

RESOLUTION NO.: 07-091

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES
ADOPTING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR
PD 06-021 AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 2716
5151 JARDINE ROAD, APN 025-441-041, 044 & 045
APPLICANT – VISTA DEL HOMBRE – GEARHART

WHEREAS, Planned Development 06-021 has been filed by Kirk Consulting on behalf of Vista Del Hombre, LLC – Kelly Gearhart, to construct a 154,340 square foot manufacturing/light-industrial complex at the Links Golf Course located at 5151 Jardine Road; and

WHEREAS, the 210 acre site is zoned AP-PD (Airport, Planned Development Overlay), and has a General Plan designation of BP, (Business Park); and

WHEREAS, in conjunction with PD 06-021, the applicant has submitted Tentative Tract 2716, which would subdivide the property into 39 separate lots; and

WHEREAS, the original project was reviewed by the Planning Commission on August 14, 2007, where the Commission on a 4-2 vote (one vacancy) denied the project, the denial was based on the Planning Commission's finding that the project as designed and conditioned, could create traffic impacts on Dry Creek Road and Jardine Road which are not currently designed to handle traffic associated with this development; and

WHEREAS, on September 11, 2007, Kirk Consulting, on behalf of Gearhart Development submitted a modified project for Vista del Hombre, the modifications consist of the following:

- a. Changed the phasing of the project to focus on Dry Creek Road improvements;
- b. Eliminating access from the project to Jardine Road. A gate will be placed and only emergency vehicle access will be allowed for;
- c. Prevent access from the project on Beacon Road;

and;

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles adopted an updated General Plan in December 2003; and

WHEREAS, this project as described above, is consistent with the General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the General Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) considered and evaluated potential impacts that may result from implementation of the General Plan, and includes mitigation measures as appropriate; and

WHEREAS, the proposed development is in compliance with the land uses permitted and applicable development standards and regulations, in the Zoning Ordinance and General Plan; and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate whether this project would result in environmental impacts, and the City has determined that this project, which is a legislative amendment, will not result in significant environmental impacts if mitigation measures included with the Initial Study that establish the scope of issues for any future development of this property, in addition to project specific development impacts are applied; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the Statutes and Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the City's Procedures for Implementing CEQA, an Initial Study and a Draft Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for public review and comment; and

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on October 23, 2007, to consider the Initial Study, the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed project, and to accept public testimony on the Development Plan, and Tentative Tract Map, and environmental determination; and

WHEREAS, based on the information contained in the Initial Study prepared for this project and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the Planning Commission finds no substantial evidence that there would be a significant impact on the environment based on the Mitigation Agreement (on-file) and mitigation measures described in the initial study and contained in the resolution approving PD 06-021 as site specific conditions summarized below.

Topic of Mitigation	Condition #
Air Quality	8
Biological (Kit Fox)	9
Traffic	10, 11 & 12

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles, based on its independent judgment, does hereby adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for

PD 06-021 and Tentative Parcel Tract 2716 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 23rd day of October, 2007 by the following Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Steinbeck, Flynn, Treach, Johnson, Peterson, Holstine

NOES: None

ABSENT: Withers

ABSTAIN: None

CHAIRMAN MARGARET HOLSTINE

ATTEST:

RON WHISENAND, PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY

CITY OF PASO ROBLES – PLANNING DIVISION

INITIAL STUDY (revised Sept, 20, 2007)

1. GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE: VISTA DEL HOMBRE (PD 06-021 & TENTATIVE TRACT 2716)

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

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

PROJECT LOCATION: 5151 Jardine Road, Paso Robles, California
(APN 025-441-041, 044 & 045)

PROJECT PROPONENT: Applicant: Vista del Hombre, LLC
6205 Alcantara Ave.
Atascadero, CA 93422
Representative: Kirk Consulting

**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: Business Park (BP), within the Airport Area Overlay

ZONING: AP-PD (Airport, Planned Development Overlay)

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Request to construct 154,340 square feet of manufacturing/light-industrial uses with a total of 32 separate buildings. Within the 154,340 square feet, there is proposed to be some support commercial and office uses included in the project. The buildings with associated parking, access and landscape areas would develop approximately 14-acres of the existing 210 acre Links Golf Course. A subdivision is also being requested so that each building would be located on a separate parcel. In conjunction with the project, the applicant will be extending the existing Aero Tech Center Way public road to the north to access the project. This would be the main access point to the project. The existing Links Golf Course will remain in operation with the development of this project.

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

None.

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).

The Mitigated Negative Declaration was approved by the City of Paso Robles Planning Commission for the original Link's Golf Course (PD 94003 & CUP 94-005), via Resolution 94-035.

