

TO: James L. App, City Manager
FROM: Ed Gallagher, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: Draft Climate Action Plan
DATE: November 19, 2013

NEEDS: For the City Council to consider and adopt the proposed draft "Qualified" Climate Action Plan and draft Negative Declaration.

- FACTS:**
1. The Planning Commission and City Council held meetings last Spring on potential Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reduction "toolbox" measures to include in the City's draft Climate Action Plan (CAP).
 2. Both the Commission and Council provided direction on the measures, which are mostly voluntary, to include in the CAP. These measures are now incorporated into the Draft CAP (part of Attachment 1).
 3. The Commission considered the Draft CAP and Negative Declaration on November 12, 2013, however the Commission's meeting date was before the Council staff report needed to be prepared. Therefore, the Commission's recommendations will be provided verbally to the Council by staff.
 4. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Initial Study was prepared for the draft CAP. No environmental impacts were identified that could result from implementation of the plan, and a draft Negative Declaration was prepared.
 5. The definition of a "Qualified" CAP is explained in detail in the Analysis and Conclusion section, below.

**ANALYSIS &
CONCLUSION:** Basis for the Climate Action Plan

In 2006, the State enacted AB 32 which requires cities and counties to reduce their greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 (approximately 15% below the 2005 levels). In 2009, the State enacted SB 97, which determined that GHG emissions can result in environmental impacts and need to be addressed as part of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process. Without a Climate Action Plan in place that demonstrates how GHG emissions will be reduced, it would not be possible to adequately measure and evaluate GHG impacts from proposed projects. This could put the City and developers at risk of

litigation. Therefore, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to reduce this risk it is necessary for the City to adopt a CAP to comply with State law.

The purpose of the CAP is to provide a “road map” for measuring, planning, and reducing GHG emissions. It identifies how much GHG emissions need to be reduced and includes actionable measures to reduce them. Once the plan is approved, the measures need to be implemented, monitored, and evaluated for future refinements to ensure the measures are effective. If it is determined that certain measures are not working locally, the City can modify those measures and adjust the plan accordingly in the future.

The City of Paso Robles partnered with the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) to prepare a CAP. APCD is also preparing a plan for each of the other six small cities. (The City of San Luis Obispo and SLO County have already adopted Climate Action Plans.) The other six cities are all concurrently reviewing their draft CAPs. Many of the measures included in each plan are similar, yet specific measures are tailored for each community.

The draft plan includes six categories of measures including: (a) energy; (b) land use & transportation; (c) off-road equipment; (d) water; (e) solid waste; and (f) trees & open space. Most GHG emissions result from the transportation sector (40%), with emissions from residences (24%) and commercial/industrial development (20%) following.

The combined measures demonstrate that the City could meet its reduction requirements and comply with State laws.

The Climate Action Plan is organized into five chapters:

- **Introduction** - purpose, scope and regulatory framework;
- **GHG Emissions and Reduction Target** - describes the sources and amount of GHG emissions, includes a GHG emissions forecast and compares it with the baseline year emissions and reductions needed to meet State targets;
- **Climate Action Measures** – Measures are organized into six focus areas with estimates of the amount of GHG reduction anticipated from each measure;
- **Adaptation** - describes what & how to plan for changes in the future;
- **Implementation and Monitoring** – CAP measures to implement, timeframe and monitoring program.

Qualified CAP

The CAP has been drafted to be designated as a "Qualified" CAP. The criteria for being designated as a qualified CAP is established in APCD's "Greenhouse Gas Thresholds and Supporting Evidence" Report, excerpts from which can be found in Attachment 3. The City's draft CAP complies with all of the elements in that document. However, it should be noted that the document places a high expectation that Qualified CAPs consist primarily of mandatory measures and most of the City's CAP measures are proposed to be voluntary. However, the City can still adopt it as a Qualified CAP if the City commits to implement and monitor the measures. This would demonstrate that enough of the measures are being implemented to meet the reduction targets.

Additionally, adoption of a Qualified CAP can streamline the planning and CEQA review process for development projects. Should a proposed development exceed the thresholds of significance for GHG emissions as adopted by APCD in March 2012, but the project is determined to be consistent with the CAP, preparation of special (and expensive) GHG studies and mitigation are avoided. Appendix C of the CAP provides a sample "consistency checklist" which may be used to determine if a project is consistent with the CAP and/or if it can be exempted from further GHG CEQA review.

Implementation of the CAP

As previously noted, AB 32 requires the City to implement measures to reduce GHG emissions to certain levels and SB 97 amended CEQA to require mitigation of GHG emissions. The CAP offers a set of measures to accomplish these directions. Should the City put forth less than a good faith effort to comply with these laws, the City and major development projects could have increased exposure to litigation that could substantially delay development.

Staff will be investigating options for resources to implement the plan with the goal of presenting them to Council as part of the Mid-Year Budget Review in early 2014. Possible options include:

- a. Hiring contract staff for 20 hours per week (the estimated minimum amount of time necessary to make a good-faith effort at implementing the CAP;
- b. Several cities contract with a consultant to perform tasks common to their CAPs (e.g., outreach/education efforts) with an eye towards achieving economies of scale;

- c. Hiring a full-time staff person who would spend 20 hours per week on CPA implementation and 20 hours a week on basic current planning tasks. This position could be an entry-level, non-management position (e.g., Assistant Planner).

POLICY

REFERENCE: AB 32, SB 97, California Environmental Quality Act, 2003 General Plan

FISCAL

IMPACT: Implementation of the CAP will necessitate allocation of staff resources and capital expenses. The latter will occur primarily when vehicles or equipment are to be replaced and secondarily in the design of new public facilities. In many cases GHG-reducing features will return long-term savings in energy costs. Options for funding implementation and staff resources will be brought back to the Council as part of the Mid-Year Budget Review.

OPTIONS: After opening the public hearing and taking public testimony, the City Council is requested to take one of the actions listed below:

- a. (1) Adopt a Negative Declaration for the Draft Qualified Climate Action Plan;
(2) Adopt the Draft Qualified Climate Action Plan;
- b. Amend, modify or reject the foregoing option.

