



CITY OF GROVER BEACH INITIAL STUDY

-
1. **Project Title:** Pacific Coast Hotel, Development Permit application No. 05-025
 2. **Lead Agency Name & Address:** City of Grover Beach
154 South Eighth Street
Grover Beach, California 93483
 3. **Contact Person & Phone #** Ray Hetherington, Planner III (Project Planner)
(805) 473-4520
 4. **Project Location** 105 West Grand Avenue
 5. **Project Sponsor's Name & Address:** Ron Perkins
IGIT, Inc
166 S. 10th Street
Grover Beach, CA 93433
 6. **General Plan Designation:** Planned Commercial
 7. **Zoning:** Coastal Planned Commercial (C-P-C) District
 8. **Surrounding land uses and setting:** State Highway 1, Union Pacific Railroad, and commercial to the east; Recreational vehicle park and golf course to the north; Grand Avenue and open space/wildlife area to the south; and, Meadow Creek, parking area, and dunes to the west.
 9. **Other agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):**
 10. **Project Description:** A Development Permit Application has been filed for approval of a General Development Plan and a Specific Development Plan, Coastal Development Permit, Architectural and Site Plan Approval, and a Vesting Tentative Tract Map to allow for the construction of an approximate 29,189 square foot retail commercial, Condominium/Hotel development at 105 West Grand Avenue in the City of Grover Beach. The project involves a 26,270 square foot parcel, located at the northwest corner of West Grand Avenue and State Highway 1. The site is currently vacant, and was previously occupied by a service station. The intent is to develop a condominium development with 20 condo/hotel units (in which each unit could be privately owned, yet rented out nightly as a typical hotel room, with the City collecting the TOT bed tax), 2,855 square feet of commercial (visitor-serving retail space and a 458 sq. ft. café), and a 37 space underground parking garage. The underground parking garage and the entire proposed project would require 5,432 cubic yards of cut material and 97 cubic yards of fill material. The development will also include a courtyard area, patios, underground utilities, and frontage road improvements. Onsite storm water drainage will be filtered in an underground Rainstore³© filtration system. The filtration device will collect and filter all on-site storm water before discharging it. The structure will be two and three-story, with a maximum height of 40 feet.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture Resources
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology/Soils
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality
- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise
- Population/Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation/Traffic
- Utilities/Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

FISH AND GAME FEES:

	There is no evidence before the Department that the project will have any potential adverse effects on fish and wildlife resources or the habitat upon which the wildlife depends. As such, the project qualifies for a de minimis waiver with regards to the filing of Fish and Game Fees.
X	The project has potential to impact fish and wildlife resources and may be subject to the payment of Fish and Game fees pursuant to Section 711.4 of the California Fish and Game Code. This initial study has been circulated to the California Department of Fish and Game for review and comment.

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE:

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

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. _____

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared. **X** _____

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required. _____

I find that the proposal MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. _____

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required. _____

Signature

Date

George Hansen, Community Development Director

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" question is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operations impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses", may be cross-referenced.)
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previous prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

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

Discussion

a) The project site is located at the northwest corner of West Grand Avenue and State Route 1, which have been classified as scenic routes in the City's General Plan (Source 2). Scenic vistas generally associated with this area are generally views of the ocean and the dunes, as well as the hills adjoining the City to the north and east. In this area of the city, views of the ocean and dunes are generally limited to within the public rights-of-way, in this case, along Grand Avenue. This project would have visual impact on portions of West Grand Avenue and Highway 1 that currently offer views of the dunes to the west and the golf courser and open space to the north of the project site.

As identified in the City's General Plan, there are four primary issues associated with development adjacent to scenic routes. These include concerns related to 1) the provision of quality architecture; 2) appropriate signage; 3) the condition of the road; and the potential presence of obstructions, such as power poles and utility lines. The proposed project will undergo architectural review to address the first and second issues and ensure the architectural design contributes to an attractive, beach oriented, visual theme which enhances the quality of the aesthetic environment within the coastal zone. The project will also be required to make necessary road improvements along its frontage to address access and safety concerns. It will also be required to contribute development fees that will be used in part to address circulation issues. Finally, he project does not include utility or power poles. For these reasons, this project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. (Sources 1,2)

b) The project site is located west of Highway 1 and north of West Grand Avenue, Highway 1 is designated as a State Scenic Highway along this segment and along West Grand Avenue is a City designated Scenic Route. No scenic trees, outcroppings, historical buildings, or other features have been identified in the City's General Plan near the project site. Thus, the project will not impact these scenic resources. Additionally, the project has been designed in an attempt to be compatible and complimentary to the existing natural vegetation and landforms. Impacts would be less than significant. (Sources 1,2)

c) The project includes frontage on Highway 1 and West Grand Avenue, designated as scenic routes in the City's General Plan Scenic Routes Element. The Element includes several policies to minimize a development's effect on scenic resources including, but not limited to use of landscaping, contiguous design styles, appropriate signage, and positive use of street furniture. Given the height and mass of the proposed structure, the project has the potential to substantially degrade the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. However, the project is subject to Architectural review by the City. The purpose and intent of the Architectural review process is to allow the city to review the project in an effort to ensure the following:

- 1) That the architectural and general appearance of buildings or structures and grounds are in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.
- 2) That the proposed design is not detrimental to the orderly and harmonious development of the City.
- 3) That the development does not impair the desirability of investment or occupation in the neighborhood.
- 4) That the proposal is consistent with any architectural guidelines or standards prepared for the area in which the project is located.
- 5) That the project is consistent with the text and maps of the Grover Beach General Plan and the Zoning regulations.

The Architectural review process would ensure that the project design is compatible with the neighborhood and that it does not substantially degrade the existing visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant. (Sources 1,2,3,14)

- d) The project will have lighting on the exterior of the buildings and lighting from the building itself. The project site is within a mostly open space setting. Project lighting plans would be reviewed prior to issuance of building permits to ensure the proposed project would not significantly contribute to excessive light and glare beyond that currently generated by surrounding development. (Source 1)

Mitigation Measures

MM-1 Prior to issuance of building permits, proposed lighting shall be indicated on site plans that demonstrates that spill-over of lighting would not affect adjacent properties. The lighting plan shall incorporate lighting that direct light pools downward to prevent glare on adjacent and surrounding areas. Lights shall have solid sides and reflectors to further reduce lighting impacts by controlling light spillage. Light fixtures that shield adjacent properties from excessive brightness at night shall be included in the lighting plan. Non-glare lighting shall be used.

Conclusion

Based upon the location and design of the proposed project, implementation of standard General Plan and ordinance requirements as part of the required Architectural Approval review, and the proposed mitigation measure, visual impacts would be less than significant.

Issues (and Supporting Information Services):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?				X
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				X
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment that, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X

Discussion

(a-c) The project site is not designated as prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide significance. The project site is not under a Williamson Act agricultural contract, nor is it now or in the historical past been utilized for agricultural production. Implementation of the project will not have any other environmental impact that would result in the conversion of farmland to a non-agricultural use. (Sources 2)

Conclusion

The project site is not designated as agricultural land nor will it have any direct or indirect impact regarding conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. Impacts to agricultural resources will be avoided and thus no mitigation measures are necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Services):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY: Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X	
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		X		

Issues (and Supporting Information Services):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?			X	
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	

Discussion

a) The proposed project would involve a condo/hotel visitor commercial development on a site that is currently designated for coastal planned commercial, with an emphasis on visitor serving facilities. The proposed 29,189 sq. ft. of commercial development, with 20 condo/hotel units and visitor serving retail uses, would be consistent with the General Plan land use and zoning designations for the site, which is therefore consistent with the goals and policies of the San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (APCD) 2004 Clean Air Plan (CAP). Based on the APCD's guidelines, projects are considered consistent with the CAP if they incorporate appropriate CAP Transportation Control Measures (TCM) and any applicable stationary source control measures, and are consistent with Air Pollution Control District (APCD) rules and regulations (Source 4). Measures to reduce the number and length of motor vehicles traveled by facilitating transit use, carpooling, bicycling and other non-motorized modes of transportation have been incorporated by reference into the Grover Beach General Plan. Since the proposed project is consistent with allowable development intensity in the General Plan and the General Plan is consistent with the CAP, the project is considered consistent with the CAP and impacts are less than significant. (Sources 1,2,4,6)

b) Applicable air quality criteria for evaluation of the project's impacts are federal air pollutant standards established by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and reported as National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), and the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS), which are equal to or more stringent than the federal standards. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) coordinates and oversees both state and federal air quality control programs in California. The CARB has established 14 air basins statewide. The City of Grover Beach is located in the South Central Coast Air Basin (SCCAB), which includes all of San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura counties. The site is under the jurisdiction of the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (APCD). CARB has established air quality standards and is responsible for the control of mobile emission sources, while the APCD is responsible for enforcing standards and regulating stationary sources. At present, the South Coast Basin of San Luis Obispo County is in attainment for all state and federal air quality standards except for State standards for particulate matter (PM₁₀). The County was identified as an ozone non-attainment area until January 2004, when it was reclassified to an attainment area for that pollutant. Maximum concentrations of other criteria pollutants are currently within state standards. San Luis Obispo County is in attainment with all federal air quality standards (Source 4).

Ozone is a secondary pollutant that is not produced directly by a source, but rather it is formed by a reaction between NO_x and reactive organic gases (ROG) in the presence of sunlight. Reductions in ozone concentrations are dependent on reducing the amount of these precursors. The major sources for this pollutant are mineral quarries, grading, demolition, agricultural tilling, road dust, and vehicle exhaust. PM₁₀ levels in the area are primarily due to grading and motor vehicle emissions.

Construction Impacts: Project construction activities would result in temporary air quality impacts due to the use of heavy construction equipment and generation of fugitive dust. Heavy construction equipment emits numerous air pollutants, including reactive organic compounds (ROC), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), and particulate matter that is less than ten microns in diameter (PM₁₀). PM₁₀ is comprised of finely divided solids or liquids such as dust, soot, aerosols, fumes and mists. The APCD has set a 185-pound per day threshold for ROC and NO_x, and requires quantification of construction-related PM₁₀ emissions based upon the defined quantitative thresholds listed in Section 6.2 of the APCD CEQA Handbook.

Trenching and its associated grading and street/sidewalk re-construction work in the project area would be required and could potentially generate fugitive dust (fine particulate matter - PM₁₀), but the concentrations of these emissions would be temporary. However, given the amount of material that may be exported from the site, and fill material imported, the project would result in a substantial number of truck trips to and from the site during construction that would produce ozone precursor emissions and carbon monoxide

All construction activity would be required to incorporate the APCD requirements pertaining to minimizing construction-related emissions. APCD does have quantitative thresholds of significance for construction emissions, even if they are considered to be

short term and temporary. In that San Luis Obispo County violates the state standard for PM₁₀, dust reduction measures are required for all discretionary construction activities (Source 4).

While not anticipated, construction activities could result in the exposure of people to health hazards related to asbestos containing materials. In addition, project implementation could expose people to health hazards related to naturally occurring asbestos. Exposure to asbestos would be considered a potentially significant impact unless mitigation is incorporated.

Operational Impacts: The APCD has set a 25-pound per day threshold for ROG and NO_x from project emissions. If emissions of any of ROG, NO_x, SO₂, or PM₁₀ are from 10 to 24 pounds per day, impacts are considered potentially significant and on-site mitigation is recommended. If emissions of ROG, NO_x, SO₂, or PM₁₀ cannot be reduced to less than 25 pounds per day or CO emissions cannot be reduced to less than 550 pounds per day, additional measures may be required. Project-related vehicle emissions were calculated using the URBEMIS 2002 for windows air quality model (Source 15). Assumptions used in the mobile emissions analysis included a project fleet mix of 55.2% light duty automobiles; 31.2% light duty trucks; 7.1% medium duty trucks; 3.4% light-heavy to heavy-heavy duty trucks; 0.1% urban buses, 1.7% motorcycles,; 0.1% school buses; and 1.2% motor homes. Table 1 summarizes project construction and operational emissions.

Table 1. Operational Air Emissions

Emission Source	ROG (lbs/day)	NO _x (lbs/day)	PM ₁₀ (µg/m ³)
Mobile (Primary Traffic)	20.63	4.31	0.14
<i>Exceeds County Threshold (25 lbs/day Vehicle)</i>	No	No	N/A
Area Source Emissions (Unmitigated)	2.92	3.35	2.78
Total	23.55	7.66	2.92
<i>Exceeds County Threshold (240 lbs/day All Sources)</i>	No	No	N/A

Note: See Appendix A for calculations.

**Unmitigated emissions generated from URBEMIS 2002 for Windows.*

There are no County APCD thresholds for PM₁₀

Operational Emissions from the project are estimated at 23.55 lbs/day of ROG and 7.66 lbs/day of NO_x. Therefore, project-generated emissions would not exceed the APCD's Tier 2 (25 lbs/day) threshold of significance of 25 lbs/day for ROG, and APCD's Tier 2 (25 lbs/day) threshold for NO_x (Source 4). However, mitigation is never the less incorporated into the project construction activities. Please refer to Appendix A for air quality model calculations. It should be noted that the proposed project includes 20 condo/hotel rooms, 2,855 square feet of retail, and a 458 square foot cafe along a major transit corridor (including nearby bus and rail transit), infill development, underground parking, efficient site access for motor vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists, and a pedestrian-friendly streetscape that may provide vehicle trip reduction, energy efficient site design, and associated air emissions reductions not accounted for in the air quality model.

