

DATE: 11/16/99 AGENDA ITEM # 15
() APPROVED () DENIED
() CONTINUED

TO: JAMES L. APP, CITY MANAGER
FROM: BOB LATA, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR *BL*
SUBJECT: CHANDLER RANCH ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS
DATE: NOVEMBER 16, 1999

Needs: For the City Council to provide staff with policy direction regarding the Chandler Ranch Environmental Review process.

- Facts:
1. The City of Paso Robles has a Council adopted procedure for the environmental review process under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). A copy has been distributed under separate cover.
 2. The environmental review process entails completion of an Initial Study Checklist. Through the completion of the Checklist, the City determines whether different aspects of a project should be categorized as one of the following:
 - a. Potentially Significant Impact
 - b. Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated
 - c. Less than Significant impact
 - d. No Impact
 3. Under Section 5.3 of the Council's adopted procedure for CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, City staff is responsible for preparing the Initial Study Checklist.
 4. The property owner of the 668 acres generally referred to as the Chandler Ranch is seeking a General Plan Amendment (and related entitlements) to change the permitted use of the 668 acres.
 - a. The current General Plan land use designation is for approximately 250 dwelling units.
 - b. The applicant is seeking a General Plan Amendment to replace the current 250 dwelling unit designation with the following entitlements:
 - 1226 dwelling units
 - 20 acres of Commercial Service
 - 5 acres of Industrial
 - 2 school sites

5. In May 1999, in response to the applicant's requests, the City circulated the Notice of Preparation (NOP) that is required by CEQA. In addition, an Initial Study was prepared and the City held a publicly noticed "Scoping Session" on June 22, 1999, to seek public comments on the scope of the environmental document. Copies of the NOP, Initial Study and the responses to the NOP are being distributed under separate cover.

6. At the time that the NOP was distributed, the applicant had requested that the City evaluate the project in terms of two project alternatives: 1706 dwelling units (plus 20 acres of commercial, 5 acres of industrial, and 2 school sites), and 1226 dwelling units (plus the same commercial, industrial and schools).

Since that time, the applicant has decided to eliminate the 1706 dwelling unit proposal and to focus on 1226 dwelling units (plus the 20 acres of commercial, 5 acres of industrial, and 2 school sites) as the current project description.

7. Consistent with the adopted procedures and the applicant's request, the City circulated a Request for Proposals (RFP) to eleven firms that are on the Council approved list of qualified environmental consultants.

8. The City received two (2) proposals from qualified firms. Both proposals needed further written clarification to insure that the consultants understood the scope of work called for in the RFP. At the same time, the consultants had to revise their scope of work to accommodate the applicant's request to delete the 1706 dwelling unit project alternative.

9. Revised proposals were received on November 4 and 5 and are now being reviewed for completeness. Selection of the consultant to prepare the EIR could occur within the next two weeks.

10. On November 2 the City received the attached letter from Dennis Schmidt of Central Coast Engineering, representing the Chandler Ranch property owner / applicant. Mr. Schmidt's letters requested the following:

a. For staff to arrange individual meetings with each of the Council members to listen to the applicant's comments on the Initial Study;

b. To set a "public hearing" on December 7, 1999.

11. On November 5, 1999, the City received the attached letter from Dennis Schmidt with copies of pages of the Initial Study with items crossed out. Attached for your reference are copies of the sections that were crossed out and which are unreadable in the copy received from Mr. Schmidt.

Analysis
and
Conclusion:

It is staff's understanding from his letter of November 5, 1999 and the attached pages from the initial study, that Mr. Schmidt is seeking a reconsideration of the conclusions of the Initial Study checklist, based on deletion of the 1706 dwelling unit option.

As staff has verbally communicated to the applicant's representative, the change in project description (eliminating the 1706 dwelling unit option in favor of 1226 dwelling units plus commercial, industrial and school sites) obviously changes the scope of the project to be analyzed in the EIR (i.e.: there would be relatively fewer autos, less sewage, etc.).

However, the change from 250 dwelling units to 1226 (about a five-fold increase in residential density) plus 20 acres of commercial, 5 acres of industrial and two school sites is still considered significant and does not change the conclusions of the environmental checklist or the matters to be considered. Hence, the scope of topics that would be studied in the EIR would not change.

Other related points of information and discussion:

1. Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the City is the lead agency for determining that the EIR is legally adequate.
2. To arbitrarily eliminate topics listed in the Initial Study Checklist would create openings for challenge to the adequacy of the EIR, potentially costing both the City and the applicant significant losses in terms of time and money (since an inadequate EIR would require further studies). It is safer to at least briefly discuss more topics rather than less topics. A copy of CEQA Guidelines Section 11063 is attached, which addresses the scope and purpose of an Initial Study.
3. As noted in the attached composite of what was crossed-out by Mr. Schmidt, none of the items that were crossed out of the Initial Study by Mr. Schmidt would appear to materially modify the scope of work to be performed by the EIR consultant (as a matter of fact, a number of the topics that are crossed out are conclusions of "less than significant impact" or "no impact").
4. Even if there were grounds to reconsider any of the conclusions of the Initial Study (which, in staff's assessment, there are not), to cause the consultants to revise their proposals for a second time / at this point in the process would further delay the beginning of work on the EIR and may not result in any material savings in terms of time and/or cost.
5. There are no requirement for a project related "public hearing" at this point in the process. Until the EIR is complete, and until the potential impacts and recommended mitigation measures are known, it would be premature to consider any project related approvals.

Policy

Reference: California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA); City Council's adopted procedures for processing under CEQA

Fiscal

Impact: None as a result of processing the property owner's applications

Options:

- a. That the City Council direct staff to proceed with processing of the Chandler Ranch EIR in a manner consistent with CEQA and the existing City Council policy for implementation of CEQA, and without the need to schedule individual meetings with Council members, and without the need for a public hearing on December 7, 1999.
- b. That the Council direct staff to modify the Initial Study Checklist and to seek a revision to the Scope of Work prepared by the two consulting firms before proceeding with evaluation of the two consultant proposals.
- c. Amend, modify or reject the foregoing options.

h:\bob\60\chandler\ cc re eir process 9b Nov 99



CENTRAL COAST
ENGINEERING

396 Buckley Road, Suite 1
San Luis Obispo
California 93401
(805) 544-3278
FAX (805) 541-3137

02 November 1999
E2309

RECEIVED

NOV '4 1999

City of Paso Robles
Community Development Dept.
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446
Attn: *Bob Lata*

Subject: *Chandler Ranch Master Plan*

Bob...

