitigation requirement for certain development projects adjacent to the Irish Hills.

Current Use
The area identified as reserve space is primarily enjoyed from afar as one of the City’s primary open space resources. A portion of the trail system goes through the reserve space, but there is otherwise no active use of the identified areas.

Relationship to ALUP Safety Policies
The Laguna Lake reserve space is mostly located outside of the Airport Land Use Plan area, although a portion of the reserve space is within the S-2 Aviation Safety Area. Still, because of the many flight paths over the park, this site represents valuable Airport Compatible Open Space.

Current Ownership and Development Status
The park is owned by the City of San Luis Obispo. The area identified for restrictive reserve space is zoned Conservation/Open Space, which does not allow for significant physical development. The long term use for this area, as identified in the Laguna Lake Master Plan, is open space and park.

Implementation

Opportunities
The property is owned by the City and the long term plan for the site is to keep it undeveloped in open space. No physical improvements are necessary in order to make the site comply with any of the reserve space requirements.

Constraints
Transmission lines and towers as well as steep hillsides flank the site to the east. The lake flanks the site to the west, however, the corridor created by these features is not overly narrow (approximately .2 miles).

Conclusion
The Laguna Lake Park reserve space appears to be an ideal area to identify as Airport Compatible Open Space, without compromising the City’s long term plans for park development and expansion.
Dalidio Open Space

Site Description

Location and Size
The property is location 1.9 miles northwest of the airport under a major flight corridor. The total size of the open space area shown on the General Plan Land Use Map is 93.8 acres. The reserve space identified in the ACOS includes 52 acres.

Natural Features
The Dalidio reserve space is flat agricultural land that is actively cultivated and irrigated. The northwest border of the reserve area is defined by Prefumo Creek. A stand of tall eucalyptus trees lines the creek in this area.

Current Use
This cultivated agricultural land is intended to remain as open space, as indicated by Land Use Element Policy 8.8 and the Land Use Element Map.

Relationship to ALUP Safety Policies
The Dalidio reserve area lies within Aviation Safety Area S-1b.

Current Ownership and Development Status
The majority of the reserve area is currently owned by the Dalidio family and managed by Ernie Dalidio. The area includes portions of the Madonna gap property and the McBride property that are designated on the City’s General Plan as permanent open space, therefore no future development within this area is anticipated.

Implementation

Opportunities
50% of each of the three ownerships that make up this reserve area are designated for development. The Marketplace Project was approved by the City Council in 2004. The approval is currently subject to referendum, with a vote scheduled for a special election in April 2005. If the approval stands, a major portion of the reserve area would be annexed to the City to implement policies that call for open space protection. The City is currently reviewing a development proposal for the McBride property, which would also involve annexation and open space zoning for a portion of the site if the project is approved.

Constraints
If no annexations or development occurs on the portions of the overall properties designated for development, the property would remain in agricultural use but the City would have no control over development of agricultural facilities that could conflict with reserve space requirements.

Conclusion
Overall, this reserve space represents an excellent opportunity for developing and maintaining Airport Compatible Open Space. If development does not occur as expected, the land would still be reserved for agricultural uses under the County zoning ordinance.
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Reserve Space Requirements

- Reserve Area B (1000 ft. x 60 ft.)
  - Streets, roads, highways, parking lots, right-of-way, vehicles, fences, light poles, trees, and fixed athletic equipment prohibited.

- Reserve Area C (800 x 30)
  - Streets, roads, highways, parking lots, right-of-way, vehicles, fences, light poles, bollard lights, trees, fixed athletic equipment, curbs, gutters, planting areas, stacked crops or plantings, and buildings prohibited.
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Orcutt Area

Site Description

Location and Size
The Orcutt Area reserve space is located parallel to the railroad right-of-way, approximately 1 mile north and east of the airport. The total reserve area includes 12 acres of land.

Natural Features
The reserve space is characterized by gently rolling grassland. A natural creek area, with slightly steeper slopes at the banks and trees is located towards the southern end of the reserve space, but not within the more restrictive reserve areas.

Current Use
The reserve space has historically been used as grazing land, though it is not actively used for any purpose at this time.

Relationship to ALUP Safety Policies
The Orcutt Area lies entirely within the S-2 Aviation Safety Area.

Current Ownership and Development Status
The property identified as reserve space is currently owned by Barbara Parsons, who is one of the major land holders and potential developers within the Orcutt Area. The Orcutt Area Specific Plan, which is intended to also serve as a Detailed Area Plan, identifies this area to be used as a detention basin. Because of its proximity to the railroad tracks, the site will not be developed with buildings or other active uses. Ultimately the site will be owned and managed by a Homeowner’s Association.

Implementation

Opportunities
The City is currently in the process of preparing a Specific Plan for the Orcutt Area. This provides an opportunity for coordination with the Airport Land Use Commission. The location of the reserve space is unsuitable for development. The land is designated as rural residential in the County, and development of this portion of the property prior to annexation is not practical or likely.

Constraints
This area will serve as a detention basin and must be engineered to accommodate storm flows for that purpose. Engineers tasked with developing the design for the basin will also have to consider the reserve space requirements included in the ALUP.