- c) Refer to the response to Item b, above.
- d) The site is bound by major roadways on the east and south sides, a beach parking area to the west, and a recreational vehicle park to the north. The adjacent uses would not be substantially affected by project emissions, since the project would involve only minor releases of air contaminants during construction and operations. Nevertheless, the APCD requirements pertaining to minimizing construction-related emissions, as stated above, would be implemented during project development. Vehicle trips generated by the proposed project would result in air contaminant emissions along local roadways. As described in the paragraphs above, these impacts would be less than significant. (Source 1)
- e) Due to the nature of the proposal, the project will not create objectionable odors that would affect substantial numbers of people. (Source 1)

Mitigation Measures

MM-2 Prior to issuance of grading and construction permits, the applicant shall submit the results of a geologic evaluation conducted to determine if naturally occurring asbestos is present within the area proposed for disturbance. If naturally occurring asbestos is not present, an exemption request shall be filed with the APCD. If naturally occurring asbestos is present, the applicant shall comply with all requirements outlined in the Asbestos Air Toxics Control Measure (ATCM). Compliance may include development of an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan and an Asbestos Health and Safety Program for APCD approval.

MM-3 Portable equipment used during construction activities may require California statewide portable equipment registration (issued by the California Air Resources Board) or an APCD permit. The following list is provided as a guide to equipment and operations that may have permitting requirements, but should not be viewed as exclusive:

- 1) Portable generators
- 2) IC Engines
- 3) Concrete batch plants

- 4) Rock and pavement crushing
- 5) Tub grinders
- 6) Trommel screens.

To minimize delays, the applicant shall contact David Dixon of the APCD's Engineering Division at (805) 781-5912 prior to the start of the project for specific information regarding permitting requirements.

MM-4

Prior to issuance of grading and construction permits, the following notes shall be shown on grading and building plans. In addition, the contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and order increased watering, as necessary, to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the APCD prior to site disturbance.

- 1) Reduce the amount of disturbed area where possible.
- 2) 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 (nonpotable) water should be used whenever possible.
- 3) All dirt stockpile areas should be sprayed daily as needed.
- 4) All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible and building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- 5) All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials shall be covered or two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top offload and top of trailer) shall be maintained in accordance with CVC Section 23114;
- 6) Streets shall be swept at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water shall be used where feasible.

MM-5

Prior to issuance of construction permits, to reduce the air quality impacts of the project, the following measures shall be considered as part of the final project design and approval:

- 1) Utilization of low energy parking lot and building exterior lighting
- 2) Utilization of roof material with a solar reflectance value meeting EPA/DOE Energy Star rating to reduce summer cooling demands
- 3) Provide on-site banking (ATM)
- 4) Provide on-site bicycle parking
- 5) Improve public transit accessibility by providing a transit turnout on Grand Avenue with transit stop amenities (bus shelter, bench)
- 6) Provide street tree plantings that will enhance the vegetative shading of the south facing building elevation
- 7) Increase building energy efficiency rating by 10 percent above what is currently required by Title 24 (May be also be necessary to meet interior noise standards)

MM-6

The applicant shall provide preferential parking for carpool and vanpool vehicles, and one bicycle parking space for every 10 car parking spaces.

MM-7

Prior to occupancy clearance, the applicant shall create a Multi-Modal Access Guide, which includes maps and other information on how to walk and cycle to nearby destinations. In addition, the applicant shall provide an on-site bulletin board specifically for the posting of bus schedules and notices of availability for car-pooling and/or shall distribute such information to property owners upon occupancy. The applicant shall be responsible for maintaining this board and updating it every two months.

MM-8

Prior to issuance of construction permits, proposed plans shall show that only APCD approved wood burning devices would be installed (if applicable). APCD approved devices include the following:

- 1) All EPA-Certified Phase II wood burning devices.
- 2) Catalytic wood burning devices that emit less than or equal to 4.1 grams per hour of particulate matter that are not EPA-Certified but have been verified by a nationally-recognized testing lab.
- 3) Non-catalytic wood burning devices that emit less than or equal to 7.5 grams per hour of particulate matter that are not EPA-Certified but have been verified by a nationally-recognized testing lab.
- 4) Pellet-fueled woodheaters.
- 5) Dedicated gas-fired fireplaces.

MM-9

The following standard construction mitigation measures for construction equipment shall apply during construction activities:

- 1) Maintain all construction equipment in proper tune according to manufacturer's specifications
- 2) Fuel all off-road and portable diesel powered equipment with ARB certified motor vehicle diesel fuel
- 3) Maximize, to the extent feasible, the use of diesel construction equipment meeting ARB's 1996 and newer certification standard for off-road heavy-duty diesel engines
- 4) Maximize, to the extent feasible, the use of on-road heavy-duty equipment and trucks that meet the ARB's 1998 or newer certification standard for on-road heavy-duty diesel engines
- 5) All on and off-road diesel equipment shall not be allowed to idle for more than 5 minutes. Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas to remind drivers and operators of the 5 minute idling limit

Conclusion

The proposed project has been determined to be consistent with the APCD Clean Air Plan. Nevertheless, standard APCD mitigation measures are required to minimize the potential for asbestos exposure, creation of particulate matter, the creation of a dust disturbance, and a reduction in potential air quality impacts. Based upon the implementation of the above mitigation measures, air quality impacts would be less than significant and would not generate pollution over APCD determined standards.

Issues (and Supporting Information Services):	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Dept. of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Dept. of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?			X	
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?			X	
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				X

Discussion

- a) A search and review of special status species records within the Oceano quadrangle was conducted using the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) (April 2006). According to the CNDDDB, special-status species occurrences in the vicinity of the site are mostly limited to plants, birds, fish and amphibian habitats along Black Lake, Small Twin Lake, Nipomo Dunes, Callendar Dunes, Jack Lake, Arroyo Grande Cemetery, Nipomo Mesa, the PG&E Callender Switching Station, Arroyo Grande Creek, Oso Flaco Lake, Pismo State Beach, Guadalupe Dunes, Oak Park District, Arroyo Grande Valley, and the Dunes west of Santa Maria Valley. Table 2 shows a list of species identified within the Oceano quad per the CNDDDB search.

Table 2. Species and their Status Within the Oceano Quad

Species	Status		
	Federal	State	CNPS
marsh sandwort (<i>Arenaria paludicola</i>)	Endangered	Endangered	List 1B
western snowy plover (<i>Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus</i>)	Threatened	--	--
La Graciosa thistle (<i>Cirsium loncholepis</i>)	Endangered	Threatened	List 1B
Pismo clarkia (<i>Clarkia speciosa ssp. Immaculate</i>)	Endangered		List 1B
Nipomo Mesa lupine (<i>Lupinus nipomensis</i>)	Endangered	Endangered	List 1B
steelhead – southern/central California coast esu (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus</i>)	Threatened	--	--
California red-legged frog (<i>Rana aurora draytonii</i>)	Threatened	--	--
Gambel's water cress (<i>Rorippa gambelii</i>)	Endangered	Threatened	List 1B
California least tern (<i>Sterna antillarum browni</i>)	Endangered	Endangered	
Pismo clarkia (<i>Clarkia speciosa ssp. Immaculate</i>)	Endangered	--	List 1B
beach spectaclepod (<i>Dithyrea maritima</i>)	--	Threatened	List 1B
Hoover's bent grass (<i>Agrostis hooveri</i>)	--	--	List 1B
sand mesa manzanita (<i>Arctostaphylos rudis</i>)	--	--	List 1B
dune larkspue (<i>Delphinium parryi ssp. Blochmaniae</i>)	--	--	List 1B
Blochman's leafy daisy (<i>Erigeron blochmaniae</i>)	--	--	List 1B
Kellog's horkelia (<i>Horkelia cuneata ssp. Sericea</i>)	--	--	List 1B
Crisp mondardella (<i>Monardella crispa</i>)	--	--	List 1B
San Luis Obispo monardella (<i>Monardella frutescens</i>)	--	--	List 1B
San Bernardino aster (<i>Symphotrichum defoliatum</i>)	--	--	List 1B

As seen in Table 2, there are several threatened, endangered, and List 1B species that have occurred with the Oceano quad area. However, none of the sightings have been located on the proposed project site. The project site is currently vacant and highly disturbed, as the site was once used as a fuel service station but has been sense removed. There is no riparian or sensitive habitat identified by any local or regional plans, polices, regulations, or by the CDFG or the USWS on site. The proposed project would have a less than significant impact on any sensitive habitats or species.

- b) The proposed project site is currently disturbed and vacant. While there is no riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified habitat on the proposed project site, Meadow Creek is adjacent to the western edge of the site and support such habitats. As indicated on the site plans, the western edge of the proposed building is 50 feet away from the centerline of Meadow Creek. However, the proposed project site itself does not support riparian vegetation or any other sensitive vegetative communities. Please refer to the discussion under item a). (Source 2)
- c) The project site does not support any drainages, ponds, or wetlands. (Sources 1,2)
- d) The project site itself is highly disturbed, surrounded by urban development, and does not support habitat suitable for wildlife movement. However, a portion of Meadow Creek is located 50 feet to the west of the proposed project which may support the movement of wildlife. While the proposed project is located near this potential wildlife movement corridor, the land between the site and the project site is owned by a third party and will not be disturbed, creating a buffer that should continue to facilitate any wildlife movement that has been occurring in the Meadow Creek riparian corridor. Impacts will be less than significant. (Sources 1,2)
- e) Implementation of the proposed project does not require the removal or impact to any locally protected tree species or biological resources (Source 1). No impact.
- f) The project site is not located within a Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural community Conservation Plan area (Source 2). No impact.

Conclusion

Based on the nature of the site and the location of the proposed project, biological resource impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Services):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?			X	X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource as defined in §15064.5?		X		
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?		X		
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?		X		

Discussion

- a) The proposed project site is a highly disturbed site. There are no buildings or structures on the site that would be considered historical resources. (Sources 1,2)
- b) The project site is highly disturbed, and the potential for intact significant archaeological deposits is low. It is unlikely that cultural materials are present in the underlying soils; however, in the event resources are discovered during construction, mitigation measures will be required. (Sources 1,2)
- c) Given the site location and the nature of the site, and a review of the General Plan, it has been determined that the site is unlikely to contain significant paleontological resources. However, in the event resources are discovered during construction, mitigation measures will be required. (Sources 1,2)
- d) Refer to b) above.

Mitigation Measure

- MM-10** In the event archaeological and/or paleontological resources are unearthed or discovered during any construction activities, the following standards apply:
- 1) Construction activities shall cease, and the City of Grover Beach Community Development Department shall be notified so that the extent and location of discovered materials may be recorded by a qualified archaeologist Northern Chumash Native American representative, and disposition of artifacts may be accomplished in accordance with state and federal law.
 - 2) In the event archaeological resources are found to include human remains, or in any other case where human remains are discovered during construction, the County Coroner is to be notified in addition to the City of Grover Beach Community Development Department so that proper disposition may be accomplished.

Conclusion

Based upon the location and nature of the proposed project site, and implementation of the above mitigation measure, impacts would be less than significant.

Issues (and Supporting Information Services):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated			X	

on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Div. of Mines and Geology Pub. 42.							
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?					X		
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X				
iv) Landslides?							X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?					X		
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?			X				
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or property?							X
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?							X

Discussion

- ai) The proposed project site is located approximately three miles from the Oceano Fault, an inactive fault that trends northwest/southeast along the coastline (Source 2). Rupture of this fault may cause ground shaking and damage to property. However, the long-term past presence of structures on the site and structures in the surrounding area demonstrates the geologic stability of the area. In addition, all proposed structures would be required to be constructed in compliance with the Uniform Building Code (Seismic Regulations) to minimize adverse effects from a ground-shaking event. Pursuant to compliance with the UBC and implementation of recommended mitigation measures from a site specific geologic investigation, less than significant impacts would result. (Sources 1,2,5)
- a ii) Refer to ai) above.
- a iii) Based on the City of Grover Beach General Plan Seismic Safety Element Update, the project site is located within an area of moderate potential for liquefaction (Source 19). The applicant is required to construct the proposed project in compliance with the Uniform Building Code, and incorporate measures to minimize the effects of liquefaction or other seismic instability in the event of a ground-shaking event. Furthermore, a Geotechnical Investigation was performed at the site by GSI Soils Inc. (May 24, 2005). The conclusion of the report said that the site is suitable for the proposed development provided the recommendations presented in the report are incorporated into the project plans and specifications. (Source 12) Impacts are potentially significant, but mitigable if the recommendations contained in the Geotechnical report are implemented.
- a iv) The project site is nearly level, and is not located in the vicinity of any steep slopes or landslide prone areas.(Source 1) No impact
- a) The proposed project site is nearly level. The site will be disturbed during grading and construction activities. Based on the size and topography of the project site, erosion would be less than significant. (Source 1)
- b) Refer to a iii) above. Impacts are potentially significant but mitigable.
- c) The proposed project would not be located on expansive soils. (Source 2)
- d) The proposed project would be served by the City wastewater collection system, and would not require the installation of an onsite septic system. (Source 1)

Mitigation Measure

MM-11 Implement all recommendations provided in the site specific Geotechnical Investigation (GSI Soils Inc. May 24, 2005).

