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PURPOSE
This project is one of 14 tested alternatives to the Orcutt Area Specific Plan (OASP) that were presented to the City of San Luis Obispo and accompanying land owners. The OASP is a housing development project that includes low density to high density housing. The site of this project is owned by 13 different land owners, for the purpose of this assignment we consider the land to be owned by one. Seabeasts and Associates were given the West Coast Olympic Training Facility as an alternative development project.
The proposed development is one of 14 tested alternatives to the current Orcutt Area Specific Plan. This project, entitled West Coast Olympic Village, was compared to the OASP on a number of key issues to determine which development is the better option.

The West Coast Olympic Village is designed to provide a full service training facility for U.S. Olympic athletes and coaches. This site can accommodate up to 1,000 athletes and 250 coaches at one time. Athletic facilities include a 290,000 square foot gymnasium, velodrome, aquatic center, tennis courts, six athletic fields, ¼ mile track, archery range, and a BMX course. On-site amenities include health services, clubhouse, meeting rooms, market, food court, on-site housing, free golf cart use for transportation around the site, visitor center, and museum.

One of the major issues analyzed was plan consistency, identifying issues with local plans and polices. There are no zoning regulations that are designed to feasibly accommodate a development of this caliber. The SLO County Regional Airport Land Use Plan does not allow high intensity land uses, such as large sporting events, and places restrictions on the density of persons and housing per acre, both of which will be violated. The density of the on-site housing is far above the regulations set by the ALUP. Correcting these inconsistencies would require significant resources and time.

Both the West Coast Olympic Village and the OASP have significant environmental impacts related to noise, aesthetics, and cultural resources. As the OASP is primarily a housing development, there are many more significant environmental impacts such as air quality. Overall the West Coast Olympic Village is much more environmentally friendly than the current OASP leading to reduced costs, mitigations, and time.

The construction of the West Coast Olympic Village is estimated at 160 million and would likely increase due to architecture fees, permits, surveying, mitigations, etc. The U.S. Olympic Committee is already in a financial crisis causing the shutdown of the training facility at Lake Placid. Not only is there not enough funding for the construction of the facility, the facility would not generate a high amount of revenue.

San Luis Obispo’s land use and zoning regulations do not accurately address this type of development. The West Coast Olympic Village is totally inconsistent with the ALUP while the OASP is more consistent with local plans and policies. Sporting events from this facility could potentially violate the maximum noise levels allowed within SLO City. Glare from sports field lighting and obstruction of viewsheds will impact the aesthetic appeal of the site. The West Coast Olympic Village is approximated to cost at least 160 million dollars, an amount that would be hard to meet by the financially stressed USOC. This type of facility requires a high amount of investment with a low amount of return. With major plan inconsistencies, financial issues, and a higher demand for housing, San Luis Obispo is not prepared for a development of this nature.

Recommendation: Not a feasible alternative to the current OASP
EXISTING CONDITIONS & SITE INVENTORY

HISTORICAL SETTING

A Native American Indian group known as the Chumash first used this land for hunting and gathering. After that time the area wasn’t developed by the Spanish or Mexican immigrants. The Peter McMillan family ranch was the first owned ranch on this site. Major Jackson was the next resident of the area. J.H Orcutt bought this land in 1875 and his property known as the Laurel Ranch. Mr. Orcutt later bought 500 acres of land and covered most of the present day site. His family owned a dairy, grew orchards and planted eucalyptus trees that are still here today.

NATURAL SETTING

The site selected for testing this development program is located in the southern section of San Luis Obispo city bound by Orcutt road and Tank Farm Road (See Figure 1). The Orcutt Plan Area is 230.85 acres in the County of San Luis Obispo. The site is currently in the process of being annexed by the city and has been designated as a Residential Neighborhood and Open Space by the Specific Plan as required by the City’s General Plan. Since this project began being developed in 1998, all 13 property owners of the Orcutt planning area have had an opportunity to be a part of all the public workshops and meetings dealing with the design and proposal of the OASP. 1 out of the 21 parcels within this planning area are annexed to be included within the city.

The site’s prominent feature is Righetti Hill, a 563 feet tall rocky hill located in the south eastern corner of the site. Righetti hill is listed in the City’s General Plan as one of the Morros. From the hill, the land rolls down to a flat field with riparian corridors and grasslands, some of which are used for grazing and, as a result, the site is completely fenced with barbed wire. Majority of the site is non-native annual grassland habitat with scattered eucalyptus, and other non native species. Tree corridors cover a percentage of the planning area and this will provide flood control prevention for the West Coast Olympic Village development.
Stagnate water and broken power lines on the west side are evidence of poor maintenance and drainage issues. A small dirt road provides access to single-family residences and a junkyard on the western portion of the site. A high voltage transmission power line traverses across the northern section of the site towards the PG&E substation across Orcutt. A small disconnected power line crosses the middle of the site from Industrial Way on the west to Orcutt on the east.

Single-family residences occupy the site on the northeast, west and one residence at the corner of Orcutt and Tank Farm with Righetti Hill as a backdrop. The primary view sheds from the site are from east to west looking at the Santa Lucia Range and north to south looking towards Righetti Hill. SLO Transit provides bus service to the site with two stops along Orcutt to the north and two stops along Tank Farm to the south.

The site is bordered on the west by railroad tracks, a single-family neighborhood, and an industrial park. The neighborhood and industrial parks are enclosed with concrete walls effectively disconnecting these areas from the site. The Union Pacific Railroad is a concern because trains carry a variety hazardous material, which makes the site at a high risk for a possible accident due to derailment.

To the north the site is bound by Orcutt Road with a retirement residence and a single-family neighborhood across the street. The retirement residence is secluded from view by a hill covered with vegetation. There are seven single-family residences that face the site and have driveways directly connected to Orcutt. The Willow Creek Mobile Home Park borders the Northwest portion of the site.

The eastern border provides a more spacious and scenic landscape with rural ranchettes located across from Orcutt Road. However, the view of the site from this area is blocked by single-family residences on the eastern portion of the site. Tank Farm Road and a single-family neighborhood border the southern side of the site. A concrete wall bordering the neighborhood isolates this area from the site.
FIGURE 1.2: Context Map
SITE OPPORTUNITIES

- Large amount of undeveloped land
- Developable land is found throughout the site
- San Luis Obispo’s small town setting provides Olympic athletes with fewer distractions than a large metropolitan city would.
- The facilities can attract youth club, high school and college teams.
- All land owners are open for new development.
- Scenic views can be found throughout the entire site.
- San Luis Obispo has a Mediterranean climate.
- The site is within the Urban Reserve Line for the City of San Luis Obispo.

Source: Poulter, 2010
SITE CONSTRAINTS

- PG&E High Power Line runs through the site.
- Has existing housing around the site.
- Wetland and creek corridors are found inside the planning area.
- Area is currently used for agriculture uses such as grazing.
- Site has native and non-native plants on site.
- Some portions of the site have existing residential units.
- Lacks adequate infrastructure and roads throughout the site.
- Protecting the scenic views from existing uses.
- Not apart of the City of San Luis Obispo.
- Planning site is within the San Luis Obispo’s Airport Plan.
- Planning site is near a Union Pacific train track.
- Most of the site is near a hill and majority of the land is not flat.

Source: Poulter, 2010
DESIGN PROPOSAL
The West Coast Olympic Village is a full service sports training facility located in San Luis Obispo. Situated on California’s Central Coast, this area affords the perfect climate for sports training. Designed to accommodate the many needs of Olympic athletes, this facility includes training facilities, on-site housing, food services, clubhouse, and other amenities. The facility is designed to accommodate up to 1,000 athletes at time. The West Coast Olympic Village anticipates over 2,000 athletes and coaches using this site per year. The administration building acts as the head of operations for all activities occurring at the facility. This development will hire around 50 full time staff for field maintenance, administrative services, customer services, and medical services. Complete with offices, classrooms, meeting rooms, a food court, visitor center, and gift shop, this building is a main hub of activity. A 290,000 square foot gymnasium offers athletes basketball courts, volleyball courts, table tennis, a gymnastic center, a 50 meter indoor pool, and state of the art locker room facilities. A portion of the roof is reserved for outdoor basketball and volleyball. The outdoor aquatic center includes a 50 meter pool, 15 foot dive pool with platforms and boards, locker rooms, and complimented by stadium seating for small events. 5 lighted tennis courts located next to the aquatic center provide a venue for tennis events. Banked track bicycle events are held at the indoor velodrome across from the gymnasium. Six athletic fields and a ¼ mile track provide venues for field sports such as soccer, rugby, field hockey, discus throw, high jump, javelin, running, and various other field sports. The far southwestern corner of the site is occupied by a BMX course and an archery range. On-site amenities include a health center for keeping athletes at top performing shape, clubhouse for meetings and events, housing for traveling athletes, and an adjacent market to provide on-site groceries and a restaurant. On-site housing is reserved for athletes but will be offered to coaches if available.

