

RESOLUTION 16-050

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES
ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE
MARRIOTT RESIDENCE INN (PD 15-005/CUP 15-020)
2930 UNION ROAD, APN: 025-362-004
APPLICANT – PASO HIGHWAY HOTEL PARTNERS, LP

WHEREAS, Paso Highway Hotel Partners, LP has filed an application for Planned Development 15-005 with a height exception, Conditional Use Permit 15-020, and an Oak Tree Removal OTR 16-002 for a Marriott Residence Inn hotel with 119 rooms and ancillary site improvements; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code, Section 21000, et seq., and the City's Procedures for Implementing CEQA, an Initial Study and a Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was prepared and circulated for a 30-day public review period beginning on March 11, 2016 and extended to May 17, 2016. No public comments were received on the MND prior to the City Council meeting; and

WHEREAS, a copy of the Draft MND/Initial Study has been on file at the Paso Robles Community Development Department; and

WHEREAS, mitigation measures have been incorporated into the MND and will be imposed on the project through the City's adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) in compliance with CEQA Guideline 15074(d), which mitigation measures are imposed on the project to address potential environmental effects from: aesthetics; air quality; traffic; biological resources, greenhouse gas emissions; and noise;

WHEREAS, with the implementation of these mitigation measures, all potential significant environmental effects will be reduced to a less than significant level; and

WHEREAS, the mitigation measures set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") are specific and enforceable. The MMRP adequately describes implementation procedures, monitoring responsibility, reporting actions, compliance schedule, and verification of compliance in order to ensure that the Project complies with the adopted mitigation measures; and

WHEREAS, the mitigation measures contained in the MMRP will also be imposed as enforceable conditions of approval; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has executed a Mitigation Agreement whereby the applicant has agreed to incorporate all of the mitigation measures listed in Exhibit B into the project and a copy of the executed Mitigation Agreement is on file in the Community Development Department; and

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the City Council on May 17, 2016, to consider the Initial Study and the draft MND prepared for the proposed project, and to accept public testimony on the Planned Development, Conditional Use Permit, Oak Tree Removal, and environmental determination; and

WHEREAS, based on the information and analysis contained in the Initial Study prepared for this project and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the City Council finds that there is no substantial evidence supporting a fair argument that there would be a significant impact on the environment with mitigation measures imposed on the project; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to CEQA the City Council has independently reviewed the Initial Study, the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and all comments received regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration, and based on the whole record before it finds that the Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, that there is no substantial evidence that the Project will have a significant effect on the environment with the incorporation of mitigation, and the Mitigated Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City Council.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles, based on its independent judgment and analysis, hereby adopts (i) the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Marriot Residence Inn Project, attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein by reference, and (ii) the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project, attached hereto as Exhibit B and incorporated herein by reference, and hereby imposes each mitigation measure as a condition of approval of the Project, 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 17th day of May, 2016, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Gregory, Strong, Martin
NOES: Hamon, Reed
ABSENT:
ABSTAIN:



Steven W. Martin, Mayor

ATTEST:



Kristen L. Buxkemper, Deputy City Clerk

Exhibit A – Mitigated Negative Declaration
Exhibit B – Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM
CITY OF PASO ROBLES**

- 1. PROJECT TITLE:** **Marriott Residence Inn**

Concurrent Entitlements: **Planned Development (PD) 15-005,
Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 15-020,
Oak Tree Removal Permit (OTR) 16-002**

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

Contact:
Phone: (805) 237-3970
Email:

- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:** 2940 Union Road (APN: 025-362-004)
(See Vicinity Map, Attachment 1)

- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** Paso Highway Hotel Partners, LP

Contact Person: Robert Miller
Phone: 805-544-4011
Email: robm@wallacegroup.us

- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** **CS (Commercial Service)**

- 6. ZONING:** **C3 PD (Commercial Light/Industry with
Planned Development Overlay),
Airport Overlay (Zone 4)**

- 7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** This is a proposal to establish a 4-story, extended-stay Residence Inn – by Marriott hotel with 119 guest rooms. The guest rooms include: 57 king bed studio rooms; 24 double queen bed studio rooms; 25 1-bedroom double queen units; 6 2-bedroom king & double queen rooms; and 7 king, double queen bed one or two bedroom rooms with a total building square footage of 98,400 square feet. In compliance with the applicable City Zoning Code Standards, the site includes 132 parking spaces allowing for one space per guest room and 8 spaces for employees. Parking spaces include standard, compact and handicapped accessible parking stalls. See Attachment 2 (Site Plan / Elevations).

The project is located in the C3-PD zoning district. One zoning code modification is being proposed. The hotel’s height at the main entrance tower element is proposed to exceed the 50-foot height limitation up to 4 feet. No other modifications are proposed.

The hotel will include ancillary guest facilities including:

- breakfast lounge for hotel guests
- meeting rooms
- fitness center
- business center
- wine tasting bar
- outdoor pool, BBQ, and patio terraces

The project site's total existing lot area is 5.35 acres and occurs wholly on one legal parcel. No subdivisions or adjustments will be required to accommodate this facility. The site has an existing single-family home, an abandoned pet boarding facility, and several storage buildings, all of which would be removed upon approval and construction of the hotel.

- 8. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:** The site is partially developed with an existing residence and pet boarding facility on approximately 1.6 acres with the remaining 3.8 acres consisting of ruderal (disturbed) habitat. The ruderal areas are dominated by non-native grass and bare dirt. The existing landform of the property consists of a gentle slope to the northwest, towards Union Road. There are no significant biological resources on the property. However, the property is within the migration corridor for the San Joaquin Kit Fox.

The site is largely surrounded by rural land uses including low-density single family residences to the southwest and east, and a mini-storage facility to the northwest (refer to Attachment 2, Site Plan).

- 9. OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (e.g., PERMITS, FINANCING APPROVAL OR PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT):** None.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils |
| <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Noise |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| <input checked="" 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:

Susan DeCauli

Date

3-10-16

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?

Discussion: The project site is located at the northwest corner of State Route 46 East and Union Road. Union Road is identified as a “gateway” to the City in the City’s Gateway Design Standards. It is also designated in the General Plan, Conservation Element (Figure C-3), as being in a scenic view corridor. The property is visible from State Route 46 East and Union Road.

To reduce potential visual impacts that may result from development in scenic vistas, project site and architectural design needs to be planned so that it is compatible with the surrounding landscape by providing well-articulated, attractive architecture that transitions well into the site, presents elevation massing in scale with the surroundings, adds visual interest to the site, and contributes to an overall positive aesthetic quality of the area.

The project site slopes upward towards the southeast, with building placement proposed along the foreground at a lower elevation. Properties to the east, south, and west are largely rural, undeveloped landscape with rural home sites. A mini storage facility to the northwest along the north side of Union Road marks the beginning of commercial development and uses along the corridor. The primary “long view” of the site and surroundings can be viewed from State Route 46 East, while the front entrance and LID features are visible along the Union Road frontage. The positioning of the building on the site will not impact the long view of the rural landscape beyond since it would not extend up the slope, but will remain at a lower elevation. The placement of the building on the site and the proposed elevation will add visual interest to the site.

The high quality of the architectural design of the building, coupled with articulation of the roofline and LID features will have a positive impact on the aesthetic quality of the area. The project design will maintain the large oak tree at the entrance to the site off of Union Road with native grasses and features to compliment the surrounding area. In addition, the building will be setback from the Union Road entrance with roadway design features that add quality to this portion of Union Road. Therefore, the projects adverse effect on a scenic vista would be less than significant.

- b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Discussion: There are no scenic resources such as rock outcroppings or historic buildings located on the site. Among the oak trees located on the property, there are two oak trees that will be preserved, one is a 30-inch diameter-at-breast-height (dbh) oak tree that will be incorporated into the site plan as a “focal” point and scenic resource, the other is a 40-inch dbh oak tree that will not be impacted by the development. Of the three oak trees on site, one is proposed for removal. This tree is 11 inches dbh, and in fair health, however it is small and not visually prominent compared to the two, other, larger surrounding oak trees that are proposed to maintained on the site. The removal of the oak tree will be mitigated in compliance with the Oak Tree Ordinance to reduce the potential impacts to a less than significant level (see Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Plan, Attachment 3).

- c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Discussion: The visual quality of the site is moderate since it is dominated by ruderal area comprised of non-native grassland and bare dirt visible from nearby roads. There is an existing single-family home, an abandoned dog kennel facility, and several storage buildings along the site, fronting Union Road.

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

The proposed project would replace the existing home, pet boarding facility, and accessory buildings. While the project will alter the visual character of the existing site, the new development will maintain open space areas and landscaping that would improve and be compatible with the visual quality of the surrounding areas. As shown on the building elevations (Attachment 2), the architecture is proposed to incorporate façade and roofline articulation, and quality building materials including use of stone veneer and tile roofing reminiscent of Tuscany. The site will include rural landscaping and fencing materials surrounding the property to blend the project into the site and surroundings to the extent possible. Therefore, the proposed project would not likely significantly degrade the existing visual character of quality of the site and its surroundings.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 1, 2, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The Zoning Code requires all new lighting to be shielded and directed downward in such a manner as to not create off-site glare or adversely impact adjacent properties. The project will be conditioned accordingly. The style, location and height of the lighting fixtures will be submitted with the building plans and subject to approval by the Development Review Committee to ensure compliance of Zoning Code, prior to issuance of building or grading permits.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the State’s inventory of forest land, including the forest and Range Assessment Project and the forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is designated in the General Plan and is zoned on the City’s Zoning Map for commercial development. The property is not identified in the City General Plan, Conservation Element (Figure C-2, Habitat Map) as having either prime or unique farmland of statewide importance. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts on converting prime or other significant soils to urban land uses.

