

RESOLUTION NO. 07-080

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES
APPROVING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 07-001(b)
(UPTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN OVERLAY DISTRICT)

WHEREAS, the City has initiated General Plan Amendment 07-001(b) to accomplish the following objectives:

- To establish the Uptown Specific Plan Overlay District on approximately 400 acres generally located north of 23rd and 24th Streets, and between Highway 101 and Vine Street as shown in the map in the Initial Study for this project, attached to this resolution;
- To delete the Oak Park Specific Plan Overlay District; and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared for this project (attached to this resolution), which proposed that a Negative Declaration be approved; and

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

WHEREAS, public hearings were conducted by the Planning Commission on April 10, 2007 and by the City Council on May 1, 2007 to consider the Initial Study prepared for this application, and to accept public testimony regarding this proposed environmental determination for the proposed code amendment; and

WHEREAS, based on the information contained in the Initial Study prepared for this General Plan Amendment and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the City Council finds no substantial evidence that there would be a significant impact on the environment if the code amendment was approved.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that based on the City's independent judgment, the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles does hereby approve a Negative Declaration for General Plan Amendment 07-001(b) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of the City of Paso Robles this 1st day of May 2007 by the following vote:

AYES: Hamon, Nemeth, Picanco, Strong, and Mecham
NOES:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

Frank R. Mecham, Mayor

ATTEST:

Deborah D. Robinson, Deputy City Clerk

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

- 1. PROJECT TITLE:** **General Plan Amendment 07-001(b): Uptown Specific Plan Overlay**
- Concurrent Entitlements:** **None**
- 2. LEAD AGENCY:** City of Paso Robles
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446
- Contact:** Ed Gallagher, Housing Programs Manager
Phone: (805) 237-3970
- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:** The area consisting of approximately 400 acres located north of 23rd and 24th Streets, east of Highway 101 and south of 38th Street (except for the “Hot Springs” property), and east of Vine Street (except for certain properties north of 28th Street) - as shown on the attached map.
- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** **City of Paso Robles**
- Contact Person:** Ed Gallagher, Housing Programs Manager
- Phone:** (805) 237-3970
- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** This project will establish the “Uptown Specific Plan” Overlay Land Use District and superimpose it on all existing underlying base land use categories within the project area. It will also delete the “Oak Park Specific Plan” Overlay Land Use District, which lies completely within the proposed “Uptown Specific Plan” Overlay Land Use District
- 6. ZONING:** There are several residential, commercial, and industrial zoning districts in the project area.

7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION: This code amendment proposes to amend the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan to accomplish the following objectives:

- To amend the text of the Land Use Element to establish the "Uptown Specific Plan" Overlay Land Use District;
- To amend the Land Use Map (Figure LU-6) to
 - a. Superimpose the "Uptown Specific Plan" Overlay Land Use District on all existing underlying base land use categories within the project area.
 - b. Delete the "Oak Park Specific Plan Overlay Land Use District.

Preparation of the actual specific plan will be subject to separate environmental review.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING: See the Environmental Impact Report for the 2003 Update of the City's General Plan

9. OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED): none

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

Ed Gallagher, Housing Programs Manager

11. RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION: none

12. CONTEXT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FOR PROJECT:

This general plan amendment (GPA) will enable the preparation of a specific plan for the northwest quadrant of the City. The general plan amendment itself will not cause any development to occur.

The specific plan that will follow will investigate opportunities for new land use types and/or intensities, new development standards, transportation system improvements, and public facility improvements. The goals, policies, and actions set forth in the 2003 General Plan and 2006 Economic Strategy will guide the preparation of the specific plan. However, the conclusions and recommendations of the specific plan in terms of actual changes to land use types and/or intensities, new development standards, transportation system improvements, and public facility improvements are unknown at this time. As required by the California Environmental Quality Act, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be prepared for the specific plan to address such possible changes, once they are identified and defined.

Most properties in the project area are already developed, very few are vacant. The overlay will result in the preparation of a Specific Plan that will guide future development and create a vision for the project area.

