RESOLUTION NO: 08-105

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PASO ROBLES ADOPTING OF A NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR THE GATEWAY DESIGN STANDARDS

WHEREAS, the City's General Plan and Economic Strategy includes numerous goals, policies and action items in support of improving the visual quality of the City's gateway; and

WHEREAS, the City initiated preparation of the Gateway Design Standards project with the intent of creating design standards to enhance and upgrade the City's gateways to be more attractive entrances to the City; and

WHEREAS, the proposed Gateway Design Standards are intended to affect the landscape and development at the City's "Entryways" from Highway 101, and the City's "Town and County" gateways AT the edges of the City; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes that it will need to collaborate with Caltrans and San Luis Obispo County regarding improvements adjacent to the highways and development projects in the County, to ensure consistency with the Gateway Design Standards; 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 Gateway Design 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 and circulated for 30 days as required by Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the Planning Commission on March 11, 2008 to consider the Initial Study, the proposed Negative Declaration prepared for this project, and to accept public testimony on the Gateway Design Standards, and environmental determination, and the Planning Commission recommended approval of the Draft Negative Declaration to the City Council; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was conducted by the City Council on May 6, 2008 and August 5, 2008 to consider the Initial Study, the proposed Negative Declaration prepared for this project, and to accept public testimony on the Gateway Design Standards, 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 City Council finds that there is no

substantial evidence that there would be a significant impact on the environment as a result of the Gateway Design Standards.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of El Paso de Robles, based on its independent judgment, that it does hereby adopt a Negative Declaration for the Gateway Design Standards 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 5th day of August, 2008, by the following roll call vote:

AYES:Hamon, Picanco, Strong, and MechamNOES:ABSENT:ABSENT:NemethABSTAIN:Image: Straight of the strai

ATTEST:

Frank Mecham, Mayor

Deborah Robinson, Deputy City Clerk

CITY OF PASO ROBLES – P INITIAL STUDY

1. GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

PROJECT TITLE:	El Paso de Robles Gateway Design Standards
LEAD AGENCY:	City of Paso Robles - 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
Contact: Telephone:	Susan DeCarli, AICP, Planning Manager (805) 237-3970
PROJECT LOCATION:	Citywide gateways and entryways
PROJECT PROPONENT:	City of Paso Robles
LEAD AGENCY CONTACT/ INITIAL STUDY PREPARED BY:	Susan DeCarli, AICP, Planning Manager
Telephone:	(805) 237-3970
Facsimile:	(805) 237-3904
E-Mail:	sdecarli@prcity.com
GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:	Not applicable
ZONING:	Not applicable

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This project provides development standards to assist in creating attractive and cohesive transitions at the City's "gateways" from surrounding rural areas, and "entryways" from Highways 101 and 46. The standards include addressing: grading; site planning; building form; landscaping; fencing; signs and other associated activities visible from the City's gateways. See attached Exhibit 1.

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

None.

4. EARLIEK ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS AND RELATED ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION:

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

5. CONTEXT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FOR THE PROJECT:

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

08/05/2008 Agenda Item No. 2, Page 39 of 62

6. PURPOSES OF AN INITIAL STUDY

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

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

7. EXPLANATION OF ANSWERS FOUND ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

A. Scope of Environmental Review

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

B. Evaluation of Environmental Impacts

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

08/05/2008 Agenda Item No. 2, Page 40 of 62

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

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

8. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

□ Land Use & Planning	□ Transportation/Circulation	□ Public Services		
□ Population & Housing	□ Biological Resources	□ Utilities & Service Systems		
Geological Problems	□ Energy & Mineral Resources	□ Aesthetics		
□ Water	□ Hazards	□ Cultural Resources		
□ Air Quality	□ Noise	□ Recreation		
	□ Mandatory Findings of Significance			

9. ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION: On the basis of this initial evaluation: I find that:

The proposed project could not have a significant therefore, a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will	· ·	
Although the proposed project could have a signifi will not be a significant effect in this case because an attached sheet have been added to the project. NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.	the mitigation measures described on	D
The proposed project may have a significant effect ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is requ		
The proposed project may have a significant efference of the proposed project may have a significant efference of the effects (1) have been adequately analyzed applicable legal standards, and (2) have been address the earlier analysis as described on attached significant impact" or is "potentially significant un Therefore, an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT of the effect of the environment of t	in an earlier document pursuant to essed by mitigation measures based on neets, if the effect is a "potentially less mitigated."	
only the effect or effects that remain to be addresse		
Signatore:	Uate:	

