

RESOLUTION NO.: 05-085

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES
ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION
FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENT 05-010 & CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 05-006 FOR THE
INNS AT VINTNERS VILLAGE HOTEL PROJECT
(CENCO Investment)

APN: 009-631-011

WHEREAS, Planned Development 05-010 has been filed by R2L Architects on behalf of CENCO Investment, LLC & Alexander Samardzich to construct a 138 room, four story hotel with bungalows and ancillary parking lot and landscaping; and

WHEREAS, the proposed project being studied at this time with PD 05-010 & CUP 05-006 is Phase 1 of a conceptual multi-phase master plan that would include additional hotel buildings as well as commercial/retail facilities, all other phases will need to be reviewed under a separate development plan including a separate environmental analysis; and

WHEREAS, the Project site is located in the vicinity of the northwest corner of Highway 46 West and South Vine Street; and

WHEREAS, the General Plan land use designation of the Project site is Regional Commercial (RC) and the Zoning designation is Highway Commercial, Planned Development Overlay (C2-PD); and

WHEREAS, Section 21.13.030 of the Zoning Code which requires approval of a Conditional Use Permit for commercial use of C2 PD-zoned properties in the Theatre Drive area so as to ensure that land uses will not have a significant adverse effect on the economic vitality of the downtown as required by Ordinance 568 N.S.; and

WHEREAS, in conjunction with Planned Development 05-010, R2L Architects on behalf of CENCO Investment, LLC, has filed Conditional Use Permit 05-006, seeking authorization to operate a hotel in the C2 PD (Highway Commercial, Planned Development) Zoning District; and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared for this project (attached to this resolution as Exhibit A) which concludes and proposes that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be adopted; and

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

WHEREAS, at its September 13, 2005 meeting, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on the proposed Hotel, to accept public testimony on the Planned Development, Conditional Use Permit and environmental review therefore; and

WHEREAS, the applicant has entered into a signed Mitigation Agreement with the City of Paso Robles (prior to Planning Commission action on the Mitigated Negative Declaration) that establishes obligation on the part of the property owner to mitigate identified environmental effects as set forth therein, most

notably with regard to the interim mitigation measures for vehicular traffic related impacts of pending development project applications within the geographic area of the Highway 46 West/Highway 101 Interchange; 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 Planning Commission finds no substantial evidence that there would be a significant impact on the environment based on the attached Mitigation Agreement and its attached Mitigation Summary Table that are also described in the initial study and contained in the resolution approving PD 05-010 as site specific conditions summarized below.

Topic of Mitigation	Condition #
Traffic and Circulation	9, 10, 11 & 17
Air Quality (Short and Long Term)	12, 13
Biological (Oak Trees)	14,15 & 16

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles, based on its independent judgment, that the Mitigated Negative Declaration for Planned Development 05-010 and Conditional Use Permit 05-006 are hereby adopted 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 27th day of September, 2005 by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Johnson, Mennath, Mattke, Hamon, Holstine
NOES: Flynn
ABSENT: Steinbeck
ABSTAIN: None

VICE CHAIRMAN ERIC MATTKE

ATTEST:

ROBERT A. LATA, PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY

h:\darren\pd\VintnersVillage\neg dec reso

CITY OF PASO ROBLES – PLANNING DIVISION INITIAL STUDY

1. GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE: The Inns at Vintners Village Development Project (PD 05-010 & Conditional Use Permit 05-006)

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

Contact: Darren Nash, Associate Planner
Telephone: (805) 237-3970

PROJECT LOCATION: In the vicinity of the northwest corner of Hwy 101 and Hwy 46 West (APN: 009-631-011)

PROJECT PROPONENT: Applicant: CENCO Investment, LLC / Alexander Samardzich
800 Pollard Road, Suite 36 – Bldg. C
Los Gatos, CA 95032

**LEAD AGENCY CONTACT/
INITIAL STUDY PREPARED BY:** Darren Nash, Associate Planner

Telephone: (805) 237-3970
Facsimile: (805) 237-3904
E-Mail: dnash@prcity.com

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RC (Regional Commercial)

ZONING: C2P-D (Highway Commercial, Planned-Development)

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is to construct a 118-unit hotel and 20 bungalow units, totaling 138 units. The project is Phase I of a multiple phase master plan. This environmental review is studying only Phase I, any additional phases will need to undergo a separate environmental review.

