

Attachment C

Response to Comments

Letter #	Name
1	Steve and Susan Benaron
2	Dr. Thomas Pachmann
3	Linda Diepenbrock
4	Kathleen Bishop & Dennis Cook
5	Gregory Ross
6	Debbie Mellow McElreath
7	Howard, Mark, & Blair Mankins
8	Richard Foster
9	Elizabeth Burkhead
10	Shelia Blake
11	Audrey Erbes
12	Jimmie & Kathleen Howell
13	Jay Erbes
14	Andrew Christie, Sierra Club
15	Ed & Dianna Muraski
16	Laura Sprague, Glen & Kelly Richardson
17	John & Rebecca Baer
18	Marcia Guthrie
19	Frank & Trudy Jarratt
20	Stewart Robinson

Pismo Beach SOI/MSR

- 21 Jamie Guthrie
- 22 Harry Goodnight, Oak Park Estates HOA
- 23 Marian Mellow
- 24 Neil Havlik, Coastal San Luis Resource Conservation District
- 25 Teresa McClish, City of Arroyo Grande
- 26 David Watson
- 27 Christine Harvey
- 28 Jackie Relyea
- 29 Michael & Peggy Cox
- 30 John Ruda
- 31 Mike & Karlie Relyea
- 32 Don Ritter
- 33 Michael Joseph
- 34 Stephnie Wald
- 35 Jack & Elizabeth Gates
- 36 Joan & Fred Lauriente
- 37 Megan Smith
- 38 Carolyn & David Scheeff
- 39 Arthur & Cheryl Nuno
- 40 Maureen Kelly
- 41 Gar & Elizabeth Salzgeber
- 42 Ginger Lordus
- 43 Edie Juck

Pismo Beach SOI/MSR

- | | |
|----|--|
| 44 | John & Gail West |
| 45 | Jack Gelb |
| 46 | Gary Linqvist |
| 47 | Neal & Leigh Ann OHagan |
| 48 | Steven Sterling |
| 49 | Dave Cowie |
| 50 | Laurina Kusell & Larry Wartenbe |
| 51 | Terry Hayes |
| 52 | Charles Pappenos, Carol Geihs, Harriet Lowrey, Jesse & Joyce Limon, Paul & Eileen Joseph, Joyce Anderson |
| 53 | Terrance & Janis Packer |
| 54 | Marilyn Morris |
| 55 | Valerie Powell |
| 56 | Suzanne & Benjamin Davis |
| 57 | April & Anthony Riforgiate |
| 58 | Gene Schafer |
| 59 | Leslie Hannon |
| 60 | Tom Rehkugler |
| 61 | Piper & Bruce Hunter |
| 62 | Lynda Steude |
| 63 | Walt Hawley |
| 64 | Judith Money |
| 65 | Petition Signed by various individuals |

Pismo Beach SOI/MSR

Response to Comments – Exhibit B

Topic: Water

Comments	Response
<p>2B, 11A, 12B, 13A, 14B, 14C, 15A, 16F, 17A, 19A, 19B, 19C, 21E, 22D, 22E, 23D, 24B, 25A, 27A, 28A, 29E, 30A, 31A, 33A, 34A, 34B, 34C, 36B, 39, 42A, 44A, 49B, 51A, 56, 57B, 60B, 61B, 62C</p>	<p>LAFCO Staff agrees any future development needs to demonstrate an adequate, sustainable, and reliable water supply that would limit groundwater use. Staff has included a condition of approval that prohibits the use of the Oak Park Aquifer for any future development.</p> <p>LAFCO has also included a condition that requires the City prior to annexation application to provide LAFCO with documentation an adequate, reliable, and sustainable water supply is available and deliverable to serve the area being annexed.</p> <p>The Draft EIR for the Price Canyon Specific Plan was released in September 2010 which identified groundwater to be used from the Indian Knob basin. The Oak Park Aquifer has not been identified as a water supply source. The draft proposed project identified the Pismo Creek Alluvium aquifer as a potential water source along with a recycled groundwater program. (EIR Pg IV-B25 & Pg V-A28)</p> <p>The City recently adopted its 2010 Urban Water Management Plan that states the City is requesting 500 AFY of State Water and 500 AFY of drought buffer to meet the future needs in the Price Canyon Area. The City's 2010 Urban Water Management Plan also indicates that the City does not intend to use the Oak Park Aquifer as a source of water. The City and developers are continue to consider a Specific Plan for the Price Canyon Area and will need to identify an adequate, sustainable, and reliable water supply. The Sphere Update as recommended includes conditions that will prohibit the use of the Oak Park Aquifer as a water supply under any future annexation.</p>