Conclusion

Based on the type of development that is proposed, and the size and location of the proposed project, and implementation of standard measures required by law and as above, geology and soils impacts would be less than significant.

Issues (and Supporting Information Services):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X	
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?			X	
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?				X
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Gov. Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X	
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?			X	
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X

Discussion

- a) Implementation of the proposed project would not include the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Construction equipment would require the use of fuels and oils, and building materials would include paints and other materials considered potentially hazardous; however, the potential for a significant hazard due to the use of these materials is unlikely (Source 1). Less Than Significant Impacts would result.
- b) Refer to a) above.
- c) The project site is not located within 0.25 mile of a school. (Sources 1,2)
- d) The site is currently vacant but in the past was occupied by a gasoline service station. The former Jackpot service station that was once located on the site was responsible for site remediation and subsequent monitoring that was conducted by Earth Systems Consultants. The report which is dated October 12, 1995 discusses the site remediation and subsequent soil and water quality test results. The scope of the remediation and monitoring included but was not limited to; dismantling and removal of vapor extraction and groundwater treatment systems, destruction of wells MW-11, EW-16, and sparge well SW-19, excavation and monitoring of gasoline impacted soil identified in the vicinity of the former UST cluster, installation of a new groundwater monitoring well at the previous location of MW-11 (hereafter "MW-11a"), and sampling laboratory analysis of MW-11a. Subsequent water sampling analysis of well MW-11a proved that all contaminants were below state and federal action and threshold levels. The site was granted closure in September of 1997 by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (Per. Comm. Earth Systems Pacific Timothy

Conroy, September 1 2006). The proposed project would not be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Gov. Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, it would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment, impacts would be less than significant.

- e) The proposed project site is located within 1.3 miles of the San Luis Obispo County Oceano Airport. The project is not located within the Airport review area. Implementation of the proposed project will not conflict with the Airport Land Use Plan for Oceano Airport. (Source 2)
- f) Implementation of the project would not interfere with any emergency response or evacuation plans. (Source 2)
- g) The project site is not located within an area exposed to wild land fires. The City Fire Department is located within a five-minute response time. City regulations require that all new commercial construction be equipped with fire sprinkles. (Source 2)

Conclusion

Based on the nature of the site and the location of the proposed project, hazardous material impacts would be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Services):	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?			X	
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?			X	
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?		X		
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site?		X		
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?			X	
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water?			X	
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?			X	
h) Place within a 100-year floor hazard area structures that would impede or redirect flood flows?		X		
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?			X	
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?			X	

Discussion

- a) Sources of surface water within the city include Meadow Creek, Pismo Lake, and the Oceano Lagoon. These areas are affected by increased development and subsequent discharge of oils, fuels, debris, and sediment into storm drains and natural drainages during storm events. The project is located adjacently east of Meadow Creek., but downstream of Pismo Lake and Oceano Lagoon. Thus, the project will not affect either Pismo Lake or Oceano Lagoon. Implementation of the proposed project would create additional paved and impermeable surfaces, which could contribute to urban storm water runoff, including oil, fuels, and sediment. The project includes a stormwater detention/filtration device that has been sized to accommodate all stormwater that would be collected on site from the new impervious surface. The device is a Rainstore³ system that has been sized to store and treat 7,670 cubic feet of water, which is 260 cubic feet more than the anticipated volume of water that will be produced from the site. The Ranstore³ would mitigate the net increase in storm runoff. Based on the size of the proposed project, its location, and the requirement for on-site drainage facilities, the potential to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would be less than significant. (Sources 2)
- b) Given the nature, scope, and location of the project, it has been determined that it will not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. Implementation of the proposed project will not result in a significant impact upon water resources, or significantly affect the City's use of groundwater resources for water supply. (Source 7)
- c) The proposed project site is approximately 26,270 square feet in size (0.60 acres). No drainage courses or paths are present onsite. However, the proposed project site is adjacent to a reach of the western branch of Meadow Creek, as it flows in a southern direction. The western edge of the proposed building is located 50 feet from the centerline of Meadow Creek. The Local Coastal Plan described Meadow Creek as follows:

"The primary function of the western branch of Meadow Creek is presently that of channeling runoff from urbanized portions of Grover Beach and adjacent communities into the Oceano Lagoon and Arroyo Grande Creek to the south. In 1963 the natural creek channel south of Grand Avenue was dredged to improve drainage blocked by sedimentation and vegetation. The portion of Meadow Creek north of Grand Avenue between the golf course and a mobilehome park has been channeled for flood control purposes and much of the original habitat value has been lost. A restoration and enhancement plan for this 0.5 mile portion of the creek could provide for planting of riparian and other native plants to help restore the resource value of the area. New development in the Beach Neighborhood shall incorporate restoration and enhancement of this portion of the creek." (Source 19).

Due to the proximity of the proposed project to Meadow Creek, a portion of the retaining wall for the underground parking garage would be located with the creek's 100-year flood plane (Source 8). The development of this portion of the project could divert flood waters that would normally flow over the site. However, the displaced flood water is not expected to substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in on- or off-site flooding, or substantially impede or restrict flows. The Implementation of the proposed project could significantly impact existing drainage patterns, unless mitigation measures are applied.. (Sources 1,2)

- d) The project site is currently vacant and covered with ruderal species. The existing area currently produces run-off that impacts the City's drainage system. The proposed project will substantially develop the site with a building and paving, which will increase drainage from existing conditions. The proposed project includes on-site drainage retention/detention and curb and gutter improvements to manage storm water drainage. As described in section c), the project design could interfere with the drainage pattern of Meadow Creek, unless mitigation measures are applied. (Sources 1,2)
- e) Refer to c) and d) above. Implementation of the proposed project would not significantly increase storm water runoff, or result in a significant source of polluted runoff. (Sources 1,2)
- f) Refer to a) above.
- g) The proposed project will place a portion of the underground parking garage within the 100-year flood plane of Meadow Creek. No houses or residences would be placed within the 100-year flood plane; the proposed condo/hotel rooms would be located on the upper levels of the proposed project which would be well above 100-year flood water surface elevation. In the event of a 100-year flood event, the location of the proposed project is not anticipated to substantially impede or restrict flood flows. Impacts would be less than significant.
- h) Refer to c) above.
- i) The City's General Plan Safety Element shows that the proposed project site is located within the Lopez Dam failure inundation zone. However, due to the fact that the project site is approximately 8 miles downstream of the damn, the flood waters are anticipated to be dispersed by the time it reaches the project site and would result in a less than significant impact. Implementation of the project would not interfere with emergency evacuation plans. (Source 2)
- j) The project site is not located near mountains or topography that is sufficient to produce a mudflow. A tsunami is a wave caused by a displacement of the ocean floor, usually by movement along a fault. As the wave approaches shore, it increases in size and can

cause extensive damage to coastal structures. Several small tsunami events have been recorded in San Luis Obispo County; however, previous studies have predicted a maximum tsunami wave “runup” of approximately 9.5 feet above sea level for a 100-year event. Wave runup could be increased substantially if a tsunami occurred during a major storm. Tsunamis are only a concern for coastal areas. Impacts from a tsunami, while possible, are unlikely. Seiche is a wave generated by earthquake in a lake, reservoir or harbor. Seiche is not considered a significant risk in San Luis Obispo County. (Source 21). Participation in the City's adopted emergency management plans would reduce the potential impacts from tsunami or seiche inundation to less than significant levels.

Mitigation

MM-12 Prior to issuing a building permit, the applicant in coordination with City staff shall agree upon restoration and enhancement measures that will be applied to the 0.5-mile reach of Meadow Creek as described with the Grover Beach Local Coastal Plan. These measures could include, but may not be limited to planting riparian and other native plants, removal of non-native invasive vegetation, and in- channel habitat improvements.

Conclusion

Based on the nature, size and location of the proposed project, and compliance with General Plan policies and ordinance requirements, impacts would be less than significant.

Issues (and Supporting Information Services):	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING: <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Physically divide an established community?			X	
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X

Discussion

- a) The project is located on West Grand Avenue and is considered infill. Implementation of the project, given its nature and location, will not physically divide the city or any established neighborhoods or districts. (Sources 1,2)
- b) The project site is designated as Visitor Services in the City General Plan. The project is located in the Grand Corridor \Neighborhood Plan area, and more specifically, in the west Grand Avenue Visitor service District. Uses contemplated in this District and use area include lodging, restaurants, and specialty retail. In this designated area, higher density residential use are encouraged in mixed use projects to provide year round vitality and a stable client base for commercial uses. Given the project proposal and its use designation, the project has been determined to be consistent with the City General Plan and thus will not conflict with the Plan.. Additionally, the project site is designated as a Coastal Commercial Plan Area on page 70 of the Local Costal Program which allows resort hotel and other visitor serving uses (Source 16). The project site is within the City’s defined Coastal Plan; however the proposed project would not be in conflict with this Plan as the project is consistent with the plans policies and actions.

The project site is located within the Coastal Planned Commercial (C-P-C) District. This district allows uses consistent with the General Plan designation, thus the project uses are consistent with this District. The project is consistent with the City of Grover Beach Visioning Project which contemplates a height allowance up to four stories for the corridor location of the project. Less than significant impacts would result. (Sources 1, 2, 3, 14)
- c) The proposed project is not located within a Habitat Conservation Plan area or within an area designated by a Natural Community Conservation Plan. (Source 2)

Conclusion

Based upon the applicability of the City General Plan and the City Zoning regulations, the size, nature, and location of the proposed project, its land use, and its planning impacts will not have a significant impact and is not in substantial conflict with adopted plans and regulations.

Issues (and Supporting Information Services):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
X. MINERAL RESOURCES. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				X

Discussion

a, b) No known mineral resources are located within the City. (Source 2) No known mineral resources are located on the proposed project site. (Source 2)

Conclusion

No known mineral resources are located within affected areas, no impacts would occur, and no mitigation is necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Services):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XI. NOISE. <i>Would the project result in:</i>				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?		X		
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?		X		
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?			X	

Discussion

a, b, d) The project site is currently vacant. The surrounding commercial development along West Grand Avenue and traffic on Highway 1 generates some operational noise, with the majority of the ambient noise being generated by vehicle traffic on nearby roadways.

Sensitive noise receptors in the vicinity of the site are limited to an existing recreational vehicle park to the north east of the site, along Highway 1. To the east of Highway 1 and to the north and south of Grand Avenue are existing residential uses. While the construction activities associated with the project would temporarily increase noise, the long-term use of the site as a commercial use would not significantly change existing noise levels in the area, since the site is located within an existing established commercial district. However, potential noise nuisances associated with mechanical equipment (such as generator, heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) units), deliveries, trash hauling activities, and customer and employee use of the facilities may affect sensitive receptors. Although vehicle trips generated as a result of project implementation would result in an increase in groundborne noise and vibration, this effect would not be considered excessive.

Project grading and construction would result in temporary noise impacts to surrounding properties. Noise levels would temporarily increase as a result of truck movement (earth movement, grading, and other associated construction activities) and operation of construction equipment (saws, power nail guns/hammering, cement mixers, etc.). The proposed project would not involve pile-driving or other construction activities that would be expected to result in excessive groundborne vibration or noise. Nevertheless, construction activities would need to be limited to daytime hours in order to reduce the potential impact to a less than significant level.

The Grover Beach General Plan Noise Element has adopted maximum outdoor and indoor noise level standards for transient lodging. A maximum outdoor noise level of 60 dBA Ldn is the adopted standard and the maximum allowable indoor noise level for this uses is 45 dBA Ldn. Project specific sensitive noise receptors are those that are located closest to Highway 1 and West Grand Avenue. Table 3 below, summarizes the project's sensitive receptors and their respective distances from roadway centerlines and their average daily traffic (Source 9). A noise model that was based on the Federal Highway Noise Prediction Model (Source 17) was used to quantify roadway noise impacts on the proposed projects sensitive receptors. The distances measurements from the receptors to the centerlines were measures from the architectural site plans. In instances where the elevation of the noise source was substantially different than the receptor distance, the distances from the centerline was calculated to include the difference in elevation.

While there area sensitive receptors that have been estimated to be affected by noise levels that are above City standards, mitigation measures that would reduce noise impacts to less than significant levels.

The City's Noise Element has established implementation Measure 5.5 which allows for flexibility in noise standards when potentially infeasible mitigation measures are required. The following is Measure 5.5:

Where mitigation of noise levels is accordance with the polices and standards of the Noise Elements is not feasible, the City Council could reduce or waive the applicable polices and standards to the degree needed to allow reasonable use of the property, provided the noise levels are mitigated to the maximum extent feasible.

