

RESOLUTION NO: 08-051

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION  
OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES  
APPROVING A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR  
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT 08-007  
(JACK IN THE BOX)  
APN: 025-421-026

WHEREAS, Planned Development 08-007 has been filed by Curt Pringle & Associates for the construction of a 2,500 square foot drive-through fast food restaurant; and

WHEREAS, the project is located at 2500 Golden Hill Road; and

WHEREAS, the approximate 30,000 square foot site is zoned C3 (Commercial / Light-Industrial), and has a General Plan designation of CS, (Commercial Service); and

WHEREAS, the site is located within Sub Area E of the Borkey Area Specific Plan (BASP); and

WHEREAS, Section 21.23B, of the Zoning Code (Development Review) requires any project subject to environmental review in which a negative declaration is required, is subject to Planning Commission approval of a development plan (PD); 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 was prepared and circulated for public review and comment; and

WHEREAS, based on the information and analysis contained in the Initial Study, a determination has been made that the proposed Project qualifies for adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration; 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, after further clarification from Air Pollution Control District (APCD) staff, it has been determined that since the project will have less than 25 employees, that a shower and locker facility is not required and in its place a discretionary condition can be applied; and

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

WHEREAS, based on the information contained in the Initial Study prepared for this project and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the Planning Commission finds no substantial evidence that there would be a significant impact on the environment based on the attached Mitigation Agreement and mitigation measures described in the initial study and contained in the resolution approving PD 08-007 as site specific conditions summarized below.

Topic of Mitigation	Condition #
Air Quality	10
Traffic	12 &13

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Planning Commission of the City of El Paso de Robles, based on its independent judgment, to approve a Mitigated Negative Declaration for Planned Development 08-007 in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 25th day of November 2008, by the following roll call vote:

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

NOES: None

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:** Jack in the Box – PD 08-007

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

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

**PROJECT LOCATION:** 2500 Golden Hill Road (APN 025-421-026)

**PROJECT PROPONENT:** Applicant: Curt Pringle and Associates  
2400 East Katella Ave, ste 350, Anaheim, CA 92806

**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:** Commercial Service (CS),

**ZONING:** Commercial/Light-Industrial (C3)

**SPECIFIC PLAN AREA:** Borkey Area Specific Plan (BASP)

## 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Request to construct a 2,500 square foot Jack in the Box drive through restaurant with ancillary parking and landscaping areas.

An existing house, and detached shop building are currently located on the site. The structures would be removed (under a separate review and permit) to allow for the development of the restaurant 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).

This site was included in an earlier environmental review process, where a Negative Declaration was approved for the commercial/industrial subdivision that created this lot (Tentative Parcel Map PR 04-0310, Resolution No. 04-0139).

## **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 type="checkbox"/> Land Use & Planning    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Circulation | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population & Housing   | <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities & Service Systems |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geological Problems    | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy & Mineral Resources            | <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards                               | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources          |
| <input 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 26, 2008

\_\_\_\_\_  
Darren Nash, Associate Planner

# 10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

## I. LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the Proposal:

- a) Conflict with general plan designation or zoning? (Sources: 1 & 8)

*Discussion: The proposed project will not conflict with the General Plan or zoning district since the proposed drive through restaurant is a permitted use in the C3 zoning district.*

- 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.*

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

*Discussion: The drive through fast food restaurant use is permitted in this zone and is consistent with other highway oriented uses in the vicinity of Golden Hill Road and Highway 46 East, therefore the use would be compatible with 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 project site is an urban infill property with no agricultural uses, resources or operations on near the property.*

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

*Discussion: The project site is located in an entirely non-residential area, thus it could not obstruct or divide an established community.*

## II. POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:

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

*Discussion: The development of the commercial project could not affect an increase in population.*

- 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: The site is accessed from an existing road (Golden Hill Road), and there is water, sewer and utility services already available along the project's frontage. Therefore, the project would not extend infrastructure and induce growth.*

# 10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

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

*Discussion: The existing single family house is not considered affordable housing, and since the house is an existing non-conforming use would not be an impact.*

### 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.*

- 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 active or potentially active faults.*

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

*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)

- e) Landslides or Mudflows? (Sources: 1, 2, & 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: 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: Per the General Plan EIR the soil condition is not erosive or otherwise unstable. As such, no significant impacts are anticipated.*

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g) 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: Not applicable.*

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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:

