
City of Grover Beach Climate Action Plan

Draft Initial Study and Negative Declaration

Prepared for:

City of Grover Beach
154 South 8th Street
Grover Beach, CA 93433

Prepared with the assistance of:

Rincon Consultants, Inc.
1530 Monterey Street, Suite D
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

November 15, 2013

This page intentionally left blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction

Legal Authority.....	1
Impact Analysis and Significance Classification.....	2

Initial Study

Project Title.....	3
Lead Agency Name and Address.....	3
Contact Person and Phone Number	3
Project Location.....	3
Project Sponsor’s Name and Address.....	3
General Plan Designation	3
Zoning	3
Description of Project.....	3
Surrounding Land Uses and Setting	9
Other Public Agencies Whose Approval is Required.....	9
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected.....	10
Determination	10
Evaluation of Environmental Impacts	13
Aesthetics.....	13
Agriculture and Forest Resources.....	14
Air Quality	15
Biological Resources	20
Cultural Resources.....	26
Geology and Soils.....	28
Greenhouse Gas Emissions.....	30
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	31
Hydrology and Water Quality.....	32
Land Use and Planning.....	35
Mineral Resources	37
Noise	38
Population and Housing.....	39
Public Services.....	40
Recreation	41
Transportation/Traffic.....	41
Utilities and Service Systems.....	43
Mandatory Findings of Significance.....	44
References.....	45



This page intentionally left blank



INTRODUCTION

LEGAL AUTHORITY

This Initial Study/Negative Declaration (IS/ND) has been prepared in accordance with the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* and relevant provisions of CEQA of 1970, as amended.

Initial Study. Section 15063(c) of the *CEQA Guidelines* defines an Initial Study as the proper preliminary method of analyzing the potential environmental consequences of a project. The purposes of an Initial Study are:

- 1) To provide the Lead Agency with the necessary information to decide whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) or a Negative Declaration (ND);
- 2) To enable the Lead Agency to modify a project, mitigating adverse impacts, thus avoiding the need to prepare an EIR; and
- 3) To provide sufficient technical analysis of the environmental effects of a project to permit a judgment based on the record as a whole, that the environmental effects of a project have been adequately mitigated or require further in-depth study in an EIR.

Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration. Section 15070 of the *CEQA Guidelines* states that a public agency shall prepare a negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration for a project subject to CEQA when:

- 1) The initial study shows that there is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the project may have a significant effect on the environment; or
- 2) The Initial Study identifies potentially significant effects but:
 - a) Revisions in the project plans or proposals made by, or agreed to by the applicant before a proposed mitigated negative declaration and initial study are released for public review would avoid the effects or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur; and
 - b) There is no substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before the agency, that the project as revised may have a significant effect on the environment.

An IS/ND may be used to satisfy the requirements of CEQA when a proposed project would have no significant unmitigable effects on the environment. As discussed further in subsequent sections of this document, implementation of the proposed project would not result in any significant effects on the environment that cannot be reduced to below a level of significance.



IMPACT ANALYSIS AND SIGNIFICANCE CLASSIFICATION

The following sections of this IS/ND provide discussions of the possible environmental effects of adoption and implementation of the proposed project for specific issue areas that have been identified in the CEQA Initial Study Checklist. For each issue area, potential effects are evaluated.

A “significant effect” is defined by Section 15382 of the *CEQA Guidelines* as “a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by a project, including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historic or aesthetic significance.” According to the *CEQA Guidelines*, “an economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment, but may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.”



INITIAL STUDY – NEGATIVE DECLARATION

1. PROJECT TITLE:

City of Grover Beach Climate Action Plan (CAP)

2. LEAD AGENCY NAME AND ADDRESS:

City of Grover Beach
154 South 8th Street
Grover Beach, CA 93433

3. CONTACT PERSON AND PHONE NUMBER:

Bruce Buckingham, Community Development Director
(805) 473-4520

4. PROJECT LOCATION: City of Grover Beach (city-wide)

5. PROJECT SPONSOR’S NAME AND ADDRESS:

City of Grover Beach
154 South 8th Street
Grover Beach, CA 93433

6. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:

The plan would be implemented throughout the City and would occur in all General Plan designations.

7. ZONING:

The plan would be implemented throughout the City in all zones.

8. DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT:

The CAP is a policy document that sets forth policies and programs (collectively referred to as “CAP measures” or “climate action measures”) and implementation actions to help the City of Grover Beach reduce its greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and prepare for the anticipated effects of climate change. CEQA requires the analysis of physical impacts on the environment. As such, the impact analysis focuses on adoption of the CAP and implementation of the climate action measures and actions and whether they would result in physical environmental impacts. It should be noted that the CAP does not propose any land use or zoning changes, nor does it



include any site-specific development. Further, any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

Project Background

The State of California considers GHG emissions and the impacts of global warming to be a serious threat to the public health, environment, economic well-being, and natural resources of California, and has taken an aggressive stance to mitigate the state's impact on climate change through the adoption of policies and legislation. In 2005, the Governor issued Executive Order S-3-05, which identifies statewide GHG emission reduction goals to achieve long-term climate stabilization as follows: reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and to 80 percent below 1990 levels by 2050.¹ Assembly Bill (AB) 32, also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, subsequently codified the 2020 target, requiring California to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. AB 32 also directed the California Air Resources Board to develop a plan to identify how the 2020 target would be met. That plan, called the Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan) was approved in 2008 and contains the main strategies California will implement to achieve the target. The Scoping Plan identifies local governments as “essential partners” in achieving the goals of AB 32 since local governments have primary authority to plan, zone, approve, and permit how land is developed and used in their jurisdictions. The Scoping Plan encourages local governments to adopt a reduction target that parallels the State commitment to reduce GHG emissions by approximately 15 percent to achieve 1990 emissions levels by 2020.