The City's 2003 General Plan sets forth policies and actions for the future development and re-development of the City of Paso Robles, striving toward an overall goal of becoming a balanced community where the great majority of the residents can live, work, and shop. The 2006 Economic Strategy enhances this vision and sets forth principles and actions to further its realization.

The portion of the City generally located north of 23rd and 24th Streets has a role to play in the attainment of this vision. There are opportunities to be pursued and problems to be addressed relating to land use, housing, community design, and circulation (for vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists) that would best be addressed in a comprehensive manner via a specific plan.

A specific plan will evaluate long-term land use and circulation opportunities for the area and propose methods to improve the health, safety, livability, and investment in the neighborhoods comprising this area in a cohesive and comprehensive manner.

It is anticipated that the Specific Plan will include such items as:

- Preparing a new vision for land uses and development for the area as a whole. This may include providing: a new mix of residential and commercial land uses with a variety of housing types and densities; neighborhood commercial sites integrated into housing areas; and new public spaces (primarily recreational).
- Proposing street, alley, and pedestrian/bikeway improvements that serve to calm through-traffic, link neighborhoods, and to support walking, bicycling, safe routes to schools and use of public transit. The City also hopes to improve the pedestrian/bicycle link between the east and west sides of the railroad, as the current 24th Street bridge over the tracks provides poor access.
- Recommendations for architectural and site planning concepts and development standards that would replace the current zoning standards and encourage future investment in the area.

The Oak Park Specific Plan Overlay Land Use Category, which already exists in the project area and applies only to the Oak Park Public Housing Property, will be replaced and superseded by the Uptown Specific Plan Overlay Land Use Category.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geological Problems | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy & Mineral Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| | <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 the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. **A NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

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

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

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect(s) on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project. (See item #11 above, for a specific reference to that EIR.)

Signature

Ed Gallagher

Printed Name

03/23/07

Date

Housing Programs Manager

Title

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

SAMPLE QUESTION:

<i>ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
<p><i>Would the proposal result in or expose people to potential impacts involving:</i></p> <p><i>Landslides or Mud flows? (Sources: 1, 6)</i></p> <p><i>Discussion: The attached source list explains that 1 is the Paso Robles General Plan and 6 is a topographical map of the area which show that the area is located in a flat area. (Note: This response probably would not require further explanation).</i></p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the Proposal:

- a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning? (Source: Paso Robles Zoning Code.)

Discussion: This general plan amendment will help implement goals and policies set forth in the 2003 General Plan. It will, however, call for more-detailed planning to implement 2006 Economic Strategy policies, which may conclude with recommendations for further general plan amendments to help fine-tune the vision set forth in these two planning documents.

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

Discussion: See response to Item #1a.

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

Discussion: See response to Item #1a. The purpose of the specific plan, however, is to minimize and mitigate any land use incompatibilities by comprehensively planning the project area.

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

Discussion: The Hot Springs property abuts agriculturally-designated land to the east (across the Salinas River). The EIR for the specific plan will assess any impacts to agricultural resources and operations that might occur if the specific plan proposes any change or intensification of land use for this property.

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

Discussion: See response to Items #Ia and Ic.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion: The specific plan may recommend increasing residential densities within the project area, which could have the effect of increasing population capacity beyond the 44,000 cap established in the 2003 General Plan. If such a recommendation is made, the future EIR for the Uptown Specific Plan will need to address the full range of environmental effects associated with the degree of population increase recommended.

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

Discussion: See response to Item #IIa.

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The 2006 Economic Strategy calls for the City to “increase labor force resident in the City” as a means of furthering the 2003 General Plan’s Goal of making the City a “balanced community where the great majority of the residents can live, work, and shop.” The Uptown Specific Plan will investigate opportunities to increase the number of residential units in the project area in such a manner that housing is affordable to all income groups and so that the number of units affordable to low and moderate income households is increased.

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

a) Fault rupture?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: Per the Safety Element, there are no known potentially active faults in the project area. The specific plan will not increase the exposure of people to seismic hazards.

b) Seismic ground shaking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: See response to Item #IIIa. The City has adopted building codes that mandate construction methods to mitigate damage from seismic events.

c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The “Hot Springs” property located northeast of Highway 101 and Spring Street is identified by the Safety Element as having a high liquefaction risk. The EIR for the specific plan will need to address this if it recommends any change or intensification of land use for this property.