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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: Items a: The development of the site will be done in a manner that meets the engineering standards for drainage and runoff, as well as incorporate low impact design measures to maintain run-off from impervious surfaces on site. Therefore, the project will not result in changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff.*

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

*Discussion: See a. above.*

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? | <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
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

(Sources: 1, 3, & 7)

*Discussion: There is no water body on or near the project site, and the site will not drain to surface waters.*

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 difference in the water usage between the existing residence and the proposed restaurant project is not anticipated to be a significant impact. Additionally, this project will not directly withdraw water from the ground water aquifer, and will be designed to provide on-site water retention in landscape areas.*

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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. Additionally, implementation of low impact development standards will clean or treat water impurities from this site before it gets into groundwater, in compliance with RWQCB & NEPDES storm water requirements.*

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| i) Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

*Discussion: The demolition of structures will need to obtain applicable permits and comply with site disturbance regulations from the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District in compliance with the Districts demo regulations per the adopted Clean Air Plan prior to commencing activities.*

## 10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

*Regarding the construction and operations of the new facility, the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District has reviewed the project (See APCD letter dated July 22, 2008, attachment C). Based on the type of use, and trip generation criteria the following mitigation measures are necessary in order to bring the project impacts to air quality to a less than significant level. With the following mitigation measures applied to the project, impacts to air quality from this project will be less than significant:*

### Dust Control Measures

The project as described in the referral will not likely exceed the APCD's CEQA significance threshold for construction phase emissions. However, construction activities can generate fugitive dust, which could be a nuisance to local residents and businesses in close proximity to the proposed construction site. Dust complaints could result in a violation of the District's 402 "Nuisance" Rule. **APCD staff recommend the following measures be incorporated into the project to control dust:**

- Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible;
- Use 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 (non-potable) water should be used whenever possible;
- All dirt stock-pile areas should be sprayed daily as needed; and,
- All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc. to be paved should be completed as soon as possible, and building pads should be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

### Construction Permit Requirements

Based on the information provided, we are unsure of the types of equipment that may be present during the project's construction phase. Portable equipment, 50 horsepower (hp) or greater, used during construction activities will require California statewide portable equipment registration (issued by the California Air Resources Board) or an APCD permit. The following list is provided as a guide to equipment and operations that may have permitting requirements, but should not be viewed as exclusive. For a more detailed listing, refer to page A-5 in the District's CEQA Handbook.

- Power screens, conveyors, diesel engines, and/or crushers;
- Portable generators and equipment with engines that are 50 hp or greater; and
- IC engines.

**To minimize potential delays, prior to the start of the project, please contact the APCD Engineering Division at (805) 781-5912 for specific information regarding permitting requirements.**

### OPERATIONAL PHASE MITIGATION

#### Nitrogen Oxide and Reactive Organic Gas Mitigation

APCD staff has determined the operational impacts of this development through the use of the URBEMIS2007 computer model, a tool for estimating vehicle travel, fuel use and the resulting emissions related to this project's land uses. The results of the model using conservative County average trip distances demonstrated that the operational impacts will likely exceed the APCD's CEQA Tier I significance threshold value of 10 lbs/day for the criteria air pollutants nitrogen oxides (NOx) and reactive organic gases (ROG); 22 lbs/day NOx and 15 lbs/day ROG).

**As a result of this estimated threshold exceedence, this project must implement all applicable Standard Mitigation Measures and at least 10 Additional Mitigation Measures listed below.** Should this project move forward, the APCD will consider the overall criteria pollutant air quality impacts from this project to have been reduced to a level of insignificance with the implementation of these mitigation measures. Other measures may be proposed as replacements by contacting the APCD's Planning Division at 781-5912.

#### **Standard Measures (Include all standard mitigation measures below)**

- Provide on-site bicycle parking. One bicycle parking space for every 10 car parking spaces is considered appropriate.

## 10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

- Provide on-site eating, refrigeration and food vending facilities to reduce employee lunchtime trips.
- Provide preferential carpool and vanpool parking spaces.

### **Discretionary Measures (Include at least 10 of the following)**

#### Site Design Mitigation for this Commercial Project

- Increase street shade tree planting.
- Increase shade tree planting in parking lots to reduce evaporative emissions from parked vehicles.
- Provide on-site banking (ATM).
- Implement on-site circulation design elements in parking lots to reduce vehicle queuing and improve the pedestrian environment with designated walkways.
- Provide pedestrian signalization and signage to improve pedestrian safety.