The West Coast Olympic Village will permit youth athletic teams to use this facility for tournament and championship games. This will attract the best young talent to come and use this facility. Youth athletic teams must make arrangements with the West Coast Olympic Village to gain access to this facility for tournaments and championship games.

FIGURE 2.1: West Coast Olympic Village 3D Sketchup Model
CIRCULATION ANALYSIS

Traffic within the site is very restricted, the primary modes of transportation within the site is by foot, bike, or golf cart. The majority of the site is closed to automobile traffic, therefore golf carts are provided free of charge for on-site residents. There are two entrances to this facility off Orcutt Road. Bullock Lane will be expanded to provide users access to the site primarily for those staying at the on-site housing. Further up Orcutt Road there is an entrance to the main center of the West Coast Olympic Village. This road (Johnson Parkway) provides access to the main parking near the administration building. On Johnson Parkway there will be a public transit spot for visitors and athletes to use. This will cut down on the number of vehicle trips to and from the site. This road does not provide continuous vehicle access throughout the whole site and is blocked off after the main parking lot. The reason for blocking off car access to most of the site is to create a walkable community and cut down the environmental impacts of this development.

FLOW OF ACTIVITY

Athletes and coaches living on-site would start their day having breakfast at their rooms or at the nearby on-site market. After preparing for the day, athletes and coaches would leave for practice; at this point the majority of activity would be at the athletic facilities. Lunch would be enjoyed back at their rooms, the market, food court, or somewhere off-site. After a day of training, the evening would be spent at their apartments, relaxing at the clubhouse, or somewhere off-site. The residencies would primarily be utilized between sunset and sunrise.

Athletes and coaches living off-site would arrive on-site in the morning primarily by car as most visitors may not live nearby nor know the local transit routes. If they had not already had breakfast, they would join the on-site residents at the market. The remainder of their day would be similar to on-site residents as described previously. At the end of the day these athletes and coaches would leave the site.

Staff working on-site would arrive to work by car, bus, bike, etc. primarily by car as the local area is auto-oriented. Their daily duties would vary as activity around the site varies, lunch would be eaten at the food court, market, or somewhere off-site. The majority of staff members would leave at the end of the day, however, a few may remain to serve athletes/coaches needs 24/7.

Tourists visiting the site would presumably travel by car as the immediate area is auto-oriented and few tourists learn the local transit routes. Visitors would enter the site from Orcutt Road on the north side of the site and enter through the administration building. A visitor center, U.S. Olympic store, museum, and food court would cater to visitors. Guided tours around the site would be by foot and last one hour, visitors would not be allowed to tour the residences or adjacent market area. Within 1-3 hour(s) visitors would leave the site.
BUILDING AND FIELD DESCRIPTIONS

The West Coast Olympic Village has a number of buildings that range in uses. There are a large amount of sports fields that can be used for a variety of activities and sports (See Site Plan and Table 2.1 Project Program).

**The administration building (1)** is a multiuse facility that is located on the Northeast portion of the site. This building will be the welcome center for tourists and guests to the West Coast Olympic Village. Inside the administration building will be an Olympic gift shop, food court, classrooms, film review theater, locker-rooms, and a museum to showcase the history of the United States Olympic Team.

**The health center (6)** is located across the street from the administration building. In this building will be health care clinic for athletes. This facility will provide emergency services for athletes who get injured on site and rehabilitation from injuries. This facility will include a small gym, MRI, x-ray machines, under water treadmills, and treatment center.

South of the administration building is a two-story, multi-purpose gymnasium (2). This holds a variety of sport uses such as basketball, volleyball, wrestling, badminton, judo, table tennis, diving, swimming, gymnastics, and weightlifting among others. This will be the primary location for locker-room and showers for all athletes. This gymnasium will also hold state of the art weigh training facilities for all the athletes and coaches to use.

**The pool facility (3)** is located next to the gymnasium. This will be an outdoor swimming pool used for diving, water polo, and swimming. This will be the second pool for athletes to use if the indoor pool is occupied. The location of the pool is purposely planned there to get the most sunlight throughout the day without shade from buildings or Righetti Hill.

**The velodrome (7)** is located across the street from the gymnasium and the outdoor pool. It will allow for track cyclists to train in an indoor facility. This facility will also provide locker-room and showers for athletes as well as a bicycle repair center.

**Multiple housing developments (8a. 8b. 8c)** are located within this plan and will allow athletes a place to stay without the long term commitment or the price of staying in a hotel for a few months. This facility is a dorm like housing development that will allow the maximum number of athletes and staff to stay on site without building on a large amount of land. There will be 400 units between two buildings. Parking for these residents will be located in close proximity of the housing. Housing was added to this project due to the short duration of time athletes would use this facility. Most athletes who train at Olympic facilities come a few months out of the year and are not permanent residents of the area. Therefore, providing housing for these athletes will less the burden for athletes on finding a short term lease within the San Luis Obispo area.
**A food market (9)** is located near the housing developments for residents and visitors to have access to a grocery/café in a scenic location. This market will also sell a small amount of health and wellness products. This will allow people to have a place to eat on site and will decrease the number of vehicle trips for athletes and visitors to offsite food options. This market will sell organic, healthy food options appropriate for Olympic athletes.

**The clubhouse (5)** is located on the southern portion of the site and is intended for use by athletes and coaches. This spa facility is a place where athletes and coaches can come for rest and relaxation from the stressful demands of being an Olympic athlete.

There are a total of 6 full-size soccer fields within the West Coast Olympic Village Plan. These fields can be used for other sports such as rugby, field-hockey, and lacrosse (possible Olympic sports). These soccer fields are all regulation size and built with artificial turf to lower the amount of water needed and less maintenance required than using grass.

A track and field facility is located near the soccer fields on the western side of project. This track and field will host a number of other events such as the shot put, javelin, high jump, triple jump, discus, hammer throw and pole vault. This track will also be made out of artificial turf and surrounded by open space to preserve sunlight throughout the whole day.

**A BMX course (11)** is located near the southern portion of the site and near the archery range. This will be a full BMX Olympic regulation course with facilities for athletes to repair and store bikes. This will be closed and fenced off during off hours so trespassers will be discouraged from using the site.

**An archery range (10)** is located near the BMX course and Tank Farm Road. This facility is over 300 feet long and designed to Olympic size regulations. This facility will have targets in a variety of ranges for all athletes to be able to use and practice on.

Parking structures and flat surfaced parking lots are located throughout the development. There is a three story parking structure located near the administration building and a two story parking structure located near the housing developments within the site. There are a total of 700 parking spots throughout the site.

Open space is found throughout the site for users to enjoy both visually and physically. All open space areas will be available to access by all visitors. The plants used for this design shall be native to the area and drought tolerant plants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Max Stories</th>
<th>Foot printin Sq. Ft</th>
<th>Total Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>175,716</td>
<td>175,716</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>190,624</td>
<td>293,479</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Facility</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59,317</td>
<td>59,317</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velodrome</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>203,000</td>
<td>203,000</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>244,648</td>
<td>354,549</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27,240</td>
<td>27,240</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubhouse</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50,922</td>
<td>50,922</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Structure 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>57,800</td>
<td>173,400</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Structure 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Parking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>106,800</td>
<td>106,800</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Fields</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>415,800</td>
<td>415,800</td>
<td>9.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Field</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>214,500</td>
<td>214,500</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>526,200</td>
<td>526,200</td>
<td>12.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMX Track</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery Field</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Open Space*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>170.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Acres: 60.01
Percent of Total Buildout: 0.26
Percent of Building Cover: 10%

*Not included in total acres

**TABLE 2.1:** Project Program
VISION

The West Coast Olympic Village envisions a state of the art US Olympic training and recreation center incorporating a unique design promoting sustainable practice and walkability throughout, altogether bolstering the attraction to the City of San Luis Obispo and the central coast region.

GOALS & OBJECTIVES

Goal 1: Cultivate a healthy, thriving and encouraging environment for US Olympians to practice and train at.

