

RESOLUTION NO. 14-019
A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES
APPROVING A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR
PLANNED DEVELOPMENT 14-002
(ANDROS ENGINEERING)

WHEREAS, PD 14-002 has been submitted by Ted Weber, Architect, on behalf of Matt Andros, to construct two buildings totaling 16,800 square feet as an expansion to their existing facility located at 4285 Second Wind Way; and

WHEREAS, the project is located on a 5.2 acre site where the existing facility including the proposed expansion would only utilize just over 50 percent of the site, the rest of the site would be undeveloped; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Andros is requesting that the Planning Commission allow a reduction in the amount of parking constructed from 61 spaces to 26, based on the number of employees and the nature of the business not having walk-in clientele; and

WHEREAS, an Initial Study was prepared for this project (attached as Exhibit A), which concludes that the project as proposed will not have significant impacts on the environment; and

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

WHEREAS, public hearings were conducted by the Planning Commission on August 12, 2014 to consider the Initial Study prepared for this application, and to accept public testimony regarding this proposed environmental determination for the proposed zoning modification; and

WHEREAS, based on General Plan Land Use Designation, the 2003 General Plan Environmental Impact Report, information contained in the Initial Study prepared for this zoning modification, the staff report and testimony received as a result of the public notice, the City Council finds no substantial evidence that the project would have a significant impact on the environment.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That the above Recitals are true and correct and incorporated herein by reference.
2. That based on the City's independent judgment, the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles does hereby approve a Negative Declaration for PD 14-002, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

PASSED AND ADOPTED THIS 12nd day of August, 2014 by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Garcia, Gregory, Barth, Cooper, Donaldson, Rollins, Vanderlip
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
ABSTAIN: None



DOUG BARTH, CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:


ED GALLAGHER, COMMISSION SECRETARY

ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM
AND NEGATIVE DECLARATION
CITY OF PASO ROBLES

- 1. PROJECT TITLE:** Andros Engineering – Industrial Building Expansion
Planned Development PD 14-002
- 2. LEAD AGENCY:** City of Paso Robles
1000 Spring Street
Paso Robles, CA 93446
- Contact:** Susan DeCarli or Darren Nash
Phone: (805) 237-3970
Email: sdecarli@prcity.com/dnash@prcity.com
- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:** 4285 Secondwind Way
Paso Robles, CA 93446
(See Attachment 1, Vicinity Map)
- Assessor Parcel Number 025-471-017
- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** Andros Engineering
- Contact Person:** Ted Weber
Phone: (805) 238-4711
Email:
- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** Business Park (BP)
- 6. ZONING:** Airport (AP)
- 7. PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD:** July 2, 2014 through July 22, 2014
- 8. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**
- This is a proposal to expand an existing manufacturing operation in two phases. Phase I would include construction of 7,200 s.f. building. Phase II would add a 9,600 s.f. building that would connect to an existing building and the building from Phase I. See Site Plan, Attachment 2. The architecture style and materials of the new buildings would be in keeping with the existing building. The project scope also includes relocating an existing chain link fence to the south approximately 45 feet. The area between the location of the existing fence and the proposed fence location would be used for storm water infiltration and storage of outdoor materials. New landscaping will be added to the lot frontage along the street in front of the new screened fencing.
- 9. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:** The project site is located within the Airport Master Plan area, which is under the City’s purview for approval. The project site is previously disturbed with existing development including pavement and buildings. The undeveloped portion of the site that the fence would be relocated on is flat graded land that has seasonal grasses. There are no oak trees or other protected biological resources on the project site. The site is surrounded by other existing development near the airport.
- 10. 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 _____

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

Discussion: The project site is located at an infill site within the Airport Master Plan Area. The site is not visible from any major highways. The site is not designated or otherwise identified in any City documents as being within a scenic vista area. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to scenic vistas.

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

Discussion: There are no scenic resources such as rock outcroppings or historic buildings located on the site, and it is not visible from any state scenic highways. Therefore, the project would not result in significant impacts to scenic resources.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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: The project site is an infill lot. The proposed building expansions would utilize the same architectural building design, materials and features as the existing building, which are in keeping with surrounding similar buildings in the airport area. The project also includes new landscaping and fencing screening along the project frontage. Therefore, the proposed project would not likely degrade the existing visual character of quality of the site and its surroundings.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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: The project will not include new light sources that would cause substantial light or glare, and it will include standard conditions of approval to ensure lights are downcast and shielded (versus radiant), and that parking lot and building lighting fixtures be the minimum necessary to ensure site safety. Therefore, the proposed project will result in less than significant impacts from light or glare.