Echicary H. 2018

Susan DeCarli, AICP, Planning Manager

1() E	nvironmental Checklist Form	Potentially	Potentially Significant Unless	Less Than	
IS	SSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):		Significant Impact	Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact	No Impact
I.		AND USE AND PLANNING. Would the Proposal: Conflict with general plan designation or zoning? (Sources: 1 & 8)				
		Discussion: The proposed Gateway Design Standards implement Design criteria would not conflict with general plan designation conflict with standards in the Zoning Code; instead they are a City's gateways. In locations where the standards suggested Caltrans right-of-way, it would be at the discretion of those development practices.	ons or proper additive to the would apply	ty zoning. Stan development re in the County?	dards in this p egulations app s jurisdiction	roject do not licable at the or with in the
	b)	Conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project? (Sources: 1 & 3)				\square
		Discussion: The proposed project complies with the EIR recent	ly certified for	the City Genera	al Plan Update	, 2 00 3 .
	c)	Be incompatible with existing land uses in the vicinity? (Sources: 1 & 3)				Ŋ
		Discussion: The project is not incompatible with existing land to to new, proposed development.	uses at the City	y's gateways. T	hese standards	would apply
	d)	Affect agricultural resources or operations (e.g., impacts to soils or farmlands, or impacts from incompatible uses)?				
		Discussion: This project does not directly affect agricultural real and forms, rural development patterns, and agricultural activities			s retention of t	natural
	e)	Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (Sources: 1 & 3)				
		Discussion: This project does not propose site development. The arrangement of land uses in the community.	erefore, the p	prøject will not a	lisrupt or divid	le the
PF.	Įr,	PULATION AND HOUSING. Would the proposal:				
		Canadatively of reed official regions for loan population majoritoury (flamous, recom	17 - 7 2 - -	t. 	and the second sec	€
		Discussion: This project does not affect population and housing projections.	r, and wilt the	efore, not result	in exceeding j	population
	b)	Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or				\checkmark

08/05/2008 Agenda Item No. 2, Page 43 of 62

10 H	Environmental Checklist Form	N	Potentially Significant		
ISSU	JES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Imapact
	extension of major infrastructure)? (Sources: 1 & 3)				
	Discussion: This project does not affect growth such as extend therefore, not result in inducing growth.	ling infrastructu	re or n ew develo	opment areas,	and will
c)	Displace existing housing, especially affordable housing? (Sources: 1, 3, & 5)				
	Discussion: This project does not propose housing, and will the	herefore not dis	place existing he	ousing.	
	EOLOGIC PROBLEMS. Would the proposal result in expose people to potential impacts involving:				
a)	Fault rupture? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)				\square
	Discussion: The proposed project does not include physical de people to potential geological impacts.	evelopment, and	l will therefore r	not result in or	expose
b)	Seismic ground shaking? (Sources:1, 2, & 3)				\mathbf{N}
	Discussion: See IIIa.				
c)	Seismic ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 2 & 3)				$\mathbf{\nabla}$
	Discussion: See IIIa				
d)	Seiche, tsunami, or volcanic hazard? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)				
	Discussion: See IIIa				
e)	Landslides or Mudflows? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)	1 - van			\square
	N				
ſ	e ost a character in trademental a ansable succeeditions force committee grading or fill? [Sources: 1, 5, 4, & 1]	(), ,			
	Discussion: See IIIa				
g)	Subsidence of the land? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)				\checkmark

08/05/2008 Agenda Item No. 2, Page 44 of 62

10 E	nvironmental Checklist Form	Potentially	Potentially Significant Unless	Less Than	
ISSU	ES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact	No Impact
	Discussion: See IIIa				
h)	Expansive soils? (Sources: 4)				$\mathbf{\nabla}$
	Discussion: See IIIa.				
i)	Unique geologic or physical features? (Sources:1 & 3)				\checkmark
	Discussion: See IIIa				
IV. W	ATER. Would the proposal result in:				
a)	Changes in absorption rates, drainage patterns, or the rate and amount of surface runoff? (Sources:1, 3, & 7)				
	Discussion: The proposed project does not include physical de water resources.	velopment, and	l will therefore n	ot result in im	pacts to
b)	Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				
	Discussion: See IVa.				
c)	Discharge into surface waters or other alteration of surface water quality (e.g., temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity)? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				\square
	Discussion: See IVa.				
d)	Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				$\overline{\mathcal{A}}$
	Discussion: See Wa.				
ĉ,	Changes in currents, or the course or direction of water in over 1975 Courses and 1977		j - F State of the state of the		(s.) 1
	ipongologi - Sea II a				
f)	Change in the quantity of ground waters, either through direct additions or withdrawals, or through interception of an aquifer by cuts or excavations or through substantial loss of groundwater recharge capability? (Sources: 1.3, & 7)				V

