

D.8 Land Use, Recreation, and Agriculture

D.8.1 Environmental Setting for the Proposed Project

The Proposed Original Steam Generator (OSG) replacement activities would occur at the 760-acre DCPD facility, located within 12,000 acres of PG&E-controlled lands on the California coast in central San Luis Obispo County. Proposed Replacement Steam Generator (RSG) offloading and transport activities would occur at Port San Luis, along Avila Beach Drive and the DCPD Access Road, which connects the DCPD facility to Port San Luis. See Section B.2.1 for a detailed description of the Proposed Project and its location.

With the exception of offloading at Port San Luis, Proposed Project activities would occur entirely on lands owned by PG&E's subsidiary, Eureka Energy Company. See Figure D.8-1 for a map of the property owners encompassing the Proposed Project.

Study Area Definition

The Land Use, Recreation, and Agriculture Study Area (Study Area) is defined as lands encompassing the DCPD facility, the RSG transport route, and Port San Luis. The DCPD facility is located within the Irish Hills, and is approximately seven miles northwest of Avila Beach, 12 miles southwest of the City of San Luis Obispo, and directly southeast of Montaña de Oro State Park. The Study Area boundaries are illustrated in Figure D.8-2, and are generally described as the following:

- Pacific Ocean to the south;
- Crowbar Canyon to the west;
- Wild Cherry Canyon to the east; and
- Public Land Survey System Cañada de Los Osos y Pecho y Islay survey line, which roughly corresponds to the southern base of the Irish Hills, to the north.

Land Use

Study Area lands are designated as Public Facilities and Agriculture by the San Luis Obispo County General Plan (PG&E, 2004a; SLO County, 2005) and the San Luis Bay Coastal Area Plan (SLO County, 1988a). Specific land use designations are illustrated in Figure D.8-3 (Land Use Designations), and include:

- **Public Facilities.** The entire DCPD facility and an approximately 0.7-mile portion of the proposed RSG transport route have a Public Facilities designation. As a nuclear power plant, this designation refers to the DCPD facility's role in generating electricity for public consumption. The DCPD facility is closed to public access.

Port San Luis Harbor District lands within the Study Area are designated Public Facilities. This designation allows the following uses at Port San Luis: berthing for commercial and pleasure craft, boat repair, auto and boat trailer parking, and restaurants.

- **Agriculture.** The remaining 5.5 miles of the proposed RSG transport route traverses lands designated as Agriculture. However, much of the activity associated with the transport of the RSGs would take place on the DCPD Access Road, which is an existing road and does not have a land use designation.

With the exception of approximately 1.5 miles of the proposed RSG transport route and the OSG Storage Facility, the Proposed Project would occur within the Coastal Zone. The California Coastal Act defines California's Coastal Zone as "that land and water area . . . extending seaward to the State's outer limit of jurisdiction, including all offshore islands, and extending inland generally 1,000 yards (3,000 feet or 0.57 miles) from the mean high tide line to the sea. . . ." (Section 30103). The County of San Luis Obispo Local Coastal Plan (LCP) defines the Coastal Zone as generally inland 1,000 yards, with extensions inland for important habitat, recreational, or agricultural resources. Within the Study Area, the Coastal Zone extends farther inland than the standard 1,000 yards in the area surrounding Nipomo Dunes.

Much of the land within the Study Area officially designated as Agriculture currently consists of natural open space. However, PG&E leases some of the lands in the eastern portion of the Study Area for agricultural and grazing uses. The leased lands are near the coast and away from the DCPP facility. Small portions of the Study Area are devoted to recreational uses (i.e., Pecho Coast Trail). The DCPP facility predominantly consists of industrial uses associated with the power plant. Ancillary industrial and storage uses dominate the area immediately surrounding the power plant. Section B.2 provides a complete description of the existing DCPP facility.

Other land uses within the eastern portion of, or near the eastern edge of, the Study Area (Wild Cherry Canyon) include:

- Port San Luis Harbor facilities, including a marina, harbor offices, boat maintenance facilities, fuel dock, and related small port facilities;
- The Port San Luis Trailer Park;
- Camping facilities located adjacent to Avila Beach Drive and in the north parking lot of Port San Luis Harbor;
- Residences along San Luis Bay Drive;
- Mobile homes for part-time residents, located approximately 1,200 feet east of the waterfront at Port San Luis; and
- Permanent residences located about two miles to the east of the proposed RSG offloading area.

Recreation

Table D.8-1 lists Study Area and surrounding recreational resources and activities. The locations of these resources are illustrated on Figure D.8-4.

Following are descriptions of the recreational resources listed in Table D.8-1 and shown in Figure D.8-4:

Port San Luis. Port San Luis offers many recreational opportunities, including boating and water sports, sport fishing, and recreational vehicle camping. There are five designated areas for recreational vehicles available at Port San Luis, each offering multiple campsites. Tent camping is not allowed, and the maximum allowable stay is 14 days (PSL, 2004).

Figure D.8-1. Diablo Canyon Power Plant Property Map
[CLICK HERE TO VIEW](#)

This page intentionally blank.

Figure D.8-2. Land Use, Recreation, and Agriculture Study Area
[CLICK HERE TO VIEW](#)

This page intentionally blank.

Figure D.8-3. Land Use Designations

[CLICK HERE TO VIEW](#)

This page intentionally blank.

Figure D.8-4. Recreational Facilities
[CLICK HERE TO VIEW](#)

This page intentionally blank.

Table D.8-1. Recreational Resources

Facility	Guided Tours	Trails	Camp Sites	Exhibits & Programs	Fishing & Boating	Water Sports	Picnic Areas	Play Facilities	Rest-rooms
Study Area									
Port San Luis			X		X	X			X
Pecho Coast Trail	X	X							
Other Resources Near the Study Area									
Montaña de Oro State Park		X	X	X	X		X		X
Avila Beach Community Park								X	X
Bob Jones Bike Trail		X							

Sources: CSP, 2004a, 2004b; SLOCP, 2004a, 2004b; PSL, 2004; CCC, 1997.

- Pecho Coast Trail.** Along most of the California coast, Highway 1 [Pacific Coast Highway (PCH)] winds along the edge of the Pacific Ocean, offering coastal access and spectacular vistas. PCH intermittently veers inland, skirting an expanse of rugged coast. This occurs in San Luis Obispo County between Morro Bay and Avila Beach, where a 13-mile stretch of coastline remained closed to the public for 140 years. Portions of this coastal reach area near Point San Luis are now accessible via the Pecho Coast Trail. PG&E controls access to this coastal reach. In 1993, PG&E opened the previously publicly inaccessible 3.7-mile Pecho Coast Trail, allowing the public to access portions of the coastline that had been closed since the Spanish mission days (CCC, 1997). Over the last 10 years, thousands of hikers have walked the Trail. The trailhead starts at Port San Luis and the Point San Luis Lighthouse, which is currently undergoing renovation, and is a popular stop along the trail. Due to concerns regarding security and sensitive biological resources, a docent must lead all hikers. Currently, hikes are offered for groups of 15 or less twice per week (CCC, 2004).
- Montaña de Oro State Park.** This park features over 8,000 acres of rugged cliffs, secluded sandy beaches, coastal plains, streams, canyons, and hills, including the 1,347-foot Valencia Peak. Mountain biking and equestrian trails also occur within the park. The most popular beach is Spooner's Cove, across from the campgrounds. The park includes primitive and equestrian campsites (CSP, 2004b).
- Avila Beach Community Park.** San Luis Obispo County Parks owns and operates Avila Beach Community Park, which includes play facilities and restrooms (SLOCP, 2004a).
- Bob Jones Bike Trail.** The Bob Jones City to the Sea Bikeway (Bob Jones Bike Trail) is a one-mile long bike trail that stretches from the Ontario Road Staging Area to San Luis Bay Drive, north of Port San Luis and the Study Area (SLOCP, 2004b).