Conclusion
The Orcutt Area is a major residential expansion area for the City of San Luis Obispo and has less development potential as County land. As a result, annexation and development is likely and will be controlled by the Orcutt Area Specific Plan, which will be development in consultation with the Airport Land Use Commission.
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**Reserve Space Requirements**

- **Reserve Area B (1000 ft. x 50 ft.)**
  - Streets, roads, highways, parking lots, rights-of-way, vehicles, fences, light poles, trees, and food athletic equipment prohibited

- **Reserve Area C (200 x 200)**
  - Streets, roads, highways, parking lots, rights-of-way, vehicles, fences, light poles, lighted lights, trees, food athletic equipment, curbs, gutters, planting areas, stacked crops or plantings, and heathcotes prohibited
Margarita Area

Site Description

Location and Size
The Margarita Area reserve space is located just north of the planned alignment for Prado Road and south and west of the South Street Hills. The size of the reserve space is contiguous with Airport Area reserve space 1, and includes a total of 110 acres.

Natural Features
The land surrounding the Margarita reserve area is mostly flat and has historically been used for grazing. There are no waterways or significant trees in this area.

Current Use
The land is currently used for grazing and equestrian activities by the property owners.

Relationship to ALUP Safety Policies
The Margarita portion of this reserve space is entirely within the S-1c Aviation Safety Area.

Current Ownership and Development Status
The property is currently owned by Roy Garcia. The site is identified in the Margarita Area Specific Plan and Section 6 of the Airport Land Use Plan as Airport Compatible Open Space. Figure 11 of the Airport Land Use Plan designates this site as Other Open Space. The area is designated Open Space in the Margarita Specific Plan and on the Land Use Element Map.

Implementation

Opportunities
The Margarita Specific Plan has been adopted by the City and annexation of the Garcia property and implementation of Specific Plan policies is likely.

Constraints
The Specific Plan does not specify dedication requirements for this open space land. If ownership of this land is retained by the Garcia family for personal use, such as for equestrian activities, it would be hard to guarantee compliance with all of the restrictions associated with Airport Compatible Open Space, although the open and undeveloped nature of the property would not change.

Conclusion
The City and the Airport Land Use Commission coordinated the development of the Margarita Area Specific Plan with the current Airport Land Use Plan and this site has always been designated as open space.
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Reserve Space Requirements
- Reserve Area B (1000 ft. x 60 ft.)
  Streets, roads, highways, parking lots,
  rights-of-way, vehicles, fences, light poles, trees,
  and fixed athletic equipment prohibited

- Reserve Area C (800 x 36)
  Streets, roads, highways, parking lots,
  rights-of-way, vehicles, fences, light poles, ballfield lights,
  trees, fixed athletic equipment, courts, galleries, playing areas,
  stocked crops or pastures, and headstones prohibited

0 200 400 600 800 Feet
Airport Area Reserve #1

Site Description

Location and Size
The Airport Area reserve space is located in the former Unocal tank farm, is contiguous to the Margarita Area reserve space, and includes a total of 110 acres.

Natural Features
This area is characterized by marshy grasslands, with mild slopes and berms surrounding the former tanks that used to occupy the site.

Current Use
The land is currently leased for grazing.

Relationship to ALUP Safety Policies
The reserve space is located partially within the Runway Protection Zone and partially within Aviation Safety Area S-1a.

Current Ownership and Development Status
The property is presently owned by Unocal and includes some areas of contamination, which may or may not have to be remediated. The property is designated as Open Space in the draft Airport Area Specific Plan and on the Land Use Element Map. The wetland areas within and surrounding the reserve space are considered of high biological value and no development of this site is anticipated or likely. Depending on remediation requirements, changes to land forms may provide opportunities for active and/or passive recreational uses.

Implementation

Opportunities
The Airport Area Specific Plan identifies this site as Open Space and the biological value of the surrounding wetlands serves to protect the site from development pressure. Modifications to land forms that may be desired by Airport operators to implement Airport Compatible Open Space requirements could serve a dual function of enhancing the habitat area.

Constraints
Existing land forms may not be consistent with the more restrictive reserve space requirements. Modifications to the land forms would require the operators of the Airport to negotiate directly with the property owners. Soil contamination and biological value may limit the ability to modify the existing mounds.

Conclusion
The Airport Area Reserve Space #1 may be one of the most valuable sites offered in this ACOS because it includes land within the Runway Protection Zone and is in line with the most frequent Runway 29 departures. Opportunities to modify land form changes to improve airport safety should also serve to enhance the habitat and biological value of the site.
Airport Area Reserve #2

Site Description

Location and Size
The second reserve space within the City’s Airport Area is located south of Tank Farm Road, due west of the Airport within the former Unocal tank farm. This is the largest reserve area proposed in the ACOS plan at 183 acres. The orientation of the restricted reserve space areas appears to follow certain flight paths (ALUP, Figure 10), although it was chosen more with respect to topography and the ability of this space to meet the most restrictive ACOS requirements.

Natural Features
The site is located within the former Unocal tank farm, which is an area identified in the Airport Area Specific Plan as having significant biological value. The site is relatively flat, although berms associated with the former tank site are significant, and contribute to localized wetland features. Features include creeks, riparian woodlands, valley needlegrass habitat, seasonal meadows and freshwater marsh land.

