

TO: James L. App, City Manager
FROM: Meg Williamson, Interim Public Works Director
SUBJECT: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Airport Master Plan Approval
DATE: November 16, 2004

NEEDS: For the City Council to consider adopting the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Master Plan Update for the Municipal Airport.

FACTS:

1. The current Airport Master Plan was adopted in 1976. It provides guidance for aviation infrastructure development for the Airport. Over the past three (3) years, the City has refined an update to the Master Plan document which anticipates and provides for future improvements to the physical airport facilities. The timing of these improvements will be contingent upon both demand and availability of funding.
2. On January 27, 2004, the Planning Commission considered the draft Master Plan and unanimously recommended City Council support. The Council reviewed the plan on March 16, 2004, and determined it to be consistent with the findings of the various committees and review bodies, and directed that the draft plan be forwarded to the required outside public agencies for their review and comment.
3. On October 20, 2004, the County Airport Land Use Commission took action, as required by law, to find the Master Plan consistent with the Airport Land Use Plan in concert with the adoption process.
4. Pursuant to the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the City's Procedures for Implementing CEQA, an Initial Study was prepared and circulated for public review and comment on the updated Airport Master Plan.
5. Public notice of intent to adopt a Negative Declaration was given as required by Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code.
6. Outside agency comment has been received from Caltrans (Division of Aeronautics) and appropriate responses have been prepared (see attached Initial Study). The content of the comments appear to be more procedural than environmentally related. As noted in the City's response, no change in the City's environmental findings is recommended at this time. The City will continue to work with Caltrans, as appropriate, in the implementation of the master plan.

**ANALYSIS
AND**

CONCLUSION: The Airport Master Plan anticipates future expansion of Airport facilities in response to demand and the availability of Federal funding. Because implementing the plan is driven by both demand and funding, there is no firm schedule for the described improvements. The Master Plan is, however, designed to anticipate the maximum feasible future operational capacity of the Airport within the Council's adopted vision as a regional Airport.

The City has diligently solicited any and all public input and comment to the Master Plan Update process, as evidenced by the extended time period involved. Every effort has been made to respond to comments received. The content of this final document is essentially unchanged from that approved by the City Council in March 2004. The action to adopt is now the final step in the process, which ratifies all actions taken in this past year on Airport planning efforts.

POLICY

REFERENCE: FAA Compliance Standards.

FISCAL

IMPACT: None.

- OPTIONS:**
- A.
 - 1) Approve Resolution No. 04-XX adopting the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Airport Master Plan, and
 - 2) Approve Resolution No. 04-XX adopting the updated Airport Master Plan.
 - B. Amend, modify or reject the above option.

Attachments (2)

1. Resolution approving Mitigated Negative Declaration with Initial Study attachment
2. Resolution approving adoption of the 2004 Airport Master Plan Update

CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES

1000 Spring Street

Paso Robles, California 93446

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

In accordance with the policies regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, this document, combined with the attached supporting data, constitutes the initial study on the subject project. This initial study provides the basis for the determination whether the project may have a significant effect on the environment. If it is determined that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report will be prepared which focuses on the areas of concern identified by this initial study.

1. Project Title: Paso Robles Municipal Airport Master Plan Update
2. Lead Agency Name and Address: *City of El Paso de Robles, 1000 Spring Street,
Paso Robles, California 93446*
3. Contact Person and Phone Number: Robert A. Lata, AICP, (805) 237-3970
4. Project Location: 4912 Wing Way, Paso Robles, California 93446
5. Project Sponsor's Name and Address: City of El Paso de Robles, 1000 Spring Street,
Paso Robles, California 93446
6. General Plan Designation: Airport
7. Zoning: Public Facilities (PF), Business Park (BP), and Agriculture (AG)
8. Description of Project: The City of El Paso de Robles (City) is updating its master plan for the Paso Robles Municipal Airport (see attached Figure 7) and is seeking to approve the plan. Attached Table 1 identifies the improvement projects that are recommended to take place over the period through 2020 based on expected growth in aviation activities. While some of the proposed improvements can be carried out by the City, many projects require combined funding actions by the City, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Division of Aeronautics. All runway improvement projects and property acquisitions will require preparation and approval of federal environmental documentation, in addition to any subsequent CEQA environmental documentation. Such additional environmental studies will be conducted in advance of the projects when funding is expected to be available. Approval of the Airport Master Plan Update is not a commitment by the City to build each proposed project within the specified timeframe, but rather the plan provides guidance as to the kinds of projects that need to be accomplished by the City in order to maintain the Airport in accordance with current FAA and Caltrans standards. Projects would be initiated as aviation activities demand and funds are available with each project being considered individually as part of the City's normal budgeting and project approval process.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM -- continued