Agriculture

California Department of Conservation Agricultural Land Classifications

The California Department of Conservation (DOC) uses the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Soils Conservation Service soil classifications to identify agricultural lands. The Study Area contains lands classified as follows (see Figure D.8-5):

- **Prime Farmland.** Land that has the best combination of physical and chemical properties for the production of crops.
- **Farmland of Statewide Importance.** Similar to Prime Farmland, but with minor shortcomings (e.g., steeper slopes, inability to hold water).
- **Unique Farmland.** Land of lesser quality soils, but recently used for the production of specific high economic value crops.
- **Farmland of Local Importance.** Land of importance to the local agricultural economy as determined by each county's Board of Supervisors and a local advisory committee.
- **Grazing Land.** Land on which the existing vegetation is suited to the grazing of livestock.
- **Urban and Built-up Land.** Land used for residential, industrial, commercial, institutional, and other developed purposes.
- **Other Land.** Land not included in any other mapping category (DOC, 2004a).

Collectively, lands classified as Prime Farmland, Farmland of Statewide Importance, and Unique Farmland are referred to as Farmland (DOC, 2004a). The DOC established the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP) in 1982 in response to a critical need for assessing the location and quantity of agricultural lands and conversion of these lands to other uses.¹ Every even-numbered year, FMMP issues a Farmland Conversion Report. The FMMP data are used in elements of some county and city general plans, environmental documents, in regional studies on agricultural land conversion as a way of assessing project impacts on Prime Farmland, and in assessing impacts of proposed projects (DOC, 2004b).

Approximately 90 percent of the FMMP's study area is covered by the USDA modern soil surveys. For the lands not within the USDA soil surveys, a classification system that combines technical soil ratings and current land use is the basis for the Important Farmland Maps. In areas where no soil survey is available, a series of Interim Farmland definitions have been developed to allow land use monitoring until soils data become available (DOC, 2004a).

Williamson Act Land Designations

The DOC also identifies lands under a Williamson Act contract as important agricultural lands. The California Land Conservation Act of 1965 (Williamson Act) is California's primary program for the conservation of private land in agricultural and open space use. It is a voluntary, locally administered program that offers preferential property taxes on lands which have enforceable restrictions on their use via contracts between individual landowners and local governments (DOC, 2004d). The Williamson Act categorizes lands according to various classifications. No Williamson Act lands occur within the Study Area. However, Williamson Act lands with the following classifications occur adjacent to or near the Study Area as shown in Figure D.8-6:

¹ DOC Farmland designation procedures are as follows:

- DOC updates soil mapping every two years using infrared aerial photos provided by NASA at a scale of 1:130,000. Its most recent update is for 2002.
- Based on these maps, land is evaluated to determine its farmland designation. If a particular piece of land is fallow, it is then flagged.
- In order to qualify as Prime Farmland, rather than just Prime Soil, the land must be irrigated as well as having prime soil attributes.
- DOC has a minimum mapping unit of 10 acres, with smaller than 10-acre parcels being absorbed into the surrounding classifications (Grazing classifications have a minimum mapping unit of 40 acres).

Figure D.8-5. Important Farmland
[CLICK HERE TO VIEW](#)

This page intentionally blank.

Figure D.8-6. Williamson Act Lands
[CLICK HERE TO VIEW](#)

This page intentionally blank.

- **Non-Prime Agricultural Land.** Enrolled land that does not meet any of the criteria for classification as Prime Agricultural Land. Most Non-Prime Land is used for grazing or non-irrigated crops. However, Non-Prime Land may also include other open space uses compatible with agriculture and consistent with local general plans.
- **Urban and Built-up Land.** Land occupied by structures with a density of at least one unit to 1.5 acres.

Study Area Agricultural Lands

Study Area agricultural resources are shown on Figures D.8-5 and D.8-6, and are described as follows:

- There are approximately 103 acres of Prime Farmland, 53 acres of Farmland of Statewide Importance, and 37 acres of Unique Farmland within the Study Area;
- Much of the land immediately north of the DCPD facility and proposed RSG transport route is classified as Grazing; and
- South of the proposed RSG transport route and adjacent to the western edge of the Prime Farmland is a 133-acre section of Farmland of Local Importance (DOC, 2004c).

The Proposed Project transport route would run northeast of and adjacent to Farmlands within the Study Area, but would not actually traverse any of these Farmlands as transport would occur entirely on an existing road, the DCPD Access Road. All Williamson Act lands are outside of the Study Area boundaries to the north and east.

A section of Farmland of Local Importance is located immediately south of and adjacent to the proposed RSG transport route and west of the Prime Farmland (see Figure D.8-5). A substantial amount of agricultural land in the Study Area is not classified under the FMMP or subject to a Williamson Act contract, but is important to the local community. Much of the 12,000-acre PG&E-controlled lands surrounding the DCPD facility is designated Agriculture and most is in active production (SLO County, 2004).

D.8.2 Applicable Regulations, Plans, and Standards

Within each section of the EIR, the plans and policies that are applicable to the respective resource areas are evaluated for consistency. Plans, policies, regulations, and standards that are applicable to land use, recreation, and agriculture are listed below followed by an analysis of the Proposed Project's consistency.

Federal

Federal authority for protection of coastal resources under the federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) is delegated to the State under the California Coastal Act. No additional federal regulations, plans, or standards related to land use, recreation, or agriculture have been identified that are directly applicable to the Proposed Project.

State of California

As a California investor-owned utility, PG&E is regulated by the CPUC and would need CPUC approval for construction and operation of the Proposed Project, pursuant to Rule 42 of the CPUC's Rules of Practice and Procedure.

California Coastal Act (1976)

The Proposed Project would be located on and traverse California Coastal Zone lands. The California Coastal Act guides the management of coastal resources within the State's jurisdiction through the establishment of a coastal zone management program as required by the CZMA. The coastal zone management program is administered by the California Coastal Commission (CCC) in partnership with local governments for protection of coastal resources. Local governments develop Local Coastal Programs or Plans (LCPs) that include specific policies to govern coastal resources within their jurisdiction. Once certified by the CCC, an LCP governs whether proposed projects within the coastal zone would be consistent with the State's coastal management program and therefore allowable. A Coastal Development Permit (CDP) would then be issued for a given project. As portions of the Proposed Project would be located within the Coastal Zone under the jurisdiction of San Luis Obispo County, it must comply with the CDP requirements of the County's LCP, which may include requesting a new CDP or an amendment to an existing CDP.