Attachments:

1. Draft Resolution of the City Council to adopt a Negative Declaration for the Climate Action Plan (includes Initial Study)
2. Draft Resolution of the City Council to adopt the Draft Climate Action Plan Climate Action Plan (The Climate Action Plan is distributed under separate cover due to its size.)
3. Excerpts from "Greenhouse Gas Thresholds and Supporting Evidence" Report
4. Newspaper Notice Affidavit

RESOLUTION NO. 13-xxx

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
ADOPTING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE CLIMATE ACTION PLAN

WHEREAS, the State adopted Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the "California Global Warming Solutions Act" in 2005 which requires cities and counties to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions; and

WHEREAS, the City of El Paso de Robles has prepared a Climate Action Plan as a "road map" on how the City will reduce GHG through various action and measures; and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate whether the Climate Action Plan would result in environmental impacts, and the City has determined that the Climate Action Plan will not result in significant environmental impacts, 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 and a Draft Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for public review and comment (see Exhibit A); and

WHEREAS, no public comments or responses were received in regard to the Draft Negative Declaration and Initial Study prepared for this project; and

WHEREAS, public notice of the proposed Draft Negative Declaration was posted as required by Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on October 22, 2013 to consider the Initial Study and the proposed draft Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed project and to accept public testimony on the Climate Action Plan and environmental determination, and the Planning Commission recommended approval of the draft Negative Declaration to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, based on the information and analysis contained in the Initial Study prepared for this project and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the City Council finds that there is no substantial evidence that there would be a significant impact on the environment as a result of implementation of the Climate Action Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles, based on its independent judgment does hereby adopt a Negative Declaration for the Climate Action Plan in accordance with the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the City's Procedures for Implementing CEQA.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 19th day of November, 2013, by the following roll call vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Duane Picanco, Mayor

ATTEST:

Caryn Jackson, Deputy City Clerk

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

1. **PROJECT TITLE:** City of Paso Robles - Climate Action Plan
2. **LEAD AGENCY:** City of Paso Robles
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446
- Contact:** Susan DeCarli, Planning Manager
Phone: (805) 237-3970
Email: sdecarli@prcity.com
3. **PROJECT LOCATION:** City of Paso Robles, citywide
4. **GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** The plan would be implemented throughout the City and would occur in all General Plan designations.
5. **ZONING:** The plan would be implemented throughout the City in all zoning designations.
6. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**
The CAP is a policy document that sets forth policies and programs (collectively referred to as “CAP measures” or “climate action measures”) and implementation actions to help the City of Paso Robles reduce its greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and prepare for the anticipated effects of climate change. CEQA requires the analysis of physical impacts on the environment. As such, the impact analysis focuses on adoption of the CAP and implementation of the climate action measures and actions and whether they would result in physical environmental impacts. It should be noted that the CAP does not propose any land use or zoning changes, nor does it include any site-specific development. Further, any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

Project Background

The State of California considers GHG emissions and the impacts of global warming to be a serious threat to the public health, environment, economic well-being, and natural resources of California, and has taken actions to mitigate the state’s impact on climate change through the adoption of policies and legislation. In 2005, the Governor issued Executive Order S-3-05, which identifies statewide GHG emission reduction goals to achieve long-term climate stabilization as follows: reduce GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020, and to 80 percent below 1990 levels by

2050.¹ Assembly Bill (AB) 32, also known as the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, subsequently codified the 2020 target, requiring California to reduce statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020. AB 32 also directed the California Air Resources Board to develop a plan to identify how the 2020 target would be met. That plan, called the Climate Change Scoping Plan (Scoping Plan) was approved in 2008 and contains the main strategies California will implement to achieve the target. The Scoping Plan identifies local governments as “essential partners” in achieving the goals of AB 32 since local governments have primary authority to plan, zone, approve, and permit how land is developed and used in their jurisdictions. The Scoping Plan encourages local governments to adopt a reduction target that parallels the State commitment to reduce GHG emissions by approximately 15 percent to achieve 1990 emissions levels by 2020.

Project Description

The CAP is a programmatic, long-range planning document with actions to reduce GHG emissions from community-wide activities and City government operations within Paso Robles to support the State’s efforts under AB 32 and to mitigate Paso Robles’s climate-related impacts. Specifically, the CAP does the following:

- Summarizes the results of the City’s GHG Emissions Inventory Update, which identifies the major sources and quantities of GHG emissions produced within Paso Robles and forecasts how these emissions may change over time.
- Identifies the quantity of GHG emissions that Paso Robles will need to reduce to meet its target of 15 percent below 2005 levels by the year 2020, consistent with AB 32.
- Sets forth City government and community-wide GHG reduction measures, including performance standards which, if implemented, would collectively achieve the specified emission reduction target.
- Identifies proactive adaptation strategies that can be implemented to help Paso Robles prepare for anticipated climate change impacts.
- Sets forth procedures to implement, monitor, and verify the effectiveness of the climate action measures and adapt efforts moving forward.

The CAP utilizes 2005 as the baseline year and 2020 as the target year for achieving reductions. The 2020 target year corresponds with the target year identified in AB 32.

GHG Emissions Inventory Forecast

According to the GHG Emissions Inventory, the Paso Robles community-as-a-whole emitted approximately 169,557 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent GHG emissions (MT CO₂e) in 2005, as a result of activities that took place within the transportation, residential energy use, commercial and industrial energy use, off-road, solid waste, and wastewater sectors. The largest contributors of GHG emissions were the transportation (40 percent), commercial/industrial energy use (20 percent), and residential energy use (24 percent) sectors. The remainder of emissions resulted from the off-road equipment (8 percent), solid waste (8 percent), and wastewater (1 percent) sectors.

¹ Executive orders are binding only on State agencies. Accordingly, Executive Order S-03-05 will guide State agencies’ efforts to control and regulate GHG emissions, but have no direct binding effect on local government or private actions.

The inventory also analyzed GHG emissions from City government operations and facilities. The City government operations inventory is a subset of, and included within, the community inventory. In 2005, City government operations generated approximately 6,022 MT CO₂e. This quantity represents approximately 4 percent of the Paso Robles community’s total GHG emissions.

Under the business-as-usual scenario (a projection of how emissions will change in the future based on 2005 emissions levels and projected growth in population, jobs, and vehicle miles traveled), Paso Robles’s community-wide GHG emissions are projected to grow approximately 20 percent above 2005 GHG emissions levels by the year 2020 (from 169,557 MT CO₂e to 203,448 MT CO₂e).

The AB 32 Scoping Plan identifies several State measures that are approved, programmed, and/or adopted and would reduce GHG emissions within Paso Robles. These State measures require no additional local action. In addition to the State measures, the City of Paso Robles has implemented a number of local measures since the 2005 baseline inventory year that will reduce the community’s GHG emissions with no further action. Therefore, these measures were incorporated into the forecast and reduction assessment to create an “adjusted forecast scenario,” which provides a more accurate picture of future emissions growth and the responsibility of the City.