Table 1
**CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
Paso Robles Municipal Airport
2002 - 2020**

PHASE I IMPROVEMENTS (2002-2007)

Land Acquisition

- 29 acres to the northeast for Runway 19 protection zone
- 4 acres to the southeast for Runway 1 protection zone

Airfield

- Extend Taxiway A 1,400 feet to the southwest
- Extend Taxiway C 1,300 feet to the east
- Partial parallel taxiway for Runway 13-31
- Rebuild Taxiway G east of Runway 13-31

Navigational Aids

- Medium Intensity Taxiway Lights (MITL) on extended Taxiway A
- Medium Intensity Taxiway Lights (MITL) on extended Taxiway C
- Medium Intensity Taxiway Lights (MITL) on partial parallel taxiway for Runway 13-31
- Medium Intensity Taxiway Lights (MITL) on Taxiway F

Terminal Area

- Aircraft wash rack
- Replace ARFF vehicle
- Extend Propeller Drive east to Taxiway B
- Extend Wing Way to south, including utilities
- New hangars (20)
- New Cirrus Way and Stratus Lane access roads off Dry Creek Road to Taxiway F
- Extend Aerotech Way onto east side of Airport

Infrastructure

- Realign and add new perimeter fencing along new property line

North Area Conceptual Development Plan

- Extend Wing Way north to Satellite Drive, including storm drain
- Construct Satellite Drive
- Construct new road into Northwest Development Area

PHASE II IMPROVEMENTS (2008-2012)

Airfield

- Taxiway connection to Taxiway E at the southwest end
- Extend Runway 1L - 19R 1,200 feet to the northeast
- Extend Taxiway A 1,200 feet to the northeast, including holding apron
- Extend Runway 19R runway safety area
- Construct blast pad on Runway 19R

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM -- continued

Table 1 – CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM -- continued

Navigational Aids

- Provide High Intensity Runway Lights (HIRL) for Runway 1L-19R extension
- Relocate Runway 19R Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI), Runway End Identifier Lights (REIL) and Threshold Lights
- Medium Intensity Approach Lighting System with Runway Alignment Indicator Lights (MALSR) for Runway 19
- Instrument Landing System (ILS) for Runway 19R
- Medium Intensity Taxiway Lights (MITL) on extended Taxiway A
- Medium Intensity Taxiway Lights (MITL) on Taxiway B west of Taxiway A

Terminal Area

- Large aircraft parking apron by CDF
- New hangars (20)
- Expand itinerant aircraft parking apron to north
- Expand vehicular parking lot to west, including lighting

North Area Conceptual Development Plan

- Extend Satellite Drive east to CDF
- Extend utility systems to area Northwest of Runway 1L-19R
- Extend Satellite Drive to the north and east
- Dry Creek area sewer and lift station No. 12

PHASE III IMPROVEMENTS (2013-2020)

Land Acquisition

- 45 acres to the southeast for Runway 31 protection zone
- 95 acres to the northwest for Runway 13 protection zone and future development
- Relocate 10 houses and 2 commercial structures in Runway 31 protection zone

Airfield

- Extend Runway 1L-19R 1,000 feet to the south
- Extend Taxiway A 1,400 feet to the southwest, including holding apron
- Extend Runway 13-31 1,700 feet to the northwest
- Provide Runway 13-31 parallel taxiway and entry/exit taxiway
- Extend Runway 13-31 runway safety areas
- Extend Taxiway D to the east to parallel taxiway for Runway 13-31
- Construct blast pads on Runway 1L, 13 and 31
- Strengthen existing Runway 13-31
- Widen Taxiways A, B and C to 75 feet
- Rebuild Taxiway G from Taxiway F for future hangars

