

RESOLUTION NO: 12-184

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
ADOPTING NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 12-003

WHEREAS, the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) established a program that requires local agencies participating in the Central Coast Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) regional "Joint Effort" for hydromodification control needs to adopt enforceable local post-construction storm water management regulations; and

WHEREAS, the City of El Paso de Robles is a participant in the regional "Joint Effort"; and

WHEREAS, the City's General Plan was adopted in 2003 prior to development of post-construction hydromodification storm water management criteria; and

WHEREAS, the 2003 General Plan does not include policy guidance to carry out the directive from the RWQCB to adopt local post-construction storm water management regulations, and in some areas the existing General Plan has language that is contrary to new storm water management criteria; and

WHEREAS, the City has prepared amendments to the General Plan Land Use, Circulation and Conservation Elements to include policy language that supports development of storm water management programs and regulations consistent with the requirements of the RWQCB; and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate whether this project would result in environmental impacts, and the City has determined that the General Plan Amendment incorporating new language in support of post-construction storm water management 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, at its meeting of November 13, 2012 the Planning Commission took the following actions:

- a. Considered the facts and analysis, as presented in the Initial Study and the proposed Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed project;
- b. Conducted a public hearing to accept public testimony on the amendment and environmental determination; and
- c. In accordance with CEQA, recommended the City Council adopt a Negative Declaration for the proposed General Plan Amendment.

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 General Plan Amendment 12-003.

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 General Plan Amendment 12-003 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 18th day of December, 2012, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Hamon, Steinbeck, Martin, Strong, Picanco
NOES:
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:



Duane Picanco, Mayor

ATTEST:



Caryn Jackson, Deputy City Clerk

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM CITY OF PASO ROBLES

1. PROJECT TITLE: **General Plan Amendment - Land Use, Circulation and Conservation Elements - Post-Construction Storm Water Management Policies (GPA 12-002)**

Concurrent Entitlements: N/A

2. LEAD AGENCY: City of Paso Robles
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446

Contact:
Phone: (805) 237-3970
Email: sdecarli@prcity.com

3. PROJECT LOCATION: Citywide

4. PROJECT PROPONENT: City of Paso Robles

Contact Person: Susan DeCarli

Phone: (805) 237-3970
Email: sdecarli@prcity.com

5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: N/A

6. ZONING: N/A

7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This project consists of amendments to the 2003 General Plan Land Use, Circulation and Conservation Elements. The proposed amendments comprehensively integrate policy language into these Elements to support implementation of post-construction storm water management systems that are consistent with requirements of the State Water Quality Control Board regulations.

The amendments modify existing language to incorporate Low-Impact Development (LID) features in new development, streets and other public infrastructure projects to address post construction hydromodification. See Exhibit A.

The intent of the amendment is to support preparation of local regulations to implement Low-Impact Development (LID) features into new development planning and design to reduce the volume and velocity of downstream storm water to predevelopment conditions

before it enters the City's storm water management facilities, and to filter out pollutants before they enter ground water or surface water resources.

8. **ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:** Incorporated boundaries of the City of Paso Robles. The Environmental Setting is adequately described in the Environmental Impact Report for the 2003 General Plan Update.

9. **OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED):** 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-c) The proposed policy amendments will not specifically result in physical alterations that would affect changes to scenic vistas, scenic resources or the visual quality of the community. These policy amendments would not affect light or glare. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in impacts to aesthetics.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST 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 model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 5114(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

There are no forest land resources within the City of Paso Robles, thus this project will have no impact on forest land and/or resources.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 proposed amendments will not directly affect agricultural resources or activities since they will not result in direct physical changes to them. However, these amendments may result in indirect benefits to agricultural resources through supporting clean water in local surface and ground water resources, as well as reduce erosive water processes that cause soil erosion.

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion a-e: The proposed amendments will not directly or indirectly affect air quality or result in air pollution emissions or odors, therefore the project will have no impact to air quality.

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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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-f): The proposed amendments will not directly affect biological resources since they will not result in direct physical changes to them. However, these amendments may result in indirect benefits to biological resources through supporting clean water in local surface water resources as well as reduce erosion in riparian areas and waterways which in turn may support enhanced ecological functions and the biological resources.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
interred outside of formal cemeteries?				

Discussion (a-d): The proposed policy amendments could not result in impacts to cultural resources.



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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 2 & 3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
iv. Landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. 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"/>
c. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion a-e: The proposed policy amendments will not result in negative impacts to geological resources, and may result in indirect benefits by reducing top soil erosion.

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

Discussion (a-b): The proposed amendments will not result in creating new greenhouse gas emissions.

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

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-h): The proposed policy amendments will not result in direct or indirect impacts to or create hazardous conditions or exposure to hazardous materials.