Based on our re-review of the *Chandler Ranch Master Plan* initial study/check list, the project proponent has requested of me to set up a series of meetings with you to discuss concerns about it's content . As you are aware, the guidelines state in the interest of reducing work and time, that one of the purposes of an initial study is to enable the applicant to modify the project before an EIR is prepared enabling it (the project) to reduce or eliminate potentially significant impacts. While the applicant does not believe the revised project (1226 units) can mitigate all impacts identified within the initial study/check list to less than significant levels (i.e. air quality), they do believe that the amended project does effect some areas that can reduce the scope of EIR review (i.e. wetland habitat, airport conflicts, noise, traffic/circulation, geologic problems, land use and planning, water, biological resources, public services, utility and service systems, cultural resources, aesthetics, and recreation).

As a head's up to you, the reason our request is for a series of meetings is to invite one member of the *City Council* to sit in and listen to our comments (so 5 meetings total), with the intent of having a public hearing on 07 December 1999 to have the *Council* give specific policy direction as how to proceed. With this in mind, please set meeting dates that are acceptable to you and each *Council* member individually. We will accommodate whatever schedules you can arrange. When complete, please contact me with meeting dates and times through writing. Thankx for your consideration with respect to this issue...

Dennis Schmidt
Dennis Schmidt 



**CENTRAL COAST
ENGINEERING**

396 Buckley Road, Suite 1
San Luis Obispo
California 93401
(805) 544-3278
FAX (805) 541-3137

**City of Paso Robles
Community Development Dept.
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93466
Attn: Bob Lata**

05 November 1999
E2309

RECEIVED

NOV 0 1999

Subject: Chandler Ranch Master Plan Initial Study

Bob...

Enclosed is a complete list of initial study issues that we feel should be reconsidered by staff. I am sure many of the items we can agree on, and others we will not. In the interest of expediency, please go through these items and determine which that are mitigable based on the amended project and text for 1226 units dated 15 June 1999, available information and previous determinations made by the City. Below is a partial list of documents that I have read for my review.

- 1990 Land Use and Circulation Elements Update Draft EIR.
- Final EIR for the Borkey Area Specific Plan.
- Final EIR for the HuerHuero Creek.
- Land Use and Circulation Element.
- Zoning Code.
- Initial Study and Negative Declaration for Barney Schwartz Park.
- Paso Robles School District Long Range Facility Master Plan.
- December 1995 Environmental Site Assessment Report for the Chandler Ranch.
- December 1995 Prel. Geotechnical Engineering Report for the Chandler Ranch.
- 1989 Chandler Ranch Specific Plan Initial Study by API and the Morro Group.
- 1977 Airport Land Use Plan.
- 1989 Draft Airport Land Use Plan.
- Department of Agriculture Soil Survey.
- Subsequent FEIR for the Cuesta College North Campus.
- Initial Study and Negative Declaration for Dwelling Unit Density Calculation.
- August 1993 City Sewer System Master Plan.
- April 1995 Update City Water Master Plan.

As a general note, we are requesting that the existing project site density be changed from 250 to 308 units based on the following:

The property consists of 672.9 acres, 50.3 acres of RSF-2 and 622.6 acres of RS:1 unit/3 acres. With this information and the amended project description, overall change is 918 versus the 1457 units. We consider this a substantial reduction in population increase from the "approximate 11%" identified in the initial study and check list to 7%.

$$\begin{aligned} 3934 \text{ persons} / 1707 \text{ units} - 250 \text{ units} &= 2.7 \text{ persons per unit} \\ 2.7 \text{ persons per unit} \times 1226 \text{ units} - 308 \text{ units} &= 2479 \text{ persons} \end{aligned}$$

In closing, please re-review the project initial study and find where we can agree/disagree so when we meet for our scheduled meetings throughout this month we can be more efficient with our and Council members time. At this time I have chosen not to address the mandatory findings portion of the check list because changes will occur on what we agree upon. Our interest is only fairness. Thankx for your consideration with respect to this issue...



Dennis Schmidt

NOV 8 1999

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the Proposal:

- a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?

Discussion: The current maximum residential density for the 661 acre property is estimated at 250 dwelling units. The applicant is requesting entitlement to develop approximately 1,707 dwelling units (single and multiple family, and mobile homes), plus 20 acres of Commercial Service uses and 5 acres of Manufacturing. The request being made for additional residential density represents a significant increase in entitlements for the project site, exceeding population and service projections contained in the City's General Plan.

- b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?

Discussion: The Airport Land Use Plan and the adjacency of the project to warrant analysis of potential conflict with agency documents.

- c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?

Discussion: The adjacency of the project to the County land to the east that is in active agricultural production would warrant analysis on land use compatibility and appropriate provision of buffers. The low density single family properties to the west should also be reviewed for adequacy of buffering when adjacent to high density residential and commercial uses.

- d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible uses)?

Discussion: The property has been historically used for dry farming and the majority of the site is designated with a Residential Agriculture zoning/land use designation. The large parcel ownership pattern, its historic farming past, and the significant amount of 0-30% slope areas that are composed of loam variety soils conducive for agricultural, would raise the issue with regard to conversion of viable agricultural land. In addition to issues associated with conversion of agricultural land, the adjacent property (previously held under the same ownership of this portion of the ranch) is currently is active grape production. The impact of this project on active adjacent agricultural operations needs to be assessed.

~~Discussion: The project would be in compliance with the City's General Plan...~~

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

- a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

Discussion: The City's General Plan policies for population growth through 2010 include a 35,000 build-out population. The addition of 3,934 new residents (an approximate 11 percent increase from projected population build-out) is a potentially significant impact to the City's infrastructure and service capabilities. There is a need to quantify the impacts of such a density increase and determine whether there are acceptable mitigation measures to be incorporated in the project, or appropriate alternatives.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?

Discussion: Current infrastructure master planning is tied to the 35,000 population build out outlined in the City's General Plan. The additional infrastructure needs generated by this project need to be identified and their potential for growth inducing impacts analyzed as part of a environmental document.

