



S.0 SUMMARY

S.1 Project Description (Refer to Volume 1, PWP)

Please refer to **Volume 1, “Public Works Plan,”** (PWP) for a detailed description of the PWP and its associated programs, actions, and Development Projects.

S.2 Purpose of the PWP and PWP Objectives

S.2.1 Purpose of PWP

The purpose of the PWP is to manage the Park in compliance with all State Parks management mandates, the California Coastal Act, and other applicable laws and regulations while providing resource protection and a positive visitor experience.

S.2.2 PWP Objectives

Specific Project Objectives include the following:

- Obtain and Manage for Coastal Act Compliance within the Oceano Dunes District.
- Manage the Park Consistent with State and Federal Resource Protection Goals and Mandates and Other Applicable Plans.
- Improve Public Access to the Park.
- Optimize Recreation.
- Enhance Visitor Experiences.
- Increase District Operational Efficiency.

S.2.3 Required Permits and Approvals

The following permits and approvals are required for managing and operating the Park:

- Take Permit under the State and federal Endangered Species Act (obtained independently of the PWP through the HCP and NCCP processes).
- Coastal Act Development Approval (obtained through this PWP process).
- Other specific permits for construction of the Development Projects included in the PWP (see required permit section under each PWP Development Project in Section 3.1 and 3.2 of Volume 1, PWP).

S.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation

Table S-1 summarizes all impacts associated with implementation of the PWP, identifies the significance determination for each impact, and presents the full text of the recommended mitigation measures for each impact. A complete discussion of impacts and associated mitigation measures is presented in Chapters 4 to 22 of this EIR.

The PWP would have no impacts on Mineral Resources and Population and Housing and beneficial impacts related to Biological Resources, Land Use Plans and Policies, and Recreation and Public Access. Impacts that were determined to be less than significant have been

identified in for Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Cultural Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Hydrology and Water Quality, Public Services, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire.

There are two significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the PWP including temporary increase in ambient noise associated with construction, and loss of recreational opportunities (motorized public recreation and coastal access) from interim reduction of use limits. Potentially significant environmental impacts of the PWP are identified in this EIR for Air Quality, Biological Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Noise, and Transportation and Traffic, along with mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid these impacts. Therefore, potentially significant environmental impacts of the PWP fall within two categories: significant impacts that would remain significant even with mitigation (significant and unavoidable), and potentially significant impacts that could be mitigated to less-than-significant (Table S-1).

S.4 Cumulative Project Impacts

CEQA requires that an EIR evaluate a project's cumulative impacts. Cumulative impacts are the project's impacts combined with the impacts of other related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects. Cumulative impacts are discussed at the end of each resource section in the EIR. This EIR determined that the PWP would result in less than cumulatively considerable when combined with other past, present, or future projects that are reasonably foreseeable in relation to Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Energy, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Public Services, Transportation and Traffic, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire. This EIR determined that the PWP would result in no cumulatively considerable impacts when combined with other past, present, or future projects that are reasonably foreseeable in relation to Land Use, Noise, and Recreation and Public Access. Therefore, there would be no potentially unavoidable significant cumulative impacts from the PWP, with the exception of Greenhouse Gas Emissions, where cumulative impacts are significant even without the PWP. Table S-2 provides a summary of cumulative impacts.

S.5 Project Alternatives

The alternatives discussion of this EIR was prepared in accordance with Section 15126(d) of the CEQA Guidelines and focuses on alternatives that are capable of eliminating or reducing significant adverse effects associated with the PWP while feasibly attaining most of the basic objectives. The following discussion summarizes the alternatives evaluated in this EIR. See Chapter 23, "Alternatives," for additional detail.

- **No Project (No PWP) Alternative:** Under this alternative, the PWP would not be approved and implemented. State Parks would maintain its current park operations, visitor use numbers and visitor programs, and continue implementing its current management programs. State Parks would continue to rely on the approved General Plan and existing Coastal Development Plan (CDP) for guidance. Other plans, such as the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), once approved, the dust control plan, Bio-Diversity Management Plan, and others, would continue to be implemented. Future projects, such as the PWP Development Projects and Small Development Projects, would still be planned and implemented as funding allows, but each project would require a new CDP or Amendment to the existing CDP. State Parks would continue to submit applications for individual projects. Other plans such as the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), once approved, and the dust control plan, would continue to be implemented.



- **No OHV (Phased) Alternative:** Under the No OHV Use Alternative, use of any vehicle identified in CVC § 38010 and 38012 as an OHV would be phased out and eliminated from the Park over five years as suggested by California Coastal Commission staff. Some vehicles, like sport utility vehicles, trucks, and dual-sport motorcycles used for OHV recreation are also classified as street-legal. By eliminating OHVs, street-legal vehicles would still be allowed to operate in the Park; thus, only removing a small subset of vehicles from the beach and dunes. See California Vehicle Code (CVC) Section (§) 38010 and § 38012 for the definition of off-highway vehicles. Street-legal vehicles would be allowed to access both unit's beach areas from Grand Avenue south to the current SVRA boundary. However, the No OHV Use Alternative would not meet the statutory purpose of the OHV park unit and would require reclassification.

With regards to the PWP Development Projects, the No OHV Alternative would result in less funding and in projects with OHV-related components not being implemented (e.g., Oso Flaco and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project). Projects with existing (non-OHV related) funding would be completed (e.g. Oceano Campground Infrastructure Improvement Project, Pier and Gran Avenue Entrances and Lifeguard Towers Project, and North Beach Campground Facility Improvements), projects with non-motorized components (e.g. Butterfly Grove Public Access Project, Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Project, Park Corporation Yard Improvement Project, and Oso Flaco Improvement Project (Initial) would be implemented; however without potential access to reliable OHV fund sources, these projects would compete with the over 271 other State Park units for possible funding and would likely be delayed.

With regards to Small Development Projects, the No OHV Alternative would result in projects with motorized recreation elements not being implemented (e.g., 40 Acre Riding Trail Installation and Replacement of the Safety and Education Center).

Under this Alternative, State Parks would be required to fund all District activities from another source instead of the currently available and dedicated OHV Trust Fund. Without OHV Trust Fund support, the now robust Resource Management Program efforts, would likely be severely curtailed. Current spending for these programs (at approximately 2 million dollars annually estimated in 2017 dollars for the shorebird program alone) would be reduced and result in significant impacts to sensitive and endangered species and habitats currently funded through OHV Trust Funds to meet the state and federal management requirements.

- **No General Plan Amendment:** The Oso Flaco Improvement Project (Future) and the Phillips 66 Southern Access Project require an amendment to the existing Pismo State Beach and Oceano Dunes SVRA General Plan. Under the No General Plan Amendment Alternative, no Oso Flaco Future and no Philips 66/Southern Entrance Development Projects would be constructed and any resolution of planning issues would have to occur within the existing Park footprint. Every other element of the PWP, including the Development Projects, could be implemented as proposed and impacts resulting from implementation of these project would be the same.

S.5.1 Environmentally Superior Alternative

CEQA requires that, among the alternatives, an “environmentally superior” alternative be selected and that the reasons for such selection be disclosed. In



general, the environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that would generate the fewest or least severe adverse impacts. For the purposes of this EIR, the No General Plan Amendment Alternative is environmentally superior, because it achieves most of the basic objectives of the PWP, but would not include the larger Development Projects (Oso Flaco Future Improvement Project and/or Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project) and would therefore result in less environmental impacts, as a result of the smaller project footprints.

S.6 Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved

CEQA Guidelines § 15123(b) requires the EIR Summary to identify areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public and issues to be resolved, including choice among alternatives and whether and how to mitigate the significant effects. These issues are discussed below.

Existing Park Operations. The effects of the existing park operation are controversial, including use of motor vehicles on the beach and in sensitive dune habitat, dust and sand blown off site and downwind, and impacts to protected species. These concerns are associated with the ongoing park operation and its recreational use; these are not concerns generated by new PWP programs of actions or by the Development Projects associated with the PWP. The activities causing impact and controversy have been previously authorized and established as allowable uses under the adopted State Park General Plan and Amendments. PWP approval would not be responsible for authorizing the underlying park activities, which are otherwise approved. It could be perceived as controversial by some to allow these existing uses to continue without greater restrictions; however, it is not the goal of this PWP EIR to evaluate existing authorized uses, the parameters of current park operations, or implementation of regulatory permit conditions. A no-OHV Alternative is discussed in Chapter 23, “Alternatives,” of this EIR.

Balance of Resource Protection and Recreation Opportunity. The main controversy concerning the PWP is striking an acceptable balance between motorized recreation opportunity and protection of natural resources and visitor experiences. State Parks’ mission is to provide both high-quality recreation opportunity (Public Resources Code [PRC] § 5090.01 et seq.) including motor vehicle recreation and resource protection that conserves and improves habitat over time (SB249). The PWP represents State Parks’ efforts to balance these competing needs. Some conservation interests and those opposed to motorized recreation at Oceano Dunes would like to see State Parks reduce park access to OHVs through a complete ban or through increased riding restrictions in either hours, open area, or vehicle numbers. Conversely, motorized recreation interests have seen multiple sizable reductions in park acreage open to OHV recreation and camping and would like to see both the existing area preserved and previously closed areas reopened.



Table S-1. Summary of Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics	<p>Impact 4-1: Substantial Adverse Effects on Scenic Vistas</p> <p>The Pier and Grand Avenue Entrances and Lifeguard Towers Project would replace the aging entrance stations, temporary lifeguard towers (which are installed seasonally during the summer months), and comfort stations with new, more modern facilities that would better serve the needs of park visitors and staff. The replacement facilities would be of similar size and mass as compared to the existing facilities. The permanent lifeguard observation towers would be constructed on top of the existing restroom buildings; therefore, the existing structures would approximately double in height (to 23 feet above the ground surface). The increased height of the lifeguard stations would represent a change in the viewshed, and would be visible from public vantage points including the beach areas, visitor parking areas, and the adjacent public roadways. Although the new lifeguard stations would be taller, they would retain the same small circumference, and lifeguard stations are a common feature in beach viewsheds. All of these new facilities, including the permanent lifeguard towers and the new entrance stations, would also have a more modern appearance than the current facilities. The facilities would be designed in accordance with California State Parks Guiding Principles for Aesthetic Design.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>The small size and natural visual appearance of the new boardwalk and viewing platforms associated with the Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Project would not detract from scenic vistas.</p> <p>The Safety and Education Center Project would replace the existing facility with a newer, more modern facility.</p> <p>The Trash Enclosure Project would substantially improve the existing visual conditions by providing screening around the dumpsters.</p> <p>There is no scenic vista at the Oso Flaco Improvement Project site. The Oso Flaco Lake Boardwalk Replacement Project would replace the existing aging boardwalk across the lake with a new boardwalk of a similar size and appearance. The new temporary lifeguard tower at the beach in the Oceano Dunes SVRA associated with the Oso Flaco Improvement Project would be a small structure that would be of a similar scale, mass, and visual appearance to existing temporary one-story lifeguard towers currently used on the beach near Pier and Grand Avenues during the summer months. Lifeguard towers are a common and normal part of the viewshed at any beach/ocean environment and are structures that recreationists are accustomed to viewing during their recreational experience. Therefore, these projects would result in a less-than-significant impact related to adverse effects on scenic vistas.</p>			