The 138 room hotel project will consist of the construction of the 69,225 square foot hotel and 5 bungalow buildings totaling 12,450 square feet (each bungalow building contains four units). Accessory to the hotel and bungalows will be a 166 space parking lot, landscaping improvements and associated infrastructure.

There are 131 oak trees located on the site which the project has been designed around. There will be some impacts to a few of the trees from the construction of the project, but with the mitigation measures outlined in the Arborist Report, there should not be a significant impact.

3. OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL MAY BE REQUIRED (For example, issuance of permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

- Agreement for Interim Traffic Mitigation Measures
- Agreement to Participate in Formation of an Assessment District for Highway Interchange Improvements at Hwys. 101 and 46 West.

4. EARLIER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:

This Initial Study incorporates by reference the City of El Paso de Robles General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (SCH#2003011123).

5. CONTEXT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FOR THE PROJECT:

This Initial Study relies on expert opinion supported by the facts, technical studies, and technical appendices of the City of El Paso de Robles General Plan EIR. These documents are incorporated herein by reference. They provide substantial evidence to document the basis upon which the City has arrived at its environmental determination regarding various resources.

6. PURPOSES OF AN INITIAL STUDY

The purposes of an Initial Study for a Development Project Application are:

- A. To provide the City with sufficient information and analysis to use as the basis for deciding whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Report, a Mitigated Negative Declaration, or a Negative Declaration for a site specific development project proposal;
- B. To enable the Applicant of a site specific development project proposal or the City as the lead agency to modify a project, mitigating adverse impacts before an Environmental Impact Report is required to be prepared, thereby enabling the proposed Project to qualify for issuance of a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration;
- C. To facilitate environmental assessment early in the design of a project;
- D. To eliminate unnecessary EIRs;
- E. To explain the reasons for determining that potentially significant effects would not be significant;
- F. To determine if a previously prepared EIR could be used for the project;
- G. To assist in the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report if one is required; and
- H. To provide documentation of the factual basis for the finding of no significant effect as set forth in a Negative Declaration or a Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the a project.

7. EXPLANATION OF ANSWERS FOUND ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

A. Scope of Environmental Review

This Initial Study evaluates potential impacts identified in the following checklist. Potential environmental impacts identified can be mitigated to a less than significant level. A project specific traffic study was also

conducted and is attached to this document in Exhibit B. The project is consistent with the applicable development standards of the M P-D zoning district and BP land use designation.

B. Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers to the questions presented on the following Environmental Checklist Form, except where the answer is that the proposed project will have “No Impact.” The “No Impact” answers are to be adequately supported by the information sources cited in the parentheses following each question or as otherwise explained in the introductory remarks. 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 and/or general standards. The basis for the “No Impact” answers on the following Environmental Checklist Form is explained in further detail in this Initial Study in Section 9 (Earlier Environmental Analysis and Related Environmental Documentation) and Section 10 (Context of Environmental Analysis for the Project).
2. All answers on the following Environmental Checklist Form must take into account the whole action involved with the project, including implementation. 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 9 (Earlier Environmental Analysis and Related Environmental Documentation) 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). See Section 4 (Earlier Environmental Analysis and Related Environmental Documentation) and Section 11 (Earlier Analysis and Background Materials) of this Initial Study.
6. References to the information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) have been incorporated into the Environmental Checklist Form. See Section 11 (Earlier Analysis and Related Environmental Documentation). Other sources used or individuals contacted are cited where appropriate.
7. The following Environmental Checklist Form generally is the same as the one contained in Title 14, California Code of Regulations; with some modifications to reflect the City’s needs and requirements.
8. Standard Conditions of Approval: The City imposes standard conditions of approval on Projects. These conditions are considered to be components of and/or modifications to the Project and some reduce or minimize environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. Because they are considered part of the Project, they have not been identified as mitigation measures. For the readers’ information, the standard conditions identified in this Initial Study are available for review at the Community Development Department.
9. Certification Statement: The statements made in this Initial Study and those made in the documents referenced herein present the data and information that are required to satisfy the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) – Statutes and Guidelines, as well as the City’s Procedures for Implementing CEQA. Further, the facts, statements, information, and analysis presented are true and correct in accordance with standard business practices of qualified professionals with expertise in the development review process, including building, planning, and engineering.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The proposed project may potentially affect the environmental factors checked below, and may involve at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact” or is “Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated,” if so indicated on the following Environmental Checklist Form (Pages 8 to.15)