Under the adjusted scenario, GHG emissions are projected to decrease approximately 19 percent below the business-as-usual scenario to 163,975 MT CO₂e in 2020. Table 1 below summarizes the reduction in local GHG emissions that would result from State and local measures compared to the business-as-usual forecast and the adjusted forecast.

Table 1: Summary of State Reductions and Adjusted Forecast

| | 2020 Reduction (MT CO₂e) |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Business-as-Usual Forecast | 203,448 |
| Reduction from State Regulations | -37,173 |
| Reduction from Local Measures | -2,300 |
| Adjusted Forecast | 169,975 |

Target

The City of Paso Robles is committed to reducing its GHG emissions by 15 percent below 2005 levels by 2020, consistent with AB 32. Based on this target, Paso Robles’s 2020 targeted GHG emissions would be 144,123 MT CO₂e. To meet this target, Paso Robles will need to reduce its GHG emissions 12 percent (or 19,852 MT CO₂e) below the adjusted forecast by 2020 through implementation of local climate action measures and implementation actions.

Climate Action Measures

To achieve the GHG emissions reduction target of 15 percent below 2005 levels by 2020 and prepare for the anticipated effects of climate change, the CAP identifies a comprehensive set of climate action measures. These CAP measures are organized into the following focus areas, or categories: City Government Operations, Energy, Transportation and Land Use, Off-Road, Water, Solid Waste, Tree Planting, and Adaptation. The climate action measures were selected

based on careful consideration of the emission reductions needed to achieve the target, the distribution of emissions in the GHG emissions inventory, existing priorities and resources, and the potential costs and benefits of each climate action measure.

Collectively, the climate action measures identified in the CAP have the potential to reduce GHG emissions within Paso Robles by 19,873 MT CO₂e by 2020 and meet the proposed GHG emission reduction target. Table 2 below shows a list of climate action measures and their associated GHG emissions reductions, where applicable.

Table 2: Summary of GHG Reductions by Measure

| CAP Measure Number | CAP Measure | 2020 GHG Reduction (MT CO₂e) |
|---|--|--|
| City Government Operations | | |
| C-1 | City Government Energy Efficiency Retrofits and Upgrades | 746 |
| C-2 | City Government Energy Efficient Public Realm Lighting | 14 |
| C-3 | Renewable Energy Systems on City Property | 22 |
| C-4 | Transportation Demand Management Program for City Employees | 49 |
| C-5 | Zero and Low Emission City Fleet Vehicles | 66 |
| C-6 | City Government Solid Waste Reduction | 47 |
| C-7 | City Government Tree Planting Program | 6 |
| City Government Total | | 950 |
| Energy | | |
| E-1 | Energy Efficiency Outreach and Incentive Programs | 426 |
| E-2 | Energy Audit and Retrofit Program | 1,497 |
| E-3 | Income-Qualified Energy Efficient Weatherization Programs | 130 |
| E-4 | Incentives for Exceeding Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards | 114 |
| E-5 | Energy Efficient Public Realm Lighting Requirements | 34 |
| E-6 | Small Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Incentive Program | 2,732 |
| E-7 | Income-Qualified Solar PV Program | 183 |
| Energy Subtotal | | 5,116 |
| Transportation and Land Use | | |
| TL-1 | Bicycle Network | 771 |
| TL-2 | Pedestrian Network | 544 |
| TL-3 | Expand Transit Network | 221 |
| TL-4 | Increase Transit Service Frequency/Speed | 363 |
| TL-5 | Transportation Demand Management Incentives | 823 |
| TL-6 | Parking Supply Management | 641 |
| TL-7 | Electric Vehicle Network and Alternative Fueling Stations | 3,448 |
| TL-8 | Infill Development | 4,356 |
| Transportation and Land Use Subtotal | | 11,167 |
| Off-Road | | |
| O-1 | Off-Road Equipment Upgrades, Retrofits, and Replacements | 564 |
| Off-Road Subtotal | | 564 |
| Water | | |

| CAP Measure Number | CAP Measure | 2020 GHG Reduction (MT CO₂e) |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| W-1 | Exceed SB X7-7, Water Conservation Target | 41 |
| <i>Water Subtotal</i> | | <i>41</i> |
| Solid Waste | | |
| S-1 | Solid Waste Diversion Rate | 3,012 |
| <i>Solid Waste Subtotal</i> | | <i>3,012</i> |
| Tree Planting | | |
| T-1 | Tree Planting Program | 18 |
| <i>Tree Planting Subtotal</i> | | <i>18</i> |
| Adaptation | | |
| A-1 | Climate Change Vulnerability | NA |
| A-2 | Public Health and Emergency Preparedness | NA |
| A-3 | Water Management | NA |
| A-4 | Infrastructure | NA |
| <i>Adaptation Subtotal</i> | | <i>NA</i> |
| TOTAL | | 20,868 |

Project-Level CAP Consistency Worksheet

The CAP includes a CAP consistency worksheet in Appendix C to assist project applicants and City staff in determining whether a proposed future development project is consistent with the CAP. If it is determined that a proposed project is not consistent with the CAP, further analysis would be required and the applicant would be required to demonstrate that the proposed project’s GHG emissions fall below the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District’s (APCD) adopted GHG significance thresholds (see Chapter 1 of the CAP). The project would also be required to demonstrate that it would not substantially interfere with implementation of the CAP.

Implementation and Monitoring

Implementation and monitoring are essential processes to ensure that Paso Robles reduces its GHG emissions and meets its target. To facilitate this, each climate action measure is identified along with implementation actions, parties responsible for implementation and monitoring, cost and savings estimates, the GHG reduction potential (as applicable), performance indicators to monitor progress, and an implementation time frame (see Chapter 4, Implementation and Monitoring, of the CAP). Climate action measure implementation is separated into three phases: near-term (by 2015), mid-term (2016-2017), and long-term (2018-2020).

In order to ensure that the CAP measures and actions are implemented and their progress is monitored, the CAP includes several implementation and monitoring policies which direct the City to establish a CAP Implementation Team and conduct periodic measure evaluation and GHG inventory and CAP updates.

9. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:

The City of Paso Robles is an urbanized area largely surrounded by agricultural and rural residential development. There are steep hillsides to the west, and rolling hills and open landscape to the south, east and north. The City includes a range of land uses including

residential, commercial and industrial uses. The Salinas River extends through the center of the City from south to north.

10. OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (e.g., PERMITS, FINANCING APPROVAL OR PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT):

None.

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"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

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 revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED 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 "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact 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. 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, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature: _____

Date _____

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 projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
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. “Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” 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 “Earlier Analyses,” as described in (5) below, 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). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---|---|---|--------------------------|
| I. AESTHETICS: Would the project: | | | | |
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Discussion: | | | | |
| b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Discussion: | | | | |
| c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Discussion: | | | | |
| d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 1, 2, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a,c) The CAP is a policy document that does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would potentially degrade the aesthetic quality of the environment. As a policy document, the CAP would not directly affect scenic vistas or the visual character or quality of the area. Implementation of the climate action measures and actions would generally be associated with activities, such as encouraging energy efficiency and conservation and the use of small-scale on-site solar energy systems; incentivizing smart growth (infill, mixed-use, and higher density development near transit stops) consistent with the General Plan; encouraging walking, bicycling, ride-sharing, and use of existing public transit; facilitating the use of low- and zero-emissions vehicles; and increasing solid waste diversion. It is not anticipated that implementation of the CAP measures and actions would result in substantial effects on a scenic vista or substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the area because the climate action measures and actions would not significantly affect the height, bulk, or scale of development resulting in large structures that could block or highly modify the visual environment.

The CAP includes climate action measures to improve and expand the City's bicycle, pedestrian, and transit networks. Implementation of these measures could result in installation of minor structures, including bicycle racks, benches, covered transit stops, and other alternative transportation related facilities. However, it is not anticipated that these structures would result in substantial effects to visual resources because structures would be small in nature and would not significantly affect the height, bulk, or scale of development or block or highly modify the visual environment. As a policy-document, the CAP does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals for related structures. Alternative transportation structures would be located in and near existing urbanized areas, consistent with the General Plan and Bicycle Master Plan. Further, any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to City policies and regulations related to the protection of visual resources, as well as additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----------------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|----------------------|

The CAP also includes a measure to encourage infill development within the community, in accordance with the existing General Plan and Uptown/Town Center Specific Plan. Infill development incentivized by the CAP would be located in and near existing urbanized areas, consistent with the General Plan. Implementation of this measure could result in increased density in these areas; however, impacts associated with this type of development were analyzed during environmental review of the General Plan. Furthermore, the CAP does not recommend specific densities, building heights massing or design of any projects, and precise project-level analysis would be speculative at this time. Any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to City policies and regulations related to the protection of visual resources, as well as environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

The CAP includes climate action measures to pursue small-scale on-site solar photovoltaic systems at City buildings and facilities and to encourage their installation throughout the community. In 2011, the California Legislature signed Senate Bill 226 and created a statutory exemption (CEQA exemption 21080.35) for solar photovoltaic systems installed on rooftops or existing parking lots (and meeting specified conditions, such as not exceeding 10 kilowatts in size). These solar installations that are exempt from CEQA are the type of solar energy projects anticipated to result from implementation of the CAP measures. Large-scale substantial solar energy facilities, such as solar farms or large solar panel installations that could have visual impacts are not the types of solar installations that would be incentivized through the measure. Implementation actions for this measure were designed consistent with the *California Solar Permitting Guidebook* (Governor’s Office of Planning and Research, 2012) which facilitates streamlined permitting for solar systems under 10 kilowatt in size. According to the Guidebook, “This 10-kilowatt threshold captures approximately 90 percent of the solar photovoltaic systems that are currently installed. Above this size threshold, a system’s design considerations become more complex.” Further, any future proposed solar systems that exceed 10 kW in size or do not meet the requirements of CEQA exemption 21080.35 would be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

Because CAP measures and actions would not generally be of a nature or scale to substantially affect a scenic vista or the existing visual character or quality of the area, and any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to further development review, impacts would be less than significant.

b) The Draft CAP is a policy document that does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would potentially damage scenic resources including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. Impacts would be less than significant.

d) Implementation of the CAP would not result in the development of new significant sources light or glare. Distributed installation of small-scale solar photovoltaic systems is encouraged to reduce community-wide GHG emissions within the community; however, solar photovoltaic panels are specifically designed to absorb, not reflect, sunlight.

The CAP includes several climate action measures where implementation may include replacing public street and parking lot lighting with energy efficient lighting; however, this would not create new sources of light and glare. Furthermore, energy efficient lighting such as light-emitting diodes (LEDs) are directional light sources, which emit light in a specific direction, unlike incandescent and compact fluorescent bulbs which emit light in all directions (Energy Star, 2013). For this reason, potential light related impacts would be less than significant.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---|---|---|----------------------|
|--|---|---|---|----------------------|

model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the State's inventory of forest land, including the forest and Range Assessment Project and the forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a-e) The CAP is a policy-level document that does not propose any land use or zoning changes, nor does it include any site-specific development. As such, implementation of the CAP would not have the potential to substantially degrade agricultural resources or convert agricultural or forest land to non-agricultural or non-forest uses, nor would it conflict with existing zoning. No impacts to agricultural resources would occur.

III. AIR QUALITY: Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Source: 11) | | | | |
| d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Environmental Setting

Paso Robles is located within the San Luis Obispo County portion of the South Central Coast Air Basin (Basin), which is under the jurisdiction of the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (APCD). The APCD is required to monitor air pollutant levels to ensure that air quality standards are met and, if they are not met, to develop strategies to meet the standards. Depending on whether the standards are met or exceeded, the local air basin is classified as being in “attainment” or “non-attainment.” Eastern San Luis Obispo County is a non-attainment area for the federal standard for ozone and the entire County is a non-attainment area for state standards for ozone and PM₁₀. The County is in attainment for the state standards for nitrogen dioxide and carbon monoxide and is unclassified for the associated federal standards (SLOAPCD, 2013).

Under state law, once San Luis Obispo County has been designated and classified as a non-attainment status, the APCD is required to prepare a plan for air quality improvement for pollutants for which the District is in non-attainment. The APCD is responsible for developing and implementing the Clean Air Plan for attainment and maintenance of the ambient air quality standards in San Luis Obispo County. The region’s existing Clean Air Plan, the San Luis Obispo County Clean Air Plan was adopted in 2001, and outlines strategies to reduce ozone precursor emissions from a wide variety of stationary and mobile sources.