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics	<p>Impact 4-2: Substantially Degrade the Visual Character or Quality of Public Views in Non-Urbanized Areas, or Conflict with Zoning or Other Regulations Governing Scenic Quality in Urbanized Areas</p> <p>The only new facilities at the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project that would be visible from public views would be the new campgrounds, which would be approximately 0.5 mile west of SR 1 and only visible for a few seconds from vehicles traveling on the roadway. Depending on the exact location of the new entrance kiosk near the intersection of SR 1 and the private access road to the Santa Maria Refinery (which would be determined in the future), the kiosk could be visible to motorists travelling on SR 1; however, the topography in this area consists of gently rolling hills, which could block all views of the entrance kiosk from SR 1.</p> <p>All State Parks facilities would be designed in accordance with California State Parks Guiding Principles for Aesthetic Design. Therefore, the Pismo Creek Estuarine (Floating) Bridge Project, Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Project, Safety and Education Center Project, Trash Enclosure Project, 40 Acre Riding Trail Project, Oso Flaco Improvement Project, Oso Flaco Lake Boardwalk Replacement Project, and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the sites or their surroundings, and would result in less-than-significant impacts.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics	<p>Replacement of the existing aging facilities with the new, more modern facilities within the North Beach Campground Facility Improvements Project, Butterfly Grove Public Access Project, Pier and Grand Avenue Entrances and Lifeguard Towers Project, Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Project, Park Corporation Yard Improvement Project, Oceano Campground Infrastructure Improvement Project, and Oceano Campground Campfire Center Replacement Project would improve the existing visual character and quality at each project site and would not result in conflicts with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality in urbanized areas. The Park Corporation Yard Improvement Project would include construction of a new two-story facilities building, along with a several one-story buildings, storage sheds, and parking. Although a portion of the existing trees and shrubs that currently provide visual screening from SR 1 would be removed to accommodate additional Corporation Yard parking, an approximately 50-foot-wide setback from SR 1 along the east side of the new parking area would be implemented. This setback area would include a portion of the existing trees and shrubs, which would help to provide visual screening of the new and modified facilities at the Corporation Yard from adjacent public viewpoints along SR 1. The existing approximately 80-foot-wide setback between the Corporation Yard and SR 1 along the northern half of the project site, which is</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	currently vegetated with grass and scattered trees, would continue to be maintained. Therefore, these impacts would be less than significant .			
Aesthetics	<p>Impact 4-3: Substantial Light and Glare Effects from New Lighting Sources</p> <p>There are no sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the Oso Flaco Improvement Project. The Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project could include a multi-use special events area with nighttime lighting for a limited number of evening events that would occur infrequently over the course of a year. The nighttime lighting of the special events area would be located approximately 0.5 mile from the nearest development, which consists of mixed light industrial/commercial/residential land uses to the northeast; this distance would eliminate light spillover effects and would reduce light and glare effects from headlights of OHVs that may operate at the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project after dark. However, lighting of the larger special events area during nighttime events could contribute to skyglow. Because the special events area would be constructed with shielded and downward-facing lights, skyglow effects would be minimized to the maximum extent feasible. Furthermore, the special events area would be used at night infrequently during the year, and the lighting would only be used for a few hours after darkness while the event is taking place. All new lighting would be</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>designed to be consistent with PWP Lighting Design Standards.</p> <p>With adherence to these PWP lighting design standards, new lighting sources would be visually consistent with building styles, new nighttime security lighting would be shielded and directed downward to reduce light spillover and skyglow effects, and the use of reflective surfaces would be minimized. Therefore, substantial new light and glare effects would not occur, and impacts from the Pismo Creek Estuarine (Floating) Bridge Project, North Beach Campground Facility Improvements Project, Butterfly Grove Public Access Project, Pier and Grand Avenue Entrances and Lifeguard Towers Project, Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Project, Park Corporation Yard Improvement Project, Oceano Campground Infrastructure Improvement Project, Oceano Campground Campfire Center Replacement Project, Safety and Education Center Project, Trash Enclosure Project, 40 Acre Riding Trail Project, Oso Flaco Improvement Project, Oso Flaco Lake Boardwalk Replacement Project, and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project would be less than significant.</p>			
Agricultural Resources	<p>Impact 5-1: Conflicts with Ongoing Agricultural Operations</p> <p>The only PWP Development Project in proximity to agricultural operations is the Oso Flaco Improvement Project. Recreational facilities along the north and northeastern border of the Oso Flaco Improvement</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>Project site would be set back from the adjacent off-site agricultural operations. Buffers consisting of bioswales and upland restored areas would be established around the improvement site boundaries providing further separation of visitors to the Oso Flaco Improvement Project site and ongoing agricultural uses. These buffers would effectively reduce potential land use conflicts with ongoing agricultural operations; therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>			
<p>Air Quality</p>	<p>Impact 6-1: Conflict with or Obstruct Implementation of the Applicable Air Quality Plan</p> <p>The Development Projects and Small Development Projects would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the SLOAPCD 2001 Clean Air Plan. These Projects would not result in changes to park visitation or vehicle use levels, though they may affect where in the Park visitors recreate. In addition, consistent with statewide regulations such as the Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling, project contractors are required limit idling time and reduce associated emissions and the project would be subject to fugitive dust control practices to further reduce fugitive dust emissions consistent with SLOAPCD Rule 401, Visible Emissions, Rule 402, Nuisance, and Rule 403, Particulate Matter Emission Standards. In addition, as detailed in Impact 6-2 below, implementation of the PWP Development Projects and Small Development Projects</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>would not exceed the thresholds established by SLOAPCD with consideration of the 2001 Clean Air Plan and achieving attainment status for the region. Thus, impacts related to the potential for conflicting with or obstructing implementation of the Clean Air Plan as a result of the proposed site-specific improvement projects are considered less than significant.</p>			
<p>Air Quality</p>	<p>Impact 6-2: Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase of Criteria Air Pollutants <u>Construction</u> Construction activities can generate fugitive dust, which could be a nuisance to local residents and businesses in close proximity to and or downwind of the various site-specific improvement project sites. Although the emissions modeling demonstrates that thresholds are not anticipated to be exceeded, SLOAPCD recommends that all projects implement fugitive dust control measures. Therefore, without implementation of the SLOAPCD-recommended fugitive dust control measures, or other measures of equal or better effectiveness, this impact is considered potentially significant. Mitigation Measures 6-1 and 6-2 would ensure that that fugitive dust mitigation measures are implemented at the PWP Development Project and Small Development Project sites; Mitigation Measure 6-1 would apply to site-specific improvement projects with grading areas that are less than 4 acres and that are not within 1,000 feet of any sensitive receptor; this would include Oso Flaco</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 6-1: Fugitive Dust Mitigation Measures for Projects with Grading Areas Less than 4-acres and Not Within 1,000 Feet of any Sensitive Receptor. To mitigate fugitive dust emissions generated by construction activities, the following shall be implemented at site-specific improvement project construction sites:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible; b. Use of water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 mph. Reclaimed (non- 	<p>LTS</p>



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>Improvement Projects, Trash Enclosure at Post 2/Beach Trash Management, Replacement of the Safety and Education Center, Oso Flaco Boardwalk Replacement, 40-Acre Riding Trail Installation, and Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Replacement. Mitigation Measure 6-2 would apply to Development Projects with grading areas that are greater than 4 acres or are within 1,000 feet of any sensitive receptor; this would include Pier & Grand Avenue Entrances and Lifeguard Towers Project, North Beach Campground Facility Improvements Project, Oceano Campground Campfire Center Replacement Project, Butterfly Grove Public Access Project, Oceano Campground Infrastructure Improvement Project, Park Corporation Yard Improvement Project and Pismo Creek Estuary Seasonal (Floating) Bridge. Implementation of Mitigation Measures 6-1 and 6-2 would further reduce fugitive dust emissions and ensure a less-than-significant impact.</p>		<p>potable) water should be used whenever possible;</p> <p>c. All dirt stock-pile areas should be sprayed daily as needed;</p> <p>d. All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc., to be paved should be completed as soon as possible, and building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.</p> <p>e. All of these fugitive dust mitigation measures shall be shown on grading a building plans; and</p> <p>f. The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the fugitive dust emissions and enhance the implementation of measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints, reduce visible emissions below 20 percent opacity, and to prevent the transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress.</p>	



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Air Quality	*Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project - There is not enough information available at the time of this analysis regarding anticipated construction requirements and future operations to support a detailed analysis. Additional environmental analysis including detailed modelling to estimate impacts would be conducted at a future time. However, it could be reasonably assumed that impacts related to air quality would be similar to those associated with the Oso Flaco (Future) Development Project.	not applicable	To be determined during future environmental analysis, if project moves forward.	not applicable
Air Quality	<u>Operations</u> New buildings and infrastructure would not generate emissions that exceed the SLOAPCD thresholds. There would not be a net increase in visitor or staff vehicle operations, and therefore no expected increase in fugitive dust emissions related to vehicle use. Long-term operations associated with the site-specific improvement projects would not 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; this impact is less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Air Quality	Impact 6-3: Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations The Pier & Grand Avenue Entrances and Lifeguard Towers Project would include construction activity as close as 50 feet to a restaurant on Grand Avenue with	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>outdoor seating, 75 feet to a fast throughput restaurant on Pier Avenue, and approximately 200 feet to vacation rental homes on Strand Avenue off of Pier Avenue. Similarly, the North Beach Campground Facility Improvements Project would include construction activity approximately 30 feet south of an RV resort and 300 feet west of a travel trailer park. The Butterfly Grove Public Access Project would include construction activity approximately 20 feet north of residences. However, as noted above, the dose to which receptors are exposed is the primary factor used to determine health risk. Dose is a function of the concentration of a substance in the environment and the extent of exposure a person has with the substance. The Development Projects are anticipated to take approximately 3 months to implement. The Pismo Creek Estuary Seasonal (Floating) Bridge Installation would also occur within approximately 150 feet of the western perimeter of a RV resort, but this activity would only take two to three days at any given time. In addition, as detailed in Table 6-1, the maximum daily emissions of DPM, which would not be the typical emissions rate over the entire construction periods, would be less than 0.5 pounds per day for any of these projects; this is less than 8 percent of the SLOAPCD daily threshold; similarly, the maximum quarterly emissions of DPM from these construction activities would be less than 0.015 tons, which is less than 11 percent of the SLOAPCD daily threshold. As</p>			



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	such, construction activities would not be anticipated to expose sensitive receptors to substantial TAC concentrations and this impact is less than significant .			
Air Quality	The Phillips 66/ Southern Entrance Project could involve additional construction, if it moves forward. Construction would be temporary, and emissions would stop at the end of the construction duration. Construction would be anticipated to occur several years into the future, not likely concurrently with other Development Projects included in Tables 6-1 and 6-2. Construction equipment that would serve projects further in the future are likely to be less emissive than the current average construction fleet due to incorporation of more equipment that meets more recent CARB emissions standards and uses cleaner burning fuel. However, there is not enough information available at the time of this analysis regarding anticipated construction requirements and future operations to support a detailed analysis; while total acreages are estimated, the potential for demolition or re-use of any existing buildings on-site is currently unknown, requirements for grading, trenching, and cut and fill are also unknown. In addition, future ground surveys would be needed to determine site constraints and opportunities, refine proposed facilities, evaluate re-use of existing site infrastructure and utilities, or add additional functional components to the site concept. Additional environmental analysis including detailed	Not applicable	To be determined during future environmental analysis, if project moves forward.	Not applicable



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	modelling to estimate impacts would be conducted at a future time.			
Biological Resources	<p>Impact on Special-status Species: PWP Implementation</p> <p>Impacts on special-status species and their habitats from existing park activities could result from operations and management of facilities, programs for visitor use and safety, park maintenance, natural and cultural resource management, and other miscellaneous Park operations. State Parks would continue to implement their standard practices and policies and AMMs currently in place for existing and future management activities and potential impacts on special-status from these activities are covered by the HCP and were analyzed in the HCP EIR. Additionally, it is the policy of State Parks to implement park acquisitions and resource, facility, and visitor use management strategies that foster long-term sustainability of natural animal and plant populations and the processes that influence the dynamics of these populations. These policies are described in detail in the Operations Manual for Natural Resources (CDPR 2004). Besides negative impacts on special-status species, there are also many beneficial effects on special-status species resulting from implementation of State Park’s ongoing standard practices and AMMs. Therefore, impacts to special-status species from existing park activities would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources	<p>Impact 7-1: Direct and Indirect Impacts on SNPL and CLTE Secondary Habitat</p> <p>Development Projects including Oso Flaco Improvement Project, Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Project, and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project could result in direct or indirect impacts on SNPL and CLTE because they would be constructed immediately adjacent to or within secondary habitat. Construction of the boardwalk associated with the Oso Flaco Improvement Project could directly impact nesting, foraging, or wintering SNPL and foraging or wintering CLTE and would remove habitat. The addition of the RV campground in the future phase would introduce more visitors to this area of the Park, which could introduce additional trash, dogs, noise, and recreational activities that could result in stress, reproductive failure, reduce foraging success, illness, or even death to SNPL. These impacts to SNPL and CLTE would be potentially significant; however, construction disturbance would be temporary, the proposed Development Projects have been designed to avoid impacts to special-status species habitat to the extent feasible, as mandated in the DOM (CDPR 2004), and Parks would seek an amendment to the HCP for the Oso Flaco Improvement Project because it would represent changes to the use pattern in the area. The HCP specifies AMMs to protect SNPL and CLTE, including but not limited to, visitor and employee education, posted speed limits, trash management and predator</p>	PS	<p>Mitigation Measure 7-1: Restore and Compensate for Impacts on Native Vegetation Communities and Special-status Species Habitat.</p> <p>The intent of this mitigation measure is to restore disturbed habitat to pre-construction conditions or to the desired future conditions per State Park’s goals and objectives. Impacts to native vegetation communities and special-status species habitat shall be avoided during the design phase to the extent feasible. Prior to final design, State Parks shall map the community type and acreage of vegetation that would be subject to project disturbance. Prior to implementation of each project affecting native vegetation communities that could support special-status species State Parks shall prepare a <u>Habitat Restoration and Revegetation Plan</u> to support the construction design specifications that shall include at a minimum, as required by the State Parks’ Natural Resources Handbook (CDPR, n.d.), the following:</p>	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>control, seasonal enclosure and single-nest enclosure fencing, monitoring, habitat enhancement, and no-disturbance buffers. The AMMs target areas where SNPL and CLTE are known to nest along the shoreline, but also include other suitable habitat areas where SNPL and CLTE could occur. Additionally, with the implementation of State Park’s standard practices and policies (SNPL and CLTE management programs), along with implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-1 (Restore and Compensate for Impacts to Native Vegetation Communities and Special-status Species Habitat) and Mitigation Measure 7-2 (Protect Breeding and Nesting SNPL and Compensate for Habitat Impacts), impacts would be reduced to less than significant.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective of the revegetation; • Characterization of the site including the identification of sensitive species; • Measures to avoid or reduce damage to native communities and sensitive species; • Vegetation expected to occupy the site in the absence of human disturbance; • Sources of materials to be used for revegetation; • Quantities of materials to be used; • Planting techniques • Appropriate planting density; • Certified Weed Free site stabilization materials; • Source and cost of labor to be used; • Timing likely to yield the best chance of success; • Any special conditions, such as short-term irrigation, or herbivore control, necessary to ensure establishment; 	



