

RESOLUTION NO: 04-0139

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
APPROVING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR
TENTATIVE MAP APPROVAL FOR PR 04-0310
(WEYRICK)

APN: 025-421-002, 025-421-006, 025-421-026

WHEREAS, Tentative Parcel Map PR 04-0310 has been filed by North Coast Engineering on behalf of Colin Weyrick and Raymond Frazier to subdivide three existing commercial lots totaling approximately 14.44 acres into twelve parcels between .75 acres and 1.58 acres each.

WHEREAS, this parcel is located within the C3 (Commercial / Light Industrial Zoning District) and is within the following General Plan land use designations: CS: Commercial Service, NC: Floating Neighborhood Commercial Designation, Airport Area Overlay, and Borkey Specific Plan Overlay; and

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on December 14, 2004 to consider the Initial Study on file with the Community Development Departments and prepared for this application, and to accept public testimony regarding this proposed environmental determination, and

WHEREAS, based on the information contained in the Initial Study prepared for this project and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the Planning Commission finds no substantial evidence that there would be a significant impact on the environment, if the application was approved with conditions as described in that initial study and contained in the resolutions approving PR 04-0310.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles, based on its independent judgment, that the Negative Declaration provided in Exhibit A is hereby approved for PR 04-0310 in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 14th day of December, 2004 by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Mattke, Kemper, Steinbeck, Flynn, Johnson, Hamon, Ferravanti
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None

 1-11-05
CHAIRMAN TOM ELYNN

ATTEST:


ROBERT A. LATA, PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY

EXHIBIT A OF RESOLUTION 04-____
Mitigated Negative Declaration Prepared for PR 04-0310

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

- 1. PROJECT TITLE:** PR 04-0310
Concurrent Entitlements: None
- 2. LEAD AGENCY:** City of Paso Robles
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446
- Contact:** Jamie Kirk, Kirk Consulting, Contract
Planner
Phone: (805) 461-5765
- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:** Golden Hill Road at Tractor Way
(025-421-002, 006, 026)
- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** Colin Weyrick / Raymond Frazier / North
Coast Engineering
- Contact Person:** Larry Werner
Phone: (805) 239-3127
- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** CS: Commercial Service, NC: Floating
Neighborhood Commercial Designation and Airport Area Overlay, Borkey and
Specific Plan Overlay
- 6. ZONING:** C3: Commercial / Light Industrial

7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Proposal to subdivide three existing commercial lots totaling approximately 14.44 acres into twelve parcels between approximately .75 acre and 1.58 acres each.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

The site is developed with a single family dwelling with accessory structures, an existing commercial business, and associated site improvements. The site is a level lot with frontage on Golden Hill Road and Tractor Way. Vegetation on the lot consists of scattered non-native grasses and shrubs, two oak trees and several non-native trees.

Neighboring Properties:

North: Vacant 2.5+ acre commercial parcels. **South:** existing commercial development (gas station / restaurant) **West:** Vacant commercial service property, **East:** mixed commercial service uses.

9. RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:

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

Jamie Kirk: Principal Planner, Kirk Consulting, John Falkenstien: City Engineer.

11. CONTEXT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FOR PROJECT:

This environmental initial study will study the associated impacts that may occur with the subdivision of three existing commercial lots totaling approximately 14.44 acres into twelve parcels between approximately .75 acre and 1.58 acres each.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION

(To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described on an attached sheet have been added to the project. A **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

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

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

Jamie Kirk
Signature

Jamie Kirk
Printed Name

11-20-04
Date

Principal Planner
Title

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

SAMPLE QUESTION:

*Potentially
Significant
Potentially Unless Less Than*

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

*Significant
Impact* *Mitigation
Incorporated* *Significant
Impact* *No Im*

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

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

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

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

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the Proposal:

- a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning? (Source: 1,2)

Discussion: The proposed subdivision would meet the City's Zoning Code and General Plan designation.

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

Discussion: There are no other environmental plans or policies by other agencies besides the City of Paso Robles.

- c) Be incompatible with existing land use in the vicinity? (Source: 1,2)

Discussion: The project is not proposing any uses at this time.

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

Discussion: The project site is zoned for commercial uses and the development of the subject project would not have an impact on agricultural resources.

