

RESOLUTION NO: 07-0033

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES  
APPROVING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR  
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT 06-012 & CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 07-005  
(FOX HOLLOW SPORTS FACILITY)  
APN: 025-371-019

WHEREAS, Section 21.16A, Planned Development District, projects located in the PD Overlay district are subject to Planning Commission approval of a development plan (PD); and

WHEREAS, Planned Development 06-012 has been filed by John McCarthy on behalf of Kim Walker to construct the Fox Hollow Sports Facility which would consist of the following development:

**Phase I:** construction of a 6,500sf club house, four tennis courts, a 25ydx12yd swimming pool and a 1,000sf pool room. The installation of the parking lot, septic system and site landscaping would be included in phase I;

**Phase II:** would consist of the construction of 8 additional tennis courts, a 4,000sf activity building and 25yd x 25 yd swimming pool. Additional parking will also be provided in Phase II.

and;

WHEREAS, the project is located on the north side of Union Road, directly across from Barney Schwartz Park; and

WHEREAS, the 19.4 acre site is zoned C3-PD (Commercial / Light-Industrial, Planned Development Overlay), and has a General Plan designation of CS, (Commercial Service); and

WHEREAS, in conjunction with PD 06-012, the applicant has submitted Conditional Use Permit 07-005 as required by Table 21.16.200 in relation to the construction of the swimming pools; and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared for this project (attached as Exhibit A) which concludes and proposes that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be approved; 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 March 13, 2007 meeting, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on the Project, to accept public testimony on the proposal including Planned Development 06-012 and related applications; and

WHEREAS, at the March 13, 2007 meeting, the Planning Commission continued this item to the March 27, 2007 meeting, at the request of Caltrans in order to allow additional time for Caltrans to review the project and coordinate with City Staff to determine if there are any impacts to Highway 46 East Corridor; and

WHEREAS, the City Engineer had discussions with James Kilmer of Caltrans and determined that it is necessary to add a condition regarding dedication along Highway 46 East, the necessary conditions have been added to the PD resolution (Condition No. 13); and

WHEREAS, at its March 27, 2007 meeting, the Planning Commission held a duly noticed public hearing on the Project, to accept public testimony on the proposal including Planned Development 06-012 and related applications; 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 based on the attached Mitigation Agreement and mitigation measures described in the initial study and contained in the resolution approving PD 06-012 as site specific conditions summarized below.

Topic of Mitigation	Condition #
Air Quality	8
Biological (Kit Fox)	7
Water Quality (storm water run-off)	11

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles, based on its independent judgment, to approve a Mitigated Negative Declaration for Planned Development 06-012 and Conditional Use Permit 07-005 in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 27th day of March, 2007, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Johnson, Withers, Holstine, Treatch, Flynn, Steinbeck, Menath

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

---

CHAIRMAN MARGARET HOLSTINE

ATTEST:

---

RON WHISENAND, PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY

H:\darren\PD\PD06-012FoxHollow\NDRes

# ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM CITY OF PASO ROBLES

1. **Project title:** PD 06-012 & CUP 07-005 - Fox Hollow Sports Facility
2. **Lead agency name and address:** City of Paso Robles  
1000 Spring Street  
Paso Robles, CA 93446
3. **Contact person, phone, email:** Darren Nash, Associate Planner  
(805) 237-3970  
[darren@prcity.com](mailto:darren@prcity.com)
4. **Project location:** north side of Union Road, across from Barney Schwartz Park
5. **Project sponsor's name and address:** John McCarthy, McCarthy Engineering, 737 Orchard Drive.
6. **General plan designation:** Commercial Service (CS)
7. **Zoning:** Commercial/Light-industrial – Planned Development Overlay (C3-PD)
8. **Description of project:** to develop approximately 6.5-acres of a larger 19.4 acre site into a private tennis and swim club. The project would be built in two phases where the first phase would consist of the construction of a 6,500sf club house, four tennis courts, a 25ydx12yd swimming pool and a 1,000sf pool room. The installation of the parking lot, septic system and site landscaping would be included in phase I. Phase II would consist of the construction of 8 additional tennis courts, a 4,000sf activity building and 25yd x 25 yd swimming pool. Additional parking will be provided as well.
9. **Surrounding land uses and environmental setting:** The project site is currently vacant, the Huer-Huero creek runs through the property. Barney Schwartz Park is directly across Union Road to the South. Highway 46 East is adjacent to the sites northerly boundary.
10. **Other public agencies whose approval is required:** CDF&G will be involved with the project regarding Kit Fox mitigation. The project is designed to stay out of the 100-year flood area, but permits from other agencies may be necessary. Conditions of approval will required the applicant to get permits from other agencies as necessary.