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Success criteria; and • A monitoring program to measure success. <p>The replacement ratios for native vegetation will be as follows: woodland vegetation (2:1), riparian vegetation (3:1); shrub-dominated vegetation (1:1), and herbaceous vegetation (1:1). Habitat enhancement such as supplemental planting with native species in disturbed areas and/or invasive weed control shall also be acceptable to compensate for impacts on natural vegetation communities, as the same ratios described above. Habitat restoration can occur anywhere in the park, and ongoing habitat enhancement and use of native vegetation for dust mitigation that creates habitat would count toward the compensation ratios. The creation or restoration of habitat shall be monitored annually for up to five years.</p> <p>Remediation activities (e.g. additional planting, removal of non-native invasive species, trash removal, or</p>	



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>erosion control) shall be undertaken as necessary to ensure the success of the restoration effort. If it can be clearly demonstrated that the intent of the mitigation measure has been met prior to the end of the 5-year monitoring period, monitoring may cease prior to the full length of the period. If the mitigation fails to meet the established performance criteria after the maintenance and monitoring period, monitoring and remedial activities shall be extended beyond the original period until the criteria are met.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 7-2: Protect Breeding and Nesting SNPL and Compensate for Habitat Impacts.</p> <p>Construction of the Oso Flaco Boardwalk in suitable habitat for SNPL shall be constructed outside of the SNPL breeding season (March 1 to September 30). Prior to construction, preconstruction surveys within 500 feet of the work area shall be conducted for SNPL that may be foraging in the area during the non-breeding season. If SNPL are present,</p>	



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>no work shall commence until they have left the area on their own. Daily monitoring of construction activities shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. If SNPL are observed within 100 feet during construction activities, work shall cease until the bird has left the area.</p> <p>After construction of the Oso Flaco boardwalk, this amenity will only be available during the non-breeding season (October – February). During the SNPL breeding season, the boardwalk extension will be closed in the location where it splits from the current boardwalk and enclosure fencing shall be installed just south of the existing trail that leads from Oso Flaco Lake down to the beach and around the new boardwalk area to protect nesting SNPL. Signs in English and Spanish shall be posted identifying this area as closed due to nesting SNPL and warning violators of penalties for trespassing into the closed area. State Park rangers will have the responsibility to enforce park regulations enacted to protect</p>	



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>SNPL, including issuing citations for incidents of trespass into the area closed for nesting. In addition, resource staff monitors will contact visitors who violate park regulations and, where appropriate, contact rangers who will issue a citation.</p> <p>Prior to opening this new boardwalk section to the public, the entire length will be assessed for maintenance to remove accumulated sand, repair sections that were damaged during the closure, and any ongoing deterioration. This activity will follow the AMMs identified in the HCP for all maintenance activities on developed infrastructure within the covered lands.</p> <p>Daily monitoring will take place during and immediately after the SNPL breeding season (when enclosure fencing is removed) to enable better identification of potential human use-related threats to SNPL and to summon law enforcement assistance, if needed, to prevent or eliminate any human use related threats to the species. Weekly</p>	



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>monitoring for the location of SNPL within the project area will occur during the non-breeding season (October 1 through February 29), as staff levels and weather conditions allow. Monitoring will be increased if necessary (e.g., during storm events). During the non-breeding season, if determined to be necessary to protect wintering SNPL, Parks staff may temporarily close the Oso Flaco Boardwalk area through suitable habitat.</p> <p>Approximately 0.542 acre of SNPL critical habitat will be impacted by the construction of the Oso Flaco Boardwalk. In addition, it is anticipated that 0.806 acre of SNPL known breeding/nesting habitat will be impacted by the changes in visitor use patterns, lifeguard tower, and other associated changes that result from the addition of the Oso Flaco campground. To compensate for this habitat impact, Parks shall prepare a Restoration Plan for enhancement of SNPL breeding/nesting habitat elsewhere in the Park at a 3:1 ratio</p>	



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>where deemed appropriate. Enhancement can take the form of creation of new foredune habitat, invasive exotic species control in suitable habitat, and/or increased management and monitoring of known habitat. Enhancement of the SNPL habitat shall be monitored for 3 years for restoration success, and indefinitely for use by SNPL. It is possible that the HCP will need to be amended and updated to include the proposed improvements for the Oso Flaco Interim and Future improvements if the loss of habitat or take numbers increase beyond the current levels identified in the HCP.</p>	
Biological Resources	<p>The Pismo Creek Estuary Seasonal (Floating Bridge) Installation Small Development Project could impact roosting and foraging SNPL and CLTE; however, construction would be temporary and with implementation of State Park’s standard practices and policies such as preconstruction surveys, avoidance, and monitoring, and HCP SNPL AMM 114 and CLTE AMM 101, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources	The Replacement of the Safety and Education Center Small Development Project has a low potential for nesting and foraging that could be disrupted during construction; however, construction would be temporary and with implementation of State Park's standard practices and policies such as preconstruction surveys, avoidance, and monitoring, and HCP SNPL AMMs 8-19 and SNPL AMM 102, and CLTE AMMs 7-16, and implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-1, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant .	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure 7-1.	LTS
Biological Resources	The Oso Flaco Boardwalk Replacement Small Development Project could disturb roosting and foraging CLTE during construction; however, construction would be temporary and with implementation of State Park's standard practices and policies such as preconstruction surveys, avoidance, and monitoring, and CLTE AMMs 102 and 103, and implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-1, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant .	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure 7-1.	LTS
Biological Resources	The 40 Acre Riding Trail Installation Small Development Project could potentially cause CLTE to be struck by a vehicle during construction or operations, as CLTE have been observed flying through this area. The Trash Enclosure at Post 2 & Beach Trash Management is outside of the typical nesting area for SNPL and CLTE; however, there is a low potential for nesting and foraging that could be disrupted during construction.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>However, with implementation of State Park’s standard practices and policies such as preconstruction surveys, avoidance, and monitoring, and HCP AMMs for SNPL and CLTE, this impact would be reduced to less than significant.</p>			
<p>Biological Resources</p>	<p>Impact 7-2: Direct and Indirect Impacts on CRLF, WPT, and WST</p> <p>Development Projects including Oso Flaco Improvement Project, Park Corporation Yard Improvement Project (bridge over Meadow Creek), Oceano Campground Infrastructure Improvement Project, North Beach Campground Facility Improvements Project, Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Project, and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project, would result in direct or indirect impacts to CFLR, WPT, and WST because they would be constructed immediately adjacent to or within suitable habitat. However, with implementation of State Park’s standard practices and policies, wildlife management programs, and HCP CRLF AMMs 1-49, as applicable (specifically CFLF AMMs 16, 17, and 24-33) that would also protect and minimize impacts to WPT and WST, and implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-1 and Mitigation Measure 7-3 (Preconstruction Surveys for Special-status Species, Avoidance or Relocation, and Monitoring), these impacts would be reduced to less than significant.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measures 7-1 and 7-3.</p> <p>MM 7-3: Preconstruction Surveys for Special-Status Species, Avoidance or Relocation, and Monitoring</p> <p>Within 30 days prior to construction, reconnaissance-level preconstruction surveys shall be conducted for special-status species (other than SNPL and CLTE) and their habitat by a qualified biologist approved by the applicable agency (CDFW and/or USFWS for listed species) to conduct surveys and handle special-status species, if necessary.</p> <p>If special-status species habitat is present within the project area, focused surveys shall be conducted for the potentially occurring special-status species, if necessary, to identify and implement appropriate</p>	<p>LTS</p>



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>avoidance and minimization measures. The surveys shall be conducted by a qualified biologist in accordance with all currently applicable presence and absences survey and/or species protocols established by CDFW and/or USFWS (“Species Protocols”), as applicable. In the absence of any approved Species Protocols, the survey shall extend for a minimum of 125 feet around areas where any ground-disturbing activities will occur, provided that permission to access has been obtained. Surveys shall be conducted during the appropriate season(s) to detect the species, if present. To meet seasonal requirements stipulated by Species Protocols, some surveys may be required more than 30 days before ground disturbances. In that case, follow-up pre-disturbance surveys also shall be required within 30 days before the start of the ground disturbance to confirm that no changes in species status have occurred in the survey area since the original survey. To avoid any impact</p>	



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>during construction in areas where special-status species have been documented, the HCP AMMs shall be implemented along with any other necessary AMMs as determined by Parks Staff while preparing the Project Evaluation Forms (PEFs) for project activities, such as implementing exclusion buffers, installation of flagging and/or fencing, timing of work activities,</p> <p>If impacts on special-status species habitat are unavoidable and special-status species are observed, they may be relocated upon determination by the agency-approved biologist that an appropriate relocation site exists, and relocation is the preferred avoidance method. The agency-approved biologist will be allowed sufficient time to move special-status species from the work site before work activities begin. Only agency approved biologists will participate in activities associated with the capture, handling, and monitoring of special-status species.</p>	



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>For areas where special-status species have been documented or where their habitat is present, an agency-approved biologist will conduct a training session for all construction personnel before any ground disturbing project activities occur. At a minimum, the training will include a description of the special-status species that have potential to occur in the area and their habitat, the importance of their habitat, the general AMMS that are implemented to conserve habitat as they relate to the project, and the potential project impacts.</p> <p>Immediately prior to the start of any ground disturbing project activities, the agency-approved biologist will conduct a survey sweep of the project area to ensure no special-status species remain in the work area. If special-status species are observed, the agency-approved biologist will relocate them as necessary.</p> <p>The agency-approved biologist will be present at the work site until the removal of all special-status species</p>	