Current Use
Although a portion of the property is leased for grazing, there are no significant ongoing uses on this open space land.

Relationship to ALUP Safety Policies
The site includes portions of the RPZ, S-1a, S-1b, and S-1c Aviation Safety Areas.

Current Ownership and Development Status
The property is owned by Unocal and designated as open space on the City’s Land Use Element Map and in the Airport Area Specific Plan. Discussions with Unocal regarding potential uses for the property are ongoing. Even if the identified reserve space area is not annexed into the City, development allowed by current County zoning standards for the site, such as a low intensity recreational use, is still compatible with the Airport Land Use Plan.

Implementation

Opportunities
The property is all owned by a single owner, Unocal. Unocal land holdings in the area are extensive and it is understood that development of other portions of the former tank farm would preclude development of this site. This is desirable because of the site’s relationship to the airport and its biological value.

Constraints
Preferred orientations and locations for the more restrictive reserve space areas may not be feasible to develop because of existing natural features of high biological value and because of the substantial size of berms from the former tank farm. Property owners may be hesitant to allow further restrictions on the use of the land.

Conclusion
Although constraints exist, the size of the proposed reserve area would be a major asset to airport operations.
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Reserve Area Requirements

- Reserve Area B (1000 ft x 60 ft)
  Streets, roads, highways, parking lots,
  rights-of-way, vehicles, fences, light poles, trees,
  and fixed athletic equipment prohibited
- Reserve Area C (300 ft x 50)
  Streets, roads, highways, parking lot,
  rights-of-way, vehicles, fences, light poles, ballast lights,
  trees, fixed athletic equipment, curbs, gutters, planted grasses,
  washed gravel or plantings, and headstones prohibited
ACOS Action Plan

Introduction
The following action plan is intended to describe the implementation mechanisms that will allow each identified ACOS area to be brought into compliance with the reserve space requirements of the Airport Land Use Plan.

General Plan Amendments
The City of San Luis Obispo shall adopt amendments to the Land Use Element of the General Plan to include specific policy language in support of implementing this Airport Compatible Open Space plan. The following policy will be recommended to be added to Chapter 7 of the Land Use Element, which includes all of the Airport related policies:

Land Use Element Policy 7.11: Airport Compatible Open Space

It is the policy of the City of San Luis Obispo to maintain open space areas within the City and in the greenbelt that is compatible with airport operations, as one of many reasons identified in the General Plan to preserve open space areas. To this end, the City shall pursue the implementation of the Airport Compatible Open Space plan (ACOS), consistent with the requirements of the Airport Land Use Plan and shall coordinate implementation of the plan closely with the Airport Land Use Commission, reporting progress on an annual basis.

Detailed Area Plans
The City of San Luis Obispo shall consult with the Airport Land Use Commission prior to finalization of the Airport Area Specific Plan and Orcutt Area Specific Plan to insure that both specific plans meet the requirements necessary to qualify as Detailed Area Plans as defined in the ALUP.

City Ownership
The City of San Luis Obispo shall pursue ownership, through property owner dedication, for each area defined as reserve space in this ACOS plan. For the properties that the City does own, the City will consider entering into Memorandums of Understanding with the Airport Land Use Commission to guarantee the long term preservation of the land, consistent with the reserve space requirements of the ALUP.

Conservation Easements
Where ownership is not feasible or desirable, the City shall pursue conservation easements to insure long term preservation of open space land, consistent with the reserve space requirements of the Airport Land Use Plan.

Zoning Restrictions
Where both ownership and conservation easements are not feasible, the City will pursue S zone (Special Considerations) rezoning for properties shown in this ACOS to insure that ALUP requirements for reserve space are achieved.

County Coordination
The City will work with the County of San Luis Obispo to coordinate the review of development for land shown in this ACOS plan that is not annexed to the City. In exchange for cooperation in the development review process, density adjustments should be made available to property outside of the City’s jurisdiction to the approval of the Airport Land Use Commission.
**Timing**
The City of San Luis Obispo should fully implement this ACOS plan within fifteen years of its approval, and make sufficient progress each year to insure this requirement is met.

**Reporting**
One time each year, the City of San Luis Obispo will provide the ALUC with an implementation report on the status of the ACOS and implementation of this Action Plan.
Appendix F:
Traffic Impact Analysis for the Proposed Regional Center at 40 Prado Road
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project consists of a General Plan Amendment and Rezone for 9.26 acres from C/OS-10 to O-PD. The planned land use is 125,200 square feet of office space with a 2,000 square foot day care center, in four buildings. The project is located in the San Luis Obispo suburban area of the city of San Luis Obispo. It is generally bounded by Prado Road, Elks Lane and the Sunset Drive-in. Access to the project is planned off of Elks Lane via a realignment of the street.

TRIP GENERATION

Using trip generation rates from Trip Generation, 5th edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1990 it was determined that the proposed project would generate 1,910 daily trips, 316 am peak hour trips and 254 pm peak hour trips.