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

Discussion: The site is not under Williamson Act contract, nor is it currently used for agricultural purposes.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

Discussion: There are no forest land or timberland resources within the City of Paso Robles.

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

Discussion: See II c. above.

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

Discussion: No farmland is located within the near vicinity of the project site. Properties to northeast, northwest, west, and south of the property are zoned commercial. The adjacent property (32.1 acres) to the southeast is vacant and zoned residential agriculture. However, as noted in the General Plan Land Use Element, this property is planned to be developed in the future with urban development under the Chandler Ranch Specific Plan. Development of this site for lodging would not have a significant impact to agricultural or forestry resources.

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

Discussion: The proposed project is consistent with existing zoning and general plan designations and would include land use and transportation features to be considered consistent and not conflict with the Clean Air Plan (CAP).

To ensure consistency, the project would include various measures to reduce emissions associated with energy and vehicle use (refer to Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Plan, Attachment 3). These measures would include the installation of onsite bicycle parking and provisions for safe and convenient internal access to adjacent uses, including future bicycle lanes which are planned for the adjacent and nearby segments of Union Road. Compliance would also include measures to increase onsite energy efficiency and water efficiency and conservation. There are no existing or planned transit stops in the project area. However, because the project site is located within the Paso Robles City limits it is served by Paso Express Dial-A-Ride transit service. The project proponent will be conditioned to participate in the SLO Car Free program, which would provide incentives for guests that utilize alternative transportation options.

The project would also include various measures that would help to promote the use of alternative transportation options and reductions in vehicle miles traveled. For these reasons, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct continued implementation of the CAP. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. | Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: As noted in III c., below, short-term construction activities may result in localized concentrations

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

of pollutants that could adversely affect nearby land uses. As a result, this impact is considered potentially significant. Refer to III c. and III d. of this report for more detailed discussions of air quality impacts attributable to the proposed project and recommended mitigation measures (Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Plan, Attachment 3).

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

Discussion:

Short-term Construction Emissions

Construction-generated emissions last only as long as construction activities occur, but have the potential to represent a significant air quality impact. The construction of the proposed project would result in the temporary generation of emissions associated with site grading and excavation, paving, motor vehicle exhaust associated with construction equipment and worker trips, as well as the movement of construction equipment on unpaved surfaces. Short-term construction emissions would result in increased emissions of ozone-precursor pollutants (i.e., ROG and NOX) and emissions of PM. Emissions of ozone-precursors would result from the operation of on- and off-road motorized vehicles and equipment. Emissions of airborne PM are largely dependent on the amount of ground disturbance associated with site preparation activities and can result in increased concentrations of PM that can adversely affect nearby sensitive land uses.

Estimated daily and quarterly emissions are summarized in Table 8 and Table 9, respectively, of the Air Quality Assessment (Attachment 4), and provided below. A summary of construction-generated emissions, in comparison to the San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District’s (SLOAPCD) significance thresholds, is provided in Table 10 below. As depicted, maximum daily emissions would total approximately 93.51 lbs/day of ROG+NOX and approximately 3.11 lbs/day of exhaust PM10. Quarterly construction-generated emissions would total approximately 1.49 tons of ROG+NOX, 0.07 tons of DPM, and 0.17 tons of Fugitive PM10. Construction generated emissions would not exceed SLOAPCD significance thresholds. However, fugitive dust generated during construction may result in localized pollutant concentrations that could result in increased nuisance concerns to nearby land uses. Therefore, construction-generated emissions of fugitive dust would be considered to have a potentially significant impact.

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

Table 8
Daily Construction Emissions Without Mitigation

Construction Period/Phase	Daily Emissions (lbs)	
	ROG+NO _x	Exhaust PM ₁₀
Demolition-Year 2016	51.34	2.31
Site Preparation-Year 2016	59.93	2.94
Grading/Excavation-Year 2016	42.30	2.20
Building Construction-Year 2016	33.56	1.99
Building Construction-Year 2017	30.98	1.80
Paving-Year 2017	22.51	1.14
Architectural Coating-Year 2017	40.02	0.17
Maximum Daily Emissions-Year 2016	59.93	2.94
Maximum Daily Emissions-Year 2017	93.51	3.11
SLOAPCD Significance Thresholds	137	7
Exceed SLOAPCD Thresholds?	No	No

Maximum Daily Emissions: Assumes that facility construction, paving, and application of architectural coatings could potentially occur simultaneously on any given day. Totals may not sum due to rounding. Refer to Appendix C for modeling assumptions and results.

Table 9
Quarterly Construction Emissions Without Mitigation

Quarter	ROG+NO _x	Quarterly Emissions (tons)		
		Exhaust	Dust	Total
Year 2016 - Quarter 1	1.49	0.07	0.17	0.25
Year 2016 - Quarter 2-4	1.09	0.06	0.01	0.08
Year 2017 - Quarter 1	0.92	0.03	0.01	0.04
SLOAPCD Significance Thresholds	2.50	0.13	2.50	None
Quarterly Emissions Exceed Thresholds?	No	No	No	No

Totals may not sum due to rounding. Refer to Appendix C for modeling assumptions and results.

Table 10
Summary of Construction Emissions Without Mitigation

Criteria	Project Emissions	SLOAPCD Significance Threshold	Exceed Significance Threshold?
Maximum Daily Emissions (ROG+NO _x):	93.51 lbs/day	137 lbs/day	No
Maximum Daily Emissions (DPM):	3.11 lbs/day	7 lbs/day	No
Maximum Quarterly Emissions (ROG+NO _x):	1.49 tons/qtr	2.50 tons/qtr	No
Maximum Quarterly Emissions (DPM):	0.07 tons/qtr	0.13 tons/qtr	No
Maximum Quarterly Emissions (Fugitive PM):	0.17 tons/qtr	2.5 tons/qtr	No

Quarterly thresholds are based on the more conservative Tier 1 thresholds. Refer to Appendix C for modeling assumptions and results.

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

Significance After Mitigation

With implementation of mitigation measures included in the Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Plan, (Attachment 3), overall emissions of fugitive dust would be reduced by approximately 58 percent. These measures would also help to ensure compliance with SLOAPCD’s 20-percent opacity limit (APCD Rule 401), nuisance rule (APCD Rule 402), and would minimize potential nuisance impacts to nearby receptors. With mitigation, this impact would be considered less than significant.

Long-term Operational Emissions

Long-term operational emissions associated with the proposed project would be predominantly associated with mobile sources. To a lesser extent, emissions associated with area sources, such as landscape maintenance activities, as well as, use of electricity and natural gas would also contribute to increased operational emissions.

Unmitigated operational emissions for summer, winter and annual conditions are summarized in Table 11. As depicted, operational emissions would be slightly higher during winter conditions. Maximum daily operational emissions would total approximately 11.40 lbs/day ROG+NOx, 25.68 lbs/day CO, 3.70 lbs/day of fugitive PM10, and 0.11 lbs/day of exhaust PM10. Maximum annual emissions would total approximately 2.05 tons/year of ROG+NOx and approximately 0.66 tons/year of fugitive PM10. Operational emissions would not exceed SLOAPCD significance thresholds. As a result, operational emissions are considered to have a less than significant impact.

**Table 11
Operational Emissions Without Mitigation**

Operational Period/Source	Emissions						
	ROG	NO _x	ROG+NO _x	CO	Fugitive	PM ₁₀ Exhaust	Total
Daily Emissions (lbs/day)							
Summer Conditions	4.19	6.66	10.85	23.58	3.70	0.11	3.80
Winter Conditions	4.37	7.03	11.40	25.68	3.70	0.11	3.81
SLOAPCD Significance Thresholds	--	--	25	550	25	1.25	--
Exceeds SLOAPCD Thresholds?	--	--	No	No	No	No	--
Annual Emissions (tons/year)							
Total Project Emissions	0.77	1.28	2.05	4.49	0.66	0.02	0.68
SLOAPCD Significance Thresholds	--	--	25	--	25	--	--
Exceeds SLOAPCD Thresholds?	--	--	No	--	No	--	--
<i>Totals may not sum due to rounding. Refer to Appendix C for modeling output files and assumptions.</i>							

- d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Source: 11)

Discussion:

The project site is located along Union Road, south of Highway 46. Adjacent land uses consist largely of undeveloped/agricultural land. Commercial uses are located to the north, across Union Road. The nearest sensitive land uses consist of residential dwellings, the nearest of which are located approximately 0.07 miles

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

to the southwest and east of the project site. Barney Schwartz Park is located approximately 0.2 miles to the southeast. Since the low-density residential dwellings are within one mile of the project site, mitigation measures will be necessary to control pollutant concentrations from the site during development. The potential pollutants and relation to sensitive receptors are described below.

Localized CO Concentrations

Localized concentrations of CO are of primary concern in areas located near congested roadway intersections. Of particular concern are intersections that are projected to operate at unacceptable levels of service (LOS) E or F.

Based on the traffic analysis prepared for this project, primarily affected intersections are projected to operate at LOS C, or better, with project implementation (CCTC 2015). The proposed hotel project would not result in or contribute to unacceptable levels of service (i.e., LOS E or F) at primarily affected nearby signalized intersections. In addition, the proposed project would not result in emissions of CO in excess of the SLOAPCD’s significance threshold of 550 lbs/day. Localized concentrations of CO are considered to be less than significant.

Naturally Occurring Asbestos

Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) has been identified as a toxic air contaminant by the ARB. In accordance with ARB Air Toxics Control Measure (ATCM), prior to any grading activities a geologic evaluation should be conducted to determine if NOA is present within the area that will be disturbed. If NOA is not present, an exemption request form, along with a copy of the geologic report, must be filed with the SLOAPCD. If NOA is found at the site, the applicant must comply with all requirements outlined in the Asbestos ATCM.