Discussion

a-d) The CAP itself does not create physical growth and will not impact air quality beyond what is anticipated in the existing General Plan. Projects that are consistent with the General Plan are also consistent with the Clean Air Plan, as the regional air quality impacts associated with the implementation of the General Plan were evaluated during development of the Clean Air Plan. Therefore, the CAP is consistent with the Clean Air Plan and would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the plan. Furthermore, the purpose and intended effect of the CAP is to reduce GHG emissions within the City to help reduce the effects of climate change, which has the secondary benefit of also reducing criteria pollutant emissions.

CAP measures and implementation actions identified in the CAP aim to increase energy efficiency, reduce vehicle miles traveled, promote travel via low- and zero- emissions modes (i.e., walking, bicycling, transit, electric vehicles, and other alternatively fueled vehicles), reduce gasoline and diesel fuel use, reduce potable water use, increase renewable energy use, and improve waste management efficiency. Implementation of these CAP measures and actions would aid in reducing overall GHG emissions, as well as criteria pollutant emissions, help meet applicable air quality plan goals, and reduce sensitive receptor exposure to pollutant concentrations. Impacts related to air quality would be less than significant.

e) The CAP does not contain any climate action measures that would directly result in the creation of objectionable odors. The CAP would not facilitate any specific development projects that would create odors. No impact would occur.

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a-d) The CAP is a policy-level document that does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would result in biological resource impacts. Infill development incentivized by the CAP, and alternative transportation facilities would be located in and near existing urbanized areas, consistent with the General Plan and Bicycle Master Plan. Further, any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA. Implementation of the CAP would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or indirectly through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, special status species or wildlife movement. In addition, the CAP would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or sensitive natural community. Impacts would be less than significant.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----------------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|----------------------|

e) The CAP does not permit any specific development nor would it add or enable any new development that would conflict with these local goals or policies ordinances protecting biological resources. Impacts would be less than significant.

f) The CAP would not facilitate any specific development projects nor would it add or enable any new development that would conflict with an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Impacts would be less than significant.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a-d) The Paso Robles CAP is a policy-level document that does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical, cultural, or archaeological resource. Further, any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to additional environmental review wherein any site-specific cultural resource impacts would be addressed. Impacts would be less than significant.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. (Sources: 1, 2, & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 2 & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a-e) The CAP is a policy-level document that does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would directly impact or be impacted by geology and soils. The CAP does not propose any site specific development that would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, or landslides. Further, any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to additional environmental review wherein any site-specific impacts related to geology and soils would be addressed. Impacts would be less than significant.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----------------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|----------------------|

Environmental Setting

In March 2012, the APCD adopted GHG thresholds in order to help lead agencies assess the significance of GHG impacts of new projects subject to CEQA. The APCD’s CEQA guidance identifies three different types of GHG thresholds designed to accommodate various development types and patterns:

- 1) Qualitative Reduction Strategies (e.g., Climate Action Plans): a qualitative threshold that is consistent with AB 32 Scoping Plan measures and goals;
- 2) Bright-Line Threshold: numerical value to determine the significance of a project’s annual GHG emissions;
- 3) Efficiency-Based Threshold: assesses the GHG efficiency of a project on a per capita basis.

The APCD recommends that lead agencies within the county use the adopted GHG thresholds of significance when considering the significance of GHG impacts of new projects subject to CEQA. Further, projects with GHG emissions that exceed the thresholds will need to implement mitigation to reduce the impacts to a less than significant level.

As identified in the APCD’s *CEQA Handbook (April 2012)*, if a project is consistent with an adopted Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy (i.e., a CAP) that addresses the project’s GHG emissions, it can be presumed that the project will not have significant GHG emission impacts and the project would be considered less than significant. This approach is consistent with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(h)11 and 15183.5(b). The City’s CAP was developed to be consistent with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5 and APCD’s CEQA Handbook to mitigate emissions and climate change impacts and will therefore serve as a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy for the City of Paso Robles.

Discussion

a) The CAP creates a comprehensive GHG emissions reduction strategy (consistent with Section 15183.5 of the CEQA Guidelines and the APCD CEQA Handbook) for the City of Paso Robles. The CAP contains a series of climate action measures and actions to reduce cumulative GHG emissions by a minimum of 15 percent below 2005 levels by 2020. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) The CAP includes climate action measures and actions to reduce the City’s GHG emissions by at least 15 percent below 2005 levels by 2020 in accordance with AB 32 (see Table 2 of this Initial Study). As stated in the project description, the purpose of the CAP is to reduce Paso Robles’s proportionate share of the statewide target set by AB 32. The CAP would not conflict with any applicable GHG reduction plan. Furthermore, the CAP is consistent with the APCD’s CEQA Handbook and meets all of the criteria specified therein as it pertains to a Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Impacts would be less than significant.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a-f, h) The CAP does not involve any site-specific development nor would it directly facilitate new development. Implementation of the proposed CAP measures would not involve the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, and would not create reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Therefore, no adverse impacts with regard to hazards to the public or environment, hazardous materials with ¼ mile of a school, development on a hazardous material site, or development near an airport or airstrip would occur. Further, the CAP would not expose people or structures to wildland fires. Impacts would be less than significant.

g) The CAP includes climate action measures to promote bicycle, pedestrian, and transit facilities, and would not impair implementation of an adopted emergency response plan. Furthermore, one of the adaptation measures supports emergency preparedness in response to anticipated effects of climate change by disseminating public preparedness and emergency response information, conducting training exercises, and identifying and focusing planning and outreach programs on particularly vulnerable populations. Impacts would be less than significant.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., Would the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? Would decreased rainfall infiltration or groundwater recharge reduce stream baseflow? (Source: 7) | | | | |
| c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (Source: 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Source: 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Source: 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| j. Inundation by mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| k. Conflict with any Best Management Practices found within the City's Storm Water Management Plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| l. Substantially decrease or degrade watershed storage of runoff, wetlands, riparian areas, aquatic habitat, or associated buffer zones? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a) Implementation of the CAP measures would not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. No impact would result.

b-f) The CAP is a policy document that does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development. As a result, no adverse impacts related to groundwater or surface water quality, groundwater resources, runoff, or sensitive areas would occur. Further, one of the climate adaptation measures identifies a strategy to seek funding to enhance flood control and improve water quality. Impacts would be less than significant.

g-i) The CAP is a policy-level document that does not propose any land use or zoning changes, nor does it include any site-specific development. As such, implementation of the CAP would neither directly or indirectly expose people or structures to potential flood hazards or impede or redirect flood flows. Further, one of the climate adaptation measures calls on the City to prepare for anticipated climate change effects on water and limit community exposure to threats such as flooding, which may have a beneficial effect. Impacts would be less than significant.