TRAFFIC ANALYSIS

An analysis of the Existing Condition traffic volumes indicated that three intersections, in the area surrounding the proposed project, currently exceed the city of San Luis Obispo acceptable level of service criteria (LOS D or better). The intersections were:

Los Osos Valley Road/U.S. 101 southbound off-ramp-Calle Joaquin
Madonna Road/U.S. 101 southbound ramps
Madonna Road/Higuera Street

The project traffic was added to the existing traffic based on the proposed phasing of the development. The addition of the proposed project traffic, from any project phase, to the existing traffic adds one new intersection to the three intersections identified under Existing Condition as exceeding the City's acceptable Level of Service D criteria. The Elks Lane approach to the Elks Lane/South Higuera Street intersection is projected to operate at an unacceptable LOS E in the Existing with Project Condition.

To determine the future traffic levels a cumulative analysis was used. The base traffic volume information was obtained from the unconstrained traffic volumes projected in the San Luis Obispo City-Wide Transportation Study, DKS Associates, July 1990 and the city of San Luis Obispo transportation model. Three Cumulative Condition alternative circulation networks were evaluated: no overpass or interchange at Prado Road/U.S. 101, an overcrossing at Prado Road/U.S. 101 with no interchange and an overpass and interchange at Prado Road/U.S. 101. Both alternatives assumed higher intensity development in the airport area.

It was assumed that roadway improvements presented in the San Luis Obispo City-Wide Transportation Study would be in place for the cumulative and cumulative with project-
Prado Road interchange alternative analysis. For all three alternatives it was assumed that the intersection lane configurations would remain the same as the existing lane configurations.

The development of lands around the San Luis Obispo Airport at a more intense level than currently shown on the city or county General Plans could have a profound effect on the transportation system in the study area. Currently studies are evaluating the options for use of the lands around the airport. Both industrial and residential alternatives have been discussed, but specific plans have not been finalized. The same goes for the Dalidio property southwest of the Central Coast Mall.

Due to the uncertainty regarding the land use plans for these areas, traffic projections for the "most intense" land use have been used as part of this study. The traffic data came from the city of San Luis Obispo city-wide transportation model. As specific plans for the airport and Dalidio area are finalized and the city adopts a new General Plan the traffic projections could change, but at the time of the writing of this report the data used in the traffic analysis was the best available.

The analysis of the traffic volumes for the no Prado Road interchange alternative indicated that eight intersections would be operating at unacceptable levels of service. The intersections were:

Los Osos Valley Road/U.S. 101 southbound off ramp-Calle Joaquin
Los Osos Valley Road/U.S. 101 northbound ramps
Madonna Road/Higuera Street
Madonna Road/U.S. 101 southbound ramps
Prado Road/South Higuera Street
Prado Road/U.S. 101 northbound ramps-Elks Lane
Tank Farm Road/South Higuera Street
Elks Lane/South Higuera Street

For the Prado Road overcrossing only alternative, seven intersections were projected to be operating at unacceptable levels of service. The intersections were:

Los Osos Valley Road/U.S. 101 southbound off ramp-Calle Joaquin
Los Osos Valley Road/U.S. 101 northbound ramps
Madonna Road/Higuera Street
Madonna Road/U.S. 101 southbound ramps
Prado Road/South Higuera Street
Tank Farm Road/South Higuera Street
Elks Lane/South Higuera Street

For the Prado Road interchange alternative, seven intersections were projected to be operating at unacceptable levels of service. The intersections were:

Los Osos Valley Road/U.S. 101 southbound off ramp-Calle Joaquin
Los Osos Valley Road/U.S. 101 northbound ramps
Madonna Road/Higuera Street
Madonna Road/U.S. 101 southbound ramps
Prado Road/South Higuera Street
Tank Farm Road/South Higuera Street
Elks Lane/South Higuera Street

To determine the Cumulative with Project Condition traffic impacts, the proposed project traffic was added to the Cumulative Condition traffic volumes. The resulting traffic levels did not cause any new intersections to operate at an unacceptable level of service. Seven intersections identified for the no Prado Road interchange alternative analysis and the seven intersections identified for the Prado Road interchange alternative analysis that were operating at unacceptable levels of service for the Cumulative Condition will continue to do so, with the additional project traffic adding to the delay at the intersections.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The installation of the Prado Road/U.S. 101 interchange and extension of Prado Road to Madonna Road or installation of the extension of Prado Road from U.S. 101 to Madonna Road would reduce the delay at one intersection to acceptable levels (Prado Road/U.S. 101 northbound ramps).

Without the interchange, the following intersection improvements would be needed to accommodate projected future traffic for this alternative:

Los Osos Valley Road/U.S. 101 southbound off-ramp-Calle Joaquin:
Widen Los Osos Valley Road to four lanes from South Higuera Street to Madonna Road. Add a third through lane to the westbound Los Osos Valley Road approach to the intersection. The through lane would be carried through the intersection and terminate west of the intersection.

Los Osos Valley Road/U.S. 101 northbound ramps:
Widen Los Osos Valley Road to four lanes from South Higuera Street to Madonna Road and add a second left turn lane to the U.S. 101 off-ramp northbound approach.

Prado Road/U.S. 101 northbound ramps:
Install a traffic signal.

Prado Road/South Higuera Street:
Add a right turn lane to the westbound Prado Road approach.
Add a second northbound left turn lane on the South Higuera Street approach.
Restripe the existing right turn lane to a thru/right turn lane on the Prado Road eastbound and westbound approaches.

