

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This section summarizes the characteristics of the proposed project, alternatives, environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and residual impacts associated with the proposed project.

### PROJECT SYNOPSIS

#### Project Applicant

The project applicant for the Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan is:

City of El Paso de Robles  
Department of Community Development  
1000 Spring Street  
Paso Robles, California 93446

Contacts:

- Bob Lata, Contract Planner, [bob@prcity.com](mailto:bob@prcity.com)  
~~Community Development Director~~  
~~(805) 237-3970~~
- Ron Whisenand, Community Development Director, [rwhisenand@prcity.com](mailto:rwhisenand@prcity.com)  
(805) 237-3970

#### Project Description

The proposed project, known as the Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan, involves the modification of the current General Plan land use designations. The existing General Plan includes the following underlying land use designations within the planning area:

- BP, Business Park (81.0 acres)
- CS, Commercial Service (34.1 acres)
- NC, Neighborhood Commercial
- RS, Residential Suburban [0.4 Dwelling Units/acre] (575.3 acres)
- RSF-2, Residential Single Family [2 Dwelling Units / acre] (89.6 acres)
- RSF-6, Residential Single-Family [6 Dwelling Units / Acre] (13.2 acres, in subarea 17)
- RMF-9, Residential Multi-Family [9 Dwelling Units / Acre] (14.1 acres, in subarea 16)

The 826.7-acre Chandler Ranch site is located at the eastern end of the City of Paso Robles. The subject property is bounded by State Route 46 East on the north, the intersection of Fontana and Linne Roads to the south, Golden Hill Road on the west and the City boundary on the east. Barney Schwartz Park is located within the northernmost extent of the study area.

The project site is mostly vacant and can be characterized by rolling terrain with a major north-south trending drainage area in the central portion of the site. The proposed Specific Plan



would facilitate the development of 20 areas that have been established for development within the Plan Area. Land use designations within these development areas include:

- Residential Suburban (RS)
- Residential Single-Family-1 (RSF-1)
- Residential Single-Family-2 (RSF-2)
- Residential Single-Family-3 (RSF-3)
- Residential Single-Family-4 (RSF-4)
- Residential Single-Family-6 (RSF-6)
- Residential Multi-Family-8 (RMF-8)
- Residential Multi-Family-9 (RMF-9)
- Neighborhood Commercial (NC)
- Commercial Service (CS)
- Parks and Open Space (POS)
- Public Facility (PF)

The Specific Plan site is proposed to include a maximum buildout of 1,439 dwelling units and 280,500 square feet of commercial space with the dedication of 303.9 acres of open space. It should be noted that the Specific Plan would not provide approval of a precise project but would be used to guide future development and to evaluate future project proposals.

## **ALTERNATIVES**

Three alternatives to the proposed project were selected for consideration as follows:

- *Alternative 1: Existing Zoning Alternative*
- *Alternative 2: Proposed August 2004 Specific Plan Land Use Scenario*
- *Alternative 3: No Project, No Development Alternative*

The No Project Alternative (Alternative 3) is considered environmentally superior overall, since no development would occur. Among the remaining development scenarios, none are considered clearly superior to the proposed project. Alternative 1 has both greater and less impacts than the proposed project. Impacts related to physical development are generally greater, since there would be no provision for open space protection, and the entire site could be developed. Impacts related to housing development would generally be less, since this alternative would allow substantially less housing than the proposed project. However, this scenario does not include the extensive mitigative guidelines that are included as part of the proposed project, suggesting that impacts related to land development impacts under this scenario could be greater. The lack of open space, a central location for Airport Road within the drainage area, and difficulties related to implementing hillside grading techniques produced greater impacts related to land use, noise, geologic hazards, cultural resources, aesthetics, drainage, biological resources and the extension of infrastructure. On the other hand, the reduced level of development made this scenario superior with respect to traffic, air quality, and for some issues related to noise, geology, drainage and public services.

Alternative 2 is the August 2004 Draft Specific Plan Land Use Scenario, and it is not environmentally superior to the proposed project. This conclusion is logical, since the proposed



project was developed as a refinement of the August 2004 Draft Specific Plan to address potential impacts that may have occurred as a result of development under the previous scenario. Mitigative features of the proposed project include 1) more open space; 2) less commercial development; 3) refined building envelopes to minimize impacts to habitat and steep slopes; 4) more extensive mitigative development guidelines; and 5) less land use conflict potential in the vicinity of Barney Schwartz Park. The alternatives analysis is described in further detail in Section 6.0, *Alternatives*.

## **AREAS OF CONCERN**

Pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines § 15123, this EIR acknowledges the areas of concern and issues to be resolved which are known to the City of El Paso de Robles or were raised during the scoping process. An Initial Study/Notice of Preparation was prepared and circulated for a 30-day public review period that began on February 2, 2004 and ended March 4, 2004. Two comment letters from public agencies (i.e., California Department of Transportation and California Regional Water Quality Control Board) and one comment letter from a citizen (Katherine Barnett) were received in response to the NOP. The NOP and comment letters are included in Appendix A of this EIR.

Primary environmental areas of concern raised by the commenting agencies and public include:

- ❖ Traffic impacts on State Route 46 and U.S. Route 101;
- ❖ Construction impacts on water quality;
- ❖ Post construction impacts on stormwater runoff volumes, velocities, and water quality;
- ❖ Impacts to wetlands;
- ❖ Wastewater systems;
- ❖ The use of reclaimed water;
- ❖ Volume of water use;
- ❖ Hillside grading;
- ❖ Construction impacts on air quality;
- ❖ Impacts to the San Joaquin Kit Fox and/or their habitat;
- ❖ Oak Tree Preservation;
- ❖ Aesthetics; and
- ❖ Affordable Housing.

## **SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Table ES-1 identifies project environmental impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and residual impacts. Table ES-2 follows to identify cumulative impacts resulting from buildout of the proposed project in conjunction with the approved and pending cumulative development near the project site. Table ES-3 summarizes potential growth inducing aspects of the proposed Specific Plan. Impacts are organized by classes. Each bolded impact listing also contains a statement of the significance determination for the environmental impact as follows:

*Class I. Significant and Unavoidable: An impact that cannot be reduced to below the threshold level given reasonably available and feasible mitigation measures. Such an impact requires a*



*Statement of Overriding Considerations to be issued if the project is approved per §15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines.*

*Class II. Significant but Mitigable: An impact that can be reduced to below the threshold level given reasonably available and feasible mitigation measures. Such an impact requires findings to be made under §15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines.*

*Class III. Not Significant: An impact that may be adverse, but does not exceed the threshold levels and does not require mitigation measures. However, mitigation measures that could further lessen the environmental effect may be suggested if readily available and easily achievable.*

*Class IV. Beneficial: An effect that would reduce existing environmental problems or hazards.*

Refer to Section 1.5 of this EIR for a discussion of additional effects found not to be significant through the Initial Study process and additional analyses. Issue areas with effects found not to be significant include: biological resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, land use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, and transportation and traffic.