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

Discussion: N/A

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

- a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? (Source: Paso Robles General Plan.)

Discussion: The proposed project is consistent with the density allowed within the current General Plan and Zoning designations. Therefore, there is no impact on population projections.

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

Discussion: The proposed project is consistent with the densities allowed in the General Plan and the infrastructure already exists. The site is surrounded by similar development and would not be considered growth inducing. Therefore, there is no impact on growth projections.

- c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?

Discussion: There is one existing house on the site that will be required to be converted to a use consistent with the Commercial Service land use category

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

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

- a) Fault rupture?

Discussion: This portion of San Luis Obispo County (generally the Paso Robles area) is located at the far southerly end of the Salinas Valley which also extends up into Monterey County. There are two known fault zones on either side of this valley. The San Marco-Rinconada Fault system runs on the west side of the valley. The San Andreas Fault is on the east side of the valley and runs through the community of Parkfield east of Paso Robles. The City of Paso Robles recognizes these geologic influences in the application of the Uniform Building Code to all new development within the City. Soils reports and structural engineering in accordance with local seismic influences would be applied in conjunction with any new development proposal. Based on standardly applied conditions of approval, the potential for fault rupture and exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards is not considered significant.

- b) Seismic ground shaking?

Discussion: See the response to Section III(a). Based on that response, the potential for exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards is not considered significant.

- c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction?

Discussion: The City's General Plan contains public safety policies that would require special attention to projects with potential for liquefaction. Also, see the response to Section III(a). Based on the above discussion, the potential for exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards, including liquefaction is not considered significant.

- d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard?

Discussion: The project site is not located in an area identified at risk for seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazards.

- e) Landslides or Mud flows?

Discussion: See discussion for III (f).

- f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?

Discussion: See the discussion in Section III(a). In addition to standard erosion control measures being part of a future development, all grading would be subject to standard conditions of approval ensuring that soils conditions are suitable for the proposed structures and improvements. As such, no significant impacts are anticipated.

- g) Subsidence of the land?

Discussion: See the discussion in Sections III (a) and (f) above. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

- h) Expansive soils?

Discussion: See the discussion in Sections III (a) and (f) above. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

- i) Unique geologic or physical features?

Discussion: N/A

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

IV. WATER. Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? (Source: 6,9, 20) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: It is a standard condition that the developer mitigates additional storm drain run-off generated by their project. Appropriate drainage facilities shall be designed in accordance with current City Standards, and design plans shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: All development will be located outside of the 100 year flood area.

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

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See Sec. IV a, discussion

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movement? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not disturb the intermittent stream that traverses the site.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| h) Impacts to groundwater quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 10,13, 18, 20) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

Discussion: The San Luis Obispo County area is a non-attainment area for the State standards for ozone and suspended particulate matter. The SLO County Air Pollution Control District (APCD) administers a permit system to ensure that stationary sources do not collectively create emissions which would cause local and state standards to be exceeded. The potential for future project development to create adverse air quality impacts falls generally into two categories: Short term and Long term impacts.

Short term impacts are associated with the grading and development portion of a project where earth work generates dust, but the impact ends when construction is complete. Long term impacts are related to the ongoing operational characteristics of a project and are generally related to vehicular trip generation and the level of offensiveness of the onsite activity being developed.

The operational phase impacts will likely be less than the District's CEQA mitigation threshold value of 10 lbs of emissions per day.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? (Source: 10,13) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature? (Source: 10,13) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Create objectionable odors? (Source: 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion? (Source: 16) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

The proposed project is consistent with the current General Plan and Zoning designations. The traffic trips allowed in the land use designations were evaluated in the EIR prepared for the General Plan and the Borkey Area Specific Plan. There are no anticipated impacts to traffic trips or congestion. Public improvements will be required on Golden Hill Road and the project will include the extension of Tractor Way which is a circulation benefit to the area.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Source: 16) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Inadequate emergency access or inadequate access to nearby uses? (Source: 16) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Emergency Services has reviewed the project and does not have concerns.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

Discussion: Future uses will be evaluated to ensure that adequate parking exists on each site.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A.

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

Discussion: N/A.

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

Discussion: N/A.

