

TO: JAMES L. APP, CITY MANAGER

FROM: ROBERT A. LATA, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 05-001 (CITY INITIATED)

DATE: DECEMBER 20, 2005

Needs: To consider the Planning Commission's recommendations to the City Council regarding a proposed modification to the text of the Land Use Element of the General Plan to reflect the most recent City "build-out" projections. This amendment does not modify policy parameters of the 2003 General Plan update.

Facts:

1. When the 2003 General Plan update was approved, it was anticipated that it would be necessary to reduce the General Plan growth potential by 416 dwelling units in order to stay within the adopted policy of accommodating 44,000 residents in the year 2025. The Land Use Element of the General Plan included provisions that called for a reduction of up to 416 dwelling units.
2. The intent of this General Plan Amendment is to reflect the most current land use patterns and calculations of City "build-out" under the 2003 General Plan. Based on the most recent projections and calculations of population in the year 2025, it has been concluded that it is no longer necessary to reduce the number of potential dwelling units by 416 in order to stay within the population of 44,000 residents in 2025.
3. Attached and labeled Exhibits "A", "B" and "C" are the pages to the General Plan Land Use Element that are proposed to be modified, along with the reflected modifications. The proposed changes to the General Plan text do not increase the potential total population. There would be no environmental impact resulting from the proposed text changes to the Land Use Element of the General Plan.
4. At their meeting of October 25, 2005, the Planning Commission voted in favor of the two-part General Plan Amendment. The vote was five in favor, one in opposition (expressing concerns regarding the Erskine component) and one Commissioner absent.
5. At their meeting of November 15, 2005, the City Council tabled consideration of the Erskine component of the General Plan Amendment when it was determined that the proposal had not been referred to the County Airport Land Use Commission (a referral is required for legislative matters like a General Plan Amendment or Zone Change).
6. At the same November 15, 2005 meeting, the City Council referred the City Initiated General Plan Amendment back to the Planning Commission, seeking to confirm that the Planning Commission had seen all of the relevant calculations that went into the formulation of the General Plan Amendment. Concerns had apparently been expressed that the numbers presented to the City Council differed from those that the Planning Commission had seen.

7. Pursuant to the Council's direction, the proposed modification to the text of the Land Use Element of the General Plan to reflect the most recent City "build-out" projections has been presented a second time to the Planning Commission.
8. The General Plan Amendment remains essentially the same. Based on some questions that had been posed by the Planning Commission at the October 25, 2005 meeting, Ed Gallagher refined his numbers for the staff report that was presented to the Council on November 15, 2005. Ed Gallagher reviewed the differences with the Planning Commission at their meeting of December 13, 2005.
9. The Planning Commission's recommendation will be presented in a verbal presentation at the December 20, 2005 Council meeting.

Analysis and
Conclusion:

The proposed General Plan Amendment is City Initiated. The purpose and intent is to reflect the most recent "build-out" population projection for the City in 2025.

The changes to the projection made in 2003 relate to the number of persons per dwelling unit, development entitlements that have occurred at less than projected intensity levels, and refinements to the calculation of the "build-out" population under the adopted General Plan. Attachment "A" details the new calculations.

Changing the General Plan text as proposed will not modify the General Plan policy of accommodating up to 44,000 residents in the year 2025.

Policy

Reference:

General Plan Land Use Element; General Plan Update EIR certified in 2003; California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Fiscal

Impact:

No fiscal impacts are anticipated in conjunction with this Land Use Element amendment.

Options:

After consideration of all public testimony, that the City Council consider the Planning Commission's recommendation regarding the following options:

- a.** Adopt Resolution No. 05-xx approving a Negative Declaration for General Plan Amendment 05-001 and adopt Resolution No. 05-xx approving General Plan Amendment 05-001 that would amend the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan, updating the text of the General Plan relating to anticipated "build out" in the year 2025 in a manner consistent with the attached Exhibits "B-1", "B-2", and "B-3".
- b.** Amend, modify or reject the foregoing option.

**ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM
CITY OF PASO ROBLES
PLANNING DIVISION**

- 1. PROJECT TITLE:** General Plan Amendment 05-01
Concurrent Entitlements: N / A
- 2. LEAD AGENCY:** City of Paso Robles
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446
- Contact:** Bob Lata, CD Director
Phone: (805) 237-3970
- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:** City-Wide
- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** City Initiated
- Contact Person:** Bob Lata
Phone: (805) 237-3970
- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** N / A
- 6. ZONING:** N / A
- 7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** General Plan Amendment to update build-out calculations in the text of the Land Use Element. No changes in build-out population or other basic General Plan policies.
- 8. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:** N / A

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

9. RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:

None.

10. PERSONS PARTICIPATING IN THE PREPARATION OF THE INITIAL STUDY:

Bob Lata; Ed Gallagher.

11. CONTEXT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FOR PROJECT:

This environmental initial study analyzes the potential impacts associated with the changing of the text of the Land Use Element to recognize the City's latest calculation of residential. There is no change in land use designations or the build-out capacity of up to 44,000 residents in the year 2025.

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

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” or is “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

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

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

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

DETERMINATION

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

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

Signature

Bob Lata

Printed Name

Date

Community Development Director

Title

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

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to the project. A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards.
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved. Answers should address off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate, if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is warranted.
4. Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, “Earlier Analyses,” may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVII at the end of the checklist.
6. References to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) have been incorporated into the checklist. A source list has been provided in Section XVII. Other sources used or individuals contacted have been cited in the respective discussions.
7. The following checklist has been formatted after Appendix I of Chapter 3, Title 14, California Code of Regulations, but has been augmented to reflect the needs and requirements of the City of Paso Robles.

(Note: Standard Conditions of Approval - The City imposes standard conditions of approval on projects which are considered to be components of or modifications to the project, some of these standard conditions also result in reducing or minimizing environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. However, because they are considered part of the project, they have not been identified as mitigation measures. For the readers’ information, a list of applicable standard conditions identified in the discussions has been provided as an attachment to this document.)

SAMPLE QUESTION:

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

Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:

Landslides or Mud flows? (Sources: 1, 6)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The attached source list explains that 1 is the Paso Robles General Plan and 6 is a topographical map of the area which show that the area is located in a flat area. (Note: This response probably would not require further explanation).

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the Proposal:

a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning? (Sources: 1 & 8)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: N/A.

b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project? (Sources: 1 & 3)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: N/A

c) Be incompatible with existing land uses in the vicinity? (Sources: 1 & 3)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: N/A

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: N/A

e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (Sources: 1 & 3)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: N/A (not a land use issue)

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? (Sources: 1 & 3)

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: N/A

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

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

extension of major infrastructure)? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: N/A

c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? (Sources: 1, 3, & 5)

Discussion: N/A

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

a) Fault rupture? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

Discussion: N/A

b) Seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

Discussion: N/A

c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 2 & 3)

Discussion: N/A

d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

e) Landslides or Mudflows? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

Discussion: N/A

f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, & 4)

Discussion: N/A

g) Subsidence of the land? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

Discussion: N/A

h) Expansive soils? (Sources: 4)

Discussion: N/A

i) Unique geologic or physical features? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: N/A

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

IV. WATER. Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? (Sources:1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A (not a land use issue)

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movement? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? (Sources: 1,3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| h) Impacts to groundwater quality? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A .

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

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

V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

- a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: N/A.

- b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: N/A

- c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature?
(Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: N/A

- d) Create objectionable odors?

Discussion: N/A

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

- a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?
(Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: A pedestrian oriented downtown would help minimize vehicular trips.

- b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: N/A.

- c) Inadequate emergency access or inadequate access to nearby uses? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: N/A.

- d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?
(Sources: 1, 3, 7, & 8)

Discussion: N/A

- e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?
(Source: 7)

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

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?
(Sources: 1 & 8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A.

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: N/A

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

Discussion: N/A

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

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?

Discussion: N/A

VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans?
(Sources: 1 & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Use non-renewable resource in a wasteful and inefficient | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

manner? (Sources: 1 & 7)

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? (Sources: 1 & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A..

- b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 1 & 7)

Discussion: N/A.

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

Discussion: N/A..

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

Discussion: N/A

X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Increases in existing noise levels? (Sources: 1, 7, & 8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion N/A.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels? (Source: 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A..

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? (Sources: 1, 3, 6, & 7)

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Police Protection? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

- c) Schools? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				
e) Other governmental services? (Sources: 1,3, & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: N/A.