~~Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?~~

~~Discussion: Current infrastructure master planning is tied to the 35,000 population build out outlined in the City's General Plan. The additional infrastructure needs generated by this project need to be identified and their potential for growth inducing impacts analyzed as part of a environmental document.~~

III. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

~~a) Earthquake?~~

~~Discussion: This portion of San Luis Obispo County (generally the Pismo Beach area) is located at the far south end of the San Luis Obispo County. There are two known fault zones on either side of this valley. The San Marcos Fault runs along the west side of the valley. The San Andreas Fault is on the east side of the valley. The San Marcos Fault is a normal fault and the San Andreas Fault is a strike-slip fault. The San Marcos Fault is a normal fault and the San Andreas Fault is a strike-slip fault. The San Marcos Fault is a normal fault and the San Andreas Fault is a strike-slip fault.~~

~~b) Seismic ground shaking?~~

~~Discussion: Seismic ground shaking is a potential hazard to property to seismic hazards is not considered significant.~~

~~c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?~~

~~Discussion: The City's General Plan contains a public utility that would be used to provide water to the project site. The project site is located in an area that is not considered to be a high seismic hazard area. The project site is located in an area that is not considered to be a high seismic hazard area.~~

~~d) Seismic surface faulting?~~

~~Discussion: The project site is located in an area that is not considered to be a high seismic hazard area. The project site is located in an area that is not considered to be a high seismic hazard area.~~

e) Landslides or Mud flows?

Discussion: The topography of the project site is characterized by rolling terrain and slopes that vary from 0-4% to excess of 25%. High density development should be appropriately located on the project site to avoid significant grading and disturbance of hillside terrain. Where development is proposed on steeper slopes, these impacts will need to be incorporated into the environmental analysis for the project. However insufficient information exists at this time to determine the extend of impacts.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?

Discussion: See the discussion in Section III(e). Where development is proposed on steeper slopes, these impacts will need to be incorporated into the environmental analysis for the project. However, insufficient information exists at this time to determine the extend of impacts.

- g) Subsidence of the land?

Discussion: See the discussion in Sections III (e) (f) and (g) above

- h) Expansive soils?

Discussion: See the discussion in Sections III (e) (f) and (g) above.

- i) Unique geologic or physical features?

Discussion: See the discussion in Sections III (e) through (h) above. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

IV. WATER. Would the proposal result in:

- a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?

Discussion: The property is currently vacant. An increase in dwelling unit development of approximate 1,707 units, along with 20 acres of commercial, 5 acres of industrial and two school sites will significantly increase the historic drainage flows associated with this site. No preliminary grading and drainage plan, or drainage calculations have been provided. A full drainage analysis, including identification of on site detention basins needs to be provided.

- b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?

Discussion: It appears that portions of the property adjacent tot he Huerhuero Creek are located in 100 year flood areas, although these areas are not designated on the conceptual plan. The potential impacts of flooding and drainage patterns in steep terrain areas needs to be fully addressed.

- c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity)?

Discussion: The physical site construction will increase impervious surfaces on the site and thus increase storm water runoff as discussed in Item IV(a). Impacts to the Huerhuero and ultimately the Salinas need to be appropriately analyzed in an environmental document..

- d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?

Discussion: It is unknown at this time the quantity of water to be discharged from the site and where it will flow to.

- e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movement?

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

Discussion: Runoff from the site, through a series of smaller drainage channels, end up in larger waterways. Impacts to the Huerhuero Creek are unknown at this time and should be reviewed further. Portions of the site also ultimately drain to the Salinas River, and impacts to that water source should also be reviewed

- f) Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability?

Discussion: The domestic water needs of the project are tied to the proposed increase in density. Full analysis of water resource impacts needs to be addressed with this environmental document.

- g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?

Discussion: Impacts are unknown at this time.

- h) Impacts to groundwater quality?

Discussion: The project is expected to proposed connection to City sewer. However, the adequacy of existing capacity of the treatment plant and capacity of service lines to the plant are unknown at this time. Should the applicant alter their application proposal to involve requests for use of private sewage disposal, there could potentially be impacts associated with cumulative systems. Until severing issues are resolved, impacts to water quality remain unknown.

- i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?

Discussion: See the discussion in Section IV (f) above. Impacts are unknown and need to be quantified for the project.

V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

- a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 10)

Discussion: The San Luis Obispo County area is a non-attainment area for the State standards for ozone and suspended particulate matter. The SLO County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) administers a permit system to ensure that stationary sources do not collectively create emissions which would cause local and state standards to be exceeded. The potential for future project development to create adverse air quality impacts falls generally into two categories: Short term and Long term impacts.

Short term impacts are associated with the grading and development portion of a project where earth work generates dust, but the impact ends when construction is complete. Long term impacts are related to the ongoing operational characteristics of a project and are generally related to vehicular trip generation and the level of offensiveness of the onsite activity being developed.

Impacts to both short and long term air quality impacts need to be properly assessed for this project.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?

Discussion: The increase of residential density in the near vicinity of the County land in active agricultural operations needs to be reviewed for adequacy of buffers to minimize conflict with ag operations, and avoid exposure hazards to the general population.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

d) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:

- a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?

Discussion: The increase in residential density, introduction of additional industrially zoned land, new commercial land, and the two new school sites is expected to significantly increase vehicle trips. Street circulation needs to accommodate the proposed project density and the interface with the existing Circulation Element of the General Plan, including the alignment and phasing of Airport Road must be adequately addressed.

- b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Discussion: Street alignments must be reviewed in conjunction with a traffic study for the site.

- c) Inadequate emergency access or inadequate access to nearby uses?

Discussion: Adequacy of access for Emergency Services Department must be reviewed in conjunction with a traffic and circulation study for the project. The project description includes reference to high density senior housing. Such uses can create higher use demand on emergency services and should be appropriately addressed.

- d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?

Discussion: The design of interior street sections and ability to provide on street parking within the project area is unknown at this time based on the level of information currently available for the project. Adequacy of parking for residential, commercial, schools and recreational uses needs to be appropriately analyzed.

SUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?

Discussion: No interior (class I) pedestrian or bikeway systems are shown within the concept plan. Given the density of the project, and the location of key sites such as schools and senior living, would warrant a review of the need and ability to adequately provide for pedestrians and bicyclists.

