

RESOLUTION NO: 08-027

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES
ADOPTING MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT 07-019
FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1441 SPRING STREET
APNs : 008-316-016 AND -015
APPLICANT – STEVE ELSAYED**

WHEREAS, Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 07-019 has been filed by Cebulla Associates on behalf of Steve Elsayed; and

WHEREAS, CUP 07-019 is an application to establish an automated carwash service at 1441 Spring Street; and

WHEREAS, the proposed carwash is a conditionally permitted use in General Plan land use designation Community Commercial / Mixed Use Overlay (CC/M-U) and the Zoning district which is Highway Commercial-Planned Development / Mixed Use Overlay (C2-PD/M-U); 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, 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 Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for public review and comment; and

WHEREAS, no public comments or responses were received in regard to the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration and Initial Study; and

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

WHEREAS, during the April 22, 2008 hearing the application for CUP 07-019 was continued to the June 10, 2008 Planning Commission hearing to resolve concerns of whether or not the car wash would operate with the doors in a fixed open position and confirmation of the decibel level of the car wash during operation with the doors closed; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on June 10, 2008 to consider the Initial Study, the proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed project, and to accept public testimony on the application and environmental determination; and

WHEREAS, based on the information and analysis contained in the Initial Study (Exhibit A) prepared for this project and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the Planning Commission finds that there is no substantial evidence that there would be a significant impact on the environment as a result of the development and operation of the proposed project.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles, based on its independent judgment, that it does hereby adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration for CUP 07-019 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 10th day of June 2008, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Steinbeck, Holstine, Peterson, Flynn, Johnson

NOES: Hodgkin, Treach

ABSENT: None

ABSTAIN: None

CHAIRMAN ED STEINBECK

ATTEST:

RON WHISENAND, PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY

CITY OF PASO ROBLES – PLANNING DIVISION INITIAL STUDY

1. GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE: Car Wash – Conditional Use Permit 07-019, Site Plan 07-017

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

Contact: Mathew Fawcett, Assistant Planner
Telephone: (805) 237-3970

PROJECT LOCATION: 1441 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446 (APN 008-316-016 & -015)

PROJECT PROPONENT: Applicant: Steve Elsayed
1441 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
Representative: Cebulla Associates

**LEAD AGENCY CONTACT/
INITIAL STUDY PREPARED BY:** Mathew Fawcett, Assistant Planner

Telephone: (805) 237-3970
E-Mail: mfawcett@prcity.com

GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: Community Commercial / Mixed Use Overlay (CC/MU)

ZONING: Highway Commercial / Mixed Use Overlay (C2/MU)

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is a request to install a new automated car wash in conjunction with the rebuilding of an existing gas station. This request includes the reconstruction of the convenience store and relocation to the southwest corner of the site and changing the location of the gas pumps, propane dispenser, and air-compressor.

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

San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District.

4. **EARLIER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:**

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

5. **CONTEXT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FOR THE PROJECT:**

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

6. PURPOSES OF AN INITIAL STUDY

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

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

7. EXPLANATION OF ANSWERS FOUND ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

A. Scope of Environmental Review

This Initial Study evaluates potential impacts identified in the following checklist.

B. Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

- 1. A brief explanation is required for all answers to the questions presented on the following Environmental Checklist Form, except where the answer is that the proposed project will have “No Impact.” The “No Impact” answers are to be adequately supported by the information sources cited in the parentheses following each question or as otherwise explained in the introductory remarks. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to the project. A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors and/or general standards. The basis for the “No Impact” answers on the following Environmental Checklist Form is explained in further detail in this Initial Study in Section 9 (Earlier Environmental Analysis and Related Environmental Documentation) and Section 10 (Context of Environmental Analysis for the Project).
- 2. All answers on the following Environmental Checklist Form must take into account the whole action involved with the project, including implementation. Answers should address off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate, if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more

“Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is warranted.