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM -- continued

Table 1 – CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM -- continued

Navigational Aids

- High Intensity Runway Lights (HIRL) on extended Runway 1
- Medium Intensity Taxiway Lights (MITL) on extended Taxiway A
- Medium Intensity Runway Lights (MIRL) on extended Runway 13-31
- Relocate Runway 13 Precision Approach Path Indicator (PAPI) and threshold lights
- Medium Intensity Taxiway Lights (MITL) on Runway 13-31 parallel and entry/exit taxiways
- Runway End Identifier Lights (REIL) on Runway 31
- Medium Intensity Taxiway Lights (MITL) on extended Taxiway D
- Relocate segmented circle and lighted wind cone
- Medium Intensity Taxiway Lights (MITL) on Taxiway G

Terminal Area

- New Aircraft Rescue and Fire Fighting (ARFF) building and replace existing ARFF building with itinerant tiedowns
- New hangars (30)
- Extend Cirrus Way north of Taxiway F and install access control gates
- Transit improvements

Infrastructure

- Extend utility systems north of Taxiway F
- Fuel Farm
- Security Fencing Program (replacement)
- Realign and add perimeter fencing along new property line

North Area Conceptual Development Plan

- Construct new road into Northwest Development Area
- New access road north of Satellite Drive
- Extend North Area Streets
- Extend North Area utilities

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM -- continued

9. Surrounding Land Uses and Setting: Land uses surrounding the Airport are primarily agricultural and industrial in character with some rural residential areas to the east. Prior to completion of the revised Airport Master Plan Update, surrounding land uses were subject to the policies of the Paso Robles Municipal Airport Land Use Plan adopted by the San Luis Obispo County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) on November 13, 1977. This Airport Land Use Plan has been updated to reflect the Airport Master Plan Update and a current draft of the revised Airport Land Use Plan is attached for reference. The San Luis Obispo County Airport Land Use Commission is expected to consider the draft revised Airport Land Use Plan after the City adopts the Airport Master Plan Update.
10. Other public agencies whose approval is required:
- San Luis Obispo County Airport Land Use Commission. The ALUC reviews the Airport Master Plan Update to determine its consistency with the ALUC’s adopted Airport Land Use Plan. Since the Airport Land Use Plan is also being revised, the ALUC is expected to approve the revised Airport Land Use Plan in principal (potentially with some revisions) and then determine if the Airport Master Plan Update is consistent. Once the City has adopted the Airport Master Plan Update, the ALUC will then adopt the revised Airport Land Use Plan.
 - Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The FAA does not approve the Airport Master Plan per se, but approves what is known as the Airport Layout Plan (ALP), which is a set of drawings representing what the Airport would be like if all the proposed improvements are made. Since the ALP will show land acquisition and runway extensions, FAA conditional approval of the ALP is typically given with an exception for subsequent completion of federal environmental documentation. The subsequent federal environmental documentation (as well as any associated CEQA documentation) is prepared at the point in time when the improvement(s) are considered for construction.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use and Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population and Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities and Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geological Problems | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy and Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM -- continued

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation: I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect(s) on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets, if the effect is a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated." An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there WILL NOT be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project.

Signature _____ Date _____

Printed Name _____ For _____

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM -- continued

	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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g. impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible land uses)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:				
a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g. through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
III. GEOLOGICAL PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:				
a) Fault rupture?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Landslides or mudflows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Subsidence of the land?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Expansive soils?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i) Unique geologic or physical features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IV. WATER. Would the proposal result in:				
a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g. temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM -- continued

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
h) Impacts to groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:				
a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature, or cause any change in climate?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Create objectionable odors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
VI. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the proposal result in:				
a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Locally designated species (e.g. heritage trees)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM -- continued

	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g. oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
d) Wetland habitat (e.g. marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
 VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:				
a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
b) Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
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?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
 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)?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
c) The creation of any health hazard or potential health hazard?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
d) Exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
e) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
 X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:				
a) Increases in existing noise levels?	[]	[X]	[]	[]
b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels?	[]	[X]	[]	[]
 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?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
b) Police protection?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
c) Schools?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
e) Other governmental services?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
 XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or				

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM -- continued

	<u>Potentially Significant Impact</u>	<u>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</u>	<u>Less Than Significant Impact</u>	<u>No Impact</u>
supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:				
a) Power or natural gas?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
b) Communications systems?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
d) Sewer or septic tanks?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
e) Storm water drainage?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
f) Solid waste disposal?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
g) Local or regional water supplies?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
 XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:				
a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
c) Create light or glare?	[]	[]	[X]	[]
 XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:				
a) Disturb paleontological resources?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
b) Disturb archaeological resources?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
c) Affect historical resources?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
 XV. RECREATION. Would the proposal:				
a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
b) Affect existing recreational opportunities?	[]	[]	[]	[X]
 XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitats 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?	[]	[]	[]	[X]

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM -- continued

	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21087.