#### Transportation Demand Mitigation

- If the project is located on an established transit route, improve public transit accessibility by providing a transit turnout with direct pedestrian access to the project or improve existing transit stop amenities.
- Increase the quality of existing bicycle routes/lanes or add bicycle routes/lanes which access the project.
- Implement compressed work schedules.

Energy Efficiency Measures: Green House Gas mitigation listed below requires a 20% efficiency improvement over Title 24 standard. Potential Energy Efficiency Measures are listed below. If these measures are used to achieve the 20% improvement over Title 24 for GHG mitigation, they can not be counted for energy efficiency measures for NOx and ROG mitigation.

- Shade tree planting along southern exposures of buildings to reduce summer cooling needs;
- Use roof material with a solar reflectance value meeting the EPA/DOE Energy Star® rating to reduce summer cooling needs;
- Use built-in energy efficient appliances, where applicable;
- Use double-paned windows;
- Use low energy parking lot and street lights (e.g. sodium).
- Use energy efficient interior lighting;
- Install door sweeps or weather stripping if more energy efficient doors and windows are not available;
- Install high efficiency or gas space heating; and
- Replace diesel fleet vehicles with cleaner fueled low emission vehicles (e.g. delivery vehicles frequenting facility).

#### Greenhouse Gas Impacts and Mitigation

*In 2006, the California State Legislature adopted AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. AB 32 requires the California Air Resources Board (CARB), the State agency charged with regulating statewide air quality, to adopt rules and regulations that would achieve greenhouse gas emissions equivalent to statewide levels in 1990 by 2020. Carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) is the most dominant greenhouse gas, making up approximately 84% of all greenhouse gases (GHGs). Fossil fuel combustion is responsible for 97% of all CO<sub>2</sub> emissions worldwide; thus, reducing fossil fuel combustion is essential to solving this problem.*

*On June 19, 2008, the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) released a Technical Advisory titled CEQA and Climate Change: Addressing Climate Change Through CEQA Review (<http://opr.ca.gov/index.php?a=ceqa/index.html>). In this document OPR verifies that GHG emissions are appropriate subjects for CEQA analysis that should be evaluated even without the presence of established thresholds. Further OPR establishes that lead agencies must assess whether emissions are individually or cumulative significant. **The APCD suggests that lead agencies become familiar with the recommendations outlined in this Technical Advisory and ensure that projects subject to CEQA quantify GHG emissions and implement feasible mitigation.***

*The APCD staff considered the operational GHG impact of the proposed Jack in the Box with drive-through restaurant by running the URBEMIS2007. This analysis indicated that operational phase impacts of the GHG CO<sub>2</sub> emissions will be approximately 8,350 pounds per day or 1,382 metric tons per year. **The APCD recommends the implementation of***

**10 Environmental Checklist Form**

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

**feasible mitigation measures to minimize project related GHG impacts.**

- Reconsider drive-thru application
- Post “no-idling” restriction notices at several locations in the drive-through queue;
- Make safe walking or bicycling connectivity to/from and on the site;
- Improve nearby transit amenities (e.g. bus stop smart signs);
- Implement green building techniques such as:
  - Building positioning and engineering that eliminate or minimize the development’s active heating and cooling needs;
  - Implement solar systems to reduce energy needs;
  - Increase the building energy efficiency rating by 20% above what is required by Title 24 requirements.
  - Plant native shade trees along southern exposures of buildings to reduce summer cooling needs;
  - Plant native, drought resistant landscaping;
  - Use locally or nearby produced building materials;
  - Use renewable or reclaimed building materials;
  - Install outdoor electrical outlets to encourage the use of electric appliances and tools; and
  - Include teleconferencing capabilities, such as web cams or satellite linkage, which will allow employees to attend meetings remotely without requiring them to travel out of the area.

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

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

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

*Discussion: This project does not have the potential to significantly alter air movement, moisture, or temperature.*

d) Create objectionable odors?                       

*Discussion: This project does not have the potential to create objectionable odors.*

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

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

# 10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

*Discussion: A Traffic Study was prepared by Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE) on February 18, 2008 to study the traffic and circulation affects of the proposed restaurant on the Golden Hill Road corridor.*

The City Engineer reviewed the ATE traffic study and provided the following determinations and conclusions:

The development of the Jack in the Box restaurant will incrementally affect operations on the intersection of Golden Hill Road and SR 46E, and will thereby affect overall operations of Highway 46 East. The improvement of the intersection of SR 46E and Golden Hill Road is necessary for the successful operation of this restaurant.