Project Description

The CAP is a programmatic, long-range planning document to reduce GHG emissions from community-wide activities and City government operations within Grover Beach to support the State's efforts under AB 32 and to mitigate Grover Beach's climate-related impacts. Specifically, the CAP does the following:

- Summarizes the results of the City's GHG Emissions Inventory Update, which identifies the major sources and quantities of GHG emissions produced within Grover Beach and forecasts how these emissions may change over time.
- Identifies the quantity of GHG emissions that Grover Beach will need to reduce to meet its target of 15 percent below 2005 levels by the year 2020, consistent with AB 32.
- Sets forth City government and community-wide GHG reduction measures, including performance standards which, if implemented, would collectively achieve the specified emission reduction target.
- Identifies proactive adaptation strategies that can be implemented to help Grover Beach prepare for anticipated climate change impacts.
- Sets forth procedures to implement, monitor, and verify the effectiveness of the climate action measures and adapt efforts moving forward.

¹ Executive orders are binding only on State agencies. Accordingly, Executive Order S-03-05 will guide State agencies' efforts to control and regulate GHG emissions, but have no direct binding effect on local government or private actions.



The CAP utilizes 2005 as the baseline year and 2020 as the target year for achieving reductions. The 2020 target year corresponds with the target year identified in AB 32.

GHG Emissions Inventory and Forecasts

According to the GHG Emissions Inventory, the Grover Beach community-as-a-whole emitted approximately 48,169 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent GHG emissions (MT CO₂e) in 2005, as a result of activities that took place within the transportation, residential energy use, commercial and industrial energy use, off-road, and solid waste sectors. The largest contributors of GHG emissions were the transportation (39 percent), residential energy use (33 percent) sectors and commercial/industrial energy use (13 percent). The remainder of emissions resulted from the off-road equipment (10 percent) and solid waste (5 percent).

The inventory also analyzed GHG emissions from City government operations and facilities. The City government operations inventory is a subset of, and included within, the community inventory. In 2005, City government operations generated approximately 1,344 MT CO₂e. This quantity represents approximately three percent of the Grover Beach community's total GHG emissions.

Under the business-as-usual scenario (a projection of how emissions will change in the future based on 2005 emissions levels and projected growth in population, jobs, and vehicle miles traveled), Grover Beach's community-wide GHG emissions are projected to grow approximately 20 percent above 2005 GHG emissions levels by the year 2020 (from 48,169 MT CO₂e to 57,794 MT CO₂e).

The AB 32 Scoping Plan identifies several State measures that are approved, programmed, and/or adopted and would reduce GHG emissions within Grover Beach. These State measures require no additional local action. In addition to the State measures, the City of Grover Beach has implemented a number of local measures since the 2005 baseline inventory year that will reduce the community's GHG emissions with no further action. Therefore, these measures were incorporated into the forecast and reduction assessment to create an "adjusted forecast scenario," which provides a more accurate picture of future emissions growth and the responsibility of the City.

Under the adjusted scenario, GHG emissions are projected to decrease approximately 19 percent below the business-as-usual scenario to 46,659 MT CO₂e in 2020. Table 1 below summarizes the reduction in local GHG emissions that would result from State and local measures compared to the business-as-usual forecast and the adjusted forecast.



Table 1: Summary of State Reductions and Adjusted Forecast

	2020 Reduction (MT CO₂e)
Business-as-Usual Forecast	57,794
Reduction from State Regulations	-10,641
Reduction from Local Measures	-494
Adjusted Forecast	46,659

Target

The City of Grover Beach is committed to reducing its GHG emissions by 15 percent below 2005 levels by 2020, consistent with AB 32. Based on this target, Grover Beach’s 2020 targeted GHG emissions would be 40,944 MT CO₂e. To meet this target, Grover Beach will need to reduce its GHG emissions 12 percent (or 5,715 MT CO₂e) below the adjusted forecast by 2020 through implementation of local climate action measures and implementation actions.

Climate Action Measures

To achieve the GHG emissions reduction target of 15 percent below 2005 levels by 2020 and prepare for the anticipated effects of climate change, the CAP identifies a comprehensive set of climate action measures. These CAP measures are organized into the following focus areas, or categories: City Government Operations, Energy, Transportation and Land Use, Off-Road, Solid Waste, and Tree Planting. The climate action measures were selected based on careful consideration of the emission reductions needed to achieve the target, the distribution of emissions in the GHG emissions inventory, existing priorities and resources, and the potential costs and benefits of each climate action measure.

Collectively, the climate action measures identified in the CAP have the potential to reduce GHG emissions within Grover Beach by 5,716 MT CO₂e by 2020 and meet the proposed GHG emission reduction target. Table 2 below shows a list of climate action measures and their associated GHG emissions reductions, where applicable.



Table 2: Summary of GHG Reductions by Measure

CAP Measure Number	CAP Measure	2020 GHG Reduction (MT CO₂e)
City Government Operations		
C-1	Zero and Low Emission City Fleet Vehicles	3
<i>City Government Subtotal</i>		3
Energy		
E-1	Energy Efficiency Outreach and Incentive Programs	134
E-2	Energy Audit and Retrofit Program	248
E-3	Income-Qualified Energy Efficient Weatherization Programs	63
E-4	Small Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Incentive Program	234
E-5	Income-Qualified Solar PV Program	37
<i>Energy Subtotal</i>		716
Transportation and Land Use		
TL-1	Bicycle Network	211
TL-2	Pedestrian Network	99
TL-3	Expand Transit Network	17
TL-4	Increase Transit Service Frequency/Speed	10
TL-5	Transportation Demand Management Incentives	7
TL-6	Parking Supply Management	56
TL-7	Electric Vehicle Network and Alternative Fueling Stations	364
TL-8	Smart Growth	1,790
<i>Transportation and Land Use Subtotal</i>		2,554
Off-Road		
O-1	Construction Equipment Techniques	1,755
O-2	Equipment Upgrades, Retrofits, and Replacements	49
<i>Off-Road Subtotal</i>		1,804
Solid Waste		
S-1	Solid Waste Diversion Rate	638
<i>Solid Waste Subtotal</i>		638
Adaptation		
A-1	Climate Change Vulnerability	NA
A-2	Public Health and Emergency Preparedness	NA
A-3	Water Management	NA
A-4	Infrastructure	NA
A-5	Coastal Resource Protection	NA
<i>Adaptation Subtotal</i>		NA
TOTAL		5,715