j) The CAP is a policy-level document that does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would expose people and structures to inundation by seiches, tsunamis, or mudflows.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----------------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|----------------------|

Discussion

a) The CAP does not include any climate action measures or any specific development projects that would divide an established community. The CAP includes several climate action measures that would support pedestrian and bicycle circulation and improved transportation alternatives, which would improve connectivity throughout Paso Robles. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) The CAP is a policy-level document that does not propose any land use or zoning changes, nor does it include any site-specific development; therefore it would not conflict with the City’s General Plan or Zoning Ordinance. The CAP includes a climate action measure to facilitate mixed-use, higher density, and infill development near transit routes, in existing community centers/downtowns, and in other designated areas. Implementation of this measure would occur in areas currently designated for these uses in the General Plan and in a manner consistent with existing policies. Any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to additional environmental review. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) The CAP does not include any site-specific development, designs, or proposals, nor does it grant any entitlements for development that would potentially conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. Any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to subsequent environmental review wherein any site-specific impacts would be addressed accordingly. Impacts would be less than significant.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Source: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (Source: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a-b) Paso Robles does not contain any areas identified by the California Department of Mines and Geology as having substantial mineral resources and has no operating mine or quarry operations.

The CAP would not directly facilitate any specific development projects and would not add or enable development that could result in the loss of mineral resources. No impact to mineral resources would occur.

XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Source: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| groundborne noise levels? | | | | |
| c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1, 4) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a-d) Implementation of the CAP measures would not result in exposure of persons to noise in excess of established standards or groundborne vibration or noise, nor would it result in a temporary, periodic, or permanent increase in ambient noise levels above existing levels. Several of the CAP measures are designed to encourage a shift from single occupancy vehicle to walking and bicycling or from conventional fuels to electric vehicles which would reduce vehicular travel and noise. Therefore, future ambient noise levels should be similar or somewhat reduced from present levels. Further, any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to additional environmental review wherein any site-specific noise impacts would be addressed. Impacts would be less than significant.

e-f) The CAP does not propose any land use or zoning changes, nor does it include any site-specific development which would expose people to excessive noise levels. Impacts would be less than significant.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Source: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a-c) The CAP would not directly or indirectly result in an increase in population and would not accommodate growth beyond that anticipated by the City’s adopted General Plan or induce additional population growth. Further, implementation of the CAP measures would not displace existing housing or people. Therefore, no impacts related to population and housing would result.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES: Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Fire protection? (Sources: 1,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Police protection? (Sources: 1,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Other public facilities? (Sources: 1,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a) Implementation of the CAP would not facilitate additional growth beyond that anticipated by the General Plan. Therefore, it would not increase demand for public services or facilities or generate a need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objective for any of the public services. Therefore, no impact on public services causing the need for new governmental facilities is expected.

XV. RECREATION

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a-b) Implementation of the CAP would not directly or indirectly increase population or demand for park facilities. Therefore, the CAP would not result in physical deterioration of park facilities or require new park facilities, the construction of which could cause physical environmental impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
|--|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to a level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a-b) The CAP is a policy-level document that includes climate action measures to reduce GHG emissions. It does not propose any land use or zoning changes, nor does it include any site-specific development. Please note any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA. Implementation of the CAP would not conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system or an applicable congestion management program. Implementation of the CAP measures would encourage alternatives to single occupancy vehicle travel (i.e., walking, bicycling, transit, carpooling, telecommuting, etc.) in order to reduce vehicle trips and miles traveled. This could reduce the number of vehicle trips, volume-to-capacity ratio, and intersection congestion within the City, thereby improving levels of service on local roads. This would provide a positive benefit in the performance of the circulation system. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) Implementation of the CAP would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. No impact related to air traffic or

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----------------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|----------------------|

safety would occur.

d-e) The CAP would not directly facilitate any specific development projects nor would it add or enable development that would increase hazards or result in inadequate emergency access. Further, any future site-specific discretionary projects would be subject to additional environmental review wherein any site-specific impacts related to hazards or emergency access would be addressed. Impacts would be less than significant.

f) Implementation of the CAP would encourage alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle travel, consistent with adopted local and regional plans, policies, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities, and would not result in adverse effects on their safety or performance. Impacts would be less than significant.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project=s projected demand in addition to the provider=s existing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion

a-e) The CAP would not accommodate growth beyond that anticipated by the General Plan nor does it propose any specific development projects that would increase wastewater generation, water demand, or stormwater runoff. Further, the CAP includes a climate action measure that aims to reduce potable water consumption compared to business-as-usual, which would reduce wastewater generation and water demand. Impacts would be less than

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----------------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|----------------------|

significant.

f-g) The CAP would not accommodate growth beyond that anticipated by the General Plan nor does it propose any specific development projects that would increase solid waste generation. Further, the CAP includes a measure that aims to reduce community-wide waste. Impacts would be less than significant.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>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?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>b. 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)?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>c. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion:

a) The intent of the CAP is to reduce GHG emissions from City of Paso Robles operations and within the City through implementation of GHG reduction measures. CAP measures encourage actions by residents, businesses, and the City to reduce energy, water, and fuel use and associated GHG emissions. The CAP would not directly facilitate any specific development plans or projects or have any climate action measures that would diminish wildlife habitats or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. As discussed in Sections IV, *Biological Resources*, and V, *Cultural Resources*, impacts would be less than significant.

b) Implementation of the CAP would result in a cumulatively considerable beneficial reduction of GHG emissions and would not make a considerable contribution to any significant cumulative impacts. Impacts would be less than significant.

c) The CAP does not have any effects which would cause a direct or indirect adverse effect on human beings. Rather, the CAP would reduce GHG emissions as well as have many other secondary environmental benefits. These include: reduction in air pollution, reduction in transportation congestion, reduction in landfilled solid waste, energy efficiency, and water conservation. Therefore, CAP implementation would have less than significant impacts with respect to adverse effects on humans.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|----------------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|---|---|----------------------|

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 that may have been used 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 | 2005 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 Urban Water Management Plan 2005 | Same as above |
| 8 | City of Paso Robles Sewer Master Plan | Same as above |
| 9 | City of Paso Robles Housing Element | Same as above |
| 10 | City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval for New Development | Same as above |
| 11 | San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Guidelines for Impact Thresholds | APCD 3433 Roberto Court San Luis Obispo, CA 93401 |
| 12 | San Luis Obispo County – Land Use Element | San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning County Government Center San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 |
| 13 | USDA, Soils Conservation Service, Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, Paso Robles Area, 1983 | Soil Conservation Offices Paso Robles, Ca 93446 |
| 14 | Draft Bike Plan, 2009 | City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446 |