Based on a review of the SLOAPCD’s map depicting potential areas of NOA, the project site is not located in an area that has been identified as having a potential for NOA (SLOAPCD 2015a). As a result, the disturbance and potential exposure to NOA is considered to have a less than significant impact.

Asbestos Material in Demolition

Demolition activities can have potential negative air quality impacts, including issues surrounding proper handling, demolition, and disposal of asbestos containing material (ACM). Asbestos containing materials could be encountered during demolition of existing buildings, particularly older structures constructed prior to 1970. Asbestos can also be found in various building products, including (but not limited to) utility pipes/pipelines (transit pipes or insulation on pipes). If a project will involve the disturbance or potential disturbance of ACM, various regulatory requirements may apply, including the requirements stipulated in the National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants (40CFR61, Subpart M - Asbestos NESHAP). These requirements include but are not limited to: 1) notification, within at least 10 business days of activities commencing, to the APCD, 2) an asbestos survey conducted by a Certified Asbestos Consultant, and, 3) applicable removal and disposal requirements of identified ACM.

The project site will require demolition of onsite structures. As a result, demolition activities have the potential to result in the disturbance of ACM. The disturbance and potential exposure to ACM during demolition of onsite structures is considered to have a potentially significant impact.

Construction-Generated PM

Implementation of the proposed project would result in the generation of fugitive PM emitted during construction. Fugitive PM emissions would be primarily associated with earth-moving, demolition, and material handling activities, as well as, vehicle travel on unpaved and paved surfaces. Onsite off-road equipment and trucks would also result in short-term emissions of diesel-exhaust PM (DPM). Construction generated emissions of PM could result in localized concentrations of PM that could result in increased nuisance impacts to nearby land uses and receptors. As a result, localized uncontrolled concentrations of construction-generated PM would be considered to have a potentially-significant impact.

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

Significance After Mitigation

The Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Plan, (Attachment 3), includes measures for the control of fugitive dust emitted during project construction, including emissions generated during the demolition of existing structures that may affect sensitive land uses within a mile. Mitigation measures also include additional provisions for reducing emissions of DPM from onsite mobile sources. With implementation of mitigation, this impact would be considered less than significant.

- e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Source: 11)

Discussion: The occurrence and severity of odor impacts depends on numerous factors, including: the nature, frequency, and intensity of the source; wind speed and direction; and the sensitivity of the receptors. While offensive odors rarely cause any physical harm, they can be very unpleasant, leading to considerable distress among the public and often generating citizen complaints to local governments and regulatory agencies. Projects with the potential to frequently expose members of the public to objectionable odors would be deemed to have a significant impact.

The proposed project would not result in the installation of any equipment or processes that would be considered major odor-emission sources. However, construction of the proposed project would involve the use of a variety of gasoline or diesel-powered equipment that would emit exhaust fumes. Exhaust fumes, particularly diesel-exhaust, may be considered objectionable by some people. In addition, pavement coatings and architectural coatings used during project construction would also emit temporary odors. However, construction-generated emissions would occur intermittently throughout the workday and would dissipate rapidly with increasing distance from the source. As a result, short-term construction activities would not expose a substantial number of people to frequent odorous emissions. For these reasons, potential exposure of sensitive receptors to odorous emissions would be considered less than significant.



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 Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Discussion: The Biological Survey Area (BSA) and property have been disturbed from existing development (i.e. structures) and agricultural practices, including disking and tilling. No special-status plant species were observed nor are special-status plant species expected to occur within the BSA (See Biological Resources Assessment, Attachment 5). However, three valley oak trees within the project impact area are protected under the Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance (refer to IV e. further information).

Birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) are expected to occur on the property and may utilize the oak trees and weedy areas within the BSA for nesting and foraging purposes. California horned larks may forage on the property. The likelihood of this species occurring within the BSA is low since California horned lark is not a common resident to the Paso Robles area. The nearest known occurrence of this species is a year-round population at Camp Roberts, approximately 15 miles north of the BSA (CNDDDB 2015).

Mitigation measures recommended in the Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Plan (Attachment 3) ensures that project activities avoid impacts to migratory nesting birds and that California horned larks are not present

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

prior to the start of construction. The BSA does not contain suitable denning habitat for San Joaquin kit fox. Huerhuero Creek serves as a wildlife corridor for the purposes of foraging for the species. Due to the property’s distance from this creek (0.2 miles west), there is potential that San Joaquin kit fox may pass through the project area. Therefore, standard San Joaquin kit fox avoidance measures should be implemented during project construction (refer to San Joaquin Kit Fox Evaluation, Attachment 5).

In addition, the project site is located in a 3:1 mitigation area for the San Joaquin kit fox as preliminarily defined by the City, California Department of Fish & Wildlife (CDFW), and the County of San Luis Obispo. Based on analysis of the site and the completion of the CDFW habitat evaluation form (refer to Attachment 5), the total score on the evaluation was 53. According to CDFW, a score of less than 60 would require a 1:1 mitigation ratio. Therefore, the adverse effect of the project on special status species is reduced to less than significant with mitigation measures incorporated.

- 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 Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?
- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: There is no riparian habitat located on this property. However, there are several oak trees on the property that are within the area of disturbance of the project. The applicant has proposed to remove one oak tree and to trim other remaining trees for maintenance purposes. Oak trees that are 6 inches in diameter (dbh) are protected under the City’s Oak Tree Protection Ordinance. The proposed removal, if approved, would require oak tree replacement mitigation by planting a minimum of 25% of the total combined diameter of all oak trees to be removed. Tree protection is also required for work that may occur within the “critical root zone” of remaining trees. An Arborist Report (refer to Arborist Report, Attachment 6) was prepared for this project which identifies all oak tree mitigations to reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

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

Discussion: Per the Biological Resources Assessment (Attachment 5) there are no wetlands, waterways or other hydrological features located on the project site, or within the near vicinity that could be affected by the proposed project. Therefore, the project will not result in impacts to hydrological features and/or resources.

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

Discussion: The biological study prepared for this project indicates that the site is not suitable for denning of San Joaquin Kit Fox and that migration for this species is typically contained along the Huerhuero Creek, 0.2 miles west of the project site. However, mitigations have been included in the study in the event that they use the site for migration. No sensitive bird species were identified on the site, however in accordance with the

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

MBTA, specific mitigations are included to ensure that nesting birds are not significantly impacted by the construction of the proposed project.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The BSA contains three large valley oak trees that meet the qualifications for protection under the City Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance (2002). This ordinance applies to all oak species native to Paso Robles with a DBH equal to or greater than 6 inches and their corresponding “critical-root-zone” (CRZ), which is calculated by a radius of 1 foot per inch (dbh). Development of the project should avoid impacts to the CRZ and every reasonable effort must be made to avoid impact to the oak trees, including preventing compaction, soil retention, and diversion or increased water flow to the root zone. Existing ground surface within the CRZ shall not be cut, filled, compacted, or pared, and nearby excavation shall not damage roots. A registered civil engineer or land surveyor must provide the City with an inventory and map of all qualifying oak trees in the BSA. A permit must be obtained from the City to prune or remove qualifying oak trees.

Damage to any qualifying oak tree must be reported immediately and corrected in a manner specified by an arborist hired by the City at the applicant’s cost. Mitigation plantings are required for removal of qualifying oak trees, and all others remaining in the BSA must be protected. Oak trees that are 6 inches in diameter (dbh) are protected under the City’s Oak Tree Protection Ordinance. The proposed removal, if approved, would require oak tree replacement mitigation by planting a minimum of 25% of the total combined diameter of all oak trees to be removed (refer to Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Plan, Attachment 3).

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

Discussion: There are no Habitat Conservation Plans or other related plans applicable in the City of Paso Robles.

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

Discussion: See item V. d.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See item V. d.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique | <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
--	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

geologic feature?

Discussion: See item V. d.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: There are no historic resources (as defined), located on the site. There are also no archaeological or paleontological resources known to be present on the site or in the near vicinity. Since the property is not located within proximity to a creek or river or known cultural resource it is unlikely that there are resources located on the site (See Archeological Surface Survey, Attachment 7).

There are no known human remains on the project site, however per conditions of approval incorporated into the project, if human remains are found during site disturbance, all grading and/or construction activities shall stop, and the County Coroner shall be contacted to investigate. Therefore, this project will result in less than significant impacts on 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The potential for and mitigation of impacts that may result from fault rupture in the project area are identified and addressed in the General Plan EIR, pg. 4.5-8. There are two known fault zones on either side of the Salinas Rivers Valley. The Rinconada Fault system runs on the west side of the valley, and grazes the City on its western boundary. The San Andreas Fault is on the east side of the valley and is situated about 30 miles east of Paso Robles. The City of Paso Robles recognizes these geologic influences in the application of the California Building Code (CBC) to all new development within the City. Review of available information and examinations indicate that neither of these faults is active with respect to ground rupture in Paso Robles. Soils and geotechnical reports and structural engineering in accordance with local seismic influences would be applied in conjunction with any new development proposal. Based on standard conditions of approval, the potential for fault rupture and exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards is not considered significant. There are no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones within City limits.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project will be constructed to current CBC codes. The General Plan EIR identified impacts resulting from ground shaking as less than significant and provided mitigation measures that will be incorporated into the design of this project including adequate structural design and

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

not constructing over active or potentially active faults. Therefore, impacts that may result from seismic ground shaking are considered less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 2 & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR, the project site is located in an area with soil conditions that have a moderate potential for liquefaction or other type of ground failure due to seismic events and soil conditions. To implement the EIR's mitigation measures to reduce this potential impact, the City has a standard condition to require submittal of soils and geotechnical reports, which include site-specific analysis of liquefaction potential for all building permits for new construction, and incorporation of the recommendations of said reports into the design of the project.

- | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Per the General Plan Safety Element, the project site is in an area that is designated a low-risk area for landslides. Therefore, potential impacts due to landslides is less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR the soil condition is not erosive or otherwise unstable. As such, no significant impacts are anticipated. A geotechnical/ soils analysis will be required prior to issuance of building permits that will evaluate the site specific soil stability and suitability of grading and retaining walls proposed. This study will determine the necessary grading techniques that will ensure that potential impacts due to soil stability will not occur. An erosion control plan shall be required to be approved by the City Engineer prior to commencement of site grading.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See response to item a.iii, above

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| e. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See response to item a.iii, above

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

Discussion: The development will be connected to the City’s municipal wastewater system, therefore there would not be impacts related use of septic tanks.

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?

Discussion: Estimated Green House Gas (GHG) emissions attributable to future development would be primarily associated with increases of Carbon-dioxide (CO2) from vehicles. To a lesser extent, other GHG pollutants, such as CH4 and N2O, would also be generated. Short-term and long-term GHG emissions associated with the development of the proposed project are discussed in greater detail, as follows, and can be found in the Air Quality & GHG Assessment (Attachment 4):

Short-term Construction GHG Emissions

Estimated increases in GHG emissions associated with construction of the proposed project are summarized in Table 15 below. Based on the modeling conducted, annual emissions of greenhouse gases associated with construction of the proposed project would range from approximately 52.3 to 396.2 MTCO2e. Amortized GHG emissions, when averaged over the assumed 25-year life of the project, would total approximately 17.9 MTCO2e/year. There would also be a small amount of GHG emissions from waste generated during construction; however, this amount is speculative. Actual emissions may vary, depending on the final construction schedules, equipment required, and activities conducted.

**Table 15
Construction-Generated GHG Emissions Without Mitigation**

Construction Year	GHG Emissions (MTCO2e/Year)
Year 2016	396.2
Year 2017	52.3
Construction Phase Total:	448.5
Amortized Net Change in Construction Emissions*:	17.9
*Amortized emissions are quantified based on an estimated 25-year project life. Refer to Appendix C for modeling assumptions and results.	

Long-term Operational GHG Emissions

Estimated long-term increases in GHG emissions associated with the proposed project are summarized in Table 16 below. Based on the modeling conducted, operational GHG emissions would be predominantly associated with mobile sources and energy use. To a lesser extent, GHG emissions would also be associated with solid waste generation, as well as, water use and conveyance. With amortized construction-generated emissions, annual emissions would total approximately 909 MTCO2e/year. As a result, this impact would be considered less than significant.

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

**Table 16
Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions Without Mitigation**

Source	GHG Emissions (MTCO ₂ e/Year)
Area Source	0.01
Energy Use	151.9
Motor Vehicles	701.2
Waste Generation	29.9
Water Use and Conveyance	8.2
Total Project-Generated Emissions:	891.1
Construction (Amortized)	17.9
Net Increase in Emissions:	909.0
SLOAPCD Significance Threshold:	1,150
Exceeds Significance Threshold?:	No
<i>Refer to Appendix C for modelling assumptions and results.</i>	

- b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses?

Discussion: The City of Paso Robles Climate Action Plan (CAP) was adopted by the City Council in November, 2013. The CAP is a long-range plan to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from City government operations and community activities within Paso Robles and prepare for the anticipated effects of climate change. The CAP will also help achieve multiple community goals such as lowering energy costs, reducing air pollution, supporting local economic development, and improving public health and quality of life (City of Paso Robles, 2013). To help achieve these goals, the CAP includes a “Consistency Worksheet”, which identifies various mandatory and voluntary actions designed to reduce GHG emissions. The CAP Consistency Worksheet can be used to demonstrate project-level compliance with the CAP. The City’s CAP consistency worksheet is included in the Air Quality & GHG Assessment (Attachment 4).

The proposed land use would be consistent with current zoning (i.e., commercial/light industry). In addition, the project sponsor has agreed to implement measures sufficient to ensure consistency with the CAP.

Significance After Mitigation

Implementation of mitigation measures included in the Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Plan, (Attachment 3), would ensure consistency with the City of Paso Robles CAP. With mitigation, increased emissions of GHGs would be considered less than significant.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:

- a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Discussion: The project would use industry-standard landscape and building maintenance products which would be stored in compliance with all applicable safety requirements. The project does not include use of, transport, storage or disposal of hazardous materials that would create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>
Discussion: See VIII a. above.				
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"/>
Discussion: The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or use hazardous materials. There are no schools located within a ¼ mile radius of the project site, therefore the project will result in no impact on an existing or proposed schools.				
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"/>
Discussion: The project site is not identified as a hazardous site per state codes.				
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: The project location is within the Airport Land Use Plan, Safety Zone 4, which permits land uses such as hotels, provided they comply with density restrictions.

Airport Land Use Plan

As provided in Table 6 of the Airport Land Use Plan (See Airport Land Use Summary, Attachment 7), the use intensity of Hotels and Motels within Zone 4 shall not exceed an average 40 persons per gross acres, maximum 120 persons per single acre, at any time. Usage calculations shall include all people (e.g., employees, customers/visitors, etc.) who may be on the property at any single point in time, whether indoors or outside.

In addition, Appendix E of the Airport Land Use Plan (See Airport Land Use Summary, Attachment 8) allows for 1.8 persons per room or group of rooms to be occupied as a suite; plus, one person per 60 sq. ft. floor area of any restaurants, coffee shops, bars, or night clubs; plus, one person per 10 sq. ft. of floor area of meeting rooms.

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

Project Site Land Use Density Calculations	
Density by Acreage	
<i>Gross Site Area</i>	5.36 acres
<i>Average number of persons per gross acres</i>	40
<hr/>	
Allowable Maximum Density by Acreage	214 persons
Density by Type of Use	
Common Area	
<i>Common Area</i>	5,661 sq. ft.
<i>Square Feet per person</i>	60 sq. ft.
<hr/>	
<i>Allowable Maximum Density</i>	94 persons
Per Room	
<i>Number of Guest Rooms</i>	119 rooms
<i>Number of persons per room</i>	1.8 persons
<hr/>	
<i>Allowable Maximum Density</i>	214 persons
<hr/>	
Allowable Maximum Density by Type of Use	308 persons

Due to the type of hotel proposed, an extended stay hotel promoted for “business/corporate,” rather than “leisure,” stays generally constitute a single-occupant-per-room guest. In addition, guest accommodations and amenities are designed to accommodate guest needs and not as a venue rentable to the general public for meetings, conferences, or other such functions.

The project proposes to accommodate 214 guests with an additional 5 staff members for a total maximum of 219 persons on the premises at any one time. The applicant has noted that the number of staff drops down to 1 person at night with the majority of the staff working during day-time hours.

Therefore, due to the gross site area and average number of persons permitted in Zone 4, the project will comply with the Airport Land Use Plan and will not result in a safety hazard for people residing in 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?

Discussion: The project is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

- g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

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

Discussion: The City does not have an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan, therefore the project will result in no impact.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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: The project is not in the vicinity of wildland fire hazard areas.

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 project is designed to retain stormwater on-site through installation of various low-impact development (LID) features. The project was designed to reduce impervious surfaces, preserve existing vegetation, and promote groundwater recharge by employing bioretention through implementation of these measures (refer to Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Plan, Attachment 3). Thus, water quality standards will be maintained and discharge requirements will be in compliance with State and local regulations. Therefore, impacts to water quality and discharge will be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 project would be connected to the City’s municipal water supply system; therefore, it could not individually impact nearby ground water supplies. The City’s municipal water supply is composed of groundwater from the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin, an allocation of the Salinas River underflow, and a surface water allocation from the Nacimiento Lake pipeline project. The site is designed to reduce impervious surfaces where possible and to direct surface drainage to onsite retention systems to facilitate groundwater recharge.

The City established a groundwater stewardship policy to not expand dependency on the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin (“the basin”) over historic use levels/pumping from the City’s peak year of 2007. The City augmented water supply and treatment capacity by procuring surface water from Lake Nacimiento and construction of delivery facilities to the City. This project will not affect the amount of groundwater that the City withdraws from the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin. Per the City’s 2010 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP), page 21:

“The City is progressing with its plans for a water treatment plant (WTP) to treat surface

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

water received from Lake Nacimiento. The WTP is being designed to treat 4 million gallons per day (mgd), with construction to begin in 2015. The WTP can be expanded to treat 6 mgd to meet future demands (Paso Robles website, October 13, 2010). Specific facilities include a water treatment plant, treated water reservoir and pump station, transmission pipeline, appurtenances and other site improvements (Padre, 2008). Half of the initial 4,000 AFY Nacimiento allocation and half of the 4 mgd Phase 1 treatment plant capacity are to replace lost well production capacity and improve water quality. The remaining capacity is to provide for new development. In order to limit reliance on the highly-stressed groundwater basin new development—per City policy—is required to be served with surface and recycled water. Therefore, the second 1,400 AFY Nacimiento allocation, the 2 mgd treatment plant expansion, and recycled water infrastructure will be funded by development.”