In order to ensure that noise levels are reduced to the maximum extent feasible, mitigation measures beyond standard construction techniques would be required. With the implementation of the suggested mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

- c) Ambient noise levels in the project vicinity is primarily a result traffic along roadways. The proposed project would generate a net increase of 403 average daily trips (ADT) along local roadways (section XV), including West Grand Avenue and North 4th Street (See Section XV, Transportation/Traffic). While this increase in traffic would increase existing noise levels in the project vicinity, the addition 403 ADT is not sufficient to substantially increase roadway noise levels. Impacts to the ambient noise level would be less than significant.
- e) The proposed project site is located 1.3 miles from the San Luis Obispo County Oceano Airport. The project site is not located within the Airport Review Area. Noise exposure to airplanes would be intermittent and would not be significant. (Source 2)

Mitigation Measure

MM-13 The City Council of Grover Beach shall adopt Noise Element Implementation Measure 5.5 for this proposed project; allowing relaxation of noise standards to allow the reasonable use of the property.

MM-14 The project shall include the following design components to attenuate noise that may be experienced by resident's onsite:

- Exterior Doors: Exterior doors are solid core with superior weatherization packages-including high quality gasketing/weather stripping at jambs, heads, and door bottoms. Doors with a minimum STC of 35 should be used for doorways facing Highway 1 and West Grand Avenue and should be insulated in conformance with California Title 24 requirements.
- Windows: Windows should have a minimum Standard Transmission Class (STC) of 35 and be properly installed, weather-stripped, and insulated. Glass in both windows and doors should not exceed 20% of floor area in a room. Windows and sliding glass doors are mounted in low air infiltration rate frames (0.5 cfm or less per ANSI specification).

Table 3. Project Sensitive Receptor Noise Levels

Sensitive Receptor	Distance To Grand Avenue CL	Distance to Highway 1 CL	Noise Receptor Elevation	Noise Source Elevation	dBA Noise impact level			Met Interior Noise Standard (45 dBA)?	Met Exterior Noise Standard (60 dBA)?
					dBA Ldn (Highway 1 2003 ADT = 14,000)	dBA Ldn (Grand Ave. 2003 ADT = 2,900)	Interior Noise level with Title 24 and UBC building regulations		
Room 110's window	63 feet	n/a	25' above msl	13' above msl	n/a	59.4 dBA	39.4 dBA	yes	n/a
Room 110's balcony	58 feet	n/a	25' above msl	13' above msl	n/a	59.8 dBA	n/a	n/a	yes
Room 205's window	63 feet	n/a	36' above msl	16' above msl	n/a	59.4 dBA	39.4 dBA	yes	n/a
Room 205's balcony	57 feet	n/a	36' above msl	16' above msl	n/a	59.9 dBA	n/a	n/a	yes
Room 205's window	n/a	60 feet	36' above msl	17' above msl	69.1 dBA	n/a	49.1 dBA	no	n/a
Room 205's balcony	n/a	55 feet	36' above msl	17' above msl	69.5 dBA	n/a	n/a	n/a	no
Room 201's window	n/a	36 feet	36' above msl	16' above msl	71.0 dBA	n/a	51.0 dBA	no	n/a
Room 201's balcony	n/a	31 feet	36' above msl	16' above msl	71.4 dBA	n/a	n/a	n/a	no
Commercial space 101's window	n/a	55 feet	25' above msl	17' above msl	69.6 dBA	n/a	49.6 dBA	no	n/a
Commercial space 101's window	60 feet	n/a	25' above msl	16' above msl	n/a	59.7 dBA	39.7	yes	n/a
Commercial space 103's window	n/a	30 feet	25' above msl	16' above msl	72.2 dBA	n/a	52.7 dBA	no	n/a

- Exterior Walls: Exterior walls consist of stucco or brick veneer when possible. These should be framed walls with 7/8" stucco over 1/2" plywood on the exterior and one layer of 1/2" gypsum board on the interior (plus R-13 cavity insulation) will be appropriate for sound isolating construction. If wood siding is used anywhere on exterior walls, sub layers of plywood, gypsum board, or backboard are recommended to bring the overall exterior sheathing weight to at least 5 psf. The exterior wall facing material shall be stucco and/or shall be designed for a minimum STC of 45.
- Roof/Ceiling Assembly: Roofs of clay or concrete tile or composition roofing over 5/8" plywood on 2x roof joints and separately-framed ceilings of 1/2" gypsum board on 2x framing with R-19 above are recommended for sound-isolating construction. Roof vents facing Highway 1 and West Grand Avenue should be baffled.
- Air Conditioning: Air conditioning or a mechanical ventilation system should be installed so that windows may remain closed
- Outside Air Intakes For HVAC Systems: Air intake ducts should include 1"-thick acoustical lining and at least one elbow.
- Kitchen and Bathroom Ventilation: Kitchen and bathroom ventilation ducts should include at least two elbows.
- General Airtightness: All building joints should be carefully detailed and sealed to avoid weakening the exterior envelope. Both exterior and interior surfaces should be sealed at joints and isolating joints. Electrical boxes in framed, exterior walls or ceilings should be backed with sheet caulking outlet box pads (such as "Lowry" pads). For all building "shell" construction, all interior gypsum board joints at dissimilar surfaces (floors, door and window frames, electrical boxes, etc.) should include acoustical sealant. The reference of ASTM E497 (Standard Practice for Installing Sound-Isolating Lightweight Partitions) and ASTM C919 (Practice for Use of Sealants in Acoustical Applications) in construction document is advised.

MM-15 To minimize construction noise impacts, the project applicant shall limit all construction activities to 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Mondays through Fridays and 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays.

MM-16 All stationary construction equipment shall be located at least 300 feet from identified sensitive receptors unless noise reducing engine housing enclosures or noise screens are provided by the contractor. All construction equipment powered by internal combustion engines shall be properly muffled and maintained. Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines shall be prohibited.

MM-17 Air compressors and generators used for construction shall be surrounded by temporary acoustical shelters if within 300 feet of a sensitive receptor.

MM-18 External noise-generating equipment associated with commercial uses (e.g., HVAC units, etc.) shall be shielded from adjacent residential units or enclosed with solid sound barriers.

MM-19 The owners or operators of commercial uses shall post a sign at each loading area which states that the idling time for delivery truck engines shall be limited to no more than three minutes.

MM-20 Common walls between horizontal (side-by-side) and vertical (stacked) mixed use commercial/residential development shall be noise-insulated to provide attenuation of indoor noise levels.

Conclusion

Based on the nature, size, and location of the proposed project, and compliance with General Plan policies and ordinance requirements, and with the mitigation measures, impacts would be less than significant.

Issues (and Supporting Information Services):	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

Discussion

- a) The project includes 20 condo/hotel units and approximately 3,313sq. ft. of commercial space. This, on an incremental basis, will potentially induce some additional growth in the City. This growth is not considered, either directly or indirectly, to be substantial in nature. The project does not require the extension of roads or other infrastructure (Source 1). Less than significant impacts would result.
- b,c) The project site is not currently occupied by residential uses, thus it will not displace any housing or displace substantial number of people. No impact is expected.

Conclusion

Based upon the nature of the proposed project, population and housing impacts will be less than significant and no mitigation measures are necessary.

Issues (and Supporting Information Services):	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES:				
a) Would the proposal result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire Protection?			X	
Police Protection?			X	
Schools?			X	
Parks			X	
Other public facilities?			X	

Discussion

- a) The City of Grover Beach provides fire and police protection services. The Fire Department has 7 full time fire fighters that work on a shift basis, along with paid call fire fighters. The City has a mutual aid agreement with local area fire service providers, which includes Oceano, Arroyo Grande, and Pismo Beach, as well as the California Department of Forestry. The fire station is located generally in the center of the city at the corner of 7th Street and Rockaway Avenue. Response time to the project site is within 5 minutes, which meets Department response time goals. The Police Department staff includes a police chief, 2 lieutenants, 4 sergeants, and 12 officers. The Department has a mutual aid agreement with the City of Arroyo Grande and Pismo Beach, as well as with the County Sheriff’s Department and California Highway Patrol. These agencies may be called upon for back-up assistance. The project site is within the normal patrol area and the Department has an average response time of four minutes for emergency cases. The City is located within the Lucia Mar Unified School District, which provides K-12 grade levels. The Lucia Mar Unified School District is currently investigating school closures due to declining enrollment. Therefore, the students that may be generated by the project employment would not be expected to overburden existing facilities. Parks within and adjacent to the City include the Oceano Dunes and Pismo Beach, and several smaller city parks (refer to Item XIV). The city currently has about 16.5 acres of active park lands. This does not include nature areas or the State beach and golf course areas, which comprises about 200 acres. Based upon the current City population of 13,500, it is estimated that the City needs about 50 acres of parks to meet the City’s 5 acres of parkland per 1,000 population ratio. Development of the project into the condo/hotel and commercial uses will create an incremental demand for an increase in public services, but would not significantly overburden such services. (Source 1)

The project applicant, at the time of building permit issuance, is required to pay development impact fees to off-set impacts associated with its incremental effect on city operations and capital improvements, specifically police and fire service. The project applicant is also required to pay school impact fees to off-set impacts to the Lucia Mar Unified School district. In addition, the project would be required to comply with all applicable Fire Code and Building Safety Codes, including the installation of automatic

fire sprinklers and fire suppression facilities for all buildings. With payment of applicable fees and compliance with Fire Code and Building Safety Codes, impacts would be less than significant.

Conclusion

Based upon the nature and scope of the project, the incremental increase in the need for public services would be less than significant with the payment of City required fees.

Issues (and Supporting Information Services):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. RECREATION:				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?			X	
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?			X	

Discussion

- a) Implementation of the proposed project would result in the occupation of additional condo/hotel rooms within the City, which would contribute to the cumulative demand for recreational resources. The demand resulting from the proposed project would not be significant (refer to Item XIII.a, above). In addition, the applicant is required to pay Quimby Fees to the City prior to recordation of the proposed tract map. Quimby fees are used by local jurisdictions to fund communitywide recreational projects. (Sources 1,3)
- b) The proposed project includes limited recreational amenities for use by guests. These are to be constructed within the project. Given the nature and scope of the project, it will not require the construction of recreational facilities or require a significant expansion of existing facilities. (Source 1)

Conclusion

Based on the nature and scope of the project, impacts to recreational resources would be less than significant with the payment of City required fees.

Issues (and Supporting Information Services):	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?			X	
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?			X	
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?				X

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?						X		
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?								X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity						X		
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?						X		

Discussion

a) The project site is located at the northwest corner of West Grand Avenue and State Route 1. West Grand Avenue serves as one of two entrances to the State Off-road vehicle beach, as well as to a restaurant and a beach parking area. The site will be directly accessed from West Grand Avenue, westerly of its intersection with Highway 1. The following represents a discussion of affected area roadways as well as an analysis of the project’s impacts upon these roadways.

The project will directly impact West Grand Avenue, as well as its intersection with Highway 1. Grand Avenue is the principal east-west travel corridor within and through the City and is a general five-lane arterial (two travel lanes per direction with a two-way left turn median lane). Grand Avenue represents one of the “gateway” routes for recreational travelers headed westward from US 101 to the Pacific coastline and eastward from Highway 1. Grand Avenue is designated as a Major Arterial in the City General Plan Circulation Element. Highway 1 is a state highway that runs practically along the Pacific coast of California. Within the city of Grover Beach, it has a two to three-lane arterial cross-section, and the roadway connects Grover Beach to the city of Pismo Beach to the north and Oceano to the south. This roadway represents an important recreational as well as commuter travel route serving the five cities coastal communities.

The Technical Appendix prepared for the 2005 General Plan Circulation Element (Source 9) provides existing (2003) average daily traffic volumes (ADT) and levels of service (LOS) ratings. For Grand Avenue west of Highway 1, the 2003 ADT levels were 2,900. For Highway 1 north of Grand Avenue, ADT levels were 14,000 trips per day. Highway 1 north of Grand Avenue operates at as LOS C, while it operates at a LOS A south of Grand Avenue. Grand Avenue operates at a LOS A both north and south of Highway 1.

The above traffic levels are average daily traffic. Traffic volumes on both West Grand Avenue and Highway 1 experience higher levels on weekends due to access to the beach area and the State recreational park. For this reason, the traffic generation analysis that follows utilizes Saturday generation rates, which are the highest usage day. Trip generation rates are based upon the Institution of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation manual, 6th edition (Source 10).

Traffic generated from the proposed development uses is as follows:

2,855 sq. ft. special retail @ 42.04 trips/day/1,000 sq. ft.	=	120 trips/day
458 sq. ft. restaurant @ 158.37 trips/day/1,000 sq. ft.	=	73 trips/day
20 occupied hotel rooms @ 10.5 trips/day/room	=	<u>210 trips/day</u>
Total		403 trips/day

Based upon the above, approximately 403 vehicle trips per day (Saturday) will be generated by the project. As noted, this assumes full occupancy of the condo/hotel. It also assumes a separate traffic generation rate for each use, which is considered a worst case scenario in that commercial facilities will likely be utilized to some extent by condo/hotel occupants. These trips will impact area roadways. In order to assess the impact, it is assumed that 40 percent (161 trips/day) can be assigned to Grand Avenue to the east of Highway 1, 40 percent assigned to Highway 1 north of Grand Avenue, and 20 percent (81 trips/day) on Highway 1 south of Grand Avenue.