Madonna Road/Higuera Street:
Add a two left turn lanes on the northbound Higuera Street approach.
Add a third through lane on the southbound Higuera Street approach.  
Note: These improvements are considered infeasible give the existing land uses and  
intersection spacing between Madonna Road/Higuera Street, Higuera Street and  
South Street and Madonna Road/U.S. 101 northbound ramps.

Madonna Road/U.S. 101 southbound ramps:  
Add through and right turn lane on the eastbound Madonna Road approach.  
Add a left turn lane and a through lane on the westbound Madonna Road approach.  
Add a left turn lane and convert the thru/left turn lane into a through lane on the  
northbound U.S. 101 ramp approach. Note: this improvement may be infeasible due  
to the proximity of existing land uses and would necessitate the widening of the  
structure over U.S. 101.

Tank Farm Road/South Higuera Street:  
Add a left turn lane to the southbound South Higuera Street approach.  
Add a through lane and a right turn lane to the northbound South Higuera Street  
approach.  
Add a through lane and restrripe the existing left/through lane to a left turn lane on  
the westbound Tank Farm Road approach.

Elks Lane/South Higuera Street:  
Install a traffic signal. Note: Discussions with city of San Luis Obispo staff indicates  
that this is an infeasible mitigation.

The intersections of Madonna Road/Higuera Street, Elks Lane/South Higuera Street and  
Madonna Road/U.S. 101 southbound ramps are still projected to be operating at  
unacceptable LOS due to the lack of feasibility of providing adequate mitigations to relieve  
projected traffic congestion. Thus, the intersections experience traffic impacts that are  
significant and unavoidable.

With construction of an overcrossing of U.S. 101 by Prado Road and removal of the existing  
ramps, the following intersection improvements would be needed to accommodate projected  
future traffic for this alternative:

Los Osos Valley Road/U.S. 101 southbound off-ramp-Calle Joaquin:  
Widen Los Osos Valley Road to four lanes from South Higuera Street to Madonna  
Road. Add a third through lane to the westbound Los Osos Valley Road approach  
to the intersection. The through lane would be carried through the intersection and  
terminate west of the intersection.

Los Osos Valley Road/U.S. 101 northbound ramps:  
Widen Los Osos Valley Road to four lanes from South Higuera Street to Madonna  
Road and add a second left turn lane to the U.S. 101 off-ramp northbound approach.

Prado Road/South Higuera Street:  
Add a right turn lane to the westbound Prado Road approach.
Add a second northbound left turn lane on the South Higuera Street approach. 
Restripe the existing right turn lane to a thru/right turn lane on the Prado Road 
eastbound and westbound approaches.

Madonna Road/Higuera Street: 
Add a two left turn lanes on the northbound Higuera Street approach.  
Add a third through lane on the southbound Higuera Street approach. 
Note: These improvements are considered infeasible give the existing land uses and 
intersection spacing between Madonna Road/Higuera Street, Higuera Street and 
South Street and Madonna Road/U.S. 101 northbound ramps. 

Madonna Road/U.S. 101 southbound ramps:  
Add through and right turn lane on the eastbound Madonna Road approach.  
Add a left turn lane and a through lane on the westbound Madonna Road approach.  
Add a left turn lane and convert the thru/left turn lane into a through lane on the 
northbound U.S. 101 ramp approach. Note: this improvement may be infeasible due 
to the proximity of existing land uses and would necessitate the widening of the 
structure over U.S. 101.

Tank Farm Road/South Higuera Street: 
Add a left turn lane to the southbound South Higuera Street approach.  
Add a through lane and a right turn lane to the northbound South Higuera Street 
approach.  
Add a through lane and restripe the existing left/through lane to a left turn lane on 
the westbound Tank Farm Road approach.

Elks Lane/South Higuera Street:
Install a traffic signal. Note: Discussions with city of San Luis Obispo staff indicates that this is an infeasible mitigation.

The intersections of Madonna Road/Higuera Street, Elks Lane/South Higuera Street and 
Madonna Road/U.S. 101 southbound ramps are still projected to be operating at 
unacceptable LOS due to the lack of feasibility of providing adequate mitigations to relieve 
projected traffic congestion. Thus, the intersections experience traffic impacts that are 
significant and unavoidable.

To aid in the overall reduction in am peak hour (7:30-8:30) and pm peak hour (4:30-5:30) 
single occupancy vehicle trip generation in the San Luis Obispo area it is recommended that 
the City adopt a city-wide TSM program that would reduce peak hour trip generation by 
employers. The city of Pleasanton has adopted such program that has a goal to reduce peak 
hour travel by 45 percent within 4 years (15 percent in the first year and increasing 10 
percent per year for the next three years).

The following intersection improvements are necessary to mitigate the intersection LOS for 
the Prado Road interchange alternative to acceptable levels:
Los Osos Valley Road/U.S. 101 southbound off-ramp-Calle Joaquin:
Widen Los Osos Valley Road to four lanes from South Higuera Street to Madonna Road.

Los Osos Valley Road/U.S. 101 northbound ramps:
Widen Los Osos Valley Road to four lanes from South Higuera Street to Madonna Road and add a second left turn lane to the U.S. 101 off-ramp northbound approach.