08/05/2008 Agenda Item No. 2, Page 45 of 62

10	E	nvironmental Checklist Form	Potentially	Potentially Significant Unless	Less Than	
IS	SUI	ES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Significant Impact	Mitigation Incorporated	Significant Impact	No Impact
		Discussion: See IVa.				
	g)	Altered direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				V
		Discussion: See IVa.				
	h)	Impacts to groundwater quality? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				
		Discussion: See IVa.				
	i)	Substantial reduction in the amount of groundwater otherwise available for public water supplies? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				\mathbf{N}
		Discussion: See IVa.				
V.	AI	R QUALITY. Would the proposal:				
	a)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				
		Discussion: The proposed project does not include physical dev resources.	velopment, and	will therefore n	ot result in imj	pacts to air
	b)	Expose sensitive receptors to pollutants? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				\square
		Discussion: See Va.				
	c)	Alter air movement, moisture, or temperature? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				\square
		Discussion: See Va.				
	d)	Create state or other odors?	• • .	- - 	1	1
		, i.e.iisidaa – See E.a.				
		ANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION. Would the posal result in:				
	a)	Increased vehicle (rips or traffic congestion? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				\square

08/05/2008 Agenda Item No. 2, Page 46 of 62

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

Discussion: The proposed project does not include physical development, and will therefore not result in impacts to transportation or circulation.

b)	Hazards to safety from design features (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				
	Discussion: See VIa.				
c)	Inadequate emergency access or inadequate access to nearby uses? (Sources:1, 3, & 7)				
	Discussion: See VIa.				
d)	Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (Sources: 1, 3, 7, & 8)				\square
	Discussion: See Vla.				
e)	Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (Source: 7)				
	Discussion: See Via				
f)	Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (Sources: 1 & 8)				
	Discussion: See Via.				
g)	Rail, waterborne or air traffic impacts?				\square
	Discussion: Via.				
HOL Fracts	OCICAL RESOURCES. Woold the proposal result in to:				
	e a l'encara e su la care specier or treir (disputs (debedons) not l'inited de planic, fich, insocis, adminis, and blads)?	i de la compañía	for a second sec	i In agree of the)

Discussion: a-e. The proposed project does not include physical development, therefore, this project could not impact these resources.

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

08/05/2008 Agenda Item No. 2, Page 47 of 62

10 Environmental Checklist Form ISSUES (and Supporting Information Sources):		Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
					\mathbf{N}
	Discussion: See above.				
c)	Locally designated natural communities (e.g., oak forest, coastal habitat, etc.)?				
	Discussion: See above.				
d)	Wetland habitat (e.g., marsh, riparian and vernal pool)?				
	Discussion: See above.				
e)	Wildlife dispersal or migration corridors?				\square
	Discussion: See above.				
	ENERGY AND MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the proposal:				
a)	Conflict with adopted energy conservation plans? (Sources: 1 & 7)				\square
	Discussion: This project could not affect or conflict with energ	y conservation	plans.		
b)	Use non-renewable resources in a wasteful and inefficient manner? (Sources: 1 & 7)				\square
	Discussion: The project will not use non-renewable resource in	ı a wasteful an	d inefficient mar	ner.	
c)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the State? (Sources: 1 & 7)				
	rmennesse. The project decement in the physical devolution computer	and the sfore	wild ng sasali	in 138 of tuin	
N. II.	AZARDS. Would the proposal involve.				
a)	A risk of accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to: oil, pesticides,				\checkmark

chemicals or radiation)?

/08/05/2008 Agenda Item No. 2, Page 48 of 62

		nvironmental Checklist Form ES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Im pact
		Discussion: No development is proposed with this project there	fore it could ne	ot result in haza	rd related imp	acts.
	b)	Possible interference with an emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? (Sources: 1 & 7)				M
		Discussion: Refer to item a.				
	c)	The creation of any health hazard or potential hazards?				
		Discussion: Refer to item a.				
	d)	Increased fire hazard in areas with flammable brush, grass, or trees?				M
		Discussion: Refer to item a.				
X.	NC	DISE. Would the proposal result in:				
	a)	Increases in existing noise levels? (Sources: 1, 7, & 8)				\checkmark
		Discussion: No development is proposed with this project, there	efore it could n	ot result in noise	e related impa	cts.
	b)	Exposure of people to severe noise levels? (Source: 3)				
		See item a.				
XI.	upo	JBLIC SERVICES. Would the proposal have an effect n, or result in a need for new or altered government services in of the following areas:				
	a)	Fire protection? (Sources: 1, 3, 6, & 7)				\checkmark
	b)	Police Protection? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				
	c)	Schools? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)		Π		P4
		Et vintenance of public facilities, and balance reado? (Sources: 1, 5, & 7)				
	t''s	Contact groups and the source of $(1, 0, 0) = (81, 1, 5, 3, 5, 7)$	1	Antonia La		4 4 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

