

PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT

NIPOMO COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT



PROGRAM
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
REPORT

SAN LUIS OBISPO
LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

December 8, 2003

SAN LUIS OBISPO

LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION

Commissioners

Chairwoman: Carolyn Moffatt, Special District Member

Vice Chairwoman: Shirley Bianchi, County Member

Richard Roberts, Public Member

Duane Picanco, City Member

Wendy Scalise, City Member

Michael P. Ryan, County Member

Barbara Mann, Special District Member

Alternates

Katcho Achadjian, County Member

Allen Settle, City Member

Tom Murray, Public Member

Stan Gustafson, Special District Member

Staff

Paul L. Hood, Executive Officer

Ray Biering, Legal Counsel

David Church, LAFCO Analyst

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction And Purpose	1-1
Chapter 2: EIR Summary/Mitigation Monitoring Program	2-1
Chapter 3: Project Description	3-1
Chapter 4: Environmental Setting–Cumulative Projects	4-1
Chapter 5: Environmental Analysis	5-1
5.1: Land Use And Planning	5.1-1
5.2: Population And Housing	5.2-1
5.3: Geology	5.3-1
5.4: Water	5.4-1
5.5: Air Quality	5.5-1
5.6: Transportation-Circulation	5.6-1
5.7: Biology	5.7-1
5.8: Energy and Mineral Resources	5.8-1
5.9: Hazards	5.9-1
5.10: Noise	5.10-1
5.11: Public Services	5.11-1
5.12: Utilities and Service Systems	5.12-1
5.13: Aesthetics	5.13-1
5.14: Cultural Resources	5.14-1
5.15: Recreation	5.15-1
Chapter 6: Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	6-1
Chapter 7: Alternatives	7-1
Chapter 8: Growth Inducing Impacts	8-1

APPENDIX A: Notice of Preparation, Initial Study, Comments

APPENDIX B: County of San Luis Obispo, Land Use Ordinance Chapter 4

REFERENCES

FIGURES

Figure 1-1: Eight Study Areas	1-6
Figure 2-1: NCSO Current Boundary and Sphere of Influence	2-2
Figure 3-1: NCSO Current Boundary and Sphere of Influence	3-4
Figure 3-2: Sphere of Influence Study Areas	3-13
Figure 3-3: Study Area #1	3-14
Figure 3-4: Study Area #2	3-15
Figure 3-5: Study Area #3	3-16
Figure 3-6: Study Area #4	3-17
Figure 3-7: Study Area #5	3-18
Figure 3-8: Study Area #6	3-19
Figure 3-9: Study Area #7	3-20
Figure 3-10: Study Area #8	3-21
Figure 4-1: NCSO Service Area and SOI	4-1
Figure 4-2: Land Use in Nipomo Mesa Area	4-8
Figure 4-3: Major Nipomo Roads and Streets	4-10
Figure 5.1-1: Land Uses	5.1-5
Figure 5.1-2: Study Areas & Urban Reserve Line	5.1-23
Figure 5.1-2: Study Area Soil Types	5.1-33
Figure 5.1-3: Study Area #1	5.1-35
Figure 5.1-4: Study Area #2	5.1-36
Figure 5.1-5: Study Area #3	5.1-37
Figure 5.1-6: Study Area #4	5.1-38
Figure 5.1-7: Study Area #7	5.1-39
Figure 5.1-8: Study Area #1	5.1-46
Figure 5.1-9: Study Area #2	5.1-47
Figure 5.1-10: Study Area #3.....	5.1-48
Figure 5.1-11: Study Area #4.....	5.1-49
Figure 5.1-12: Study Area #5.....	5.1-50
Figure 5.1-13: Study Area #6.....	5.1-51
Figure 5.1-14: Study Area #7.....	5.1-52
Figure 5.1-15: Study Area #8.....	5.1-53
Figure 5.1-16: Recommended NCSO Sphere of Influence	5.1-54
Figure 5.2-1: Nipomo Population Growth	5.2-2
Figure 5.2-2: Finalized Permits, 1993-2003.....	5.2-3
Figure 5.2-3: Projected Nipomo Population Increase.....	5.2-4
Figure 5.2-4: Mitigated NCSO Sphere of Influence	5.2-11
Figure 5.3-1: Fault Hazards	5.3-6
Figure 5.4-1: Dependable Yield and Water Demand.....	5.4-7
Figure 5.4-2: Water Production vs. Consumption	5.4-10
Figure 5.4-3: NCSO Water Infrastructure	5.4-12
Figure 5.4-4: Nipomo Area Water Purveyors	5.4-18
Figure 5.6-1: Existing Street Network	5.6-4
Figure 5.6-2: Functional Classification System for the South County Circulation Update	5.6-8
Figure 5.9-1: Flood Hazard Areas	5.9-2
Figure 5.9-2: Fire Response Times.....	5.9-3
Figure 5.9-3: Fault Hazards	5.9-4
Figure 5.10-1: Examples of Noise Levels	5.10-4
Figure 5.11-1: Action for Healthy Communities Survey Question: <i>"How safe would you say you feel in your neighborhood?"</i>	5.11-3