4. Potentially Significant Impact Unless Mitigated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. Mitigation Measures from Section 9 (Earlier Environmental Analysis and Related Environmental Documentation) may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). See Section 4 (Earlier Environmental Analysis and Related Environmental Documentation) and Section 11 (Earlier Analysis and Background Materials) of this Initial Study.
6. References to the information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances) have been incorporated into the Environmental Checklist Form. See Section 11 (Earlier Analysis and Related Environmental Documentation). Other sources used or individuals contacted are cited where appropriate.
7. The following Environmental Checklist Form generally is the same as the one contained in Title 14, California Code of Regulations; with some modifications to reflect the City’s needs and requirements.
8. Standard Conditions of Approval: The City imposes standard conditions of approval on Projects. These conditions are considered to be components of and/or modifications to the Project and some reduce or minimize environmental impacts to a level of insignificance. Because they are considered part of the Project, they have not been identified as mitigation measures. For the readers’ information, the standard conditions identified in this Initial Study are available for review at the Community Development Department.
9. Certification Statement: The statements made in this Initial Study and those made in the documents referenced herein present the data and information that are required to satisfy the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) – Statutes and Guidelines, as well as the City’s Procedures for Implementing CEQA. Further, the facts, statements, information, and analysis presented are true and correct in accordance with standard business practices of qualified professionals with expertise in the development review process, including building, planning, and engineering.

8. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

April 2, 2008

Mathew Fawcett, Assistant 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, 11)

Discussion: The proposed project would conflict with the Noise Element's thresholds established in the 2003 General Plan/General Plan EIR unless mitigated. With mitigation measures incorporated the project would be in compliance with the General Plan and therefore the potential impacts would then be less than significant. See Sec. Xa. for full discussion.

- 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 and other adopted environmental policies that apply to this project therefore no significant impacts are anticipated with this project.

- c) Be incompatible with existing land uses in the vicinity?
(Sources: 1, 3, & 11)

Discussion: The surrounding uses include a mix of commercial to the north, south, and east, and residential to the west. The proposed project would likely be incompatible with the adjacent residential land use (Duplex, Triplex / R-2) to the west due to the noise the carwash would produce. However, mitigation measures have been added to bring the car wash into compliance with the Noise Element, including installation of bifold doors to baffle noise resulting from this use. Therefore, noise impacts that would otherwise be incompatible with the adjacent residential land use would be mitigated to a less than significant use.

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

Discussion: The project site is an urban infill property with no agricultural uses, resources or operations on or near the property, therefore there are no anticipated 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)

Discussion: The site is already developed with an existing gas station, and with mitigation measures incorporated the proposed project would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community. Therefore the project would not result in impacts related to this issue.

II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion: The proposed project does not propose any new housing, therefore the project would not result in impacts to the established population thresholds.

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

- 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)

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

Discussion: This is an existing infill property. The project will not extend major infrastructure that would induce substantial growth since there are existing services and infrastructure surrounding the property, therefore the project would not impact growth.

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

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

Discussion: There is currently an existing gas station and convenience store on the project site, thus, the project will not displace existing housing.

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

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

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

Discussion: The potential for and mitigation of impacts that may result from fault rupture in the project area are identified and addressed in the General Plan EIR, pg. 4.5-8. There are two known fault zones on either side of this valley. The Rinconada Fault system runs on the west side of the valley. The San Andreas Fault is on the east side of the valley and runs through the community of Parkfield east of Paso Robles. The City of Paso Robles recognizes these geologic influences in the application of the California 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.

- b) Seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

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

Discussion: The City is located within an active earthquake area that could experience seismic ground shaking from the Rinconada and San Andreas Faults. The proposed structure will be constructed to current CBC codes. The General Plan EIR identified impacts resulting from ground shaking as less than significant and provided mitigation measures that will be incorporated into the design of this project including adequate structural design and not constructing over active or potentially active faults.

- c) Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 2 & 3)

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

Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR, the project site is 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

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

level.

d) Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

e) Landslides or Mudflows? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

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)

Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR the soil condition is not erosive or otherwise unstable. As such, no significant impacts are anticipated. The site is relatively flat and will need minimal grading

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

Discussion: See Item c.

h) Expansive soils? (Sources: 4)

Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR, Paso Robles is an area that has moderately expansive soils. This issue will be addressed through implementation of appropriate 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)

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

IV. WATER. Would the proposal result in:

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

Discussion: The project site is currently developed with an existing gas station. With the rebuild of the gas station and the addition of the carwash does not significantly change the absorption rate, drainage pattern, or rate and amount of surface runoff. See attachment 3 & 4 Existing Site Plan and Preliminary Grading Plan.

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

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

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

in a flood zone.