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources                | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources               | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems     | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance   |   |

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

---

Signature: Darren Nash, Associate Planner

---

Date

**EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact”. The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from 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). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
  - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
  - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
  - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are “Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated,” describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. The explanation of each issue should identify:
  - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
  - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.

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

**I. AESTHETICS:** Would the project:

- |    |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. | Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

- |    |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b. | Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: the project is not located along a state scenic highway.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. | Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project as proposed would be consistent with other development in the vicinity of the site, such as Barney Schwartz Park.

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

Discussion: The tennis courts will be illuminated for night play. Light fixture standards have been submitted by the applicant and are shielded fixtures. Because of the height of the light poles (approximately 25-feet) the light source and effects of the light will be seen from off-site. The nature of the project being a sports facility, adjacent to the existing Barney Schwartz Park, which has sports lighting for multiple sports fields would not appear to be significant.

**II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES:** In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

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

Discussion: The site is not considered prime farmland, development of the site would not be a conversion of farmland that is considered prime, unique or have statewide importance.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b. | Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The site is zoned for commercial/light-industrial use (C3), the proposed project is a permitted use in the C3 zoning district.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: N/A				

**III. AIR QUALITY:** Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The project was reviewed by the Air Pollution Control District of the County of San Luis Obispo. Andy Muntziger, Air Quality Specialist prepared a letter dated January 16, 2007, outlining suggested mitigation measures for the project during the construction phase and the Operational phase. The measures are listed below:

Construction Phase:

The project shall be conditioned to comply with all applicable District regulations pertaining to the control of fugitive dust (PM-10) as contained in section 6.5 of the Air Quality Handbook. All site grading and demolition plans noted shall list the following regulations:

- a. Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible.
- b. Use of water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency would be required whenever wind speeds exceed 15 mph. Reclaimed (nonpotable) water should be used whenever possible.
- c. All dirt stockpile areas should be sprayed daily as needed.
- d. Permanent dust control measures identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans should be implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities.
- e. Exposed ground areas that are to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading should be sown with a fast-germinating native grass seed and watered until vegetation is established.
- f. All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation should be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the APCD.
- g. All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved should be completed as soon as possible. In addition, building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.
- h. Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site.
- i. All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil, or other loose materials are to be covered or should maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top of load and top of trailer) in accordance with CVC Section 23114.

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	--	---	----------------------

- j. Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site.
- k. Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water should be used where feasible

**Operational Permit Requirements:**

If any of the following equipment is present at the site either during construction or in the operational phase of the project, Contact Gary Willey of the District’s Engineering division at (805) 781-5912 for specific information regarding permitting requirements:

- Portable generators and equipment with engines that are 50hp or greater;
- Electric generation plants of the use of standby generator;
- Boilers; and
- IC Engines

To minimize potential delays, prior to the start of the project, please contact Gary Willey of the District’s Engineering division at (805) 781-5912 for specific information regarding permitting requirements.

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

Discussion: See response to Section A

- |   |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See response to Section A

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: It is not anticipated that this project will have sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: It is not anticipated that this project will have objectionable odors that would effect a substantial number of people.

---

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:



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

- |  |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

A Biological Report dated October 2006 was prepared by Althouse & Meade addressing the effects of the proposed project on biological resources.

*Discussion: A biological assessment was conducted on the project site and a study prepared in October 2006. The study indicates that the site has two habitat types: annual grassland & riparian. There is the potential for four special status plants and two special status animals have the potential to occur on the site, however, none of these species are present. The site is within identified San Joaquin Kit Fox habitat. The project biologist calculated the score for mitigating potential impacts to the habitat. This mitigation measure has been confirmed by the California Dept. of Fish and Game as appropriate mitigation. The applicant will be required to pay the calculated in-lieu mitigation fees to an appropriate agency, such as the Nature Conservancy. This is included in the project mitigation measures. Compliance with payment of in-lieu mitigation fees to be used for protection of habitat will reduce potential SJKF impacts to less than significant*

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Riparian habitat is confined to the Huerhuero Creek channel and banks. The creek bottom is a wide and flat channel with a deep sand layer. Much of the creek bottom is barren, with no vegetation cover. The Biological study indicates that project would not remove riparian habitat from the property. Water quality could be affected from storm drains and surface run-off and that poor water quality negatively affects wildlife and riparian vegetation communities. City Section VIII of this Checklist regarding requirements for storm water run-off and water quality.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not proposing any grading or alteration of the Huerhuero creek.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				

Discussion: There are no native resident or migratory fish habitat on this site.