**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS I IMPACTS (Significant and Unavoidable)</b>  |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Impact</b>   | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b>  |
| <b>LAND USE AND AGRICULTURE</b>   |   |   |
| <p><b>Impact LU-1</b> The proposed Specific Plan would convert lands currently used for livestock grazing to urban use and may create conflicts in some instances, particularly where urban and off-site agricultural uses would directly abut each other. This is considered a Class I, significant and unavoidable impact.</p>  | <p><b><u>Specific Plan Policies:</u></b></p> <p><b>Policy LU-17</b> (Agricultural Land Use Conflicts)</p> <p><b><u>Subarea Specific Policies:</u></b></p> <p><b>Disclosure Agreements</b> (Applies to Subareas 5, 6, 7, 9, 14, 16, 18 and 19)</p> <p><b>Agriculture Buffer</b> (Applies to Subareas 5, 6, 7, 9, 14, 16 and 19)</p> <p><b><u>EIR Mitigation Measures:</u></b></p> <p><b>LU-1(a) Air Conditioning.</b> All future residential development that is not buffered from adjacent agricultural uses by other homes or vegetative screening shall be equipped with air conditioning units to reduce potential noise and air quality impacts from existing agricultural operations.</p> <p><b>LU-1(b) Airport Road Construction Timing.</b> Grading and construction activities associated with the development of Airport Road shall not occur during harvest periods of adjacent vineyards. The appropriate timing of such activities shall be determined by the City in coordination with the County Agricultural Commissioner and neighboring vineyards operators.</p> <p><b>LU-1(c) No-Climb Fencing.</b> Those developers who have the responsibility to construct Airport Road shall install no-climb fencing on the boundary of the Airport Road right-of-way and adjacent vineyard operations to discourage trespassing onto agricultural properties, where the Airport Road right-of-way is adjacent to such operations.</p> | <p>Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan policies and proposed mitigation measures would reduce compatibility conflicts between urban and agricultural uses in the subareas to a large extent, but a significant unmitigable impact (Class I) would occur along the eastern edge of the Specific Plan area.</p>  |
| <b>TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</b>   |   |   |
| <p><b>Impact T-1</b> The addition of traffic generated by the Specific Plan to existing traffic volumes would cause eight intersections (including the SR 46E/US 101 intersection) to operate at unacceptable levels during peak hours. The project would also cause the Spring Street/US 101 off-ramp, both north- and southbound offramps at SR46W/US 101, and the northbound onramp at SR 46W/US 101 to operate at unacceptable levels of service.</p> | <p><b><u>Specific Plan Policies:</u></b></p> <p><b>Policy C-1</b> (Circulation Plan)</p> <p><b>Policy C-2</b> (Circulation Improvements) Includes the following on-site and off-site improvements programmed as part of the Specific Plan:</p> <p><b><u>Onsite (to be constructed by developers):</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Airport Road extension between Highway 46 East and Union Road to arterial standards</li> <li>• Airport Road extension between Union Road and Linne Road to arterial standards</li> <li>• Extension of Sherwood Road to arterial standards</li> </ul>   | <p>With implementation of these Specific Plan policies and improvements, impacts to roadways and intersection operations would be reduced to the extent feasible. Development within the Specific Plan area will pay a fair share of off-site traffic impact fees as development occurs over time. As these fees are collected, priority mitigation improvements will be constructed to maintain the City's LOS goals. However, operations at some roadways and intersections off-site would be at an unacceptable LOS under post-Specific Plan conditions until improvements were constructed. No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS I IMPACTS (Significant and Unavoidable)</b>  |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Impact</b>   | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>   | <b>Residual Impact</b>  |
| <p>This would result in a Class I, <i>significant and unavoidable</i>, impact under Existing Plus Specific Plan Conditions.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extension of Gilead Lane to Airport Road to collector standards</li> <li>• Golden Hill and Union Road frontages to be constructed to 4-lane arterial standards</li> <li>• Wherever feasible, traffic calming measures shall be designed and implemented instead of installing traffic signals and/or traffic control devices that tend to hinder constant traffic flow. When traffic calming measures are not feasible, traffic signals and/or other controls shall be installed at locations designed by the City Engineer.</li> <li>• Airport Road bridge/crossing over unnamed drainage in east- central portion of site</li> <li>• Gilead Lane bridge/crossing over central drainage feature</li> <li>• Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan trail system, which may include all-weather creek crossings</li> <li>• Traffic Calming Measures where appropriate/applicable</li> <li>• LED lighted crosswalks, especially near school</li> <li>• Airport Road bridge over Huerhuero Creek</li> <li>• Applicable share of Airport Road connection to Highway 46 East</li> </ul> <p><u>Offsite (to be constructed by City through payment of fees, a portion of which would be generated by development within the Specific Plan):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>State Route 46 East/US 101 intersection.</u> An interim improvement is being proposed by Caltrans to add dual left turn lanes in the westbound direction of SR 46E for the southbound U.S. 101 on-ramp. With this improvement, an additional westbound through lane will be added at the northbound ramp intersection, which will add sufficient capacity to improve Level of Service at both of these intersections.</li> <li>• <u>Union Road/SR 46 East intersection.</u> Subject to Caltrans approval, modify intersection to right turn only from Union Road to SR 46 East, prohibiting a left turn from Union Road to SR 46. With prohibition of left turn movement, this Level of Service and safety problem could be mitigated to acceptable levels. This improvement would also relieve future projected Level of Service problems at the Union Road/Union Road extension intersection.</li> <li>• <u>Union Road/Golden Hill Road intersection.</u> Subject to Caltrans approval, signalization and some additional widening or creation of a roundabout would provide interim traffic congestion relief and improve Levels of Service to acceptable conditions.</li> <li>• <u>Golden Hill Road/SR 46 East.</u> Intersection to be improved in accordance with EIR mitigation.</li> </ul> | <p>this impact to an acceptable level. Therefore, impacts would remain Class I, <i>significant and unavoidable</i>.</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS I IMPACTS (Significant and Unavoidable)</b>  |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Impact</b>   | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b>   |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Rolling Hills Road/Golden Hill Road</u>. Intersection be improved in accordance with EIR mitigation.</li> <li>• <u>Niblick Road/Creston Road</u>. Intersection to be improved in accordance with EIR mitigation.</li> <li>• <u>Golden Hill Road/SR 46 intersection</u>. Recognizing that commercial development north of Gilead Lane is limited, particularly if access to SR 46E is restricted to a right turn movement only at the Union Road/SR 46E intersection, further improvements should occur at the Golden Hill Road/SR 46E intersection before full development of the commercial uses north of Gilead Lane.</li> <li>• <u>Airport Road/SR 46 East intersection</u>. A Project Study Report (PSR) is being prepared that is intended to evaluate both interim and long-term improvement needs for this intersection. Subject to Caltrans approval, interim improvements may consist of an at-grade signalized intersection. The PSR will determine long-term improvement needs including right-of-way requirements for the long-term needs. A connection from Airport Road to SR 46E should be made prior to full development of commercial uses north of Gilead Lane.</li> <li>• <u>Golden Hill Road/SR 46 East</u>. Assuming that SR 46E remains a four-lane divided arterial through its intersections with Golden Hill Road and that residential development occurs before all commercial development, 1,200 residential units (80% of total) within the CRASP could be accommodated with the following intersection configuration at SR 46E/Golden Hill Road: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Northbound and southbound Golden Hill Road – one lane for each turn movement (left, through, right)</li> <li>○ Eastbound and westbound SR 46E – one left-turn lane, two through-lanes, one right-turn lane.</li> <li>○ Signalize all approaches with protected phasing.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Policy C-5</b> (Right-of-Way Dedication and Street Improvement)</p> <p><b>Policy C-6</b> (Funding Improvements)</p> <p><b>Policy C-8</b> (Airport Road and Sherwood Road Obligations)</p> <p>Please refer to mitigation measures associated with Impact T-4 (cumulative impacts) for further discussion of potential mitigation measures to reduce impacts.</p> |  |