- f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

Discussion: Alternative transportation needs are not addressed within the conceptual plan. Proposed senior living and school site locations increase the probable need and appropriateness of alternative transportation needs. These needs should be projected and alternatives for meeting those needs addressed within a circulation analysis document.

- g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?

Discussion: Ability to impact rail or waterborne traffic is considered less than significant. However, portions of the project are located within airport traffic impact areas. The appropriateness of locating concentrations of higher density residential (e.g. senior housing and apartments) in areas expected to be exposed to higher levels of noise and related airport impacts needs to be evaluated.

VII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in impacts to:

- a) Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to: plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?

Discussion: The 661 acres proposed for development has been the subject of previous development proposals and master planning. In conjunction with those past planning efforts, biological studies were conducted. The existence of kit fox (an endangered species) was identified in two independent biological studies. The existence of kit fox and/or other endangered species and/or habitat impacts are a significant environmental concern which must be appropriately documented with this proposal.

- b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)?

Discussion: There are a significant number of oak trees and woodland across this site. The conceptual level of information provided at this time does not allow for individual or cumulative assessment of impacts on oak trees. Although the project description states a desire to maximize preservation of oak trees, the concentration of development density in steep topography and oak wooded areas would indicate a likelihood of significant impacts to trees. Proper identification of oak tree inventory and the impacts of the project on these trees needs to be further provided in an environmental document.

- c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?

Discussion: The two primary vegetation communities on the site appear to be oak woodland and valley grassland. There is a small portion of the site (northwest corner near Golden Hill Road) where there is an aging almond orchard. The City of Paso Robles has adopted stringent oak tree protection policies within its Municipal Code, requiring extensive preservation measures to occur and removal only upon approval by City Council. As discussed in Section VII(b), the impacts of this project on oak trees needs to be further documented.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?

Discussion: No marsh, riparian or vernal pool habitat characteristics have been identified by the applicant. However, their existence on the site has not been ruled out through even a preliminary biological assessment. The presence or non presence of these habitat features should be identified within a biological assessment for the 661 acres in conjunction with other biological impact studies.

- e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?

Discussion: The oak woodlands and arroyos within this project site eventually connect through to the Huerhuero River to the north. Such areas characteristically can serve as movement corridors for animals. As discussed in Section VII(a), the presence of kit fox (among other wildlife) has been identified on this site. The function this property serves in the context of wildlife habitat needs to be further assessed.

VII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

~~Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?~~

~~Discussion: The proposed development is not a mining or mineral extraction project. It is a residential development and does not require the extraction of any mineral resources.~~

~~Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?~~

~~Discussion: A resource development project involving the extraction of a mineral resource is not proposed. The project is a residential development and does not require the extraction of any mineral resources.~~

~~Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?~~

~~Discussion: There are no known mineral resources associated with this site that would be compromised as a result of this proposal. No impacts are anticipated.~~

VIII. HAZARDS. Would the proposal:

~~a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to, petroleum products) that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?~~

~~Discussion: This project, as described, in and of itself would not have the potential to release or create hazardous substance concerns. Any future commercial and industrial development would be subject to adopted operational performance standards and projects would be reviewed in the future for potential impacts. As such, subject to standard operational mitigation measures, no hazardous exposure is anticipated from this project. (However, it should be noted that as discussed in Sections I(c) (Land Use) and V(b) (Air Quality) that the impacts associated with adjacent agricultural operations to the east need to be appropriately assessed).~~

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Discussion: Because the project has only been described at a very conceptual level at this time, it is not possible to determine if all future street connections and proposed street sections would conflict with required local and state standards. However, at this time since specific exceptions to standards are not requested (reduced street widths, extended lengths of cul-de-sacs, etc.) it is assumed the project could be designed to conform with those adopted code requirements. As such, impacts are considered less than significant at this time. However, if further refinement of the project indicates deviation from standards, this assessment could change.

- c) The creation of any health hazard or potential hazards?

Discussion: As discussed in Items IX (a) and (b), above, health or other hazards are anticipated to be less than significant and/or mitigatable as the project is currently described.

- d) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?

Discussion: With an increase in development concentration to this area, an increase to fire service needs would be anticipated and fire suppression mitigation measures would have to be put in place to adequately offset those impacts. As discussed in Section IX(b), it is assumed the project will be able to meet all necessary Fire standards to offset impacts and would therefore generate less than significant impacts. However, if further refinement of the project indicates deviation from standards, this assessment could change.

X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

- a) Increases in existing noise levels?

Discussion: The Paso Robles Municipal Airport is located approximately 4.5 miles to the northeast of the Chandler Ranch project area. The proximity to active and expanding airport operations poses the most significant concerns about noise for the project area. The northwestern portion of the 661 acre site is located within identified airport impact areas. These impact areas are also proposed for some of the higher concentrations of the residential development. Projected impacts of noise from future airport operations need to be adequately assessed.

- b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?

Discussion: See the discussion within Section X(a), above.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:

- ~~a) Fire protection?~~

~~Discussion: The fire suppression services are provided by the Paso Robles Fire Department. The fire department provides fire suppression services within the physical boundaries of the project. At this time, it is assumed the physical design of the project can be mitigated through standard~~

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

measures, but as the project description is refined, this assessment could change. However, there are independent needs assessment related to fire service threshold capabilities associated with the increased population from this project. As discussed in Section I (Land Use), the City's current infrastructure master planning is tied to the 35,000 population build out outlined in the City's General Plan. The additional service needs generated by this project need to be identified and appropriate mitigation measures and project alternatives for off-setting those impacts identified.

- b) Police Protection?

Discussion: As discussed in Section in Section XI(a), above, the City's current infrastructure master planning is tied to the 35,000 population build out outlined in the City's General Plan. The additional police service needs generated by this project must be identified and appropriate mitigation measures and project alternatives for off-setting those impacts identified.

- c) Schools?

Discussion: Tied to the proposed increase in residential population, as noted above in this section, school impacts would need to be identified and the adequacy of the two school sites proposed in the plan area should be properly assessed as to their ability to off-set the identified project needs/impacts.

- d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?