Project-Level CAP Consistency Worksheet

The CAP includes a CAP consistency worksheet in Appendix C to assist project applicants and City staff in determining whether a proposed future development project is consistent with the CAP. If it is determined that a proposed project is not consistent with the CAP, further analysis would be required and the applicant would be required to demonstrate that the proposed project's GHG emissions fall below the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District's (APCD) adopted GHG significance thresholds (see Chapter 1 of the CAP). The project would also be required to demonstrate that it would not substantially interfere with implementation of the CAP.

Implementation and Monitoring

Implementation and monitoring are essential processes to ensure that Grover Beach reduces its GHG emissions and meets its target. To facilitate this, each climate action measure is identified along with implementation actions, parties responsible for implementation and monitoring, cost and savings estimates, the GHG reduction potential (as applicable), performance indicators to monitor progress, and an implementation time frame (see Chapter 4, Implementation and Monitoring, of the CAP). Climate action measure implementation is separated into three phases: near-term (by 2015), mid-term (2016-2017), and long-term (2018-2020).

In order to ensure that the CAP measures and actions are implemented and their progress is monitored, the CAP includes several implementation and monitoring policies which direct the City to establish a CAP Implementation Team and conduct periodic measure evaluation and GHG inventory and CAP updates. Pursuant to these measures, the City will establish a CAP Coordinator who will provide essential CAP oversight and coordination of a multi-departmental CAP Implementation Team comprised of key staff in each selected department. The CAP Implementation Team will meet at least one time per year to assess the status of CAP efforts. The City's CAP Coordinator will be responsible for developing an annual progress report to the City Council that will: identify the implementation status of each climate action measure and action; evaluate achievement of, or progress toward performance criteria/indicators (located in Chapter 5, Table 5-1 Implementation Matrix, of the CAP); assess the effectiveness of the climate action measures included in the CAP; report on the State's implementation of state-level measures included in Chapter 2 of the CAP; and recommend adjustments to climate action measures or implementation actions, as needed. An implementation and monitoring tool will facilitate this process. To evaluate the performance of the CAP as a whole, the City will re-inventory community-wide and municipal GHG emissions every five years and compare them to the 2005 baseline GHG emissions inventory. If an update reveals that the plan is not making progress toward meeting the GHG reduction target, the City will adjust the measures as necessary.

9. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:

The project relates to the entire City of Grover Beach, located approximately 15 miles south of the City of San Luis Obispo located in San Luis Obispo County. The City is bounded by the City of Pismo Beach, the City of Arroyo Grande, the unincorporated community of Oceano, and the Pacific Ocean. The City is generally surrounded by residential development to the north,



south, and east. The western boundary abuts Pismo State Beach. As the City is surrounded by developed areas and the ocean, redevelopment and infill are the primary types of development in Grover Beach. Grover Beach is located on California State Highway 101, 245 miles south of the City of San Francisco and 175 miles north of the City of Los Angeles.

The City is located on the coastal plain and the topography of the City is relatively flat with a few hillside areas in the northern portion of the City. A section of the City is located in the Coastal Zone. Meadow Creek is the primary perennial natural water body in the City of Grover Beach. It runs along the City's northern boundary with the Cities of Pismo Beach and Arroyo Grande and the Highway 101 right-of-way and extends around the western edge of the city adjacent to the coastal dunes and into the community of Oceano.

The predominant land use in the City is residential with commercial uses located primary along the West Grand Avenue corridor. The City's primary industrial area is located south of Farroll Road, east of South 4th Street.

10. OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (e.g., PERMITS, FINANCING APPROVAL OR PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT):

None.



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 on the following pages:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geology / Soils | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation / Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

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 by or 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.
- I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact, 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 (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or **NEGATIVE DECLARATION**, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

November 15, 2013
Date

Bruce Buckingham, Community Development Director
Printed Name



INITIAL STUDY ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS -- <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

The City is located primarily on the coastal plain and the topography of the City is relatively flat with a few hillside areas in the northern portion of the City. The City’s western edge along the Pacific Ocean consists of beach, coastal dunes and riparian habitat within Pismo State Beach. The oak wooded hillsides and Meadow Creek along the City’s northern edge are within Open Space zones and sensitive habitat areas are protected. The City’s Scenic Routes Element contains policies to improve and protect aesthetic resources on several of the City’s arterial and secondary streets (General Plan Scenic Routes Element, 1981). The Local Coastal Plan also contains policies regarding the protection of scenic resources within the Coastal Zone (Local Coastal Program 2012). Highway 101 along the northern City limits is an eligible State Scenic Highway (California Department of Transportation, 2013).

Discussion

a,c) The CAP is a policy document that does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would potentially degrade the aesthetic quality of the environment. As a policy document, the CAP would not directly affect scenic vistas or the visual character or quality of the area. Implementation of the climate action measures and actions would generally be associated with activities, such as encouraging energy efficiency and conservation and the use of small-scale on-site solar energy systems; incentivizing



smart growth (infill, mixed-use, and higher density development near transit stops) consistent with the General Plan; encouraging walking, bicycling, ride-sharing, and use of existing public transit; facilitating the use of low- and zero-emissions vehicles; and increasing solid waste diversion. It is not anticipated that implementation of the CAP measures and actions would result in substantial effects on a scenic vista or substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the area because the climate action measures and actions would not significantly affect the height, bulk, or scale of development resulting in large structures that could block or highly modify the visual environment.