| <b>Impact T-4</b> Addition of traffic generated by the Specific Plan to Year 2025 Mitigated Base Plus | The following intersections and associated roadways require improvements to mitigate future 2025 traffic conditions to acceptable levels:   | Impacts would remain Class I, significant and unavoidable, since funding for the construction of the needed mitigation |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS I IMPACTS (Significant and Unavoidable)</b>  |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Impact</b>   | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>   | <b>Residual Impact</b>  |
| <p>Specific Plan traffic volumes would cause 4 to 7 major intersections, 2 to 4 major roadway segments, and 5-6 freeway ramps to operate at unacceptable levels depending on whether Airport Road is connected to SR 46E, and whether the Charolais Road bridge is built. This would result in a Class I, <i>significant and unavoidable</i>, impact under cumulative development conditions (Year 2025 baseline, plus specific plan development, plus general plan improvement traffic network built).</p> | <p><b>Intersections</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Route 46 East/US 101 NB Ramps</li> <li>• State Route 46 East/US 101 SB Ramps</li> <li>• State Route 46 East/Buena Vista Drive</li> <li>• State Route 46 East/Golden Hill Road</li> <li>• State Route 46 East/Airport Road</li> <li>• State Route 46 East/Jardine Road</li> <li>• Union Road/Golden Hill Road</li> <li>• Creston Road/Rolling Hills Road</li> <li>• Rolling Hills Road/Golden Hill Road</li> <li>• Niblick Road/South River Road</li> <li>• Niblick Road/Creston Road</li> </ul> <p><b>Roadways</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Route 46 East east of US 101 to west of Airport Road</li> <li>• Union Road east of Golden Hill Road to west of Airport Road</li> <li>• Creston Road west of Rolling Hills Road</li> <li>• Golden Hill Road south of State Route 46</li> <li>• Golden Hill Road south of Union Road</li> </ul> <p>Under year 2025 traffic conditions with the Charolais Road overcrossing and with the Chandler Ranch Specific Plan project, General Plan improvements are expected to yield acceptable LOS "D". The CRASP project will be expected to contribute to these long-range improvements. However, there is no assurance that these needed improvements will be built, because funding is not assured.</p> | <p>measures cannot be assured.</p>  |
| <b>AIR QUALITY</b>  |  |   |
| <p><b>Impact AQ-2</b> Development under the Specific Plan would result in the emission of air pollutants, including the ozone precursors ROC and NO<sub>x</sub>, and PM<sub>10</sub> primarily from mobile emissions and entrained road dust. Because emissions would exceed the APCD significance thresholds, the Specific Plan's operational impact is considered Class I, significant and unavoidable.</p>   | <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Policies C-9, 10, and 11</b> (Bicycle and Pedestrian provisions)</p> <p><b>Policy C-13</b> (Transit provisions)</p> <p><b>Policy LU-23</b> (Cluster Development)</p> <p><b>Policy LU-26d</b> (Residential Site and Building Design: Solar Access, Design and Orientation)</p> <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>AQ-2(a) Energy Efficiency.</b> The building energy efficiency rating shall be what is required by Title 24 requirements for all buildings within the Specific Plan Area. The following energy-conserving techniques should be incorporated in developments pursuant to the Specific Plan to the extent feasible (as determined by the Community Development Department staff): increase walls and attic insulation in accordance with Title 24 requirements; orient</p>   | <p>Emission reductions associated with these recommended mitigation measures are expected to be less than 5% of the Specific Plan's daily emissions of PM<sub>10</sub>, ROC and NO<sub>x</sub>. No other mitigation measures available appear sufficient or feasible to further reduce Specific Plan emissions to a level below the thresholds. Therefore, because emissions would be expected to remain well above San Luis Obispo APCD thresholds, the residual impact to regional air quality is considered significant and unavoidable.</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS I IMPACTS (Significant and Unavoidable)</b>  |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Impact</b>   | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b>  |
|   | <p>buildings to maximize natural heating and cooling; plant shade trees along southern and western exposures of buildings to reduce summer cooling needs; use solar water heaters if possible; and use double-paned windows.</p> <p><b>AQ-2(b) Bicycle Parking.</b> All multi-family, commercial, and recreational sites shall include bicycle parking. At least one bicycle parking space for every 10 vehicle spaces is required.</p> <p><b>AQ-2(c) Transit.</b> Bus turnouts with direct pedestrian access shall be installed at all bus stops.</p> <p><b>AQ-2(d) Telecommuting.</b> All new homes within the Specific Plan Area shall be constructed with internal wiring/cabling that allows telecommuting, teleconferencing, and telelearning to occur simultaneously in at least three locations in each home.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Impact AQ-3</b> The Specific Plan would be considered inconsistent with the San Luis Obispo APCD's 2001 Clean Air Plan because the Specific Plan exceeds the thresholds set in the CAP. This would be a Class I, significant and unavoidable impact on air quality.</p> | <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>AQ-3(a) TMP Program.</b> Applicants for commercial projects under the Specific Plan shall develop and operate an employer-based Transportation Management Program per Clean Air Plan TCM T-1C, which incorporates the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Bicycle racks and/or bicycle lockers at a ratio of 1 bicycle parking space for every 10 car parking spaces shall be installed for customers and employees, or at a ratio otherwise acceptable the SLOAPCD to be determined prior to occupancy clearance; and</li> <li>b. Carpool, vanpool and transit information shall be posted in employee break/lunch areas.</li> </ul> <p><b>AQ-3(b) Trip Reduction Measures.</b> To reduce overall project trip generation and associated air contaminant emissions, commercial tenants within the Specific Plan area will be required to establish and maintain employee trip reduction programs that may include, but are not limited to, the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employ or appoint an Employee Transportation Coordinator.</li> <li>• Implement a Transportation Choices Program.</li> <li>• Project applicants should work with the Transportation Choices Coalition partners for free consulting services on how to start and maintain a program. Contact SLO Regional Rideshare at 541-2277.</li> </ul> | <p>The implementation of the mitigation measures would reduce impacts. However, since no mitigation measures are feasible to sufficiently reduce vehicle miles traveled associated with the project due to the distance between the Specific Plan and City services, impacts related to consistency with the CAP would remain Class I, significant and unavoidable.</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS I IMPACTS (Significant and Unavoidable)</b>   |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b>   |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide for shuttle/mini bus service.</li> <li>• Provide incentives to employees to carpool/vanpool, take public transportation, telecommute, walk, bike, etc.</li> <li>• Implement compressed work schedules.</li> <li>• Implement telecommuting program.</li> <li>• Implement a lunchtime shuttle to reduce single occupant vehicle trips.</li> <li>• Participate in an employee "flash-pass" program, which provides free travel on transit buses.</li> <li>• Include teleconferencing capabilities, such as web cams or satellite linkage, which will allow employees to attend meetings remotely without requiring them to travel out of the area.</li> </ul> <p>If the development is a grocery store or large retail facility, provide home delivery service for customers.</p>   |  |