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

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

- a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

Discussion: The project site is an infill development site within the airport planning area. It is zoned and designated to accommodate light industrial types of uses. Per the General Plan Open Space Element, Figure OS-1, it does not have farmland soils of any kind, and is identified as “urban/built-up” land. Therefore, the project would result in impacts on converting prime or other significant soils to urban land uses.

- b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

Discussion: The site is not under Williamson Act contract, nor is it currently used for agricultural purposes.

- 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 5114(g))?

Discussion: There are no forest land or timberland resources within the City of Paso Robles.

- d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

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?

Discussion: There is no farmland or cultivated soils in the vicinity of the proposed infill project site. Therefore, it could result conversion of farmland.

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

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: Attachment 5) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project is an infill development project in an area with similar uses and expansion of existing site development. This is consistent with land use development policies of the Air District's adopted Clean Air Plan (CAP). Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the CAP.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. | Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Due to the size and scope of the proposed project, it is below the adopted thresholds of significance of the SLO County Air District for construction-related and operational emissions. This is confirmed through discussion of potential impacts with Air District staff. Therefore, it is determined that the project would not violate or substantially contribute to air quality impacts or violations.

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

Discussion: See III b. above. The proposed project would not exceed adopted thresholds of significance for emissions, and potential air quality impacts would be less than significant.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. | Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There are no sensitive receptors within the airport area of the proposed project. Therefore, the project could not result in impacts to sensitive receptors.

- | | | | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e. | Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project would not result in the creation of objectionable odors from either construction or operation, and the site is surrounded by other light industrial oriented land uses, with no residences in the vicinity. Therefore, the proposed project could not result in impacts due to odors.

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

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Would the project:

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

Discussion: The project area is a previously disturbed site possessing active aircraft support and office uses, contains little vegetation other than predominantly non-native grasses, and is almost completely surrounded by development. Trees on the property are ornamental and non-native, and riparian and/or wetland areas were not observed. The Conservation Element of the City of El Paso de Robles General Plan categorizes this and surrounding properties as “Urban/Disturbed” except a portion to the South categorized as “Agricultural / Rural.” Similarly, the General Plan EIR categorizes this property as “infill” in regards to the Kit Fox Mitigation Area. As such no mitigation is required.

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

Discussion: see discussion above.

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

Discussion: see discussion above.

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

Discussion: See discussion for Section a. above.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: See discussion for Section a. above.

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 Habitat Conservation Plans or other related plans applicable in 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-d): The project site is not located in an area with known 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.

The existing structures on the project site are of relatively recent construction and possess no distinguishing characteristics or historical associations.

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

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 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 the Salinas Rivers valley. The Rinconada Fault system runs on the west side of the valley, and grazes the City on its western boundary. The San Andreas Fault is on the east side of the valley and is situated about 30 miles east of Paso Robles. The City of Paso Robles recognizes these geologic influences in the application of the California Building Code (CBC) 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 and geotechnical 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. There are no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones within City limits.

ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

Discussion: The proposed project will be constructed to current CBC codes. The General Plan EIR identified impacts resulting from ground shaking as less than significant and provided mitigation measures that will be incorporated into the design of this project including adequate structural design and not constructing over active or potentially active faults. Therefore, impacts that may result from seismic ground shaking are considered less than significant.

iii. Seismic-related 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 low potential for liquefaction or other type of ground failure due to seismic events and soil conditions.

iv. Landslides?

Discussion: Per the General Plan Safety Element, the project site is in an area that is designated as a low-risk area for landslides. Therefore, potential impacts due to landslides would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
b. 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: Per the General Plan EIR the soil condition is not erosive or otherwise unstable. As such, no significant impacts are anticipated. The geotechnical study prepared includes standard requirements to assure soil stability due to erosion, including submission of an erosion control plan to be approved by the City Engineer prior to commencement of site grading.				
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion for Sections a & b above.				
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the California Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion for Sections a & b above.				
e. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See discussion for Sections a & b 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: The proposed project is an infill development project in an area with similar uses and expansion of existing site development. This is consistent with land use development policies of the Air District's adopted Clean Air Plan (CAP). Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the CAP.				
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 type="checkbox"/>