Pismo Beach SOI/MSR

Response to Comments – Exhibit B

Topic: Existing Available Land

Comments	Response
2C, 5A, 6A, 8B, 10A, 18A, 20A, 21B, 22C, 22K, 23B, 28C, 29B, 33A, 40C, 49A, 60D	<p>The City of Pismo Beach was required to identify vacant and underdeveloped properties within the City limits when they adopted the certified Housing Element in 2010. This data is presented in the MSR along with the County's forecast data. The MSR will be revised to include additional properties not identified in the Housing Element as having greater potential for future build-out. A total of 174 units should be added to the City housing supply potential because the City has approved various planning projects that have not been constructed yet. The Housing Element stated the City have available land for an additional 373 units. 373 units plus 174 approved unit's totals 547 potential units before build-out occurs. These changes are reflected on page 3-14 of the MSR.</p> <p>The MOA points out infill should be considered first followed by properties closer to the City boundary to address leapfrog and urban sprawl. An added condition address the need for the City to document and evaluate the vacant or underutilized parcels already within the boundaries of the City and provide an inventory to LAFCO as part of any annexation application. Existing land availability will be considered at the time of annexation along with other factors.</p>

Pismo Beach SOI/MSR

Response to Comments – Exhibit B

Topic: General Impacts (water, traffic, air quality, quality of life, habitats, taxes)

Comments	Response
<p>1A, 6A, 8A, 9A, 12A, 13B, 14A, 18C, 21C, 21G, 22F, 23A, 25D, 28D, 29E, 35A, 36A, 40B, 43, 47A, 50, 56, 58, 60A, 61A, 62A, 65</p>	<p>Many of the concerns expressed are a result of the proposed project description identified in the Draft EIR. The action being considered at this time is the Sphere of Influence and not the Price Canyon development or the annexation of property. Extending the Sphere of Influence in this area does not necessarily mean that the property would be annexed into the City. For example, Study Areas 3, 5, & 6 have been within the City's existing Sphere of Influence for the last 9 years and annexation has not been proposed for this area. That said the SOI is the first step towards annexation.</p> <p>LAFCO Staff agrees any future development needs to identify funding source, permanent preservation of agricultural and open space lands and adequate, sustainable, and reliable water supply. Staff has included a condition of approval that prohibits the use of the Oak Park Aquifer for any future development. Other conditions require the preservation of identified agriculture and open space lands, and a logical and orderly development pattern that is phased to include the properties closest to the City limits first.</p> <p>After the City has prepared a Specific Plan for the area, the public review process will provide a chance to comment on the project. The conditions of approval, MOA provisions and LAFCO Policies will be used to review the Draft Plan.</p> <p>The City and developers are continuing to consider a Specific Plan for the Price Canyon Area that would result in a proposed project that will be evaluated in an Environmental Impact Report that identifies potential impacts. Continued public input through the planning process will help to ensure these concerns are addressed. LAFCO will continue to provide comments to the City.</p>