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

9. ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation: I find that:

The proposed project could not have a significant effect on the environment; and, therefore, a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

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. Therefore, a **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

The proposed project may have a significant effect on the environment; and, therefore an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

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.”

Therefore, an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it will analyze only the effect or effects that remain to be addressed.

Signature:

Date:

August 19, 2005

Darren Nash, Associate Planner

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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? (Sources: 1 & 8)

Discussion: The proposed project is consistent with the C2 P-D Zoning District and RC land use designation in the General Plan Land Use Element, and they are permitted uses in compliance with all applicable development standards.

b) Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: The proposed project complies with the EIR recently certified for the City General Plan Update, 2003.

c) Be incompatible with existing land uses in the vicinity? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: The project uses, site plan and architecture are similar to and compatible with surrounding development. The project is consistent with existing land uses in the vicinity. There are other hotel developments currently operating and currently under construction in the vicinity of the project on the south side of Hwy 46 West.

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

Discussion: This is an urban infill site. There are no agricultural resources on or near the project site. Therefore, the project could not impact agricultural resources or operations.

e) Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: The project is currently vacant except for one house which will be removed. The project would meet the Zoning and General Plan designations for the site as well as meet the goals of the City's Economic Strategy. This project is not anticipated to disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

a) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: The proposed project does not include a residential component nor is it large enough to result in creating a significant number of new jobs that could affect cumulative 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)? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: This is an urban infill site and will be served by all city services which currently exist along South Vine

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

Street.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing?
(Sources: 1, 3, & 5) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There is no housing currently existing on the project site, thus the project will not displace any existing housing.

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Fault rupture? (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 this valley. The 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. Review of available information and examinations indicate that neither of these faults is active with respect to ground rupture in Paso Robles. Soils 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. In addition, per requirements of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, only structures for human habitation need to be setback a minimum of 50 feet of a known active trace fault. The proposed structures are not intended for human habitation.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The City is located within an active earthquake area that could experience seismic ground shaking from the Rinconada and San Andreas Faults. The proposed structure will be constructed to current UBC 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 not constructing over active or potentially active faults.

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

Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR, the project site is not located in an area with soil conditions that have a high risk for liquefaction or other type of ground failure.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Landslides or Mudflows? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: d. and e. The project site is not located near bodies of water or volcanic hazards, nor is the site located in an area subject to landslides or mudflows.

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

- f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, & 4)

Discussion: The site slopes up from the existing elevation of South Vine Street approximately 26 feet on the south end to approximately 14 feet on the northern end. There will need to be cuts into the slopes to provide for the entry/exit driveways. Once on top of the site there will be minimal grading for the parking lots and buildings. Per the General Plan EIR, the project site is not located in an area known to have unstable soil conditions, thus impacts resulting from grading and excavation are anticipated to be less than significant. In addition to standard erosion control measures that are a part of development, all grading would be subject to standard conditions of approval ensuring that soils conditions are suitable for the proposed structures and improvements. Soil reports are also required to be submitted with the building and grading plans. As such, no significant impacts are anticipated.

- g) Subsidence of the land? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR, the project site is not located in an area subject to subsidence from either groundwater extraction or liquefaction, thus impacts would be less than significant from development of this project.