Figure 5.11-2: Unincorporated Areas–Violent Crime per 1000 people5.11-4
Figure 5.11-3: Unincorporated Areas–Property Crime per 1000 people5.11-4
Figure 5.11-4: Fire Response Times5.11-12
Figure 5.12-1: NCSO Water System, Tanks, and Lines5.12-14
Figure 7-1: Alternative #1–No Changes to Zoning, No Increases in Allowed Density.....7-9
Figure 7-2: Alternative #1–Projected Water Supply & Demand7-11
Figure 7-3: Alternative #2–Increased Density in Areas #1, #2 and #4.....7-16
Figure 7-4: Alternative #2–Projected Water Supply & Demand7-18
Figure 7-5: Alternative #3–Reduce Study Areas #1, #3, #4, #5, #6, #8,
Increase Density in #1, #2 and #57-22
Figure 7-6: Alternative #3–Projected Water Supply & Demand7-24
Figure 7-7: Alternative #4–Reduce Study Areas #1, #3, #4, #6, #8
and Assume Existing Zoning7-28
Figure 7-8: Alternative #4–Projected Water Supply & Demand7-30

T A B L E S

Table 2-1: Summary of Residual Impacts after Mitigation/Analysis2-4
Table 2-2: Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures2-5
Table 2-3: Mitigation Monitoring Program.....2-18
Table 3-1: Other Agencies’ Responsibilities3-11
Table 4-1: Existing Zoning Summary.....4-7
Table 4-2: Cumulative Projects.....4-16
Table 4-3: Pending Annexation Applications4-18
Table 5.1-1: Existing Study Area Zoning and Acreage5.1-7
Table 5.1-2: Agricultural Contracts5.1-9
Table 5.1-3: Development Potential-Existing Zoning5.1-16
Table 5.1-4: Minimum Lot Sizes Allowed5.1-20
Table 5.1-5: Study Areas and Potential Approvals5.1-24
Table 5.1-6: Pending General Plan Amendments5.1-41
Table 5.1-7: Pending Annexation Applications5.1-43
Table 5.1-8: Minimum Lot Sizes Allowed5.1-55
Table 5.2-1: Historic & Projected Population Growth.....5.2-1
Table 5.2-2: Building Permits Finaled 1993-20035.2-3
Table 5.2-3: Projected Nipomo Population Increases.....5.2-4
Table 5.2-4: Dwelling Unit Increases5.2-5
Table 5.4-1: Existing Production Capacity.....5.4-9
Table 5.4-2: Current and Projected Water Consumption-Production.....5.4-9
Table 5.4-3: Potential Water Supply in District.....5.4-11
Table 5.4-4: Current Demand5.4-13
Table 5.4-5: Projected Demand at Build-Out5.4-14
Table 5.4-6: Private Water Purveyors in Nipomo Area5.4-17
Table 5.4-7: Existing and Projected Water Needs.....5.4-19
Table 5.4-8: Annual Resource Summary Report5.4-21
Table 5.4-9: Water Demand within Existing Boundary plus Projected Demand
of all 8 Study Areas at Build-Out under Existing Zoning5.4-31
Table 5.4-10: Alternative Water Supply Scenarios5.4-32
Table 5.5-1: Data from the Nipomo Monitoring Station, 1999-2003.....5.5-8
Table 5.5-2: Air Quality Levels Measured at the San Luis Obispo Air Monitoring Station.....5.5-10

Table 5.5-3: Federal and State Carbon Monoxide Standards5.5-11

Table 5.5-4: Conoco/Philips Odor Complaints, 1989-20025.5-13

Table 5.5-5: Existing Land Use/Land Use Approvals Needed by Area5.5-17

Table 5.5-6: Minimum Lot Sizes Allowed5.5-23

Table 5.12-1: Existing Well Data5.12-4

Table 5.12-2: Water Demand within Existing Boundary plus Projected Build-out
Future Water Demand of all 8 Study Areas Under Existing Zoning5.12-10

Table 5.12-3: Potential Water Supply Scenarios5.12-11

Table 5.12-4: Existing Demand5.12-20

Table 5.12-5: Projected Demand at Build-Out5.12-21

Table 5.15-1: Nipomo Area Recreational Facilities5.15-1

Table 6-1: Project Impact Summary6-1

Table 7-1: Project Alternatives–Elimination of Significant Impacts7-2

Table 7-2: Potential Water Supply Scenario7-7

Table 7-3: Alternative 1 – Include all 8 Study Areas and assume existing zoning7-10

Table 7-4: Alternative #1 Project Objectives Rating7-15

Table 7-5: Alternative 2 – Include all 8 Study Areas and assume
increased densities, #1, #2, #47-17

Table 7-6: Alternative #2 Project Objectives Rating7-21

Table 7-7: Alternative 3 – Reduce SOI Areas #1, # 3, #4, #6, and assume
increased density in #1, #2 and #57-23

Table 7-8: Alternative #3 – Project Objectives Rating7-27

Table 7-9: Alternative 4 – Reduce SOI Areas #1, #3, #4, #6, #8
and assume existing zoning7-29

Table 7-10: Alternative #4 – Project Objectives Rating7-33

Table 7-11: Alternative #5 Project Objectives Rating7-35

Table 7-12: Project Objectives Rating Alternatives Comparison7-36

Table 7-13: Environmentally Superior Alternatives7-40

Table 8-1: Land Use Approvals Needed, by Area8-3