Reference: Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080. 1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151; Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino, 202 Gal. App. 3d 296 (1988); Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors, 222 Gal. App. 3d 1337 (1990).

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM -- continued

Discussion of Items checked as “Potentially Significant”

Item I-c, LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the proposal be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity?

Airport land use compatibility is based on the affects of aircraft noise, airport height restrictions, and the need for appropriate safety areas off the ends of each runway. The Airport Master Plan Update provides for the continuing growth of the Airport and includes land acquisition and the extension/construction of existing or new runways. Land acquisition will change some land use patterns by converting lands designated for agricultural and business park uses to public facility use. The result is not necessarily incompatible, but may require adjustments to the City’s General Plan.

The San Luis Obispo County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) is responsible for determining airport land use compatibility through its adoption of an Airport Land Use Plan. The existing Airport Land Use Plan for the Paso Robles Municipal Airport was adopted November 13, 1977. As part of the airport master planning process, the existing Airport Land Use Plan was evaluated and a draft of a revised plan has been completed. Adoption and enforcement of the revised Airport Land Use Plan by the San Luis Obispo County ALUC provides appropriate mitigation measures for noise, safety and height restriction impacts. Such actions by the ALUC reduce any potential land use incompatibility impacts to a less than significant level.

Item II-c, POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?

Approximately 10 residential units and two commercial structures may be affected by proposed land acquisitions in Phase III. The current estimated timeframe for these actions is the period 2013 to 2020. Approximately 140 acres of land are proposed for acquisition at that time. The residential units sit on a part of the area needed for the Runway 31 protection zone (RPZ), which at that time is being upgraded to accommodate the upgrading of Runway 13-31. Any residential units affected by acquisition would be afforded protection under the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970. The number of units to be acquired may be reduced if avigation easements can be used to achieve the required protection. Under FAA guidelines (FAA AC 150/5300-13, *Airport Design*), avigation easements may be used for a portion of the RPZ in place of fee acquisition, provided the same protection is afforded to airport operations.

While it is desirable to clear all objects from the RPZ, some uses are permitted, provided they do not attract wildlife, are outside of the runway object free area (ROFA), and do not interfere with navigational aids. Automobile parking facilities, although discouraged, may be permitted, provided the parking facilities and any associated appurtenances, in addition to meeting all of the preceding conditions, are located outside of the runway object free area extension. Fuel storage facilities should not be located in the RPZ. According to FAA, land uses prohibited from the RPZ are residences and places of public assembly (churches,

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM -- continued

schools, hospitals, office buildings, shopping centers, and other uses with similar concentrations of persons that typify places of public assembly.) According to the *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook*, airport ownership of property in the RPZ is encouraged, all new structures are prohibited, residential land uses are prohibited and non-residential land uses should be avoided except if very low intensity in character and confined to the sides and outer end of the RPZ.

Changes to the runway protection zone are tied to the upgrading of Runway 13-31, and Airport operational needs will dictate when this is required. At the time funding is sought for this improvement a more comprehensive evaluation would be conducted to determine what must be done to meet federal (NEPA) and state (CEQA) environmental requirements, including any impacts associated with these residential units. The specific characteristics of the dwellings and households would be determined at that time; the use of avigation easements compared to purchase and relocation would be evaluated; and appropriate remedies would be identified. Based on current standards, as noted above, purchase and relocation would seem to be the appropriate mitigation and both federal and state laws provide compensation for these impacts. Based on existing laws and regulations, the potential impacts would then be reduced to a less than significant level.

Item IV-a, WATER. Would the proposal result in changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff?