| <b>NOISE</b>   |   |  |
| <p><b>Impact N-2</b> Specific Plan-generated traffic would incrementally increase noise levels along roads in the Specific Plan vicinity. The effect of this noise on off-site and on-site sensitive receptors in the area is considered a Class I, significant and unavoidable, impact.</p> | <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Policy LU-19</b> (Visual, Noise, and Air Quality Construction Mitigation)</p> <p><b>Policy LU-23</b> (Cluster Development)</p> <p>The Specific Plan additionally includes setback and noise attenuation standards for each of the residentially-oriented subareas to reduce noise exposure to on-site development. For subareas adjacent to planned extension of Airport Road, where it is on the eastern boundary of the Plan Area, a setback of 125 feet is required from agricultural operations. The following noise attenuation standards are also required for all subareas adjacent to a new arterials:</p> <p><b>Noise Attenuation.</b> Because of the noise that may be generated by vehicles on the Airport Road and Sherwood Road, a site specific noise evaluation shall be conducted prior to development. If the required setback [otherwise noted in the Specific Plan] is determined to be insufficient, additional buffers or barriers may be necessary to minimize the effect of noise on the neighborhood. Consistent with the General Plan, noise attenuation measures may include any or all of the following, in order of preference.</p> | <p>No mitigation measures are feasible that would reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts would remain Class I, significant and unavoidable.</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS I IMPACTS (Significant and Unavoidable)</b>   |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>   | <b>Residual Impact</b>  |
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First: Use of setbacks and/or open space separation;</li> <li>• Second: Site layout/orientation/shielding of noise-sensitive uses with non-noise-sensitive uses;</li> <li>• Third: Construction of earthen berms or soundwalls;</li> <li>• Fourth: Structural measures: Soundwalls, acoustical treatment of buildings and noise barriers constructed of concrete, wood or materials other than earth.</li> </ul>  |   |
| <p><b>Impact N-6</b> The Specific Plan, in combination with cumulative development in the vicinity, would add to roadway corridor noise levels already above the 65 dBA CNEL City threshold. This is considered a Class I, significant and unavoidable impact.</p>   | <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p>As described in Impact N-2, the proposed Specific Plan contains policies that will reduce noise impacts to on-site receptors to a less than significant level; however, impacts to off-site receptors would remain significant.</p>   | <p>No mitigation measures are feasible to ensure that impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels. Use of such techniques as setbacks and noise attenuation features will reduce impacts to on-site receptors. No additional mitigation measures are feasible to reduce impacts to existing off-site receptors due to economic, regulatory and physical constraints. Therefore, impacts would remain Class I, significant and unavoidable.</p>   |
| <b>CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES</b>   |  |   |
| <p><b>Impact CR-2</b> Development under the Specific Plan could result in direct and indirect impacts to historical resources. This is considered a Class I, significant and unavoidable, impact</p>   | <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Historical Resource Mitigation</b> (Applies to Subarea 11 to address potential impacts to the ranch/barn complex within that area)</p> <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p>Mitigation measure CR-1(a) would effectively mitigate potential impacts to unknown buried resources on the site. No additional mitigation measures are required.</p>  | <p>Implementing one or more of the strategies described in policy 11a would provide some degree of mitigation for impacts to the ranch/barn complex. However, impacts would not be fully mitigated to a less than significant level unless the complex were to remain in place in accordance with strategy #3 described in Specific Plan policy 11a. Because there is no guarantee this strategy will be used by the City, the impact is considered to remain Class I, Significant and Unavoidable.</p> |
| <b>AESTHETICS AND COMMUNITY DESIGN</b>   |  |   |
| <p><b>Impact AES-1</b> Development under the proposed Specific Plan will alter the terrain and introduce manmade features that have the potential to degrade views of the site, and introduce new sources of light and glare to the area. This will change the existing rural character of the site to a more urban condition. This alteration is considered a Class I, significant and unavoidable, impact.</p> | <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p>Visual impacts in general would be reduced by the nature of the Specific Plan, through site planning, open space preservation, minimizing the removal of oak trees, architectural treatments, minimized lighting, custom lot grading in certain areas to avoid impacts to oak trees and sensitive habitats, and setbacks from roadways. A variety of Specific Plan policies and standards would address these issues, some of which are further articulated in the Design Guidelines included in the Specific Plan. Other mitigative Specific Plan policies include:</p> <p><b>Policy LU-5 (Open Space Areas)</b></p> | <p>Although impacts would be reduced through Specific Plan policies and Design Guidelines, no mitigation is available to avoid changing the site from its unlighted rural condition, to a more urban condition. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>   |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS I IMPACTS (Significant and Unavoidable)</b>   |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>   | <b>Residual Impact</b>   |
|  | <p><b>Policy LU-13</b> (Grading)</p> <p><b>Policy LU-15</b> (Ridge and Hilltop Protection)</p> <p><b>Policy LU-19</b> (Visual, Noise, and Air Quality Construction Mitigation)</p> <p><b>Policy LU-20</b> (Constructive Notice Regarding Light and Noise)</p> <p><b>Policy LU-22</b> (Interim Land Use Compatibility [during ongoing development])</p> <p><b>Policy LU-23</b> (Cluster Development)</p> <p><b>Policy LU-24</b> (Lighting)</p> <p><b>Policy LU-26</b> (Residential Site and Building Design)</p> <p><b>Policy LU-27</b> (Commercial Site Design)</p> <p><b>Policy LU-28</b> (Design Guidelines)</p> <p><b>Subarea Specific Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Grading</b> (Applies to Subareas 1 and 2)</p> <p><b>Structure Visibility</b> (Applies to Subareas 1 and 2)</p> <p><b>Maximum Building Envelopes</b> (Applies to Subarea 1)</p> <p><b>Modified Street Standards to Avoid Oak Impacts</b> (Applies to Subarea 1)</p> <p><b>Screening</b> (Applies to Subareas 4, 5, 10 and 15)</p> <p><b>Visual Screening</b> (Applies to Subareas 6 and 10)</p> <p><b>Lighting</b> (Applies to Subarea 10)</p> <p><b>Compatibility with Residential Uses</b> (Applies to Subareas 14 and 15)</p> <p><b>Trail Lighting</b> (Applies to Subarea 20)</p> <p>Through its policies and standards, as articulated further in the Specific Plan Design Guidelines, the Specific Plan is self-mitigating to the extent possible. No additional mitigation measures are suggested.</p> |  |