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to: plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)? (Source: 14) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is in an area that is considered urbanized and the project is classified as infill development . It would not appear that endangered or threatened or rare species or their habitats will have a significant impact.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)? (Source: 13) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: There are two small oaks located on the site. All future development will be located outside of the critical root zone (CRZ) of the oak trees. No oak trees will be removed by the future construction or site improvements.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

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

Discussion: There is no evidence of wetland habitat on this site.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: This site would not appear to be a wildlife dispersal or mitigation corridor.

III. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
Discussion: N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Use non-renewable resource in a wasteful and inefficient manner?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				
c) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				

IX. HAZARDS. Would the proposal involve:

a) A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides, chemicals or radiation)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				
b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				
c) The creation of any health hazard or potential hazards?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				
d) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				

X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

a) Increases in existing noise levels? (Source 1, 19)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Besides the initial construction of the project, existing noise levels would not be significantly increased. Future uses on the site will be required to comply with the City's Noise Level standards.				
b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels? (Source 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: There would be construction noise during the construction phase of the project, but would still be within the allowable tolerances as required by Chapter 17, the Building Code.

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

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

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

Discussion: The Emergency Services Department has reviewed the development and has provided the necessary conditions of approval to adequately address fire protection concerns.

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

Discussion: N/A

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

Discussion: N/A

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

Discussion: The project will be required pay their fair share of pro-rata fees for development fees included in the Borkey Specific Plan Area.

- | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Other governmental services? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

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

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Power or natural gas? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Southern California Gas Company provides service to the Paso Robles area. The project is not anticipated to interfere with gas services or create an unmet demand.

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

Discussion: The Pacific Bell Company provides service to the Paso Robles and County areas. The project is not anticipated to interfere with phone/communication services.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Sewer or septic tanks? (Source: 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

Discussion: The project will be required to hook up to City sewer services.

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Storm water drainage? (Source: 6) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See Section IVa.

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Solid waste disposal? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Each lot would be served by Paso Robles Waste.

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) Local or regional water supplies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

XIII.AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway? (Source: 1,9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: This project is not located on a scenic vista or highway.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect? (Source: 1,9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project does not involve construction at this time. Future development projects will be evaluated to ensure that they do not create a negative aesthetic effect.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Create light or glare? (Source: 1,9) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

XIV.CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Disturb paleontological resources? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Disturb archaeological resources? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The Paso Robles area has been classified as territory occupied by the Migueleno Salinan and the Obispeno Chumash Native California populations. Past community populations have been evidenced at several sites within the Paso Robles area and unincorporated portions of the surrounding County.

If, during any future construction excavation, any buried or isolated cultural materials are unearthed, work in the affected area should stop until these materials can be examined by a qualified Archeologist and appropriate recommendations made regarding their treatment and/or disposition. Such examination should be conducted under the coordination of the City of Paso Robles.

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

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

Discussion: See XIV b.

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

Discussion: N/A.

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

Discussion: N/A

XV.RECREATION. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion: N/A.

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

Discussion: N/A.

XVI.MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: It would not appear that there would be any significant impacts in this section.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: N/A

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is anticipated within the City’s General Plan and Zoning documents. It would appear that it meets the requirements of those documents. There would not be a significant cumulative impact.

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) 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: The proposed project would meet the requirements and intent of the Zoning Code and General Plan for development within R-2 designated properties.

EARLIER ANALYSIS AND BACKGROUND MATERIALS.

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

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

<u>Reference #</u>	<u>Document Title</u>	<u>Available for Review at:</u>
1	City of Paso Robles General Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446
2	City of Paso Robles Zoning Code	Same as above
3	City of Paso Robles Environmental Impact Report for General Plan Update	Same as above
4	1977 Airport Land Use Plan	Same as above
5	City of Paso Robles Municipal Code	Same as above
6	City of Paso Robles Water Master Plan	Same as above
7	City of Paso Robles Sewer Master Plan	Same as above
8	City of Paso Robles Housing Element	Same as above
9	City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval for New Development	Same as above
10	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Guidelines for Impact Thresholds	APCD 3433 Roberto Court San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
11	San Luis Obispo County -- Land Use Element	San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning County Government Center San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
12	USDA, Soils Conservation Service, Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, Paso Robles Area, 1983	Soil Conservation Offices Paso Robles, Ca 93446
13	San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Letter dated January 14, 2003	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446