Objective 1.1: Limit built environment, preserving open space
Objective 1.2: Dense on-site housing encouraging player, team and coach interaction and connection.

Goal 2: Provide a state of the art, fully equip, training facilities with full amenities and supporting resources.

Objective 2.1: Modern and technologically advanced fitness and training centers
Objective 2.2: On-site housing, market and clubhouse.
Objective 2.3: On-site health center, airport shuttle and full 24 hour staff.

Goal 3: Reduce the on-site carbon footprint promoting walkability and sustainability.

Objective 3.1: Limit on-site automobile access.
Objective 3.2: Provide circulation through dedicated golf cart and pedestrian paths
Objective 3.3: Supply electric golf carts throughout the site

Goal 4: Create a premier central coast tourist attraction and destination.

Objective 4.1: Provide on-site tourist attractions such as monuments and gift stores.
Objective 4.2: Offer tours of the facilities.

Goal 5: Maintain the existing character and dynamics of the built and natural environment.

Objective 5.1: Conform to height restrictions and design guidelines mandated in the SLO General Plan.
CHULA VISTA OLYMPIC TRAINING CENTER

Chula Vista U.S Olympic Training is the first USOC master-planned development devoted to U.S Olympic athletes. This center is open year around in Chula Vista California. This development was funded by San Diego National Sports Training Foundation, a number of businesses, community leaders, and other volunteers who raised funds to build this facility.

There are a number of different buildings and fields located on this site. This facility has an athletic center which holds a number of administrative services, health center, and dining hall. The dining hall is for athletes and guests to eat on site. The health center is place for athletes to receive medical care, partake in sport science evaluation and psychology exercises. There is a 50 lane archery range that is 90 meters long. A sports complex is on site which holds the track and field event facilities. A field hockey venue is also found on site with artificial turf. The four soccer fields on site are Olympic size regulations with natural gras. These soccer fields are not just for Olympic athletes but for youth competition. This facility includes four hard-surface courts with the option to expand the number of courts to eight. Additionally, an indoor bicycle course, velodrome, is located on site. A man-made lake, used by the Olympic rowing team, is located on site. A boat house for use by athletes is situated near the lake.

Many of the concepts above can be found within the West Coast Olympic Village development. The only type of facility not included within both sites is the man-made rowing course and boathouse. These two projects both carry archery field, soccer fields, tennis courts, velodrome and a track and field. The idea of using artificial turf instead of grass is also a concept found in both developments. This case study provides the West Coast Olympic Village with foundation to expand from and provides a different perspective on the type of uses and facilities located within an Olympic training center. The plan to allow youth teams to use the West Coast Olympic Village for tournaments, championships, and camps came from the Chula Vista Olympic Center.
COLORADO SPRINGS OLYMPIC TRAINING CENTER

The U.S. Olympic facility in Colorado Springs acts as the headquarters for the U.S. Olympic Committee (USOC), the administrative body of the U.S. Olympic team. Since 1998, there have been 12 USOC organizations located on site. This site was formerly occupied by the ENT Air Force Base and the North American Defense Command, it became USOC’s headquarters in 1978. The facility can provide services for 557 athletes and coaches at one time.

The Aquatic Center includes a 50 meter x 25 meter swimming pool and above water and underwater cameras for filming athletes. While it is generally utilized by swimmers and water polo players, many other athletes use the facility for cross-training. The Shooting Center is the largest indoor shooting facility in the Western Hemisphere (third largest in the world) and provides 113 shooting bays accommodating rifles, pistols, rapid-fire pistols, a running target rifle range, and air rifles and pistols. Sports Center I is a 59,000 square foot facility including six gymnasiums designed to provide a venue for 14 different sports. Sports Center II was completed in 1993 and provides an additional 54,000 square foot area for nine different sports. The Visitor Center serves the general public with an Olympic Hall of Fame, indoor reception area, Olympic retail store, a 225 seat auditorium, and free tours of the premises. On-site amenities include medical center, meeting rooms, five different residence halls, dining hall, outdoor recreational pool, and interactive kiosks located around the site. The main arterial through the site does not allow automobile traffic promoting a healthy and walkable atmosphere.

The primary concept taken from this case study is the main arterial design. The West Coast Olympic Village places restrictions on automobile traffic through the site to provide a safe, healthy, and walkable space. Both facilities include administrative offices, meeting rooms, swimming pools, gymnasiums, visitor centers, medical center, on-site housing, and food options. This case study provided the West Coast Olympic Village with a practicable program of uses and an effective method of inter-site transportation.

source: http://girlfriendsgetaway.wordpress.com/category/where-ive-been/colorado-springs/
West Coast Olympic Village entrance.

Market place and on-site housing.

Arial view of entrance and Righetti Hill.

Arial view of entrance and Righetti Hill.
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FEASIBILITY
SAN LUIS OBISPO GENERAL PLAN

The site is currently in the process of being annexed by the city, this requires the city to designate the land for a certain use and zoning before annexation. The site has been designated as a “specific plan” zone with a “residential neighborhood” land use. To approve the West Coast Olympic Village, the city must adopt a land use designation which accurately represents the recreational purpose of the proposal. While a land use change is needed, a zoning change is not needed as a specific plan would still be required per policy 1.12.3.B of Land Use Element of the General Plan.

Policy 1.12.5.C in the Land Use Element of the General Plan states that annexations shall help secure protected areas for Open Space and Conservation. Section C requires Orcutt properties to dedicate land or easements to the Santa Lucia foothills and Mine Hill (Righetti Hill).

Policy 6.2.7.D in the Land Use Element of the General Plan states that all buildings within the Orcutt area shall be below 460 feet elevation to preserve open space and hillsides, particularly the volcanic Morros. All buildings within the proposed development will be below 460 feet in elevation.

Table 6 of San Luis Obispo’s Zoning Regulations identifies the parking requirements for different types of land uses. The parking regulations for the housing development require a minimum of 165 spots. The remaining amount of required parking will address the 500-800 other visitors that will comprise of athletes, coaches, facility staff, and visitors. The city does not currently have any zoning regulations that address the recreational purpose of this facility. It is suggested that the city adopt a parking regulation similar to the one listed below:

1 spot/2850 sq. ft. of footprint including buildings and athletic fields

The on-site housing is intended for athletes; however, coaches are not prohibited from choosing to live on-site if housing is available. Of the coaches and/or athletes that choose to live off-site, it is highly likely that they will carpool to some degree as teams generally travel together. This allows for a reduced amount of parking.

It is more likely that support staff working at the facility will drive vs. walk, bus, or bike as the southern section of San Luis Obispo is much more auto-oriented than other areas. This requires more parking for those commuters.

The Olympic training facility in Colorado Springs has an average of 380 visitors per day, a slightly reduced number was used to estimate the number of visitors to the West Coast Olympic Village as it is not the USOC’s headquarters. With an average of approx. 300 visitors per day, it is likely that each visitor will carpool with at least one other person averaging to 150 trips.
SAN LUIS OBISPO AIRPORT LAND USE PLAN

This site is located in safety zone S-2 of the San Luis Obispo Airport Land Use Plan. This zone is defined as the area which aircraft operate at altitudes between 501-1000 feet above ground level, the overall safety risk due to aircraft operations is considered to be lower than in Area S-1 or the Runway Protection Zone. This designation places restrictions on the site including but not limited to, the type of land uses, density of the land use, and building coverage.

Noise
The southwestern corner of the site is located within the 50dB airport noise contour. The land uses affected by this are the BMX course, archery range, and a potential for some of the residential units. Section 4.3.2.1 in the San Luis Obispo Airport Land Use Plan lists residential units as an extremely noise sensitive land use. Table 4 on page 19 clearly identifies extremely noise sensitive land uses to be an allowable land use if located outside of 55 dB contour. As the site is located outside of the 55 dB noise contour line, there is no restriction on the development based on the noise policies of the ALUP.

Safety
Section 4.4.2.2 of the ALUP identifies high intensity land uses to be events that attract dense concentrations of people such as sports tournaments or meetings. As this development is a sports complex, it is likely that there will be some events with large concentrations of people.

- Policy S-4 of section 4.4.6 of the ALUP prohibits high intensity land uses unless accompanied by an approved Airport Compatible Open Space Plan and controlled by a Detailed Area Plan that has been developed with, reviewed, and approved by the Airport Land Use Commission.

- Policy S-3 of section 4.4.6 prohibits any development that results in a building coverage of greater than 20% of the gross area. This development is projected to have a building coverage of approximately 10%.