| <p><b>Impact AES-2</b> The proposed development has the potential to alter the aesthetic character of the site vicinity through grading activities</p> | <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Policy LU-13</b> (Grading)</p>   | <p>With implementation of the mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to the extent feasible. However, impacts related to land alteration, regardless of the grading</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS I IMPACTS (Significant and Unavoidable)</b>  |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Impact</b>   | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b>  |
| <p>that would alter the topography and vegetation of the Specific Plan area. This is considered Class I, significant and unavoidable, impact to the aesthetic character of the area.</p>  | <p><b>Subarea Specific Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Grading</b> (Applies to Subareas 1 and 2)</p> <p>Visual impacts resulting from grading will be minimized to a great extent through the implementation of General Plan policies, zoning requirements, and grading requirements included in the Specific Plan. One of these requirements is that a physical model or photosimulation of grading plans must be used to illustrate the grading associated with an individual development. No other mitigation measures are suggested.</p>  | <p>approach used, would remain significant and unavoidable.</p>   |
| <b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>   |   |   |
| <p><b>Impact B-2</b> Development allowed under the Specific Plan, particularly in the oak forest portion of the site (subarea 1) would result in the removal of native oak trees within a portion of the 62.5 acres of oak woodland habitat within development areas, and up to 137 healthy oak trees, 135 of which will be in subarea 1. This is considered a Class II, significant but mitigable impact in the long-term. In the short term, oak trees that are removed can be replaced, but the quality of their habitat value will not be matched until the new trees mature. Thus, short-term impacts to oak woodland are considered Class I, significant and unavoidable.</p> | <p><b>General Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Policy C-3a</b> (City Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance)</p> <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Policy LU-14</b> (Habitat Protection)</p> <p><b>Policy I-17</b> (Drainage and Detention Basin Design)</p> <p><b>Subarea Specific Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Oak Tree Inventory</b> (Applies to Subarea 1)<br/> <b>Oak Tree Removal</b> (Applies to all Subareas)</p> <p>In addition, the major property owner on the site has prepared an oak tree management plan, included as an appendix to the Specific Plan. The general goals of the plan are to protect oak trees, increase understory shrub density, manage for native, non-invasive species and plant new oaks and protect young trees to maintain diverse age structure.</p> | <p>The implementation of the General Plan, City Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, and the Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan provisions would reduce impacts to oak trees and oak woodland habitat to the extent feasible. The effectiveness of the long-term provisions of the oak tree replacement and management aspects of the Specific Plan a would be a function of the financial capabilities of the Home Owner's Association, and the willingness of that entity to enforce the recommendations of the City-approved biologist conducting the monitoring program.</p> <p>In the short term impacts to oak trees and oak woodland habitats cannot be mitigated, because of the length of time required for replacement trees to reach maturity and have a similar habitat values as those that are replaced. Therefore, impacts will remain significant and unavoidable (Class I).</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b>  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b>   |
| <b>LAND USE AND AGRICULTURE</b>  |   |  |
| <p><b>Impact LU-4</b> Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would alter the present land use pattern of the existing area, and may result in incompatibilities related to residential uses in proximity to commercial or industrial development, and residential development adjacent to Barney Schwartz Park, a lighted recreation facility. This is considered a Class II, significant but mitigable impact.</p>  | <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>LU-20</b> (Constructive Notice Regarding Lights and Noise)</p> <p><b>Site-Specific Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Visual Screening</b> (Applies to Subareas 6 and 10)</p> <p>Through the implementation of these policies, and other mitigation measures required in Section 4.4, <i>Noise</i> and Section 4.7, <i>Aesthetics and Community Design</i>, impacts would be considered less than significant. No further mitigation would be required.</p>  | <p>Impacts would be less than significant.</p>   |
| <b>AIR QUALITY</b>   |   |  |
| <p><b>Impact AQ-1</b> Development pursuant to the Specific Plan has the potential to generate demolition and construction related emissions. Although these emissions cannot be quantified until development plans are proposed, since San Luis Obispo County is currently a non-attainment area for PM<sub>10</sub>, the Specific Plan would contribute to this existing significant condition. Therefore, construction related emissions are considered to be Class II, significant but mitigable.</p> | <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>AQ-1(a) Application of BACT (Best Available Control Technologies).</b> The following measures shall be implemented to reduce combustion emissions from construction equipment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project applicants shall submit a grading plan for review by the APCD staff showing the area to be disturbed. A description of construction equipment that will be used and pollution reduction measures that will be implemented shall be provided with grading plans. Upon approval by the APCD, appropriate BACT features shall be applied. The application of these features shall occur prior to project construction.</li> <li>• Project applicants shall be required to ensure that all construction equipment and portable engines are properly maintained and tuned according to manufacturer's specifications.</li> <li>• Project applicants shall be required to ensure that off-road and portable diesel powered equipment, including but not limited to bulldozers, graders, cranes, loaders, scrapers, backhoes, generator sets, compressors, auxiliary power units, shall be fueled exclusively with CARB motor vehicle diesel fuel (non-taxed off-road diesel is acceptable).</li> </ul> | <p>The recommended mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to construction activity to a less than significant level.</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b> |   |                        |
|---|---|------------------------|
| <b>Impact</b>                                       | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b> |
|   | <p><b>AQ-1(b) Dust Control.</b> The following measures shall be implemented in conjunction with grading and other development activity pursuant to the Specific Plan to reduce PM10 emissions during project construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce the amount of the disturbed area where possible.</li> <li>• Use water trucks or sprinkler systems in sufficient quantities to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Water shall be applied depending on conditions. Reclaimed (non-potable) water should be used whenever possible.</li> <li>• All dirt-stock-pile areas shall be sprayed daily and/or covered as needed.</li> <li>• Permanent dust control measures shall be identified in the approved project revegetation and landscape plans and implemented as soon as possible following completion of any soil disturbing activities.</li> <li>• Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates greater than one month after initial grading shall be sown with a fast-germinating native grass seed and watered until vegetation is established.</li> <li>• All disturbed soil areas not subject to revegetation shall be stabilized using approved chemical soil binders, jute netting, or other methods approved in advance by the City Engineer.</li> <li>• All paved areas (roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc.) shall be completed as soon as feasible. In addition, building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.</li> <li>• Vehicle speed for all construction vehicles shall not exceed 15 mph on any unpaved surface at the construction site.</li> <li>• All trucks hauling dirt, sand, soil or other loose materials shall be covered or shall maintain at least two feet of freeboard (minimum vertical distance between top</li> </ul> |                        |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b> |   |                        |
