



## 24.0 OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

### 24.1 Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

There are two significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the PWP including temporary increase in ambient noise associated with construction, and loss of recreational opportunities (motorized public recreation and coastal access) from interim reduction of use limits. Potentially significant impacts of the PWP are identified in this EIR for Air Quality, Biological Resources, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Noise, and Transportation and Traffic, along with mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid these impacts. There would be no potentially unavoidable significant cumulative impacts from the PWP, with the exception of Greenhouse Gas Emissions, where cumulative impacts are significant even without the PWP. Please see Table S-2 in the Executive Summary of this EIR for a Cumulative Impact Summary.

### 24.2 Growth Inducement

During implementation of the proposed PWP State Parks would implement existing park activities and operations, future management programs, and various Development Projects at Pismo State Beach and Oceano Dunes SVRA. The PWP was developed in support of an application to the California Coastal Commission for a Public Works Plan (PWP) for Coastal Act Compliance, as described in Volume 1, Chapter 1 of the PWP. Besides the existing and proposed park activities and operations, new Development Projects proposed by the PWP include Oso Flaco (Initial and Future) Improvement Project, Park Corporation Yard Improvement Project, Oceano Campground Infrastructure Improvement Project, Pier and Grand Avenue Entrances and Lifeguard Towers Project, North Beach Campground Facility Improvements Project, Butterfly Grove Public Access Project, Pismo State Beach Boardwalk Project, and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project. There are also several Small Development Projects proposed including Pismo Creek Estuary Seasonal (Floating) Bridge Installation, 40 Acre Riding Trail Installation, Replacement of the Safety and Education Center, Oso Flaco Boardwalk Replacement, Oceano Campground Campfire Center Replacement Project, and Trash Enclosure at Post 2/Beach Trash Management.

The PWP approval and subsequent issuance of the PWP would satisfy the permit requirement for existing and future proposed activities and projects in the coastal zone. The PWP does not grant any other entitlements to future projects and does not obviate the need for future permits and approvals.

The proposed PWP includes future park improvements to aging infrastructure and new infrastructure as envisioned in the General Plan. New housing is only proposed as part of the Oso Flaco Improvement Project and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project including two to six new residences at the Oso Flaco Improvement Project site, and an additional two to six residences at the Philips 66/Southern Entrance Project site. These residences would be occupied by State Parks staff and not available to residents in the surrounding area. The improvement projects would provide day use activities and overnight camping and not result in an increase in the population residing in the surrounding area. In addition, improved, relocated, and new infrastructure (i.e., roadways and water, wastewater, electrical, and telecommunications infrastructure) would be those necessary to serve visitors and State Parks employees working and living at the Oso Flaco Improvement Project and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project sites. Utility infrastructure would only be built to the size



---

needed to support these projects and land use on adjacent lands, which is regulated by agricultural designations and other local land use designations, would remain the same as under current conditions and there would be no nexus for conversion to residential use. Therefore, implementation of the Oso Flaco Improvement Project and Phillips 66/Southern Entrance Project improvements would not directly or indirectly induce substantial unplanned population growth. The park improvements would not promote development of urban growth or conversion of land from existing park uses. The PWP would not induce growth of park visitation. Park visitor vehicle limits are set by the CDP, and current limits would be reduced in the interim as described in Section 3.6, “Managing Use Limits”, of Chapter 3 in Volume 1 (PWP) during implementation of the PWP. As such, the proposed PWP is not growth inducing.