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
			and instruction of workers, and will remain available/on-call during habitat disturbance. The agency-approved biologist may determine the level of monitoring necessary and can designate a Park representative and/or the contractor or permittee to designate a person to monitor on-site compliance with all applicable AMMs. The agency-approved biologist will ensure that this individual receives training and identification of special-status species. The monitor and the agency-approved biologist will have the authority to halt any action that might result in impacts to special-status species.	
Biological Resources	The Pismo Creek Estuary Seasonal (Floating) Bridge Installation Small Development Project would be installed in aquatic habitat; however, Because CRLF, WPT and WST are unlikely to occur at this location, project activities would have a less than significant impact .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Biological Resources	The Oso Flaco Boardwalk Replacement Project Small Development Project spans approximately 940 linear feet of aquatic habitat including wetlands and open water where CRLF and WPT are known to occur and could cause temporary disturbance to habitat and	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure 7-3.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>individuals and cause injury or mortality if they are present in the work area during construction. However, construction would be temporary and with implementation of State Park’s standard practices and policies, wildlife management programs, and HCP CRLF AMMs 38-41 that would also protect and minimize impacts to WPT and WST, along with implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-3 (Preconstruction Surveys for Special-status Species, Avoidance or Relocation, and Monitoring), these impacts would be reduced to less than significant. Additionally, the HCP includes the loss of up to 1.5 acres of CRLF aquatic habitat for the boardwalk replacement.</p>			
Biological Resources	<p>The 40 Acre Riding Trail Installation Small Development Project is outside of aquatic habitat and CRLF, WPT and WST are unlikely to disperse through the area; therefore, project activities would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Biological Resources	<p>The Oceano Campground Campfire Center Replacement Project Small Development Project is adjacent to riparian and creek habitat that has potential habitat for CRLF and WPT and could result in mortality or injury of dispersing adult and juvenile frogs or turtles. However, with implementation of State Park’s standard practices and policies, wildlife management programs, and HCP CRLF AMMs 38-41 that would also protect and minimize impacts to WPT and WST, and implementation of</p>	PS	Implement Mitigation Measures 7-1 and 7-3.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	Mitigation Measure 7-1 and Mitigation Measure 7-3, these impacts would be reduced to less than significant .			
Biological Resources	Impact 7-3: Direct and Indirect Impacts on Coast (California) Horned Lizard and Silvery Legless Lizard Development Projects including the Oso Flaco Improvement Project, Oceano Campground Infrastructure Improvement Project, Pier and Grand Avenue Entrances and Lifeguard Towers, North Beach Campground Facility Improvement Project, Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Project, and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project, could result in direct or indirect impacts on coast horned lizard and silvery legless lizard because they would be constructed within suitable habitat. However, with implementation of State Park's standard practices and policies, wildlife management programs, and implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-1 and Mitigation Measure 7-3, impacts to coast horned lizard and silvery legless lizard would be less than significant .	PS	Implement Mitigation Measures 7-1 and 7-3.	LTS
Biological Resources	Small Development Projects, including the 40 Acre Riding Trail Installation, Oceano Campground Campfire Center Replacement Project, and Trash Enclosure at Post 2 and Beach Trash Management, could result in direct or indirect impacts to coast horned lizard and silvery legless lizard because they would be constructed immediately adjacent to or within suitable habitat. However, with implementation of State Park's standard	PS	Implement Mitigation Measures 7-1 and 7-3.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	practices and policies, wildlife management programs, and implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-1 and Mitigation Measure 7-3, impacts to coast horned lizard and silvery legless lizard would be less than significant .			
Biological Resources	Impact 7-4: Direct and Indirect Impacts on BUOW Development Projects including the Oso Flaco Improvement Project, Pier and Grand Avenue Entrances and Lifeguard Towers Project, Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Project, and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project, could result in direct or indirect impacts on BUOW because they would be constructed within suitable wintering habitat. However, construction activities would be temporary and with implementation of State Park’s standard practices and policies, wildlife management programs, and implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-1 and Mitigation Measure 7-3, impacts to BUOW would be less than significant .	PS	Implement Mitigation Measures 7-1 and 7-3.	LTS
Biological Resources	Small Development Projects including the Replacement of Safety and Education Center, Oso Flaco Boardwalk Replacement Project, 40 Acre Riding Trail Installation, and Trash Enclosure at Post 2 & Beach Trash Management could result in direct or indirect impacts on BUOW because construction would occur in suitable habitat. However, with implementation of State Park’s standard practices and policies, wildlife management programs, and implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-	PS	Implement Mitigation Measures 7-1 and 7-3.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	1 and Mitigation Measure 7-3, impacts to BUOW would be less than significant .			
Biological Resources	<p>Impact 7-5: Direct and Indirect Impacts on Nesting and Wintering/Migratory Birds</p> <p>Nesting birds could occur anywhere throughout the PWP planning area and could be impacted by construction activities, or other routine maintenance and Park upkeep activities that involved habitat impacts which could cause injury, mortality, and disturbance to nesting birds, their young, and their habitat. These impacts could be potentially significant; however, as part of State Park’s standard practices and policies, wildlife management programs, and implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-1 and Mitigation Measure 7-4 (Preconstruction Nesting Bird Surveys, Avoidance, and Monitoring), this impact would be less than significant.</p>	PS	<p>Implement Mitigation Measures 7-1 and 7-4.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 7-4: Preconstruction Nesting Bird Surveys, Avoidance, and Monitoring</p> <p>To the extent possible, project activities that could result in impacts to nesting birds as a result of noise or habitat removal will be scheduled to occur outside of the bird breeding season (March 1 to August 31). Any work that cannot be avoided during the bird breeding season that requires disturbance of vegetation suitable for nesting, or results in an increase in noise or other disturbance that could cause nest failure, will require prior approval from a DPR-approved biologist; and a nesting bird survey within 5 days of commencement of work will be required in and around the project area. Actively nesting birds will be protected with a no disturbance buffer to be determined by the DPR-approved biologist to ensure that project activities do not</p>	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
			result in nest failure, and a biological monitor may be required to be onsite to monitor active nests as determined by the DPR-approved biologist.	
Biological Resources	State Park’s PWP Development Projects would not result in injury or mortality of foraging/migratory birds. PWP Development Projects could result in temporary disturbance of foraging or roosting wintering/migratory birds. Specifically, individuals or flocks could be displaced from foraging or roosting habitat during the period of disturbance and/or could be deterred from foraging or roosting during the period of disturbance. However, most activities would be temporary and short in duration. Furthermore, the footprint of any PWP Development Project is small compared to the overall presence of natural habitat in the park, and therefore abundant suitable foraging and roosting habitat would be present away from any construction activities. Additionally, Mitigation Measure 7-1 would restore foraging and roosting habitat. As a result, impacts to foraging/migratory birds would be less than significant .	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure 7-1.	LTS
Biological Resources	Impact 7-6: Direct and Indirect Impacts on American Badger Development Projects including the Oso Flaco Improvement Project and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project, could result in direct or indirect impacts on American badger; however, it is unlikely as American	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure 7-3.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>badgers and/or badger dens have never been observed within the areas open to motorized recreation and tracks have only been observed once in April 2019. Therefore, because potential for American badgers is low and with implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-3, this impact would be less than significant.</p>			
<p>Biological Resources</p>	<p>Impact 7-7: Direct and Indirect Impacts on Special-Status Plants</p> <p>Development Projects including the Oso Flaco Improvement Project, Pier and Grand Avenue Entrances and Lifeguard Towers, Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Project, Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project, could result in impacts to special-status plants. However, as part of its standard practices and policies, State Parks would conduct a survey for special-status plant species prior to the start of construction during the appropriate phenological period, if determined to be necessary by a State Parks Environmental Scientist (CDPR 2004). Additionally, State Parks would implement HCP Plants AMMs 1-38. Any special-status plant species found would be flagged and/or fenced off and avoided during construction. In addition, State Parks will also continue to provide educational content to workers and pedestrians in the area, which includes information on what they can do to prevent introducing invasive species. State Parks would also implement Mitigation Measure 7-1, which would require restoration and compensation for natural vegetation loss. For any take</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measure 7-1.</p>	<p>LTS</p>



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	of federally or state listed plants are that is unavoidable, State Parks would seek coverage under the HCP. With implementation of these standard practices and measures, impacts on special-status plants would be less than significant .			
Biological Resources	Small Development Projects including the Pismo Creek Estuary Seasonal (Floating) Bridge Installation, Oso Flaco Boardwalk Replacement, and 40 Acre Riding Trail Installation would occur in special-status plant suitable habitat. However, as part of its standard practices and policies, State Parks would conduct a survey for special-status plant species prior to the start of construction during the appropriate phenological period, if determined to be necessary by a State Park Environmental Scientist (CDPR 2004). Any special-status plant species found would be flagged and/or fenced off and avoided during construction. Trails open to vehicles will be sited with adequate buffers from any known occurrences of special-status plants and select segments could also be fenced to protect populations from driving or trampling by park visitors. In addition, State Parks will also continue to provide educational content to workers and pedestrians in the area, which includes information on what they can do to prevent introducing invasive species. For any take of federally or state listed plants are that is unavoidable, State Parks would seek coverage under the HCP. Along with these measures and	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure 7-1.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	implementation of Mitigation Measure 7-1, impacts on special-status plants would be less than significant .			
Biological Resources	<p>Impacts on Riparian and other Sensitive Habitats/ESHA: PWP Implementation</p> <p>Impacts from PWP implementation could include impacts on riparian and/or other sensitive natural communities that also qualify as ESHA under the California Coastal Act. However, State Parks would continue to implement their standard practices and AMMs currently in place for existing and future management activities. These AMMs can be found in the HCP EIR Appendix B (CDPR 2020). Besides negative impacts to these sensitive habitats, there are also beneficial effects due to State Park’s ongoing standard practices and AMMs, including surveys, restoration work, and monitoring. Therefore, impacts to riparian and other sensitive habitats/ESHAs from existing park activities would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Biological Resources	<p>Impact 7-8: Direct and Indirect Impacts on Riparian and other Sensitive Natural Communities/ESHA</p> <p>Development Projects including the Oso Flaco Improvement Project, Park Corporation Yard Improvement Project, Oceano Campground Infrastructure Improvement Project, Pier and Grand Avenue Entrances and Lifeguard Towers Project, Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Project, and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project, would occur within riparian or other</p>	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure 7-1.	LTS B



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>sensitive communities/ESHA that could cause indirect and direct impacts. However, as part of State Parks' standard practices and policies, impacts to sensitive natural communities would be avoided to the extent feasible and these areas would be excluded from construction with flagging and fencing. State Parks would also implement BMPs during construction activities, as necessary, to reduce impacts. These BMPs could include fencing off adjacent areas, erosion control, and/or biological monitoring. Additionally, State Parks would implement Mitigation Measure 7-1, which would restore and/or mitigate for loss of sensitive natural communities/ESHA. State Parks will also continue to provide educational content to workers and pedestrians in the area, which includes information on what they can do to prevent introducing invasive species. State Parks would obtain any necessary permits, such as a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), for impacts to jurisdictional resources such as riparian habitat. Additionally, extensive restoration of riparian habitat and other natural vegetation will occur at the Oso Flaco Improvement Project resulting in a net gain of sensitive natural communities/ESHA of up to 24.22 acres, which would be a beneficial impact. As a result, effects on sensitive natural communities/ESHA would be less than significant.</p>			



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources	<p>Small Development Projects including the Replacement of Safety and Education Center and 40 Acre Riding Trail Installation, would occur within riparian or other sensitive natural communities/ ESHAs. However, as part of their standard practices and policies, State Parks would avoid impacts to sensitive habitats to the extent feasible and exclude these areas from construction with flagging and fencing. State Parks would also implement BMPs during construction activities, as necessary, to reduce impacts. These BMPs could include fencing off adjacent areas, erosion control, and/or biological monitoring. Additionally, State Parks would implement Mitigation Measure 7-1, which would restore and/or mitigate for loss of natural vegetation communities including those that qualify as sensitive natural communities/ESHA. In addition, State Parks will also continue to provide educational content to workers and pedestrians in the area, which includes information on what they can do to prevent introducing invasive species. As a result, effects on sensitive natural communities would be less than significant.</p>	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure 7-1.	LTS
Biological Resources	<p>Impacts on Wetlands/WUS: PWP Implementation Impacts from PWP management activities could include impacts on wetlands and/or wetland vegetation alliances, other Waters of the US (WUS), and wetlands as defined by the Coastal Commission and USFWS. However, State Parks would continue to implement their standard practices and AMMs currently in place for</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS

B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable



Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>existing and future management activities. These AMMs can be found in the HCP EIR Appendix B (CDPR 2020). Besides negative impacts to wetlands and WUS, there are also beneficial effects due to State Park’s ongoing standard practices and AMMs, including surveys, restoration work, and monitoring. Therefore, impacts to wetlands, wetland vegetation alliances, WUS, and wetlands as defined by the Coastal Commission and USFWS from existing park activities would be less than significant.</p>			
<p>Biological Resources</p>	<p>Impact 7-9: Direct and Indirect Impacts on Wetlands/WUS</p> <p>Development Projects including the Oso Flaco Improvement Project, Park Corporation Yard Improvement Project (including bridge over Meadow Creek), Oceano Campground Infrastructure Improvement Project, North Beach Campground Facility Improvements Project, Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Project, Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project, would occur within areas containing wetlands, and/or wetland vegetation alliances, WUS, and wetlands as defined by the Coastal Commission and USFWS. However, as part of their standard practices and project planning, State Parks would avoid impacts to wetlands and/or wetland vegetation alliances, other WUS, and wetlands as defined by the Coastal Commission and USFWS to the extent feasible and exclude these areas from all development and construction activities with a</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measure 7-1.</p>	<p>LTS</p>

B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable



Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>minimum of 25-foot buffers (or less depending on site constraints), which may include flagging and/or fencing. State Parks would also implement BMPs during construction activities, as necessary, to reduce impacts. These BMPs could include fencing off adjacent areas, erosion control, and/or biological monitoring. Where wetlands cannot be avoided, State Parks will conduct a wetland delineation to determine the exact acreage that will be impacted by project activities. Additionally, State Parks would implement Mitigation Measure 7-1, which would restore and/or mitigate for natural vegetation communities, and would also include any wetland communities. State Parks would obtain any necessary permits, including a Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 permit from the US Army Corps of Engineers, CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW for any project that would require such permit, and would comply with all permit conditions during project implementation, including any specification related to wetland/WUS replacement, as applicable. As a result, effects on wetlands/wetland alliances, other WUS, and wetlands as defined by the Coastal Commission and USFWS would be less than significant.</p>			
Biological Resources	Small Development Projects including the Pismo Creek Estuary Seasonal (Floating) Bridge Installation Oso Flaco Boardwalk Replacement Project, and Oceano	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure 7-1.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>Campground Campfire Center Replacement Project would occur within wetlands, wetland vegetation alliances, other WUS, and wetlands as defined by the Coastal Commission and USFWS. However, as part of their standard practices and project planning, State Parks would avoid impacts to wetlands to the extent feasible and exclude these areas from all development and construction activities with a minimum of 25-foot buffers (or less depending on site constraints), which may include flagging and fencing. State Parks would also implement BMPs during construction activities, as necessary, to reduce impacts. These BMPs could include fencing off adjacent areas, erosion control, and/or biological monitoring. Where wetlands cannot be avoided, State Parks will conduct a wetland delineation to determine the exact acreage that will be impacted by project activities. Additionally, State Parks would implement Mitigation Measure 7-1, which would restore and/or mitigate for natural vegetation communities. Also, State Parks would obtain any necessary permits, including a Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 permit from the US Army Corps of Engineers and CWA Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the Regional Water Quality Control Board and a Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW if applicable, and would comply with all permit conditions during project implementation, including any specification related to wetland/WUS replacement, as applicable. As a result,</p>			