Additionally, the City assigns “duty” factors that anticipate the amount of water supply necessary to serve various types of land uses. These factors are derived from determining the average water demands for each zoning district in the City. In this circumstance, the water supply necessary for development of commercial land uses permitted in the C3 Zone includes hotels, as well as other uses, is incorporated into the water demand assumptions of the UWMP. As noted above, the City has augmented future reliance on groundwater resources to surface water resources, and commercial development has been accounted for in the overall water projections and demand for the City. As noted in the Project Description, the proposed project would be served with the City’s municipal water supply system. Since the City’s water supply, as documented in the UWMP, is not reliant on increased groundwater pumping for new development, it demonstrates adequate water supply procured from Lake Nacimiento to accommodate the projected growth in the City and it demonstrates that this project will have adequate water supply available, and will not further deplete or in any way affect, change or increase water demands on the basin.

In addition, in compliance with recently adopted updates to the applicable code sections of the California Green Building Code (adopted by the City in 2013), the project will be required to install more restrictive water-conserving plumbing fixtures than what would have previously been required in 2010. The City also implements the State Landscape Water Conservation regulations, which requires further reductions in water demand for landscaping. Additionally, in compliance with the City’s Climate Action Plan adopted in 2013, “Project Consistency Checklist”, Appendix C, the applicant will be incorporating landscape water fixtures and drought-resistant landscaping that will achieve a 20 percent reduction in water demand above what is required by State law. Thus, the project will implement *all* best management practices available to reduce water demands over “business-as-usual” and what is anticipated in the UWMP. Therefore, this project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering of the groundwater basin, and impacts to groundwater resources would be less than significant.

- 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 drainage pattern on the site would not be substantially altered with development of this project since the project largely maintains the existing, historic drainage pattern of the property, and drainage will be maintained on the project site. Additionally, surface flow would be directed to historic drainage areas for percolation in bioswale drainage features at the northeast corner of the property (refer to Stormwater Control Plan, Attachment 9). There are no streams, creeks or rivers on or near the project site that could be impacted from this project or result in erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Therefore, impacts to drainage patterns and facilities would less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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: See IX c. above. Drainage resulting from development of this property will be maintained onsite and will not contribute to flooding on- or off-site. Thus, flooding impacts from the project are considered less than significant.				
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: As noted in IX a. above, surface drainage will be managed onsite and will not add to offsite drainage facilities. Additionally, onsite LID drainage facilities will be designed to clean pollutants before they enter the groundwater basin. Therefore, drainage impacts that may result from this project would be less than significant.				
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See answers IX a. – e. This project will result in less than significant impacts to water quality.				
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: There is no housing associated with this project nor is there any housing in the near vicinity downstream from the site and the site is not within or near a flood hazard area. Therefore, this project could not result in flood related impacts to housing.				
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See IX h. above				
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. Additionally, there are no levees or dams in the City.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
j. Inundation by mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: In accordance with the Paso Robles General Plan, there is no mudflow hazards located on or near the project site. Therefore, the project could not result in mudflow inundation impacts.				
k. Conflict with any Best Management Practices found within the City's Storm Water Management Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project will implement the City's Storm Water Management Plan - Best Management Practices, and would therefore not conflict with these measures				
l. Substantially decrease or degrade watershed storage of runoff, wetlands, riparian areas, aquatic habitat, or associated buffer zones?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project will incorporate all feasible means to manage water runoff on the project site. There are no wetland or riparian areas in the near vicinity, and the project could not result in impacts to aquatic habitat. Therefore, the project will not result in significant impacts to these resources.				

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 project is largely surrounded by low density residences located to the south and east of the site, vacant property, and commercial use to the north. The project will therefore not physically divide an established community.				
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The proposed project is consistent with the City's General Plan and Zoning Ordinance, except for a request for a height exception. The Conditional Use Permit (CUP) process will require specific findings be determined to allow the height exception. Therefore, if findings to approve the proposed height exception can be made, there will be no conflict with applicable regulations.				
With the removal of one of the oak trees on site, mitigation measures implemented to reduce impacts to the oak tree would therefore not conflict with the City of Paso Robles Oak Tree Ordinance.				
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 habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans established in this area of the City. Therefore, there would be no conflicts.				

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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 known mineral resources at this project site.				
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: There are no known mineral resources at this project site.				

XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:

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

Discussion: The proposed project would not include the installation of major stationary sources of exterior noise. As a result, potential long-term exposure to noise would be primarily associated with vehicle traffic noise emanating from area roadways.

For determination of land use compatibility for transportation noise sources, the City’s General Plan establishes a “normally acceptable” exterior noise standard of 65 dBA/CNEL/Ldn. Exterior noise levels of up to 70 dBA CNEL/Ldn are considered “conditionally acceptable” provided necessary noise-reduction measures are incorporated. Exterior levels between 70 and 80 dBA CNEL/Ldn are considered “normally unacceptable” and levels in excess of 80 dBA CNEL/Ldn are considered “clearly unacceptable”. In addition to the noise criteria for determination of land use compatibility, General Plan Policy N-1A also establishes exterior and interior noise standards for transportation sources. For hotel uses, the maximum allowable noise exposure within outdoor activity areas is 65 dBA CNEL/Ldn. The maximum allowable noise exposure for interior areas of the hotel is 45 dBA CNEL/Ldn.

For determination of consistency with the City of Paso Robles General Plan noise standards, traffic noise modeling was conducted to determine the predicted traffic noise levels at various onsite locations. Traffic noise modeling was conducted using the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Traffic Noise Model, version 2.5, for nearby segments of Highway 46 and Union Road. Traffic noise levels were evaluated for *Near-Term Plus Project* traffic volumes derived from the traffic analysis prepared for this project. The for *Near-Term Plus Project* traffic scenario includes existing traffic volumes along with approved and pending projects in the study area. A future cumulative traffic noise analysis was also conducted based on projected future cumulative year 2025 traffic data derived from the City of Paso Robles General Plan Circulation Element.

Projected near-term and future cumulative traffic noise levels at the proposed project site are depicted in Tables 7 and 8, in the Noise Study (Attachment 10) prepared for this project. In comparison to ground-level locations, predicted noise levels at upper-floor locations are projected to be slightly higher due to decreased ground attenuation and increased line-of-sight of area roadways. Predicted noise levels would be highest along the northern-most building façade. Under near-term conditions, projected exterior noise levels of the northern façade would range from approximately 59 dBA CNEL/Ldn at ground floor locations to

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

approximately 62 dBA CNEL/Ldn at upper floor locations. Under future cumulative conditions projected exterior noise levels of the northern façade would range from approximately 62 dBA CNEL/Ldn of ground-floor locations to approximately 65 dBA CNEL/Ldn of upper floor locations. No outdoor activity areas would be located along the northern building façade. Predicted exterior traffic noise levels would not exceed the City’s exterior noise standard of 65 dBA CNEL/Ldn.

Newer building construction typically provides exterior-to-interior noise reductions of 25-30 dB. Based on the predicted exterior noise levels discussed above and assuming a minimum exterior-to-interior noise reduction of 25 dB, predicted interior noise levels for the proposed hotel would be approximately 40 dBA CNEL/Ldn, or less. Predicted interior traffic noise levels would not exceed the City's noise standard of 45 dBA CNEL/Ldn. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

- b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Discussion: Increases in groundborne vibration levels attributable to the proposed project would be primarily associated with short-term construction-related activities. Construction activities associated with the proposed project would likely require the use of various off-road equipment, such as tractors, concrete mixers, and haul trucks. The use of major groundborne vibration-generating construction equipment, such as pile drivers, is not anticipated to be required for this project.

Groundborne vibration levels associated with representative construction equipment are summarized in Table 7 below. Based on the vibration levels presented in Table 7, ground vibration generated by construction equipment would not be anticipated to exceed City standards. Predicted vibration levels at the nearest offsite structures, which are located in excess of 25 feet from the project site, would not exceed the minimum recommended criterion for structural damage and/or human annoyance (refer to the Noise Impact Assessment, Attachment 10). As a result, this impact would be considered less than significant.

**Table 7
Representative Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment**

Equipment	Peak Particle Velocity at 25 Feet (In/Sec)
Loaded Trucks	0.076
Jackhammer	0.035
Small Bulldozers/Tractors	0.003
<i>Source: FTA 2006, Caltrans 2004</i>	

- c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Discussion: Implementation of the proposed project would result in increased traffic volumes along the adjacent segments of Union Road. Traffic noise levels were quantified for existing conditions, with and without project-generated traffic, based on data derived from the traffic analysis prepared for this project. The project’s contribution to traffic noise levels was determined by comparing the predicted noise levels with and without project-generated traffic. Predicted traffic noise levels are summarized in Table 8 below.

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

In comparison to existing conditions, the proposed project would result in predicted increases in traffic noise levels of approximately 0.3 dBA, or less, along the adjacent segments of Union Road. Implementation of the proposed project would not contribute to a substantial increase in traffic noise levels along area roadways. As a result, this impact would be considered less than significant.

**Table 8
Predicted Increases in Existing Traffic Noise Levels**

Roadway Segment	CNEL/L _{dn} at 50 Feet from Near-Travel-Lane Centerline ¹		Predicted Noise Level Increase	Substantial Noise Level Increase? ²
	Without Project	With Project		
Union Road, West of Project Site	64.9	65.1	0.2	No
Union Road, East of Project Site	64.3	64.6	0.3	No
<p>1. Traffic noise levels were calculated using the FHWA roadway noise prediction model based on data obtained from the traffic analysis prepared for this project (CCTC 2015).</p> <p>2. For purposes of this analysis, a substantial increase in noise levels is defined as an increase of 5.0, or greater, where the noise levels, without project implementation, are less than the City's "normally acceptable" noise standard. Where the noise level, without project implementation, equals or exceeds applicable noise standards, an increase of 3.0 dBA, or greater, would be considered a substantial increase.</p>				

- d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Discussion: Construction noise typically occurs intermittently and varies depending upon the nature or phase of construction (e.g., land clearing, grading, excavation, and paving). Noise generated by construction equipment including earth movers, material handlers, and portable generators, can reach high levels. Although noise ranges are generally similar for all construction phases, the initial site preparation phase tends to involve the most heavy-duty equipment, having a higher noise-generation potential.