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.

B. Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

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).

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.

“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.

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).

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.

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.

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.

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.

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:

September 20, 2007

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: Manufacturing, Light-industrial, Commercial and Office land uses are permitted uses in the BP Land Use category and in the AP Zoning district. Therefore, the proposed development would not conflict with the existing General Plan and Zoning applied to this property.

- 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 proposed manufacturing/light industrial project with office and commercial uses are complementary to the existing Links Golf Course. These type of uses are anticipated with the Business Park land use and the Airport zoning designations.

There are existing residences adjacent to the along the south side of Beacon Road and on the east side of Jardine Road. The proposed project is centrally located near the center of the Golf Course, where there are a few buildings that are approximately 600 feet away from home. Most of the proposed buildings would be at least 1,000 feet away from the homes.

The land between the existing homes and the new project would continue to operate as a Golf Course and physically the portions of the site adjacent to Jardine Road and Beacon Road will not change.

Based on the significant distance of the proposed development to the existing residences, and the fact that physically the existing golf course along the roads will remain un-changed, the proposed project result in less than significant impacts to the exiting residential land uses.

It is anticipated that the proposed project would provide the possibility for job opportunities as well as provide some goods and services for the residents in the vicinity of the project.

Additionally, traffic generated by this project would primarily use the extension of Aero Tech Center Way, and not result in significant traffic impacts to the surrounding land uses in the vicinity.

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

Discussion: The site is not used for agricultural purposes. Thus, there would not be significant impacts to 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)

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

Discussion: The project will not disrupt or divide the established community.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion: The proposed 154,430 square foot manufacturing/light-industrial project is not providing any residential uses, and would therefore not result in impacts to 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 project will be extending water services to the site to serve the project, but since the residential properties to the east and south are in the County, it is not anticipated that this project will induce substantial growth. The rest of the surrounding properties are the Airport area, vineyards and other AP zoned properties.

- c) Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? (Sources: 1, 3, & 5)

Discussion: There is no housing on the project site, therefore, no housing would be displaced with this project.

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

- a) Fault rupture? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

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)

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

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

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 located in an area with soil conditions that have a potential for liquefaction or other type of ground failure due to seismic events due to soil conditions. The EIR identifies measures to reduce this potential impact, which will be incorporated into this project. This includes a requirement to conduct a site-specific analysis of liquefaction potential. Based on analysis results, the project design and construction will include specific design requirements to reduce the potential impacts on structures due to liquefaction to a less than significant level.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Erosion, changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill? (Sources: 1, 2, 3, & 4) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is relatively flat and therefore there will not be a significant amount of grading. As such, no significant impacts are anticipated.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Subsidence of the land? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See Item c.

- | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| h) Expansive soils? (Sources: 4) | <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 soil preparation as determined necessary by recommendations of site specific soils report. Therefore, impacts related to expansive soils will be less than significant.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| i) Unique geologic or physical features? (Sources: 1 & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

IV. WATER. Would the proposal result in:

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

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

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

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 an on-site detention basin.

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

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

Discussion: There is no potential to expose people or property to water related hazards due to this project since it is not in or near 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)

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

Discussion: The volume of discharge that may result from this project could not be of a quantity 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)

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

Discussion: There are a few ponds on site that were created with the existing golf course for irrigation purposes. Besides the addition of drainage facilities including detention basins, there would not be a significant impact to surface water or water body.

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

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

Discussion: This project could not result in changes in currents or water movement since it is not large enough to significantly affect changes in currents, or the course or direction of water movement.

- 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)

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

Discussion: Build-out of the City is anticipated in the General Plan and evaluated in the GP EIR. This project is in compliance with 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, building fixtures, and development impact fees which will help pay for the City to obtain new water resources. The project will not make any direct additions or withdrawals or result in substantial loss of ground water.

With the construction of Club House for the Links Golf Course a new water line will be extended to the site. The line has been sized to accommodate the Vista Del Hombre project.

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

- 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, and the proposed uses do not utilize construction materials or methods that would result in reduced groundwater quality. 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.

V. AIR QUALITY. Would the proposal:

- a) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 11)

Discussion: The project has been reviewed by the County of San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (APCD). The City received a letter on June 29, 2007 outlining the impacts the project will have related to air quality issues.

The APCD recommended various mitigation measures necessary to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. The mitigation measures provides mitigations for both construction phase and the on-going operational phase of the project.

The construction phase mitigations relate to asbestos in existing utility lines, dust control measures and permit requirements for portable equipment.