- h) Expansive soils? (Sources: 4)

Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR, Paso Robles is an area that has moderately expansive soils. This issue will be addressed through implementation of appropriate excavation and compaction of soils. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soils will be less than significant.

- i) Unique geologic or physical features? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: There are no unique geologic or physical features on or near the project site.

IV. WATER. Would the proposal result in:

- a) Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: The project includes structures and parking lots which will increase the amount of surface runoff and decrease absorption rates. However, site drainage will be conveyed to the storm water system where it will be filtered in compliance with the NPDES regulations prior to flowing into the Salinas River and recharge groundwater resources.

- b) Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: There is no potential to expose people or property to water related hazards due to this project since it is not near a water source and it is not in a flood zone.

- c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

Discussion: The project will utilize the existing storm water system and historical flow to the Salinas River. The volume of discharge that may result from this project could not be of a quantify to alter water quality in terms of temperature, dissolved oxygen or create significant turbidity.

- d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body?
(Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: The resulting project surface water is not large enough to significantly affect the amount of surface water in any water body. Additionally, water is pumped from several City wells from the groundwater basin, which has adequate capacity for city build-out.

- e) Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movement? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: This project could not result in changes in currents or water movement since it is not located near surface water.

- 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? (Sources: 1,3, & 7)

Discussion: Build-out of the City is anticipated in the General Plan and evaluated in the GP EIR. This project is in compliance with the adopted build-out scenario and anticipated impacts to water demand. The project will implement water conservation measures through use of water conservation landscape and irrigation measures, and building fixtures.

- g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater?
(Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: This project could not result in alterations to the direction or rate of groundwater flow since this project does not directly extract groundwater or otherwise affect these resources.

- h) Impacts to groundwater quality? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: The project will not affect groundwater quality since this project does not directly extract groundwater or otherwise affect these resources. This project will not change existing water quality from discharging in surface waters with implementation of standard storm water discharge infrastructure that is in compliance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements.

- i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies?
(Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: Refer to response f.

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

- a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

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. To aid in the assessment of project impacts subject to CEQA review, the APCD published the “CEQA Air Quality Handbook” in April, 2003. This handbook establishes screening thresholds for measuring the potential of projects to generate air quality impacts. Generally, any project that generates less than 10lbs./day of emissions would “qualify” for a Negative Declaration determination, and a project that generates between 10 and 24lbs./day of emissions would “qualify” for a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Based on Table 1-1 of the APCD’s handbook, a threshold of 66 rooms would place emissions at an estimated 10 lbs./day. A 160 room project would be estimated at generating 25 lbs./day of emissions. Based on these table projections, the 138 unit project would generate approximately 15 lbs. / day of ozone and particulate matter emissions. This would place the project slight higher than the 10lbs./day (for a Negative Declaration without mitigation measures), but clearly below the 25lbs./day emission threshold for the granting of a Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Based on exceeding the 10 bs./day threshold for a Negative Declaration, it will be necessary for the project to incorporate appropriate short and long term mitigation measures as outlined in the APCD’s CEQA Handbook. The recommended mitigation measures are included in the attached mitigation summary , and they include measures for dust control and Best Available Technology (BAT) during construction , and heating/cooling standards in building construction and landscaping for reducing long term impacts. Based on implementation of short and long term mitigation measures outlined in this report, the resultant impacts are considered to be less than significant.

- b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: There are no sensitive receptors such as schools, hospitals, etc. within the near vicinity that could be impacted by this project.

- c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: This project does not have the potential to significantly alter air movement, moisture, or temperature since it does not include a large parking lot without trees.

- d) Create objectionable odors?

Discussion: The construction of this project will not result in objectionable odors.