Consistency. The County's certified LCP implements the policies of the Coastal Act. Therefore, consistency with the County's LCP (discussed below) provides de facto consistency with the Coastal Act. The following section provides a brief analysis of the Proposed Project's consistency with the County of San Luis Obispo's LCP policies applicable to the resources discussed in this land use section. However, it should be noted that any further LCP consistency analysis would occur as part of the County's own review of PG&E's Coastal Development Permit and Conditional Use Permit application processes for the Proposed Project as described below.

Local Ordinances and Policies

Lands within the Study Area are also under the jurisdiction of San Luis Obispo County and the Port San Luis Harbor District. Therefore, the County of San Luis Obispo LCP, which implements the requirements of the California Coastal Act (CCA) would apply to the Proposed Project. Although the CPUC has primary approval authority over the Proposed Project, the CPUC highly encourages cooperation with all affected local governments to ensure compatibility between proposed projects and the surrounding jurisdictions.

PG&E has filed a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Application with the County of San Luis Obispo for the OSG Storage Facility and a CDP for the temporary staging areas (TSA) and containment access facilities (CAF). Both Applications were submitted to the County on February 2, 2005.

The actual repair and replacement activities associated with the Proposed Project are exempt from the requirements of Title 23 of the San Luis Obispo County Code [Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance (CZLUO)] as stated in Section 23.03.040(d)(1).

The Proposed Project would require the construction of temporary structures within the coastal zone. The temporary structures require approval by the County under the CZLUO, and PG&E has filed a CDP application pursuant to Section 23.02.034 of the CZLUO.

The Proposed Project would also require construction of the OSG Storage Facility, which is outside of the coastal zone, and therefore governed by Title 22 of the County Code [Land Use Ordinances (LUO)], rather than the LCP and CDP process. While it is not entirely clear from the LUO whether a CUP or a Site Plan Review is required for the OSG Storage Facility, PG&E has filed a CUP application with the County according to Section 22.62.060 of the County Code. If it is later determined that a CUP is not required for the OSG Storage Facility, a Site Plan Review would be required under Section 22.62.040.

The County of San Luis Obispo has not yet made decisions on the CUP and CDP applications filed by PG&E. These two applications will be processed by the County in accordance with their requirements and both application review and approval processes are wholly independent of the CPUC's approval process for the Proposed Project (including the CEQA environmental review process and this EIR). PG&E's communications with the County of San Luis Obispo indicate that some of the alternate locations analyzed in this EIR have been presented in the CUP and/or CDP as PG&E's preferred locations for the various project components. For the purposes of this EIR, the Proposed Project consists of PG&E's preferred TSA and OSG Storage Facility locations as described in Section B. However, given that the analysis in this EIR addresses these alternate locations, the County could utilize the information from this EIR while processing the CUP and CDP applications if it deems the information applicable to the County's application review processes. Detailed analysis of Proposed Project consistency with the County's LCP would occur as part of the County's own review of PG&E's CDP and CUP application processes.

County of San Luis Obispo Local Coastal Plan (LCP)

The County of San Luis Obispo LCP consists of the following components: The Coastal Plan Policies (SLO County, 1988b); Framework for Planning Coastal Zone (SLO County, 1988c); Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance (SLO County, 1988d); and the Coastal Area Plans (i.e., San Luis Bay Coastal Area Plan) (SLO County, 1988a). These LCP components and the Proposed Project's consistency with LCP policies applicable to land uses are described below.

Coastal Plan Policies (Adopted 1988, Revised 2004), County of San Luis Obispo

The Coastal Plan Policies implement the County of San Luis Obispo LCP by identifying general plan policies and detailed land use recommendations, many of which have been implemented in the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance. The policies include programs and standards that iterate the policy commitment of San Luis Obispo County to implement the mandates of the Coastal Act (SLO County, 1988b).

The following identifies specific policies from the Coastal Plan Policies of the County of San Luis Obispo, followed by the rationale used to determine the Proposed Project's consistency with the given policy:

- **Chapter 2, Shoreline Access, Policy 1: Protection of Existing Access.** Development shall not interfere with the public's right of access to the sea where acquired through historic use or legislative authorization.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would not alter existing land uses such as coastal access areas. Any development that would occur as a result of the Proposed Project, which includes the facilities within the TSAs, the OSG Storage Facility, the CAF, and any additional decontamination and personnel processing facilities, would be located adjacent to or in the immediate vicinity of the power plant on DCPP facility grounds. The DCPP facility is currently inaccessible to the public and construction of project-related structures at the DCPP facility would not preclude any existing coastal access. In addition, offloading at Port San Luis would not conflict with this policy because Port San Luis is not a public point of access acquired through historic use or legislative action. Therefore, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this shoreline access policy.

- **Chapter 2, Shoreline Access, Policy 2: New Development.** Maximum public access from the nearest public roadway to the shoreline and along the coast shall be provided in new development. Exceptions may occur where: (1) it is inconsistent with public safety, military security needs, or the protection of fragile coastal resources; (2) adequate access exists nearby; or (3) agriculture would be adversely affected. Such access can be lateral and/or vertical.

Consistency. Chapter 2 of the Coastal Plan Policies (San Luis Bay Planning Area) recommends that no new access be permitted to the property surrounding the DCPP facility due to safety concerns, high bluffs, and the condition of the access roads used to reach the area. However, this section also states that lateral access on the property should be secured for the area extending from mean high tide to the bluff. Limited lateral access is currently provided through the Pecho Coast Trail, which is managed by PG&E. The Proposed Project would not permanently impede access to the Pecho Coast Trail. Any temporary impacts as a result of a disruption or preclusion of trail use during transport of the RSGs from Port San Luis to the RSG storage facility would be mitigated to a less than significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure L-2b (Schedule Pecho Coast Trail hikes around RSG transport) detailed in Section D.8-3. Thus, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this shoreline access policy.

- **Chapter 2, Shoreline Access, Policy 8: Minimizing Conflicts with Adjacent Uses.** Maximum access shall be provided in a manner that minimizes conflicts with adjacent uses. Where a proposed project would increase the burdens on access to the shoreline at the present time or in the future, additional access areas may be required to balance the impact of heavier use resulting from the construction of the Proposed Project.

Consistency. Proposed Project activities such as staging and preparation of the RSGs, OSG removal, transport and storage, and RSG installation would be located at the DCPP facility on land that is owned by PG&E's subsidiary, the Eureka Energy Company. Because these activities involve the replacement of power plant equipment and would occur on the site of a nuclear power plant, the Proposed Project activities would not conflict with the existing industrial land uses at the facility. The transport of the RSGs from Port San Luis to the DCPP facility would occur on Avila Beach Drive and the DCPP Access Road, and would run adjacent to designated Farmland (see Figure D.8-5). Transport of the RSGs would not preclude access along the proposed route and would not leave the DCPP Access Road right-of-way. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not impact the agricultural uses shown in Figures D.8-5 and D.8-6. In order to reduce impacts to recreational land uses during RSG transport, the Proposed Project would implement Mitigation Measures L-2a (Avoid peak recreational usage) and L-2b (Schedule Pecho Coast Trail hikes around RSG transport) discussed in Section D.8.3. The Proposed Project would not create permanent conflicts with adjacent land uses, and would not increase the need for coastal access. There would be no conflict with this policy.