- Policy S-2 of section 4.4.6 of the ALUP in accordance with Table 7 on page 31 limits the density of non-residential uses to 150 persons/acre and residential uses to 6 dwelling units/acre. The concentration of persons on-site will fluctuate throughout the daily operations. Due to the nature of the facility, the density of persons on site will not be a major issue as the highest concentration will occur at night and the local airport does not operate heavily at night. Refer to the Project Description and Overview section for a detailed explanation of the facilities operations. The housing element of the development is projected to have a density of 72 dwelling units/acre, far exceeding the ALUP’s regulations. However, this type of housing is not designed to be permanent residences and will rarely be filled to capacity.
There are three possible options for the housing development to conform to ALUP regulations, they are listed below:

1. Reduce the amount of dwelling units to an appropriate level to conform to ALUP regulations. However, this will lead to an increased amount of required parking and heavier impacts on the local traffic patterns.

2. Spread out the housing development across a greater amount of land to reduce the density. However, the amount of land required may take away from the facilities main purpose as an athletic training facility.

3. Locate the housing development within a Clustered Development Zone specified by an approved Airport Compatible Open Space Plan and a Detailed Area Plan that has been developed with, reviewed, and approved by the Airport Land Use Commission. This option may be not be feasible due to the extra resources required and the ALUC may choose to deny approval.

FIGURE 3.1: Aviation Safety Areas
source: Airport Land Use Plan, (2005)
ORCUTT AREA SPECIFIC PLAN ANALYSIS

The Environmental Impact Report identified a number of inconsistencies with the proposed specific plan, many of which have been mitigated. The following is a list of issues that may potentially still be inconsistent; these issues are general to the site and could potentially apply to the West Coast Olympic Village as well.

SLO General Plan

- Policy COSE 9.1.1 Preserve natural and agricultural landscapes. Important view corridors and viewsheds will be impacted by the urban development of a currently rural area.

- Policy CI 14.1, 14.2, and 14.3 Scenic Resources and Scenic Roadways Views from both Tank Farm and Orcutt Roads will be impacted by development under the Specific Plan. The open fields and riparian areas on the site will no longer be visible and views of the surrounding hillsides from these scenic roads will be impaired. With development, the rural character of the Specific Plan Area will be lost. Thus, proposed development is potentially inconsistent with this policy.

- Policy S 2.1 Adequate Fire Services SLOFD maintains a response time goal of four minutes, 90% of the time. The current average response time is four minutes. The estimated response time to the Orcutt Area is between four and six minutes. 5% of the Orcutt Area is currently outside of the Fire Department’s four to five minute response area (Knabe, February, 2004). Development under the Plan will not be consistent with this policy.

Airport Land Use Plan

The EIR initially identified the specific plan as being inconsistent with the ALUP based on the lot coverage and density of housing on the site. However, the Orcutt Area Specific Plan, which has been updated more recently than the EIR, identifies the plan as consistent with the ALUP. It seems that the inconsistencies with the ALUP have been resolved.

Comparison

While there may be some inconsistencies with the proposed specific plan, they are considerably less significant than those encountered with the West Coast Olympic Village. The inconsistencies with the training facility would require significant changes to both the development program and the plans, requiring the adoption of new policies that would promote the development of an Olympic training facility.
This section compares the environmental effects of the Orcutt Specific Plan and the West Coast Olympic Village alternative plan. This section will summarize the characteristic of both projects, the environmental impacts with each project and look into the types of mitigations possible for each project. An initial study was done to review the basic environmental issues with this development (See Appendix A)

Project Description

Orcutt Specific Plan
This project is a specific plan for development and annexation within the urban reserve line of the City’s General Plan. The current specific plan proposed to develop 113 acres of residential development, 81 acres of open space, 21 acres of parks, 5 acre school site and .25 acres of neighborhood development. This specific plan would require infrastructure such as roads, water, wastewater, and storm water systems.

West Coast Olympic Village
The West Coast Olympic Village will be a state of the art Olympic training facility with a diversity of purposes. Some of the amenities will be administrative offices, training center/gymnasium, one indoor and one outdoor training pool, track and field venue, six full-size sports fields, classrooms, medical services center, clubhouse and meeting rooms, velodrome, parking, tennis courts, residential housing, food market, and support facilities.

Summary of Impacts
This section will compare and contrast the unavoidable environmental impacts and significant impacts but can be mitigated from the Orcutt EIR and an initial study for the West Coast Olympic Village. The issues in this comparison include but are not limited to the following:

- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Energy and Mineral Sources
- Geologic Soils
- Hazards and Hazards Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation and Circulation
- Utilities and Service Systems
ORCUTT AREA SPECIFIC PLAN (OASP)

The Orcutt Area Specific Plan is a large residential development with a few significant environmental impacts. Some impacts can be mitigated to be less than significant but others impacts cannot. In the aesthetics section of the EIR has two significant and unavoidable impacts. The first impact is how the proposed specific plan would affect the aesthetic character of the site through alteration of view sheds from Orutt and Tank Farm. The change from a rural to urban development would be such a large change in the nature of the land that this impact is significant and unavoidable. The second impact would be the proposed development would affect the aesthetic character of the Specific Plan area and impede views of the Righetti Hill. The EIR found no mitigation measures that would allow this impact to not be significant and be consistent with the specific plan.

The air quality section of the EIR for the Orcutt Specific Plan found a significant and unavoidable impact. The EIR states that the specific plan is consistent with population growth found in San Luis Obispo’s General Plan but isn’t consistent on the types of uses within Urban Reserve Line. The project proposes low density residential and this is not consistent with the General Plan and the city will require a change to the current Urban Reserve Line to be consistent with the General Plan. The proposed project has mitigation measures to reduce the impacts of low density residential but the plan will still be inconsistent with the general plan and therefore cannot be mitigated.

The final significant and unavoidable impact deals with noise caused by the development of the Orcutt Specific Plan. The development would to existing roadway which is already above the 60 dBA City’s threshold. The EIR states that a Fair Share of Cumulative Noise Improvement mitigation measure would require the applicants to contribute a financial share to the implementation of mitigation measures listed in the Noise Element of the General Plan. This mitigation would not ensure noise be reduced to less than significant levels at all locations.
WEST COAST OLYMPIC VILLAGE

The West Coast Olympic Village has a couple of significant impacts that are unavoidable. The first deals with aesthetics. This proposed project would have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista because of the nature of the development. The current site has largely no development and remains rural while the project proposes compact development. This project would largely affect some view sheds to the Righetti Hill and part Orcutt Road. These impacts would be unavoidable. The proposal also would impact the existing current of the site and affect the surroundings of the area. This can not be mitigated due to the fact that on the site currently there is little to no development.

The second unavoidable impact deals with noise impacts from the proposal. Parts of Orcutt Road would see an increase in noise levels to portions of the area and would exceed the City’s noise level thresholds. This facility would create a significant amount of noise during peak hours of use and a noise study will have to be done to further review the noise impacts of this development. Mitigation would reduce the impacts of noise within the area but would not be fully mitigated.

One huge impact of this development deals with land use capability, which is significant and unmitigatable. As explained in General Plan consistency section of this report this project does not follow Airport Land Use Plan guidelines and the City of San Luis Obispo’s General Plan.

One major significant impact with this development is glare produced from the outdoor sports lights. This impact can be reduced to less than significant with the appropriate mitigation measures. See Appendix A for examples of different types of mitigation which can be implemented to reduce this impact to less than significant.
Both the Orcutt Area Specific Plan and Olympic Village Specific Plan have significant and unavoidable impacts. The Olympic Village has fewer unavoidable impacts; however, it shares a few that cannot be resolved through mitigation with the Orcutt Area Specific Plan.

For both plans the impacts related to aesthetics are unavoidable and significant. As explained early in this section each plan deals with a large development and significantly changed the character and feel for the area. Not only will this be significant in terms of aesthetics but the views of Righetti Hill and San Lucia Mountain Range.

A difference between the two projects is the noise impacts, the West Coast Olympic Village Plan does not increase noise levels on all surrounding streets as the OASP will. The West Coast Olympic Village will have significant noise impacts that will exceed the city’s noise threshold but not as frequent as the OASP. The OASP uses more existing roads and will create more traffic throughout the existing streets surrounding the site. The major disparity between the two projects is that the Orcutt Specific Plan has many significant impacts that can be improved by mitigation while the Olympic Village Specific Plan has fewer of these impacts.