Prado Road/South Higuera Street:
Add a right turn lane to the westbound Prado Road approach.
Add a second northbound left turn lane on the South Higuera Street approach.
Restripe the existing right turn lane to a through lane on the westbound approach and to a thru/right turn lane on the eastbound approach to Prado Road.

Madonna Road/Higuera Street:
Add a two left turn lanes on the northbound Higuera Street approach.
Add a third through lane on the southbound Higuera Street approach.
Note: These improvements are considered infeasible give the existing land uses and intersection spacing between Madonna Road/Higuera Street, Higuera Street and South Street and Madonna Road/U.S. 101 northbound ramps.

Madonna Road/U.S. 101 southbound ramps:
Add a through turn lane on the eastbound Madonna Road approach.
Add a left turn lane and a through lane on the westbound Madonna Road approach.
Add a left turn lane and convert the thru/left turn lane into a through lane on the northbound U.S. 101 ramp approach. Note: this improvement may be infeasible due to the proximity of existing land uses and would necessitate the widening of the structure over U.S. 101.

Tank Farm Road/South Higuera Street:
Add a left turn lane to the southbound South Higuera Street approach.
Add a through lane and a right turn lane to the northbound South Higuera Street approach.
Add a through lane and restripe the existing left/through lane to a left turn lane on the westbound Tank Farm Road approach.

Elks Lane/South Higuera Street:
Install a traffic signal. Note: Discussions with city of San Luis Obispo staff indicates that this is an infeasible mitigation.

The intersections of Madonna Road/Higuera Street, Elks Lane/South Higuera Street and Madonna Road/U.S. 101 southbound ramps are still projected to be operating at unacceptable LOS due to the lack of feasibility of providing adequate mitigations to relieve projected traffic congestion. Thus, the intersections experience traffic impacts that are significant and unavoidable.
The proposed project traffic impacts did not cause any of the ten study area critical intersections, that were not already operating at unacceptable levels of service, to operate at unacceptable levels for the Cumulative Condition for the no Prado Road interchange alternative, Prado Road overcrossing only alternative or Prado Road interchange alternative. Thus, there are no new physical improvements or mitigation measures that need to be recommended to the roadway intersections surrounding the project. The project should contribute to a fund that would provide the funding for the improvements recommended for the roadways and intersections in the study area. The contributions should be based on the projects share of the total traffic on the facility (see Table XVIII).

To help reduce single occupancy vehicle travel and peak hour congestion it is recommended that the project should be required to install the following TSM measures: a bus stop on Prado Road at the project frontage, bicycle storage lockers, showers and lockers, a pedestrian connection to the existing office park on South Higuera Street, preferential parking for carpool and vanpools, have an annual survey to determine the employee mode choices, housing locations and possible transit improvements.

To aid in the overall reduction in am peak hour (7:30-8:30) and pm peak hour (4:30-5:30) single occupancy vehicle trip generation in the San Luis Obispo area it is recommended that the City adopt a city-wide TSM program that would reduce peak hour trip generation by employers. The city of Pleasanton has adopted such program that has a goal to reduce peak hour travel by 45 percent within 4 years (15 percent in the first year and increasing 10 percent per year for the next three years).

Two alternatives were evaluated for the Prado Road northbound ramps. The alternatives were: a diamond design and a design similar to the southbound Madonna Road/U.S. 101 ramps (Type L-8). The diamond design would accommodate the projected traffic with the least amount of improvements. The diamond ramp configuration accommodates the projected heavy northbound U.S. 101 to eastbound Prado Road movement in a right turn move. The location of the northbound on-ramp for this alternative provides a longer weaving distance on U.S. 101 between the Prado Road interchange and the Madonna Road interchange.

Alternative two would require the northbound U.S. 101 to eastbound Prado Road movement would have to be accommodated in a left turn move, which adds to delay at the intersection and requires the construction of additional lanes at the intersection. Also, the alternative two design extends the location of the northbound on-ramps merging point with U.S 101 further north and closer to the Madonna Road/U.S. 101 northbound off-ramp diverging point. This would reduce the weaving distance between the two interchanges.

Based on the data evaluated in this report the diamond design for the northbound ramp at the Prado Road/U.S. 101 interchange is recommended.
Appendix G: Consultant Contract
CONSULTANT PROPOSAL AND SERVICE AGREEMENT

For the

City of San Luis Obispo

Jeremiah Robbins and Joe Michael, hereinafter referred to as CONSULTANT, agrees to provide consultant services to the City of San Luis Obispo, a municipal corporation, hereinafter referred to as CITY, as further described below. This proposal is made as partial fulfillment of the requirements of the City and Regional Planning Department, College of Architecture and Environmental Design, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo California.

TERM. The term of the proposed scope of services shall be from the date of CITY approval of this proposal until acceptance or completion of said services but no later than June 5th, 2008. All work products shall be submitted to CITY representative no later than 5:00 p.m., June 12, 2007. Materials received after that time will not be accepted.

CITY REQUIREMENTS. This proposal is based on and is intended to fulfill the City’s requirements, as described in the CRP 463 Course Syllabus, Spring 2008. Said document is hereby into the proposal by reference.

FEE SCHEDULE. As this proposal is intended to meet academic requirement, no fees are proposed or stated for the services specified in this agreement.