Pismo Beach SOI/MSR

Response to Comments – Exhibit B

Topic: Price Canyon Specific Plan Project

Comments	Response
<p>2A, 5A, 13C, 21I, 28E, 45C, 60C</p>	<p>The action requested is the consideration of the Sphere of Influence at this time not the Price Canyon development or the annexation of property. Many of the issues require detail analysis based on project specifics that will only be known at the annexation stage. The Sphere of Influence considers a broader view of where the City of Pismo Beach might grow. The City is in the process of preparing the Specific Plan.</p> <p>Study Areas Three, Five, and Six are existing properties within the current SOI. Area Four (Godfrey) is recommended to be included in the SOI and Study Area Two is not recommended to be included in the Sphere of Influence. The Draft Price Canyon proposal is expected to be refined as the City prepares the Specific Plan while implementing the conditions of approval and the guiding principles outlined in the MOA.</p>

Topic: Urban Sprawl

Comments	Response
<p>2C, 29A, 41, 42B, 44B, 54C</p>	<p>LAFCO Staff would agree any future development proposed should not result in urban sprawl. The conditions of approval require the City to annex land that is closest to the existing City limits as part of the first phase of development. The MOA outlines good planning strategies to encourage development be directed towards existing incorporated areas and areas with logical infrastructure connections. Other guiding principles include creating walkable and transit friendly neighborhoods, compact building design and a range of housing choices.</p> <p>Study Area Four provides an opportunity to create a logical extension of the City's infrastructure including roads, water, sewer systems to the surrounding existing SOI properties if the Specific Plan and General Plan Amendments being considered by the City incorporates the MOA provisions and excellent land use planning is implemented.</p> <p>After the City has prepared a Specific Plan for the area, the public review process will provide a chance to comment on the project. LAFCO, other agencies, and the public will be able to comment on</p>

Pismo Beach SOI/MSR

Comments	Response
	the proposal. If the project does not meet the goals and objectives then any potential annexation could be denied, or approved with conditions.

Response to Comments – Exhibit B

Topic: Mankins Property

Comments	Response
7A, 10A, 16D, 18B, 21D, 22I, 23C, 34B, 54E	An Inland Arterial is identified in the City's Circulation Element that generally shown a road alignment across the Mankins Ranch. The City has stated publicly the City does not wish or intend to request an easement from the Mankins family unless the owners are a willing participant. Typically, eminent domain powers are no used by jurisdiction without justification. Eminent domain is a mechanism of last resort. In this case the City is on record as stating that it does not intend to use eminent domain regarding the Mankins property. The land would remain in the County jurisdiction and County is not likely to add a segment surrounded by City roads to the County's maintenance program.

Pismo Beach SOI/MSR

Response to Comments – Exhibit B

Topic: Agriculture/Open Space Protection

Comments	Response
8C, 16G, 16I, 17B, 24A, 25B, 40D,54B	<p>LAFCO Staff would agree any future development proposed should result in the permanent preservation of open space and agricultural lands. The MOA, mitigation measures, conditions of approval, and implementation practice by LAFCO would require the City to identify all open space and agricultural lands when preparing a specific plan. If an annexation is approved conservation easement(s) shall be recorded on the deed(s) of the properties affected in perpetuity prior to final completion of an annexation.</p> <p>The MOA states "The City and the County will work together to permanently preserve agricultural and open space resources in the SOI area using the City's and County's Agriculture Element policies, Strategic Growth principles, and the Conservation and Open Space Element (COSE) policies."</p> <p>The action requested is the consideration of the Sphere of Influence at this time not the Price Canyon development or the annexation of property. However, if any future annexation is proposed LAFCO's policy regarding protection of prime farmland 1:1 ratio will likely require conservation easements within the project site. As for the amount of open space being protected with the Price Canyon project, the City would identify all open space and agricultural lands when preparing a specific plan.</p>