All other properties in the project area have moderate risk, which is regularly addressed by the City’s standard requirement for issuance of a building permit to submit soils studies and that building footings be designed to meet recommendations outlined in those studies. (This applies whether or not a specific plan is prepared.)

d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The City of Paso Robles is not subject to these risks.

e) Landslides or Mud flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The Safety Element identifies all properties within the project area as having low risk for landslides.

f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: All properties located east of Vine Street are on flat land where this problem does not exist. Some properties located west of Vine Street have hillsides. Whether or not a specific plan is prepared, at the time of their development, these properties would be subject to approval of grading and drainage plans that would be subject to codes and standards designed to mitigate this type of problem.

g) Subsidence of the land?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

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

Discussion: See response to Item #IIIc. Liquefaction is the only known agent to present a potential land subsidence problem within the City of Paso Robles.

- h) Expansive soils?

Discussion: Whether or not a specific plan is prepared, it is a standard requirement for issuance of a building permit to submit soils studies and that building footings be designed to meet recommendations outlined in those studies.

- i) Unique geologic or physical features?

Discussion: There are not any known unique geologic features in the project area. Physical features in the project area would include hillsides west of Vine Street and the Salinas River (on the "Hot Springs" property). Those features would be subject to General Plan policies, and zoning code regulations that would serve to protect their amenity, regardless of whether a specific plan is prepared.

IV. WATER. Would the proposal result in:

- a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? (Source: 9)

Discussion: As noted in Item #Ia, this general plan amendment may recommend increasing residential densities within the project area. If such a recommendation is made, the future EIR for the specific plan will need to address any drainage impacts that might occur in proportion to the degree of change and/or intensification of development recommended.

- b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? (Source: 9)

Discussion: According to the Flood Insurance Rate Maps prepared in 1981, most properties in the project area are located above the 100 year flood zone. The "Hot Springs" property, a handful of properties between 23rd and 24th Streets west of Oak Street, and the intersection of 24th Street and Black Oak Drive are in the 100 year flood zone. The specific plan will need to identify means to address this condition and recommend appropriate mitigation measures. It should be noted that this problem exists whether or not a specific plan is prepared.

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

Discussion: Most all of the properties in the project were developed in advance of current EPA regulations governing stormwater pollution prevention. The specific plan will offer an opportunity to identify methods to mitigate any existing impacts. This will be addressed as part of the EIR for the specific plan.

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

Discussion: The City presently requires that new developments be designed to limit runoff to historic levels in order to minimize downstream impacts. This generally results in the construction of detention basins in an incremental/ad hoc basis. The specific plan offers an opportunity to investigate alternative and area-wide drainage detention facilities that could improve present conditions. This will be addressed as part of the EIR for the specific plan.

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

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
movement?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Not applicable to this project.				
f) Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability? (Source: 9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Not applicable to this project.				
g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Not applicable to this project.				
h) Impacts to groundwater quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: This will be addressed as part of the EIR for the specific plan.				
i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: This will be addressed as part of the EIR for the specific plan.				

V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: As noted in Item #Ia, this general plan amendment may recommend increasing residential densities within the project area. If such a recommendation is made, the future EIR for the Uptown Specific Plan will need to address any air quality impacts that might occur in proportion to the degree of population increase recommended. It is the City's intention that the project area be planned so that neighborhoods are walkable, transit opportunities enhanced, and convenience commercial uses centrally-located so that vehicle miles traveled and attendant emissions are decreased.				
b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? (Source: 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See response to Item Va. This impact will be addressed as part of the EIR for the specific plan.				
c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature? (Source: 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: It is not anticipated that any change in land use or development pattern that might be recommended by the specific plan would cause such an impact.				
d) Create objectionable odors? (Source: 10)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See response to Item # Vc.				

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

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

- a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?

Discussion: If the specific plan proposes changes in land use types and intensities, there could be increases in vehicle trips. It is the City's intention that the project area be planned so that neighborhoods are walkable, transit opportunities enhanced, and convenience commercial uses centrally-located so that vehicle miles traveled are decreased.