Proposed runway and taxiway improvements, aircraft parking aprons, internal roadways, vehicle parking lots, and an aircraft wash rack collectively will add approximately 16 acres of paved surfaces to the Airport, if all projects are developed as planned. Collectively, such improvements have the potential to significantly increase the quantity of surface water runoff during storm events. Overall, Airport drainage is designed to slow runoff either through on-site accumulation in the various drainage ways or, if necessary, in temporary holding basins that allow gradual release or infiltration of the runoff. The design and construction of these drainage ways and holding basins is considered sufficient to mitigate potential impacts to an insignificant level.

Item IV-h, WATER. Would the proposal result in impacts to groundwater quality?

Existing contaminants in stormwater runoff from the runway and taxiways include oil and grease residues, tire particles, plant and animal debris (i.e., leaves, dust, and animal feces), pesticides, and general litter. Proposed runway and taxiway improvements, aircraft parking aprons, internal roadways, vehicle parking lots, and an aircraft wash rack collectively will add approximately 16 acres of paved surfaces to the Airport, if all projects are developed as planned. The proposed projects have the potential to degrade water quality through increased erosion or sedimentation, together with increased stormwater runoff with accompanying pollutant loadings. Such impacts can be reduced to insignificant levels by the use of Best Management Practices (BMP) and Best Available Technology (BAT) for non-point source control.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM -- continued

Under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) the City files an annual Notice-of-Intent for the Airport to comply with the terms of the State's General Industrial Stormwater Permit (General Permit) for the purpose of discharging stormwater on a day-to-day basis. The Notice-of-Intent includes the City's proposed use of BMP and BAT to control non-point source water pollution. As each new project is added to the Airport inventory, the BMP and BAT contents of the Notice-of-Intent will be updated as needed.

The aircraft wash rack will require special attention because it cannot be connected to any existing septic systems. Instead the design typically includes a degreasing facility to separate out the oils and other residues removed during washing. Use of the wash rack by aircraft owners typically requires the use of approved biodegradable detergents.

There is also the potential to impact water quality during construction of the various facility improvements. Under current water quality management guidelines, all land-disturbing activities, including clearing, grading, and excavation, that disturb 1 or more acres are required to be covered under a state or Environmental Protection Agency-issued NPDES construction stormwater permit prior to land disturbance. In California, these permits are issued through the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). As a part of this permit, the City contractor would need to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which describes specific best management practices for events such as spill preventions and controls, recycling of oils and fluids, and requirements for the use of biodegradable cleaning products. To the extent practicable, Storm Water Best Management Practices supported by the California Stormwater Quality Task Force, or other such professional body, are typically identified in this SWPPP.

The application of best management practices and best available technology for non-point source control through the various NPDES permits are expected to reduce potential water and water quality impacts to insignificant levels.

Item V-a, AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

San Luis Obispo County currently meets all federal air quality standards, but is designated Non-attainment Transitional for PM-10 (particulate matter smaller than 10 microns in overall size). Until recently, the County was also designated Non-attainment Transitional for Ozone, as well, but is now designated as Attainment.

Construction and demolition activities add 14 percent to total PM-10 levels in the County and wind blown and fugitive dust sources contribute another 6 percent. Construction activities and stockpiled soil associated with the various projects proposed within the Airport Master Plan Update have the potential of contributing PM-10 pollutants to existing violations. The degree of contribution depends upon the project and the application of mitigation measures that could reduce such contribution. Appropriate mitigation measures for PM-10 are likely to be defined further by the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) at the time of construction, but are likely to include the following specific measures:

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM -- continued

- The application of non-toxic soil stabilizers to inactive soil areas can reduce PM-10 emissions by as much as 65 percent
- All excavated or graded material, as well as paved roads should be sufficiently watered twice a day to prevent excessive amounts of dust. This would be expected to reduce PM-10 emissions by about 3 percent.
- At the discretion of the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District, clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation activities may be halted or slowed when PM-10 emissions from other sources create severe air quality problems.
- Reducing speeds on haul roads within the project site to 15 miles per hour can contribute as much as 70 percent reductions in associated PM-10 emissions.

Implementation of these and other specific measures that may be required by the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District should reduce any potential air quality impacts to less than significant levels.

Item X-a and X-b, NOISE. Would the proposal result in increases in existing noise levels or the exposure of people to severe noise levels?