In terms of agriculture the Olympic Village has far less impacts than the Orcutt Area Specific Plan. The Olympic Village does not build near a majority of the agriculture grazing sites and will not need to worry about mitigation. However, Orcutt Area Specific Plan builds on land designated for grazing and would require a buffer to mitigate the impact to be less than significant.

The air quality impacts with the Orcutt Area Specific Plan distances the Olympic Village Plan as the more sustainable plan. The OASP will create more traffic due to the large amount of residential on site and the type of residential units proposed. This in turn will create more vehicle emissions and will have a heavier impact on the environment than the West Coast Olympic Village. The Orcutt Specific Plan includes low density residential, which does not conform to the San Luis Obispo county Clean air Plan and the General Plan. This is an avoidable impact and this impact is not found in the West Coast Olympic Village.

The Orcutt Specific Plan has a large amount of significant impacts related to biological resources due to building near natural riparian habitats. The West Coast Olympic Village Plan builds around very little of the riparian habitat and has less than significant effect on these areas even without mitigation. Both of these plans emphasize the importance of setbacks from riparian habitats and creeks.

Overall the West Coast Olympic Village is more environmentally friendly due to the fact that most of the land that will be built is for recreation and won’t impede on the natural habitat. Orcutt Area Specific Plan proposal develops approximately 45% of the total project area while the West Coast Olympic Village is close to 26% total build out. However, the West Coast Olympic Village has more issues with the Airport Land Use Plan compatibility than the OASP. The current project will allow for expansion of the West Coast Olympic Village if the plan is as effective as planned. More housing and other sports facilities could be built on site to use more of the planning site.
ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY

Estimating the economic feasibility for this type of development is hard to accurately estimate because of multiple variables in projecting the total cost and finding the funds to support this type of development. The goal of this economic feasibility study is to get a snapshot of the total cost of the project. However, these projections are based off square footage building cost for different types of uses. For example, gymnasium square footage will cost more per square foot than a market/convenience store. These square footage cost estimates come from Reeds Construction Data, which is a cost estimating construction website (Melville, 2010). The square footage cost for artificial turf came from a private artificial sport field installation company that estimates the cost of artificial turf ranges from 7 to 8 dollars per square foot (Sporturf, 2009). There are many factors to consider when constructing a building or field such as the cost of the material being used, who designed the building, types of windows, utilities, location on site, the grading and other variables. Therefore, estimating the cost for this development alone is huge task in itself. This would require a more time than allowed for this whole project.

Overall the projected cost is estimated to cost around $161,359,641.75(Table 3.1). This cost projection is a low budget considering the amount of development on site. This number only covers the building cost and not the amount of equipment, infrastructure and utilities needed inside and outside of each building. The real cost will be much more expensive than this, similar types of recreation facilities such as the new California Polytechnic State University; San Luis Obispo recreation facility is estimated at around 71 million dollars (“Project news- Facilities,” 2010). The Colorado Springs Olympic Training Center, at $23.8 million, is significantly less than this plan but the West Coast Olympic Village Plan provides a larger variety of facilities and uses. Another reason the cost are significantly lower is due to inflation, the Colorado Springs project is over 15 years old. The West Cost Olympic Village would use far less area and provide a wider range of sports facilities than the Chula Vista Olympic Center and Colorado Springs Olympic Training Center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Total Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>175,716</td>
<td>$22,386,218.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Center</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td>$1,951,236.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>$37,470,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Facility</td>
<td>59,317</td>
<td>$1,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velodrome</td>
<td>203,000</td>
<td>$1,500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>354,549</td>
<td>$57,277,390.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>27,240</td>
<td>$2,542,581.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubhouse</td>
<td>50,922</td>
<td>$6,487,462.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Structure 1</td>
<td>173,400</td>
<td>$9,498,852.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Structure 2</td>
<td>180,000</td>
<td>$9,860,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat Parking</td>
<td>106,800</td>
<td>$1,281,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Fields</td>
<td>415,800</td>
<td>$3,326,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track and Field</td>
<td>214,500</td>
<td>$1,716,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>526,200</td>
<td>$3,683,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>$210,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMX Track</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>$19,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery Field</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>$360,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>$288,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$161,359,641.75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 3.1: Project Costs**
One of the major financial resources for the United States Olympic team, the U.S. Olympic Committee (USOC), is being hit hard by the present state of the economy. In the past year USOC has laid off more than 10% of its staff. The USOC is looking for other funding options and is even considering getting money from the Federal government (Friedman, 2007). The USOC does not currently receive any federal government subsidies. The USOC has been receiving funds by private donations from families and business throughout the past year. USOC leaders don’t believe this type of funding will continue especially during this economic recession. The Olympic Regional Development Authority (ORDA) has been cutting back funding for its current facilities in Lake Placid (Sichko, 2010). Currently the ORDA is considering shutting down the Olympic training center in Lake Placid. At first they were considering cutting back funds for the facility by 20% but decided to shut it down completely. The lack of USOC funding is a major concern to consider when analyzing this proposal.

As indicated above, there is a lack of financial feasibility in both the cost and funding for the project. This is a huge problem with this type of project especially since Olympic training centers are not a high revenue source. Getting the support from the City of San Luis Obispo and the USOC would be a difficult undertaking and would take quite a bit of work to gain support for approving this project. The current state of the economy dramatically effects the funding situation with the USOC and City of San Luis Obispo improved.
RECOMMENDATION

The West Coast Olympic Village was designed and tested against the current Orcutt Area Specific Plan as an alternative. The results of this comparison provide a clear understanding of which development is the better option as detailed below.

Current land use regulations and zoning regulations do not appropriately address this type of development. Applying current parking regulations would require an excess amount of parking, much more than a facility of this nature would need. This issue with parking regulations is one example of how the City of San Luis Obispo’s plans and policies are not designed to allow this form of development. Furthermore, the West Coast Olympic Village is very inconsistent with the SLO County Regional Airport Land Use Plan.

The proposed development violates regulations set forth by the ALUP on three major issues, high intensity land uses, non-residential density (potentially), and residential density. High intensity land uses that have the potential to attract dense concentrations of people, such as large sporting events, are not allowed by the ALUP. The density of persons per acre regulation is a potential issue as it would be violated if the residences are filled to capacity. However, this would generally only occur at night when the airport is least active and therefore could potentially be overlooked by the Airport Land Use Commission. The density of housing within the West Coast Olympic Village far exceeds the regulations set by the ALUP at 72 dwelling units per acre.

Correcting these inconsistencies would require significant changes to both the development program and the plans, requiring the adoption of new policies that would promote the development of an Olympic training facility. The current OASP has far fewer inconsistencies than the West Coast Olympic Village. Approving the OASP would be much easier, require less resources, and less time than the tested development.

The initial study found many environmental impacts dealing with the West Coast Olympic Village Plan that are both similar and different from the Orcutt Specific Plan. Both of these plans have significant issues dealing with noise, aesthetics, and culture resources. However, these plans differ greatly in impacts such as air quality and land use compatibility. The West Coast Olympic Village Plan uses more design practices that promote better air quality than the OASP but has major issues in land use compatibility especially in terms of the Airport Land Use Plan. The major problem in land use compatibility portion does not deter the environmental quality of the planning area but rather regulates the density within the sphere of influence of the Airport Land Use Plan. The OASP EIR identifies many more environmental impacts than are found in the West Coast Olympic Plan. Most of these impacts can be mitigated but would require a great deal of mitigation monitoring that would cost a significant amount of capital and more maintenance than the West Coast Olympic Village. Overall, the West Coast Olympic Village Plan is far more sustainable and more environmentally friendly than the Orcutt Specific Plan.
The construction alone of the West Coast Olympic Village would cost over 160 million dollars and this is only a first estimate. This number would likely increase due to architectural fees, permit fee, surveying and fees associated with mitigation measures needed to lessen the environmental impacts on the natural environment.

Not only is the total budget for this project hard to estimate, but this facility will struggle to gather enough funds to fully build this development. The United States Olympic funding is coordinated by the United States Olympic Committee (USOC).

Currently, the USOC doesn’t have enough funding for all of its current facilities and is completely shutting down the Lake Placid facility for the year (Sichko, 2010). As stated earlier the USOC receives no federal funding subsidies and relies mostly on sponsorships and private donations (Friedman, 2007). During times of recession the USOC has even harder time getting enough capital to run and maintain its facility. The USOC would have to look for other options such as federal funding subsides for funds to create this type of project.