CITY CONSIDERATION. CITY representative, Jeff Hook, agrees to assist CONSULTANT by providing base information and technical support and guidance during the course of this project, pursuant to his role as instructor for the said course, to the extent that is feasible and reasonable.

CONTRACTOR’S OBLIGATION. For the consideration noted above, and to fulfill the requirements of CRP 463, CONSULTANT proposes and agrees to: A) provide consultant services as described particularly below, B) to meet University and Department of City and Regional Planning requirements regarding senior project completion, and C) to complete all required work in a timely, thorough and professional manner, to the approval of the CITY representative.

AMENDMENTS. Amendments to this proposal, once accepted, are discouraged. Any amendment, modification or variation from this proposal shall require prior written approval by the CITY representative and where necessary, by the Department of City and Regional Planning, and then only for reasons that are beyond the control of the CONSULTANT.

SCOPE OF SERVICES. CONSULTANT hereby proposes and agrees to provide the following services:

A. Proposed Project A tourist commercial center including a 150-room hotel, 24,000 s.f. conference/banquet facility that includes a great hall and smaller break out venues, and 64 seat restaurant with kitchen, storage and support facilities, and large outdoor patio, meeting
and event area (for events like open air concerts, wine-maker dinners, business fairs, fundraisers and weddings), and 2400 s.f. Central Coast welcome center with lobby and display area, office and restrooms.

B. Key Tasks:
1. Site assessment
2. Data collection
3. Statistical analysis
4. Alternative conceptual design
5. Present information collected and site analysis
6. Research case studies
7. Design preliminary development plan
8. Present case studies
9. Begin graphics work in SketchUp and PhotoShop
10. Write detailed client program
11. Refine development plan
12. Draw site sections
13. Begin initial environmental study
14. Determine preliminary location and design of offsite improvements
15. Write rough outline of narrative report
16. Begin organizing final document and deliverables
17. Write preliminary draft report
18. Present complete preliminary draft report and posters
19. Prepare PowerPoint
20. Verbally present project results
21. Refine final report, graphics, and posters
22. Submit all deliverables in final form

C. Methods and Resources:
1. Digital Camera
2. Site Reconnaissance
3. Adobe Photoshop
4. GIS Analysis
5. Hand Drawing
6. Interviews
7. Adobe InDesign
8. City of San Luis Obispo General Plan
9. Airport Land Use Plan for SLO County Regional Airport
10. City of San Luis Obispo Zoning Regulations
11. Research of similar projects and scholarly works
12. Microsoft Excel
13. SketchUp
14. Kennedy Library

D. Deliverables:
1. Contract Proposal that outlines, in detail, the full scope of the project through the listing of tasks, methods and resources used, the project deliverables and the schedule of services which must be endorsed by both the CITY representative and CONSULTANT.
2. Written report with 8.5” X 11” landscape or portrait format, double sided, bound with cerlox or tape bind, using 12 pt. Times New Roman or Arial font and includes:
   a. Table of contents
   b. Photos of the study area
   c. Field data analysis
   d. Findings and recommendations
   e. Methodology/Goals and Policies
   f. Graphics
      o Two conceptual bubble diagrams showing alternative use layouts and circulation.
      o Existing Conditions/Site analysis plan
      o Opportunities and Constraints plan
      o Illustrative development plan
      o Two sectional views through the site showing proposed features, topography and context.
      o Detailed Sketch-Up architectural model of the proposed development plan.
      o Three perspective sketches of the proposed development.
      o Vicinity Map
   g. Two case studies of professional projects comparable in terms of scale, context and objectives, and identify aspects of the plan applicable to the client’s program, lessons learned and best practices.
   h. An initial environmental study to identify potential environmental impacts, including recommended mitigation measures, and sources of information. The initial study shall follow the City of San Luis Obispo’s required format and may serve as a workscope for an EIR (to be completed by others), depending upon the recommended determination of the initial study.
   i. An analysis of the locations of all easements, existing utilities and rights-of-way.
   j. A preliminary feasibility assessment that describes the proposed uses, addresses market area and target clientele, market demand, sales and/or marketing strategy.

3. A PowerPoint presentation of at least 10 slides and not exceeding 25 slides, summarizing the project’s key findings and recommendations to be presented to a group
### E. SCHEDULE OF SERVICE