Pismo Beach SOI/MSR

Response to Comments – Exhibit B

Topic: Economy and the Demand for Development

Comments	Response
<p>8C, 10B, 12C, 15B, 21H, 45B, 48</p>	<p>The action requested is the consideration of the Sphere of Influence at this time not the Price Canyon development or the annexation of property. The Sphere of Influence is a 20-year planning horizon. The current economic situation will likely change and is difficult to predict. Establishing an SOI allows the City to focus on planning efforts that should address the concerns expressed by LAFCO and others. The City's planning efforts should consider the economic conditions.</p> <p>Extending the Sphere of Influence into Study Area Four does not necessarily mean that the property would be annexed into the City. For example, Study Areas 3, 5, & 6 have been within the City's existing Sphere of Influence for the last 9 years and annexation has not been proposed for this area.</p> <p>LAFCO does not have direct land use authority regarding zoning for golf courses. The public should continue to be involved in the planning process and express their concerns and ideas to assist the City in their planning efforts.</p>

Topic: Cost to All Tax Payers

Comment	Response
<p>16C, 21H, 22G, 29E, 42C, 44C, 49C, 52, 54D, 61D, 62B, 63, 64B</p>	<p>The action requested is the consideration of the Sphere of Influence at this time not the Price Canyon development or the annexation of property. The City and landowners are in the process of developing a Specific Plan for the area, which should include a financing and implementation plan to address the cost and construction of all improvements. The City has a policy base that requires the developer to pay for improvements associated with the proposed development. The financing plan for infrastructure should address the costs and who pays for the improvements. After the City has prepared a Specific Plan for the area, public review provides a chance to comment on the project and financing components.</p>

Pismo Beach SOI/MSR

Response to Comments – Exhibit B

Topic: Leapfrog Development

Comments	Response
16E, 20A, 21F, 22A, 47B, 54A	The MOA points out that infill should be considered first followed by properties closer to the City boundary to avoid leapfrog and urban sprawl land pattern. An added condition addresses leapfrog development by requiring the City to annex land that is closest to the existing City limits as part of the first phase of development.

Topic: Preservation of Price Canyon

Comments	Response
3A, 4A, 21A, 37A, 40A, 53, 55	<p>These comments state the need to preserve the Price Canyon area because of its beauty, habitat qualities, and vital resources. The City and landowners have embarked on preparing a Specific Plan for the area. The City has commissioned a Constraints Analysis that assisted in identifying areas to be protected and areas possibly better suited for various land uses. In preparing the Specific Plan, the City can identify areas to be preserved. It is anticipated that preservation of areas would be proposed in the Specific Plan. The conditions of approval call for the permanent preservation of agriculture/open space areas prior to annexation.</p> <p>Adding Godfrey to the SOI with conditions allows the City to continue proper planning efforts to address the concerns expressed by other agencies, the public, and LAFCO. The City and landowners are continuing to develop a Specific Plan for the Price Canyon Area and could propose a concurrent application for an SOI amendment and Annexation in the future. Having a joint application typically is more difficult to evaluate and takes effort and time. By including the area in the SOI with conditions any future applications would be subject to the conditions of approval, would allow the focus on the annexation piece, uphold the MOA approved by the City and County that provides guidance for developing the Price Canyon area, and will require future development to meet all other factors and determinations outlined in the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Act.</p>

Pismo Beach SOI/MSR

Response to Comments – Exhibit B

Topic: Air Quality/GHG

Comments	Response
13B, 22J	The action requested is the consideration of the Sphere of Influence at this time not the Price Canyon development or the annexation of property. The Specific Plan and Environmental Impact Report being prepared by the City would consider air quality impacts.

Topic: City's General Plan

Comments	Response
16A	LAFCO considers the jurisdiction's General Plan when establishing a SOI. There is no law that mandates the General Plan to be updated except for the Housing Element. The City adopted its General Plan in 1992. The City recently held public meeting to discuss the goals of the general plan including "Planning Area R" which includes the Price Canyon Area. The Price Canyon area is identified as a area of interest in the City's General Plan.