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

- a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: An analysis of future vehicle trips and traffic circulation were analyzed by an independent transportation consultant. The consultant prepared a traffic study which evaluated project related and cumulative traffic impacts

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

particularly as they relate to the intersection of Hwys. 46 West and 101. The study determined that with interim improvements planned at this intersection, that LOS D could be maintained, which is an acceptable interim level of service until long-term improvements can be completed. Intersections on the east side of Hwy 101 near the project site, are forecasted operate at LOS B-C. Peak hour trips and traffic contributions were also determined in the study. The applicant will be required to participate in their share of interim and long-term improvements as calculated in the study to mitigate the project traffic impacts to a less than significant level.

The subject property will be affected by the ultimate improvements to the intersection of State Highways 101 and 46 West. A Project Study Report (PSR) has been prepared by the City and was signed as approved by Caltrans last April.

Numerous alternative designs have been studied over the past four years. The PSR identifies four alternatives which Caltrans approves for further study. All four of these alternatives involve the realignment of Vine Street westerly through the CENCO property to point of connection to Highway 46 west roughly 1,000 feet west of its current intersection.

The geometrics of the PSR must be considered with any application involving property within its study area. In the case of the Vintners Village project, only the Vine Street leg of the PSR affects the project property. Vine Street is unique to the PSR in that it will remain a City street while all other improvements will be owned and operated by Caltrans. Therefore, Vine Street will be subject to design criteria established by the City, as opposed to Caltrans.

Consistent with the PSR, a condition of approval has been added to PD 05-010 requiring the following:

Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant will provide the City with an irrevocable and perpetual offer of dedication for public right-of-way for the extension of Vine Street westerly through the subject property. The width of the offer shall be 68 feet. The horizontal alignment of the offer shall be subject to the approval of the City Engineer.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g. farm equipment)? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project does not include road improvements that may result in safety hazards or in incompatible uses.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Inadequate emergency access or inadequate access to nearby uses? (Sources:1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is adequately served by public streets for emergency services.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (Sources: 1, 3, 7, & 8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The Site Plan indicates the required number of parking spaces (165) per Zoning Ordinance requirements for the proposed uses. Therefore, the project will have sufficient on-site parking spaces.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (Source: 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project includes curb, gutter and sidewalk improvements along property frontages. The project will not affect travelways for pedestrians or bicyclists.

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?
(Sources: 1 & 8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project would not conflict with or otherwise affect adopted policies supporting alternative transportation.

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

Discussion: The project could not result in impacts to rail, waterborne or air transportation.

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

Discussion A Sensitive Species and Habitat Survey was prepared by LFR on June 7,2005. The study concluded that "No listed sensitive plant or wildlife species were observed or are expected to be present on the site." Thus, impacts to endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats would be less than significant.

See attached copy of the LFR Survey. Source 11

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

Discussion: There are twenty-nine (29) oak trees located within the developable areas of this project. All of the oak trees are proposed to be saved/preserved. An Arborist Report was completed for the project by Consulting Arborist, E. Wesley Conner. The report concludes that the project has been redesigned from the initial design to better work around the oak trees. There will be mitigation measures for the trees including protection during construction, monitoring during construction and use of pervious pavers for driveway and parking lot areas within the oak tree critical root zone to reduce potential impacts to oak trees to a less than significant level.

By applying the mitigation measures as requested by the Arborist, impacts to oak trees will not be significant.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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: There are no locally designated natural communities on the project site.

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

Discussion: There are no wetland habitats on the project site.

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

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

Discussion: There are no wildlife dispersal or migration corridors on or near the project site.

VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? (Sources: 1 & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The structures will be designed and constructed according to applicable UBC codes and Title 24 energy conservation requirements, thus it will not conflict with adopted energy conservation plans.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? (Sources: 1 & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not use non-renewable resource in a wasteful and inefficient manner.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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? (Sources: 1 & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not located in an area of a known mineral resources that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State.

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: It is not anticipated that the hotel project will create a risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances..

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 1 & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not interfere with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan since it is not a designated emergency response location to be used for staging or other uses in an emergency.

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

Discussion: The project and future uses will not likely result in creating any health or other hazards.

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

Discussion: The project is not located in or near an area subject to increased fire hazards.