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

Discussion: there are no oak trees within the developable area of this site.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: there are no HCPs over this property.

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: A cultural resources survey and impact analysis was completed for the 19.4 acre property by C.A. Singer & Associates, Inc., dated April 27, 2006.

The study concluded, the 19.4 acre property on the tablelands east of the City of Paso Robles was surveyed to determine if cultural resources existed in the area. The area is just south of the Huerhuero Creek and has been used for dry farming and stock grazing. No buildings or structures exist within the surveyed area and prehistoric and early historic resources are absent. The property is not associated with an important historic event or person and has no unique characteristics. The topography, arid conditions, and simple geology imply the subterranean cultural resources are absent. Although Pleistocene age fossils are found in the Paso Robles Formation, mostly marine mammals, cultural (archaeological) materials have never been seen.

Future development of any part of the 19.4 acres will have no impact to any known or suspected resources. Since no impacts to cultural resources are expected, no further archeological investigations are recommended.

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

Discussion: No impact, see comments above in Section A.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

Discussion: No impact, see comments above in Section A.

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

Discussion: No impact, see comments above in Section A.

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?   | <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.*

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | <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*

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

*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.*

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

Discussion: See discussion for section iii above.

b. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: there would not be a substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

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

Discussion: See discussion in Section iii above.

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

*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.*

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

Discussion: as part of the issuance of a building permit the applicants will need to satisfy the Building and Engineering departments by providing the necessary soils reports. It is not anticipated that the soil will be incapable for the proposed project.

---

**VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:** Would the project:

a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

materials?

Discussion: It is anticipated that there will be some chemicals on site that will be used to care for the swimming pools. The chemicals will be kept in a secure area as required by the County Health Department. No other chemicals are anticipated to be used, transported or disposed.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There is not a school within a quarter mile of this site.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project is compatible with the Air Port Land Use Plan.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

Discussion: Complies with emergency services requirements.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| h. | Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: No significant impact.

**VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:** Would the project:

- |    |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. | Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion:

- |    |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. | Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project use is consistent with the Commercial General Plan and Zoning designations and there fore would not have a significant effect on ground water supplies. There will be an initial need for larger amounts of water to fill the pools in the beginning, but the project will not be a significant water user on a day to day operation.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c. | Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project will be required to meet the requirements of the City Engineer for grading and drainage.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d. | Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: No alteration of streams or the existing drainage patterns. See comment for Section C above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The proposed project would increase the amount of surface water with the construction of the 8 tennis courts, the proposed buildings, parking lots and sidewalks. A standard condition for the project is to require the construction of adequate storm drainage facilities which would include a water quality control basin that would filter the storm water prior to being metered into the Huer Huero Creek.				
f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: This project will not substantially degrade the water quality.				
g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Portions of the site are within the 100-year flood area, but not buildings or structures will be constructed in the flood area. The parking lot in Phase II would be within the flood area. The conditions requiring storm water quality devices will control the water run-off from the parking area and insure that it is filtered.				
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The parking lot in Phase II would be in the flood area, but it will not impede or redirect flood flows.				
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: This project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk or loss as a result of flood.				
j. Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: This project would not create an inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.				

---

**IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING:** Would the project:

- a. Physically divide an established community?

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

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

Discussion: The project is consistent with the General Plan Land Use and the Zoning designations for this site, and therefore would not have a significant impact.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b. | Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is consistent with the General Plan Land Use and the Zoning designations for this site, and therefore would not have a significant impact.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. | Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is consistent with the General Plan Land Use and the Zoning designations for this site, and therefore would not have a significant impact.

**X. MINERAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:

- |   |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a.  | Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?                                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Discussion: There are no know significant mineral resources on this site. |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
| b.  | Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: There are no know significant mineral resources on this site.

**XI. NOISE:** Would the project result in:

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

Discussion: The project will not be a significant generator of noise.

- |    |   |
|----|---|
| b. | Exposure of persons to or generation of |
|----|---|



	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: There will not be excessive groundborne vibration or noise with this proposed project.				
c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project will not be a significant generator of noise.				
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Since the site is currently vacant, there will be increase in noise levels from day to day operation. It is not anticipated that as a result of this project that there would be a substantial increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. There may be periodic increase as a result of holding swimming lessons or possibly having competitive events, but it is not anticipated to be a significant impact, since the project is consistent with the General Plan and Zoning designations for Commercial/Light industrial uses.				
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project is located within Zone 4 of the Paso Robles Airport Land Use Plan. The Plan permits swimming pools and tennis courts within Zone 4. The zone does limit the maximum amount of people per gross acre as follows, the condition has been added to the project and it is not anticipated that the project will exceed the requirements: <i>The use intensity of this activity shall not exceed the average of 40 persons per gross acre, maximum of 120 persons per single acre, at any time. Usage calculations shall include all people (e.g. employees, customers/visitors, etc.) who may be on the property at any single point in time whether indoors or outdoors.</i>				
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: There are not private airstrips in the vicinity of the project.				