The CAP includes climate action measures to improve and expand the City's bicycle, pedestrian, and transit networks. Implementation of these measures could result in installation of minor structures, including bicycle racks, benches, covered transit stops, and other alternative transportation related facilities. However, it is not anticipated that these structures would result in substantial effects to visual resources because structures would be small in nature and would not significantly affect the height, bulk, or scale of development or block or highly modify the visual environment. As a policy-document, the CAP does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals for related structures. Alternative transportation structures would be located in and near existing urbanized areas, consistent with the General Plan and Bicycle Master Plan. Further, any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to City policies and regulations related to the protection of visual resources, as well as additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

The CAP also includes a measure to encourage smart growth (i.e., infill, mixed-use, and/or high-density) development within the community, in accordance with the existing General Plan. Smart growth incentivized by the CAP would be located in and near existing urbanized areas, consistent with the General Plan. Implementation of this measure could result in increased density in these areas; however, impacts associated with this type of development were analyzed during environmental review of the General Plan. Furthermore, the CAP does not recommend specific densities, building heights massing or design of any projects, and precise project-level analysis would be speculative at this time. Any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to City policies and regulations related to the protection of visual resources, as well as environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

The CAP includes climate action measures to pursue small-scale on-site solar photovoltaic systems and to encourage their installation throughout the community. In 2011, the California Legislature signed Senate Bill 226 and created a statutory exemption (CEQA exemption 21080.35) for solar photovoltaic systems installed on rooftops or existing parking lots (and meeting specified conditions, such as not exceeding 10 kilowatts in size). These solar installations that are exempt from CEQA are the type of solar energy projects anticipated to result from implementation of the CAP measures. Large-scale substantial solar energy facilities, such as solar farms or large solar panel installations that could have visual impacts are not the types of solar installations that would be incentivized through the measure. Implementation actions for this measure were designed consistent with the *California Solar Permitting Guidebook* (Governor's Office of Planning and Research, 2012) which facilitates streamlined permitting for solar systems under 10 kilowatt in size. According to the Guidebook, "This 10-kilowatt threshold captures approximately 90 percent of the



solar photovoltaic systems that are currently installed. Above this size threshold, a system’s design considerations become more complex.” Further, any future proposed solar systems that exceed 10 kW in size or do not meet the requirements of CEQA exemption 21080.35 would be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

The CAP also includes climate action measures to pursue energy efficiency and conservation of buildings and facilities and to encourage energy efficiency improvements in new and existing buildings throughout the City. However, making buildings more energy efficient does not inherently involve any design features that would adversely affect the aesthetic quality of the environment.

Because CAP measures and actions would not generally be of a nature or scale to substantially affect a scenic vista or the existing visual character or quality of the area, and any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to further development review, impacts would be less than significant.

b) The Draft CAP is a policy document that does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would potentially damage scenic resources including but not limited to, trees, and rock outcroppings, along the section of Highway 101 that is an eligible state scenic highway. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) Implementation of the CAP would not result in the development of new significant sources light or glare. Distributed installation of small-scale solar photovoltaic systems is encouraged to reduce community-wide GHG emissions within the community; however, solar photovoltaic panels are specifically designed to absorb, not reflect, sunlight.

The CAP includes several climate action measures where implementation may include replacing public street and parking lot lighting with energy efficient lighting; however, this would not create new sources of light and glare. Furthermore, energy efficient lighting such as light-emitting diodes (LEDs) are directional light sources, which emit light in a specific direction, unlike incandescent and compact fluorescent bulbs which emit light in all directions (Energy Star, 2013). For this reason, LED lighting is able to provide a higher quality light that can be directed more precisely to control for glare and light pollution. Impacts would be less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES -- *In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California*



Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and Forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion or forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Environmental Setting

Although the city of Grover Beach has a mild coastal climate and suitable soils for agricultural production, there is only one parcel within the City in agricultural use. The site is located south of Highland consists of approximate 30 acres and is designated as Farmland of Statewide Importance by the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (California Department of Conservation, 2010).

Discussion

a-e) The CAP is a policy-level document that does not propose any land use or zoning changes, nor does it include any site-specific development. As such, implementation of the CAP would not have the potential to substantially degrade agricultural resources or convert agricultural or forest land to non-agricultural or non-forest uses, nor would it conflict with existing zoning. No impacts to agricultural resources would occur.



	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

III. AIR QUALITY -- *Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:*

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) 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 quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

Grover Beach is located within the San Luis Obispo County portion of the South Central Coast Air Basin (Basin), which is under the jurisdiction of the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (APCD). The APCD is required to monitor air pollutant levels to ensure that air quality standards are met and, if they are not met, to develop strategies to meet the standards. Depending on whether the standards are met or exceeded, the local air basin is classified as being in “attainment” or “non-attainment.” Eastern San Luis Obispo County is a non-attainment area for the federal standard for ozone and the entire County is a non-attainment area for state standards for ozone and PM₁₀. The County is in attainment for the state standards for nitrogen dioxide and carbon monoxide and is unclassified for the associated federal standards (SLOAPCD, 2013).

Under state law, once San Luis Obispo County has been designated and classified as a non-attainment status, the APCD is required to prepare a plan for air quality improvement for pollutants for which the District is in non-attainment. The APCD is responsible for developing



and implementing the Clean Air Plan for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality standards in San Luis Obispo County. The region’s existing Clean Air Plan, the San Luis Obispo County Clean Air Plan was adopted in 2001, and outlines strategies to reduce ozone precursor emissions from a wide variety of stationary and mobile sources.