Based upon the assumed traffic assignment, and the current operating capacity of area roadways, being either at LOS A (Grand Avenue, Highway 1 south of Grand Avenue) or C (Highway 1 north of Grand Avenue), it is determined that the project will not cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic levels and capacity of the street system, nor will it degrade the current level of services (LOS). However, the project traffic generation, in addition to planned development in the vicinity, could have a potential significant impact. Based upon the year 2025 analysis provided in the Technical Appendix to the Circulation Element, the level of services for several roadways will be degraded. It is projected that the level of service for Grand Avenue will decrease from LOS A to LOS B between Ninth and Tenth Streets and from LOS A to LOS E on Grand Avenue east of Oak Park Boulevard. For Highway 1, north of Grand Avenue, the LOS is projected to degrade from current LOS C to LOS E. For Highway 1 south of Grand Avenue, the LOS is project to degrade from the current LOS A to LOS D. The project, on a cumulative basis, will contribute proportionately to the need for area circulation improvements. The payment of traffic impact fees will be required as a condition of approval and would reduce impacts to a less than significant level (Sources 1,2,9,10).

b) Refer to Item a) above.

- c) The project site is located approximately 1.3 miles northerly of the Oceano Airport, a County general aviation airport. Based upon the project's location and the operational characteristics of the airport, implementation of the proposed project would not affect air traffic operations or patterns. (Source 2)
- d) The proposed access driveways on Grand Avenue will have adequate site distance in both directions, and do not include sharp turns or hazardous features. (Source 1)
- e) The proposed project site access points will be designed for adequate emergency access and will be reviewed City Staff to ensure emergency access widths and routes are provided. (Source 1)
- f) The proposed condo/hotel project has provided sufficient parking spaces to serve the proposed uses.
- g) The project site is located on Grand Avenue, which is on the transit routes for local bus service for the Five Cities area and regional service to San Luis Obispo and Santa Maria. The project site is also within walking distance to the AMTRAK train station located at 180 Grand Avenue, which offers twice daily train service to Southern California. Given its access to public transit, it has been determined that the project will not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. (Source 2)

Conclusion

Based on the nature, size, and location of the proposed project, traffic and circulation impacts would be less than significant with the mitigation measures required.

Issues (and Supporting Information Services):	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. <i>Would the project:</i>				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Central Coast Region Water Quality Control Board?			X	
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?		X		
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X	
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?			X	
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	

Discussion

- a) The proposed project will connect to the City's wastewater collection system; as a result, the proposed project will not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Central Coast Region Water Quality Control Board. Given the nature of the project and

its consistency with area plans, it has been determined that the project will not violate Regional Water Quality Control Board requirements. (Sources 2, 11)

- b) The City of Grover Beach is a member of the South San Luis Obispo County Sanitation District. Waste water is collected and treated at a treatment facilities located southwest of the Oceano Airport in Oceano. The plant currently operates with combined flows from Arroyo Grande, Oceano and Grover Beach at 57.6 percent in 2001-2002, or 2.8 million gallons per day (MGD), of its 5 MGD capacity.

The proposed project will intensify use of the site and will contribute additional sewage flows that will need to be collected and treated at the treatment facility. The treatment facility has adequate capacity to serve the project. To off-set impacts associated with the incremental effect on the wastewater system, a wastewater development impact fee is required of all new developments. (Source 11)

- c) Most of the city is inadequately served by the City storm water system. The proposed project will require an internal drainage and storm water management system. The design of the on-site facilities is required to result in no net increase in storm flows that would affect the City's storm water system. (Sources 1,3)

- d) The City of Grover Beach is located over the Arroyo Grande Tri-cities Mesa Groundwater Sub-basin of the Arroyo Grande Groundwater Basin. The proposed project will be served by the City municipal water supply. The City's total current water supply capacity is approximately 2,202 acre-feet per year. Current usage is approximately 2,120 acre-feet per year. Water use in the city is currently nearing capacity. The City has recently entered into an agreement with the Oceano Community services District to obtain an additional 200 acre-feet of water a year, and is pursuing other additional water sources.

The proposed project involves 20 condo/hotel units, 2855 square feet of retail space and a 458 square foot café. Table 4 summarizes the estimated water use for the condo/hotel units

Table 4. Summary of Hotel Water Use Estimates

Water Use Factor	Acre Feet/Year	Source
173 gallons/room/day	3.88	City of Pismo Beach Master Water Plan
92 gallons/room/day	2.06	Meter reading from existing Grover Beach hotel
132.5 gallons/room/day	2.97	Average water use factor

As seen in table 4, the estimated water use for the 20 condo/hotel rooms in the proposed project will use from 2.06 to 3.88 acre feet of water per year. The water use factor for the retail and café space is estimated to be 0.21 gallons per day per square foot of commercial space. Based on the proposed square footage (3,313) an additional 696 gallons of water per day will be demanded or an additional 0.78 acre foot per year will be consumed. An estimated total range of 2.84 – 4.66 acre feet per year is estimated to be used by the proposed project. Table 5 summarizes the estimated total project water demand.

Table 5. Summary of Total Proposed Project Water Use Estimates

Water Use Factor	Total Acre Feet/Year	Source
173 gallons/room/day	4.66	City of Pismo Beach Master Water Plan
92 gallons/room/day	2.84	Meter reading from existing Grover Beach hotel
132.5 gallons/room/day	3.75	Average water use factor

Of the 2,202 acre feet of water the City can allocate, the proposed project accounts for approximately 0.1 – 0.2 percent of the total City supply. It has been determined that the project itself can be served and will not create a significant impact on water supply. However, the project will on an incremental basis create a need for additional water supplies. All construction will be subject to the installation of water conservation devices such as low flow fixtures that are designed to reduce water consumption. In that a portion of water usage is for site landscaping, the installation of low water usage and drought resistant plantings to further reduce water consumption. In addition, the project applicant is required to pay the City a water development impact fee to off-set impacts associated with its incremental effect on city water supply and delivery. The proposed project is also consistent with the General Plan which assumed a commercial buildout of the site. Thus water use impacts were adequately addressed in the General Plan EIR. Pursuant to the payment of applicable fees, and with the implementation of mitigation measure 21 and 22, impacts would be less than significant (Sources 1, 7)

- e) Refer to b) above.
- f) Solid waste generated by the City is disposed of at Cold Canyon Landfill, which is a Class II landfill, located south of the City of San Luis Obispo. The landfill has a permitted capacity of 8.7 million cubic yards, and has a remaining capacity as of January, 2002 of 3.8 million cubic yards (Source 13). The landfill as an estimated long term project until 2012 contingent on subsequent county

landfill closures and demographic influences. The landfill anticipates additional expansion by 2005. The estimated yearly disposal at the landfill facility is approximately 170,000 tons per year (TPY).

The entire City of Grover Beach produces approximately 8,700 TPY of solid waste. Of this amount approximately 4,176 TPY goes to the landfill and the remaining 4,524 TPY are diverted through recycling, green waste, and buy-back programs. Refuse pickup in the city includes a recycling and green waste program. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant amount of additional solid waste exceeding estimated amounts based on build out of the City. (Source 13)

g) Refer to f) above.

Mitigation Measures

MM-21 Concurrent with plans submitted for building permit review, a landscape plan shall be submitted demonstrating that site landscaping includes low water usage and/or drought resistant plantings.

MM-22 Interior water conservation measures, as required by the State of California, shall be incorporated into the project. These include, but are not limited to:

- Installation of low flow toilets and urinals in all new construction.
- Installation of water heating system and pipe insulation in all new construction to reduce water used before water reaches equipment or fixtures
- Installation of self-closing faucets in all lavatories

Conclusion

Based on the nature, the size, and location of the proposed project, impacts to utilities and services, with the above mitigation measure, would be less than significant.

Issues (and Supporting Information Services):	Potentially Significant Impact		Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact		No Impact
<p>XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.</p> <p>a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</p>				X		
<p>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)</p>				X		
<p>c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p>				X		

a) Based upon the analysis throughout this Initial Study, the proposed project would not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. The biological and cultural elements analyzed above indicate that this site does not consist of suitable habitat for any species of special concern, nor is there any significant evidence of historical importance or prior Native American occupancy. Mitigation measures are required to ensure less than significant impacts related to on-site resources and protected species.

- b) The project would involve the development of a 20 room condo/hotel on a site that has been planned for commercial (condo/hotel) uses in the City's General Plan. As a result, impacts relating to land use and planning, population and housing, water, air quality, transportation/circulation, public services utilities and service systems attributable to the project have been addressed in the General Plan EIR and are considered less than significant. Implementation of the proposed project would result in minor incremental reductions in air quality and the character of the aesthetic environment in the project vicinity, and minor increases in traffic congestion and the ambient noise level. As described in this Initial Study, the incremental air quality, noise, transportation/traffic, public services, and utilities impacts of the project, when considered in combination with the effects of past projects, current projects, and probable future projects in the planning area, would result in less than significant impacts upon incorporation of mitigation and conditions of project approval. Project impacts related to several issue areas, including geology, hazards and hazardous materials, and hydrology, would be site-specific and would result in no cumulative impacts.
- c) Conditions of approval would ensure consistency with relevant General Plan policies and development standards concerning aesthetics, biology, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems. Mitigation measures have been included in the initial study with regard to aesthetics, biological resources, and noise resources. All potential impact areas are deemed less than significant with City imposed conditions of approval and the mitigation measures set forth within this initial study

SOURCES:

1. Project Application Submittal Package (Application No. 05-025, including architectural plans, tentative map and supporting data).
2. City of Grover Beach General Plan, as amended.
3. City of Grover Beach Municipal Code, including Article IX, Chapter 1 – Zoning Regulations.
4. County of San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (SLOAPCD) CEQA Air Quality Handbook.
5. State of California Uniform Building Codes.
6. San Luis Obispo County Clean Air Plan, San Luis Obispo APCD.
7. City of Grover Beach 2002 Urban Water Management Plan.
8. Federal Emergency Management Agency, Flood Insurance Rate Map, November 5, 1997.
9. City of Grover Beach 2005 Circulation Element and Technical Appendix.
10. Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation 5th Edition
11. South San Luis Obispo Sanitation District.
12. GSI Soils Inc., Geotechnical Investigation Pacific Coast Hotel 105 West Grand Avenue Grover Beach, California (May 25, 2005).
13. Cold Canyon Sanitary Landfill.
14. City of Grover Beach Visioning Project.
15. California EPA, Air Resources Board. *URBEMIS Computer Program, Version 7.0(g). 2002.*
16. City of Grover Beach Local Costal Program. November 1, 1999.
17. Federal Highway Administration "*Highway Traffic Noise Model*", FHWA-RD-77-104, 2004.
18. Grover Brach Zoning Map, amended November 1, 2000.
19. San Luis Obispo County General Plan Safety Element, December 1999.