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

**XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING:** Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There is no residential development proposed with this project.

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

Discussion: The site is currently vacant.

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

Discussion: N/A

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

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

Discussion: The project has been reviewed by the ES department and the necessary conditions of approval have been added to the project to meet the ES needs.

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

Discussion: The project is consistent with the City's General Plan, Zoning and Economic Strategy and therefore is not an impact.

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

Discussion: The project is consistent with the City's General Plan, Zoning and Economic Strategy and therefore is not an impact.

- |           |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is consistent with the City's General Plan, Zoning and Economic Strategy and therefore is not an impact.

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

- |                             |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e. Other public facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is consistent with the City's General Plan, Zoning and Economic Strategy and therefore is not an impact.

**XIV. RECREATION**

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is consistent with the City's General Plan, Zoning and Economic Strategy for Commercial / Light-industrial use.

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

Discussion: The project is consistent with the City's General Plan, Zoning and Economic Strategy and therefore is not an impact.

**XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC:** Would the project:

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project is consistent with the City's General Plan, Zoning and Economic Strategy for Commercial / Light-industrial use. It is not anticipated that the proposed sports facility will have an increase in traffic that would be more significant than a commercial project on the site.

Union Road is an arterial road that will be improved with the development of this project.

This project will be required to pay development impact fees that will be used for traffic facilities in this area of the City.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b. Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Discussion: The project is consistent with the City's General Plan, Zoning and Economic Strategy and therefore is not an impact.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is consistent with the City's General Plan, Zoning and Economic Strategy and therefore is not an impact.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not altering the existing alignment of Union Road.

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

Discussion: The project is designed to provide the necessary emergency access.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| f. Result in inadequate parking capacity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: the project has been designed to provide adequate parking. An overflow parking area will be provided with Phase I and be improved as permanent parking in Phase II.

It is anticipated that if there were an event that would impact the improved parking lot, that the overflow area will handle the overflow parking.

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

Discussion: The project is consistent with the City's General Plan, Zoning and Economic Strategy and therefore is not an impact.

**XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:** Would the project:

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The applicants will need to obtain any necessary permits from the RWQCB prior to issuance of a Grading Permit. The City is requiring storm water detention and facilities to insure filtering of storm water.

- |   |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| b. Require or result in the construction of new |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p> <p>Discussion: The applicant will need to go before the City Council to request the use of a septic tank, since sewer facilities are not in the vicinity of this site. The project will need to provide the infrastructure necessary to hook up to City sewer when it is brought down Union Road near this site. The project will have to hook up at that time. All septic facilities will need to meet the requirements of the City and RWQCB.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</p> <p>Discussion: The proposed project would increase the amount of surface water with the construction of the 8 tennis courts, the proposed buildings, parking lots and sidewalks. A standard condition for the project is to require the construction of adequate storm drainage facilities which would include a water quality control basin that would filter the storm water prior to being metered into the Huer Huero Creek.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</p> <p>Discussion: The Emergency Service department is requiring water pressure tests to be completed prior to issuance of a building permit to insure adequate water pressure.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project=s projected demand in addition to the provider=s existing commitments?</p> <p>Discussion: See discussion in Section b.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</p> <p>Discussion: The project is consistent with the City’s General Plan, Zoning and Economic Strategy and therefore is not an impact.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</p> <p>Discussion: The project is consistent with the City’s General Plan, Zoning and Economic Strategy and therefore is not an impact.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Potentially  
Significant  
Impact

Less Than  
Significant with  
Mitigation  
Incorporation

Less Than  
Significant  
Impact

No  
Impact

---

**XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

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

Discussion: The project does not 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.

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

Discussion: *The project will not have a significant impact.*

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

Discussion: *The project will not result in substantial adverse environmental impacts on human beings, either directly or indirectly.*

## EARLIER ANALYSIS AND BACKGROUND MATERIALS.

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

Earlier Documents 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	2005 Airport Land Use Plan	Same as above
5	City of Paso Robles Municipal Code	Same as above
6	City of Paso Robles Water Master Plan	Same as above
7	City of Paso Robles 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.	Cultural Survey by CA Singer dated April 27, 2006	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446
14	Biological Study by Althouse & Meade dated October 2006	Same as above.