Discussion: The applicant's project description does not specifically indicate at this time the phasing of improvements and whether there will be any private development features in need of maintenance, or new public facilities with maintenance demands. Until service and infrastructure needs are quantified for the project, and consequent service responsibilities identified, the maintenance impacts for the project are unknown.

- e) Other governmental services?

Discussion: See discussion in items XI(a) through (d). Impacts to governmental services are expected to occur commensurate with the increased project population in excess of the City's planned population build-out. These impacts need to be properly identified and mitigation measure alternatives identified, including project phasing, inherent design off-sets, and potential payment of area-specific development impact fees.

~~THE PROJECT IMPACTS AND SERVICE SYSTEMS WILL BE~~

~~assessed and compared for service systems or utilities or~~
~~identified to determine the following:~~

- ~~a) Power or natural gas?~~

~~Discussion: The Pacific Bell Company provides service to the Base Station and County area. The project is not~~
~~anticipated to interfere with phone/communication services.~~

- ~~b) Communication systems?~~

~~Discussion: The Pacific Bell Company provides service to the Base Station and County area. The project is not~~
~~anticipated to interfere with phone/communication services.~~

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?

Discussion: The conceptual master plan indicates a 1 acre water tank site along the eastern project frontage. As previously discussed in Section XI (Services) the City's current infrastructure master planning is tied to the 35,000 population build out outlined in the City's General Plan. The additional service needs generated by this project need to be identified and appropriate mitigation measures and project alternatives for off-setting those impacts identified. It is unknown at this time whether the proposed tank site is needed and/or adequate for the project.

- d) Sewer or septic tanks?

Discussion: It is anticipated that the project will propose to connect to the City's sewer system. As discussed, above, the City's current infrastructure master planning is tied to the 35,000 population build out outlined in the City's General Plan. The additional service needs generated by this project need to be identified and appropriate mitigation measures and project alternatives for off-setting those impacts identified. If private septic systems become part of a refined project description in the future, the potential impacts to water quality would need to be appropriately identified.

- e) Storm water drainage?

Discussion: The quantities of storm water discharge and proposed methods for its discharge are unknown at this time. The intensification of development will surely increase historic flows. Preliminary analysis must demonstrate the potential impacts associated with the levels of development and site disturbance proposed, and mitigation measures identified.

- f) Solid waste disposal?

Discussion: The City's land fill is located on the north side of Highway 46, east of Airport Road. As with aforementioned service threshold issues, the potential for impact to the City's land fill should be analyzed, as it relates to proportional population build-out figures.

- g) Local or regional water supplies?

Discussion: As discussion in Section XII(c), the City's current infrastructure master planning is tied to the 35,000 population build out outlined in the City's General Plan. The additional service needs generated by this project need to be identified and appropriate mitigation measures and project alternatives for off-setting those impacts identified.

XIII AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

- a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?

Discussion: The project is not located on a highway, but is bordered by two arterial roads on its eastern and western borders (the Airport Road extension has been dedicated at the east and Golden Hill Road is existing at the west). The oak scattered terrain is visible from Highway 46 East, Union Road, Golden Hill Road, and Linne Roads. The extent of project grading, massing of buildings/development, and visibility from prominent City streets is not known at this time, based on the preliminary nature of the project description. At this time, aesthetic impact to these streets is identified as potentially significant. However, as the project description and master plan concept is refined, this assessment may change.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

- b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?

Discussion: See the discussion in Item XIII (a), above. The potential for aesthetic impacts are not clearly addressed in the current level of project information and remain an potentially significant impact until further demonstration to the contrary is provided (grading/landscaping and development approach defined and represented).

~~c) Create light glare?~~

~~Discussion: The location of the project in airport impact areas will necessitate measures to minimize the use of architectural materials and/or lighting that would increase light and glare from the site. Further, the City has development policies in place that require projects to minimize off-site glare. Therefore, consistent with the City's standard conditions of new construction, the project will be required to have all its lighting fully shielded (down lighting on buildings, fixtures, and unshielded or directly visible light sources). Light and glare are expected to be less than significant impacts (unless identified to the contrary through Airport land use compatibility analysis, which is recommended to be conducted in other portions of this environmental assessment).~~

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

~~a)~~

Discussion: No known paleontological resources exist in this area.

- b) Disturb archaeological resources?

Discussion: The Paso Robles area has been classified as territory occupied by the Migueleno Salinan and the Obispeno Chumash Native California populations. Past community populations have been evidenced at several sites within the Paso Robles area and unincorporated portions of the surrounding County. During past site planning efforts there was preliminary archaeological reconnaissance conducted for the full site. That effort resulted in the identification of a single prehistoric artifact at the northwestern corner of the site that was described as an "isolated" piece. The past archaeological findings for the site should be reviewed by a qualified archaeologist to determine the appropriateness of that conclusion. If an independent archaeologist determines no additional study of the site is necessary, impacts to archaeological resources would be considered less than significant. However, if the study is deemed insufficient to determine potential effects of the current project, a new archaeological study must be conducted.

~~c) Affect historical resources?~~

Discussion: The site has been historically used for agricultural, dry farming, purposes. While there are several buildings existing as the historic "ranch house" for the Chandler Ranch, the ranch house is not a part of this development proposal and would not appear impacted by the proposed project.

- d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?

Discussion: As noted in Item XIV (b), impacts are not fully known at this time.

- e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Discussion: As discussed in Item XIV (b) and (d), impacts are not fully known at this time.

XV. RECREATION. Would the proposal:

- a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?

Discussion: This proposal represents a significant increase in the number of residential dwelling units currently planned for within the City's General Plan build-out of 35,000. The proposed approximate 1,707 dwelling units would amount to approximately 3,934 new residents, or about an 11 percent increase in the City's General Plan population. The project description and conceptual master plan for this 661 acre area do not propose any parks or open space. Two school sites are shown, but would not be considered parks. Barney Schwartz Regional Park is proposed for development directly abutting the project to the north. However, Barney Schwartz is a planned for meeting the local and regional needs at current population levels, and not necessarily an additional 3,934 resident population directly on its borders. The proposal for apartments and senior living generate their own recreational needs that should be appropriately addressed within a recreational needs study and mitigation measures and/or project alternatives identified.

- b) Affect existing recreational opportunities?