Topic: Recent Census Data

Comments	Response
16B, 22B, 29B	<p>The City of Pismo Beach was required to identify vacant and underdeveloped properties within the City limits when they adopted the certified Housing Element in 2010. This data is presented in the MSR along with the County's forecast data. Although the 2010 Census does reflect a reduction in population over the last ten years the Sphere of Influence looks at a twenty year horizon along with the goals of the agency. The MSR will be revised to include those properties not identified in the Housing Element as having greater potential for future build-out. (See Existing Available Land Topic above)</p> <p>The MSR on page 3-12 states "In 2010, the U.S. Census stated the total number of dwelling units as 5,838 with an average household size of 1.9 persons and an occupancy rate of about 77%." According to the U.S. Census Table 2: E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 1/1/2010 the City of Pismo Beach has a</p>

Pismo Beach SOI/MSR

	percent vacancy rate of 23.04. The Council of Governments and County Resource Management System project the future population to grow.
--	--

Topic: Compatible Surrounding Land Uses

Comments	Response
16H, 28B, 31A, 51B, 56, 57A, 58, 59, 61C, 64A	The MOA outlines planning strategies to create walkable and transit friendly neighborhoods, compact building design, and a range of housing choices. The MOA's intent is for any future planning efforts to protect and preserve the area by clustering urban development where appropriate. LAFCO does not have direct land use authority regarding zoning, or density.

Topic: Process and Public Input

Comments	Response
18D, 24C, 29C, 29E, 45A	<p>The action requested is the consideration of the Sphere of Influence at this time not the Price Canyon development or the annexation of property. The City and landowners are in the process of developing a Specific Plan for the area. The public should continue to be involved in the planning process and express their concerns and ideas to assist the City in their planning efforts.</p> <p>LAFCO has held 10 public meetings including a Tour of the Study Areas and a Public Workshop to engage the public in the process. Sixty plus comment letters and/or e-mails have been submitted by the public regarding primarily the Price Canyon area. Public input has assist LAFCO in understanding the concerns and issues. As a result of the process conditions of approval have been recommended.</p> <p>The City has held public meeting to discuss the goals of their General Plan including "Planning Area R" which includes the Price Canyon Area.</p>

Pismo Beach SOI/MSR

Response to Comments – Exhibit B

Topic: Clarifications

Comments	Response
<p>25C, 25F, 26B, 26C, 26D, 26E, 26F, 32A, 32B, 32C</p>	<p>The MSR was revised to include shared opportunity with the Los Robles Del Mar Study Area for roadways, and habitat/open space corridor link to Oak Park Blvd.</p> <p>The guiding principles are addressed in provision 10 of the MOA and apply to the entire SOI.</p> <p>The intent of the mitigation measure and condition of approval is to ensure the protection of agricultural and open space lands are protected in perpetuity.</p> <p>A conservation easement can be placed on private open space or agricultural lands that identify various types of uses allowed. The fact the property is held in private ownership with an easement would not prevent the continued or identified uses allowed by the owner and stipulated in the easement.</p> <p>The studies and Draft EIR considers the soils on the Big Bird and Godfrey properties as being of local importance under the LESA analysis. LAFCO's definition of prime farmland is broader and includes land that can be feasibly irrigated for a rating of class II. The Godfrey site has existing wells that could be feasibly used to irrigate the property. The Big Bird property will be revised to "To Be Determined" (TBD).</p> <p>LAFCO's understanding is that portions of the Price Canyon area properties would be placed in open space and not the entire property. A Specific Plan should be prepared that identifies the open space areas.</p> <p>The correction will be made to Table 2-3 referencing County Designation of Godfrey as AG to RL "Rural Lands" and the potential for 24 residential units.</p> <p>A recommended condition is added to eliminate the use of Oak Park Aquifer from future uses if annexed. If groundwater from other aquifers or basins is used to serve an annexation area then the documented safe yield needs to be established and potentially limited use for agriculture or outdoor landscape be required.</p>

Responses to Question Cards

LAFCO Public Workshop, September 21, 2011

Question Cards

1. Because you have identified the need of the Godfrey property for roads, we all are wanting to know where the roads will be.