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Increases in existing noise levels? (Sources: 1, 7, & 8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not likely result in a significant increase in operational noise levels. It may result in short-term construction noise. However, construction noise will be limited to specific daytime hours per city regulations.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels? (Source: 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

See Discussion Xa. above.

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? (Sources: 1, 3, 6, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Police Protection? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Schools? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Other governmental services? (Sources: 1,3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: a.-e. The project applicant will be required to pay development impact fees as established by the city per AB 1600 to mitigate impacts to public services.

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? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Communication systems? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Sewer or septic tanks? (Sources: 1, 3, 7, & 8) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Storm water drainage? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Solid waste disposal? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

- g) Local or regional water supplies? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: a.-g. The project will not result in the need for new systems or supplies, or result in substantial alterations to utilities and service systems.

XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

- a) Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: The project is located in the Highway 101 and Highway 46 West area, which is a highly traveled area of the City and is considered an entrance to the City. Although the site is not specifically a scenic vista or on a scenic highway, it located at the entrance to the City and aesthetics are a high priority for the City. This project has been reviewed by the City's Development Review Committee (DRC). The DRC was in favor of the project including the architecture, color and materials and recommended that the Planning Commission approve the project.

- b) Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: See discussion above, with the proposed architecture and landscaping, it is not anticipated that this project will have a negative aesthetic effect.

- c) Create light or glare? (Sources: 1, 3, 7, & 8)

Discussion: All light fixtures will be shielded and downcast as required per city regulations.

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

- a) Disturb paleontological resources? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

- b) Disturb archaeological resources? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: a.-b. An Archaeological/ Paleontological Evaluation Report was prepared by Cogstone Resource Management Inc. The report was prepared in June 2005. The report concludes that there are no archaeological, paleontological or historic sites were found on the subject property.

If these types of resources are found during grading and excavation, appropriate procedures will be followed including halting activities and contacting the County Coroner.

- c) Affect historical resources? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: There are no existing historical resources on the project site.

- d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: The project is not proposed in a location where it could affect unique ethnic cultural values.

10 Environmental Checklist Form

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: Discussion: There are no known existing religious or sacred uses on or near the project site.

XV.RECREATION. Would the proposal:

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is industrial in nature and will not likely result in an increase in the demand for recreational facilities.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Affect existing recreational opportunities? (Sources 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not affect existing recreational opportunities.

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? (Sources: 1 & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project does not have any significant existing natural resources located on it, nor is the site located near any plant, animal or habitat resources or historical resources that could be negatively affected by this project.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals? (Sources: 1 & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: With mitigations incorporated for traffic impacts and building design to current UBC code standards the project will not have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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.) (Sources: 1 & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: With mitigations incorporated for traffic impacts and building design to current UBC code standards the project will not result in significant cumulative impacts.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):

substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: With mitigations incorporated for traffic impacts and building design to current UBC code standards the project will not result in substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

11. 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). The earlier documents that have been used in this Initial Study are listed below.

Reference Number	Document Title	Available for Review At
1	City of Paso Robles General Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
2	Seismic Safety Element for City of Paso Robles	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
3	Final Environmental Impact Report City of Paso Robles General Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
4	Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, California Paso Robles Area	USDA-NRCS, 65 Main Street-Suite 108 Templeton, CA 93465
5	Uniform Building Code	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
6	City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval For New Development	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
7	City of Paso Robles Zoning Code	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
8	City of Paso Robles, Water Master Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
9	City of Paso Robles, Sewer Master Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
10	Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
11	Sensitive Species and Habitat Survey June 7, 2005 By LFR	Attached as Exhibit D
12	Archaeological-Paleontological Eval. & Mit. Plan By Cogstone Resource Mgt. Inc.	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
13	Tree Survey Report, May 30, 2005 By E. Wesley Conner	Attached as Exhibit I to the Resolution Approving PD 05-010
14	Traffic Study by ATE	Attached as Exhibit B

Attachments:

Exhibit A – Site Plan and Elevations

Exhibit B – Traffic Study

Exhibit C – Sensitive Species and Habitat Survey