|---|---|------------------------|
| <b>Impact</b>                                       | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b> |
|   | <p>of load and top of trailer) in accordance with CVC Section 23114.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Install wheel washers where vehicles enter and exit unpaved roads onto streets, or wash off trucks and equipment leaving the site.</li> <li>• Sweep streets at the end of each day if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent paved roads. Water sweepers with reclaimed water shall be used where feasible.</li> </ul> <p><b>AQ-1(c) Cover Stockpiled Soils.</b> If importation, exportation, or stockpiling of fill material is involved, soil stockpiled for more than two days shall be covered, kept moist, or treated with soil binders to prevent dust generation. Trucks transporting material shall be tarped from the point of origin to trip end.</p> <p><b>AQ-1(d) Dust Control Monitor.</b> The contractor or builder shall designate a person or persons to monitor the dust control program and to order increased watering as necessary to prevent transport of dust off-site. Their duties shall include holiday and weekend periods when work may not be in progress.</p> <p><b>AQ-1(e) Asbestos Sampling.</b> Prior to demolition work, areas of the on-site residential structures shall be sampled as part of an asbestos survey in compliance with the National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP). If asbestos is found in any building, asbestos-related work, including demolition, involving 100 square feet or more of asbestos containing materials (ACMs) shall be performed by a licensed asbestos abatement contractor under the supervision of a certified asbestos consultant and asbestos shall be removed and disposed of in compliance with applicable State laws. Regardless of whether asbestos is identified in any building, prior to demolition of existing structures the SLOAPCD shall be notified and an SLOAPCD Notification of Demolition and Renovation Checklist shall be submitted to both SLOAPCD and the Community Development Department.</p> <p>Prior to construction, an evaluation of areas of serpentinite outcrops or serpentinite rich</p> |                        |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b>  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b>   |
|  | <p>soils shall be made by a qualified professional such as a Certified Industrial Hygienist (CIH) as to whether such conditions represent a threat to human health. If so, a safety program shall be initiated and shall include providing personal protective equipment to workers and a worker education program. The Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA) ATCM requirements may include but are not limited to 1) an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan which must be approved by the APCD before construction begins, and 2) an Asbestos Health and Safety Program will also be required.</p> <p><b>AQ-1(f) Paint Waste Evaluation.</b> If during demolition of the existing buildings within the Specific Plan area, paint is separated from the building material (e.g. chemically or physically), the paint waste will be evaluated independently from the building material by a qualified hazardous materials inspector to determine its proper management. All hazardous materials shall be handled and disposed in accordance with local, state and federal regulations. According to the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), if paint is not removed from the building material during demolition (and is not chipping or peeling), the material can be disposed of as construction debris (a non-hazardous waste). The landfill operator will be contacted prior to disposal of building material debris to determine any specific requirements the landfill may have regarding the disposal of lead-based paint materials. The disposal of demolition debris shall comply with any such requirements.</p> |  |
| <b>NOISE</b>   |   |  |
| <p><b>Impact N-1</b> Specific Plan construction and demolition could be within 20 to 200 feet of a sensitive receptor (nearest existing off-site residence), and could intermittently generate nuisance noise levels at locations on and adjacent to the Specific Plan area. This noise has the potential to exceed thresholds in the City General Plan Noise Element; impacts are considered a Class II, significant but mitigable.</p> | <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Policy LU-19</b> (Visual, Noise and Air Quality Construction Mitigation)</p> <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>N-1(a) Construction Activity Timing.</b> Demolition and construction activity for site preparation and for future development shall be limited to the hours between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM. Non-noise generating construction activities such as interior painting are not subject to these restrictions.</p>  | <p>With implementation of recommended mitigation measures, demolition and construction noise impacts would be less than significant.</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b>  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b>  |
|  | <p><b>N-1(b) Construction Noise Attenuation.</b><br/>                     For all demolition and construction activity on the Specific Plan area, additional noise attenuation techniques shall be employed as needed to ensure that noise remains within levels allowed by the City of Paso Robles noise standards. The following measures shall be incorporated into contract specifications to reduce the impact of construction noise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All construction equipment shall have properly maintained sound-control devices. No equipment shall have an unmuffled exhaust.</li> <li>• Contractors shall implement appropriate additional noise mitigation measures including, but not limited to, siting the stationary construction equipment away from residential area to the extent possible, shutting off idling equipment, rescheduling construction activity, notifying adjacent residents in advance of construction work, and installing acoustic barriers around stationary construction noise sources.</li> </ul> <p><b>N-1(c) Construction Equipment.</b><br/>                     Stationary demolition and construction equipment that generates noise that exceeds 65 dBA CNEL at the boundaries of adjacent residential properties shall be baffled. All construction equipment powered by internal combustion engines shall be properly muffled and maintained. Unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines shall be prohibited. Whenever feasible, electrical power shall be used to run air compressors and similar power tools.</p> |   |
| <p><b>Impact N-3</b> Operation of neighborhood commercial uses associated with development in the Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan would potentially affect adjacent residences. This is considered a Class II, significant but mitigable impact.</p> | <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Compatibility With Residential Uses</b><br/>                     (Applies to Subareas 14 and 15)</p> <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>N-3(a) Disclosure of Nuisance.</b> Upon the transfer of residential property in Subareas 13, 14, and 17, the transferor shall deliver to the prospective transferee a written disclosure statement which shall make prospective home buyers aware that although potential impacts or conflicts between commercial and residential uses</p>  | <p>Impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b>  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b>   |
|  | <p>(e.g., noise) may be decreased by proper operation and maintenance of noise generators, some level of incompatibility between the two uses would remain.</p> <p><b>N-3(b) Constructive Notice.</b> Upon the transfer of residential property in Subareas 13 and 14, the developer(s) shall record constructive notice on each parcel, in a form to be approved by the Community Development Department, advising future residents near the commercial noise sources prior to occupation.</p>   |  |
| <b>SAFETY AND GEOLOGIC HAZARDS</b>   |   |  |