The economic feasibility of the project alone makes this project almost impossible to approve due to the lack of funding available from the USOC and current budget of the City of San Luis Obispo. The City of San Luis Obispo and the USOC would have a hard time supporting this type of development without a huge economic return and likely never approve this project until additional funding was available. After reviewing this section it is highly unlikely this project would work at this current time due to the economic constraints of the West Coast Olympic Village Plan. Not only will the current OASP generate more revenue as a housing development, there is much more demand for housing than an athletic training facility.

The West Coast Olympic Village has major plan inconsistencies, funding issues, and does not produce a high amount of revenue. The current OASP has fewer inconsistencies, produces a higher amount of return on the investment, and there is a higher demand for housing than an Olympic training center. San Luis Obispo is not prepared to host an Olympic training facility of this caliber.

Final Recommendation: Not a feasible alternative to the current OASP
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1. Introduction

1.1 Background
West Coast Olympic Village is essential for the growth of San Luis Obispo to create unique tourist and recreation facility that will put San Luis Obispo as one of the premier designations on the Central Coast. Currently the area holds a few residential units and large amount natural open spaced used for grazing and recreational uses. This development will help create a new economic revenue source for the City of San Luis Obispo residents. The West Coast Olympic Village project will create a large amount of full time jobs for residents. San Luis Obispo currently lacks full time jobs and many citizens of San Luis Obispo must commute to work in this area. This project will require an initial study to determine if the city must decide if an environmental impact. An initial study will review the environmental issues for this site if the project is implemented and if there are any significant effects to building this project.

1.2 Purpose and Legal Authority:
California Environmental Quality Act purpose is to enhance and protect the environment. Olympic Village development has a creek running through the site, wetlands, and vegetation that must be protected. CEQA uses a variety of analysis such as water quality, soil, biological, safety, hazard, and other environmentally important factors to figure out how to maintain the environmental quality of the site. The analysis will turn into a final document that reports all the findings for these studies and measures that should be implemented if this site is built. An initial study will review the environmental issues for this site if the project is implemented and if there are any significant effects to building this project.

Note
Due to constraints of a class project we have not addressed all impact areas or prepared mitigation monitoring program.
INITIAL STUDY
ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project Title:
   West coast Olympic training facility

2. Lead Agency Name and Address:
   Seabeast Associates
   1034 Islay Street, San Luis Obispo, California 93401

3. Contact Person and Phone Number:
   Environmental Review: Drew Poulter
   Phone: (805) 448-9938
   Project Design: Kelly McGrane, Andrew Myers
   Phone: 661-246-6419

4. Project Location:
   The site is bounded on the north and east by Orcutt Road, on the south by Tank Farm Road and on the west by the Union Pacific Railroad.

Figure 1 Site Location (Environmental Impact Report for The Orcutt Area Specific Plan, 2009)
5. **Project Sponsor’s Name and Address:**
   1034 Islay Street, San Luis Obispo, California 93401

6. **General Plan Designation:**
   The properties in the West coast Olympic Training Facility Alternative Plan are in the County and are designated by the County’s General Plan Land Use Element as residential single family and Agricultural lands. The City’s General Plan designates the area as an annexation area and the City’s Land Use Element shows the Orcutt Area as residential neighborhood and open space.

7. **Zoning:**
   The Orcutt Plan Area, located southeast of the City of San Luis Obispo (City), is designated as an expansion area within the urban reserve line in the City’s General Plan. The General Plan requires that a Specific Plan for the entire Orcutt Area be adopted prior to annexation of any portion of the Plan Area. Therefore the project area is not currently zoned for any use and the area will be rezoned after this specific plan is approved.

8. **Description of the Project**
   West coast Olympic training facility will be a state of the art Olympic training facility with a diversity of purposes. Some of the amenities will be administrative offices, training center/gymnasium, one indoor and one outdoor training pool, track and field venue, six full-size sports fields, classrooms, medical services center, clubhouse and meeting rooms, velodrome, parking, tennis courts, residential housing, food market, and support facilities.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:**
   The major features of the Specific Plan include hillside and creek open space areas with bike and pedestrian paths, and a public park with a potential school site in the center of the Plan Area surrounded by residential neighborhoods. A modest community commercial retail and office zone is also proposed. The Orcutt Area Plan is designed to protect the natural resources of the site through generous reservations of open space including the upper slopes of Righetti Hill, wetlands, creeks, and riparian corridors.

10. **Project Entitlements Requested:**
    The City will need to obtain grading plan approval for CAO/City Council approval of plans and specifications for the work.

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

    - California Department of Fish and Game – Streambed Alteration Agreement
    - Caltrans encroachment permit
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – Form ENG4345
Calif. Regional Water Quality Control Board – 401 Water Quality Certification
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>X</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Geology/Soils</th>
<th>Public Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture Resources</td>
<td>Hazards &amp; Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Hydrology/Water Quality</td>
<td>X Transportation &amp; Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Land Use and Planning</td>
<td>Utilities and Service Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>X Noise</td>
<td>Mandatory Findings of Significance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FISH AND GAME FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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. The earlier initial study was circulated to the California Department of Fish and Game for review and comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

| I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. |  
|---|---|
| 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. |  
| I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required. | X |
| 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 |  
| 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. |  

June 9, 2010

Signature

Date

For: John Mandeville,
Community Development Director

Printed Name
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 Code of Regulations. 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources</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>ER # 43-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. AESTHETICS. Would the project:

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>1</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>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation

A, C) The major features of the site include hillsides and creek open space areas with bike and pedestrian paths, and a public park with a potential school site in the center of the Plan Area surrounded by residential neighborhoods. Most of the site has some slope and the slope increases as you get closer to Righetti Hill. The scenic views will be affected due to the change from rural to urban setting.
D) Light and glare from the project would create a potentially significant impact unless mitigation was incorporated.

Mitigation:

A, B) Mitigation Measure: There are no feasible mitigation measures that will make either of these impacts less than significant.

C) AES-1 Mitigation: The City shall require a lighting study to determine effects of development of outdoor
 athletic lighting.

AES-1 Mitigation: Stadium lighting will be designed and operated so that light visible to area residential an area is maintained at current existing levels or reduced. Athletic field lighting can only be used between the hours of 8 am to 10 pm. The lighting shall be sized, and hooded to minimize spillover beyond the athletic fields and glare to nearby residences. On-field lighting should be matched to the specific type of field requirements. Lighting should be directed more towards the vertical than the horizontal plane. Only fields furthest away from residential and existing uses shall be allowed to have lighting.

Monitoring Program: The City will require the development to install a timing device on the athletic fields lighting.

Conclusion:
The aesthetic will have possible significant issues due to the fact this is a large development and the current site is mostly a rural area. All mitigation will be done to prevent views from residential neighborhoods current around the area from being affected. Glare and lighting could be a potentially significant impact but mitigation should make those impacts less than significant. Multiple mitigation measures will be implemented to lower the effects of glare and lighting.

2. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES. Would the project:

| 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? | 2 | X |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract? | | X |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use? | 2 | X |

Evaluation

A, B, C) The project would not adversely affect agricultural land. The current grazing areas would not be significantly impacted by the West Coast Olympic Village. The land with no current uses is potential farmland but there are no plans to make this land into a useable agriculture area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Agriculture Use</th>
<th>Buffer Distance Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vineyard</td>
<td>400-800 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated Orchards</td>
<td>300-800 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigated Vegetables</td>
<td>200-500 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Crops</td>
<td>100-400 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Farm almonds</td>
<td>100-200 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources</td>
<td>Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangeland/pasture</td>
<td>50-200 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale nurseries</td>
<td>150-500 Feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: San Luis Obispo County Agriculture and Open Space Element Appendix D

![Figure 2: Farmland Map (Environmental Impact Report For The Orcutt Area Specific Plan, 2009)](image_url)

**Mitigation:**

C) **AR-1 Mitigation:** The development shall build around existing grazing areas and protect the existing agricultural uses. A 100 foot buffer area should be created to protect a conflict between the residential and agriculture uses.
Conclusion
With the required mitigation measures, the impacts related to agriculture will be less than significant.

3. AIR QUALITY. 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)</td>
<td>Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>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></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation
A,B,C,D) There will be insignificant emissions from construction equipment. Air quality could decrease in parts of the projects due to the increase in vehicle traffic. All Mitigation measures will be implemented to make any impact this development improve the current air quality of the surrounding and planning area.

Mitigation:

A,B,C,D,E)

AIQ Mitigation 1- To help lower emissions production by site design mitigation is to create continuous sidewalks separated from the roadway by landscaping and on-street parking. Adequate lighting for sidewalks must be provided, along with crosswalks at intersections. Easements or land dedications for bikeways and pedestrian walkways should be developed as well.