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

Discussion: Due to the size and scope of the proposed project` is below the adopted thresholds of significance of the SLO County Air District for construction-related and operational emissions. This is confirmed through discussion of potential impacts with Air District staff. Therefore, it is determined that the project would not violate or substantially contribute to GHG impacts or violations.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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"/> |
| 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 (a-c): Discussion: The use within the proposed new buildings is for the expansion of the existing manufacturing of agricultural farm equipment. The industrial activities do not routinely use or transport hazardous materials. The manufacturing process does not include machinery that produce emissions and the project site is not located in the vicinity of an existing or proposed school.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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: The project site is not identified as a hazardous site per Government Code Section 65962.5.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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: The project is located within the City of Paso Robles Municipal Airport property. It is located in an area of the Airport that is not located within an Airport Safety Zone, and is considered a non-aviation use and conforms with the provisions of the Airport Layout Plan.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The site is not located in close proximity to a private airstrip.				
g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The City does not have <i>adopted</i> emergency response or evacuation plans. Per the City Emergency Services Battalion Chief, the proposed location does not pose a risk that would impair City response to emergencies.				
h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Per the 2003 General Plan Safety Element, and the Public Review Draft of the 2014 Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Update, the project is not in the vicinity of wildland fire hazard areas.				

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 is designed to retain stormwater on-site through installation of various low-impact development (LID) features. The project was designed to reduce impervious surfaces, preserve existing vegetation, and promote groundwater recharge by employing bioretention through implementation of these measures. Thus, water quality standards will be maintained and discharge requirements will be in compliance with State and local regulations. Therefore, impacts to water quality and discharge will be less than significant.

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

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

Discussion: The proposed project would be on the City’s municipal water supply system, therefore it could not individually impact nearby well production. The site is designed to reduce impervious surfaces where possible and to direct surface drainage to onsite retention systems to facilitate groundwater recharge.

- 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: The drainage pattern on the site would not be substantially altered with development of this project since the project largely maintains the existing, historic drainage pattern of the property, and drainage will be maintained on the project site. There are no streams, creeks or rivers on or near the project site that could be impacted from this project or result in erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Therefore, impacts to drainage patterns and facilities would be less than significant.

- d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? (Source: 10)

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

Discussion: See IX c. above. Drainage resulting from development of this property will be maintained onsite and will not contribute to flooding on- or off-site. Thus, flooding impacts from the project are considered less than significant.

- 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)

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

Discussion: As noted in IX a. above, surface drainage will be managed onsite and will not add to offsite drainage facilities. Additionally, onsite LID drainage facilities will be designed to clean pollutants before they enter the groundwater basin. Therefore, drainage impacts that may result from this project would be less than significant.

- f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

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

Discussion: See answers IX a. – e. This project will result in less than significant impacts to water quality.

- g. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?

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

Discussion: There is no housing associated with this project nor is there any housing in the near vicinity downstream from the site and the site is not within or near a flood hazard area. Therefore this project could not result in flood related impacts to housing.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The property is not within or near a 100-year flood hazard area.				
i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See IX h. above. Additionally, there are no levees or dams in the City.				
j. Inundation by mudflow?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: In accordance with the Paso Robles General Plan, there are no mudflow hazards located on or near the project site. Therefore, the project could not result in mudflow inundation impacts.				
k. Conflict with any Best Management Practices found within the City's Storm Water Management Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project will implement the City's Storm Water Management Plan - Best Management Practices. Therefore, it would not conflict with these measures.				
l. Substantially decrease or degrade watershed storage of runoff, wetlands, riparian areas, aquatic habitat, or associated buffer zones?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project will incorporate all feasible means to manage water runoff on the project site. There is no wetland or riparian areas in the near vicinity, and the project could not result in impacts to aquatic habitat. Therefore, the project will not result in significant impacts to these resources.				

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: The project consists of adding buildings to an existing site that is currently developed with buildings, parking, and outdoor storage areas. The addition of the proposed buildings will not divide an established community.				
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 development and use complies with the AP zoning designation and the BP land use designations.				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans established in this area of the City. Therefore, there could be no conflicts with conservation plans.				

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: There are no known mineral resources at this project site.				
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: There are no known mineral resources at this project site.				

XII. NOISE: Would the project result in:

a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Source: 1)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion (a-c): The project consists of adding buildings to an existing site that is currently developed with buildings, parking, and outdoor storage areas. This project is associated with an existing business that manufactures agriculture related machinery. The addition of the proposed buildings will not increase noise, vibration levels from the current levels associated with the industrial business.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Discussion: There will be an increase in noise level with the construction activities for this project. However, based on the remoteness of the site and its proximity to other industrial type uses the noise levels will not be significant.