- c) Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)? (Sources: 1, 3, 7, & Attachment 7, 8)
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The carwash is proposing to use the RYKO Environmentalist II-A reclaim system that reuses and treats water used from previous washes as well as utilize a reverse osmosis spot-free rinse instead of a chemical treated spot free rinse. In addition to the RYKO Environmentalist II-A the water discharge from this project will be required to meet all Municipal codes, CBC codes, and the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements relating to water discharge. With compliance with these required regulations and as a condition of approval, this project will not result in impacts to water quality.

- 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 is no water body on or near the project site, therefore the project could not impact surface water.

- 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 there is no water course in the vicinity that could be affected by this project.

- 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: The proposed project does not directly withdraw water resources. The project is consistent with the build-out scenario in the General Plan and planned water use and reserve capacity.

- g) Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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 significantly affect these resources.

- h) Impacts to groundwater quality? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)
- | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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 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

10 Environmental Checklist Form

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
available for public water supplies? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed use is less than the APCD level of significant threshold with the addition of the following mitigation measure the potential impacts to air quality standards or contribution to an existing air quality violation are consider less than significant.

AQ-2: Prior to issuance of a construction permit, the subject project shall be in compliance with the SLO Co. Air Pollution Control District and the San Luis Obispo County Clean Air Plan standard and discretionary conditions of approval.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature?
(Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: This project does not have the potential to significantly alter air movement, moisture, or temperature since the project is a small scale redevelopment project.

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

Discussion: Given the nature of the proposed uses, this project does generally have the potential to create objectionable odors from idling cars and gasoline, however the following mitigation measure reduces any potential impacts to less than significant:

AQ-2: Prior to issuance of a construction permit, the subject project shall be in compliance with the SLO Co. Air Pollution Control District and the San Luis Obispo County Clean Air Plan standard and discretionary conditions of approval.

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a) Increased vehicle trips or traffic congestion?
(Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion. The uses proposed are consistent with the General Plan's land use designation and the Zoning Ordinance's zoning designation. The additional trips are generated by the use do not impact the Level of Service (LOS) along Spring Street. The trip generation for the convenience store, gas station, and carwash has been calculated using rates contained

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

in the Trip Generation Manual, 6th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers. The average weekday trips generated for this project will result in approximately 1,223 average daily trips (ADT), and 85 AM peak hour and 106 PM peak hour trips. The existing level of service (LOS - volume to capacity) of the surrounding street network and intersections (and with planned mitigation improvements per General Plan EIR, 2003) are LOS B. The addition of the trips that are anticipated to be generated by this project will be less than significant on the surrounding network since the additional trip generation volume resulting from this project will not exceed the design capacity for local, collector or arterial streets identified in the General Plan Circulation Element.

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

Discussion: Per the Zoning Ordinance requirements, the site plan parking design and number of parking spaces complies with the Ordinance requirements for the proposed uses. The project requires 15 total parking spaces. The site plan shows 7 spaces. The 8 missing will be accounted for through the downtown parking in-lieu fee program which addresses any potential parking impacts.

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

Discussion: The project does not have hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Sources: 1 & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

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

Discussion: The project could not affect rail, waterborne or air traffic.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal result in impacts to:

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

Endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats (including but not limited to: plants, fish, insects, animals, and birds)?

Discussion: There are no endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats located on the project site. The property is currently developed with an existing gas station. Thus, there could not be potential impacts to endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats.

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

Discussion: There are no locally designated species, including oak trees on the project site.

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

Discussion: See item b. above.

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

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

e) Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?

Discussion: The site is not part of a wildlife dispersal or migration corridor.

VIII. ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

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

Discussion: The structures will be designed and constructed according to applicable CBC 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)?

Discussion: The project is required to meet all applicable Municipal Code requirements, therefore mitigating the project's risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances since the uses do not generally use these types of substance to less than significant.

- b) Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 1 & 7)

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?

Discussion: The project is required to meet all applicable Municipal Code requirements, therefore the project and future uses will not likely result in creating any health or other hazards, thus reducing the anticipated impacts to less than significant.

- d) Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?

Discussion: The project site is not located in an area with the potential for increased fire hazards. The site will be required to be in compliance with City and County brush and grass clearance requirements.