The operational phase mitigation includes standard site amenities such as bike racks, lockers, car pool parking and food services.

The APCD letter is provided in Attachment 1 to this Initial Study. The specific mitigation measures will be added as conditions of approval to the Resolution approving Planned Development 06-021.

- 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.

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

- 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 the project incorporates parking lot and periphery shade trees to help cool site temperatures. This will reduce potential changes to moisture or temperature to less than significant levels.

- d) Create objectionable odors?

Discussion: This project does not have the potential to create objectionable odors since the future uses (offices, storage and other business park uses) do not generally create odors.

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

- a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?
(Sources: 1, 3, & 15)

Discussion:

A Traffic Study was prepared for the project by Fehr & Peers, Transportation Consultants dated June 14, 2007 with a supplemental analysis dated September 10, 2007. The study concludes that the proposed 154,340 square foot project would generate 1,048 net new daily trips, 92 net new AM peak-hour trips, and 57 net new PM peak-hour trips. The project site is estimated to generate the same number of trips during the Friday peak-hour as the typical weekday PM peak-hour.

The project includes the extension of Aerotech Center Way, which would be the main entrance into the project. By having Aerotech Center Way as the main entrance, it would seem that the traffic to and from the project would have less of an impact on the Jardine Rd./SR 46 intersection as well as Jardine Road and Beacon Road.

The project will impact the intersections of 46E-Airport Road, 46E-101 and the entire 46E corridor. The City intends to retain a consultant to study concepts for parallel routes and alternative access points to the highway. The applicant should contribute to projects that will augment parallel routes with Highway 46 East. The applicant may mitigate their impacts on the 46E corridor by applying their share of costs for improvements at 46E-Airport Road and 46E-101 to improving Dry Creek Road.

The operating levels of SR 46/Airport Road intersection degrade with increased traffic due to the revised access proposal directing project traffic towards Airport Road instead of Jardine Road. However, the SR 46 Widening Project will provide additional through capacity and operational enhancements will improve operating levels at both SR 46/Airport Road and SR 46/Jardine Road intersections. This results in better operations under Existing Plus Project Conditions under Existing Conditions, and thereby results in a less than significant impact. Additional improvements (e.g. grade separation) to the SR 46/Airport Road intersection will eventually serve future traffic from pending projects and from regional growth in the corridor.

The Traffic Study, along with input by the City Engineer recommend the following mitigation measures for the projects cumulative impacts to reduce the impacts of the increase in vehicle trips created by the project, to a less than a significant impact:

T-1: Dry Creek Road will be improved from Airport Road to Aerotech Center Way in accordance with conceptual

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

plans approved by City Council and construction documents approved by the City Engineer.

- *The project will include a modern roundabout at the intersection of Airport Road and Dry Creek Road.*
- *The project will modify the intersection of Dry Creek Road and Aerotech Way in accordance with the applicant's presentation.*
- *The plans will incorporate low impact development design techniques.*

T-2: Improvements to Beacon Road and Jardine Road along the project frontage will be waived. The estimated cost of these improvements will be applied to the reconstruction of Dry Creek Road.

T-3: Prior to occupancy of any unit, Aerotech Way shall be extended from its northerly terminus to the project in accordance with plans approved by the City Engineer (28-foot paved width). Low impact development practices shall be incorporated into the design.

T-4: The applicant shall apply their share of improvements to the intersection of State Highways 101 and 46E to the Dry Creek Road project.

T-5: The applicant shall apply their share of improvement of the intersection of Airport Road and State Highway 46E to the Dry Creek Road project.

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

Discussion: The proposed Vista del Hombre project would be a 154,340 square foot development which would include manufacturing/light-industrial (along with some support commercial and office uses along with the ability to provide for a mixture of office and commercial uses.) The 431 parking spaces would meet the zoning code standard for the proposed project, based on approximately 100,000 square feet of manufacturing/light-industrial use and approximately 54,000 square feet of commercial/office uses.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (Source: 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
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

Discussion: The development of this project within the existing Link's Golf Course will not create a hazard for pedestrians or bicyclists. With the extension of Aero Tech Center Way, there will be a sidewalk from Dry Creek Road up to the project..

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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. Bike racks will be installed throughout the project.

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

Discussion: The project will not result in impacts to rail, waterborne or air traffic. The project is located within Zone 5 of the City's Airport Land Use Plan. The proposed manufacturing/light-industrial uses along with the commercial and office uses are permitted uses in Zone 5.