Response: The City would identify the location of all streets and roads in the Specific Plan. The impacts caused by the location and construction of the roads would be studied in the Environmental Impact Report prepared by the City.

Will you (Pismo Beach) guarantee the rural property bordering the Godfrey property be protected by a buffer zone?

Response: Pismo Beach has not guaranteed this to date; however they are aware of the issue and it should be considered in their plans.

2. Who pays to maintain Vetter?

Response: Currently the County maintains Vetter Lane from Oak Park to the gate at the Godfrey property using funds from the Countywide road fund.

Why doesn't Pismo require this large project to include its own access to Price Canyon Blvd., the logical access road?

Response: The City's Specific Plan would identify the access roads for the project. Price Canyon Road would be evaluated as an access road.

3. Will the new development and SOI change Arroyo Grande SOI on the Oak Park Road side?

Response: No changes are proposed for the Arroyo Grande SOI on the Oak Park Road Side.

Will zoning change in the Vetter Rd. area if it becomes connecting street?

Response: No the zoning would not be changed in that area. To change the zoning in this area the County Board of Supervisors would have to approve a general plan amendment.

4. How committed is LAFCO about protecting the residents of the county from leapfrog development?

Response: This issue was raised at the Commission's Study Session on September 15, 2011. It is addressed in the Memorandum of Agreement and

clarified in the Conditions of Approval under Phasing. The properties adjacent to the City are to be developed as part of the first phase of development.

5. I heard one commissioner say that water conditions should be spelled out before or in the SOI. I would like you to spell out another condition of inclusion into the SOI:

A MANDATE THAT THE RURAL ATMOSPHERE of the existing area be preserved by creating a huge buffer zone between existing boundaries and any roads or homes!

Response: Your comment is noted and a condition of approval that requires conservation easements on the areas identified as agriculture or open space in the City's Specific Plan is recommended as part of the SOI Update.

6. The property has been in an agricultural preserve for many years. After the agricultural preserve period it was zoned rural 20 acre parcels. HOW IN THE WORLD DID IT GET TO THE STAGE THAT IT WILL BE DEVELOPED INTO A MINI CITY?

Response: Typically City's will plan for the future by identifying areas for future growth. In the case of Pismo Beach, they identified this area as an "area of interest" in their General Plan. The City and property owners have been working towards a development in the Price Canyon area. First, with the preparation of a Constraints Analysis and then with a Draft EIR. The City intends to prepare a Specific Plan and EIR for public review sometime after the SOI Update is completed. The public review process will involve hearings by the City Planning Commission and City Council. LAFCO would provide comments and if an application for annexation is eventually submitted LAFCO would review and consider the application.

7. Where can I find the surveys and predictions from the developers as to expected needs and expansion?

Response: The Municipal Service Review contains information about the future growth of the City. Several sources are used to project the future population including the Council of Governments, the County's Resource Management System, and the City's Urban Water Management Plan.

8. When did Pismo and the developer decide that they were going to use Oak Park Aquifer to water their lawns & golf course? How does that fit with a sustainable water supply that won't sustain that type of development (Oak Park Aquifer)?

Response: A condition of approval that prohibits the use of the Oak Park Aquifer has been recommended as part of approving the Sphere of Influence.

The Draft EIR for the Price Canyon Specific Plan was released in September 2010 which identified groundwater to be used from the Indian Knob basin. The Oak Park Aquifer has not been identified as a water supply source. The draft proposed project identified the Pismo Creek Alluvium aquifer as a potential recycled groundwater program. (Pg IV-B25 & Pg V-A28) The City recently adopted its 2010 Urban Water Management Plan that states the City is requesting 500 AFY of State Water and 500 AFY of drought buffer to meet the future needs in the Price Canyon Area. The City and developers are continue to consider a Specific Plan for the Price Canyon Area and will need to identify an adequate, sustainable, and reliable water supply. The Sphere Update as recommended includes conditions that will eliminate the use of the Oak Park Aquifer as a water supply under any future annexation.