Discussion: As noted in Section XV(a), above, the adjacent Barney Schwartz regional park is serving a current and projected local and regional need based on General Plan population build-out, and not necessarily designed for the anticipated additional population impact associated with this proposed project. As the closest public park, it would be expected that Barney Schwartz would be impacted by an increased concentration of residential density. Within the aforementioned recreational needs study, the project impacts on existing recreational facilities should be addressed.

XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Discussion: Based on the discussions within preceding sections of this document, there exists the potential for impacts to the natural environment. Additional information and documentation as previously described is necessary in order to determine what level of impact and what mitigation measures may or may not be available for the project.

- b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?

Discussion: Based on the discussions within this document, there is not information known about the project at this time to make the determination that there would not be significant long term impacts.

Chandler Ranch Initial Study

Copies of Pages With Areas Crossed Out

By Applicant's Representative

(topics that the applicant wants deleted from the scope of
the Environmental Impact Report)

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the Proposal:

- a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning?

Discussion: The current maximum residential density for the 661 acre property is estimated at 250 dwelling units. The applicant is requesting entitlement to develop approximately 1,707 dwelling units (single and multiple family, and mobile homes), plus 20 acres of Commercial Service uses and 5 acres of Manufacturing. The request being made for additional residential density represents a significant increase in entitlements for the project site, exceeding population and service projections contained in the City's General Plan.

- b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?

Discussion: The Airport Land Use Plan and the adjacency of the project to warrant analysis of potential conflict with agency documents.

- c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?

Discussion: The adjacency of the project to the County land to the east that is in active agricultural production would warrant analysis on land use compatibility and appropriate provision of buffers. The low density single family properties to the west should also be reviewed for adequacy of buffering when adjacent to high density residential and commercial uses.

- d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible uses)?

Discussion: The property has been historically used for dry farming and the majority of the site is designated with a Residential Agriculture zoning/land use designation. The large parcel ownership pattern, its historic farming past, and the significant amount of 0-30% slope areas that are composed of loam variety soils conducive for agricultural, would raise the issue with regard to conversion of viable agricultural land. In addition to issues associated with conversion of agricultural land, the adjacent property (previously held under the same ownership of this portion of the ranch) is currently is active grape production. The impact of this project on active adjacent agricultural operations needs to be assessed.

- e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?

Discussion: Not anticipated as an issue.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

- a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?

Discussion: The City's General Plan policies for population growth through 2010 include a 35,000 build-out population. The addition of 3,934 new residents (an approximate 11 percent increase from projected population build-out) is a potentially significant impact to the City's infrastructure and service capabilities. There is a need to quantify the impacts of such a density increase and determine whether there are acceptable mitigation measures to be incorporated in the project, or appropriate alternatives.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?

Discussion: Current infrastructure master planning is tied to the 35,000 population build out outlined in the City's General Plan. The additional infrastructure needs generated by this project need to be identified and their potential for growth inducing impacts analyzed as part of an environmental document.

- c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?

Discussion: No housing will be displaced as a result of this project.

III. GEOLOGIC PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

- a) Fault rupture?

Discussion: This portion of San Luis Obispo County (generally the Paso Robles area) is located at the far southerly end of the Salinas Valley which also extends up into Monterey County. There are two known fault zones on either side of this valley. The San Marco-Rinconada Fault system runs on the west side of the valley. The San Andreas Fault is on the east side of the valley and runs through the community of Parkfield east of Paso Robles. The City of Paso Robles recognizes these geologic influences in the application of the Uniform Building Code to all new development within the City. No unusual factors are expected to be present for this project area.

- b) Seismic ground shaking?

Discussion: See the response to Section III(a). Based on that response, the potential for exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards is not considered significant.

- c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?

Discussion: The City's General Plan contains public safety policies that would require special attention to projects with potential for liquefaction. Also, see the response to Section III(a). Based on the above discussion, the potential for exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards, including liquefaction is not considered significant.

- d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?

Discussion: The project site is not located in an area identified at risk for seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazards.

- e) Landslides or Mud flows?

Discussion: The topography of the project site is characterized by rolling terrain and slopes that vary from 0-4% to excess of 25%. High density development should be appropriately located on the project site to avoid significant grading and disturbance of hillside terrain. Where development is proposed on steeper slopes, these impacts will need to be incorporated into the environmental analysis for the project. However insufficient information exists at this time to determine the extend of impacts.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?

Discussion: The increase of residential density in the near vicinity of the County land in active agricultural operations needs to be reviewed for adequacy of buffers to minimize conflict with ag operations, and avoid exposure hazards to the general population.

c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature?

Discussion: Impacts to air movement, moisture or temperature are not anticipated to be significant.

d) Create objectionable odors?

Discussion: The proposed uses within the commercial and industrial zones are unknown at this time. However, the City has operational performance standards in place for such operations and uses would be individually reviewed at the time they were proposed for potential air quality impact and appropriate mitigation measures relating to odor.

VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:

a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?

Discussion: The increase in residential density, introduction of additional industrially zoned land, new commercial land, and the two new school sites is expected to significantly increase vehicle trips. Street circulation needs to accommodate the proposed project density and the interface with the existing Circulation Element of the General Plan, including the alignment and phasing of Airport Road must be adequately addressed.

b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Discussion: Street alignments must be reviewed in conjunction with a traffic study for the site.

c) Inadequate emergency access or inadequate access to nearby uses?

Discussion: Adequacy of access for Emergency Services Department must be reviewed in conjunction with a traffic and circulation study for the project. The project description includes reference to high density senior housing. Such uses can create higher use demand on emergency services and should be appropriately addressed.

d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?

Discussion: The design of interior street sections and ability to provide on street parking within the project area is unknown at this time based on the level of information currently available for the project. Adequacy of parking for residential, commercial, schools and recreational uses needs to be appropriately analyzed.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?

Discussion: No marsh, riparian or vernal pool habitat characteristics have been identified by the applicant. However, their existence on the site has not been ruled out through even a preliminary biological assessment. The presence or non presence of these habitat features should be identified within a biological assessment for the 661 acres in conjunction with other biological impact studies.

- e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?

Discussion: The oak woodlands and arroyos within this project site eventually connect through to the Huerhuero River to the north. Such areas characteristically can serve as movement corridors for animals. As discussed in Section VII(a), the presence of kit fox (among other wildlife) has been identified on this site. The function this property serves in the context of wildlife habitat needs to be further assessed.

VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?

Discussion: The proposal is consistent with the City's Mineral and Energy Resource Conservation policies in as much as it does not jeopardize the conflict with any efforts for water and mineral resource extraction in the area.

- b) Use non-renewable resource in a wasteful and inefficient manner?

Discussion: Any new development occurring within this project area would be subject to all Uniform Building Code standards and energy conservation standards required by that code.

- c) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?

Discussion: There are no know mineral resources associated with this site that would be compromised as a result of this proposal. No impacts are anticipated.

IX. HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve:

- a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?

Discussion: This project, as described, in and of itself would not have the potential to release or create hazardous substance concerns. Any future commercial and industrial development would be subject to adopted operational performance standards and projects would be reviewed independently in the future for potential impacts. As such, subject to standard operational mitigation measures, no hazardous exposure is anticipated from this project. (However, it should be noted that as discussed in Sections I(c) (Land Use) and V(b) (Air Quality) that the impacts associated with adjacent agricultural operations to the east need to be appropriately assessed).

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

Discussion: Because the project has only been described at a very conceptual level at this time, it is not possible to determine if all future street connections and proposed street sections would conflict or not with required local and state standards. However, at this time, since specific exceptions to standards are not requested (reduced street widths, extended lengths of cul-de-sacs, etc..) it is assumed the project could be designed to conform with those adopted code requirements. As such, impacts are considered less than significant at this time. However, if further refinement of the project indicates deviation from standards, this assessment could change.

- c) The creation of any health hazard or potential hazards?

Discussion: As discussed in Items IX (a) and (b), above, health or other hazards are anticipated to be less than significant and/or mitigatable as the project is currently described.

- d) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?

Discussion: With an increase in development concentration to this area, an increase to fire service needs would be anticipated, and fire suppression mitigation measures would have to be put in place to adequately off set those impacts. As discussed in Section IX(b), it is assumed the project will be able to meet all necessary Fire standards to off set impacts and would therefore generate less than significant impacts. However, if further refinement of the project indicates deviation from standards, this assessment could change.

X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

- a) Increases in existing noise levels?

Discussion: The Paso Robles Municipal Airport is located approximately 4.5 miles to the northeast of the Chandler Ranch project area. The proximity to active and expanding airport operations poses the most significant concerns about noise for the project area. The northwestern portion of the 661 acre site is located within identified airport impact areas. These impact areas are also proposed for some of the higher concentrations of the residential development. Projected impacts of noise from future airport operations need to be adequately assessed.

- b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?

Discussion: See the discussion within Section X(a), above.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect upon, or result in a need for new or altered government services in any of the following areas:

- a) Fire protection?

Discussion: All fire suppression measures would be subject to approval by the Fire Chief. See the discussion within Section IX(b & d) regarding the need to provide for adequate emergency service impact mitigation within the physical design of the project. At this time, it is assumed the physical design of the project can be mitigated through standard

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

measures, but as the project description is refined, this assessment could change. However, there are independent needs assessment related to fire service threshold capabilities associated with the increased population from this project. As discussed in Section I (Land Use), the City's current infrastructure master planning is tied to the 35,000 population build out outlined in the City's General Plan. The additional service needs generated by this project need to be identified and appropriate mitigation measures and project alternatives for off-setting those impacts identified.

- b) Police Protection?

Discussion: As discussed in Section in Section XI(a), above, the City's current infrastructure master planning is tied to the 35,000 population build out outlined in the City's General Plan. The additional police service needs generated by this project must be identified and appropriate mitigation measures and project alternatives for off-setting those impacts identified.

- c) Schools?

Discussion: Tied to the proposed increase in residential population, as noted above in this section, school impacts would need to be identified and the adequacy of the two school sites proposed in the plan area should be properly assessed as to their ability to off-set the identified project needs/impacts.

- d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?

Discussion: The applicant's project description does not specifically indicate at this time the phasing of improvements and whether there will be any private development features in need of maintenance, or new public facilities with maintenance demands. Until service and infrastructure needs are quantified for the project, and consequent service responsibilities identified, the maintenance impacts for the project are unknown.

- e) Other governmental services?

Discussion: See discussion in items XI(a) through (d). Impacts to governmental services are expected to occur commensurate with the increased project population in excess of the City's planned population build-out. These impacts need to be properly identified and mitigation measure alternatives identified, including project phasing, inherent design off-sets, and potential payment of area-specific development impact fees.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

- a) Power or natural gas?

Discussion: Southern California Gas Company provides service to the Paso Robles area. The project is not anticipated to interfere with gas services or create an unmet demand.

- b) Communication systems?

Discussion: The Pacific Bell Company provides service to the Paso Robles and County areas. The project is not anticipated to interfere with phone/communication services.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

- b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?

Discussion: See the discussion in Item XIII (a), above. The potential for aesthetic impacts are not clearly addressed in the current level of project information and remain an potentially significant impact until further demonstration to the contrary is provided (grading/landscaping and development approach defined and represented).

- c) Create light or glare?

Discussion: The location of the project in airport impact areas will necessitate measures to minimize the use of architectural materials and/or lighting that would increase light and glare from the site. Further, the City has development policies in place that require projects to minimize off-site glare. Therefore, consistent with the City's standard conditions of new construction, the project would be required to have all its lighting fully shielded (down lighting on buildings, fixtures, and no exposed or directly visible light sources). As such, light and glare are expected to be less than significant impacts (unless identified to the contrary through Airport land use compatibility analysis recommended to be conducted in other portions of this environmental assessment).

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- a) Disturb paleontological resources?

Discussion: No known paleontological resources exist in this area.

- b) Disturb archaeological resources?

Discussion: The Paso Robles area has been classified as territory occupied by the Migueleno Salinan and the Obispeno Chumash Native California populations. Past community populations have been evidenced at several sites within the Paso Robles area and unincorporated portions of the surrounding County. During past site planning efforts there was preliminary archaeological reconnaissance conducted for the full site. That effort resulted in the identification of a single prehistoric artifact at the northwestern corner of the site that was described as an "isolated" piece. The past archaeological findings for the site should be reviewed by a qualified archaeologist to determine the appropriateness of that conclusion. If an independent archaeologist determines no additional study of the site is necessary, impacts to archaeological resources would be considered less than significant. However, if the study is deemed insufficient to determine potential effects of the current project, a new archaeological study must be conducted.