Noise levels associated with individual construction equipment is summarized in Table 9 below. As depicted, noise levels generated by individual pieces of construction equipment typically range from approximately 74 dBA to 89 DBA Lmax at 50 feet (FTA 2006). Average-hourly noise levels associated with road improvement projects can vary depending on the activities performed, reaching levels of up to approximately 83 dBA Leq at 50 feet. Short-term increases in vehicle traffic, including worker commute trips and haul truck trips may also result in temporary increases in ambient noise levels at nearby receptors. Construction activities occurring during the more noise-sensitive nighttime hours would be of particular concern given the potential for increased levels of annoyance. The proposed project, however, does not identify hourly restrictions for construction activities. As a result, noise-generating construction activities occurring during nighttime hours, if required, would be considered to have a potentially significant short-term noise impact.

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

**Table 9
Typical Construction Equipment Noise Levels**

Equipment	Typical Noise Level (dBA Lmax) 50 feet from Source
Air Compressor	81
Backhoe	80
Compactor	82
Concrete Mixer	85
Concrete Vibrator	76
Crane, Mobile	83
Dozer	85
Generator	81
Grader	85
Impact Wrench	85
Jack Hammer	88
Loader	85
Truck	88
Paver	89
Pneumatic Tool	85
Roller	74
Saw	76

Sources: FTA 2006

With the mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Plan, Attachment 3, construction activities would be limited to the daytime hours. The proper maintenance of construction equipment and use of mufflers would reduce equipment noise levels by approximately 10 dB. With mitigation, this impact is considered less than significant.

- 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)

Discussion: The nearest public or private airport is the Paso Robles Municipal Airport, which is located approximately 1.4 miles north of the project site. The project site is not located within the projected 65 dBA CNEL contours of Paso Robles Municipal Airport (City of Paso Robles 2004). As a result, the project site is not subject to high levels of aircraft noise.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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"/>
Discussion: The proposed hotel project will create jobs that can be absorbed by the local and regional employment market, and will therefore not create the demand for new housing or population growth or displace housing or people.				
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"/>
Discussion: See response XIII a.				
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: See response XIII a.				

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

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

Discussion: (XIV a-e) The proposed project will not result in a significant demand for additional new services since it is not proposing to include new neighborhoods or a significantly large scale development, and the incremental impacts to services can be mitigated through payment of development impact fees. Therefore, impacts that may result from this project on public services are considered less than significant.

XV. RECREATION

a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that	<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
substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				

b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: (a & b) As a commercial development project that will not encourage new housing demands and use of recreational facilities, it will not result in impacts to recreational facilities.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:

a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The proposed project provides frontage improvements that includes sidewalks and Class II bike lanes which is consistent with City standards and the 2009 Bike Master Plan. The project is consistent with the policies of the City’s 2011 Circulation Element by providing facilities for multiple modes of transportation.

Potential transportation impacts for the development indicate the northbound approach to State Route 46 E/Union Road would worsen to vehicular level of service (LOS) F with the addition of project traffic while the intersection will remain at LOS A. Prohibiting the northbound left turns at this intersection would improve operations by reducing turning conflicts, while the westbound left turn lane should remain as it provides substantial relief to the State Route 46 East/Golden Hill Road intersection, located west of the project (refer to the Transportation Impact Analysis, Attachment 11). In order to enhance the effectiveness of the circulation system, the project will work with Caltrans to remove this turning option as part of the Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Plan (Attachment 3). Therefore, with the turning conflict removed, the project result will be less than significant.

b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to a level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The traffic study prepared for this project by Central Coast Transportation Consulting evaluated project related traffic impacts for existing plus-project traffic conditions (Attachment 11). The study determined all intersections operate at LOS C or better with no queuing deficiencies. Mitigation measures

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

identified in the Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Plan, Attachment 3, addresses site distance conflicts and reduces congestion levels to less than significant.

The applicant is required to pay transportation impact fees established by City Council in affect at the time of occupancy to mitigate future impacts with planned improvements by the City and Caltrans.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 project site will not affect air traffic patterns at the Paso Robles airport or affect airport operations.

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

Discussion: The project's Transportation Impact Analysis (See Attachment 11) determined under existing, existing plus project, near term, and near term plus project conditions, all of the study intersections will operate at LOS C or better during the weekday peak hours. With the anticipated closure of northbound left turns at the State Route 46/Union Road intersection, potentially dangerous design features will be reduced to less than significant. In addition, the raised median with a left turn lane serving inbound traffic to the site, as well as outbound left turns prohibited from the northern project driveway, will reduce traffic conflicts and hazards. Narrowing Union Road eastbound travel lane to 10 feet will slow traffic approaching the project driveway, decreasing any hazards due to design features.

With the Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Plan (See Attachment 3), the project will not substantially increase hazards due to design features, nor will the use be incompatible, reducing impacts to less than significant.

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

Discussion: The project will not impede emergency access, and is designed in compliance with all emergency access safety features and to City emergency access standards.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 project incorporates multi-modal transportation facilities such as bike lanes, sidewalks, walkways, and can be served with the Paso Express dial-a-ride service. The project will also be conditioned to participate in the SLO Car Free program, which would provide incentives for guests to use alternative transportation options. Therefore, the project does not conflict with policies and plans regarding these facilities.

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

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

Discussion: The project will comply with all applicable wastewater treatment requirements required by the City, RWQCB and the State. Therefore, there will be no impacts resulting from wastewater treatment from this project.

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

Discussion: Per the City's General Plan EIR, Urban Water Management Plan, and Sewer System Management Plan (SSMP), the City's water and wastewater treatment facilities are adequately sized, including planned facility upgrades, to provide needed water and to treat effluent resulting from this project. Therefore, this project will not result in the need to construct new facilities.

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

Discussion: All new stormwater resulting from this project will be managed on the project site, and will not enter existing storm water drainage facilities or require expansion of new drainage facilities (refer to the Stormwater Control Plan, Attachment 9). Therefore, the project will not impact the City's storm water drainage facilities.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: As noted in section IX on Hydrology, the project can be served with existing water resource entitlements available and will not require expansion of new water resource entitlements.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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: Per the City's SSMP The City's wastewater treatment facility has adequate capacity to serve this project as well as existing commitments.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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: Per the City's Landfill Master Plan, the City's landfill has adequate capacity to accommodate construction related and operational solid waste disposal for this project.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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: The project will comply with all federal, state, and local solid waste regulations.

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

Discussion: As noted within this environmental document, and with the mitigation measures outlined in the document, the project’s impacts related to habitat for wildlife species (San Joaquin Kit Fox) will be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. There will be no impact to fish habitat as well as no impact to fish and wildlife populations. The site is comprised of disturbed habitat, so impact to fish, wildlife, of plant habitat would be less than significant.

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

Discussion: The project is consistent with the City’s General Plan and Planned Development, Land Use designation and Zoning, and the adopted General Plan EIR, which evaluated City growth and build out. Therefore, the project will not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

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

Discussion: As noted within this environmental document, and with the mitigation measures outlined in the document, the project’s potential to cause what may be considered substantial, adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly is negligible. Therefore, the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

EARLIER ANALYSIS AND BACKGROUND MATERIALS.

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

Earlier Documents that may have been used in this Analysis and Background / Explanatory Materials

<u>Reference #</u>	<u>Document Title</u>	<u>Available for Review at:</u>
1	City of Paso Robles General Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446
2	City of Paso Robles Zoning Code	Same as above
3	City of Paso Robles Environmental Impact Report for General Plan Update	Same as above
4	2005 Airport Land Use Plan	Same as above
5	City of Paso Robles Municipal Code	Same as above
6	City of Paso Robles Water Master Plan	Same as above
7	City of Paso Robles Urban Water Management Plan 2005	Same as above
8	City of Paso Robles Sewer Master Plan	Same as above
9	City of Paso Robles Housing Element	Same as above
10	City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval for New Development	Same as above
11	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Guidelines for Impact Thresholds	APCD 3433 Roberto Court San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
12	San Luis Obispo County – Land Use Element	San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning County Government Center San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
13	USDA, Soils Conservation Service, Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, Paso Robles Area, 1983	Soil Conservation Offices Paso Robles, Ca 93446
14	Bike Master Plan, 2009	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446

Attachments:

- 1. Vicinity Map**
- 2. Site Plan & Elevations**
- 3. Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Plan**
- 4. Air Quality & GHG Assessment**
- 5. Biological Resources Assessment & San Joaquin Kit Fox Evaluation**
- 6. Arborist Report**
- 7. Archeological Surface Survey**
- 8. Airport Land Use Table 6**
- 9. Stormwater Control Plan**
- 10. Noise Impact Assessment**
- 11. Transportation Impact Analysis**

Attachments are available at City Hall, Community Development Department, or by downloading [May 17, 2016 City Council Agenda Item 9](#) [pdf:19mb/396pp]

Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan

Project File No./Name: PD 15-005, CUP 15-020, OTR 16-002 – The Residence Inn, Marriott

Approving Resolution No.: Resolution No. 16-050 by: Planning Commission City Council

Date: _____

The following environmental mitigation measures were either incorporated into the approved plans or were incorporated into the conditions of approval. Each and every mitigation measure listed below has been found by the approving body indicated above to lessen the level of environmental impact of the project to a level of non-significance. A completed and signed checklist for each mitigation measure indicates that it has been completed.

