

RESOLUTION NO. 11-024

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
OF THE CITY OF EL PASO DE ROBLES
RECOMMENDING ADOPTION TO THE CITY COUNCIL
OF A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE
EMERGENCY SHELTER ORDINANCE**

WHEREAS, the State adopted legislation in 2007, SB 2, that requires local agencies to incorporate provisions in Housing Element updates to provide for Emergency Shelters permitted “by right” within specified zoning district; and

WHEREAS, the City of El Paso de Robles adopted a General Plan, Housing Element Update in June 2011; and

WHEREAS, the Housing Element is consistent with State legislation (SB 2), and includes specific actions to amend the City’s Zoning Code to include Emergency Shelters permitted “by right” in zoning districts, that can accommodate the housing needs of local homeless persons, and to provide transitional and supportive housing “by right” in all residential districts; and

WHEREAS, the City has prepared an ordinance to amend the Zoning Code to permit Emergency Shelters “by right” in the Riverside Corridor (RC) Zone and the Planned Manufacturing (PM) Zone within the Sherwood Industrial Park area, and with approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in the T-3 Neighborhood (T-3N), T-3 Flex (T-3F), T-4 Neighborhood (T-4N), and the T-Flex (T-4F) districts within the Uptown/Town Center Specific Plan; and

WHEREAS, the ordinance also includes an amendment to permit transitional and supportive housing “by right” in all residential districts; and

WHEREAS, the ordinance includes objective development standards in compliance with the requirements of SB 2, which are not more stringent than development standards for other land uses within the same zoning districts; and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to evaluate whether this project would result in environmental impacts, and the City has determined that the Zoning Code Amendment incorporating Emergency Shelters, transitional and supportive housing within specified zoning districts with applicable development standards will not result in significant environmental impacts, and;

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

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

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

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on October 25, 2011 to consider the Initial Study and the proposed Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed project, and to accept public testimony on the Emergency Shelter Ordinance and environmental determination; and

WHEREAS, based on the information and analysis contained in the Initial Study prepared for this project and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the Planning Commission finds that there is no substantial evidence that there would be a significant impact on the environment as a result of implementation of the Emergency Shelter Ordinance.

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 recommend the City Council adopt a Negative Declaration for the Emergency Shelter Ordinance 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 25th day of October, 2011, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Commissioners Vanderlip, Holstine, Peterson, Barth, Garcia and Chair Gregory
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Treach
ABSTAIN: None

CHAIRMAN STEVE GREGORY

ATTEST:

ED GALLAGHER, PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on October 25, 2011 to consider the Initial Study and the proposed Negative Declaration prepared for the proposed project, and to accept public testimony on the Emergency Shelter Ordinance and environmental determination; and

WHEREAS, based on the information and analysis contained in the Initial Study prepared for this project and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the Planning Commission finds that there is no substantial evidence that there would be a significant impact on the environment as a result of implementation of the Emergency Shelter Ordinance.

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 recommend the City Council adopt a Negative Declaration for the Emergency Shelter Ordinance 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 25th day of October, 2011, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Commissioners Vanderlip, Holstine, Peterson, Barth, Garcia and Chair Gregory
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Treach
ABSTAIN: None



CHAIRMAN STEVE GREGORY

ATTEST:



ED GALLAGHER, PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY

**ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM
CITY OF PASO ROBLES**

- PROJECT TITLE:** Emergency Shelter Ordinance
- 2. LEAD AGENCY:** City of Paso Robles
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446
- Contact Person:** Susan DeCarli, AICP
Phone: (805) 237-3970
Email: sdecarli@prcity.com
- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:** Zoning Districts: Riverside Corridor (RC), Planned Manufacturing (Sherwood Industrial Park), T-3 Neighborhood (T-3N), T-3 Flex (T-3F), T-4 Neighborhood (T-4N), and the T-Flex (T-4F), residential districts
- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** City of Paso Robles
- Contact Person:** Susan DeCarli, AICP
Phone: (805) 237-3970
Email: sdecarli@prcity.com
- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** Various
- 6. ZONING:** Riverside Corridor (RC), Planned Manufacturing (Sherwood Industrial Park), T-3 Neighborhood (T-3N), T-3 Flex (T-3F), T-4 Neighborhood (T-4N), and the T-Flex (T-4F), residential districts
- 7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** The project is a zoning code amendment to add Emergency Shelters as a permitted land use “by right” in the RC and PM (Sherwood Industrial Area only) zoning districts and to allow them with approval of a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in the T-3N, T-3F, T-4N, and T-4F zoning districts, subject to specific objective development standards that are not more stringent than what is required for other land uses in the same district(s). The amendment includes permitting all “transitional and supportive” housing “by right” in all residential zoning districts. (See Attachment 1, Proposed Emergency Shelter Ordinance.)
- 8. OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED):** None

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature: _____

Date _____

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature: Susan DeLoe Date: 11/10/11

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except “No Impact” answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A “No Impact” answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A “No Impact” answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved. 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. “Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. “Potentially Significant Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a. Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b. Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c. Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
8. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a. the significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b. the mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

I. AESTHETICS: Would the project:

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

Discussion: The proposed project is a zoning code amendment to allow Emergency Shelters, transitional and supportive housing in various zoning districts subject to development standards. As a text amendment, the “project” in and of itself would not result in physical changes to the environment or impacts on scenic resources. However, the project may result in indirect impacts on scenic resources at some point in the future. Impacts that may result from future land uses proposed as a result of this code amendment. They will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and be evaluated in compliance with CEQA. Since direct impacts cannot be determined with this code amendment, and future CEQA evaluation would be conducted on future projects subject to CEQA, and projects resulting from this amendment would be subject to development standards, it is anticipated that impacts to aesthetic resources would be less than significant.

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

Discussion: See I.a. above.

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

Discussion: See I.a. above.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 1, 2, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See I.a. above.



II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the State’s inventory of forest land, including the forest and Range Assessment Project and the forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

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

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

Discussion: There are no agricultural properties or farmlands within the zoning districts proposed for modifications by this project. Therefore, these resources could not result in impacts from this project.

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

Discussion: There are no properties within the City of Paso Robles under Williamson Act contract. Therefore, this project could not result in impacts to agricultural lands, uses or properties under Williamson Act contract.

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. | Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There are no forest land or timberland properties within the City of Paso Robles, therefore this project could not result in impacts to these resources.

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. | Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See II. C. above.

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e. | Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There are no agricultural properties or farmlands within the zoning districts proposed for modifications by this project. Therefore, these resources could not result in impacts from this project.

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

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. | Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project (code amendment) will not result in direct air quality impacts or conflict with applicable air quality plans. The amendment will likely result in future beneficial impacts by directing growth to be located within the City limits, primarily in the town center area where the new housing or reuse of existing facilities for housing would be close to services and thus reduce the need for occupants to travel outside of the city to meet their needs, reducing air pollution emissions.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 11)</p> <p>Discussion: See III.a. above.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Source: 11)</p> <p>Discussion: See III.a. above.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>d. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Source: 11)</p> <p>Discussion: The proposed project will not result in direct or indirect exposure of pollutants to sensitive receptors.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Source: 11)</p> <p>Discussion: See III d. above.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <p>a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</p> <p>Discussion: The proposed project would not result in a direct impact to biological resources, and future development that may occur as a result of this code amendment would occur in previously disturbed, urbanized areas that do not have sensitive biological resources.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?</p> <p>Discussion: See IV a above.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: See IV a. above, in addition there are no wetlands or other hydrological resources within future development areas identified in the code amendment that could be impacted.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See IV a. above, in addition there are no areas proposed in the code amendment that would be subject to movement of native or migratory fish or wildlife species that could be impacted as a result of future development in areas identified in the code amendment.

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

Discussion: The proposed project does not conflict with any local regulations regarding biological resources. Should future development be proposed in areas where they are biological resources, they would be subject to CEQA review and/or need to comply with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance.