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

Discussion: It is the City's intention that the specific plan propose improvements to streets, bikeways, and pedestrian paths to improve safety in, and livability of, the project area.

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

Discussion: It is the City's intention that the specific plan propose improvements to connect existing and proposed land uses and mitigate problems associated with inadequate access.

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

Discussion: The specific plan will review existing parking behavior, the parking standards in the Zoning Code, and opportunities for enhanced transit that might help reduce the need for parking.

- e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists?

Discussion: See response to Item #VIb

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

Discussion: See response to Item #VIa

- g) Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?

Discussion: Not applicable to this project.

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

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>a) Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to: plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?</p> <p>Discussion: The only expected location of habitats for such species would be the “Hot Springs” property, which has riparian vegetation along the Salinas River. If the specific plan recommends any intensification of use of this property, its EIR will need to address attendant impacts on these species.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)?</p> <p>Discussion: There are oak trees in the project area. As provided for in the Conservation Element of the General Plan and the City’s Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, the specific plan will need to provide for preservation of mature oaks. The specific plan EIR will address this.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?</p> <p>Discussion: The “Hot Springs” property has riparian vegetation along the Salinas River. If the specific plan recommends any intensification of use of this property, its EIR will need to address attendant impacts on this plant community.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?</p> <p>Discussion: The only known wetland in the project area would be the Salinas River on the “Hot Springs” property. If the specific plan recommends any intensification of use of this property, its EIR will need to address attendant impacts on wetlands.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?</p> <p>Discussion: San Joaquin Kit Fox are known to travel along the Salinas River Corridor. If the specific plan recommends any change or intensification of use of the “Hot Springs” property, its EIR will need to address attendant impacts on Kit Fox migration.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

VIII.ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

<p>a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? (Source: 1)</p> <p>Discussion: The specific plan will be tasked with incorporating Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) principles and standards. This should provide an enhanced level of mitigation of existing energy impacts.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>b) Use non-renewable resource in a wasteful and inefficient manner? (Source: 1)</p> <p>Discussion: See response to Item VIIIa.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>c) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of</p>				

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
the State? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The only known mineral resource in the project area would be sand in the Salinas River (a resource for building materials). There is no institutional history of mining of sand on the "Hot Springs" property. With or without a specific plan, the property owners could apply to the City for a mining permit.

IX. HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The specific plan will evaluate existing and proposed land uses to evaluate whether or not this problem exists and, if it does, whether mitigation measures are warranted.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The specific plan will evaluate existing and proposed land uses to evaluate whether or not this problem exists and, if it does, whether mitigation measures are warranted.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) The creation of any health hazard or potential hazards? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The specific plan will evaluate existing and proposed land uses to evaluate whether or not this problem exists and, if it does, whether mitigation measures are warranted.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The specific plan will evaluate existing and proposed land uses to evaluate whether or not this problem exists and, if it does, whether mitigation measures are warranted.

X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Increases in existing noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Increases in noise levels are not anticipated. However, the specific plan EIR will include an evaluation of any increases in noise levels that might occur if there are any changes in land use type or intensity.

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

Discussion: Increases in exposure of people to severe noise levels are not anticipated. However, the specific plan EIR will include an evaluation of any increases in exposure to noise levels that might occur if there are any changes in land use type or intensity.

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

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
a) Fire protection? (Source: 1,9) Discussion: The specific plan will include an evaluation of impacts of any changes in land use type or intensity upon fire and emergency services.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Police Protection? (Source: 1,9) Discussion: The specific plan will include an evaluation of impacts of any changes in land use type or intensity upon police services.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Schools? Discussion: Paso Robles Public Schools and the County Office of Education will be invited to participate in the preparation of the specific plan. The specific plan will offer an opportunity to make improvements to public facilities in the planning area that might better serve school activities than would occur without a specific plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? Discussion: The specific plan will include an evaluation of existing public facilities, including roads, and will identify needed improvements and additional facilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Other governmental services? (Source: 1,9) Discussion: The specific plan will include an evaluation of impacts of any changes in land use type or intensity upon governmental services.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