X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

- a) Increases in existing noise levels? (Sources: 1, 3, 7, & 11)

Discussion: A noise study was prepared for this project to assess potential noise impacts that may result from this project. According to the noise study report prepared by the Morro Group, Inc., the operation of the automated car wash would exceed the 70 dB threshold of the Community Commercial Land Use Category, by 17 dB and it would exceed the 65 dB threshold for the Residential Multi-Family Land Use Category by 19 dB. The report recommends two mitigation measures to mitigate the noise of the carwash so that it will be in compliance with City standards. See attached mitigation measures:

N-1: Prior to issuance of construction permits, the applicant shall submit revised plans showing the use of Ryko bifold doors at the entrance and exit of the car wash facility. The applicant shall submit documentation in the form of a noise diagram from the manufacturer verifying the statements made by Mike McGinness, which support the operational mitigation measure.

N-2: The applicant shall limit hours of car wash operation from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. to avoid Community Noise Equivalency weighting factors.

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

- b) Exposure of people to severe noise levels? (Source: 1, 3, 7, & 11)

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

Discussion: Noise related impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level. See Sec. Xa.) discussion.

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

- a) Fire protection? (Sources: 1, 3, 6, & 7)
- b) Police Protection? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)
- c) Schools? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)
- d) Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)
- e) Other governmental services? (Sources: 1,3, & 7)

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

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

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

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

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 proposed to be designed with high quality materials and architectural design that is suitable to the site and will complement the downtown area, and will not have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect. The Development Review Committee reviewed and approved the project on October 15, 2007 with the following recommendations:

- 1. Any equipment such as back flow devices, transformers and HVAC equipment shall be full screened from the streets.*
- 2. The final landscape plan along with the final colors and materials will need to go back to the DRC for approval.*

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

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

XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

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

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

Discussion: a.-b. The project site is not located in an area with know paleontological or archaeological resources. If these types of resources are found during grading and excavation, appropriate procedures will be followed including halting activities and contacting the County Coroner, and follow standard mitigation procedures.

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

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

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

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

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

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

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

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 significantly affect the demand for parks and recreational facilities. The project complies with the build-out scenario of the General Plan which has adopted park and recreation facility thresholds per population.

- b) Affect existing recreational opportunities? (Sources 1, 3, & 7)

Discussion: The project will not affect existing recreational opportunities.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

- 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)

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.

- Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals? (Sources: 1 & 3)

Discussion: The project will not likely have a potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals.

- 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)

Discussion: The project will not result in significant cumulative impacts.

- Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 1 & 3)

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

10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

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	California 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	Noise Study Report	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446

Attachments:

- Attachment 1 – Site Plan
- Attachment 2 – Floor Plans
- Attachment 3 – Existing Site Plan
- Attachment 4 – Preliminary Grading Plan
- Attachment 5 – Elevations
- Attachment 6 – Noise Study Report
- Attachment 7 – Rainmaker III Envi- R/O
- Attachment 8 – Environmentalist II-A

Exhibit B

Mitigation Summary Table

Air Quality Mitigation Measures

AQ-1: **Prior to issuance of a construction permit**, the following measures shall be incorporated into the construction phase of the project and shown on all applicable plans prior to construction permit issuance:

- 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 stock-pile areas should be sprayed daily as needed.
- d. 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.
- e. Building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

AQ-2: **Prior to issuance of a construction permit**, *the subject project shall be in compliance with the SLO Co. Air Pollution Control District and the San Luis Obispo County Clean Air Plan standard and discretionary conditions of approval.*

Noise Mitigation Measures

N-1: Prior to issuance of construction permits, the applicant shall submit revised plans showing the use of Ryko bifold doors at the entrance and exit of the car wash facility. The applicant shall submit documentation in the form of a noise diagram from the manufacturer verifying the statements made by Mike McGinness, which support the operational mitigation measure.

N-2: The applicant shall limit hours of car wash operation from 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. to avoid Community Noise Equivalency weighting factors.

Cultural Resources Mitigation Measures

CR-1: In the event archaeological resources are unearthed or discovered during any construction activities, the following standards apply:

- a. Construction activities shall cease, and the Community Development Director shall be notified so that the extent and location of discovered materials may be recorded by a qualified archaeologist, and disposition of artifacts may be accomplished in accordance with state and federal law.
- b. In the event archaeological resources are found to include human remains, or in any other case where human remains are discovered during construction, the County Coroner is to be notified in addition to the Community Development Director so that proper disposition may be accomplished.

Water Mitigation Measures

W-1: Water discharge from this project will be required to meet all Municipal codes, CBC codes, and the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements relating to water discharge.