Caltrans is currently in the process of developing a Route 46E Comprehensive Corridor Study. The City is currently in the process of developing an updated traffic model with the intention of updating the Circulation Element of the General Plan. Once the documents referenced above have been adopted by the City Council, transportation impact fees will be amended to reflect new improvement projects which will mitigate traffic impacts from development in the project vicinity, including this project.

Fast food restaurants typically generate a high volume of traffic in relationship to the size of the store. Amended transportation impact fees may address this issue by basing the fees on criteria more reflective of the impact of the types of development.

The Jack in the Box restaurant will be conditioned to pay transportation development impact fees in effect at the time of occupancy. These fees will be based on the results of the studies and improvements noted above. The calculation of the fees will not include consideration of fees currently in effect or those that may have been in effect at the time the entitlement application was made or in effect at the time of submittal of a building permit.

Improvements to Golden Hill Road and to the intersection of Golden Hill Road and SR 46E, as outlined on approved plans for the Regency Center, must be complete and in operation prior to occupancy of the proposed restaurant.

In order to adequately mitigate it's traffic related impacts to a level of less than significant, the following mitigation measures need to be applied to this project:

**Mitigation Measures:**

- T-1. The Jack in the Box restaurant will be conditioned to pay transportation development impact fees in effect at the time of occupancy. The calculation of the fees will not include consideration of fees currently in effect or those that may have been in effect at the time the entitlement application was made or in effect at the time of submittal of a building permit.
- T-2 Improvements to the intersection of Golden Hill Road and SR 46E, as outlined on approved plans for the Regency Center, must be complete and in operation and in operation to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to occupancy of the proposed restaurant.

- 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)

*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

# 10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

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

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

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

*Discussion: The project has been designed to exceed the Zoning Code requirement of 25 on-site parking spaces.*

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

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

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f) Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?<br>(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. The bus turn-out is located within 600 feet of the project site on Dallons Road, and the site plan includes a bike rack for 6 bikes.*

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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:

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

*Discussion: There are no endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats located on the project site. Thus, there could not be potential impacts to endangered, threatened or rare species or their habitats. It is a previously disturbed site, and is an urban infill property.*

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

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

*Discussion: See item b. above.*

## 10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

- 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: This project could 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, and building construction will comply with Title 24 energy conservation requirements..*

- 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)

*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 will not result in a risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances since demolition project do not generally uses these types of substances. The applicant will need to comply with SLOAPCD regulations regarding asbestos removal should this material be encountered in the structures. Therefore, impacts resulting from potential release of hazardous materials will be 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.*



## 10 Environmental Checklist Form

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

- c) The creation of any health hazard or potential hazards?

*Discussion: see a. above.*

- 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.*

### X. NOISE. Would the proposal result in:

- a) Increases in existing noise levels? (Sources: 1, 7, & 8)

*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)

*The project site is not located in the vicinity where it would expose 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 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)

*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 as applicable.*

### 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)

## 10 Environmental Checklist Form

ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. The applicant will mitigate solid waste disposal by recycling building materials to the extent feasible, per mitigation measures.*

### XIII. AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:

- 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 has been designed to be similar in architecture and materials to buildings that have been previously approved by the Planning Commission for the Regency Center located across Golden Hill Road, therefore it would not have a negative effect.*

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

*Discussion: Light cut-sheets have been provided with the project that indicate the use of shielded exterior light fixtures that will not create off-site light and glare.*

### XIV. CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:

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

- b) Disturb archaeological resources? (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	No Impact
--	--------------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------

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

*Discussion: The development of this project would not affect historic resources, since the existing house and detached shop building would not be considered historically or architecturally significant.*

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d) Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

*Discussion: See c. above.*

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e) Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

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

**XV.RECREATION. Would the proposal:**

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

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

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

*Discussion: The project will not affect existing recreational opportunities.*

**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 | <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	Potentially Significant No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	---

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 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.

<b>Reference Number</b>	<b>Document Title</b>	<b>Available for Review At</b>
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

### Attachments:

- A – Vicinity Map
- B – Site Plan
- C – APCD Letter - 7/22/08
- D – ATE Traffic Study – 2/28/08 ON FILE – NOT ATTACHED
- E – Caltrans letter – 9/18/08