Discussion

a-d) The CAP itself does not create physical growth and will not impact air quality beyond what is anticipated in the existing General Plan. Projects that are consistent with the General Plan are also consistent with the Clean Air Plan, as the regional air quality impacts associated with the implementation of the General Plan were evaluated during development of the Clean Air Plan. Therefore, the CAP is consistent with the Clean Air Plan and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the plan. Furthermore, the purpose and intended effect of the CAP is to reduce GHG emissions within the City to help reduce the effects of climate change, which has the secondary benefit of also reducing criteria pollutant emissions.

CAP measures and implementation actions identified in the CAP aim to increase energy efficiency, reduce vehicle miles traveled, promote travel via low- and zero- emissions modes (i.e., walking, bicycling, transit, electric vehicles, and other alternatively fueled vehicles), reduce gasoline and diesel fuel use, increase renewable energy use, and improve waste management efficiency. Implementation of these CAP measures and actions would aid in reducing overall GHG emissions, as well as criteria pollutant emissions, help meet applicable air quality plan goals, and reduce sensitive receptor exposure to pollutant concentrations. Impacts related to air quality would be less than significant.

e) The CAP does not contain any climate action measures that would directly result in the creation of objectionable odors. The CAP would not facilitate any specific development projects that would create odors. No impact would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- *Would the project:*

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly 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?

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural



- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Environmental Setting

Land use within the city limits consists almost entirely of residential and commercial/industrial areas. However, there are several Open Space zones that provide suitable habitat for special-status species. Plant communities and habitat types observed include: willow riparian woodland, riparian scrub, coastal dunes, coast live oak woodland, freshwater/brackish marsh, coastal scrub, dune scrub, non-native (ruderal) grassland, seasonal wetlands, tree groves/windrows, and open water habitat. Based on a query of the CNDDDB (2009) and the CNPS Electronic Inventory of Rare and Endangered Plants (2009), a total of 38 sensitive plant species and 19 individual sensitive wildlife species were identified as occurring within the region (General Plan Land Use Element Master EIR, 2010) and therefore have the potential to occur in the City. The vast majority of these areas are within Open Space zones that are protected from future development.

Discussion

a-d) The CAP is a policy-level document that does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would result in biological resource impacts. Infill development and smart growth incentivized by the CAP, and



alternative transportation facilities would be located in and near existing urbanized areas, consistent with the General Plan and Bicycle Master Plan. Further, any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA. Implementation of the CAP would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or indirectly through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, special status species or wildlife movement. In addition, the CAP would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community. Impacts would be less than significant.

e) The City’s General Plan Land Use Element contains goals and policies to protect and enhance important natural/biological resources within Grover Beach, and to ensure that new development complies with the adopted policies. The CAP does not permit any specific development nor would it add or enable any new development that would conflict with these local goals, policies, and ordinances protecting biological resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

f) The CAP would not facilitate any specific development projects nor would it add or enable any new development that would conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

Grover Beach is located in an area of the California coast that once supported significant populations of the Chumash, a Native American group. Numerous Chumash cultural sites in Grover Beach have been recorded by the San Luis Obispo County Archaeological Society (General Plan Land Use Element Master EIR, 2010). The locations of archaeological sites are confidential



per requirements of the State Historic Preservation Officer and the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS). These sites are all in areas of present-day residential land use. The City is aware of the sensitive cultural resources areas and the Land Use Element contains policies to protect these resources. The City also has standard implementation measures to stop any construction should cultural resources be unearthed until appropriate safeguards are taken to protect the resources.

Discussion

a-d) The Grover Beach CAP is a policy-level document that does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical, cultural, or archaeological resource. Further, any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to additional environmental review wherein any site-specific cultural resource impacts would be addressed. Impacts would be less than significant.

Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant w/ Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- *Would the project:*

- a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:
 - i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on 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? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.
 - ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?
 - iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?
 - iv) Landslides?
- 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 landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

e) 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?

f) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

Environmental Setting

The City is located in the Santa Maria Basin-San Luis Range (SMB-SLR) seismotectonic domain. The SMB-SLR is one of four distinct seismotectonic domains within San Luis Obispo County, as defined by rock type and the nature of faulting and folding. This domain’s surface geology consists of Quaternary and Holocene sediments of alluvium and dune deposits underlain by Jurassic Age Franciscan basement. The coastal topography of Grover Beach is predominantly flat to gently rolling.

San Luis Obispo County is located within the Southern Coast Ranges Province, one of the most complex geologic provinces in the State of California. It is characterized by a number of subparallel structural blocks bounded by several on- and off-shore faults. Earthquake-related hazards have the potential to result in public safety risks and property damage in Grover Beach. Several secondary seismic hazards are associated with strong seismic shaking, especially in areas characterized by a relatively shallow ground water table, and underlain by loose, cohesion-less soil deposits. These secondary seismic hazards include fault rupture, liquefaction, and ground shaking.

The Safety Element of the General Plan contains policies and implementation measures with respect to geologic and seismic hazards, with the objective of minimizing the potential for loss of life and property (General Plan Safety Element, 2000). The policies address hazards associated with seismicity, fault rupture, groundshaking, liquefaction and seismic settlement, slope instability, landslides, and coastal bluff erosion.

Discussion

a-e) The CAP is a policy-level document that does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would directly impact or be impacted by geology and soils. The CAP does not propose any site specific development that would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, or landslides. Further, any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to additional environmental review wherein any site-specific impacts related to geology and soils would be addressed. Impacts would be less than significant.