| <p><b>Impact G-1</b> Due to the presence of active faults in the vicinity, the planning area is subject to strong ground shaking. Ground shaking has the potential to cause fill material to settle, de-stabilize slopes, and cause physical damage to structures, property, utilities and road access. Ground shaking has the potential to cause injury and death to humans. This is considered a Class II, significant but mitigable impact.</p> | <p>The philosophy in the Uniform Building Code is to prevent structural collapse and thereby mitigating life safety issues. By definition, significant structural damage is acceptable in Code-conforming structures; although it has been found by experience that single-family, wood-frame structures properly built to the latest building codes generally perform well in response to strong ground shaking where ground failure is not involved.</p> <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>G-1(a) UBC Compliance.</b> Above-ground structures shall be designed and built according to the latest Uniform Building Code Seismic Zone 4 standards.</p>  | <p>Through code-conformance and proper engineering design and construction, hazards of strong ground shaking would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p><b>Impact G-2</b> Seismic activity could produce sufficient ground shaking which may result in liquefaction. On-site soils proposed for future development of residential uses and commercial facilities are subject to a generally moderate potential for liquefaction. This is considered a Class II, significant but mitigable impact.</p>   | <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>G-2(a) Geotechnical Study.</b> In conjunction with any development in the Plan Area, a geotechnical study shall be prepared by a registered civil or geotechnical engineer. This report shall include a soils report and an analysis of the liquefaction potential of the underlying materials. If a particular development site is confirmed to be in an area prone to seismically-induced liquefaction, appropriate techniques to minimize liquefaction potential shall be prescribed and implemented. Any structures proposed under the Specific Plan shall comply with applicable methods of the Uniform Building Code.</p> <p>Suitable measures to reduce liquefaction impacts could include: specialized design of foundations by a structural engineer; removal or treatment of liquefiable soils to reduce the potential for liquefaction;</p> | <p>Implementation of the mitigation measure would reduce impacts from potential liquefaction to a less than significant level.</p>               |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b>  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b>  |
|  | <p>drainage to lower the groundwater table to below the level of liquefiable soils, in-situ compaction of soils; or other alterations to the ground characteristics. In areas prone to liquefaction, current structural engineering methods for foundation design may not be sufficient to prevent a building's foundation from failing in a larger earthquake which would result in stronger and longer ground shaking.</p>  |   |
| <p><b>Impact G-3</b> Soils within the planning area have the potential to present soil-related hazards (expansive soils, erosive soils) to potential structures and roadways in the planning area and are considered Class II, significant but mitigable, impacts.</p> | <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Policy LU-13</b> (Grading practices)</p> <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>G-3(a) Soils/Foundation Report.</b> Upon implementation of the Specific Plan, individual property developers proposing development within the areas identified as having a moderate potential for <del>landsliding</del> expansive soils (refer to Table 4.5-1 and Figure 4.5-2) shall submit a soils/foundation report as part of the application for any proposed Building Permit(s). To reduce the potential for foundation cracking, one or more of the following shall be implemented and/or as recommended by a qualified engineer based on the conclusions of the soils report:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Use continuous deep footings (i.e., embedment depth of 3 feet or more) and concrete slabs on grade with increased steel reinforcement together with a pre-wetting and long-term moisture control program within the active zone.</li> <li>2. Removal of the highly expansive material and replacement with non-expansive import fill material provided this is consistent with other grading provisions of the Specific Plan.</li> <li>3. The use of specifically designed drilled pier and grade beam system incorporating a structural concrete slab on grade supported approximately 6 inches above the expansive soils.</li> <li>4. Chemical treatment with hydrated lime to reduce the expansion characteristics of the soils.</li> </ol> | <p>Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan Policy LU-13, along with recommended measures to ensure properly designed and constructed foundations and grading and erosion control, should adequately mitigate the potential for structural problems caused by soil-related hazards, thereby reducing impacts to less than significant levels.</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b> |  |                        |
|---|--|------------------------|
| <b>Impact</b>                                       | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>   | <b>Residual Impact</b> |
|   | <p><b>G-3(b) Grading and Erosion Control Plan.</b> A grading and erosion control plan that minimizes erosion, sedimentation, and unstable slopes shall be submitted and approved for development proposed on slopes, prior to issuance of Grading Permits. It must include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Methods such as retention basins, drainage diversion structures, grading reduction, silt fencing/coordinated sediment trapping, straw bales, and sand bags. These methods shall be used to minimize erosion on slopes and siltation into Huerhuero Creek and its tributaries during grading and construction activities.</li> <li>b. Graded areas shall be revegetated within 2 weeks of grading activities with deep-rooted, native, drought-tolerant species to minimize slope failure and erosion potential. Geotextile binding fabrics shall be used if necessary to hold slope soils until vegetation is established.</li> <li>c. After construction of tract improvements and until construction of individual homes, exposed areas shall be stabilized to prevent wind and water erosion, using methods approved by APCD. These methods may include importing topsoil and/or the mixing of the highly erosive sand with finer-grained materials (silt or clay) in sufficient quantities to prevent its ability to be transported by wind. The topsoil or silt/clay mixture is to be used to stabilize the existing soil. At a minimum, six inches of topsoil or silt/clay/sand mixture is to be used to stabilize the wind-erodable soils.</li> <li>d. Where necessary, site preparation shall include the removal of all or a portion of the expansive soils at the building sites and replacement with compacted fill.</li> <li>e. Where necessary, construction on transitional lots shall include overexcavation to expose firm subgrade, use of post tension slabs in future structures, or other geologically acceptable method.</li> <li>f. Landscaped areas adjacent to structures</li> </ul> |                        |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b>   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Impact</b>   | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b>   |