Discussion: a.-e) No development is proposed with this project, therefore it could not result in public service related impacts.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the proposal result in a need for new systems or supplies, or

^{'08/05/2008} Agenda Item No. 2, Page 49 of 62

10 E	Environmental Checklist Form		Potentially Significant		
ISSU	ES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	substantial alterations to the following utilities:				
a)	Power or natural gas? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				\checkmark
b)	Communication systems? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				$\mathbf{\nabla}$
c)	Local or regional water treatment or distribution facilities? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				\square
d)	Sewer or septic tanks? (Sources: 1, 3, 7, & 8)				
e)	Storm water drainage? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				\square
f)	Solid waste disposal? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				\square
g)	Local or regional water supplies? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				\square
	Discussion: ag. The project will not result in the need for new to utilities and service systems.	v s ystems or su	pplies, or result	in substantial	alterations
XIII.	AESTHETICS. Would the proposal:				
a)	Affect a scenic vista or scenic highway? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				\square
	Discussion: This project is designed to result in a beneficial im design sensitivity and standards to address visual impacts at spe	•		's gateways by	requiring
b)	Have a demonstrable negative aesthetic effect? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				\square
	Discussion: See XIIIa.				
c)	Create light or glare? (Sources: 1, 3, 7, & 8)				\checkmark
	Discussion: See XIIIa				
XIV. (THEFTERAL RESOURCES. Would be proposal:				
8 J	Disturb paleontological resources? (Sources: 1, 3, & /)	6 B			r.y
	Triscussion of extrement is propered whereasts project the eq	fere a could n.	www.1036.0656.	es gravat	anana tao 200
b)	Disturb archaeological resources? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				\checkmark

The state of the s	Disci	ussion:	See	XIVa.
--	-------	---------	-----	-------

^{1/0}08/05/2008 Agenda Item No. 2, Page 50 of 62

10 Environmental Checklist Form Potentially					
ISSU	ES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c)	Affect historical resources? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				\mathbf{N}
	Discussion: see item a. above.				
d)	Have the potential to cause a physical change which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				V
	Discussion: Refer to item a.				
e)	Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				\square
	Discussion: Refer to item a.				
XV.R	ECREATION. Would the proposal:				
a)	Increase the demand for neighborhood or regional parks or other recreational facilities? (Sources: 1, 3, & 7)				
	Discussion: This project could not affect recreation resources.				
b)	Affect existing recreational opportunities? (Sources 1, 3, & 7)				\square
	Discussion: The project will not affect existing recreational opp	ortunities.			
XVI.M	IANDATORY 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				

Discussion: This project does not include development and it could not result in impacts that would degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a field or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drow heldwelf. Sustaining locale threaten to elipitude a obtained or animal community reduce the obtained of the engine of a field or animal community reduce the obtained of the engine of the

the atsauranage of long-terror concurational grade.

Discussion: This project will likely result in beneficial long term environmental goals since it will help address visual impacts, reduce grading, and help provide for more site sensitive development practices at the City's gateways.

c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited.

a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or

prehistory? (Sources: 1 & 3)

¹⁰08/05/2008 Agenda Item No. 2, Page 51 of 62

10 Er	vironmental Checklist Form		Potentially Significant		
ISSUE	ES (and Supporting Information Sources):	Potentially Significant Impact	Unless Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.) (Sources: 1 & 3)				\mathbf{N}
	Discussion: This project will not result in cumulative environmental impacts.				
d)	Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? (Sources: 1 & 3)				

Discussion: This project does not have the potential to result in substantial adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly.

11. EARLIER ANALYSIS AND BACKGROUND MATERIALS

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

Reference Number	Document Title	Available for Review At
1	City of Paso Robles General Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
2	Seismic Safety Element for City of Paso Robles	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
3	Final Environmental Impact Report City of Paso Robles General Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
4	Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, California Paso Robles Area	USDA-NRCS, 65 Main Street-Suite 108 Templeton, CA 93465
5	Uniform Building Code	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
6	City of Paso Robles Standard Conditions of Approval For New Development	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
7	City of Paso Robles Zoning Code	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
8	City of Paso Robles, Water Master Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
9	City of Paso Robles, Sewer Master Plan	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446
10	Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street, Paso Robles, CA 93446

Exhibit - Gateway Design Standards