RESOLUTION NO. 13-xxx

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
ADOPTING THE CLIMATE ACTION PLAN

WHEREAS, Assembly Bill (AB) 32, known as the "Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006", requires that California's greenhouse gas emissions be reduced to 1990 levels by the year 2020, and the AB 32 Climate Change Scoping Plan (2008) calls on local governments to reduce emissions in their jurisdictions by approximately 15 percent below 2005 levels; and

WHEREAS, the Draft Climate Action Plan is a policy document that:

- Identifies the City's 2005 baseline and 2020 projected greenhouse gas emissions;
- Establishes a greenhouse gas emissions reduction target of 15 percent below 2005 levels by the year 2020;
- Sets forth the climate action measures the City will implement to achieve its emissions reduction targets and to address potential climate change impacts; and
- Establishes procedures to implement, monitor, and verify the effectiveness of the climate action measures and adaptation efforts moving forward; and

WHEREAS, the Draft Climate Action Plan was developed to streamline environmental review of future development projects consistent with the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code § 21000, et seq., as amended and implementing State California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, Title 14, Chapter 3 of the California Code of Regulations (collectively, "CEQA"), in particular CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5(b); and

WHEREAS, City conducted four public workshops to gather public input on the Draft Climate Action Plan "toolbox" of implementation measures, and the toolbox measures were modified to reflect public input and direction from the Planning Commission and City Council; and

WHEREAS, the Draft Climate Action Plan was posted on the City's website for public review for 30 days; and

WHEREAS, the Draft Climate Action Plan was considered by the Planning Commission on October 22, 2013, and the Planning Commission recommended approval of the Draft Climate Action Plan to the City Council (see Exhibit A, Draft Climate Action Plan); and

WHEREAS, the City Council conducted a duly-noticed public hearing on the Draft Climate Action Plan on November 19, 2013; and

WHEREAS, a draft Negative Declaration was prepared for the Draft Climate Action Plan pursuant to CEQA and released for a 30-day public review period and no comments were received regarding the CEQA determination. The draft Negative Declaration is considered under a separate resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles that the City Council finds and determines that the Draft Climate Action Plan is consistent with the State law regarding reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and meeting reduction targets identified in AB 32.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 19th day of November, 2013, by the following roll call vote:

AYES:
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:

Duane Picanco, Mayor

ATTEST:

Caryn Jackson, Deputy City Clerk

Draft Climate Action Plan

A hard copy of the plan is on file at the City of Paso Robles Community Development Department, at the City Library, and it is distributed under separate cover.

See City website at www.prcity.com/government to view a digital copy of the Climate Action Plan.

GREENHOUSE GAS THRESHOLDS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE



March 28, 2012



2.2.1 Qualified GHG Reduction Strategies

Many local agencies have already undergone or plan to undergo efforts to create or update general plans or other plans consistent with AB 32 goals. The Air District encourages such planning efforts and recognizes that careful upfront planning by local agencies is invaluable to achieving the state's GHG reduction goals. If a project is consistent with an adopted Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy (e.g. Climate Action Plan) that addresses the project's GHG emissions, it can be presumed that the project will not have significant GHG emission impacts and the project would be considered less than significant. This approach is consistent with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15064(h)¹¹ and 15183.5(b), which provides that a "lead agency may determine that a project's incremental contribution to a cumulative effect is not cumulatively considerable if the project will comply with the requirements in a previously approved plan or mitigation program which provides specific requirements that will avoid or substantially lessen the cumulative problem."

A Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy (or similar adopted policies, ordinances and programs) is one that is consistent with all the AB 32 Scoping Plan measures and goals. The Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy should identify a land use design, transportation network, goals, policies and implementation measures that would achieve AB 32 goals. Strategies with horizon years beyond 2020 should consider continuing the downward reduction path set by AB 32 and move toward climate stabilization goals established in Executive Order S-3-05.

A Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy adopted by a local jurisdiction should include the following elements as stated in the State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5:

- (A) Quantify greenhouse gas emissions, both existing and projected over a specified time period, resulting from activities within a defined geographic area;
- (B) Establish a level, based on substantial evidence, below which the contribution to greenhouse gas emissions from activities covered by the plan would not be cumulatively considerable;
- (C) Identify and analyze the greenhouse gas emissions resulting from specific actions or categories of actions anticipated within the geographic area;
- (D) Specify measures or a group of measures, including performance standards, that substantial evidence demonstrates, if implemented on a project-by-project basis, would collectively achieve the specified emissions level;
- (E) Establish a mechanism to monitor the plan's progress toward achieving the level and to require amendment if the plan is not achieving specified levels;
- (F) Be adopted in a public process following environmental review.

The District's revised CEQA Handbook will include detailed methodology to determine if a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy meets these requirements. In addition, the APCD has developed more specific guidance intended to assist local governments in developing community scale Climate Action Plans. The guidance emphasizes the need for GHG inventories to be comprehensive and based on valid, well documented methodologies; the reduction strategies developed as part of the Climate Action Plans should rely on mandatory measures that address both new and existing development. Please refer to Attachment 1 for the complete guidance document.

¹¹ California Air Resources Board. 2010 (December). California Greenhouse Gas Inventory for 2000-2008-by IPCC Category. Sacramento, CA. Available: http://arb.ca.gov/cc/inventory/data/tables/ghg_inventory_ipcc_00-08_all_2010-05-12.pdf. Accessed December 1, 2011.



APCD staff recognizes some communities in SLO County have been proactive in planning for climate change but have not yet developed a stand-alone Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy that meets the above criteria. Nonetheless, some jurisdictions have adopted climate action policies, ordinances and programs that may, in fact, achieve the goals of AB 32 and a Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. If a local jurisdiction can demonstrate its collective set of climate action policies, ordinances and other programs is consistent with AB 32 and State CEQA Guidelines Section 15183.5, and includes requirements or feasible measures to reduce its GHG emissions to 1990 levels or 15% below 2008 emission levels, staff recommends the AB 32 consistency demonstration be considered equivalent to a Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies that are tied to the AB 32 reduction goals would promote reductions on a plan level without impeding the implementation of GHG-efficient development, and would recognize the initiative of many SLO County communities who have already developed or are in the process of developing a GHG Reduction Plan. Compliance with a Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy (or equitably similar adopted policies, ordinances and programs) would provide the evidentiary basis for making CEQA findings that development consistent with the plan may normally be considered to have a less than significant GHG emissions impact. Therefore, projects approved under qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategies or equivalent demonstrations would achieve their fair share of GHG emission reductions in meeting AB 32 goals.