Appendix A
Air Quality Model Results

output with cut and fill

Page: 1
08/16/2006 9:10 AM

URBEMIS 2002 For Windows 8.7.0

File Name: L:\ESP\SLO Co\Grover Beach\05-58760 Pacific Coast
Hotel CEQA\Report\pacific Coast Hotel.urb
Project Name: Pacific Coast Hotel, Grover Beach
Project Location: San Luis Obispo County
On-Road Motor Vehicle Emissions Based on EMFAC2002 version 2.2

SUMMARY REPORT
(Pounds/Day - Summer)

CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES

PM10 *** 2007 ***	PM10 ***	ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10 TOTAL
EXHAUST	DUST					
TOTALS (lbs/day,unmitigated)		0.23	4.29	0.85	0.01	0.12
0.10	0.02					

PM10 *** 2008 ***	PM10 ***	ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10 TOTAL
EXHAUST	DUST					
TOTALS (lbs/day,unmitigated)		20.40	0.02	0.50	0.00	0.02
0.00	0.02					

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES

TOTALS (lbs/day,unmitigated)	ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10
	0.58	0.30	2.58	0.00	0.01

OPERATIONAL (VEHICLE) EMISSION ESTIMATES

TOTALS (lbs/day,unmitigated)	ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10
	2.33	3.05	28.34	0.02	2.78

SUM OF AREA AND OPERATIONAL EMISSION ESTIMATES

TOTALS (lbs/day,unmitigated)	ROG	NOX	CO	SO2	PM10
	2.92	3.35	30.93	0.02	2.78

Page: 2
08/16/2006 9:10 AM

URBEMIS 2002 For Windows 8.7.0

File Name: L:\ESP\SLO Co\Grover Beach\05-58760 Pacific Coast
Hotel CEQA\Report\pacific Coast Hotel.urb
Project Name: Pacific Coast Hotel, Grover Beach
Project Location: San Luis Obispo County
On-Road Motor Vehicle Emissions Based on EMFAC2002 version 2.2

output with cut and fill

DETAIL REPORT
(Pounds/Day - Summer)

Construction Start Month and Year: June, 2007
 Construction Duration: 12
 Total Land Use Area to be Developed: 0 acres
 Maximum Acreage Disturbed Per Day: 0 acres
 Single Family Units: 0 Multi-Family Units: 0
 Retail/Office/Institutional/Industrial Square Footage: 13313

CONSTRUCTION EMISSION ESTIMATES UNMITIGATED (lbs/day)

PM10 Source	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10 TOTAL	PM10
EXHAUST DUST *** 2007***						
Phase 1 - Demolition Emissions						
Fugitive Dust	-	-	-	-	0.00	
- 0.00						
Off-Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	0.00	
0.00 0.00						
On-Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
0.00 0.00						
Worker Trips	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
0.00 0.00						
Maximum lbs/day	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
0.00 0.00						
Phase 2 - Site Grading Emissions						
Fugitive Dust	-	-	-	-	0.00	
- 0.00						
Off-Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	0.00	
0.00 0.00						
On-Road Diesel	0.23	4.29	0.85	0.01	0.12	
0.10 0.02						
Worker Trips	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
0.00 0.00						
Maximum lbs/day	0.23	4.29	0.85	0.01	0.12	
0.10 0.02						
Phase 3 - Building Construction						
Bldg Const Off-Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	0.00	
0.00 0.00						
Bldg Const Worker Trips	0.03	0.01	0.31	0.00	0.01	
0.00 0.01						
Arch Coatings Off-Gas	0.00	-	-	-	-	
- -						
Arch Coatings Worker Trips	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
0.00 0.00						
Asphalt Off-Gas	0.00	-	-	-	-	
- -						
Asphalt Off-Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	0.00	
0.00 0.00						
Asphalt On-Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
0.00 0.00						
Asphalt worker Trips	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
0.00 0.00						
Maximum lbs/day	0.03	0.01	0.31	0.00	0.01	
0.00 0.01						
Max lbs/day all phases	0.23	4.29	0.85	0.01	0.12	
0.10 0.02						

output with cut and fill

*** 2008***

Phase 1 - Demolition Emissions

Fugitive Dust	-	-	-	-	0.00
-	0.00				
Off-Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	0.00
0.00	0.00				
On-Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	0.00				
Worker Trips	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	0.00				
Maximum lbs/day	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	0.00				

Phase 2 - Site Grading Emissions

Fugitive Dust	-	-	-	-	0.00
-	0.00				
Off-Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	0.00
0.00	0.00				
On-Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	0.00				
Worker Trips	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	0.00				
Maximum lbs/day	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	0.00				

Phase 3 - Building Construction

Bldg Const Off-Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	0.00
0.00	0.00				
Bldg Const Worker Trips	0.02	0.01	0.29	0.00	0.01
0.00	0.01				
Arch Coatings Off-Gas	20.35	-	-	-	-
-	-				
Arch Coatings Worker Trips	0.02	0.01	0.25	0.00	0.01
0.00	0.01				
Asphalt Off-Gas	0.00	-	-	-	-
-	-				
Asphalt Off-Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	-	0.00
0.00	0.00				
Asphalt On-Road Diesel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	0.00				
Asphalt Worker Trips	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.00	0.00				
Maximum lbs/day	20.40	0.02	0.50	0.00	0.02
0.00	0.02				
Max lbs/day all phases	20.40	0.02	0.50	0.00	0.02
0.00	0.02				

Page: 3
08/16/2006 9:10 AM

Phase 1 - Demolition Assumptions: Phase Turned OFF

Phase 2 - Site Grading Assumptions
Start Month/Year for Phase 2: Jun '07

output with cut and fill

Phase 2 Duration: 1.3 months
On-Road Truck Travel (VMT): 194
Off-Road Equipment

No.	Type	Horsepower	Load Factor	Hours/Day
-----	------	------------	-------------	-----------

Phase 3 - Building Construction Assumptions

Start Month/Year for Phase 3: Jul '07

Phase 3 Duration: 10.7 months

Start Month/Year for SubPhase Building: Jul '07

SubPhase Building Duration: 10.7 months

Off-Road Equipment

No.	Type	Horsepower	Load Factor	Hours/Day
-----	------	------------	-------------	-----------

Start Month/Year for SubPhase Architectural Coatings: Apr '08

SubPhase Architectural Coatings Duration: 1.1 months

Start Month/Year for SubPhase Asphalt: May '08

SubPhase Asphalt Duration: 0.5 months

Acres to be Paved: 0

Off-Road Equipment

No.	Type	Horsepower	Load Factor	Hours/Day
-----	------	------------	-------------	-----------

Page: 4
08/16/2006 9:10 AM

AREA SOURCE EMISSION ESTIMATES (Summer Pounds per Day, Unmitigated)					
Source	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10
Natural Gas	0.02	0.29	0.24	0	0.00
Hearth - No summer emissions					
Landscaping	0.37	0.01	2.34	0.00	0.01
Consumer Prdcts	0.00	-	-	-	-
Architectural Coatings	0.19	-	-	-	-
TOTALS(lbs/day,unmitigated)	0.58	0.30	2.58	0.00	0.01

Page: 5
08/16/2006 9:10 AM

UNMITIGATED OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS

	ROG	NOx	CO	SO2	PM10
High turnover (sit-down)	0.35	0.52	4.87	0.00	0.48
Hotel	1.24	1.47	13.66	0.01	1.34
Strip mall	0.74	1.06	9.82	0.01	0.96
TOTAL EMISSIONS (lbs/day)	2.33	3.05	28.34	0.02	2.78

Does not include correction for passby trips.
Does not include double counting adjustment for internal trips.

OPERATIONAL (Vehicle) EMISSION ESTIMATES

Analysis Year: 2007 Temperature (F): 85 Season: Summer

EMFAC Version: EMFAC2002 (9/2002)

output with cut and fill

Summary of Land Uses:

Unit Type	Acreage	Trip Rate	No. Units	Total Trips
High turnover (sit-down)		127.15 trips/1000 sq. ft.	0.46	58.23
Hotel		8.17 trips/rooms	20.00	163.40
Strip mall		42.94 trips/1000 sq. ft.	2.86	122.59
			Sum of Total Trips	344.23
			Total Vehicle Miles Traveled	1,829.41

Vehicle Assumptions:

Fleet Mix:

Vehicle Type	Percent Type	Non-Catalyst	Catalyst	Diesel
Light Auto	55.20	1.80	97.80	0.40
Light Truck < 3,750 lbs	15.10	3.30	94.00	2.70
Light Truck 3,751- 5,750	16.10	1.90	96.90	1.20
Med Truck 5,751- 8,500	7.10	1.40	95.80	2.80
Lite-Heavy 8,501-10,000	1.10	0.00	81.80	18.20
Lite-Heavy 10,001-14,000	0.40	0.00	50.00	50.00
Med-Heavy 14,001-33,000	1.00	0.00	20.00	80.00
Heavy-Heavy 33,001-60,000	0.90	0.00	11.10	88.90
Line Haul > 60,000 lbs	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Urban Bus	0.10	0.00	0.00	100.00
Motorcycle	1.70	82.40	17.60	0.00
School Bus	0.10	0.00	0.00	100.00
Motor Home	1.20	8.30	83.30	8.40

Travel Conditions

	Residential			Commercial		
	Home-Work	Home-Shop	Home-Other	Commute	Non-Work	Customer
Urban Trip Length (miles)	13.0	5.0	5.0	13.0	5.0	5.0
Rural Trip Length (miles)	15.0	10.0	10.0	15.0	15.0	15.0
Trip Speeds (mph)	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0	40.0
% of Trips - Residential	27.4	17.7	54.9			
% of Trips - Commercial (by land use)						
High turnover (sit-down) rest.				5.0	2.5	92.5
Hotel				5.0	2.5	92.5
Strip mall				2.0	1.0	97.0

Page: 6
08/16/2006 9:10 AM

Changes made to the default values for Land Use Trip Percentages

Changes made to the default values for Construction

Changes made to the default values for Area

Changes made to the default values for Operations

The operational emission year changed from 2005 to 2007.
Page 5

Appendix B
Noise Model Results

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel Project No. 05-58760
 Date: 30-Aug-06
 Roadway: Highway 1 Commercial Space 101 window

PROJECT DATA and ASSUMPTIONS

Vehicle Reference Energy Mean Emission Levels (FHWA 1977, TNM®, or CALVENO): TNM
 Distance to Receptor: 56 feet
 Site Condition (Hard or Soft): Hard
 Upgrade longer than 1 mile: 0 %
 Existing Total Traffic Volume (ADT): 14,000 vehicles
 Ambient Growth Factor: 0.0%
 Future Year : 2020
 Total Project Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Total Cumulative Growth Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Source of Traffic Data: ITE trip Generation

Daily Vehicle Mix

	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Future</i>
Automobile	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
Medium Truck	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Heavy Truck	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%

Source: Assumed given land use and road characteristics

Percentage of Daily Traffic

	<i>Existing and Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	77.5%	12.9%	9.6%
Medium Truck	84.8%	4.9%	10.3%
Heavy Truck	86.5%	2.7%	10.8%

Source: Default Assumption

	<i>Project</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Heavy Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: Default Assumption

Average Speed

	<i>Existing</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	45	45	45
Medium Truck	45	45	45
Heavy Truck	45	45	45

Source: Assumed average speed

	<i>Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	45	45	45
Medium Truck	45	45	45
Heavy Truck	45	45	45

Source: Assumed average speed

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel
 Date: 23-Oct-06

Project No. 05-58760

Roadway: Highway 1 Commercial Space 101 window

Vehicle Noise Emission Levels*: TNM

RESULTS

DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE LEVEL (Ldn)	Ldn at Site		Distance to dBA Contour Line from roadway centerline, feet				
	56 feet from road centerline		75	70	65	60	55
Existing	69.6 dBA		#N/A	53	114	245	529
Existing + Project	69.6 dBA		#N/A	53	114	245	529
Future with Ambient Growth	69.6 dBA		#N/A	53	114	245	529
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	69.6 dBA		#N/A	53	114	245	529
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	69.6 dBA		#N/A	53	114	245	529
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	69.6 dBA		#N/A	53	114	245	529
Change in Noise Levels							
Due to Project	0.0 dBA						
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA						
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA						
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA						

COMMUNITY NOISE EXPOSURE LEVEL (CNEL)	CNEL at Site		Distance to dBA Contour Line from roadway centerline, feet				
	56 feet from road centerline		75	70	65	60	55
Existing	70.1 dBA		#N/A	57	122	264	568
Existing + Project	70.1 dBA		#N/A	57	122	264	568
Future with Ambient Growth	70.1 dBA		#N/A	57	122	264	568
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	70.1 dBA		#N/A	57	122	264	568
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	70.1 dBA		#N/A	57	122	264	568
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	70.1 dBA		#N/A	57	122	264	568
Change in Noise Levels							
Due to Project	0.0 dBA						
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA						
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA						
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA						

*NOTES: Based on algorithms from the Federal Highway Administration "Traffic Noise Model ®", FHWA-PD-96-010, January, 1998.

#N/A = Not Applicable

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel Project No. 05-58760
 Date: 30-Aug-06

Roadway: West Grand Avenue Commerical space 101 window

PROJECT DATA and ASSUMPTIONS

Vehicle Reference Energy Mean Emission Levels (FHWA 1977, TNM®, or CALVENO): TNM
 Distance to Receptor: 60 feet
 Site Condition (Hard or Soft): Hard
 Upgrade longer than 1 mile: 0 %
 Existing Total Traffic Volume (ADT): 2,900 vehicles
 Ambient Growth Factor: 0.0%
 Future Year : 2020
 Total Project Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Total Cumulative Growth Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Source of Traffic Data: ITE trip Generation

Daily Vehicle Mix

	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Future</i>
Automobile	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
Medium Truck	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Heavy Truck	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%

Source: Assumed given land use and road characteristics

Percentage of Daily Traffic

	<i>Existing and Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	77.5%	12.9%	9.6%
Medium Truck	84.8%	4.9%	10.3%
Heavy Truck	86.5%	2.7%	10.8%

Source: Default Assumption

	<i>Project</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Heavy Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: Default Assumption

Average Speed

	<i>Existing</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	35	35	35
Medium Truck	35	35	35
Heavy Truck	35	35	35

Source: Assumed average speed

	<i>Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	35	35	35
Medium Truck	35	35	35
Heavy Truck	35	35	35

Source: Assumed average speed

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel
 Date: 23-Oct-06

Project No. 05-58760

Roadway: West Grand Avenue Commerical space 101 window

Vehicle Noise Emission Levels*: TNM

RESULTS

DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE LEVEL (Ldn)	Ldn at Site 60 feet from road centerline	Distance to dBA Contour Line from roadway centerline, feet				
		75	70	65	60	55
Existing	59.7 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	57	123
Existing + Project	59.7 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	57	123
Future with Ambient Growth	59.7 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	57	123
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	59.7 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	57	123
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	59.7 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	57	123
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	59.7 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	57	123
Change in Noise Levels						
Due to Project	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA					
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA					

COMMUNITY NOISE EXPOSURE LEVEL (CNEL)	CNEL at Site 60 feet from road centerline	Distance to dBA Contour Line from roadway centerline, feet				
		75	70	65	60	55
Existing	60.1 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	61	131
Existing + Project	60.1 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	61	131
Future with Ambient Growth	60.1 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	61	131
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	60.1 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	61	131
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	60.1 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	61	131
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	60.1 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	61	131
Change in Noise Levels						
Due to Project	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA					
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA					

*NOTES: Based on algorithms from the Federal Highway Administration "Traffic Noise Model ©", FHWA-PD-96-010, January, 1998.