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

Discussion: There are no applicable conservation plans within the City of Paso Robles.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

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

Discussion: Since this project does not propose to affect historic resources it would not result in a direct impact to these resources. If future development were to be deemed a "project under CEQA, and had the potential to affect historic resources the significance of those impacts would be evaluated in compliance with CEQA and the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance. Therefore, it is not foreseeable that this project would result in impacts to historic resources, and thus it is anticipated that impacts would be less than significant.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? Discussion: See V a. above. There are no known archaeological resources in the vicinity of the zoning districts associated with the proposed code amendment. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? Discussion: See V. b. above. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? Discussion: See V. b. above. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS: Would the project:

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |
| i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. (Sources: 1, 2, & 3) Discussion: The proposed code amendment could not result in exposing people or structures to potential risks from geologic impacts. Future development that may occur as a result of this code amendment would need to be consistent with all applicable building and safety codes, include earthquake safety regulations. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3) Discussion: See VI a. above. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 2 & 3) Discussion: See VI a. above. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

Discussion: See VI a. above. Additionally, there are no known risks for landslides within the zoning districts affected by the proposed code amendment.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See VI a. above. Additionally, any future development that may occur as a result of the proposed code amendment would need to comply with the City’s Grading and Erosion Control regulations best management practices to control soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

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

Discussion: See VI a. above.

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

Discussion: See VI a. above.

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

Discussion: See VI a. above.



VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS: Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: As a code amendment, this project could not result in direct impacts to GHG. See item III a. above.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: As a code amendment, this project could not result in direct impacts to GHG. See item III a. above.

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS: Would the project:

- a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

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

Discussion: The proposed project (code amendment), could not affect or be affected by hazardous materials or result in hazards to the public.

- b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

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

Discussion: See VIII a. above.

- c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

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

Discussion: See VIII a. above.

- d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

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

Discussion: Not applicable.

- e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

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

Discussion: Not applicable.

- f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

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

Discussion: Not applicable.

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? Discussion: Not applicable. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? Discussion: Not applicable. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY: Would the project:

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

Discussion: The proposed project (code amendment) could not result in direct impacts to water supplies, in either quantity or quality, or alterations to natural hydrological systems. Any future development that occurs as a result of this code amendment would need to be evaluated in compliance with CEQA and consistent with the City's General Plan, and applicable State water quality requirements.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., Would the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? Would decreased rainfall infiltration or groundwater recharge reduce stream baseflow? (Source: 7) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See IX a. above.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (Source: 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See IX b. and VI c. above.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <p>the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Source: 10)</p> <p>Discussion: See IX b. above.</p> | | | | |
| <p>e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Source: 10)</p> <p>Discussion: See IX b. above.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</p> <p>Discussion: See IX b. above.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</p> <p>Discussion: None of the zones proposed to allow the uses in the code amendment are within a 100 year flood zone.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</p> <p>Discussion: See IX g. above.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</p> <p>Discussion: See IX g. above.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>j. Inundation by mudflow?</p> <p>Discussion: Not applicable.</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <p>k. Conflict with any Best Management Practices found within the City's Storm Water Management Plan?</p> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|---|---|---|----------------------|
|--|---|---|---|----------------------|

Discussion: See IX b.

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. | Substantially decrease or degrade watershed storage of runoff, wetlands, riparian areas, aquatic habitat, or associated buffer zones? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See IX b.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING: Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. | Physically divide an established community? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Not applicable.

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

Discussion: The proposed zoning text amendment is consistent with all applicable City plans, codes and regulations.

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

Discussion: Not applicable.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. | Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Source: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Not applicable.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b. | Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (Source: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Not applicable.

XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Source: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The proposed project (code amendment) could not result in direct noise related impacts. Potential development that may be proposed as a result of this amendment would need to be constructed and operated in compliance with application noise codes and regulations, and are not anticipated to be significant.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See XII a. above.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See XII a. above.

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See XII a. above.