Explanation of Headings:

Type:Project, ongoing, cumulative

Monitoring Department or Agency:Department or Agency responsible for monitoring a particular mitigation measure

Shown on Plans:When a mitigation measure is shown on the plans, this column will be initialed and dated.

Verified Implementation:When a mitigation measure has been implemented, this column will be initialed and dated.

Remarks:Area for describing status of ongoing mitigation measure, or for other information.

Mitigation Measure	Type	Monitoring Department or Agency	Shown on Plans	Verified Implementation	Timing/Remarks
AES – 1 The project shall be designed in accordance with the attached specific architectural features to ensure visual impacts are mitigated.	Project	CDD			Prior to issuance of building permits.
AQ-1 a. The following measures are recommended to minimize nuisance impacts associated with construction-generated fugitive dust emissions: 1. Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible; 2. Use of water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 mph. Reclaimed (non-potable) water should be used whenever possible; 3. All dirt stock pile areas should be sprayed daily as needed; 4. Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans should be implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities;	Project, ongoing	CDD		Notes to be shown on grading plans and construction documents	Prior to site disturbance.

Mitigation Measure	Type	Monitoring Department or Agency	Shown on Plans	Verified Implementation	Timing/Remarks
<p>5. Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading should be sown with a fast germinating, non-invasive grass seed and watered until vegetation is established;</p> <p>6. All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the APCD;</p> <p>7. All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used;</p> <p>8. Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site;</p> <p>9. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with CVC Section 23114;</p> <p>10. Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site;</p> <p>11. Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water should be used where feasible;</p> <p>12. The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the fugitive dust emissions and enhance the implementation of the measures as necessary to minimize dust complaints, reduce visible emissions below 20% opacity, and to prevent transport of dust offsite. Their duties shall include holidays and weekend periods when work may not be in progress. The name and telephone number of such persons shall be provided to the APCD Compliance Division prior to the start of any grading, earthwork or demolition.</p> <p>b. The above mitigation measures shall be shown on grading and building plans.</p>					
<p>AQ-2 a. Implement Mitigation Measure AQ-1</p>	Project	SLOAPCD CDD			Prior to issuance of permits for demolition of onsite structures.

Mitigation Measure	Type	Monitoring Department or Agency	Shown on Plans	Verified Implementation	Timing/Remarks
<p>b. Demolition of onsite structures shall comply with the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Emissions (NESHAP) requirements (NESHAP, 40 CFR, Part 61, Subpart M) for the demolition of existing structures. The SLOAPCD is delegated authority by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to implement the Federal Asbestos NESHAP. Prior to demolition of onsite structures, the SLOAPCD shall be notified, per NESHAP requirements. SLOAPCD notification form and reporting requirements are included in Appendix A. Additional information may be obtained at website url: http://slocleanair.org/business/asbestos.php.</p> <p>c. Maintain all construction equipment in proper tune according to manufacturer's specifications;</p> <p>d. Fuel all off-road and portable diesel powered equipment with ARB certified motor vehicle diesel fuel (non-taxed version suitable for use off-road);</p> <p>e. Use diesel construction equipment meeting ARB's Tier 2 certified engines or cleaner off-road heavy-duty diesel engines, and comply with the State Off-road Regulation;</p> <p>f. Idling of all on and off-road diesel-fueled vehicles shall not be permitted when not in use. Signs shall be posted in the designated queuing areas and or job site to remind drivers and operators of the no idling limitation.</p> <p>g. Electrify equipment when possible;</p> <p>h. Substitute gasoline-powered in place of diesel-powered equipment, when available; and,</p> <p>i. Use alternatively fueled construction equipment on-site when available, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), propane or biodiesel.</p>					
<p>BIO-1 To the maximum extent possible, site preparation, ground-disturbing, and construction activities should be conducted outside of the migratory bird breeding season. If such activities are required during this period, the applicant should retain a qualified biologist to conduct a nesting bird survey and verify that migratory</p>	Project	Qualified Biologist CDD			Prior to issuance of grading permit

Mitigation Measure	Type	Monitoring Department or Agency	Shown on Plans	Verified Implementation	Timing/Remarks
<p>birds are not occupying the site. If nesting activity is detected the following measures should be implemented:</p> <p>a. The project should be modified or delayed as necessary to avoid direct take of identified nests, eggs, and/or young protected under the MBTA;</p> <p>b. The qualified biologist should determine an appropriate biological buffer zone around active nest sites. Construction activities within the established buffer zone will be prohibited until the young have fledged the nest and achieved independence; and,</p> <p>c. The qualified biologist should document all active nests and submit a letter report to the City documenting project compliance with the MBTA.</p>					
<p>BIO-2 Prior to construction, a qualified biologist should conduct a pre-activity survey to identify known or potential dens or sign of San Joaquin kit fox no less than 14 days and no more than 30 days prior to the beginning of the site preparation, ground-disturbing, or construction activities, or any other activity that has the potential to adversely affect the species. If a known or potential den or any other sign of the species is identified or detected within the project area, the biologist will contact USFWS and CDFW immediately. No work will commence or continue until such time that USFWS and CDFW determine that it is appropriate to proceed. Under no circumstances will a known or potential den be disturbed or destroyed without prior authorization from USFWS and CDFW. Within 7 days of survey completion, a report will be submitted to USFWS, CDFW, and the City. The report will include, at a minimum, survey dates, field personnel, field conditions, survey methodology, and survey results.</p>	Project	Qualified Biologist CDD			Prior to issuance of grading permit
<p>BIO-3 During the site-disturbance and/or construction phase, to prevent entrapment of the San Joaquin kit fox, all excavation, steep-walled holes, or trenches in excess of 2 feet in depth should be covered at the close of each working day by plywood or similar materials, or provided</p>	On-going	CDD			Prior to issuance of grading permit

Mitigation Measure	Type	Monitoring Department or Agency	Shown on Plans	Verified Implementation	Timing/Remarks
<p>with one or more escape ramps constructed of earth fill or wooden planks. Trenches should also be inspected for entrapped kit fox each morning prior to onset of field activities and immediately prior to covering with plywood at the end of each working day. Before such holes or trenches are filled or covered, they should be thoroughly inspected for entrapped kit fox. If any kit fox is found, work will stop and USFWS and CDFW will be contacted immediately to determine how to proceed.</p>					
<p>BIO-4 During the site disturbance and/or construction phase, any pipes, culverts, or similar structures with a diameter of 4 inches or greater stored overnight at the project site should be thoroughly inspected for trapped San Joaquin kit foxes before the subject pipe is subsequently buried, capped, or otherwise used or moved in any way. If any kit fox is found, work will stop and USFWS and CDFW will be contacted immediately to determine how to proceed.</p>	On-going	CDD			Prior to issuance of grading permit
<p>BIO-5 Prior to, during, and after the site disturbance and/or construction phase, use of pesticides or herbicides should be in compliance with all federal, state, and local regulations. This is necessary to minimize the probability of primary or secondary poisoning of endangered species utilizing adjacent habitats, and the depletion of prey upon which San Joaquin kit foxes depend.</p>	On-going	CDD			Prior to issuance of grading permit
<p>BIO-6 During the site disturbance and/or construction phase, any contractor or employee that inadvertently kills or injures a San Joaquin kit fox or who finds any such animal either dead, injured, or entrapped should be required to report the incident immediately to the applicant and City. In the event that any observations are made of injured or dead kit fox, the applicant should immediately notify USFWS and CDFW by telephone. In addition, formal notification should be provided in writing within 3 working days of the finding of any such animal(s). Notification should include the date, time, location, and circumstances of the incident. Any threatened or endangered species found dead or injured should be turned over immediately to CDFW for care, analysis, or disposition.</p>	On-going	CDD			Prior to issuance of grading permit

Mitigation Measure	Type	Monitoring Department or Agency	Shown on Plans	Verified Implementation	Timing/Remarks
<p>BIO-7 Prior to final inspection, should any long internal or perimeter fencing be proposed or installed, the City should do the following to provide for kit fox passage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. If a wire strand/pole design is used, the lowest strand should be no closer to the ground than 12 inches. b. If a more solid wire mesh fence is used, 8 x 12-inch openings near the ground should be provided every 100 yards. <p>Upon fence installation, the applicant should notify the City to verify proper installation. Any fencing constructed after issuance of a final permit should follow the above guidelines.</p>	Project	CDD			Prior to issuing Certificate of Occupancy permit
<p>BIO-8 Prior to site disturbance, the CRZ of all oak trees with a DBH of 6 inches or greater must be fenced to protect from construction activities. The proposed fencing shall be shown in orange ink on the grading plan. It must be a minimum of 4' high chain link, snow or safety fence staked (with t posts 8 feet on center) at the edge of the critical root zone or line of encroachment for each tree or group of trees. The fence shall be up before any construction or earth moving begins. The owner shall be responsible for maintaining an erect fence throughout the construction period. The arborist(s), upon notification, will inspect the fence placement once it is erected. After this time, fencing shall not be moved without arborist inspection/approval. If the orange plastic fencing is used, a minimum of four zip ties shall be used on each stake to secure the fence. All efforts shall be made to maximize the distance from each saved tree. Weather proof signs shall be permanently posted on the fences every 50 feet (See Arborist Report for specific language required for signage). All areas within the critical root zone of the trees that can be fenced shall receive a 4-6" layer of chip mulch to retain moisture, soil structure and reduce the effects of soil compaction.</p>	Project	Certified Arborist CDD			Prior to issuing grading permit
<p>BIO-9 All trenching within the critical root zone of native trees shall be hand dug. All major roots shall be avoided whenever possible. All exposed roots larger than 1" in diameter shall be clean cut with sharp pruning tools and not left ragged. A Mandatory meeting between the</p>	On-going	Certified Arborist CDD		Notes shown on construction documents.	Prior to issuing grading permit.