	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS –

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Environmental Setting

In March 2012, the APCD adopted GHG thresholds in order to help lead agencies assess the significance of GHG impacts of new projects subject to CEQA. The APCD’s CEQA guidance identifies three different types of GHG thresholds designed to accommodate various development types and patterns:

- 1) Qualitative Reduction Strategies (e.g., Climate Action Plans): a qualitative threshold that is consistent with AB 32 Scoping Plan measures and goals;
- 2) Bright-Line Threshold: numerical value to determine the significance of a project’s annual GHG emissions;
- 3) Efficiency-Based Threshold: assesses the GHG efficiency of a project on a per capita basis.

The APCD recommends that lead agencies within the county use the adopted GHG thresholds of significance when considering the significance of GHG impacts of new projects subject to CEQA. Further, projects with GHG emissions that exceed the thresholds will need to implement mitigation to reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

As identified in the APCD’s *CEQA Handbook (April 2012)*, if a project is consistent with an adopted Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy (i.e., a CAP) that addresses the project’s GHG emissions, it can be presumed that the project will not have significant GHG emission impacts and the project would be considered less than significant. This approach is consistent with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(h)11 and 15183.5(b). The City’s CAP was developed to be consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5 and APCD’s CEQA Handbook to mitigate emissions and climate change impacts and will therefore serve as a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy for the City of Grover Beach.

Discussion

- a) The CAP creates a comprehensive GHG emissions reduction strategy (consistent with Section 15183.5 of the CEQA Guidelines and the APCD CEQA Handbook) for the City of Grover Beach. The CAP contains a series of climate action measures and actions to reduce cumulative GHG



emissions by a minimum of 15 percent below 2005 levels by 2020. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) The CAP includes climate action measures and actions to reduce the City’s GHG emissions by at least 15 percent below 2005 levels by 2020 in accordance with AB 32 (see Table 2 of this Initial Study). As stated in the project description, the purpose of the CAP is to reduce Grover Beach’s proportionate share of the statewide target set by AB 32. The CAP would not conflict with any applicable GHG reduction plan. Furthermore, the CAP is consistent with the APCD’s CEQA Handbook and meets all of the criteria specified therein as it pertains to a Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would *the project*:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonable foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or | | | | |



- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g) Impair implementation of or physically Interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Environmental Setting

The City has no history of hazardous waste disposal or toxic sites. However, there are commercial/industrial uses where the transport, storage and handling of hazardous wastes could occur. The City could also be exposed to other hazards as a result of the Union Pacific Railroad running through the City, the nearby Oceano Airport, or wildland fires.

Discussion

a-f, h) The CAP does not involve any site-specific development nor would it directly facilitate new development. Implementation of the proposed CAP measures would not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and would not create reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, no adverse impacts with regard to hazards to the public or environment, hazardous materials with ¼ mile of a school, development on a hazardous material site, or development near an airport or airstrip would occur. Further, the CAP would not expose people or structures to wildland fires. Impacts would be less than significant.

g) The CAP includes climate action measures to promote bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities, and would not impair implementation of an adopted emergency response plan. Furthermore, one of the adaptation measures supports emergency preparedness in response to anticipated effects of climate change by disseminating public preparedness and emergency response information, conducting training exercises, and identifying and focusing planning and outreach programs on particularly vulnerable populations. Impacts would be less than significant.



	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY .

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on-or off-site (e.g. downstream)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner, which would result in flooding on-or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



which would impede or redirect flood flows?

- i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

- j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Environmental Setting

The city’s groundwater is supplied from the 184,000-acre Santa Maria River Valley Groundwater Basin. This groundwater supply is shared with other South San Luis Obispo County communities under the terms of the “Arroyo Grande – Tri-Cities Mesa Groundwater Basin Gentlemen’s Agreement.” Groundwater is extracted from five wells, four of which are shallow wells that draw from the Paso Robles Formation. The fifth is a deep well that draws from the Careaga Formation. The City currently obtains approximately 1,198 afy from these five wells under the Gentlemen’s Agreement. The City is entitled to an additional 209 afy for agricultural land conversion water credits, bringing the City’s total groundwater extraction allowance to 1,407 afy. According to the 2010 Grover Beach *Urban Water Management Plan*, the City’s groundwater supply is projected to be sufficient to serve the City until 2030.

Surface water supply for Grover Beach comes from the Lopez Reservoir, constructed and operated by Zone 3 of the San Luis Obispo County Flood Control and Water Conservation District. The reservoir is considered 98 percent reliable, operating at a safe yield of 8,730 afy. Currently, Grover Beach and other contracting agencies have entitlements that total 4,530 afy. Of this 4,530 acre-feet of water, Grover Beach has entitlements for 800 afy. The difference between the availability and total usage of Lopez Reservoir water is intended to provide a sustainable supply and buffer during drought years.

The City has two areas with a potential of “100-year flooding,” or areas with a flood elevation that has a one percent chance of being exceeded each year. These flood zones, located by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for inclusion in its Flood Insurance Rate Map program, are located in the northern and western portions of the city adjacent to Meadow Creek.

In general, coastal Grover Beach is protected from tsunami hazards by the area’s wide beaches and coastal dunes. Those areas of Grover Beach located below 100-year flood zones at elevations lower than 24 feet below mean sea level, are affected by increased tsunami hazard potential. These include those portions of the community along the mouth of Meadow Creek. Several small tsunami events have been recorded in San Luis Obispo County, none of which have caused major damage in Grover Beach. According to the San Luis Obispo County *Local Hazard Mitigation Plan*, studies have established that the maximum wave “run-up,” or elevation reach, is approximately 9.5 feet above sea level in Grover Beach.

The Lopez Dam and associated Lopez Reservoir are positioned approximately eight miles from Grover Beach, northeast of the city of Arroyo Grande. The dam is owned and operated by San Luis Obispo County Flood Control. Lopez Reservoir has an approximate capacity of 51,000 acre-feet of



water. In the event of a complete failure of the dam, water from the reservoir would flow down-slope toward the ocean, in a westerly direction following Arroyo Grande Creek. The flow of water would likely spread outward approximately 3,000 feet in each direction of the centerline of the creek channel. This water flow would pass through Grover Beach before reaching the Pacific Ocean.