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	effects on wetlands/wetland alliances, other WUS, and wetlands as defined by the Coastal Commission and USFWS would be less than significant .			
Biological Resources	Impacts on Wildlife Movement: PWP Implementation Impacts on wildlife movement from Park/PWP activities could disturb wildlife and disrupt their movements; however, wildlife would be habituated to the current existing conditions. State Parks would continue to implement their standard practices and AMMs currently in place for existing and future management activities. Besides negative impacts to wildlife movement, there are also beneficial effects due to State Park's ongoing standard practices and AMMs, such as surveying, habitat restoration, and monitoring. Therefore, impacts to wildlife movement from existing park activities would be less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Biological Resources	Impact 7-10: Impacts on Wildlife Movement Development Projects including the Oso Flaco Improvement Project, Park Corporation Yard Improvement Project (bridge over Meadow Creek), Butterfly Grove Public Access Project, Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Project, and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project, could temporarily disrupt wildlife movement during project construction. However, impacts would be temporary during construction and would not be expected to result in new permanent wildlife barriers. The projects would occur in areas of ample open	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	space/natural communities and any wildlife would be able to pass through the area even during construction. As a result, effects on wildlife movement would be less than significant .			
Biological Resources	The Pismo Creek Estuary Seasonal (Floating) Bridge Installation Small Development Project could inhibit fish movement, especially during low flows when water levels in the estuary are low. However, the bridge would be designed to allow movement of all fish species, as well as an exchange of fresh and saltwater by constructing the interlocking pieces of the bridge with wide openings. In addition, if water levels are so low that the bridge is not allowing the free movement of fish, the bridge would be removed until there is sufficient water to allow the bridge to float. As a result, wildlife movement impacts associated with the floating bridge would be less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Biological Resources	The 40 Acre Riding Trail Installation Small Development Project could deter wildlife from moving through the area at times when recreation is high or during trail development. However, no barriers or impediment to wildlife movement would occur with this Small Development Project because it would occur in an area of ample open space/natural communities and any wildlife would be able to pass through the area during construction and operation; therefore, the impact would be less than significant	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources	The Oso Flaco Boardwalk Replacement Small Development Project could temporarily deter wildlife from moving through the area during construction. However, construction impacts would be temporary and the new structure would be located in the same alignment at its current location; therefore, no new wildlife barriers would be constructed and the impact is less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources	<p>Impact 8-1: Substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5?</p> <p>Archaeological resources have been identified in the Park, and some have been identified within the footprint of the PWP Development Projects and other Small Development Projects; however, where known resources have been documented, Development Projects have been designed to avoid impacts to previously documented archeological resources. If any newly encountered archaeological resources were discovered as the designs move forward, Development Projects would be redesigned if necessary, to avoid any adverse impacts on archeological resources. Prior to implementing PWP Development Projects, State Park Archaeologists will establish conditions and treatments for avoidance and monitoring if determined necessary. If conditions have changed since environmental review and indicate the need for additional archaeological inventory or indicate newly identified project impacts,</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>avoidance measures will be developed prior to and during project implementation. There is the possibility that unknown buried archaeological resources are present and susceptible to damage or discovery during project implementation. State Parks has policies and procedures to ensure proper treatment of inadvertently discovered archaeological resources. Because State Parks will continue to implement its cultural resources management project to avoid impacts and because PWP Development Projects and Small Development Projects have been designed and will continue to be designed and implemented to avoid and sensitive archeological resources, implementation of the PWP would result in a less-than-significant impact on archaeological resources.</p>			
<p>Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources</p>	<p>Impact 8-2: Disturbance of any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? Implementation of the PWP including the management programs and the Development Projects is not expected to disturb any human remains, including those interred outside formal cemeteries. No human remains have been identified in the Park; however, ground-disturbing activities in areas previously undeveloped or containing undisturbed soils and sediments may result in the inadvertent discovery of human remains. Encountering human remains would initiate specific treatment plans, conditions, and procedures as mandated by Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5, by the Public Resources</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	Code Section 5097.98, and CEQA California Code of Regulations Section 15064.5(e). Incorporating CDPR policies and protocols of avoidance, monitoring, inadvertent discovery, and project redesign (if required) would reduce potential disturbance of human remains to less than significant .			
Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources	<p>Impact 8-3: Substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal cultural resource, pursuant to Assembly Bill 52?</p> <p>The PWP is not expected to result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074. As described above, a request for a Sacred Lands File (SLF) records search and Native American contacts list for the PWP project areas was sent to the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC). The NAHC confirmed the presence of Native American cultural sites and provided a list of Native American individuals who may have knowledge of cultural resources within the PWP project areas. State Parks sent letters to each of these individuals inviting them to participate in consultation pursuant to AB52 regarding Tribal cultural resources and has received responses from three groups. To date, consultation has not identified any tribal cultural resources in the planning area that could be impacts as a result of project implementation. Therefore, impacts on tribal cultural resources from implementation of the PWP is less-than-</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>significant. Consultation will continue throughout project planning and implementation to ensure no newly identified tribal cultural resources are impacted.</p>			
<p>Energy</p>	<p>Impact 9-1: Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.</p> <p>Construction of Development Projects would involve consumption of construction-related energy in the form of electricity, natural gas, and fossil fuels (e.g., gasoline, diesel fuel). The primary energy demands during construction would be associated with construction equipment and vehicle fueling. Energy in the form of fuel and electricity would be consumed during this period by construction vehicles and equipment operating on-site, trucks delivering equipment and supplies to the site, and construction workers driving to and from the site. Development Projects would be constructed to meet currently-applicable energy efficiency standards at the time of construction.</p> <p>Once the projects are constructed, operations would not result in a net increase in users of or staff to serve the PWP area. Therefore, while use patterns may shift in how users use the PWP area and facilities, there would not be a net increase in vehicle trips or related fuel use. Operation of buildings and facilities in the PWP area would consume energy for multiple purposes including, but not limited to, building heating and cooling, lighting,</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>electronics, and office equipment. Energy demand to serve current building and facility operations is considered a part of the baseline conditions for the purposes of this analysis. New projects would be more energy efficient than existing projects of the same type within the PWP area that were constructed prior to the existence of energy efficiency standards or under previous less stringent energy efficiency standards. Considering this information, the site-specific projects would not be expected to cause inefficient, wasteful, or unnecessary consumption of energy and this impact is considered less than significant.</p>			
Energy	<p>Impact 9-2: Conflict with or Obstruct a State or Local Plan for Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency.</p> <p>The Development Projects would be primarily construction-only projects and not result in the development of new land uses that would induce new demand for electricity and natural gas. However, the Oso Flaco Phase 1 and Phase 2 Projects and the Park Corporation Yard Improvement Project would include the construction and operation of new buildings that would generate new demand for electricity and natural gas. State plans and policies for renewable energy and energy efficiency include the most recently adopted California Energy Code and California Green Building Standards Code (CalGreen). The design and construction of new and retrofit buildings would be required to comply with the California Code of Regulations. The</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	California Energy Code and CalGreen are expected to become increasingly more stringent over time to further the State’s renewable energy and GHG reduction goals. Replacement of existing infrastructure would also result in new facilities built to current standards, which are more energy efficient than older facilities that were built to prior, less stringent, standards. Implementation of the proposed site-specific projects would not conflict with or obstruct a State or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Therefore, this impact is less than significant .			
Geology and Soils	Impacts: PWP Implementation All buildings would be designed and constructed according to applicable building codes, including the CBC. Ongoing operation of park management programs and plans involves structural maintenance and upkeep. New construction only includes facilities that are consistent with existing facilities and do not expand the existing footprint above 10% and for which grading is generally minor. Therefore, implementation of the PWP would result in less-than-significant impacts related to seismic and geologic hazards.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Geology and Soils	Operation and maintenance activities associated with the PWP may include grading of areas larger than 50 cubic yards. Grading of amounts larger than 50 cubic yards is subject to all resource management guidelines and would be conducted in full compliance with all	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	applicable permits such as the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits issued by SWRCB. Furthermore, ground disturbance of areas larger than 1 acre requires a site-specific SWPPP with associated BMPs specifically designed to control stormwater discharges and prevent pollutant transport into downstream receiving waters. Therefore, ongoing operation of the PWP would not violate water quality standards or WDRs, or conflict with implementation of the Basin Plan (which is intended to protect designated beneficial uses). This impact would be less than significant .			
Geology and Soils	Most of the PWP planning area is underlain by Holocene-age rock formations of the Young Alluvial Valley Deposits that are considered to be of low paleontological sensitivity. Because ongoing maintenance and operational activities associated with implementation of the PWP involve only a limited amount of minor grading for facilities that are consistent with existing facilities and do not expand the existing footprint above 10%, implementation of the PWP would result in less-than-significant impacts related to destruction of unique paleontological resources.	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Geology and Soils	Ongoing OHV riding at the Oceano Dunes SVRA does not destroy or substantially modify the dunes. The dunes constitute an active, not a static, geologic feature; the sand is always present and the dunes themselves are continually reshaped on a daily basis by strong winds	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	blowing from the Pacific Ocean. OHV riding does not eliminate the sand. Tracks in the sand from OHV riding are eliminated overnight or within 1–2 days from the force of the wind, which constantly redistributes the sand into different patterns regardless of whether OHV riding occurs or not. Furthermore, the OHV riding area includes only approximately 2 miles of the 18-mile-long Guadalupe-Nipomo Dune Complex. Therefore, implementation of the PWP would result in less-than-significant impacts related to destruction of a unique geologic feature.			
Geology and Soils	<p>Impact 10-1: Seismically-Induced Risks to People and Structures from Strong Seismic Ground Shaking and Liquefaction</p> <p>PWP Development and Small Development Projects in the PWP planning area are vulnerable to seismic ground shaking generated by earthquakes. Due to underlying geologic conditions in the Oceano area, Site amplification may cause shaking from distant earthquakes, which normally would not cause damage, to increase locally to damaging levels. The vulnerability in the PWP planning area is compounded by the widespread distribution of highly liquefiable soils that are expected to re-liquefy when ground shaking is amplified from the next earthquake on regionally active faults. However, construction of all project-related buildings that are intended for human habitation is required by law to comply with the requirements of the</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>California Building Standards Code (CBC). As required by the CBC, site-specific geotechnical reports would be prepared by licensed engineers, and recommendations contained therein to provide for seismic safety (as determined by CBC requirements) would be incorporated into the project design and construction of all buildings. Because the CBC is designed to reduce hazards from seismic ground shaking and liquefaction to the maximum extent practicable, the site-specific projects proposed in the PWP planning area would result in less-than-significant impacts related to seismic hazards.</p>			
<p>Geology and Soils</p>	<p>Impact 10-2: Potential for Short-Term Construction-Related Erosion and Loss of Topsoil</p> <p>Soils at all of the Development Project sites, except the North Beach Campground Facility Improvements Project, have a moderately high to high potential for wind erosion. Parks would continue to implement their Soil Conservation Standards and supporting Guidelines including OHV Best Management Practices (BMPs) (which apply primarily to trails) and SWPPPs and associated BMPs (which apply primarily to other new construction) as necessary. Therefore, the site-specific projects proposed in the PWP planning area would result in less-than-significant impacts from short-term construction-related erosion hazards.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Geology and Soils	<p>Impact 10-3: Increase in Geologic Hazards from Unstable/Expansive Soils</p> <p>Soils at the Development Project sites are unstable and subject to liquefaction, lateral spreading hazards, and/or expansion potential. However, by law, buildings and other structures must be designed according to the requirements of the CBC, which contains criteria for reducing structural damage from unstable and expansive soils to the maximum extent practicable. With compliance with the CBC, the Development Projects proposed in the PWP planning area would result in less-than-significant impacts related to unstable and expansive soils.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Geology, Soils, and Paleontological Resources	<p>Impact 10-4: Potential for Damage to or Destruction of Unique Paleontological Resources</p> <p>Holocene-age rock formations (which underlie most of the PWP planning area), are not paleontologically sensitive. The Holocene to late Pleistocene-age Young Alluvial Valley Deposits at the North Beach Campground Facility, Butterfly Grove Public Access, eastern end of the Oso Flaco Lake Boardwalk Replacement, and Oso Flaco Improvement Project sites are considered to be of low paleontological sensitivity. Thus, construction-related earthmoving activities would have a less-than-significant impact on unique paleontological resources.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Geology and Soils	<p>Impact 10-5: Potential for Destruction of a Unique Geologic Feature</p> <p>The Guadalupe-Nipomo Dune Complex is identified as a unique coastal dune landscape, park of which is a National Landmark. The Pier and Grand Avenue Entrances and Lifeguard Towers Project, Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Project, 40 Acre Riding Trail Project, Safety and Education Center Replacement Project, Trash Enclosure Project, Oso Flaco Lake Boardwalk Replacement Project, and the Oso Flaco Improvement Project, which would all be implemented in the Guadalupe-Nipomo Dune Complex, would not directly or indirectly destroy the unique geologic feature (i.e., sand dunes) as compared to current conditions. Therefore, these development projects would have less-than-significant impacts.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	<p>Impact 11-1: Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment, or conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases.</p> <p>With consideration for the existing SLOAPCD emissions thresholds, the revised Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District thresholds, and the minor long-term net increase in emissions that could occur as a result of the construction of proposed site-specific projects, implementation of site-specific projects would</p>	LCC	No mitigation is required.	LCC