#N/A = Not Applicable

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel Project No. 05-58760
 Date: 30-Aug-06

Roadway: Highway 1 Commercial Space 103 window

PROJECT DATA and ASSUMPTIONS

Vehicle Reference Energy Mean Emission Levels (FHWA 1977, TNM®, or CALVENO): TNM
 Distance to Receptor: 31 feet
 Site Condition (Hard or Soft): Hard
 Upgrade longer than 1 mile: 0 %
 Existing Total Traffic Volume (ADT): 14,000 vehicles
 Ambient Growth Factor: 0.0%
 Future Year : 2020
 Total Project Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Total Cumulative Growth Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Source of Traffic Data: ITE trip Generation

Daily Vehicle Mix

	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Future</i>
Automobile	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
Medium Truck	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Heavy Truck	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%

Source: Assumed given land use and road characteristics

Percentage of Daily Traffic

	<i>Existing and Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	77.5%	12.9%	9.6%
Medium Truck	84.8%	4.9%	10.3%
Heavy Truck	86.5%	2.7%	10.8%

Source: Default Assumption

	<i>Project</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Heavy Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: Default Assumption

Average Speed

	<i>Existing</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	45	45	45
Medium Truck	45	45	45
Heavy Truck	45	45	45

Source: Assumed average speed

	<i>Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	45	45	45
Medium Truck	45	45	45
Heavy Truck	45	45	45

Source: Assumed average speed

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel
 Date: 23-Oct-06

Project No. 05-58760

Roadway: Highway 1 Commercial Space 103 window

Vehicle Noise Emission Levels*: TNM

RESULTS

DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE LEVEL (Ldn)	Ldn at Site 31 feet from road centerline	Distance to dBA Contour Line from roadway centerline, feet				
		75	70	65	60	55
Existing	72.2 dBA	#N/A	43	94	201	434
Existing + Project	72.2 dBA	#N/A	43	94	201	434
Future with Ambient Growth	72.2 dBA	#N/A	43	94	201	434
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	72.2 dBA	#N/A	43	94	201	434
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	72.2 dBA	#N/A	43	94	201	434
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	72.2 dBA	#N/A	43	94	201	434
Change in Noise Levels						
Due to Project	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA					
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA					

COMMUNITY NOISE EXPOSURE LEVEL (CNEL)	CNEL at Site 31 feet from road centerline	Distance to dBA Contour Line from roadway centerline, feet				
		75	70	65	60	55
Existing	72.7 dBA	#N/A	47	101	217	467
Existing + Project	72.7 dBA	#N/A	47	101	217	467
Future with Ambient Growth	72.7 dBA	#N/A	47	101	217	467
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	72.7 dBA	#N/A	47	101	217	467
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	72.7 dBA	#N/A	47	101	217	467
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	72.7 dBA	#N/A	47	101	217	467
Change in Noise Levels						
Due to Project	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA					
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA					

*NOTES: Based on algorithms from the Federal Highway Administration "Traffic Noise Model ®", FHWA-PD-96-010, January, 1998.

#N/A = Not Applicable

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel Project No. 05-58760
 Date: 30-Aug-06

Roadway: West Grand Avenue room 110 balcony

PROJECT DATA and ASSUMPTIONS

Vehicle Reference Energy Mean Emission Levels (FHWA 1977, TNM®, or CALVENO): TNM
 Distance to Receptor: 58 feet
 Site Condition (Hard or Soft): Hard
 Upgrade longer than 1 mile: 0 %
 Existing Total Traffic Volume (ADT): 2,900 vehicles
 Ambient Growth Factor: 0.0%
 Future Year : 2020
 Total Project Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Total Cumulative Growth Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Source of Traffic Data: ITE trip Generation

Daily Vehicle Mix

	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Future</i>
Automobile	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
Medium Truck	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Heavy Truck	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%

Source: Assumed given land use and road characteristics

Percentage of Daily Traffic

	<i>Existing and Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	77.5%	12.9%	9.6%
Medium Truck	84.8%	4.9%	10.3%
Heavy Truck	86.5%	2.7%	10.8%

Source: Default Assumption

	<i>Project</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Heavy Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: Default Assumption

Average Speed

	<i>Existing</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	35	35	35
Medium Truck	35	35	35
Heavy Truck	35	35	35

Source: Assumed average speed

	<i>Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	35	35	35
Medium Truck	35	35	35
Heavy Truck	35	35	35

Source: Assumed average speed

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel
 Date: 23-Oct-06

Project No. 05-58760

Roadway: West Grand Avenue room 110 balcony

Vehicle Noise Emission Levels*: TNM

RESULTS

DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE LEVEL (Ldn)	Ldn at Site 58 feet from road centerline	Distance to dBA Contour Line from roadway centerline, feet				
		75	70	65	60	55
Existing	59.8 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	56	121
Existing + Project	59.8 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	56	121
Future with Ambient Growth	59.8 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	56	121
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	59.8 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	56	121
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	59.8 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	56	121
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	59.8 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	56	121
Change in Noise Levels						
Due to Project	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA					
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA					

COMMUNITY NOISE EXPOSURE LEVEL (CNEL)	CNEL at Site 58 feet from road centerline	Distance to dBA Contour Line from roadway centerline, feet				
		75	70	65	60	55
Existing	60.2 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	60	130
Existing + Project	60.2 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	60	130
Future with Ambient Growth	60.2 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	60	130
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	60.2 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	60	130
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	60.2 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	60	130
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	60.2 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	60	130
Change in Noise Levels						
Due to Project	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA					
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA					

*NOTES: Based on algorithms from the Federal Highway Administration "Traffic Noise Model ®", FHWA-PD-96-010, January, 1998.

#N/A = Not Applicable

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel Project No. 05-58760
 Date: 30-Aug-06

Roadway: West Grand Avenue room 110 window

PROJECT DATA and ASSUMPTIONS

Vehicle Reference Energy Mean Emission Levels (FHWA 1977, TNM®, or CALVENO): TNM
 Distance to Receptor: 63 feet
 Site Condition (Hard or Soft): Hard
 Upgrade longer than 1 mile: 0 %
 Existing Total Traffic Volume (ADT): 2,900 vehicles
 Ambient Growth Factor: 0.0%
 Future Year : 2020
 Total Project Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Total Cumulative Growth Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Source of Traffic Data: ITE trip Generation

Daily Vehicle Mix

	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Future</i>
Automobile	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
Medium Truck	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Heavy Truck	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%

Source: Assumed given land use and road characteristics

Percentage of Daily Traffic

	<i>Existing and Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	77.5%	12.9%	9.6%
Medium Truck	84.8%	4.9%	10.3%
Heavy Truck	86.5%	2.7%	10.8%

Source: Default Assumption

	<i>Project</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Heavy Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: Default Assumption

Average Speed

	<i>Existing</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	35	35	35
Medium Truck	35	35	35
Heavy Truck	35	35	35

Source: Assumed average speed

	<i>Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	35	35	35
Medium Truck	35	35	35
Heavy Truck	35	35	35

Source: Assumed average speed

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel
 Date: 23-Oct-06

Project No. 05-58760

Roadway: West Grand Avenue room 110 window

Vehicle Noise Emission Levels*: TNM

RESULTS

DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE LEVEL (Ldn)	Ldn at Site	Distance to dBA Contour Line from roadway centerline, feet				
	63 feet from road centerline	75	70	65	60	55
Existing	59.4 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	58	125
Existing + Project	59.4 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	58	125
Future with Ambient Growth	59.4 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	58	125
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	59.4 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	58	125
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	59.4 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	58	125
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	59.4 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	58	125
Change in Noise Levels						
Due to Project	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA					
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA					

COMMUNITY NOISE EXPOSURE LEVEL (CNEL)	CNEL at Site	Distance to dBA Contour Line from roadway centerline, feet				
	63 feet from road centerline	75	70	65	60	55
Existing	59.9 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	62	133
Existing + Project	59.9 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	62	133
Future with Ambient Growth	59.9 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	62	133
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	59.9 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	62	133
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	59.9 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	62	133
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	59.9 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	62	133
Change in Noise Levels						
Due to Project	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA					
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA					

*NOTES: Based on algorithms from the Federal Highway Administration "Traffic Noise Model ®", FHWA-PD-96-010, January, 1998.

#N/A = Not Applicable

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel Project No. 05-58760
 Date: 30-Aug-06
 Roadway: Highway 1 Room 201 balcony

PROJECT DATA and ASSUMPTIONS

Vehicle Reference Energy Mean Emission Levels (FHWA 1977, TNM®, or CALVENO): TNM
 Distance to Receptor: 37 feet
 Site Condition (Hard or Soft): Hard
 Upgrade longer than 1 mile: 0 %
 Existing Total Traffic Volume (ADT): 14,000 vehicles
 Ambient Growth Factor: 0.0%
 Future Year : 2020
 Total Project Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Total Cumulative Growth Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Source of Traffic Data: ITE trip Generation

Daily Vehicle Mix

	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Future</i>
Automobile	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
Medium Truck	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Heavy Truck	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%

Source: Assumed given land use and road characteristics

Percentage of Daily Traffic

	<i>Existing and Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	77.5%	12.9%	9.6%
Medium Truck	84.8%	4.9%	10.3%
Heavy Truck	86.5%	2.7%	10.8%

Source: Default Assumption

	<i>Project</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Heavy Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: Default Assumption

Average Speed

	<i>Existing</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	45	45	45
Medium Truck	45	45	45
Heavy Truck	45	45	45

Source: Assumed average speed

	<i>Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	45	45	45
Medium Truck	45	45	45
Heavy Truck	45	45	45

Source: Assumed average speed

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel
 Date: 23-Oct-06

Project No. 05-58760

Roadway: Highway 1 Room 201 balcony

Vehicle Noise Emission Levels*: TNM

RESULTS

DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE LEVEL (Ldn)	Ldn at Site	Distance to dBA Contour Line				
	37 feet from road centerline	75	70	65	60	55
Existing	71.4 dBA	#N/A	46	99	214	460
Existing + Project	71.4 dBA	#N/A	46	99	214	460
Future with Ambient Growth	71.4 dBA	#N/A	46	99	214	460
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	71.4 dBA	#N/A	46	99	214	460
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	71.4 dBA	#N/A	46	99	214	460
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	71.4 dBA	#N/A	46	99	214	460
Change in Noise Levels						
Due to Project	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA					
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA					

COMMUNITY NOISE EXPOSURE LEVEL (CNEL)	CNEL at Site	Distance to dBA Contour Line				
	37 feet from road centerline	75	70	65	60	55
Existing	71.9 dBA	#N/A	50	107	230	495
Existing + Project	71.9 dBA	#N/A	50	107	230	495
Future with Ambient Growth	71.9 dBA	#N/A	50	107	230	495
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	71.9 dBA	#N/A	50	107	230	495
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	71.9 dBA	#N/A	50	107	230	495
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	71.9 dBA	#N/A	50	107	230	495
Change in Noise Levels						
Due to Project	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA					
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA					

*NOTES: Based on algorithms from the Federal Highway Administration "Traffic Noise Model ®", FHWA-PD-96-010, January, 1998.

#N/A = Not Applicable

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel Project No. 05-58760
 Date: 30-Aug-06

Roadway: Highway 1 Room 201 window

PROJECT DATA and ASSUMPTIONS

Vehicle Reference Energy Mean Emission Levels (FHWA 1977, TNM®, or CALVENO): TNM
 Distance to Receptor: 41 feet
 Site Condition (Hard or Soft): Hard
 Upgrade longer than 1 mile: 0 %
 Existing Total Traffic Volume (ADT): 14,000 vehicles
 Ambient Growth Factor: 0.0%
 Future Year : 2020
 Total Project Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Total Cumulative Growth Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Source of Traffic Data: ITE trip Generation

Daily Vehicle Mix

	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Future</i>
Automobile	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
Medium Truck	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Heavy Truck	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%

Source: Assumed given land use and road characteristics

Percentage of Daily Traffic

	<i>Existing and Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	77.5%	12.9%	9.6%
Medium Truck	84.8%	4.9%	10.3%
Heavy Truck	86.5%	2.7%	10.8%

Source: Default Assumption

	<i>Project</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Heavy Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: Default Assumption

Average Speed

	<i>Existing</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	45	45	45
Medium Truck	45	45	45
Heavy Truck	45	45	45

Source: Assumed average speed

	<i>Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	45	45	45
Medium Truck	45	45	45
Heavy Truck	45	45	45

Source: Assumed average speed

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel
 Date: 23-Oct-06

Project No. 05-58760

Roadway: Highway 1 Room 201 window

Vehicle Noise Emission Levels*: TNM

RESULTS

DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE LEVEL (Ldn)	Ldn at Site	Distance to dBA Contour Line				
	41 feet from road centerline	75	70	65	60	55
Existing	71.0 dBA	#N/A	48	103	221	476
Existing + Project	71.0 dBA	#N/A	48	103	221	476
Future with Ambient Growth	71.0 dBA	#N/A	48	103	221	476
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	71.0 dBA	#N/A	48	103	221	476
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	71.0 dBA	#N/A	48	103	221	476
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	71.0 dBA	#N/A	48	103	221	476
Change in Noise Levels						
Due to Project	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA					
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA					

COMMUNITY NOISE EXPOSURE LEVEL (CNEL)	CNEL at Site	Distance to dBA Contour Line				
	41 feet from road centerline	75	70	65	60	55
Existing	71.5 dBA	#N/A	51	110	238	512
Existing + Project	71.5 dBA	#N/A	51	110	238	512
Future with Ambient Growth	71.5 dBA	#N/A	51	110	238	512
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	71.5 dBA	#N/A	51	110	238	512
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	71.5 dBA	#N/A	51	110	238	512
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	71.5 dBA	#N/A	51	110	238	512
Change in Noise Levels						
Due to Project	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA					
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA					

*NOTES: Based on algorithms from the Federal Highway Administration "Traffic Noise Model ®", FHWA-PD-96-010, January, 1998.