AIQ Mitigation 2- Lowering emission production can be done in residential neighborhoods by creating traffic calming modifications to project roads. For example, creating narrower streets, speed platforms, bulb-outs and intersection modifications designed to reduce vehicle speeds, which in turn would encourage pedestrian and bicycle travel.

AIQ Mitigation 3- To help lower emissions due to commercial development portion providing on-site bicycle parking. One bicycle parking space for every 10 car parking is an accepted standard.

Conclusion
4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

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?  

<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>

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?

<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>

c) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance (e.g. Heritage Trees)?

<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>

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migrant fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migrant wildlife corridors, or impede the use of wildlife nursery sites?

<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>

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?

<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>

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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation

Majority of the site is non-native annual grassland habitat with scattered eucalyptus, and other non-native species. Many of the riparian habitats and native species will not be affected from this project. The majority of the special status plants do not occur within the project site. However, there are a few species and plants in the area and mitigation to make these impacts less than significant.

D)

Mitigation:

BIR Mitigation 1 - To protect the plant species in the area it should be required to have a plant program, which would require planting 4 plants for every 1 rare/endangered plant removed.

Conclusion:

With required mitigation measures implemented, impacts related to the biology resources will be less than significant.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:
Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources

ER # 43-07

<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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic resource? (See CEQA Guidelines 15064.5)

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource? (See CEQA Guidelines 15064.5)

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Evaluation

Currently there are two sites that have not been surveyed for human remains and historical artifacts (See Figure 3). The West Coast Olympic Village Plan proposes development in both these areas. Mitigation measures will need to be followed to make this impact less than significant.

Source: USGS 7.5’ San Luis Obispo Quadrangle, 1965, photorevised 1979
Figure 3: Cultural Resources Survey Area

Mitigation:

D) CR-1 Mitigation: All areas that will be built will be surveyed before construction is built (See Figure 3).

CR-2 Mitigation: Protect cultural sensitive areas by posting signs and build fences were needed to discourage use by users.

Conclusion:
Surveying the area for human remains one of the possible significant impacts but with mitigation this will become less than significant. Protecting cultural sensitive areas will also make possible impacts less than significant. With required mitigation measures implemented, impacts related to the culture resources will be less than significant.

6. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentialy 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)</td>
<td>Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation
There will be no non renewable resources used for this project. The site also does not have any mineral resources and therefore the plan will have no impact to the energy and mineral resources in the area.

Mitigation:
No mitigation required.

Conclusion:
With required mitigation measures implemented, impacts related to the energy and mineral resources will be less than significant.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including risk of loss, injury or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Landslides or mudflows?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Issues</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
<td>No Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
Evaluation:

The potential for earthquakes and the amount of damages depends on how many vaults are in the area and the types of vaults. San Luis Obispo has a very complex geographical location and active seismically area. Surface ruptures mean the top of the ground moving along the fault lines. This happens usually when an earthquake occurs of a magnitude 5 or greater. This can highly affect the safety of those in the fault zone area.

![Fault Lines Near San Luis Obispo](image)

Figure 4: Fault Lines Near San Luis Obispo

a.c) Geographic Hazards: San Luis Obispo has one major fault line called Los Osos Fault line. This fault line is identified by the California Alquist-Priolo Fault Hazards Act(Figure 4). This is an active
fault line for the last 11,000 years. This fault has high to very high rupture hazard potential to the Los Osos Valley. There are three faults in the area known as West Huasna, Oceanic and Edna faults (Figure 4).

Fault Rapture: There are no active faults within the proposed project, therefore, no impact will be a result of this development. There are faults surrounding the area but not directly through.

Ground Shaking: This term means the vibration that happens due to displacement along a fault. According to the Figure 3, San Luis Obispo is in the 20 to 30 percent for peak ground acceleration. With this data it can be determine of the affect an earthquake would have on this area (Figure 4). A 20-30% PGA results in a Modified Mercalli Intensity of a VII out of X. This is a fairly high score for this scale. According to USGS the result of earthquake in the area means damage negligible in buildings of good design and construction; slight to moderate in well-built ordinary structures; considerable damage in poorly built or badly designed structures; some chimneys broken. Therefore, there are potentially significant impacts due to the ground shaking acceleration of the area of the proposed area of development.

Figure 5: PGA Map
Seismic Ground Failure: Liquefaction is the incident in where soil loses strength from to a increase build up of excess water pressure caused by seismic movement. According to the GIS map it becomes clear that the liquefaction of much of the site could become an issue. The green area in Figure 6 represents high potential of liquefaction but indicates landslide potential is low. This green area is the cropley clay soil. The yellow area is a variety of soil types and its liquefaction has low potential. However, it has a high probability rate of landslide. It’s odd that the high liquefaction areas don’t have high chance of landslide but the reason is these areas are relatively flat. Most of the high liquefaction areas have high shrink swell which means that the area soil is still unstable. Therefore, there will be significant impact on this project due to liquefaction. The landslide potential isn’t prominent throughout
the site, therefore, there will not be potentially significant impacts on the development.

**Mitigation:**
GES-1 Mitigation: Hire a geologist engineer to monitor the construction and development of the project.

**Conclusion:**
With the required mitigation measures implemented, impact to geology and soil will be less than significant.

### 8. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. 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)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation:**

f. **Airport:** San Luis Obispo currently has the San Luis Obispo County Airport. This airport has the services of commuter, charter and private services available to the public. The main hazard that deals with airports is the risk of planes crashing on takeoff or landing of the aircraft. The flight patterns for approaching and take off for this airport are in close proximity of agriculture and business uses. Farther away from the airplane patterns there are residential, commercial and school uses. The city of San Luis
Obispo is required to adopt Airport Land Use Plan. This plan describes zones for flight patterns, noise and safety exposure (Figure 7). Looking at the Airport Land Use Plan is project is partially within the project. The portion the project is largely in is called S-2, which is when aircrafts are between 500 to 1000 feet when flying over. The plan is within two miles of a public airport and around 1.2 miles away from the site. Therefore, there could be potentially significant impacts to the site due to location of the project within the Airport Land Use Plan.

**Figure 7: Airport Land Use Plan**
h. **Fire Hazard:** Fires can produce loss of life, property and environment. Fires can happen in urban and rural environments. The vegetation surrounding and in the San Luis Obispo area can fuel fires. Zoning regulations is used by the city to prevent and stop the spread of fires. There are also safety regulations such as automatic fire sprinklers and fire-resistant roof materials that go above and beyond minimum statewide requirements.
According to the fire hazard map (Figure 8) of San Luis Obispo County the site has moderate fire hazard potential. Therefore, there are no potentially significant impacts based on fire hazards for this development proposal.

Mitigation:
HHM-1 Mitigation: No development in the section of the Airport Land Use Plan Safety Area S-1C.

Conclusion:
With the required mitigation measures implemented, impact to hazards issues on site, the impacts will be less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impac</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? X

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 (e.g. The production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses for which permits have been granted)? X

c) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide additional sources of runoff into surface waters (including, but not limited to, wetlands, riparian areas, ponds, springs, creeks, streams, rivers, lakes, estuaries, tidal areas, bays, ocean, etc.)? X

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 offshore? X

e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area in a manner which would result in substantial flooding onsite or offshore? X

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? X

g) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? X

h) Will the project introduce typical storm water pollutants into ground or surface waters? X

i) Will the project alter ground water or surface water quality, temperature, dissolved oxygen, or turbidity? X

Evaluation:
The project is mostly made up of artificial fields and won’t require much irrigation. Typically these fields are washed and sprayed down with sanitizer to keep the fields clean.
Mitigation:
HYD-1 Mitigation: Create an irrigation plan/water management plan for runoff from sanitation spray used on artificial turf to protect existing wetland and natural habitats.

Conclusion:
With the required mitigation measures implemented, impact to hydrology issues on site, the impacts will be less than significant.

10. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<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)</td>
<td>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></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plans?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elevation:
a, b) The project would change land use, and zoning consistency is not an issue. That is because the current site is not apart of the City of San Luis Obispo. Once the City adopts the project it will expand the boundaries of the city’s limits to include this area. Than the City of San Luis Obispo will create a zoning and change the land use of this site to fit the projects description. The Airport Land Use Plan needs to adapt to this West Coast Olympic Village project. The channel changes will not adversely affect agricultural land or connections within or between neighborhoods.

c) Two adopted documents contain City policies on wetland modifications: the Conservation and Open Space Element of the General Plan (May 2006), and the Waterway Management Plan, Stream Management & Maintenance Program. The Conservation and Open Space Element has several general goals and policies for creek corridors, which do not raise issues for this project.