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? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Communication systems? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				
c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Sewer or septic tanks? (Sources: 1, 3, 7, & 8)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Storm water drainage? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Solid waste disposal? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				
g) Local or regional water supplies? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: N/A

XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

- a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: N/A

- b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?
(Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: N/A

- c) Create light or glare? (Sources: 1, 3, 7, & 8)

Discussion: N/A

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

a) Disturb paleontological resources? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Disturb archaeological resources? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				

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

Discussion: N/A

- c) Affect historical resources? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: N/A

- d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: N/A

- e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: N/A

XV.RECREATION. Would the proposal:

- a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: N/A

- b) Affect existing recreational opportunities? (Sources 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: N/A

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? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: N/A.

- b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: N/A.

- 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.) (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: N/A.

- d) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 1 & 3)

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

Discussion: N/A.

II.

c)

d)

a)

b)

c)

III.

a)

b)

c)

e)

f)

EARLIER ANALYSIS AND BACKGROUND MATERIALS.

Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063 (c)(3)(D).

Earlier Documents Prepared and Utilized in this Analysis and Background / Explanatory Materials

<u>Reference #</u>	<u>Document Title</u>	<u>Available for Review at:</u>
1	City of Paso Robles General Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446
2	City of Paso Robles Zoning Code	Same as above
3	City of Paso Robles Environmental Impact Report for General Plan Update	Same as above
4	1977 Airport Land Use Plan	Same as above
5	City of Paso Robles Municipal Code	Same as above
6	City of Paso Robles Water Master Plan	Same as above
7	City of Paso Robles Sewer Master Plan	Same as above
8	City of Paso Robles Housing Element	Same as above
9	City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval for New Development	Same as above
10	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Guidelines for Impact Thresholds	APCD 3433 Roberto Court San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
11	San Luis Obispo County – Land Use Element	San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning County Government Center San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
12	USDA, Soils Conservation Service, Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, Paso Robles Area, 1983	Soil Conservation Offices Paso Robles, Ca 93446

Summary of Mitigation Measures

Description of Impact

N/A

Mitigation Measure

N/A

RESOLUTION NO. 05-

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES
APPROVING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 05-001
(GENERAL PLAN BUILD-OUT CALCULATIONS - CITY INITIATED)

WHEREAS, when the 2003 General Plan update was approved, it was anticipated that it would be necessary to reduce the General Plan growth potential by 416 dwelling units in order to stay within the adopted policy of accommodating 44,000 residents in the year 2025. The Land Use Element of the General Plan included provisions that called for a reduction of up to 416 dwelling units; and

WHEREAS, the intent of this General Plan Amendment is to reflect the most current land use patterns and calculations of City "build-out" under the 2003 General Plan. Based on the most recent projections and calculations of population in the year 2025, it has been concluded that it is no longer necessary to reduce the number of potential dwelling units by 416 in order to stay within the population of 44,000 residents in 2025; and

WHEREAS, changing the General Plan text as proposed will not modify the General Plan policy of accommodating up to 44,000 residents in the year 2025; and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared for this project (on file in the Community Development Department), which concludes that the project as proposed will not have significant impacts on the environment, and

WHEREAS, Public Notice of the proposed Negative Declaration was given as required by Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code; and

WHEREAS, public hearings were conducted by the Planning Commission on October 25, 2005 and December 13, 2005 and by the City Council on November 15, 2005 and December 20, 2005 to consider the Initial Study prepared for this application, and to accept public testimony regarding this proposed environmental determination for the proposed zoning modification, and

WHEREAS, at their hearing on December 13, 2005, the Planning Commission on a 7-0 vote recommended that the City Council adopt the General Plan Amendment as proposed; and

WHEREAS, based on General Plan Land Use Designation, the 2003 General Plan Environmental Impact Report, information contained in the Initial Study prepared for this Amendment, the staff report and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the City Council finds no substantial evidence that the project would have a significant impact on the environment.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That the above recitals are true and correct and incorporated herein by reference.

2. That based on the City's independent judgment, the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles does hereby approve a Negative Declaration for General Plan Amendment 05-001 in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles at a regular meeting of said Council held on 20th December 2005 by the following vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

Frank R. Mecham, Mayor

ATTEST:

Sharilyn M. Ryan, Deputy City Clerk