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"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The proposed General Plan Amendments are intended to provide policy support to implement LID measures to address post-construction hydromodification control and comply with water quality and water discharge requirements. Therefore, the proposed project will result in a benefit to water quality and consistency with water quality standards.

b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater 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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The proposed General Plan Amendments are intended to provide policy support to implement LID measures to address post-construction hydromodification control and will result in indirect benefits to groundwater supplies since the implementation of LID will support groundwater recharge.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>
Discussion: The proposed General Plan Amendments are intended to provide policy support to implement LID measures to address post-construction hydromodification control and will result in indirect benefits to citywide drainage systems including rivers and streams and reduce erosion and siltation by managing storm water onsite.				
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"/>
Discussion: The proposed General Plan Amendments are intended to provide policy support to implement LID measures to address post-construction hydromodification control and will result in indirect benefits to citywide drainage systems including rivers and streams and reduce surface runoff and subsequent flooding risks by managing storm water onsite.				
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"/>
Discussion: See IX d. above.				
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See IX a.				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The proposed amendments will not affect housing or the flood zone, nor could it result in placing housing in a flood zone.				
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area	<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
--	---	---	---	----------------------

structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

Discussion: The proposed amendments will not affect flood zones or structures. The amendments will guide storm water implementation measures to control storm water efficiently and reduce potential downstream water flows which would reduce the potential for flooding.

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

Discussion: See IX h. above. There are no levees or dams within Paso Robles.

- | | | | | | |
|----|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| j. | Inundation by mudflow? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed amendments are not related to mudflow inundation issues.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed policy amendments are not in conflict with storm water BMPs, but are intended to support implementation of the City's BMPs.

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

Discussion (a-l): The proposed policy amendments will guide storm water management implementation to retain storm water on site which would result in greater infiltration and not decrease watershed storage or impact wetlands, riparian areas, aquatic habitat, or associated buffer zones.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. | Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed policy amendments will not physically divide established communities.

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

Discussion: The proposed amendments will provide policy consistency and support mitigation of environmental impacts that may result from storm water management, and will not conflict with other applicable regulations.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: There are no applicable habitat conservation plans within the City of Paso Robles.				

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: There are no know mineral resources within the City of Paso Robles.				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: see XI a. above.				

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The proposed project is not related to noise and could not result in noise-related impacts.				
b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See XII a. above.				
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See XII a. above.				
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?				

Discussion: See XII a. above.

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

Discussion: The proposed amendments are not related to airport issues, and could not result in impacts to the City's airport or airport related functions.

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion (a-c): The proposed amendments are not related to and could not affect housing or population.

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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Police protection? (Sources: 1,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The proposed storm water policy amendments will have no effect on police protection.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Schools? Discussion: The proposed storm water policy amendments will have no effect on schools.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Parks? Discussion: The proposed storm water policy amendments will have no effect on parks.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e. Other public facilities? (Sources: 1,10) Discussion: The proposed storm water policy amendments may result in beneficial impacts to City storm water facilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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? Discussion: The proposed storm water policy amendments will have no effect on recreational facilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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? Discussion (a&b): See XIV above, the project will not impact recreational facilities.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:

a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures or 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? Discussion: The proposed storm water policy amendments will provide policy consistency between storm water management and circulation related policies and implementation measures.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable congestion	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?				

Discussion: The proposed storm water policy amendments will have no effect on traffic management.

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

Discussion: The proposed storm water policy amendments will have no effect on air traffic management.

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

Discussion: The proposed storm water policy amendments will have no effect on traffic hazards.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e. Result in inadequate emergency access? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed storm water policy amendments will have no effect on emergency access.

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

Discussion: The proposed storm water policy amendments will have no effect on policies related to alternative modes of transportation.

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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed policy amendments will support storm water management BMPs to reduce impacts to wastewater treatment facilities, thus resulting in beneficial impacts.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed policy amendments will not result in direct impacts through construction of

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

facilities, however they support storm water management BMPs to reduce impacts to the waste water treatment facilities, thus resulting in indirect beneficial impacts.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion. See XVII b. above. The proposed policy amendments will not result in direct impacts through construction of site facilities, however they support storm water management BMPs to reduce impacts to the waste water treatment facilities, thus resulting in indirect beneficial impacts.

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

Discussion: This project does not relate to water supply and does not require water resources.

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

Discussion: The proposed amendments will not directly nor indirectly impact capacity of the WWTP.

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

Discussion: This project does not relate to nor will it impact landfill capacity.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion See XVII f. above.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

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

Discussion: The proposed amendments would not result in direct impacts on the environment, and would likely result in indirect beneficial impacts to habitat or wildlife through implementation of associated storm water BMPs supported by the proposed General Plan policy amendments.

- 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)?

Discussion: The proposed amendments would not result in individually limited or cumulatively considerable impacts on the environment, and would likely result in indirect beneficial impacts to the environment through implementation of associated storm water BMPs supported by the proposed General Plan policy amendments.

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

Discussion: The proposed amendments would not result in direct or indirect impacts on the environment that would cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

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 Or online: www.prcity.com
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 Storm Water Management Plan	Same as above
98	City of Paso Robles Sewer Master Plan	Same as above
10	City of Paso Robles Housing Element	Same as above
11	City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval for New Development	Same as above
12	Uptown/Town Centre Specific Plan	Same as above
13	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Guidelines for Impact Thresholds	APCD 3433 Roberto Court San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
14	San Luis Obispo County – Land Use Element	San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning County Government Center San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
15	USDA, Soils Conservation Service, Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, Paso Robles Area, 1983	Soil Conservation Offices Paso Robles, Ca 93446