The project is intended to comply with the Federal Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, and California regulations concerning wetland alterations.

Mitigation
LUP-1 Mitigation: The Airport Land Use Plan must adopt new policies to allow for higher density residential within the plan’s area of influence.

LUP-2 Mitigation: The City of San Luis Obispo must expand to include this site within its city’s limits.

Conclusion:
With the required mitigation measures implemented, impact to Land Use and Planning issues on site, the impacts will be less than significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ER # 43-07</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There will be a minor, short-term increase in noise from construction equipment and related traffic.

**Evaluation:**
Currently surrounding areas have two main noise generators, Union pacific Train Tract and San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport. Broad Street connects to Highway 101 but is far enough away from the highway where noise is a non-factor in the area. The train tracks are too far away from the development site to be considered for excess noise factor.

a) The project is located near Union Pacific Train Track and in the vicinity of the train tracks. The project will have slight noise levels from Broad Street but won’t be heavy enough to make a significant impact (Figure 9).

e) The project is about 1.1 miles away from the San Luis Obispo County Regional Airport. The noise contours produced by the airport will be less than significant impact to the development. The figure below illustrates how much noise will impact the surrounding area heavily near the airport. As the figure shows that the development will not be in the area that will have excessive noise levels. There will be noise produced by the airport from the site but it will not significant to the development.
Figure 8: Noise Contours from Roads, Rails, and Highways

Figure 9: Airport Noise Contours

Mitigation:
No Mitigation Required.

**Conclusion:**
The impacts from noise have been determined to be less than significant.

### 12. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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)?</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) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development of this project will be within the General Plan’s population standard and will not induce substantial growth in the area. This growth from development will not exceed the growth standards found in the general plan. Therefore, there are no potential impacts based on population estimates for this development proposal. In addition, there is also no displaced housing due to the fact that the current site houses no residents.

The project does not involve development or removal of dwellings.

**Mitigation:**
No mitigation required.

**Conclusion:**
The impacts to population and housing have been determined to be less than significant.

### 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>a) Fire protection?</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) Police protection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Schools?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Parks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Roads and other transportation infrastructure?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Other public facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation:**

a) San Luis Obispo City has four fire stations in the area. The nearest fire stations are Fire Station 1 and the Airport Fire Station on Board Street. From the Orcutt DEIR: “According to the City of San Luis Obispo Fire Department, response times to urban development should be a maximum of four minutes, 90% of the time, and there should be a firefighter/population ratio of approximately one firefighter for
every 1,000 residents in the City.” (p. 4.10-3). Currently there are 45 available service fire fighters ready for emergencies. Currently the population is in the area of 44,000 and fits under the General Plans ratio guidelines of 1 firefighter to 1000 residents. The total new residential population will be 500 residents. This means that the city needs to add a total of ½ of a fire fighter, which is not significant impact.

Also, Nation Fire Protection Associate Code 1710 states “The fire department shall have the capability to deployed an initial full-alarm assignment within an 4 minute response time to 90 percent of the incidents as established in Chapter 4.” The Airport Fire Station is 1.2 miles away from the proposed site. The insurance Services Office, Inc. has a Response Time Considerations that helps calculate how fast an emergency vehicle can respond to a call. The equation is:

\[ T = 0.65 + 1.7D \]

Where
\[ T = \text{time in minutes to the nearest 1/10 of a minute} \]
\[ 0.65 = \text{vehicle acceleration constant for the first .5 mile traveled} \]
\[ 1.7 = \text{a vehicle-speed constant validated for response distances ranging form .5 miles to 8.} \]
\[ D = \text{Distant} \]

The total time it would take for a fire services to come to the development would be 2.38 minutes. The threshold of significant according to Professor Bosewell is a 4 minute response time. Therefore, the project will not impact the site significantly due to fire protection.

b) The current site holds a large amount of natural open space a few residential units. The 20 acre facility holds multiple use sport fields. These fields also hold special events. The site currently has inactive open space that cant be accessed.

The general plan has a Parks and Recreation section. In section PR 2.1.1: Park Land Ratio it states the city shall develop and maintain a park system at the rate of 10 acres of park land per 1,000 residents. In the General Plan it also states that in section PR 4.1.1: Access to Neighborhood Parks that the San Luis Obispo residents shall have access to a neighborhood park within .5 to 1.0 mile walking distance of their residence (Recreation, Open Space and Greenway Guidelines, Mertes and Hall, 1996). These are the two determining standards that were looked at the parks section of this development.

c) Mitigation:
No mitigation required.
Issues, Discussion and Supporting Information Sources

ER # 43-07

<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>
</table>

Conclusion:
No impacts would occur to the City’s public services.

14. RECREATION. Would the project:

a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? 

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>
</table>

Evaluation:
This project will add a significant amount of recreation facilities. This should not adversely affect the physical environment.

Mitigation:
REC-1 Mitigation: The development shall protect 60% of the current open space.

Conclusion:
With the required mitigation measures implemented, impact to recreation issues on site, the impacts will be less than significant.

15. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC. Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system?

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads and highways?

c) Substantially increase hazards due to design features (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?

d) Result in inadequate emergency access?

e) Result in inadequate parking capacity onsite or offsite?

f) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

g) Conflict with the with San Luis Obispo County Airport Land Use Plan resulting in substantial safety risks from hazards, noise, or a change in air traffic patterns?

<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>
</table>

There is high traffic throughout Orcutt and Tank Farm Road during peak hours near the site. Bullock Road currently has little vehicle traffic but this project plans to expand the site and therefore increase the traffic heavily. The site would require a new left and right hand turn lane into the main street of the West Coast Olympic Village (Johnson Parkway). Also, a new parking standard will need to be in place in order to change the parking requirements for recreation buildings and athletic fields. 1 spot/ 2850 sq. ft. of footprint would be the new recreation parking standard.
Mitigation:

TRA-1 Mitigation: A left and right turn lane on Orcutt Road to allow vehicles to access the West Coast Olympic Village.

TRA-2 Mitigation: The City shall change the parking requirement for recreation buildings and athletic fields to 1 spot per 2850 sq. ft.

Conclusion:
With the required mitigation measures implemented, impact to transportation/traffic issues on site, the impacts will be less than significant.

### 16. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</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>b) Require or result in the construction or expansion of new water treatment, waste water treatment, water quality control, or storm drainage facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new and expanded water resources needed?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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 in addition to the provider’s existing commitment?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project will not affect utility demand or amount of supplies.

Evaluation:

b,c) San Luis Obispo has adopted a multi-source water supply strategy and obtains water from three different sources: Salinas Reservoir Whale Rock Reservoir and ground water. The ground water only supplies less than 5 percent of the water. The city is looking for other ways to meet future demands by looking for new water sources.

City of San Luis Obispo determined that there is adequate water to serve a projected population of 56,000 people (table 4.12-2). Therefore there is adequate water to support the projected population growth from the West Coast Olympic Village development. Therefore, the project will require new water services but will not have a significant impact on the city’s resource limits.
Mitigation:
No mitigation is required.

Conclusion:
This project will increase the demand of water but the current water supplies and wastewater treatment facility will be able to handle the developments new utility needs. No mitigation will be needed.

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?

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)

Other, similar projects may be undertaken by the City, private landowners, or other organizations. At this time, none are proposed for simultaneous construction. Projects based on the same design principles and incorporating the same types of mitigation will not have cumulative, adverse impacts.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

The project will not adversely affect creek resources used by humans, nor the adjacent human community.

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 analysis 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 the earlier analysis.

c) Mitigation measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions of the project.

The applicable mitigation measures from Initial Study ER 91-97 related to silt removal activities are
reiterated in this initial study in the categories of Biological Resources and Hazards & Hazardous Materials.

19. SOURCE REFERENCES,

1. City of SLO General Plan Land Use Element
2. Environmental Impact Report for Orcutt Specific Plan
3. City of SLO General Plan Noise Element
4. City of SLO General Plan Water and Wastewater Element
5. California Geological Survey
6. City of SLO General Plan Conversation and Open Space Element.
7. City of SLO General Plan Safety Element
8.
9.
10.
11.
12.

Attachments:

Attachment 1: Project Site Plan