- **Chapter 4, Energy and Industrial Development, Policy 14: Request for Coastal Commission Designation.** In its request for biennial review of areas to be designated inappropriate for power plant siting, the County has not designated the two-mile stretch of coastal terrace between the southern border of the Diablo Canyon Power Plant site and Point San Luis as inappropriate for siting power plants. With the existing location of the Diablo Canyon Power Plant on the terrace, concerns may be raised for the total intensity of industrial development that could be located on the terrace as well as the impacts of additional development on the onshore and offshore environmentally sensitive habitat.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would not involve the siting of new power plants, and the development of any new facilities at DCPP would be located on previously developed areas. As shown in Figure C-1, the TSAs would be located at the southern end of the DCPP facility on a previously developed flat terrace area, the OSG Storage Facility would be located at the upper portion of the DCPP facility near the 500 kV switchyard, the CAF would be located adjacent to the Unit 1 fuel handling building, and any additional decontamination and personnel processing facilities would be located adjacent to Unit 1 and 2 containment structures inside the RCA. Thus, the Proposed Project would be consistent with CCC designation of the coastal area.

- **Chapter 7, Agriculture, Policy 1: Maintaining Agricultural Lands.** Prime agricultural land shall be maintained in or available for agricultural production unless: (1) agricultural use is already severely limited by conflicts with urban uses; or (2) adequate public services are available to serve the expanded urban uses, and the conversion would preserve prime agricultural land or would complete a logical and viable neighborhood, thus contributing to the establishment of a stable urban/rural boundary; and (3) development on converted agricultural land will not diminish the productivity of adjacent prime agricultural land. Other lands (non-prime) suitable for agriculture shall be maintained in or available for agricultural production unless: (1) continued or renewed agricultural use is not feasible; or (2) conversion would preserve prime agricultural land or concentrate urban development within or contiguous to existing urban areas which have adequate public services to serve additional development; and (3) the permitted conversion will not adversely affect surrounding agricultural uses.

Consistency. Although Prime Farmland is located within the Study Area (see Figure D.8-5), the Proposed Project is not located within nor would it traverse any Farmland. Therefore, no Farmlands would be affected and no existing agricultural land uses would be altered. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.

- **Chapter 7, Agriculture, Policy 3: Non-Agricultural Uses.** In agriculturally designated areas, all non-agricultural development that is proposed to supplement the agricultural use permitted in areas designated as agriculture shall be compatible with preserving a maximum amount of agricultural use. When continued agricultural use is not feasible without some supplemental use, priority shall be given to commercial recreation and low intensity visitor-serving uses allowed in Policy 1, Chapter 7. No development is permitted on prime agricultural land. Development shall be permitted on non-prime land if it can be demonstrated that all agriculturally unsuitable land on the parcel has been developed or has been determined to be undevelopable.

Consistency. While transport of the RSGs would occur adjacent to existing agricultural areas, no Proposed Project activities would occur on Farmland or alter any existing agricultural land uses. The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.

Framework for Planning Coastal Zone (Adopted 1988, Revised 2001), Land Use and Circulation Elements of the San Luis Obispo County General Plan

The Land Use and Circulation Elements incorporate the Land Use and Transportation Plan portions of the County LCP. These elements coordinate policies and programs in other County General Plan elements that affect land use and transportation, and provide policies and standards for the management of growth and development in each unincorporated community and the rural areas of the Coastal Zone. While detailed goals, objectives, and policies that address specific planning issues are presented in the Coastal Plan Policies and in the San Luis Bay Coastal Area Plan, the Land Use and Circulation Elements are designed to carry out these goals (SLO County, 1988c).

The following bullet items identify specific goals from the Framework for Planning Coastal Zone of the San Luis Obispo County General Plan's Land Use Element, followed by the rationale used to determine the Proposed Project's consistency with the given goal:

- **Chapter 6, Land Use Categories & Allowable Uses: Goal No. 1.** Reconciling discordant land uses by identifying the relationships between uses that minimize land use conflicts.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would not alter existing land uses, such as the recreational and agricultural uses described in Section D.8.1 (above). As there would be no conflict with these land uses, the Proposed Project would be consistent with Goal No. 1.

- **Chapter 6, Land Use Categories & Allowable Uses: Goal No. 2.** Supporting preservation of the County's agricultural industry and the soils essential to agriculture.

Consistency. As stated above, the Proposed Project would not conflict with agricultural land uses adjacent to the RSG transport route. The Proposed Project would be consistent with Goal No. 2.

- **Chapter 6, Land Use Categories & Allowable Uses: Goal No. 3.** Supporting protection and preservation of County open space and recreational resources while providing for appropriate development.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would not create new development in open space areas, nor would it permanently impact existing recreational resources. Temporary impacts to recreation would be less than significant through the implementation of Mitigation Measures L-2a (Avoid peak recreational usage) and L-2b (Schedule Pecho Coast Trail hikes around RSG transport) discussed in Section D.8.3. Thus, the Proposed Project would be consistent with Goal No. 3.

- **Chapter 6, Land Use Categories & Allowable Uses: Goal No. 5.** Protecting coastal resources, public access to the shoreline, and visitor-serving areas, as required by the California Coastal Act.

Consistency. Because construction of any new project-related facilities described in Section B.3.2 would be located at the DCPD facility on previously developed areas (see Figure B-2), the Proposed Project would not create new impacts to coastal resources. While public access and visitor-serving areas, such as the Pecho Coast Trail and Port San Luis, may be temporarily disrupted during the RSG transport, implementation of Mitigation Measures L-2a (Avoid peak recreational usage) and L-2b (Schedule Pecho Coast Trail hikes around RSG transport) would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. The Proposed Project would be consistent with Goal No. 5.

Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance (Adopted 1988, Revised 2004), County of San Luis Obispo

The Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance is Title 23 of the San Luis Obispo County Code. While the Land Use Element established the location of specific land uses, the ordinances regulate site design and development. The ordinances are designed to minimize adverse effects on the public resulting from the inappropriate creation, location, use or design of building sites, buildings, land uses, parking areas, or other forms of land development by providing appropriate standards for development, and also to protect and enhance the significant natural historic, archaeological, and scenic resources within the unincorporated areas of San Luis Obispo County (SLO County, 1988d).