Discussion

a) Implementation of the CAP measures would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. No impact would result.

b-f) The CAP is a policy document that does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development. As a result, no adverse impacts related to groundwater or surface water quality, groundwater resources, runoff, or sensitive areas would occur. Further, one of the climate adaptation measures identifies a strategy to seek funding to enhance flood control and improve water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.

g-i) The CAP is a policy-level document that does not propose any land use or zoning changes, nor does it include any site-specific development. As such, implementation of the CAP would neither directly or indirectly expose people or structures to potential flood hazards or impede or redirect flood flows. Further, one of the climate adaptation measures calls on the City to prepare for anticipated climate change effects on water and limit community exposure to threats such as flooding, which may have a beneficial effect. Impacts would be less than significant.

j) The CAP is a policy-level document that does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would expose people and structures to inundation by seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows. Further, one of the climate adaptation measures calls on the City to collaborate with California State Parks for anticipated climate change effects on vulnerable coastal resources by monitoring and studying beach profiles and resource vulnerability, and implementing policies and programs to address those vulnerabilities, such as beach replenishment, artificial dune creation, and managed realignment. In addition, because potential climate changes resulting from GHG emissions are expected to contribute to an increase in sea level, the CAP may have a beneficial impact on potential impacts from tsunamis and seiches by incrementally minimizing the rise in sea level through reductions in GHG emissions. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – *Would the project:*

- a) Physically divide an established community?
- a) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with



jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

b) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Environmental Setting

The City is approximately 2.25 square miles and is primarily a residential community that is built out. Accordingly, new land uses are accommodated through infill development and redevelopment. In addition to the City’s General Plan and Development Code, the City has two other specific land use plans: the Local Coastal Program and the Ramona Specific Plan Area.

Discussion

a) The CAP does not include any climate action measures or any specific development projects that would divide an established community. The CAP includes several climate action measures that would support pedestrian and bicycle circulation and improved transportation alternatives, which would improve connectivity throughout Grover Beach. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) The CAP is a policy-level document that does not propose any land use or zoning changes, nor does it include any site-specific development; therefore it would not conflict with the City’s General Plan or Development Code. The CAP includes a climate action measure to facilitate mixed-use, higher density, and infill development near transit routes. Implementation of this measure would occur in areas currently designated for these uses in the General Plan and in a manner consistent with existing policies. Any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to additional environmental review. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) The CAP does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would potentially conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to subsequent environmental review wherein any site-specific impacts would be addressed accordingly. Impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -- *Would the project:*

a) 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?



- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

Environmental Setting

Grover Beach does not contain any areas identified by the California Department of Mines and Geology as having substantial mineral resources and has no operating mine or quarry operations.

Discussion

a-b) The CAP would not directly facilitate any specific development projects and would not add or enable development that could result in the loss of mineral resources. No impact to mineral resources would occur.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XII. NOISE -- *Would the project result in:*

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |



- 8) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Environmental Setting

Highway 1 and U.S. Highway 101 are the primary sources of traffic noise in the City. Railroad, aircraft, and agricultural operations also contribute to noise within the City. The primary sources of stationary noise are industrial and commercial uses.

Discussion

a-d) Implementation of the CAP measures would not result in exposure of persons to noise in excess of established standards or groundborne vibration or noise, nor would it result in a temporary, periodic, or permanent increase in ambient noise levels above existing levels. Several of the CAP measures are designed to encourage a shift from single occupancy vehicle to walking and bicycling or from conventional fuels to electric vehicles which would reduce vehicular travel and noise. Therefore, future ambient noise levels should be similar or somewhat reduced from present levels. Further, any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to additional environmental review wherein any site-specific noise impacts would be addressed. Impacts would be less than significant.

e-f) The CAP does not propose any land use or zoning changes, nor does it include any site-specific development which would expose people to excessive noise levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – *Would the project:*

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?
- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?
- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?



Environmental Setting

The State of California Department of Finance estimates the population for Grover Beach was 13,211 as of January 2013. The City currently has approximately 5,780 residential dwellings.

Discussion

a-c) The CAP would not directly or indirectly result in an increase in population and would not accommodate growth beyond that anticipated by the City’s adopted General Plan or induce additional population growth. Further, implementation of the CAP measures would not displace existing housing or people. Therefore, no impacts related to population and housing would result.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES --

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objective for any of the public services:

Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Police protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

The City has public services provided by the following: Grover Beach Police Department, Five Cities Fire Authority and the Lucia Mar Unified School District.

Discussion

a) Implementation of the CAP would not facilitate additional growth beyond that anticipated by the General Plan. Therefore, it would not increase demand for public services or facilities or generate a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause



significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objective for any of the public services. Therefore, no impact on public services causing the need for new governmental facilities is expected.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XV. RECREATION --

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

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

Environmental Setting

The City manages seven parks, two dedicated open space areas, a skate park, Community Center, and the Ramona Garden Park Center. The California Department of Parks and Recreation manages the recreational facilities within Pismo State Beach. The City has a Parks and Recreation Element that contains goals to provide a wide range of recreational opportunities for all ages.

Discussion

a-b) Implementation of the CAP would not directly or indirectly increase population or demand for park facilities. Therefore, the CAP would not result in physical deterioration of park facilities or require new park facilities, the construction of which could cause physical environmental impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – *Would the project:*

- a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of



the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Environmental Setting

The City is served by a series of arterial and secondary streets. The City is also served by a regional transit station and an Amtrak station. Transit service is provided by Regional Transit Authority South County Area Transit (RTA/SCAT) with four routes. Ride-on Transportation operates a Transportation Management Association with a fleet of 90 vans and buses county-wide, some of which serve Grover Beach. The City has an adopted Bicycle Master Plan.