9. It appears that Godfrey's property is being asked to be in the sphere of influence to give access to developing the other properties. Is this the case?

Response: The City and developers are continuing to consider a Specific Plan for the Price Canyon Area that will meet the City's goals outlined in their General Plan and input provided by the public through the planning process.

10. Hasn't anyone addressed the problem of endangered and/or unique species living in that area and on some of the property? (Pismo Clarkia, horned toads and Wall's Manzanita). There are numerous places where all these live on that property.

Response: The City and developers are continuing to consider a Specific Plan for the Price Canyon Area that will result in a proposed project that will be evaluated in an Environmental Impact Report that will identify potential impacts to endangered and/or unique species. Continued public input through the planning process will help to ensure these concerns are addressed.

11. How do you square urban sprawl and the Godfrey property with leapfrog development?

How do you stop this development from dumping thousands of car trips a day on Vetter Lane and Old Oak Park?

Response: The Godfrey property is being planned for as part of a Specific Plan for the Price Canyon Area. Continued public participation in the planning process at the Specific Plan stage that expresses the citizens' desires will help shape the project. The Specific Plan and EIR should identify the circulation plan for the area and the impacts. Also, it should review alternatives.

12. If we know of all of these SOI barriers (water, urban sprawl, and preserving the existing rural setting) why advance this idea of a possible annexation by putting it into the SOI of Pismo?

Response: Adding Godfrey with conditions to the SOI would allow the City to continue with planning efforts to address the concerns expressed by LAFCO, other agencies and the public. The City and landowners are developing a Specific Plan for the Price Canyon Area and could propose a concurrent application SOI amendment and Annexation in the future. Having a joint application typically is more difficult to evaluate. By including the area in the SOI with conditions any future applications would allow the focus on the annexation piece. The memorandum of agreement also helps guide the process and implement good planning strategies. The MOA also brings the County to the table to talk about potential development and the process. Mitigation and conditions of approval assist in shaping a future annexation by ensuring a water supply meets LAFCO policies and prohibits the use of the Oak Park Aquifer, phasing development to prevent leapfrogging, and permanently preserves agriculture and open space lands.

13. What is wrong with the current 20ac parcel zoning?

Response: The City and developers are considering a Specific Plan for the Price Canyon Area that will meet the City's goals outlined in their General Plan. The area will continue to be under the County's jurisdiction and 20 acres zoning.

14. I am tired of hearing we will discuss the problems at annexation time! Pismo Beach has massive acreage in the properties of 3, 5, 6, and 7.

PB should develop these first.

Response: Many of the issues require detail analysis based on project specifics that will only be known at the annexation stage. The Sphere of Influence considers a broader view of where the City of Pismo Beach might grow. A Specific Plan is being considered by the City for the Price Canyon Area. The MOA and conditions of approval address developing closer to the existing City limits before the areas further inland. Continued public input through the planning process will help to ensure these concerns are addressed.

15. If one parcel was denied inclusion in the SOI because it would be considered leapfrog development - why is the Godfrey property being allowed in the Pismo SOI? It definitely is leapfrog development.

Response: The City and developers are considering a Specific Plan for the Price Canyon Area that includes the Godfrey property. The block of

properties that makes up the planning area should use the MOA to guide future planning efforts. The Spanish Spring North Ranch property was identified as being developed in the first phase and not requiring full City services. The Sphere of Influence considers a broader view of where the City of Pismo Beach might grow. As greater detail is developed a closer look at the development pattern, infrastructure, and service needs will be evaluated.