The following identify specific policies of the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance of the County of San Luis Obispo, followed by the rationale used to determine the Proposed Project's consistency with the given policy:

- **Chapter 4, Section 23.04.420: Coastal Access Required.** Development within the Coastal Zone between the first public road and the tidelands shall protect and/or provide coastal access as required by this section. All new development shall provide a lateral access dedication of 25 feet of dry sandy beach available at all times during the year. Where topography limits the dry sandy beach to less than 25 feet, lateral access shall extend from the mean high tide to the toe of the bluff. Where the area between the mean high tide line (MHTL) and the toe of the bluff is constrained by rocky shoreline or other limitations, the County shall evaluate the safety and other constraints and whether alternative siting of access ways is appropriate.

Consistency. As stated in Chapter 2, Policy 2 of the Coastal Plan Policies, no new access is recommended on the property surrounding the DCPP facility due to safety concerns, high bluffs, and the condition of the access roads used to reach the area. Limited lateral access to the coast is currently provided through the Pecho Coast Trail, which is managed by PG&E. The Proposed Project would not permanently preclude access to the Pecho Coast Trail, and any temporary impacts resulting from transport of the RSGs would be mitigated to a less than significant level through implementation of Mitigation Measure L-2b (Schedule Pecho Coast Trail hikes around RSG transport), which is described in Section D.8.3. Thus, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.

- **Chapter 8, Section 23.08.246: Temporary Dwellings or Offices.** A temporary dwelling may be established on the same site as the construction of a non-residential construction project. The temporary dwelling shall only be occupied by the property owner, permittee, contractor or an employee of the owner or the contractor who is directly related to the construction project. Use of a temporary dwelling is limited to a maximum period of one year, unless an extension of the land use permit is authorized per the requirements of Section 23.02.050, which would allow the County Planning Department to approve a maximum of three 12-month extensions. A temporary business office may be established on the site of any construction project or temporary offsite construction yard (Section 23.08.244) pursuant to the provisions of this section. The temporary office may remain on the site until construction is completed.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would require the construction of temporary facilities in order to house most of the Proposed Project TSA activities. Any offices within the TSA would be constructed and operated according to the regulations of the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance and would require approval of a CDP, which would ensure consistency with this policy. There are no known constraints that preclude PG&E's ability to construct and operate the temporary facilities in accordance with the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance.

San Luis Bay Coastal Area Plan (Adopted 1988, Revised 1995), Land Use and Circulation Elements of the San Luis Obispo County General Plan

The San Luis Bay Coastal Area Plan describes County land use policies for the Coastal Zone portion of the San Luis Bay Planning Area. Within the Coastal Area Plan, policies regarding potential impacts to the Harford Pier Area and the Lighthouse Area are listed (SLO County, 1988a).

The following identify specific applicable policies of the San Luis Bay Coastal Area Plan, followed by the rationale used to determine the Proposed Project's consistency with the given policy:

- **Chapter 8, PSL Policy L-4: Lighthouse Point Goals and Policies.** Open the Point San Luis area to managed public access and use. Any public access beyond the 30-acre Point San Luis recreation area to portions of the Pecho Coast Trail shall be coordinated with PG&E and the County to ensure compatibility with the agricultural operations, marine and coastal resources present in this area, and with PG&E activities associated with the DCPP.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would not conflict with managed public access and use of the Pecho Coast Trail and the Port San Luis Lighthouse. Any temporary impacts to the trail during transport of the RSG would be less than significant after implementation of Mitigation Measure L-2b (Schedule Pecho Coast Trail hikes around RSG transport). The Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.

- **Chapter 8, PSL Policy O-3: Open Water Area.** It shall not be inconsistent with the Master Plan to allow mooring and anchoring of other commercial and governmental vessels, subject to case-by-case Harbor District regulation, pending adoption of a marine area use plan.

Consistency. The Proposed Project would offload the RSGs in the Harford Landing area of Port San Luis, just north of a small peninsula that currently acts as a boat launch as shown in Figure B-6. With Harbor District approval, the Proposed Project would be consistent with this policy.

Port San Luis Harbor District Master Plan (Adopted 1984, Revised 1994)

The Port San Luis Harbor District Master Plan has been incorporated into the County's LCP. The Harbor District has established levels of priority for six major user groups in Port San Luis, which include energy-related facilities. The Plan also includes policies to work with PG&E to implement the Pecho Coast Accessway Management Program. These plans have been incorporated into the San Luis Bay Coastal Area Plan, and are listed under the policies for this area plan (discussed above) (PSL, 1984).

D.8.3 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Proposed Project

D.8.3.1 Definition and Use of Significance Criteria

Based on the CEQA Guidelines (Appendix G, Environmental Checklist Form), standard CEQA practice, and previous environmental documents, the significance criteria presented below have been used to determine if the Proposed Project would result in a significant impact.

Policy consistency impacts would be considered significant if the Proposed Project would:

- Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Land Use Impacts – The Proposed Project would result in significant land use impacts if it would:

- Physically divide an established community; or
- Create long-term disturbances that would disrupt an established land use.

Recreational Resource Impacts – Recreational resources would be significantly impacted if the Proposed Project would:

- Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or recreational facilities such that substantial deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated; or
- Disrupt recreational activities, which would adversely affect the recreational value of existing facilities.

Agricultural Resource Impacts – The Proposed Project would significantly affect agricultural resources if it would:

- Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland) to non-agricultural use; or
- Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract.

D.8.3.2 Replacement Steam Generator Transport

Conflict with an Applicable Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation

The Proposed Project's consistency with applicable plans and policies is discussed in detail in Section D.8.2 (above).

Land Use Impacts – Physically divide an established community

A project could physically divide a community by introducing a substantial linear facility with actual and/or perceived physical barriers to crossing. The Proposed Project would involve transport of the RSGs through existing Port San Luis and along the existing DCPD Access Road, and would not create any such physical barriers. In addition, Proposed Project activities at Port San Luis would be temporary (i.e., limited to between one and four days). The transport of the RSGs would occur almost entirely on PG&E-controlled property, where no established communities exist. No impacts related to the physical division of an established community would occur.

Impact L-1: Transport would disrupt an established land use

The Proposed Project would transport the RSGs across or adjacent to the following types of land uses:

- Public facilities;
- Recreation; and
- Agriculture.

As described in Section B.3.1.2 (Offloading Steam Generators at Port San Luis), offloading would affect Port San Luis for up to four days, from initial offloading through optional temporary storage to departure onto the DCPD Access Road. However, because Port San Luis is an active port, offloading activities would be consistent with the intended uses of Port San Luis. While vessels moored along the barge route may be temporarily relocated within the harbor, such relocation efforts would not substantially affect these vessels' use of the harbor. Temporary staging and storage of the RSGs at Port San Luis could temporarily disrupt commercial or recreational uses at Port San Luis (see Impact L-2 below). However, due to their temporary nature, potential staging and storage associated with RSG transport activities would have less than significant impacts to established land uses at Port San Luis (Class III).

After leaving the Port, the RSGs would travel along Avila Beach Drive to the existing DCPD Access Road, which was specifically constructed to support heavy equipment and loads, and has been utilized for this purpose on various occasions since the initial construction of DCPD. Traveling at speeds of 3 to 10 miles per hour, the transporter would complete each trip (eight total) in approximately one to two hours. Due to the short duration of transport, the passage of the transporter along the existing access road would not disrupt adjacent land uses significantly.