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	not generate GHG emissions at a rate or in an amount that would directly or indirectly have a significant impact on the environment, or conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases; this impact is less than cumulatively considerable .			
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<p>Impacts: PWP Implementation</p> <p>State Parks routinely uses and stores unleaded gasoline, diesel fuel, oil, solvents, paint, and tires at the Corporation Yard within Pismo Beach on SR 1. State Parks employees are required to use and dispose of hazardous materials in accordance with all federal, state, and local regulations, thus minimizing any potential for an accidental release of or exposure to such materials. Training related to use, storage, and handling of hazardous material is routinely provided to employees at the Corporation Yard. Hazardous materials are collected annually by a hazardous materials recycler. The Corporation Yard is operated under a site-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (California State Parks 2017) as required by the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board, which includes measures to prevent spills of hazardous materials and to appropriately clean up any accidental spills that may occur. Therefore, implementation of the PWP would result in less-than-significant impacts associated with the routine use, transport, disposal, upset, and accident conditions related to hazardous materials.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<p>Impact 12-1: Potential Risks Associated with the Routine Use, Transport, Disposal, Upset, and Accidental Discharge of Hazardous Materials</p> <p>Hazardous materials typically used in construction operations such as diesel fuel, solvents, and paints would likely be used during construction activities associated with all of the Development Projects. Hazardous materials used during construction activities would be handled and stored in accordance with all federal, state, and local regulations, thus minimizing any potential for an accidental release of or exposure to such materials.</p> <p>The enhancement and expansion of facilities and recreational opportunities at Pismo State Beach and the Oceano Dunes SVRA is not anticipated solely to attract additional visitors to the SVRA; however, attendance is anticipated to fluctuate over time, which during times of high use, would result in an increased use of gasoline and oils needed for the operation of OHVs. The increased use of these common materials would not create a substantial hazard to the public or environment because individuals would handle relatively small volumes to operate OHVs at the Oceano Dunes SVRA. In addition, SVRA staff members are required to promptly clean up hazardous spills (if any occur) and dispose of trash for the health and safety of the environment. Furthermore, State Parks requires that construction, maintenance, and operation of all facilities occur in</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>compliance with federal, state, and local regulatory requirements regarding the handling and disposal of hazardous materials for the protection of surface water and groundwater, soils, and people. Therefore, impacts from the routine use, transport, and disposal of hazardous materials associated with all of the site-specific PWP improvement projects would be less than significant.</p>			
<p>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</p>	<p>Impact 12-2: Potential Exposure to Hazardous Materials from Construction and Operation in a Cortese-Listed Site or Other Known Hazardous Materials Site</p> <p>Sediment in Oso Flaco Lake and Little Oso Flaco Lake contains elevated residues of DDD, DDE, and DDT (i.e., hazardous materials) from pesticide runoff related to agricultural activities. The level of contamination does not meet the threshold for a California hazardous waste (Padre Associates 2017). Human contact with lake sediment would be minimal as a result of construction and recreation activities, and the levels of residual pesticides are not high enough to result in the endangerment of human health. Therefore, the Oso Flaco Improvement Project and the Oso Flaco Lake Boardwalk Replacement Project would have a less-than-significant impact related to construction and operation in a site that is known to contain low levels of hazardous materials.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<p>A small portion of the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project would be located within an open-active hazardous materials site on the Cortese List, which is related to past activities by Phillips 66 at its Santa Maria Refinery. Groundwater has been contaminated with LNAPL, and the plume extends in a radius of approximately 3.7 acres. The LNAPL contamination is present at depths of 50 to 70 feet below the ground surface. The contaminated groundwater plume is confined to an area that is underneath the existing Phillips 66 buildings on the east side of the railroad tracks. A system to treat the contaminated groundwater is in the process of being tested, but has not yet been installed by Phillips 66, and the treatment system is likely to be operational for at least 5 years (SWRCB 2020b). Because the contaminated groundwater is 50 to 70 feet below the ground surface, direct contact with contaminated groundwater by construction workers, and park visitors or staff would not occur. However, chemicals could travel upwards through the soil and volatilize inside new buildings, which could result in an indoor human health hazard. Furthermore, a new groundwater well would be required to support future recreational activities at the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project. Depending on the timing, location, depth, and amount of groundwater that is withdrawn, such withdrawal could either directly encounter contaminants or indirectly cause contaminants in the</p>	<p>S</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 12-2a: Perform a Hydraulic Analysis, Human-Health Risk Assessment, and Screening-Level Ecological Risk Assessment, Coordinate with SWRCB, and Revise Site Plans as Necessary.</p> <p>Prior to finalization of site-specific improvement plans, State Parks shall hire a licensed civil engineer to prepare a site-specific Hydraulic Analysis related to the new groundwater well at the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project site. The study shall include recommended setbacks for drilling of the new groundwater well in a location that will not influence the contaminated groundwater plume, and shall include recommendations for groundwater treatment for human consumption as drinking water (if necessary).</p> <p>State Parks shall also hire a licensed environmental professional to perform a Human-Health Risk Assessment (including an indoor air quality analysis), along with a Screening-Level Ecological Risk Assessment for the development</p>	<p>LTS</p>



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>plume to migrate, thereby expanding the size of the plume and potentially resulting in additional contaminated groundwater. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 12-2a, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>		<p>proposed at the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project site.</p> <p>Finally, State Parks shall coordinate with SWRCB regarding the results of the Hydraulic Analysis for the new well and the indoor air quality analysis, to ensure that human health and surface and groundwater quality are sufficiently protected. State Parks shall also coordinate with SWRCB and Phillips 66 to ensure that proposed development of the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project does not interfere with ongoing remedial activities.</p> <p>Recommendations contained in the Hydraulic Analysis, Human-Health Risk Assessment, and Screening-Level Ecological Risk Assessment shall be implemented by State Parks, and site plans for the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project shall be revised as necessary to incorporate such recommendations. Any necessary on-site groundwater treatment infrastructure (if required) shall be implemented to ensure that the on-</p>	



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
			site groundwater well meets State drinking water standards.	
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Due the age of on-site buildings that would be demolished as part of the North Beach Campground Facility Improvements Project, Butterfly Grove Public Access Project, Pier and Grand Avenue Entrances and Lifeguard Towers Project, Park Corporation Yard Improvement Project, Oceano Campground Infrastructure Improvement Project, Oceano Campground Campfire Center Replacement Project, Safety and Education Center Replacement Project, and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project, asbestos and lead-based paint could be encountered during demolition activities. If not handled properly, asbestos-containing materials and lead-based paint could pose a human and environmental health hazard. With the implementation of Mitigation Measure 12-2b, this impact is considered significant .	S	Mitigation Measure 12-2b: Perform a Survey for Lead-Based Paint and Asbestos-Containing Materials and Implement Proper Demolition and Disposal Procedures. Prior to demolition or reuse of any on-site buildings, State Parks shall retain a California Division of Occupational Safety and Health (Cal-OSHA) certified asbestos consultant to investigate whether any asbestos-containing materials or lead-based paints are present, and could become friable or mobile during rehabilitation or demolition activities. If any materials containing asbestos or lead-based paints are found, they shall be removed by an accredited contractor in accordance with EPA and Cal/OSHA standards. In addition, all activities (construction or demolition) in the vicinity of these materials shall comply with Cal/OSHA asbestos and lead worker construction standards. The materials containing lead or asbestos shall be disposed of properly	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
			at an appropriate off-site disposal facility.	
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	<p>Impact 12-3: Airport Safety Hazards</p> <p>The Pier and Grand Avenue Entrances and Lifeguard Towers Project, Oceano Campground Infrastructure Improvement Project, and the Oceano Campground Campfire Center Replacement Project would not create new sources of glare that could adversely aircraft pilots, would not create new lighting that is difficult to distinguish from airport lighting. The Pier Avenue Entrance and Lifeguard Tower Project would be consistent with the Oa (open space) classification in the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, which recognizes the need to continue existing uses. The new lifeguard tower proposed as part of the Pier Avenue Entrance and Lifeguard Tower Project would be 23 feet tall, which is the same height as a standard two-story house. There are many existing two-story structures in the vicinity that are closer to the airport runway than the proposed new lifeguard tower. Furthermore, given the distance of the lifeguard tower from the runway and the height of the proposed structure, the new lifeguard tower would not exceed the FAA height restriction for structures within the 20:1 approach surface. Therefore, impacts related to airport hazards from the Pier Avenue Entrance Project, Oceano Campground Infrastructure Improvement Project, and the Oceano Campground</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	Campfire Center Replacement Project would be less than significant .			
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	The Oso Flaco Improvement Project and the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project may require the construction and use of a small stormwater detention basin to appropriately treat and detain flows. However, if such a basin is necessary, it would be small in size and would be designed for short-term detention (i.e., empties in 2–3 days) rather than long-term retention. Thus, these projects would not involve new uses that could attract birds and thereby create bird strike hazards. Therefore, impacts related to airport hazards from the Oso Flaco Improvement Project and the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project would be less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Hydrology and Water Quality	PWP Implementation Operation and maintenance activities associated with the Corporation Yard are regulated under a site-specific SWPPP. Corporation Yard activities and their standard operational practices are evaluated annually and enhanced, as needed, to prevent impacts to stormwater. Quarterly O&M Activity and BMP Assessment Forms are prepared by the Oceano Dunes District and submitted to the Central Coast RWQCB. State Parks follows the approach recommended by the California Stormwater Quality Association in its <i>Municipal Stormwater BMP Handbook</i> , which provides	LTS	No mitigation is required	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>guidance to municipal stormwater programs on selecting and implementing BMPs to reduce pollutants in runoff from municipal operations, including recommendations for “Fertilizer and Pesticide Management.”</p> <p>Operation and maintenance activities associated with the PWP may include grading of areas larger than 50 cubic yards. Grading of amounts larger than 50 cubic yards is subject to all resource management guidelines and would be conducted in full compliance with all applicable permits such as the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits issued by SWRCB. Furthermore, ground disturbance of areas larger than 1 acre requires a site-specific SWPPP with associated BMPs specifically designed to control stormwater discharges and prevent pollutant transport into downstream receiving waters. Therefore, ongoing operation of the PWP would not violate water quality standards or WDRs, or conflict with implementation of the Basin Plan (which is intended to protect designated beneficial uses). This impact would be less than significant.</p>			
Hydrology and Water Quality	<p>Impact 13-1: Violate Water Quality Standards or Waste Discharge Requirements or Conflict with a Water Quality Control Plan</p> <p>All of the site-specific projects within the PWP planning area are required to adhere to the SWRCB’s NPDES Construction General Permit requirements and the</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>Phase II MS4 Permit requirement, along with the State Parks Stormwater Management Plan related to stormwater management and discharge and control, and BMP Manual requirements related to trails. Compliance with these existing laws, regulations, and plans would serve to minimize both short-term water quality impacts from construction (at all of the Proposed Development Projects and Small Development Projects) and long-term water quality impacts associated with new development (at the Oso Flaco Improvement Project and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project) in order to protect beneficial uses of receiving waters as designated in the Basin Plan and comply with WDRs issued to meet TMDLs established by the Central Coast RWQCB. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.</p>			
Hydrology and Water Quality	<p>Impact 13-2: Substantially Deplete Groundwater Supplies or Substantially Interfere with Groundwater Recharge such that Sustainable Groundwater Management of the Basin would be Impeded</p> <p>Most of the land surface at the Oso Flaco Improvement Project and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project sites is composed of soils with a high permeability rate and would not be covered with impervious surfaces; therefore, most of these 215-acre and 890-acre sites, respectively, would continue to be available for rainfall to percolate through the soil and recharge the groundwater aquifer. In addition, some of the landscape</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	irrigation water would also likely percolate through the soil for recharge. Because most of the Oso Flaco Improvement Project and the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project sites would still be available for rainfall to recharge the aquifer, these projects would not interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that sustainable groundwater management of the basin would be impeded. Therefore, impacts related to groundwater recharge would be less than significant .			
Hydrology and Water Quality	The Oso Flaco Improvement Project is estimated to require approximately 233.6 afy of groundwater. The Oso Flaco Improvement Project site is currently leased by State Parks for agricultural use (i.e., row crops grown on 166 acres). Actual groundwater usage data for the agricultural field at the Oso Flaco Improvement Project site is not available; however, implementing the Oso Flaco Improvement Project would likely result in a net reduction in groundwater use as compared to the existing agricultural use for irrigation of row crops (i.e., using a water demand factor of 2.5 afy per acre of rotational vegetables, the existing agricultural water usage at the project site likely averages approximately 415 afy). The groundwater used to support the Oso Flaco Improvement Project (233.6 afy) would represent approximately 0.21% of the total groundwater extracted in the SMVMA. Therefore, the impact of the Oso Flaco Improvement Project related to increased need for groundwater supplies and potential conflicts with	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	groundwater sustainability is considered less than significant .			
Hydrology and Water Quality	The NMMA (which includes the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project site) continues to experience a severe water shortage as evidenced by declining well levels. The Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project is estimated to require a similar amount of water as the Oso Flaco Improvement Project, including landscape irrigation (233.6 afy). However, the existing Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery is already using 1,100 afy for its facility, and this water would transfer over to State Parks for use at the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project. Therefore, no additional groundwater supplies from the NMMA would be required to serve the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project, and the current groundwater usage at this site would be reduced by 866.4 afy as compared to 2019 conditions. Therefore, the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies such that sustainable groundwater management of the basin would be impeded. This impact is considered less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Hydrology and Water Quality	Impact 13-3: Substantial Alteration of Drainage Patterns Resulting in Substantially Increased Erosion, Siltation, Downstream Flooding, or Increased Stormwater Runoff Volumes that would Exceed Stormwater Drainage Capacity	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>The Oso Flaco Improvement Project and the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project would require grading, excavation, and earthmoving activities could alter existing drainage patterns and would result in an increase in impervious surfaces as compared to existing undeveloped conditions. The increased impervious surfaces would result in additional stormwater runoff, that could contribute to increased pollutant transport to downstream waterbodies, increased erosion, as well as downstream flooding conditions. Compliance with SWRCB’s NDPES Construction General Permit requirements and the Phase II MS4 Permit requirement, along with the State Parks Stormwater Management Plan requirements related to stormwater management and discharge and control and BMP Manual guidelines related to trails, would minimize both short-term impacts from construction and long-term impacts associated with new development. Therefore, the Oso Flaco Improvement Project and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project would not result in substantially increased erosion, siltation, or exceedance of stormwater drainage capacity, and would not create new flood conditions as a result of stormwater runoff, and this impact is considered less than significant.</p>			