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: The project is located within the City of Paso Robles Municipal Airport property. It is located in an area of the Airport that is not located within an Airport Safety Zone, and is considered a non-aviation use and conforms with the provisions of the Airport Layout Plan.

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

Discussion (a-c): The project consists of adding buildings to an existing site that is currently developed with buildings, parking, and outdoor storage areas. The addition of the proposed buildings will not impact population or housing.

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

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"/> |
| b. Police protection? (Sources: 1,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Other public facilities? (Sources: 1,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion (a-e): The proposed project will not result in a significant demand for additional new services since it is not proposing to include new neighborhoods or a significantly large scale development that cannot be provided services through existing resources, and the incremental impacts to services can be mitigated through payment of standard development impact fees. Therefore, impacts that may result from this project on public services are considered less than significant.

XV. RECREATION

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion (a-b): The proposed industrial development project will not encourage new housing demands, therefore it will not result in an increase in demand for recreational facilities or accelerate deterioration of recreational facilities.

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

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC: Would the project:

a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures or 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion (a-b): It is not anticipated that the trips created by this expansion to an existing industrial use will create enough traffic trips that would significantly impact any of the roadways or intersections in the vicinity of this project. Since the use is permitted in the AP zone and consistent with the BP land use designation, traffic related to this use would not have a less than significant impact on the City's circulation system or standards.

c. Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

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

Discussion: The project would not require a change in air traffic patterns.

d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

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

Discussion: The design of the existing adjacent streets would not need to change as a result of this project.

e. Result in inadequate emergency access?

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

Discussion: This project has been reviewed by the Emergency Services Department and complies with their requirements for access.

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?

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

Discussion: The project as proposed will not trigger new road improvements. In the future when the ultimate design for Dry Creek Road is determined, public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities will need to be

addressed.

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

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS: Would the project:

a. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

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 (a-b): The project will need to provide for a septic system, or utilize the existing septic system since City sewer facilities are not available for this site. The project will be required to meet City and State standards for septic systems.

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: The project will be required to provide low impact development, best management practices with the design of the grading and drainage for this project. Based on the site size and the proposed impervious surfaces, low impact drainage facilities can be provided for on site, therefore this impact will be less than significant.

d. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Discussion: This project is already connected to the City's municipal water system with the existing buildings and office. The new buildings will not require a separate connection to the system. Sufficient water is available to serve the project and no new facilities or entitlements are necessary.

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 projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments?

Discussion: See Section b. above.

f. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

Discussion: The project can be served by the existing landfill.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Solid Waste services are available for this project.				

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

Discussion: Based on the site size, characteristics, existing disturbance and relatively low impact use, the development of this project will not degrade or substantially reduce habitat, threaten or reduce the plant or animal community, reduce or restrict endangered plants and animals.

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

Discussion: Since this project complies with the AP/BP designations and is consistent with the other types of business park/industrial type developments in the area, the impacts of the addition of this project 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: Given that the project complies with the zoning and land use designations for this area of the City, and since the project is an expansion of the existing facility where the same use will continue, and since the proposed development would only develop less than 50-percent of the site, the project will not impact human beings, either directly or indirectly.

EARLIER ANALYSIS AND BACKGROUND MATERIALS.

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

Earlier Documents Prepared and Utilized in this Analysis and Background / Explanatory Materials

<u>Reference #</u>	<u>Document Title</u>	<u>Available for Review at:</u>
1	City of Paso Robles General Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446
2	City of Paso Robles Zoning Code	Same as above
3	City of Paso Robles Environmental Impact Report for General Plan Update	Same as above
4	2005 Airport Land Use Plan	Same as above
5	City of Paso Robles Municipal Code	Same as above
6	City of Paso Robles Water Master Plan	Same as above
7	City of Paso Robles Urban Water Management Plan 2010	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 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	Gateway Design Standards	Community Development Department
15	Paso Robles Bicycle Master Plan	Same as above
16	Development Impact Fees (DIF) in accordance with Council Resolution No. 14-035, and related Justification Study prepared by David Taussig & Associates dated March 20, 2014.	Community Development Department
17	Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared by Caltrans and the City of Paso Robles dated December 2009 (SCH # 2008051102) and related Project Approval/Environmental Document (PAED)	Community Development Department

Attachments:

1. Vicinity Map
2. Site Plan