1. **Individual Completion Dates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>consultant contract</td>
<td>Jeremiah and Joe</td>
<td>4/10/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site visit</td>
<td>Jeremiah and Joe</td>
<td>4/17/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preliminary bubble diagram</td>
<td>Jeremiah and Joe</td>
<td>4/17/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunities and constraints</td>
<td>Jeremiah and Joe</td>
<td>4/17/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site analysis</td>
<td>Jeremiah and Joe</td>
<td>4/17/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draft site analysis chapter</td>
<td>Jeremiah and Joe</td>
<td>4/17/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>case study: Wine and Roses</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>4/24/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study: Sycamore Springs</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>4/24/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preliminary development plan and chapter</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>4/24/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draft case study chapter</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>4/24/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detailed development plan</td>
<td>Jeremiah and Joe</td>
<td>5/1/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>begin Sketchup modeling</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>5/1/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site sections</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>5/1/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draft development plan chapter</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>5/1/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draft initial study</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>5/1/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>begin organizing final document</td>
<td>Jeremiah and Joe</td>
<td>5/8/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present preliminary location and design of offsite improvements</td>
<td>Jeremiah and Joe</td>
<td>5/8/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rough outline of narrative report</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>5/8/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>table of contents</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>5/15/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finalize initial environmental study</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>5/15/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organize preliminary graphics into chapters</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>5/15/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present preliminary draft report</td>
<td>Jeremiah and Joe</td>
<td>5/22/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic design of posters</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>5/22/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present complete report</td>
<td>Jeremiah and Joe</td>
<td>5/29/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete site plan, elevations, sections, perspectives, etc.</td>
<td>Jeremiah and Joe</td>
<td>5/29/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Sketchup model</td>
<td>Jeremiah</td>
<td>5/29/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create Powerpoint Presentation</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>5/29/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print final posters</td>
<td>Jeremiah and Joe</td>
<td>6/2/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final presentation</td>
<td>Jeremiah and Joe</td>
<td>6/5/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submit final report, graphics, and posters</td>
<td>Jeremiah and Joe</td>
<td>6/12/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Overall Completion Schedule (Gant Chart)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>April 3-10</th>
<th>April 10-17</th>
<th>April 17-24</th>
<th>April 24-May 1</th>
<th>May 1-8</th>
<th>May 8-15</th>
<th>May 15-22</th>
<th>May 22-29</th>
<th>May 29-June 5</th>
<th>June 5-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contract Creation</td>
<td>site visit</td>
<td>preliminary bubble diagram</td>
<td>opportunities and constraints</td>
<td>site analysis</td>
<td>case studies</td>
<td>preliminary development</td>
<td>draft case study chapter</td>
<td>development plan</td>
<td>sketchup model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. CONSULTANT TEAM. CONSULTANT’s team shall consist of the following members: Jeremiah Robbins and Joe Michael. CONSULTANT hereby states and agrees that team members will be equally and jointly responsible for completion of all work products, and that final work projects will clearly and accurately identify individual team members work to enable the Instructor to assign final class grades.

COMPLETE AGREEMENT. This written agreement, including information incorporated specifically by reference, shall constitute the complete agreement between CONSULTANT and CITY. CONSULTANT understands that failure to meet requirement and obligations under this agreement will result in failure to pass CRP 463 – Senior Project.

AGREEMENT APPROVED:

CONSULTANT:

(Jeremiah Robbins) date

(Joe Michael) date

CITY REPRESENTATIVE (Instructor):

Jeff Hook date
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Appendix H: Ownership Table
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APN</th>
<th>AREA_SQ_FT</th>
<th>Shape_Leng</th>
<th>Shape_Area</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>SUF</th>
<th>ADNUM</th>
<th>ST_NAME</th>
<th>SIC</th>
<th>ADDRESS/Main</th>
<th>ADDRESS/Others</th>
<th>Owners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>053-041-020</td>
<td>72335.35</td>
<td>330.31</td>
<td>6720.20</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>93401-5420</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>ELKS</td>
<td>6515</td>
<td>333 ELKS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moreno Cayetano D Tre Etal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053-011-006</td>
<td>17514.10</td>
<td>161.43</td>
<td>1627.12</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>93401-5413</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>ELKS</td>
<td>4226</td>
<td>350 ELKS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Glick Kenneth L Tre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053-041-034</td>
<td>407157.35</td>
<td>821.54</td>
<td>3826.31</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>93401-7313</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>PRADO</td>
<td>0014</td>
<td>40 PRADO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Midland Pacific Oregon Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053-041-036</td>
<td>8738.98</td>
<td>370.06</td>
<td>811.82</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>93401-7313</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>PRADO</td>
<td>0012</td>
<td>40 PRADO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sievers H William Tre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053-041-037</td>
<td>97631.88</td>
<td>474.54</td>
<td>9070.33</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>93401-7313</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>PRADO</td>
<td>0041</td>
<td>46 PRADO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sievers H William Tre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053-041-027</td>
<td>28966.59</td>
<td>206.84</td>
<td>2691.10</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>93401-5410</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>ELKS</td>
<td>0071</td>
<td>253 ELKS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Midland Pacific Oregon Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053-041-031</td>
<td>28622.29</td>
<td>206.59</td>
<td>2659.11</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>93401-7313</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>PRADO</td>
<td>7532</td>
<td>70 PRADO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Duong Hong Tre Etal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053-041-032</td>
<td>43556.28</td>
<td>273.94</td>
<td>4046.53</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>93405-4716</td>
<td>RD</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>PRADO</td>
<td>0041</td>
<td>56 PRADO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prado Road Group A CA Gen PTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053-041-025</td>
<td>1116415.71</td>
<td>1388.83</td>
<td>103718.83</td>
<td>25.63</td>
<td>93401-5410</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>ELKS</td>
<td>7833</td>
<td>255 ELKS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pasquini Charles A Jr Tre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053-011-027</td>
<td>143415.32</td>
<td>525.33</td>
<td>13323.77</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>93401-5434</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>ELKS</td>
<td>0161</td>
<td>240 ELKS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pasquini Charles A Jr Tre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>