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Hydrology and Water Quality	<p>Impact 13-4: Impede Flood Flows or Risk Release of Pollutants from Inundation in a Flood or Tsunami Hazard Zone</p> <p>Most of the Oso Flaco Improvement Project campgrounds and facilities and the Oso Flaco Lake Boardwalk Replacement Project would be developed in a tsunami inundation zone. In the event of a tsunami hazard, State Parks would coordinate with the State OES, the County OES, and local law enforcement to provide notification to Park staff and visitors, and to provide for orderly evacuation out of the Park eastward along Oso Flaco Lake Road, and thence to SR 1. During construction activities, construction materials and equipment would be staged within each site-specific project site. Small quantities of hazardous materials such as fuels, oils, lubricants, and paint would be temporarily stored within each staging area. If construction work is necessary during the winter rainy season, State Parks would require construction contractors to remove any hazardous materials from staging areas if flood warnings are issued. Therefore, impacts related to inundation and release of pollutants or impedance of flood flows would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Hydrology and Water Quality	<p>Impact 13-5: Conflict with or Obstruct Implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan or Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan</p> <p>All of the PWP Development Projects are required to implement the SWRCB’s NDPES Construction General Permit requirements and the Phase II MS4 Permit requirement, and the State Parks Stormwater Management Plan requirements, related to stormwater management and discharge and control, and BMP Manual guidelines related to trails. In addition, State Parks is required to obtain CWA Section 404 permit from the USACE, CWA Section 401 Clean water certification from the Central Coast RWQCB, and a Fish & Game Code Section 1602 Streambed Alteration Agreement from CDFW for repeated installation and removal of the Pismo Creek Estuary Seasonal (Floating) Bridge Installation and for work associated with the Oso Flaco Lake Boardwalk Replacement Project. Compliance with these existing laws, regulations, and plans would serve to minimize both short-term water quality impacts from construction and long-term water quality impacts associated with new development in order to protect beneficial uses of receiving waters as designated in the Basin Plan and comply with WDRs issued to meet TMDLs established by the Central Coast RWQCB. Therefore, the site-specific projects within the PWP planning area would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	the Basin Plan, and this impact is considered less than significant .			
Hydrology and Water Quality	The extraction of groundwater that would be necessary to support the Oso Flaco Improvement Project (233.6 afy) would result in a net decrease of groundwater extraction in the SMVMA as compared to existing (2019) conditions, since approximately 166 acres of agricultural irrigation for row crops (estimated annual groundwater use of 415 afy) would no longer occur. Annual extraction of groundwater in the NMMA to support the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project (233.6 afy) would also be reduced as compared to 2019 conditions, since the Santa Maria refinery currently extracts substantially more water than would be needed for the proposed project. Therefore, the groundwater required to supply the Oso Flaco Improvement Project and the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies in the basin and would not interfere with sustainable groundwater basin management. This impact is considered less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Land Use Plans and Policies	Impact 14-1: Cause a Significant Environmental Impact Due to a Conflict With Any Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation Adopted for the Purpose of Avoiding or Mitigating an Environmental Effect? The proposed PWP includes Development Projects and Small Development Projects and Park operations and	B	No mitigation is required.	B



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>maintenance activities. The North Beach Campground Facility Improvements Project, Oceano Dunes Campground Infrastructure Improvements Project, Pier and Grand Avenue Entrances and Lifeguard Towers Project, Butterfly Grove Public Access Project, Park Corporation Yard Improvement Project, Oceano Campground Campfire Center Replacement Project, Safety and Education Center Project, and Oso Flaco Boardwalk Replacement Project, Trash Enclosure Project would include upgrades and improvements to existing facilities.</p> <p>The Pismo State Beach (Grand Dunes) Boardwalk Project would be an extension of the existing boardwalk north of Grand Avenue in Grover Beach. As described in the Pismo State Beach and Oceano Dunes SVRA General Plan, the purpose of Pismo State Beach is to make available to the people an outstanding coastal area of beach and sand dunes located in and southward from the City of Pismo Beach in San Luis Obispo County. The Pismo State Beach Boardwalk will provide a substantial internal public access improvement for the public trail system within the Park and to adjacent neighborhoods and therefore will result in a beneficial impact to the intended land use in the Park.</p> <p>The Pismo Creek Estuary Seasonal (Floating Bridge) Installation would reduce the pedestrian impact on Pismo Creek. This project will reduce erosion and provide a safe and convenient alternative to walking</p>			



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>through the mouth of the creek to access Pismo State Beach from the Pismo Coast Village RV Resort, a private campground that abuts the Pismo State Beach boundary. Therefore, the bridge would have a beneficial impact on the intended land uses of the Park.</p> <p>The Oso Flaco (Initial) Improvement Project will support increased recreational opportunities in the southern portion of Oceano Dunes SVRA as envisioned and authorized in the General Plan. The project would develop a southern Park destination spot that enhances day-use and adds low-cost overnight camping. The project includes additional visitor serving amenities and would have a beneficial impact on the intended land uses at Oso Flaco.</p>			
Noise	<p>Impact 16-1: Generation of a Substantial Temporary or Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels in the Vicinity of Development Projects in Excess of Applicable Standards:</p> <p>An average of approximately 30 construction workers would be employed at the project site during peak construction activities. Trucking for delivery and disposal of materials would occur throughout the construction period and would average one to two truck trips per day. Project-related construction traffic would result in a noise level of 54 dB Leq at 50 feet from the roadway centerlines.</p> <p>Simultaneous operation of the on-site construction equipment for the PWP Development Projects could</p>	S	<p>Mitigation Measure 16-1: Implement Noise Control Measures</p> <p>State Parks and the general construction contractor shall implement the following measures to reduce construction-generated noise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project construction activities shall be limited to 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday. • Construction staging areas within the Development Projects shall be located as far from noise-sensitive uses as feasible. 	SU



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>generate combined intermittent noise levels of up to approximately 87 dBA Leq at 50 feet from the project construction activities, which is approximately how close the nearest noise-sensitive uses are located.</p> <p>Construction activities would cause an increase in noise at all of the Development Projects from 12 to 42 dB above existing ambient noise conditions. Mitigation Measure 16-1 would be implemented to reduce construction-related noise impacts; however, this impact would still be significant.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction equipment and vehicles shall be fitted with efficient, well-maintained mufflers that reduce equipment noise emission levels at the project site. Internal combustion-powered equipment shall be equipped with properly operating noise suppression devices (e.g., mufflers, silencers, wraps) that meet or exceed manufacturers' specifications. Mufflers and noise suppressors shall be properly maintained and tuned to ensure proper fit, function, and minimization of noise. • Portable and stationary site support equipment (such as generators, compressors, rock crushers, and cement mixers) shall be located as far as possible from nearby noise-sensitive receptors. • Impact tools shall have the working area/impact area shrouded or shielded, with intake and exhaust ports on power equipment muffled or 	



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>suppressed. This may necessitate the use of temporary or portable, application-specific noise shields or barriers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction equipment shall not be idled for extended periods (e.g., 15 minutes or longer) of time in the immediate vicinity of noise-sensitive receptors. • A disturbance coordinator shall be designated by the general contractor, which will post contact information in a conspicuous location near the entrance of the subject construction sites so that it is visible to nearby receivers most likely to be disturbed. The coordinator shall manage complaints resulting from the construction noise. Reoccurring disturbances shall be evaluated by a qualified acoustical consultant retained by the project proponent to ensure compliance with applicable standards. 	



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Noise	<p>Impact 16-2: Generation of Excessive Groundborne Vibration or Groundborne Noise Levels.</p> <p>The movement and operation of construction equipment during construction of the Development Projects may generate temporary ground-borne vibration. The nearest vibration-sensitive uses (buildings) to any of the Development Project construction sites are approximately 50 feet. At these distances, the most substantial vibration generated by project construction equipment would attenuate to less than 78 VdB and 0.031 in/sec PPV, less than the criteria of 80 VdB and 0.5 in/sec PPV recommended by Caltrans. The vibration generated by equipment is not anticipated to be excessive or significant. Therefore, short-term construction of the Development Projects would not expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne noise or vibration. For these reasons, this impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Noise	<p>Impact 16-3: For a Project Located Within the Vicinity of a Private Airstrip or 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?</p> <p>The proposed project activities would be located within the airport land use plan area for Oceano County Airport, but would not increase or otherwise affect the number of people exposed to noise from the project.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>The proposed project does not have the potential to expose people residing or working at the proposed project sites to excessive, airstrips-related noise levels because there are no private airstrips within two miles of the project sites. This impact would be less than significant.</p>			
Public Services	<p>Impact 18-1: Increased Demand for Fire Protection Services</p> <p>The Oso Flaco Improvement Project and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Improvement Project provide new recreational opportunities in currently inaccessible areas of the Oceano Dunes SVRA; therefore, a larger area would be available in which visitors could recreate, thereby increasing the potential for accidental fires and the need for fire suppression. Both projects propose RV, tent, and cabin camping and the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project proposes a multi-use event space and multiple OHV trails. State Parks would design the Oso Flaco Improvement Project and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project interior circulation networks according to local and State standards to provide for emergency access and all new facilities would be accessible using standard fire equipment. Any new structures constructed as part of these site-specific improvement projects (e.g., residences, office space, kiosks, ranger stations, and concession buildings) would be required to incorporate California Fire Code requirements, as summarized in Section 18.1, "Regulatory Setting." As</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>discussed in Chapter 23, “Wildfire,” State Parks would comply with California Public Resources Code fire safety regulations and park visitors would be subject to regulations for lighting, building, and use of campfires. Incorporation of California Fire Code requirements, OSHA fire suppression and emergency medical services standards, and compliance with California Public Resources Code fire safety regulations would reduce the dependence on San Luis Obispo County Fire Department equipment and personnel by reducing fire hazards. Therefore, the demand for fire protection would not substantially increase and implementation of the Oso Flaco Improvement Project and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project would not require the construction of new or expansion of existing fire service facilities. This impact would be less than significant.</p>			
Public Services	<p>Impact 18-2: Increased Demand for Law Enforcement and Emergency Services</p> <p>The Oso Flaco Improvement Project and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Improvement Project provides new recreational opportunities in currently inaccessible areas of the Oceano Dunes SVRA. Proposed PWP programs include enhancing enforcement, enhancing staff and volunteer patrol programs, and installing additional signage to assist with management of vehicular use and restrictions. Rangers and park aide patrols would continue to patrol the Oceano Dunes SVRA and would continue to be supported by the San</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	Luis Obispo County Sheriff's Department South County Patrol Division and San Luis Ambulance should an emergency require outside attention. Therefore, implementation of the Oso Flaco Improvement Project and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project would not result in the construction of new or expansion of existing law enforcement facilities. This impact would be less than significant .			
Public Services	The 40 Acre Riding Trail Installation Project would provide more recreational opportunities for beginner to intermediate OHV riders. The family-focused atmosphere and focus on novice and intermediate riding conditions at the SVRA would help to minimize the risk of potential emergency and security situations (e.g., high-risk challenges or high-speed collisions). Therefore, implementation of the 40 Acre Riding Trail Installation would not result in the construction of new or expansion of existing law enforcement facilities. This impact would be less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS
Recreation and Public Access	Impacts 19-1: Construction or Expansion of Recreational Facilities which Might Adversely Affect the Physical Environment The Oso Flaco (Initial) and (Future) Improvement Project would support increased recreational activities in the southern portion of Oceano Dunes SVRA as envisioned and authorized in the 1975 Pismo State Beach and Oceano Dunes SVRA General Plan (General	B	No mitigation is required.	B



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	Plan). With regards to recreation, these projects would have a beneficial impact on recreation by improving public access, providing enhanced recreation opportunities, and providing new low cost overnight accommodations on the coast. Both Project phases would expand non-motorized recreation access to the Oso Flaco Day Use Area through additional trail and camping opportunities, expand recreational activities to include primitive camping (in the initial project) and a developed campground (in the future project), and include new visitor services amenities.			
Recreation and Public Access	The Oceano Campground Infrastructure Improvement Project, Pier and Grand Avenue Entrances & Lifeguard Towers Project, and North Beach Campground Facility Improvements Project would have beneficial impacts on recreation by improving public access through: improving existing low cost accommodations in the campgrounds; replacing non-compliant ADA accessible amenities; and providing new accessible amenities and visitor services.	B	No mitigation is required.	B



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Recreation and Public Access	The Park Corporation Yard Improvement Project would improve park operations and visitor services functions for the Oceano Dunes District. It would benefit recreation users by re-routing park operations traffic to avoid the North Beach Campground and therefore would have a beneficial impact on recreation.	B	No mitigation is required.	B
Recreation and Public Access	The Butterfly Grove Public Access and Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Project make improvements to existing recreational facilities and include the expansion of some recreational facilities that might adversely affect the environment. These projects would have a beneficial impact on recreation by improving public access through: creating new pedestrian and equestrian recreation opportunities in sensitive coastal areas that were previously closed to the public; improving parking and safe access to the Butterfly Grove; and, improving existing and creating new environmental education programs and opportunities in these project areas. The Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project would support increased recreational activities in the southern portion of Oceano Dunes SVRA as envisioned and authorized in the 1975 General Plan. These projects would have a beneficial impact on recreation by improving public access and providing new low cost overnight accommodations on the coast. The project would create new OHV and non-motorized recreation access.	B	No mitigation is required.	B