Noise levels at the Paso Robles Municipal Airport are expected to increase over time regardless of the improvements proposed in the Airport Master Plan Update because the Airport continues to attract increasing numbers of airport users and their aircraft operations. Airport and aircraft noise compatibility are specifically addressed in Airport Land Use Plan adopted by the San Luis Obispo County Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC), which is responsible for determining airport land use compatibility. The existing Airport Land Use Plan for the Paso Robles Municipal Airport was adopted November 13, 1977. As part of the airport master planning process, the existing Airport Land Use Plan was evaluated and a draft of a revised plan has been completed, including revised aircraft noise contours (see attached Figure 3). The noise contours illustrated are based on airfield capacity conditions – full build out of the Airport Master Plan Update and therefore represent a worst case condition. Under proposed ALUC policies, new residential development and other listed noise sensitive land uses would be prohibited within the area defined by the 55 dB Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) noise contour, although land uses that qualify as “infill” development would be allowed. Adoption and enforcement of the revised Airport Land Use Plan by the San Luis Obispo County ALUC provides appropriate mitigation measures for noise, and reduces any potential land use incompatibility impacts due to noise to a less than significant level.

The Airport Master Plan is available for review in the City Clerk's Office, the City Library, and on the City website at www.prcity.com

RESOLUTION NO. 04-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES
ADOPTING THE AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE
FOR THE PASO ROBLES MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

WHEREAS, the Airport Master Plan provides guidance for future aviation infrastructure development for the Airport facility; and

WHEREAS, the City Council approved the content of the proposed draft Master Plan update on March 16, 2004, after significant review and input by appointed committees and the public review process; and

WHEREAS, As required, the City forwarded the proposed Master Plan to the County Airport Land Use Commission (APLUC) for their review and comment. The APLUC considered the City's Master Plan on October 20, 2004, and found it to be consistent with the Land Use Plan, as required; and

WHEREAS, the proposed document has been forwarded to outside agencies, as required, and those comments have also been received and considered; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the City's Procedures for Implementing CEQA, an Initial Study was prepared and circulated for public review and comment; and

WHEREAS, public notice of intent to adopt a Negative Declaration was given as required by Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code; and

WHEREAS, a Mitigated Negative Declaration was adopted by the City Council for the Airport Master Plan update in accordance with CEQA.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles, using its independent judgment and analysis, does hereby adopt the 2004 update to the City's Airport Master as reflected in the attached "Exhibit A":

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Paso Robles this 16th day of November 2004, by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

Frank R. Mecham, Mayor

ATTEST:

Sharilyn M. Ryan, Deputy City Clerk

RESOLUTION NO. 04-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES
ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE MASTER PLAN
UPDATE FOR THE PASO ROBLES MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

WHEREAS, the Airport Master Plan provides guidance for future aviation infrastructure development for the Airport facility; and

WHEREAS, the City Council approved the content of the proposed Master Plan update on March 16, 2004, after significant review and input by appointed committees and the public review process; and

WHEREAS, As required, the City forwarded the proposed Master Plan to the County Airport Land Use Commission (APLUC) for their review and comment. The APLUC considered the City's Master Plan on October 20, 2004, and found it to be consistent with the Land Use Plan, as required; and

WHEREAS, the proposed document has been forwarded to outside agencies, as required, and those comments have also been received and considered; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the City's Procedures for Implementing CEQA, an Initial Study was prepared and circulated for public review and comment; and

WHEREAS, public notice of intent to adopt a Negative Declaration was given as required by Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code; and

WHEREAS, based on the information and analysis contained in the Initial Study and the attachments thereto (Exhibit A), a determination has been made that the proposed Master Plan Update qualifies for adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

NOW, THEREFORE, the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles, using its independent judgment and analysis, does hereby:

1. Find and determine that the proposed Airport Master Plan Update will not have a significant impact on the environment.

This finding and determination was made based upon the substantial evidence presented at the public hearing, including the whole record before the City Council (including the Initial Study, the Staff Report, the proposed Airport Master Plan Update, and any public comments or testimony received thereon); and,

2. Adopt a Negative Declaration for the proposed Airport Master Plan Update.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Paso Robles this 16th day of November 2004 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Frank R. Mecham, Mayor

ATTEST:

Sharilyn M. Ryan, Deputy City Clerk