#N/A = Not Applicable

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel Project No. 05-58760
 Date: 30-Aug-06

Roadway: West Grand Avenue room 205 balcony

PROJECT DATA and ASSUMPTIONS

Vehicle Reference Energy Mean Emission Levels (FHWA 1977, TNM®, or CALVENO): TNM
 Distance to Receptor: 57 feet
 Site Condition (Hard or Soft): Hard
 Upgrade longer than 1 mile: 0 %
 Existing Total Traffic Volume (ADT): 2,900 vehicles
 Ambient Growth Factor: 0.0%
 Future Year : 2020
 Total Project Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Total Cumulative Growth Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Source of Traffic Data: ITE trip Generation

Daily Vehicle Mix

	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Future</i>
Automobile	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
Medium Truck	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Heavy Truck	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%

Source: Assumed given land use and road characteristics

Percentage of Daily Traffic

	<i>Existing and Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	77.5%	12.9%	9.6%
Medium Truck	84.8%	4.9%	10.3%
Heavy Truck	86.5%	2.7%	10.8%

Source: Default Assumption

	<i>Project</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Heavy Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: Default Assumption

Average Speed

	<i>Existing</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	35	35	35
Medium Truck	35	35	35
Heavy Truck	35	35	35

Source: Assumed average speed

	<i>Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	35	35	35
Medium Truck	35	35	35
Heavy Truck	35	35	35

Source: Assumed average speed

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel
 Date: 23-Oct-06

Project No. 05-58760

Roadway: West Grand Avenue room 205 balcony

Vehicle Noise Emission Levels*: TNM

RESULTS

DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE LEVEL (Ldn)	Ldn at Site	Distance to dBA Contour Line				
	57 feet from road centerline	75	70	65	60	55
Existing	59.9 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	56	121
Existing + Project	59.9 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	56	121
Future with Ambient Growth	59.9 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	56	121
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	59.9 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	56	121
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	59.9 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	56	121
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	59.9 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	56	121
Change in Noise Levels						
Due to Project	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA					
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA					

COMMUNITY NOISE EXPOSURE LEVEL (CNEL)	CNEL at Site	Distance to dBA Contour Line				
	57 feet from road centerline	75	70	65	60	55
Existing	60.3 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	60	129
Existing + Project	60.3 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	60	129
Future with Ambient Growth	60.3 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	60	129
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	60.3 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	60	129
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	60.3 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	60	129
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	60.3 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	60	129
Change in Noise Levels						
Due to Project	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA					
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA					

*NOTES: Based on algorithms from the Federal Highway Administration "Traffic Noise Model ®", FHWA-PD-96-010, January, 1998.

#N/A = Not Applicable

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel Project No. 05-58760
 Date: 30-Aug-06
 Roadway: Highway 1 Room 205 Balcony

PROJECT DATA and ASSUMPTIONS

Vehicle Reference Energy Mean Emission Levels (FHWA 1977, TNM®, or CALVENO): TNM
 Distance to Receptor: 58 feet
 Site Condition (Hard or Soft): Hard
 Upgrade longer than 1 mile: 0 %
 Existing Total Traffic Volume (ADT): 14,000 vehicles
 Ambient Growth Factor: 0.0%
 Future Year : 2020
 Total Project Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Total Cumulative Growth Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Source of Traffic Data: ITE trip Generation

Daily Vehicle Mix

	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Future</i>
Automobile	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
Medium Truck	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Heavy Truck	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%

Source: Assumed given land use and road characteristics

Percentage of Daily Traffic

	<i>Existing and Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	77.5%	12.9%	9.6%
Medium Truck	84.8%	4.9%	10.3%
Heavy Truck	86.5%	2.7%	10.8%

Source: Default Assumption

	<i>Project</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Heavy Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: Default Assumption

Average Speed

	<i>Existing</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	45	45	45
Medium Truck	45	45	45
Heavy Truck	45	45	45

Source: Assumed average speed

	<i>Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	45	45	45
Medium Truck	45	45	45
Heavy Truck	45	45	45

Source: Assumed average speed

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel
 Date: 23-Oct-06

Project No. 05-58760

Roadway: Highway 1 Room 205 Balcony

Vehicle Noise Emission Levels*: TNM

RESULTS

DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE LEVEL (Ldn)	Ldn at Site		Distance to dBA Contour Line from roadway centerline, feet				
	58 feet from road centerline		75	70	65	60	55
Existing	69.5 dBA		#N/A	53	115	248	535
Existing + Project	69.5 dBA		#N/A	53	115	248	535
Future with Ambient Growth	69.5 dBA		#N/A	53	115	248	535
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	69.5 dBA		#N/A	53	115	248	535
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	69.5 dBA		#N/A	53	115	248	535
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	69.5 dBA		#N/A	53	115	248	535
Change in Noise Levels							
Due to Project	0.0 dBA						
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA						
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA						
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA						

COMMUNITY NOISE EXPOSURE LEVEL (CNEL)	CNEL at Site		Distance to dBA Contour Line from roadway centerline, feet				
	58 feet from road centerline		75	70	65	60	55
Existing	69.9 dBA		#N/A	58	124	267	575
Existing + Project	69.9 dBA		#N/A	58	124	267	575
Future with Ambient Growth	69.9 dBA		#N/A	58	124	267	575
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	69.9 dBA		#N/A	58	124	267	575
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	69.9 dBA		#N/A	58	124	267	575
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	69.9 dBA		#N/A	58	124	267	575
Change in Noise Levels							
Due to Project	0.0 dBA						
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA						
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA						
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA						

*NOTES: Based on algorithms from the Federal Highway Administration "Traffic Noise Model ®", FHWA-PD-96-010, January, 1998.

#N/A = Not Applicable

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel Project No. 05-58760
 Date: 30-Aug-06
 Roadway: West Grand Avenue room 205 window

PROJECT DATA and ASSUMPTIONS

Vehicle Reference Energy Mean Emission Levels (FHWA 1977, TNM®, or CALVENO): TNM
 Distance to Receptor: 63 feet
 Site Condition (Hard or Soft): Hard
 Upgrade longer than 1 mile: 0 %
 Existing Total Traffic Volume (ADT): 2,900 vehicles
 Ambient Growth Factor: 0.0%
 Future Year : 2020
 Total Project Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Total Cumulative Growth Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Source of Traffic Data: ITE trip Generation

Daily Vehicle Mix

	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Future</i>
Automobile	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
Medium Truck	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Heavy Truck	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%

Source: Assumed given land use and road characteristics

Percentage of Daily Traffic

	<i>Existing and Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	77.5%	12.9%	9.6%
Medium Truck	84.8%	4.9%	10.3%
Heavy Truck	86.5%	2.7%	10.8%

Source: Default Assumption

	<i>Project</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Heavy Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: Default Assumption

Average Speed

	<i>Existing</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	35	35	35
Medium Truck	35	35	35
Heavy Truck	35	35	35

Source: Assumed average speed

	<i>Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	35	35	35
Medium Truck	35	35	35
Heavy Truck	35	35	35

Source: Assumed average speed

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel
 Date: 23-Oct-06

Project No. 05-58760

Roadway: West Grand Avenue room 205 window

Vehicle Noise Emission Levels*: TNM

RESULTS

DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE LEVEL (Ldn)	Ldn at Site	Distance to dBA Contour Line				
	63 feet from road centerline	75	70	65	60	55
Existing	59.4 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	58	125
Existing + Project	59.4 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	58	125
Future with Ambient Growth	59.4 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	58	125
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	59.4 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	58	125
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	59.4 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	58	125
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	59.4 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	58	125
Change in Noise Levels						
Due to Project	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA					
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA					

COMMUNITY NOISE EXPOSURE LEVEL (CNEL)	CNEL at Site	Distance to dBA Contour Line				
	63 feet from road centerline	75	70	65	60	55
Existing	59.9 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	62	133
Existing + Project	59.9 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	62	133
Future with Ambient Growth	59.9 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	62	133
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	59.9 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	62	133
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	59.9 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	62	133
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	59.9 dBA	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	62	133
Change in Noise Levels						
Due to Project	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA					
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA					

*NOTES: Based on algorithms from the Federal Highway Administration "Traffic Noise Model ®", FHWA-PD-96-010, January, 1998.

#N/A = Not Applicable

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel Project No. 05-58760
 Date: 30-Aug-06
 Roadway: Highway 1 Room 205 Window

PROJECT DATA and ASSUMPTIONS

Vehicle Reference Energy Mean Emission Levels (FHWA 1977, TNM®, or CALVENO): TNM
 Distance to Receptor: 63 feet
 Site Condition (Hard or Soft): Hard
 Upgrade longer than 1 mile: 0 %
 Existing Total Traffic Volume (ADT): 14,000 vehicles
 Ambient Growth Factor: 0.0%
 Future Year : 2020
 Total Project Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Total Cumulative Growth Volume (ADT): 0 vehicles
 Source of Traffic Data: ITE trip Generation

Daily Vehicle Mix

	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Future</i>
Automobile	95.0%	95.0%	95.0%
Medium Truck	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Heavy Truck	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%

Source: Assumed given land use and road characteristics

Percentage of Daily Traffic

	<i>Existing and Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	77.5%	12.9%	9.6%
Medium Truck	84.8%	4.9%	10.3%
Heavy Truck	86.5%	2.7%	10.8%

Source: Default Assumption

	<i>Project</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Medium Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Heavy Truck	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%

Source: Default Assumption

Average Speed

	<i>Existing</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	45	45	45
Medium Truck	45	45	45
Heavy Truck	45	45	45

Source: Assumed average speed

	<i>Future</i>		
	<i>Day (7 am-7 pm)</i>	<i>Evening (7-10 pm)</i>	<i>Night (10 pm - 7 am)</i>
Automobile	45	45	45
Medium Truck	45	45	45
Heavy Truck	45	45	45

Source: Assumed average speed

ROADWAY TRAFFIC NOISE

Project: Pacific Coast Hotel
 Date: 23-Oct-06

Project No. 05-58760

Roadway: Highway 1 Room 205 Window

Vehicle Noise Emission Levels*: TNM

RESULTS

DAY-NIGHT AVERAGE LEVEL (Ldn)	Ldn at Site 63 feet from road centerline	Distance to dBA Contour Line from roadway centerline, feet				
		75	70	65	60	55
Existing	69.1 dBA	#N/A	55	118	255	550
Existing + Project	69.1 dBA	#N/A	55	118	255	550
Future with Ambient Growth	69.1 dBA	#N/A	55	118	255	550
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	69.1 dBA	#N/A	55	118	255	550
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	69.1 dBA	#N/A	55	118	255	550
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	69.1 dBA	#N/A	55	118	255	550
Change in Noise Levels						
Due to Project	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA					
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA					

COMMUNITY NOISE EXPOSURE LEVEL (CNEL)	CNEL at Site 63 feet from road centerline	Distance to dBA Contour Line from roadway centerline, feet				
		75	70	65	60	55
Existing	69.6 dBA	#N/A	59	127	274	591
Existing + Project	69.6 dBA	#N/A	59	127	274	591
Future with Ambient Growth	69.6 dBA	#N/A	59	127	274	591
Future with Ambient Growth and Project	69.6 dBA	#N/A	59	127	274	591
Future with Ambient Growth and Cumulative Projects	69.6 dBA	#N/A	59	127	274	591
Future with Ambient, Cumulative, and Project Growth	69.6 dBA	#N/A	59	127	274	591
Change in Noise Levels						
Due to Project	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient Growth	0.0 dBA					
Due to Ambient and Cumulative	0.0 dBA					
Due to All Future Growth	0.0 dBA					

*NOTES: Based on algorithms from the Federal Highway Administration "Traffic Noise Model ®", FHWA-PD-96-010, January, 1998.

#N/A = Not Applicable