Discussion

a-b) The CAP is a policy-level document that includes climate action measures to reduce GHG emissions. It does not propose any land use or zoning changes, nor does it include any site-specific development. Please note any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA. Implementation of the CAP would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system or an applicable congestion management program. Implementation of the CAP measures would encourage alternatives to single occupancy vehicle



travel (i.e., walking, bicycling, transit, carpooling, telecommuting, etc.) in order to reduce vehicle trips and miles traveled (by approximately 11 percent). This could reduce the number of vehicle trips, volume-to-capacity ratio, and intersection congestion within the City, thereby improving levels of service on local roads. This would provide a positive benefit in the performance of the circulation system. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Implementation of the CAP would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. No impact related to air traffic or safety would occur.

d-e) The CAP would not directly facilitate any specific development projects nor would it add or enable development that would increase hazards or result in inadequate emergency access. Further, any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to additional environmental review wherein any site-specific impacts related to hazards or emergency access would be addressed. Impacts would be less than significant.

f) Implementation of the CAP would encourage alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle travel, consistent with adopted local and regional plans, policies, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, and would not result in adverse effects on their safety or performance. Impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS –

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements | | | | |



- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Environmental Setting

The City of Grover Beach manages its stormwater and drainage infrastructure. The system is characterized by small- to medium-sized retention basins on individual properties or common areas in planned neighborhoods throughout the city.

The collection and disposal of solid waste in Grover Beach is managed by the San Luis Obispo County Integrated Waste Management Association (IWMA). Garbage and recycling in Grover Beach is collected by South County Sanitary Service and is taken to Cold Canyon Landfill. According to the California Integrated Waste Management Board, it has a total capacity of 10.9 million cubic yards. Currently, almost 75 percent of the capacity is filled.

South San Luis Obispo County Sanitation District (SSLOCSD) is responsible for the treatment of wastewater in Grover Beach. The SSLOCSD’s wastewater treatment facility is located in Oceano. The wastewater collected by Grover Beach is transported through its own collection system to the treatment facility. SSLOCSD wastewater facilities are capable of processing five million gallons of wastewater per day. In 2010, the average wastewater flow per day was 2.9 million gallons, or 81 gallons per person per day. Projected population growth for Arroyo Grande, Oceano, and Grover Beach indicates that, at build-out of these three communities, the average flow per day will equal 75 percent of the capacity of the system. The City continues the process of upgrading and replacing wastewater collection pipelines through the implementation of their Capital Improvement Plan.

Discussion

a-e) The CAP would not accommodate growth beyond that anticipated by the General Plan nor does it propose any specific development projects that would increase wastewater generation, water demand, or stormwater runoff. Impacts would be less than significant.

f-g) The CAP would not accommodate growth beyond that anticipated by the General Plan nor does it propose any specific development projects that would increase solid waste generation. Further, the



CAP includes a measure that aims to reduce community-wide waste by 75 percent by 2020. Impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

XVIII. 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 past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

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

a) The intent of the CAP is to reduce GHG emissions from City of Grover Beach operations and within the City through implementation of GHG reduction measures. CAP measures encourage actions by residents, businesses, and the City to reduce energy, and fuel use and associated GHG emissions. The CAP would not directly facilitate any specific development plans or projects or have any climate action measures that would diminish wildlife habitats or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. As discussed in Sections IV, *Biological Resources*, and V, *Cultural Resources*, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Implementation of the CAP would result in a cumulatively considerable beneficial reduction of GHG emissions and would not make a considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.



c) The CAP does not have any effects which would cause a direct or indirect adverse effect on human beings. Rather, the CAP would reduce GHG emissions as well as have many other secondary environmental benefits. These include: reduction in air pollution, reduction in transportation congestion, reduction in landfilled solid waste, and energy efficiency. Therefore, CAP implementation would have less than significant impacts with respect to adverse effects on humans.



REFERENCES:

California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program. *San Luis Obispo County Important Farmland 2010*. September 2010. Retrieved from: <ftp://ftp.consrv.ca.gov/pub/dlrp/FMMP/pdf/>

California Department of Transportation. Scenic Highway Program. 2013. Available at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic_highways/scenic_hwy.htm

City of Grover Beach. 1981. *City of Grover Beach General Plan Scenic Routes Element*.

City of Grover Beach. 1993. *City of Grover Beach General Plan Noise Element*.

City of Grover Beach. 2000. *City of Grover Beach General Plan Safety Element*.

City of Grover Beach. 2005. *City of Grover Beach General Plan Circulation Element*.

City of Grover Beach. 2005. *City of Grover Beach General Plan Parks & Recreation Element*.

City of Grover Beach. 2009. *City of Grover Beach General Plan Housing Element 2007-2014*.

City of Grover Beach. 2010. *City of Grover Beach General Plan Land Use Element*.

City of Grover Beach. 2010. *City of Grover Beach Urban Water Management Plan*.

Energy Star. Learn About LEDs. 2013. Available at: http://www.energystar.gov/index.cfm?c=lighting_pr_what_are

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), National Flood Insurance Program. *Flood Insurance Rate Map, San Luis Obispo County, California, Panel 1582, Map Number 0607C1582F*. August 28, 2008. Retrieved from: <http://map1.msc.fema.gov>

Governor's Office of Planning and Research. California Solar Permitting Guidebook. June 2012. Available at: http://opr.ca.gov/docs/California_Solar_Permitting_Guidebook.pdf

San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD). San Luis Obispo County Attainment Status. August 20, 2013. Available at: <http://www.slocleanair.org/images/cms/upload/files/AttainmentStatus20August2013%288%29.pdf>

SWCA Environmental Consultants. 2010. *Land Use Element Update Master EIR*. Certified February 2010.