RSG transport impacts on established land uses would be less than significant (Class III). Impacts specific to recreational land uses are discussed below.

Recreational Resource Impacts – Physical deterioration of a recreational facility

A project would result in or accelerate the substantial physical deterioration of recreational facilities if it increases their use beyond existing capacity. Generally, this increased use is a result of an increase in population local to the recreational resources. As shown in Section D.11 (Socioeconomics), RSG trans-

port activities are not expected to induce population growth and are unlikely to draw additional residents or recreationists to the area. Therefore, RSG transport activities would not increase local need for recreational resources that could lead to the physical deterioration of recreational facilities. No impacts would occur.

Impact L-2: Transport would disrupt recreational activities

RSG transport would pass through recreational facilities at Port San Luis and at the Pecho Coast Trail. During offloading and potential storage, some recreational activities at Port San Luis such as boating, fishing, or recreational vehicle use could be temporarily precluded. Offloading of the RSGs would also have the potential to affect the recreational vehicle campsites at Port San Luis. Impacts on recreational users would be considered potentially significant, but would be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of Mitigation Measures N-1a (Provide advance notice of transport) (see Section D.9, Noise and Vibration), and L-2a (Avoid peak recreational usage) (Class II).

Offloading and initial transport activities would occur at the northeastern (Port San Luis) trailhead of the Pecho Coast Trail (see Figure D.8-4). Given the high recreational value and limited access to this resource, any disruption or preclusion of the use would represent a potentially significant impact. However, this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level with implementation of Mitigation Measures N-1a (Provide advance notice of transport) (see Section D.9, Noise and Vibration), L-2a (Avoid peak recreational usage), and L-2b (Schedule Pecho Coast Trail hikes around RSG transport) (Class II).

Mitigation Measures for Impact L-2, Transport would disrupt recreational activities

- L-2a Avoid peak recreational usage.** PG&E shall not schedule RSG offloading during times of peak recreational usage of Port San Luis (as defined by and coordinated with the Port San Luis Harbor District).
- L-2b Schedule Pecho Coast Trail hikes around RSG transport.** PG&E shall schedule the twice-weekly Pecho Coast Trail hikes such that they do not occur during transport activities. PG&E shall also ensure that the number of hiking opportunities does not diminish as a result of the Proposed Project. The number of hiking opportunities available shall be no less than the current level of frequency of twice-weekly hikes of up to 15 people per hike.

Agricultural Resource Impacts – Conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use

Generally, the conversion of Farmland to a non-agricultural use is considered a significant impact due to Farmland's high capacity for agricultural production. The Proposed Project's transport route would travel adjacent to or near Farmland of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland, Prime Farmland, and Farmland of Local Importance as it travels northwest from approximately Rattlesnake Canyon past Little Irish Canyon (see Figure D.8-5). However, the RSG transport period would be of a short duration (each trip would last approximately one hour), and would not traverse lands outside the existing public access road right-of-way. Therefore, no Farmland would be converted to non-agricultural use as a result of the Proposed Project. No impacts to Farmland are expected.

Agricultural Resource Impacts – Conflict with an existing agricultural use or a Williamson Act Contract

The Proposed Project does not cross, or run adjacent to, any properties under a Williamson Act contract. The nearest lands under a Williamson Act contract are located north and east of the Study Area (see Figure D.8-6), and would not be affected by RSG transport activities. Therefore, there would be no project-related conflicts with lands under an existing Williamson Act contract or any other existing agricultural use. As discussed above, the Proposed Project would not affect agricultural lands adjacent to the existing public access road right-of-way. No impacts to agricultural lands or Williamson Act Contract Lands would occur.

D.8.3.3 Replacement Steam Generator Staging and Preparation

Conflict with an Applicable Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation

The Proposed Project's consistency with applicable plans and policies is discussed in detail in Section D.8.2 (above).

Land Use Impacts

As described in Section B.1.2 (Replacement Steam Generator Staging and Preparation), staging and preparation of the Proposed Project would be located on previously developed or disturbed areas at the DCPD facility. A temporary staging area would house most project activities and would consist of offices, fabrication, mock-up, weld testing, warehouse, and laydown areas. Approximately 90,000 additional square feet would be required in temporary or existing facilities in order to perform the required project staging activities. PG&E has proposed to locate the TSA facilities at Parking Lot 1 south of Diablo Ocean Road (see Figure C-1). In addition to the TSA facilities, a dedicated CAF and additional decontamination and personnel processing facilities would be needed. These facilities are expected to be compact prefabricated modular units or warehouse facilities up to 30 feet tall. However, because the staging activities would not be incompatible with existing onsite industrial uses, no impacts would occur.

Recreational Resource Impacts

As staging and preparation activities would occur within the DCPD facility, there would be no direct physical impacts to recreational facilities. The nearest recreational facilities within the Study Area are approximately 5 to 6 miles southeast of the DCPD facility. Montaña de Oro State Park, outside the Study Area, is located approximately 1.5 miles northwest of the DCPD facility. Because these recreational sites are located such that they would not be affected by staging and preparation activities, no impacts would occur. In addition, as discussed in Section D.11, Socioeconomics, staging and preparation activities would not permanently increase local population and consequently would not increase the need for recreational resources. These activities would not lead to the physical deterioration of recreational facilities due to prolonged increased use. Therefore, there would be no impacts associated with potential deterioration of recreational facilities resulting from staging and preparation activities.

Agricultural Resource Impacts

The nearest Farmland is located along the Proposed Project's RSG transport route, southeast of the DCPD facility. Staging and preparation activities would occur within the DCPD facility, approximately three miles northwest of these agricultural lands. The nearest Williamson Act contract is located east of

the DCPP facility, outside of the Study Area. As such, there would be no impacts to Farmland, Williamson Act contract lands, or other agricultural resources.

D.8.3.4 Original Steam Generator Removal, Transport, and Storage

Conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation

The Proposed Project's consistency with applicable plans and policies is discussed in detail in Section D.8.2 (above).

Land Use Impacts

The activities involved in removing, transporting, and storing the OSGs would occur within the DCPP facility, where no established communities exist. The preferred method for removing the OSGs would be to haul them out of the containment building through the equipment hatch over the auxiliary building roof and through the fuel handling building. After removal of the OSGs, they would be properly treated in preparation for transport to and storage at the proposed OSG Storage Facility, and eventually decommissioned along with the remaining plant equipment after the plant has been shut down. The OSG Storage Facility would consist of an 18,000-square-foot reinforced concrete building at the upper portion of the DCPP facility, near the 500 kV switchyard. PG&E would obtain all required permits for this storage facility, which would be constructed to store and secure all eight OSGs. The OSG Storage Facility would be similar to the existing onsite industrial uses, and would not conflict with nearby uses or established communities. No impacts to established land uses would occur.

Recreational Resource Impacts

As OSG removal, transportation, and storage would occur within the DCPP facility, these activities would not directly affect recreational facilities. The nearest recreational facilities within the Study Area are approximately 5 to 6 miles southeast of the DCPP facility. Montaña de Oro State Park, outside the Study Area, is located approximately 1.5 miles northwest of the DCPP facility. These sites are located such that they would not be directly affected by OSG removal, transport, and storage activities.