- c) Affect historical resources?

Discussion: The site has been historically used for agricultural, dry farming, purposes. While there are several buildings existing as the historic "ranch house" for the Chandler Ranch, the ranch house is not a part of this development proposal and would not appear impacted by the proposed project.

- d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?

Discussion: As noted in Item XIV (b), impacts are not fully known at this time.

- e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	-----------

Discussion: As discussed in Item XIV (b) and (d), impacts are not fully known at this time.

XV. RECREATION. Would the proposal:

- a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?

Discussion: This proposal represents a significant increase in the number of residential dwelling units currently planned for within the City's General Plan build-out of 35,000. The proposed approximate 1,707 dwelling units would amount to approximately 3,934 new residents, or about an 11 percent increase in the City's General Plan population. The project description and conceptual master plan for this 661 acre area do not propose any parks or open space. Two school sites are shown, but would not be considered parks. Barney Schwartz Regional Park is proposed for development directly abutting the project to the north. However, Barney Schwartz is a planned for meeting the local and regional needs at current population levels, and not necessarily an additional 3,934 resident population directly on its borders. The proposal for apartments and senior living generate their own recreational needs that should be appropriately addressed within a recreational needs study and mitigation measures and/or project alternatives identified.

- b) Affect existing recreational opportunities?

Discussion: As noted in Section XV(a), above, the adjacent Barney Schwartz regional park is serving a current and projected local and regional need based on General Plan population build-out, and not necessarily designed for the anticipated additional population impact associated with this proposed project. As the closest public park, it would be expected that Barney Schwartz would be impacted by an increased concentration of residential density. Within the aforementioned recreational needs study, the project impacts on existing recreational facilities should be addressed.

XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Discussion: Based on the discussions within preceding sections of this document, there exists the potential for impacts to the natural environment. Additional information and documentation as previously described is necessary in order to determine what level of impact and what mitigation measures may or may not be available for the project.

- b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals?

Discussion: Based on the discussions within this document, there is not information known about the project at this time to make the determination that there would not be significant long term impacts.

15063. Initial Study.

(a) Following preliminary review, the lead agency shall conduct an initial study to determine if the project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency can determine that an EIR will clearly be required for the project, an initial study is not required but may still be desirable.

(1) All phases of project planning, implementation, and operation must be considered in the initial study of the project.

To meet the requirements of this section, the lead agency may use an *environmental assessment* or a similar analysis prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act.

(3) *An initial study may rely upon expert opinion supported by facts, technical studies, or other substantial evidence to document its findings. However, an initial study is neither intended nor required to include the level of detail included in an EIR.*

(b) Results.

(1) If the agency determines that there is substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may cause a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency shall do one of the following:

(A) Prepare an EIR or

(B) Use a previously prepared EIR which the lead agency determines would adequately analyze the project at hand, or

(C) Determine, pursuant to a program EIR, tiering, or another appropriate process, which of a project's effects were adequately examined by an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Another appropriate process may include, for example, a master EIR, a master environmental assessment, approval of housing and neighborhood commercial facilities in urban areas as described in section 15181, approval of residential projects pursuant to a specific plan as described in section 15182, approval of residential projects consistent with a community plan, general plan or zoning as described in section 15183, or an environmental document prepared under a State certified regulatory program. The lead agency shall then ascertain which effects, if any, should be analyzed in a later EIR or negative declaration.

(2) The lead agency shall prepare a negative declaration if there is no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment.

(c) Purposes. The purposes of an initial study are to:

(1) Provide the lead agency with information to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an EIR or negative declaration;

(2) Enable an applicant or lead agency to modify a project, mitigating adverse effects before an EIR is prepared, thereby enabling the project to qualify for a negative declaration;

(3) Assist the preparation of an EIR, if one is required, by:

(A) Focusing the EIR on the effects determined to be significant,

(B) Identifying the effects determined not to be significant,

(C) Explaining the reasons for determining that potentially significant effects would not be significant, and

(D) Identifying whether a program EIR, tiering, or another appropriate process may be used for analysis of the project's environmental effects.

(4) Facilitate environmental assessment early in the design of a project;

(5) Provide documentation of the factual basis for the finding in a negative declaration that a project will not have a significant effect on the environment;

(6) Eliminate unnecessary EIRs;

(7) Determine whether a previously prepared EIR could be used with the project.

(d) Contents. An initial study shall contain in brief form:

(1) A description of the project including the location of the project;

(2) An identification of the environmental setting;

(3) An identification of environmental effects by use of a checklist, matrix, or other method, provided that entries on a checklist or other form are briefly explained to indicate that there is some evidence to support the entries. The brief explanation may be either through a narrative or a reference to another information source such as an attached map, photographs, or an earlier EIR or negative declaration. A reference to another document should include, where appropriate, a citation to the page or pages where the information is found.

(4) A discussion of ways to mitigate the significant effects identified, if any;

(5) An examination of whether the project would be consistent with existing zoning, plans, and other applicable land use controls;

(6) The name of the person or persons who prepared or participated in the initial study.

(e) *Submission of Data.* If the project is to be carried out by a private person or private organization, the lead agency may require such person or organization to submit data and information which will enable the lead agency to prepare the initial study. Any person may submit any information in any form to assist a lead agency in preparing an initial study.

(f) *Format.* Sample forms for an applicant's project description and a review form for use by the lead agency are contained in Appendices G and H. When used together, these forms would meet the requirements for an initial study, provided that the entries on the checklist are briefly explained pursuant to subsection (d)(3). These forms are only suggested, and public agencies are free to devise their own format for an initial study. A previously prepared EIR may also be used as the initial study for a later project.

(g) *Consultation.* As soon as a lead agency has determined that an initial study will be required for the project, the lead agency shall consult informally with all responsible agencies and all trustee agencies responsible for resources affected by the project to obtain the recommendations of those agencies as to whether an EIR or a negative declaration should be prepared. During or immediately after preparation of an initial study for a private project, the lead agency may consult with the applicant to determine if the applicant is willing to modify the project to reduce or avoid the significant effects identified in the initial study.