a) Power or natural gas? Discussion: Utility companies will be invited to participate in the preparation of the specific plan. This could improve the overall service to the planning area at a higher level than would occur without a specific plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Communication systems? Discussion: Utility companies will be invited to participate in the preparation of the specific plan. This could improve the overall service to the planning area at a higher level than would occur without a specific plan.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? (Source: 1,9) Discussion: Any impacts that might result from an increase in residential density or any other changes in land use type or intensity will be addressed in the specific plan's EIR.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d) Sewer or septic tanks? (Source: 1,9)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion: Any impacts that might result from an increase in residential density or any other changes in land use type or intensity will be addressed in the specific plan's EIR.

- e) Storm water drainage? (Source: 1,9)

Discussion: See response to Item IV.

- f) Solid waste disposal? (Source: 1,9)

Discussion: Any impacts that might result from an increase in residential density or any other changes in land use type or intensity will be addressed in the specific plan's EIR.

- g) Local or regional water supplies? (Source: 1,9)

Discussion: Any impacts that might result from an increase in residential density or any other changes in land use type or intensity will be addressed in the specific plan's EIR.

XIII.AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

- a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway?

Discussion: The specific plan will coordinate with the City's present efforts to improve these resources as part of its Gateways Plan. The specific plan will offer opportunities to arrange land uses and adopt development standards that would implement the Gateways Plan.

- b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect?

Discussion: One of the purposes of the specific plan will be to improve the aesthetic quality of the built environment and preserve natural resources such as hillside form, oak trees, and the Salinas River.

- c) Create light or glare? (Source: 1, 2, 9)

Discussion: No new light-generating land uses are envisions. However, the specific plan will be tasked with preparing lighting standards that would improve upon the City's present zoning standards for lighting.

XIV.CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- a) Disturb paleontological resources?

Discussion: There are no known paleontological resources in the project area. The specific plan and its EIR will need to investigate this further.

- b) Disturb archaeological resources?

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

Discussion: Most properties in the planning area are already developed. As required by SB 18, the City notified the Native American Heritage Commission and the four tribal groups it identified as having potential interest in the project. The specific plan and its EIR will need to investigate this further.

- | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Affect historical resources? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See response to Item #XIVb. The specific plan and its EIR will need to identify and evaluate any impacts to historic resources that could result from the preparation of the specific plan.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See response to Item #XIVb.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See response to Item #XIVb.

XV.RECREATION. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project area is generally regarded as being underserved with parks and recreation facilities in proportion to the number of residents. It is anticipated that the specific plan may recommend providing new parks and recreation facilities in the project area. If such a recommendation is made, the future EIR for the Uptown Specific Plan will need to address any environmental effects associated with such recommendations.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Affect existing recreational opportunities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The only existing recreational opportunities that might be affected are the soccer field, basketball courts, and recreation center at Oak Park Public Housing. It is anticipated that any redesign of the public housing complex will include replacement and enhancement of these facilities. The specific plan should look for opportunities to increase the recreational facilities at Oak Park. This impact will be addressed as part of the future EIR for the Uptown Specific Plan.

XVI.MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of

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

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

Discussion: The general plan amendment proposes to establish the specific plan overlay as a means of improving the natural and artificial (man-made) the environment. The specific plan will be accompanied by an EIR that will evaluate any and all impacts and recommend means to mitigate them.

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

Discussion: The purpose of the project is to take a long-range look at the housing and commercial needs of the City and the project area and to provide a vehicle for planning the redevelopment of this area to improve both the natural and artificial environment.

- c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

Discussion: In advance of preparation of the specific plan, the changes, if any, in land use and intensity of development cannot be known. If residential densities are increased beyond those established in the 2003 General Plan, the cumulative impacts will need to be addressed in the specific plan EIR.

- d) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Discussion: Establishment of a specific plan overlay will provide a means for comprehensively planning for the future of the project area and the City, with the objective of providing a greater level of mitigation of impacts that might already be occurring.

EARLIER ANALYSIS AND BACKGROUND MATERIALS.

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

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

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