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Recreation and Public Access	Proposed Small Development Projects and ongoing maintenance would enhance existing coastal access and recreation opportunities (motorized and non-motorized) and make improvements to accessibility and replace aging infrastructure. The Trash Enclosure at Post 2/Beach Trash Management would improve public access to waste disposal while on the beach. Small development projects would have beneficial impacts on recreation.	B	No mitigation is required.	B
Recreation and Public Access	The PWP proposes interim use limits until another carrying capacity study is conducted. Until a new study is completed, the following use capacity limits will be implemented: 500 street-legal vehicles for camping, 1,000 street-legal vehicles for day use, and 1,000 OHVs for day use. The interim use limit would pose a significant and unavoidable impact to motorized public recreation and coastal access to Pismo State Beach and Oceano Dunes SVRA because it would severely reduce the number of visitors that can recreation in the Park at any time when compared to current conditions.	SU	No mitigation is available.	SU
Transportation and Traffic	Impact 20-1: Conflict with a Program, Plan, Ordinance, or Policy Addressing the Circulation System, Including Transit, Roadway, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Facilities. The Project, while it would not increase vehicular travel demand, would include improvements to bicycle and pedestrian access, avoiding any conflict with local and regional land use and transportation plans. The project	PS	Mitigation Measure 20-1: Prepare and Implement a Traffic Control Plan Before construction begins, the State Parks and/or its construction contractor shall prepare and implement a traffic control plan to minimize construction-related traffic	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>does not conflict with any applicable circulation system plans and does not significantly add to demand on the circulation system or conflict with any congestion management programs or any other agency’s plans for congestion management. The Project would not change the current use of the site or result in an increase in vehicular traffic. Vehicular traffic accompanying the construction or operation of the Project would not result in a significant traffic impact. Short-term construction activities will require the use of roadways in the area; however, this movement of equipment, materials, and construction workers would be short term. Project construction activities may add as many as 38 trips per day to roadways in the project area throughout the 8-hour work window; this would not cause any significant increase to the area roadways that would substantially affect their function. During the peak hour, a maximum of five trips would be added to area roadways. Because the proposed project would not generate more than 50 new trips during the a.m. or p.m. peak hour, based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) screening criteria, the project would not cause a substantial increase in traffic relative to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (ITE 1988). Mitigation Measure 20-1 have been recommended to minimize construction-related traffic impacts. Implementing Mitigation Measure 20-1 would</p>		<p>safety hazards on affected roadways and ensure adequate access for emergency responders. The lead agency and/or its contractor shall coordinate the development and implementation of this plan with agencies with jurisdiction over the affected routes (i.e., SLO County, City of Pismo Beach, and the City of Grover Beach), as appropriate. The traffic control plan shall, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss work hours and haul routes, delineate work areas, and identify traffic control methods and plans for flagging. • Determine the need to require workers to park personal vehicles at an approved staging area and take only necessary project vehicles to the work sites. • Develop and implement a process for communicating with affected residents and landowners about the project before the start of construction. The public notice shall include posting notices and appropriate signage regarding 	



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	reduce the potentially significant construction impact associated with traffic hazards to a less-than-significant .		<p>construction activities. The written notification shall include the construction schedule, the exact location and duration of activities on each roadway (e.g., which roads/lanes and access points/driveways will be blocked on which days and for how long), and contact information for questions and complaints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notify the public regarding alternative routes that may be available to avoid delays by use of electronic message signs if/when traffic is disrupted on Highway 1 and any other public roads providing the traveling public, on all modes, with current construction information and the availability of alternate travel routes • Plan schedules to show hours of operation to minimize congestion during peak hours and special events. Ensure that appropriate warning signs are posted in advance of construction activities, alerting bicyclists and pedestrians 	



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
			<p>to any closures of nonmotorized facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notify administrators of police and fire stations, ambulance service providers, and recreational facility managers regarding the timing, location, and duration of construction activities and the locations of detours and lane closures, where applicable. Maintain access for emergency vehicles in and/or adjacent to roadways affected by construction activities at all times. Require the repair and restoration of affected roadway rights-of-way to their original condition after construction is completed. 	
Transportation and Traffic	<p>Impact 20-3: Substantial Increase in Hazards Due to a Geometric Design Feature (e.g., Sharp Curves or Dangerous Intersections) or Incompatible Uses (e.g., Farm Equipment)</p> <p>The proposed Development Projects do not include any design features or introduce incompatible uses that would increase hazards on local roadways. The primary access to the project sites would be from SR 1 to public roads. Project construction vehicles and equipment</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p>Implement Mitigation Measure 20-1.</p>	<p>LTS</p>



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>would maneuver among the general-purpose vehicles on local roads, which could cause safety hazards. The presence of haul trucks and other on-road construction vehicles could increase hazard risks on existing roadways. The use of large trucks to transport equipment and materials to and from the worksite could also increase the rate of roadway wear. Also, the trip generation levels under the proposed project would not result in increased congestion on, or reduce the effectiveness of the local and regional transportation system used to access the proposed sites in the area, as the proposed project would only result in up to one to two truck trips per day and during the peak hour, a maximum of five trips would be added to area roadways. Traffic would be controlled and coordinated with Caltrans, County of San Luis Obispo, City of Pismo Beach, and the City of Grover Beach. Signage will be posted that will warn users of the roadway to slow down, entrances and exits to project construction sites will be located in order to avoid conflicts, and speed limits will be reduced in order to avoid conflict areas, as necessary. Mitigation Measure 20-1 will be imposed to minimize construction-related traffic impacts. During project operations, no more staff than those under existing conditions would be required for project operations and maintenance. This impact would be less than significant.</p>			



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Transportation and Traffic	<p>Impact 20-4: Inadequate Emergency Access as a Result of Project Construction Activities</p> <p>Construction activities for the Development Projects in the PWP could reduce emergency access to roadways in the project area. Slow-moving trucks entering and exiting the project sites along roadways in the vicinity of the project sites could delay the movement of emergency vehicles. Emergency access along the surface streets would be maintained during construction, staging, and access activities. Construction staging will occur within construction areas and will not affect emergency access to any of the project sites.</p> <p>The roads and other transportation facilities within the project area operate at acceptable service levels, except for the congestion experienced during weekends, holidays, and summer months on Pier Avenue and Grand Avenue at the entrances to the State Beach. The project sites are served by a network of highways, arterial, and collector streets. Oso Flaco Improvement Project site is served by Oso Flaco Lake Road. The project is proposing to expand the Oso Flaco Lake Road as part of the project to accommodate increased traffic and to reduce impacts to farm activities. The improvement will facilitate continued use of the roadways and avoid conflicts related to movement of agricultural equipment, and in case of emergency needs. Similarly, the North Beach Campground Facility Improvements Project site, Butterfly Grove Public Access</p>	PS	Implement Mitigation Measure 20-1	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>Project site, and Park Corporation Yard Improvement Project are accessed directly from Highway 1. There are multiple access points along Highway 1 and also sides of the highway (shoulders and driveways) can be used in case of emergency. Grand Avenue would be the access road for Grand Avenue Entrance & Lifeguard Towers Project site. Grand Avenue is a multi-lane roadway and would provide sufficient access for emergency access during the proposed project construction. Oceano Campground Infrastructure Improvement Project site, Pier Avenue Entrance & Lifeguard Towers Project site, and Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Project site would be accessed through Pier Avenue. Pier Avenue is a multi-lane roadway and would provide sufficient access for emergency access during the proposed project construction. Also, the 40 Acre site, Trash Enclosure site, Safety and Education Center Replacement site, and Oceano Campfire Center site would be accessed through Pier Avenue. The Floating Bridge Installation site would be accessed through Addie Street in Pismo Beach. Mitigation Measure 20-1 is imposed to help manage construction-related traffic. During project operations, no more staff than those under existing conditions would be required for project operations and maintenance. This impact would be less than significant.</p>			
Utilities and Service Systems	Impact 21-1: Increase Demand for Water Supply Implementing the Oso Flaco Improvement Project would require 233.6 afy of groundwater, which would result in	LTS	No mitigation is required.	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>an estimated net decrease of groundwater extraction in the SMVMA as compared to existing (2019) conditions for agricultural irrigation. The groundwater used to support the Oso Flaco Improvement Project, which would represent approximately 0.21% of the total groundwater extracted in the SMVMA, would not substantially decrease the groundwater supplies available to serve existing and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.</p>			
<p>Utilities and Service Systems</p>	<p>The NMMA (which includes the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project site) continues to experience a severe water shortage as evidenced by declining well levels. However, the existing Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery is already using 1,100 afy for its facility, and this water would transfer over to State Parks for use at the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project. Therefore, no additional groundwater supplies from the NMMA would be required to serve the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project, and the current groundwater usage at this site would be reduced by 866.4 afy. Therefore, the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies available to serve existing and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry, and multiple dry years. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	<p>LTS</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>LTS</p>



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Utilities and Service Systems	<p>Impact 21-2: Increased Demand for Wastewater Treatment Capacity</p> <p>Based on gallon per day per use identified in Title 24 of the California Building Code Title 4, Part 5 and NFPA, the wastewater flow for the Oso Flaco Improvement Project would be 0.03 mgd and the wastewater flow for the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project would be 0.03 mgd. Wastewater from both of these Development Projects would be conveyed to the SSLOCS District WWTP, and they would not exceed the design capacity of the SSLOCS District WWTP (5.0 mgd). Therefore, the SSLOCS District WWTP would have adequate capacity to treat wastewater flows generated by the Oso Flaco Improvement Project and the Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project in addition its existing commitments. This impact would be less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required	LTS
Utilities and Service Systems	<p>Impact 21-3: Increased Demand for Solid Waste Disposal and Compliance with Solid Waste Regulations</p> <p>The Oso Flaco Improvement Project and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project would result in increased generation of solid waste as a result of new recreational facilities, staff residences, and park office buildings. Considering existing remaining capacity at the Cold Canyon Landfill (where solid waste disposal would occur), there is sufficient capacity to accept the anticipated increase in solid waste generated by the Oso Flaco Improvement Project and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project. In addition, State Parks would comply</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	with all State and local statues related to recycling. Thus, construction and operation of the Oso Flaco Improvement Project and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project would not generate solid waste in excess of State of local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reductions goals or other federal, state, and local management and reduction status and regulations. Therefore, impacts related to increased generation of solid waste would be less than significant .			
Utilities and Service Systems	All of the site-specific and small development projects could result in the generation of various construction-period wastes, including scrap lumber, scrap finishing materials, various scrap metals, and other recyclable and nonrecyclable construction-related wastes. The 2019 CALGreen Code (Title 24, Part 11 of the California Code of Regulations) requires all construction contractors to reduce construction waste and demolition debris by 65 percent. In addition, the 2019 CALGreen Code requires that 100 percent of trees, stumps, rocks, and associated vegetation and soils resulting primarily from land clearing be reused or recycled. Compliance with the 2019 CALGreen Code would support the attainment of solid waste reductions. Therefore, impacts related to increased generation of solid waste from development of the site-specific and small development improvement projects would be less than significant .	LTS	No mitigation is required	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
Wildfire	<p>PWP Implementation</p> <p>Operations and maintenance activities associated with implementation of the PWP include the use of heavy equipment (e.g., loader, tractor) in all areas of the Oceano Dunes District. Depending on the location of maintenance activities and equipment required, fire risks could result from vehicle mufflers, gasoline-powered tools, and other equipment could produce a spark, fire, or flame. State Parks would comply with all Public Resource Codes related to fire safety and wildfire suppression. Strict adherence to applicable Public Resource Codes requirements would ensure that wildfire risks are minimized. Therefore, impacts related to the potential for PWP implementation to exacerbate wildfire risks is less than significant.</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required	LTS
Wildfire	<p>Impact 23-1: Exacerbate Wildfire Risks</p> <p>The Oceano Campground Infrastructure Improvement Project, Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Project, and Park Corporation Yard Infrastructure Improvement Project are within a State Responsibility Area and designated by CAL FIRE as Moderate Fire Severity Zones; however, the risk of wildfire is low and this impact would be less than significant</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required	LTS
Wildfire	<p>The western/northwestern portion of the Oso Flaco Improvement Project site and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project site are within a State Responsibility Area. Adherence to safety measures identified in State</p>	LTS	No mitigation is required	LTS



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Impact Area Topic	Impacts	Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Significance After Mitigation
	<p>Parks District Management Plan, Public Resources Code, and Oceano Dunes District Order 544-008-2020, when considered together, would minimize the risk of increased frequency, intensity, or size of wildfires and decrease the risk of exposure of people or structures to wildfire. Therefore, impacts related to the potential for the Oso Flaco Improvement Project and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project to exacerbate wildfire risks would be less than significant.</p>			



B = Beneficial Impact; LCC = Less than Cumulatively Considerable; LTS = Less than Significant; S = Significant; PS = Potentially Significant; SU = Significant and Unavoidable

Table S-2. Cumulative Impact Summary

Impact Area Topic	Significant Cumulative Impact?	Project Contribution
Aesthetics	No	Less than cumulatively considerable
Agricultural Resources	No	Less than cumulatively considerable
Air Quality	No	Less than cumulatively Considerable
Biological Resources	No	Less than cumulatively considerable. Beneficial impact.
Cultural Resources	No	Less than cumulatively considerable
Energy	No	Less than cumulatively considerable
Geology and Soils	No	Less than cumulatively considerable
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Yes	Less than cumulatively considerable
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	No	Less than cumulatively considerable
Hydrology and Water Quality	No	Less than cumulatively considerable
Land Use Plans and Policies	No	No cumulative impacts would occur
Noise	No	No cumulative impacts would occur
Public Services	No	Less than cumulatively considerable
Recreation and Access	No	No cumulative impacts would occur
Transportation and Traffic	No	Less than cumulatively considerable
Utilities and Service Systems	No	Less than cumulatively considerable
Wildfire	No	Less than cumulatively considerable