Appendix 1

San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Qualified GHG Plan Level Guidance

This guidance is intended to assist local governments in developing community scale Climate Action Plans. In drafting this guidance, the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) has drawn from established methodologies and practices, rather than creating new protocols or quantification methods. This guidance should be interpreted as recommended approaches rather than a formal protocol. This guidance will be continually updated as new tools, methodologies and protocols are developed and refined.

Any Climate Action Plan (CAP) that aims to support tiering of future development projects for purposes of CEQA review of GHG impacts must include these standard elements.

- a) A community-wide GHG emissions inventory and "business-as-usual" forecast of year 2020 community-wide GHG emissions;
- b) GHG reduction targets consistent with AB 32;
- c) An analysis of local and state policies and actions that may impact GHG emissions within the jurisdiction;
- d) Quantification of GHG reduction measures demonstrating that, if fully implemented, the GHG reduction targets will be met;
- e) An implementation and monitoring strategy and timeline;
- f) An adequate environmental review of the proposed CAP.

Early consultation with APCD staff is essential; the importance of communicating with District staff early in the climate planning process cannot be overemphasized. District staff is available to meet with local government planners, review methodologies, discuss approaches and any other issues throughout the process of preparing the CAP.

An environmental document that relies on a greenhouse gas reduction plan for a cumulative impacts analysis must identify those requirements specified in the plan that apply to the project; if those requirements are not otherwise binding and enforceable, they must be incorporated as mitigation measures applicable to the project. If there is substantial evidence that the effects of a particular project may be cumulatively considerable, notwithstanding its compliance with the specified requirements in the plan for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, an EIR must be prepared for the project.



Qualitative Requirements for Qualified GHG Reduction Strategies

1) *The GHG emissions inventory should be complete and comprehensive*

Any GHG emissions source addressed in this guidance should be included in the GHG inventory and forecast for the local CAP. If an emissions source is not included (for example, direct access electricity use or wastewater treatment), it should be clearly explained why that source was omitted. District staff will review this explanation as part of the evaluation of the CAP.

2) *Calculations and assumptions should be transparent*

It is important to emphasize that all methodologies and assumptions should be documented and explained within the CAP document.

3) *GHG reduction strategies should rely primarily on mandatory measures*

To date, most CAPs have emphasized voluntary GHG reduction measures over mandatory measures, indicated with language like "should promote," and "will encourage," etc. However, because implementation of voluntary measures cannot be guaranteed, their contribution to meeting the GHG reduction target is more speculative than that of mandatory measures. Problems that may result from over-reliance on voluntary measures include the following:

- It could be very difficult for local jurisdictions to demonstrate that GHG reduction targets are being met through voluntary measures.
- This, in turn, will make it difficult for a local government to determine if a project is complying with the adopted CAP in order to appropriately tier off of the CAP CEQA document.
- If the local government cannot document that its CAP is on track to achieve the GHG reduction target, then the CAP may cease to comply with the "qualified" criteria. In this case subsequent projects would not be eligible to benefit from the tiering provisions of CEQA.

If voluntary measures are included in the CAP, distinctions should be drawn between those that are more or less likely to result in full implementation. For example, incentive-based programs (like AB 811 programs) are usually more likely to achieve results than outreach-based programs. Some CAPs have taken a cautious approach and have not quantified GHG reductions from the latter type of measure, due to their highly speculative nature. The APCD recommends only mandatory measures and strong voluntary measures (such as incentive-based programs) be quantified as contributing toward the GHG reduction target.

4) *Build in a margin of safety*

Once the CAP enters the implementation phase it is possible that unforeseen issues or obstacles may arise that prevent full implementation of all CAP measures, or the emission reductions achieved for some measures may be less than anticipated. These risks may be



heightened by unforeseen economic or political developments that adversely affect implementation of the measures. Therefore, APCD recommends the CAP build in a margin of safety to ensure it can continue to serve as a defensible "Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy." This can be accomplished by:

- Including more GHG mitigation measures than needed to meet the GHG reduction target, thus creating a "buffer" against lower than anticipated results;
- Emphasizing mandatory over voluntary measures;
- Including contingency measures (with quantified emission reduction estimates) that can be activated to fill any gap needed to maintain the expected rate of progress toward achieving the emissions reduction target.

5) *Measures should address existing as well as new development*

The AB 32 target of reducing GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 represents an initial step toward achieving the longer term goal of Executive Order S-3-05, which calls for reducing GHG emissions to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050; this equates to less than 2 metric tons of GHGs per capita. Reducing GHG emissions from new development alone cannot provide sufficient GHG reductions to achieve this long-term target. Therefore, climate action plans should address energy use and emissions from existing development as well. In its review of climate action plans, the APCD recommends aggressive and innovative strategies to achieve emission reductions from existing as well as new development.

6) *Implementation and monitoring should be clearly defined*

The parameters for determining if the CAP is being fully implemented, and if development projects are consistent with the CAP, must be clearly laid out. If a local government plans to tier future projects off the environmental review performed on a CAP, the monitoring program should include the following elements:

- *Annual tracking/reporting on implementation of all CAP measures, including measures that address existing development.* The phasing-in of mitigation measures should be addressed (i.e. — have all the measures that were to have been adopted or expanded in the past year actually been adopted/expanded?).
- *Annual reporting of how new development projects have been implementing CAP measures.* Tracking individual project attributes and implementation of mitigation measures should be done on a project-by-project basis. This can be facilitated through the use of a compliance checklist for new development projects to demonstrate consistency with the plan (listing all mandatory and voluntary measures that apply to new development) and whether the project is implementing the measures; the District will request a copy of this checklist (or similar documentation) when reviewing projects for CEQA.



- *Annual review of the State's implementation of measures included in the CAP. Are state-level policies achieving the reductions anticipated?*
- *Periodic update of the GHG inventory.* The APCD recommends updating the community-wide GHG inventory at least once every 5 years. However, updating the inventory on a more frequent basis may improve the ability to monitor progress toward achieving the GHG reduction target in the CAP.
- *Analysis of whether the CAP is still a "qualified" plan for CEQA purposes.* The analysis should be based on level of implementation and effectiveness of measures.