In addition, as discussed in Section D.11, Socioeconomics OSG removal, transportation, and storage activities would not permanently increase local population and consequently would not increase the need for recreational resources. These activities would be unlikely to have a substantial effect on the demand for recreational facilities and would not lead to the physical deterioration of recreational facilities due to prolonged increased use. No impacts to recreational facilities would occur.

Agricultural Resource Impacts

The nearest Farmland is located along the Proposed Project's RSG transport route, southeast of the DCPP facility. The nearest Williamson Act contract is located north and east of the DCPP facility, outside of the Study Area. OSG removal, transportation, and storage activities would occur within the DCPP facility and would not affect agricultural lands. Consequently, there would be no impacts to Farmland, Williamson Act contract lands, or other agricultural resources.

D.8.3.5 Replacement Steam Generator Installation

Conflict with an Applicable Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation

The Proposed Project's consistency with applicable plans and policies is discussed in detail in Section D.8.2 (above).

Land Use Impacts

The RSGs would occupy the location vacated by the OSGs, and no other structures would be constructed in this phase of the Proposed Project. The temporary facilities constructed for staging and preparation would be taken down and removed following the Steam Generator Installation for Unit 1. Steam generator installation would not contribute to development that would potentially divide a community, or disrupt any land uses. No impacts would occur.

Recreational Resource Impacts

Impacts to recreational resources resulting from steam generator installation activities would be similar to those discussed for activities related to OSG Removal, Transport, and Storage (analyzed in Section D.8.3.4).

Agricultural Resource Impacts

Impacts to agricultural resources resulting from steam generator installation activities would be similar to those discussed for activities related to OSG Removal, Transport, and Storage (analyzed in Section D.8.3.4).

D.8.4 Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures for the Alternatives

D.8.4.1 Replacement Steam Generator Offloading Alternative

This alternative would be similar to the Proposed Project, except for the transport route. The RSGs would be offloaded at the Intake Cove within the DCPP facility. The proposed transport route from the Intake Cove to the temporary RSG storage facility would be along the Intake Cove Access Road or Marina Drive and turning right to head south on Shore Cliff Road to the temporary storage facility. By following this alternate transport route, this alternative would avoid the Proposed Project's Class II policy consistency and recreational impacts, as discussed above. During RSG transport, transport activities would not result in any conflicts with applicable land use plans, policies or regulations, because the RSG Offloading Alternative at the Intake Cove would avoid the recreational resources that would be affected by the Proposed Project. Similar to the Proposed Project, disruptions to established land uses (Impact L-1) would be less than significant (Class III). This alternative would not have impacts on recreational or agricultural resources.

All impacts of the Intake Cove Alternative would be negligible or less than significant (Class III).

D.8.4.2 Temporary Staging Area Alternatives

TSA Alternatives A, B, and C would change the location of the TSA from Parking Lot 1 south of the Access Road to Parking Lot 7 or Parking Lot 8, or by adding a second floor to Warehouse B and con-

structing a small building in Parking Lot 1, respectively. As all of the TSA Alternatives are located within the DCPP facility, the alternatives would have the same impacts as each other and as the Proposed Project.

D.8.4.3 Original Steam Generator Storage Facility Location Alternatives

All four of the OSG Storage Facility Location Alternatives would change the location of the proposed OSG Storage Facility, but they would still be located within the same general area of the DCPP facility as the OSG Storage Facility in the Proposed Project. Therefore, the OSG Storage Facility Location Alternatives would have the same impacts as the Proposed Project.

D.8.4.4 Original Steam Generator Offsite Disposal Alternative

Under this alternative, the OSGs would likely be transported offsite via barge to a licensed low-level radioactive waste disposal facility. The OSGs would be transported via barge from either the DCPP Intake Cove or Port San Luis directly to the disposal facility, or to a transfer point where they would be shifted to a different mode of transportation, such as railway, for ultimate delivery to the facility. If the OSGs are disposed offsite, they may be transported through Port San Luis an additional time to the Proposed Project. Therefore, transport through Port San Luis could potentially restrict public access to the Port facilities and recreational resources. As such, impacts could be greater for disposal of the OSGs offsite than for the Proposed Project and the OSG Storage Facility Location Alternatives. Impacts associated with other phases associated with this alternative would be similar to the impacts described for the Proposed Project. Transport of the OSGs along DCPP Access Road could disrupt recreational activities. However, through the implementation of Mitigation Measures N-1a (Provide advance notice of transport), L-2a (Avoid peak recreational usage), and L-2b (Schedule Pecho Trail hikes around the RSG transport), this impact would be reduced to a less than significant level (Class II).

D.8.5 Environmental Impacts of the No Project Alternative

The No Project Alternative would not result in Study Area or regional land use impacts in the near future. However, development scenarios foreseeable under the No Project Alternative could result in new generation or transmission facilities in San Luis Obispo County, or elsewhere in northern California or the southern Central Valley to compensate for the eventual loss of generation at DCPP. Construction of new or increased use of existing power plants may create impacts to land use, recreation, or agricultural lands outside of the Study Area. Although construction and operation of new power plants and transmission lines would be necessary, their locations and development schedules cannot be predicted at this time. However, some impacts would be typical of electric generation and transmission projects, and can be discussed generally.

Natural gas is the most common fuel for most new generation facilities. Approximately 25 to 30 acres of land are needed to construct and operate a typical 500 MW combined cycle power plant. Impacts to land use, recreation, and agriculture from new generation facilities can sometimes include the conversion of agriculture lands to industrial uses, and conflicts with Williamson Act contracts. New generation facilities are typically not sited such that they conflict with adjacent land uses or recreational facilities. However, due to proximity to utility corridors and a lower cost of land relative to urban areas, new generation facilities can often be sited in rural areas on agricultural lands, which may include Farmland or lands subject to a Williamson Act contract. This could result in a potentially significant conversion of agricultural lands to industrial uses, which may or may not be mitigable to a less than significant level through the use of land trusts or other preservation mechanisms.

Because of the difficulty of securing new rights-of-way, replacement transmission facilities would likely follow existing major paths. Using existing rights-of-way would reduce the potential for significant land use incompatibilities or impacts to agricultural or recreational lands. During construction, the possibility would exist for temporary impacts to nearby recreational areas. This would include, for example, situations where communities developed after placement of the transmission line right-of-way and have since developed portions of the right-of-way as parkland. Many of these impacts could be reduced through noticing and other public notification efforts.