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (Sources: 1, 4) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: Not applicable.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING: Would the project:

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Source: 1) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project could not result in direct impacts in population growth. However, the code amendment is intended to result in accommodating homeless persons within the vicinity. The population growth is provided for in the City's General Plan Housing Element housing needs assessment. Future development of housing units for homeless persons shall be in compliance with maximum growth anticipated

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

in the Housing Element, therefore the project would not result in indirect significant growth impacts.

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

Discussion: See XIII a. above.

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

Discussion: See XIII a. above.

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

- | | | | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. | Fire protection? (Sources: 1,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project would not result in direct impacts to public services, however, potential future development that may result from the code amendment would need to be evaluated to be found in compliance with public service and facility capacities and limitations. It is not anticipated that future development would result in the need for new or altered public services or facilities, and new development would be required to offset service and facility impacts through applicable development fees.

- | | | | | | |
|----|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. | Police protection? (Sources: 1,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See XIV a. above.

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

Discussion See XIV a. above.

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

Discussion: See XIV a. above.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| e. | Other public facilities? (Sources: 1,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See XIV a. above.

XV. RECREATION

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Discussion: See XIV a. above. | | | | |
| b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Discussion: See XIV a. above. | | | | |

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Discussion: The proposed project could not result in direct conflicts with circulation plans and performance measures. It is not anticipated that indirect impacts would result from future foreseeable development as an outcome of this code amendment since homeless shelters do not cause significant traffic demand or impacts. | | | | |
| b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to a level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Discussion: See XVI a. above. | | | | |
| c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Discussion: Not applicable. | | | | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? Discussion: Not applicable. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Result in inadequate emergency access? Discussion: Not applicable. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? Discussion: See XVI a. above. In addition, indirect potential foreseeable impacts from homeless shelter development and alternative transportation are anticipated to be less than significant. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? Discussion: The proposed project could not result in direct exceedance of wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board. Indirect impacts that may result from future development would be evaluated in compliance with CEQA and other applicable regulations, but are not anticipated to exceed requirements. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? Discussion: There will be no direct impacts from this project, however indirect impacts to the City's water and wastewater systems are accounted for in the General Plan build out projections and impact fee program. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? Discussion: See XVII above. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? Discussion: See XVII above. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? Discussion: See XVII above. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? Discussion: See XVII above. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? Discussion: See XVII above. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? Discussion: The proposed project could not directly impact the quality of the environment, and indirect impacts will be less than significant. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**Potentially
Significant
Impact**

**Less Than
Significant with
Mitigation
Incorporated**

**Less Than
Significant
Impact**

**No
Impact**

Discussion: The proposed project could not directly impact the quality of the environment, and indirect impacts will be less than significant.

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

Discussion: The proposed project could not directly impact the quality of the environment, and indirect impacts will be less than significant.

EARLIER ANALYSIS AND BACKGROUND MATERIALS.

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

Earlier Documents that may have been used in this Analysis and Background / Explanatory Materials

| <u>Reference #</u> | <u>Document Title</u> | <u>Available for Review at:</u> |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| 1 | City of Paso Robles General Plan | City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446 |
| 2 | City of Paso Robles Zoning Code | Same as above |
| 3 | City of Paso Robles Environmental Impact Report for General Plan Update | Same as above |
| 4 | 2005 Airport Land Use Plan | Same as above |
| 5 | City of Paso Robles Municipal Code | Same as above |
| 6 | City of Paso Robles Water Master Plan | Same as above |
| 7 | City of Paso Robles Urban Water Management Plan 2005 | Same as above |
| 8 | City of Paso Robles Sewer Master Plan | Same as above |
| 9 | City of Paso Robles Housing Element | Same as above |
| 10 | City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval for New Development | Same as above |
| 11 | San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District Guidelines for Impact Thresholds | APCD 3433 Roberto Court San Luis Obispo, CA 93401 |
| 12 | San Luis Obispo County – Land Use Element | San Luis Obispo County Department of Planning County Government Center San Luis Obispo, CA 93408 |
| 13 | USDA, Soils Conservation Service, Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, Paso Robles Area, 1983 | Soil Conservation Offices Paso Robles, Ca 93446 |
| 14 | Draft Bike Plan, 2009 | City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446 |