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to: plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?
(Sources: 1, 3, 7, & 12) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: A Biological Assessment was prepared by Sierra Delta Corporation for the project, January 30, 2007. The report indicates that based on site reconnaissance, reviews of faunal and floral databases and review of assessments conducted in the vicinity of the property, it has been determined that no sensitive plant or animal species are expected to occur on the subject property. Based on site reconnaissance, the size, location, and condition of the subject property and surrounding properties, impacts to natural communities were determined to be low with incorporation of recommended mitigation measures and no adverse impacts to sensitive species are expected. No significant impacts are expected to result from the proposed off-site improvements including the proposed Aerotech Center Way extension. The proposed project is not expected to increase bird-strike hazard to aircraft using the adjacent Paso Robles Municipal Airport. Due to the potential for grading and construction activities to impact nesting birds the following mitigation measure are recommended:

Mitigation Measure 1: Nesting bird surveys shall be conducted prior to any site disturbance initiated between the dates of April 1st and August 30th.

The following wildlife species were identified as having a potential to occur in the region of the property, however, based on existing site conditions, current land use of the site, routine landscaping maintenance activities, and lack of sufficient ponding time on the site, it is unlikely that these species occur on the subject property: Vernal Pool Fairy Shrimp, Western Spadefoot Toads, Southwestern Pond Turtles and San Joaquin Kit Fox.

An analysis of the site and the project in relation to impacts to the San Joaquin Kit Fox was studied for the project. Daniel Meade of Althouse and Meade completed the Kit Fox Habitat Evaluation Form for the project. The Evaluation concluded that the project would affect 22.5 acres of the site and based on the habitat of the disturbed area would score a 66, which would indicate a 2:1 ratio for mitigation. The score along with the mitigation measure was confirmed by Bob Stafford from the California Department of Fish and Game.

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
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

Mitigation measures have been added to the project regarding the payment of the necessary mitigation fees based on the above noted ratio, along with the standard mitigation measures related to Kit Fox protection prior to and during construction.

- b) Locally designated species (e.g., heritage trees)?

Discussion: There are multiple oak trees located on the entire 230-acre site, none of which will be impacted as a result of the proposed project.

- c) Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?

Discussion: There are no locally designated natural communities on this site.

- d) Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?

Discussion: There are no wetland habitats in the area of the site where the project is proposed to be developed.

- e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?

Discussion: As mentioned above in Section A, the project would impact 22.5 acres of the site that is considered habitat for the San Joaquin Kit Fox. Mitigation measures have been required for the project which will result in impacts to the mitigation corridor not being a significant impact.

VII.ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal involve:

- Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? (Sources: 1 & 7)

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)

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)

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

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: The project will not result in a risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances since the uses do not generally use these types of 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 site is currently cleared and grubbed, and is not within an area that would result in increase fire hazards.

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

The proposed project would not result in exposure of people to severe noise levels.

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

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

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"/> |
| g) Local or regional water supplies? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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) | <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: The project is not located in a scenic vista or scenic highway area.

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

Discussion: The project is not located in an area that has significant views from public streets. Since the site is relatively flat and the buildings are single story, there will not be 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 & 14)
- b) Disturb archaeological resources? (Sources: 1, 3, 7 & 14)

Discussion: A Cultural resources survey was conducted by C.A. Singer & Associates, Inc, dated January 19, 2007. The study concluded that the surface study of the property found no evidence of prehistoric early historic archeological resources. Furthermore, geologic and topographic conditions imply that subterranean resources are absent.

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

Discussion: See response for Section XIV a & b

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

Discussion: See response for Section XIV a & b.

- e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: See response for Section XIV a & b.

XV. RECREATION. Would the proposal:

- a) Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: The project will not affect the demand for parks and recreational facilities.

- b) Affect existing recreational opportunities? (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 not affect existing recreational opportunities. The existing Link's Course will remain functional as a result of this project.

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 expansion to the existing facility is not anticipated to have significant environmental impacts.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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: The project will likely have a beneficial long-term environmental impact since it will result in increased jobs which aid the jobs/housing balance.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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: The expansion to the existing facility is not anticipated to have significant environmental impacts.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 1 & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project will not result in substantial adverse environmental impacts 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	APCD Comments dated June 29, 2007	Attachment 1
12	Biological Assessment by Sierra Delta Corp. dated January 30, 2007, which includes the Kit Fox Evaluation Form by Althouse & Meade, dated January 18, 2007	Attachment 2
13	E-mail from Bob Stafford, CDFG of February 9, 2007 confirming evaluation score.	Attachment 3
14	Archeological Study by C.A. Singer, dated January 19, 2007	Attachment 4
15	A Traffic Study by Fehr & Peers, Transportation Consultants dated June 14, 2007.	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446