Alternative energy technologies could be used to make up for generation lost by the decommissioning of DCPP, but most of these alternative technologies would not be feasible for providing the level of generation required to make up the capacity lost by closing DCPP. Wind power, geothermal power, and biomass power are all feasible means of alternative generating strategies, and San Luis Obispo County is already utilizing geothermal resources. The use of wind turbines allows for dual uses such as for agriculture or ranching in addition to power generation, but would result in the conversion of some agricultural lands, both for the wind turbines as well as for transmission ROWs. Geothermal plants must be built near geothermal reservoir sites because steam and hot water cannot be transported long distances without significant thermal energy loss. This reduces the flexibility of site selection, and may result in siting near sensitive land uses, recreational areas, or agricultural lands, as well as the need to construct transmission corridors through these areas. While biomass power plants would guarantee a demand for agricultural products and therefore the preservation of agricultural lands, increased use of this energy source could lead to increased crop specialization and subsequent land degradation, as well as general impacts related to plant siting and construction.

System enhancement options could provide minor offsets to the generation capacity lost by decommissioning DCPP, but would not result in substantial land use, recreation, or agricultural impacts because construction would be limited to relatively small distributed generation facilities.

D.8.6 Mitigation Monitoring, Compliance, and Reporting Table

Table D.8-2 shows the mitigation monitoring, compliance, and reporting program for Land Use, Recreation, and Agriculture.

Table D.8-2. Mitigation Monitoring Program – Land Use, Recreation, and Agriculture

IMPACT L-2	Transport would disrupt recreational activities (Class II)
MITIGATION MEASURE	Implement Mitigation Measure N-1a (Provide advance notice of offloading and transport).
Location	As in Mitigation Measure N-1a (see Table D.9-3)
Monitoring / Reporting Action	As in Mitigation Measure N-1a (see Table D.9-3)
Effectiveness Criteria	As in Mitigation Measure N-1a (see Table D.9-3)
Responsible Agency	As in Mitigation Measure N-1a (see Table D.9-3)
Timing	As in Mitigation Measure N-1a (see Table D.9-3)
MITIGATION MEASURE	L- 2a: Avoid peak recreational usage. PG&E shall not schedule offloading during times of peak recreational usage of Port San Luis (as defined by and coordinated with the Port San Luis Harbor District).
Location	Port San Luis Harbor
Monitoring / Reporting Action	Verification of offloading and transport schedule as compared to peak recreational usage of Port San Luis (as defined by and coordinated with the Port San Luis Harbor District).
Effectiveness Criteria	Offloading occurs outside of peak recreational usage of Port San Luis (as defined by and coordinated with the Port San Luis Harbor District).
Responsible Agency	CPUC, PG&E, Port San Luis Harbor District
Timing	Pre-transport, Transport
MITIGATION MEASURE	L-2b: Schedule Pecho Coast Trail hikes around RSG transport. PG&E shall schedule the twice-weekly Pecho Coast Trail hikes such that they do not occur during transport activities. PG&E shall also ensure that the number of hiking opportunities does not diminish as a result of the Proposed Project. The number of hiking opportunities available shall meet or exceed the current level of twice-weekly hikes of up to 15 people per hike, as discussed above (Section D.8.1).
Location	Pecho Coast Trail – Trailhead at Port San Luis Harbor
Monitoring / Reporting Action	Verification of offloading and transport schedule as compared to scheduled hikes. Number of hiking opportunities as compared to current (Two hikes per week with 15 available spots on each hike).
Effectiveness Criteria	Offloading and transport schedule does not occur at the same time as Pecho Coast Trail hikes. The number of hiking opportunities available meets or exceeds the current level of 15 people per hike, with two hikes per week, as discussed above (Section D.8.1).
Responsible Agency	CPUC, PG&E
Timing	Pre-transport, Transport

D.8.7 References

- CCC (California Coastal Commission). 2004. "Coastal Access Program: The California Coastal Trail." <http://www.coastal.ca.gov/access/ctrail-access.html>. Accessed December 2.
- _____. 1997. "Pecho Coast Trail." California Coast & Ocean. Summer 1997. <http://ceres.ca.gov/coastalconservancy/coast&ocean/suchive/PECHO.HTM>. Accessed December 1.
- County of Ventura. 2004. County of Ventura Saticoy Operations Yard Focused FEIR. April. <http://www.ventura.org/planning/pdf/eirs/soy/3.2%20Agricultural%20Res.pdf>. Accessed December 2.
- CSP (California State Parks). 2004a. "Find a Park: Central Coast Region." http://www.parks.ca.gov/parkindex/region_info.asp?regiontab=0&id=6. Accessed November 30.
- _____. 2004b. "Montaña de Oro State Park." http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=592. Accessed November 30.
- DOC (California Department of Conservation). 2004a. "Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map Categories, Criteria and Uses: Important Farmland Categories." http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/fmmp/mccu/map_categories.htm. Accessed November 30.
- _____. 2004b. "Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program Map Categories, Criteria and Uses: Data Uses and Users." http://www.consrv.ca.gov/DLRP/fmmp/mccu/data_use.htm. Accessed November 30.
- _____. 2004c. Personal communication via email and telephone from Patrick L. Hennessy, Research Analyst, California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, to Kathleen Robertson of Aspen Environmental Group. November 30.
- _____. 2004d. Personal communication via email from James Nordstrom, Research Analyst, California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, to Kathleen Robertson of Aspen Environmental Group. November 30.
- PG&E (Pacific Gas and Electric Company). 2004a. Proponent's Environmental Assessment of the Diablo Canyon Steam Generator Replacement Project. Prepared by URS Corporation. January 9.
- _____. 2004b. Application 04-01-009, Data Request Number ED_002-VIS-1. October 21.
- _____. 2004c. PG&E's First Response to CPUC Deficiency Report. May 10.
- PSL (Port San Luis Harbor District). 1984. Port San Luis Harbor District Master Plan. Adopted 1984.
- _____. 2004. "Port San Luis Harbor District Master Plan." <http://www.portsanluis.com>. Accessed December 1.
- SLO County (San Luis Obispo County). 1988a. San Luis Bay Coastal Area Plan, Land Use and Circulation Elements of the San Luis Obispo County General Plan. Adopted March 1, 1988.
- _____. 1988b. Coastal Plan Policies. Adopted March 1, 1988.
- _____. 1988c. Framework for Planning Coastal Zone, Land Use and Circulation Elements of the San Luis Obispo County General Plan. Adopted March 1, 1988.

- _____. 1988d. Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance, Title 23 of the San Luis Obispo County Code. Adopted March 1, 1988.
- _____. 2004. Personal communication via email from James Caruso, Senior Planner, San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning and Building, to Nicolas Procos of the California Public Utilities Commission. November 8.
- _____. 2005. Personal communication via email from Kami Griffin, Planner, San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning and Building, to Kathleen Robertson of Aspen Environmental Group. January.
- SLOCP (San Luis Obispo County Parks). 2004a. "Avila Beach Community Park." <http://www.slocountyparks.com/images/Day%20Use%20Maps/Avila.gif>. Accessed November 30.
- _____. 2004b. "San Luis Obispo County Parks." <http://www.slocountyparks.com/facilities/index.htm>. Accessed November 30.
- Sneed, David. 2003. "A hike with postcard views: Pecho called the 'jewel' of coastal access program". San Luis Obispo Tribune. May 3. <http://www.sanluisobispo.com/mld/sanluisobispo/5777856.htm>. Accessed December 2.