Mitigation Measure	Type	Monitoring Department or Agency	Shown on Plans	Verified Implementation	Timing/Remarks
arborists and grading contractor(s) must take place prior to work start. During the site disturbance and/or construction phase, grading, cutting, or filling within 5 feet of a CRZ of all oak trees with a DBH of 6 inches or greater must be supervised by a certified arborist approved by the City. Such activities beyond 5 feet of a CRZ must be monitored to ensure that activities are in accordance with approved plans. Root pruning outside of the CRZ must be done by hand. Grading should not encroach within the critical root zone unless authorized. Grading should not disrupt the normal drainage pattern around the trees. Fills should not create a ponding condition and excavations should not leave the tree on a rapidly draining mound.					
BIO-10 Oil, gasoline, chemicals, or other construction materials potentially harmful to oak trees may not be stored in the CRZ of any oak tree with a DBH of 6 inches or greater. No liquid or solid construction waste shall be dumped on the ground within the critical root zone of any native tree. The critical root zone areas are not for storage of materials either.	On-going	CDD		Notes shown on construction documents.	Prior to issuing grading permit.
BIO-11 Drains shall be installed according to City specification so as to avoid harm by excessive watering to oak trees with a DBH of 6 inches or greater.	Project	CDD		Notes shown on construction documents.	Prior to issuing Certificate of Occupancy permit
BIO-12 Landscaping within the CRZ of any oak tree with a DBH of 6 inches or greater is limited to indigenous plant species or non-plant material, such as cobbles or wood chips. All landscape within the critical root zone shall consist of drought tolerant or native varieties. Lawns shall be avoided. All irrigation trenching shall be routed around critical root zones, otherwise above ground drip-irrigation shall be used.	Project	CDD		Notes shown on construction documents.	Prior to issuing Building Permit.
BIO-13 Wires, signs, or other similar items shall not be attached to oak trees with a DBH of 6 inches or greater.	On-going	CDD		Notes shown on construction documents.	Prior to issuing Building Permit.
BIO-14 For each oak tree removed (DBH of 6 inches or greater), a tree or trees of the same species must be planted with a combined DBH of 25% of the removed tree's DBH within the property's boundary.	Project	CDD			Prior to issuing Certificate of Occupancy permit
BIO-15 It is the responsibility of the owner or project manager to	Project	CDD			Prior to site disturbance, grading permit issued

Mitigation Measure	Type	Monitoring Department or Agency	Shown on Plans	Verified Implementation	Timing/Remarks
provide a copy of the tree protection plan to any and all contractors and subcontractors that work within the critical root zone of any native tree and confirm they are trained in maintaining fencing, protecting root zones and conforming to all tree protection goals. Each contractor must sign and acknowledge this tree protection plan.					
BIO-16 Any exposed roots shall be re-covered the same day they were exposed. If they cannot, they must be covered with burlap or another suitable material and wetted down 2x per day until re-buried. All heavy equipment shall not be driven under the trees, as this will contribute to soil compaction. Also there is to be no parking of equipment or personal vehicles in these areas. All areas behind fencing are off limits unless pre-approved by the arborist.	On-going	Certified Arborist CDD		Shown on construction documents	Prior to issuance of grading permit
BIO-17 As the project moves toward completion, the arborist(s) may suggest either fertilization and/or mycorrhiza applications that will benefit tree health. Mycorrhiza offers several benefits to the host plant, including faster growth, improved nutrition, greater drought resistance, and protection from pathogens.	On-going	Certified Arborist CDD		Shown on construction documents	Prior to issuance of Certificate of Occupancy
BIO-18 Class 4 pruning includes crown reduction pruning shall consist of reduction of tops, sides or individual limbs. A trained arborist shall perform all pruning. No pruning shall take more than 25% of the live crown of any native tree. Any trees that may need pruning for road/home clearance shall be pruned prior to any grading activities to avoid any branch tearing.	On-going	Certified Arborist CDD		Shown on construction documents	Prior to issuance of building permit
BIO-19 An arborist shall be present for selected activities (trees identified in Arborist Report and items bulleted below). The monitoring does not necessarily have to be continuous but observational at times during these activities. It is the responsibility of the owner(s) or their designee to inform us prior to these events so we can make arrangements to be present. All monitoring will be documented on the field report form which will be forwarded to the project manager and the City of Paso Robles Planning Department. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● pre-construction fence placement inspection 	On-going	Certified Arborist CDD		Shown on construction documents	Prior to issuance of building permit

Mitigation Measure	Type	Monitoring Department or Agency	Shown on Plans	Verified Implementation	Timing/Remarks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> all grading and trenching identified on the spreadsheet any other encroachment the arborist feels necessary 					
<p>BIO-20 Pre-Construction Meeting: An on-site pre-construction meeting with the Arborist(s), Owner(s), Planning Staff, and the earth moving team shall be required for this project. Prior to final occupancy, a letter from the arborist(s) shall be required verifying the health/condition of all impacted trees and providing any recommendations for any additional mitigation. The letter shall verify that the arborist(s) were on site for all grading and/or trenching activity that encroached into the critical root zone of the selected native trees, and that all work done in these areas was completed to the standards set forth above.</p>	Project	Certified Arborist CDD			Prior to issuance of Final Occupancy
<p>GHG-1 Prior to occupancy permit being approved, the project shall complete a CAP consistency report and secure approval of the report from the City Planning Department and SLOAPCD. The consistency report shall provide record of compliance with the mandatory and any substituted measures in the City of Paso Robles CAP Consistency Worksheet (refer to Attachment 4).</p>	Project	CDD			Prior to occupancy permit
<p>HD-1 Prior to project construction the owner will provide (1) a commitment to execute any necessary agreements, and (2) a statement accepting responsibility for operation and maintenance of drainage facilities until that responsibility is formally transferred.</p>	Project	CDD			Prior to issuance of grading permit.
<p>HD-2 Maintenance items required for the bioretention basin:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clean up. Remove any soil or debris blocking inlets or overflows. Remove any trash that collects in the facilities. Vegetation maintenance. Prune or cut back plants for health and to ensure flow into inlets and across the surface of the facility. Remove and replant as necessary. Weed control. Control weeds by manual methods and soil amendment where possible. In response to problem areas or threatening invasions, non- 	On-going	CDD			Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy

Mitigation Measure	Type	Monitoring Department or Agency	Shown on Plans	Verified Implementation	Timing/Remarks
<p>selective natural herbicides may be used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add mulch. Mulch may be added from time to time to maintain a mulch layer thickness of 1 to 2 inches. Maintain the underlying soil surface layer beneath the overflow elevation. • Irrigation. Check irrigation, if any, to confirm it is adequate but not excessive. • Training for Landscape Maintenance. Landscape Maintenance Personnel will be informed of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Do not add synthetic fertilizer to bioretention facilities. ○ Do not apply fertilizer when rain is forecast in the next 48 hours. ○ Do not use synthetic pesticides on bioretention facilities. 					
<p>HD-3 The following maintenance items are required for the Contech CDS®:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inspect the unit at regular intervals: twice a year at a minimum. • Open both manhole access covers. One cover will allow for the inspection and cleanout of the separation chamber and isolated sump. The other cover allows for inspection and cleanout of sediment captured and retained outside the screen. • Sediment shall be cleaned when the level has reached 75% of the capacity. • Clean during dry weather conditions. • The use of a vacuum truck is generally the most effective and convenient method of removing pollutants from the system. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Insert the vacuum hose into the sump. ○ The system should be completely drained down. ○ The sump should be fully evacuated of sediment. ○ The area outside the screen should also be cleaned out if pollutant build-up exists in this area. ○ Clean the system immediately in the event of an oil or gasoline spill. • Secure the lids when cleaning and maintenance 	On-going	CDD			Prior to issuance of certificate of occupancy

Mitigation Measure	Type	Monitoring Department or Agency	Shown on Plans	Verified Implementation	Timing/Remarks
are completed.					
NO-1 Unless otherwise provided for in a validly issued permit or approval, noise-generating construction activities should be limited to the hours of 7:00am and 7:00pm. Noise-generating construction activities should not occur on Sundays or City holidays	On-going	CDD			
NO-2 Construction equipment should be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reduction intake and exhausted mufflers and engine shrouds, in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations. Equipment engine shrouds should be closed during equipment operation.	On-going	CDD			
TR-1 The project will be required to pay traffic mitigation fees to offset to offset its impacts to the citywide transportation network.	Project	CDD			Prior to certificate of occupancy
TR-2 The applicant will implement employee transportation demand measures to reduce traffic congestion, such as providing information on regional rideshare programs, bike racks, well as provide shuttle service to the multi-modal transportation center and downtown for residents and guests.	Project	CDD			Prior to certificate of occupancy
TR-3 The applicant will work with CalTrans to prohibit northbound left turns on the northbound approach to State Route 46E/Union Road to improve operations at this intersection by reducing turning conflicts.	Project	CDD			Prior to certificate of occupancy
TR-4 The project will be required to participate in the SLO Car Free program with SLO County APCD	Project	CDD			Prior to certificate of occupancy

(add additional measures as necessary)

Explanation of Headings:

Type:Project, ongoing, cumulative

Monitoring Department or Agency:Department or Agency responsible for monitoring a particular mitigation measure

Shown on Plans:When a mitigation measure is shown on the plans, this column will be initialed and dated.

Verified Implementation:When a mitigation measure has been implemented, this column will be initialed and dated.

Remarks:Area for describing status of ongoing mitigation measure, or for other information.