|   | <p>shall be graded so that drainage is away from structures.</p> <p>g. Irrigation shall be controlled so that overwatering does not occur.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>Impact G-4</b> The Specific Plan area contains several steep slopes and is underlain by the Paso Robles Formation, which presents a moderate slope stability hazard. Landsliding has the potential to damage and destroy structures, roadways and other improvements as well as to deflect and block drainage channels, causing further damage and erosion. Soil slumping can damage or destroy structures and lead to erosion problems. These are considered Class II, significant but mitigable impact.</p> | <p><b><u>Specific Plan Policy:</u></b></p> <p><b>Policy LU-13</b> (Grading practices)</p> <p><b><u>EIR Mitigation Measures:</u></b></p> <p><b>G-4(a) Site-Specific Investigations.</b> Each area to be graded will need to be further inspected to ensure that the slope is not subject to soil slumping. Geotechnical engineering measures, such as shoring soils of any landslide areas shall be required to ensure that the slope will not be destabilized during the grading activity. Remedial measures during grading may include the removal of the slump or debris slide from the top to the toe of slope.</p> <p>In accordance with the applicable building codes, site specific investigations shall be performed upon implementation of the proposed Specific Plan in areas determined to have a moderate landslide hazard (as seen in Figure 4.5-4). Investigations and practices to be prepared and implemented include the following:</p> <p>a) Prior to issuance of any building permits, a qualified geotechnical engineer and/or engineering geologist shall prepare thorough site-specific geologic/geotechnical studies, and a slope stability analysis which shall incorporate site specific recommendations. The slope stability analysis is to meet the requirements of CDMG 1997 (Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, Special Publication 117). In addition, the stability analysis is to meet the requirements of the City Building Division.</p> <p>b) During construction, engineering geologists and geotechnical engineers shall confirm preliminary findings reported in the preliminary studies.</p> <p>c) All applicable recommendations of final geologic and geotechnical investigations prepared for the project shall be</p> | <p>Implementation of the mitigation measures would reduce impacts from potential landsliding and debris flows to less than significant levels.</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b>  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>   | <b>Residual Impact</b>   |
|  | <p>implemented. These recommendations may include: avoidance of or setbacks from historic landslide deposits or areas susceptible to a high potential for landslides; grading restriction areas; drainage improvements to ensure potential landslide areas do not become saturated; excavating standard keyways and benches in a stair-step configuration; water addition or drying-out as needed to bring soils close to their optimum moisture content; limitations on cut and fill slope gradients; and/or removal and backfilling or potential landslide areas.</p> <p>d) During construction grading, close coordination shall occur between the civil engineer and the project engineering geologist and geotechnical engineer to ensure that the recommendations of the geologic and geotechnical investigations are properly implemented.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>Impact G-5</b> Specific Plan implementation would occur in an area historically used for agricultural production with soils that could contain residual quantities of presently-banned agricultural chemicals. Past industrial uses nearby may have also contributed to potential onsite groundwater contamination. The exposure of future site construction workers and residents to these contaminants is considered a Class II, significant but mitigable impact.</p> | <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>G-5(a) Soil and Groundwater Assessment.</b> Prior to construction of development, a soil and groundwater assessment shall be completed by a registered soils engineer or soils remediation specialist to determine the presence or absence of regulated contaminants within the planning area. This assessment shall target agricultural chemicals that may have been used in the historically farmed portions of the site and contamination associated with historic exploratory off-site oil wells. If soil or groundwater sampling indicates the presence of any contaminant in quantities not in compliance with applicable laws, the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) and Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) shall be contacted by the project applicant to determine any necessary remediation efforts. Soils and/or groundwater shall be remediated in compliance with applicable laws. Site assessments that result in the need for soil excavation are required to include: an assessment of air resource impacts and health impacts associated with excavation activities; identification of any applicable local standards that may be exceeded by the excavation activities, including dust and noise levels; transportation impacts from the removal or</p> | <p>If the mitigation measures are implemented, the impacts related to hazardous materials would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b>  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>   | <b>Residual Impact</b>   |
|  | <p>remediation activities; and risk of upset management practices should be employed if an accident occurs on or off the site. A copy of applicable remediation certification from RWQCB and/or DTSC, or written confirmation that a certification is not required shall be submitted to the Community Development Department prior to issuance of a building permit.</p> <p><b>G-5(b) Potential Discovery of Groundwater.</b> In the event that groundwater is encountered during grading or construction, all grading or construction work in the vicinity of the groundwater will be halted. The groundwater shall be tested for TPH and VOC, and be screened for common industrial groundwater pollutants using EPA testing method 8260b. If one or more pollutants are found in unsafe concentrations, the water shall be treated to a concentration below RWQCB standards, by a City approved registered environmental assessor or environmental engineer in consultation with RWQCB before the water can be released into the watershed. Such testing can occur in advance of grading activities to preclude the possibility of watershed contamination.</p> <p><b>G-5(c) Screening of Imported Fill Material.</b> Prior to issuance of building permits, a soils engineering study and hazardous materials report of all imported fill materials shall be prepared by a qualified professional and submitted to the City Engineer for review. The soils engineer study and hazardous materials report shall demonstrate that all imported fill materials maintain engineering properties that are suitable for site development, and are free from contaminants that exceed threshold health and public safety levels.</p> |  |
| <b>CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES</b>   |  |  |
| <p><b>Impact CR-1</b> There is potential that Specific Plan implementation will disturb previously unidentified buried archeological deposits and/or human remains. This is considered a Class II, significant but mitigable impact.</p> | <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>CR-1(a) Archaeological Resource Construction Monitoring.</b> At the commencement of construction activities in <del>of</del> the Specific Plan area, an orientation meeting shall be conducted by an archaeologist, general contractor, subcontractor, and construction workers associated with earth disturbing activities. The orientation meeting shall describe the</p>   | <p>Impacts would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of these mitigation measures.</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b> |   |                        |
|---|---|------------------------|
| <b>Impact</b>                                       | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b> |
|   | <p>potential of exposing archaeological resources, the types of cultural materials may be encountered, and directions on the steps that shall be taken if such a find is encountered.</p> <p>A qualified archaeologist shall be present during all initial earth moving activities within native soil within 600 feet of Chandler Isolate #1. All cultural resource monitors hired to monitor future initial earth moving activities within this area shall be properly informed of the occurrence of the aforementioned isolate for the understanding of the known cultural resources in the area. In the event that archaeological and historic artifacts are encountered during project construction, all work in the vicinity of the find will be halted until such time as the find is evaluated by a qualified archaeologist and appropriate mitigation (e.g., curation, preservation in place, etc.), if necessary, is implemented.</p> <p>In the event of the discovery of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the following steps shall be taken:</p> <p>I. There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:</p> <p>A. The county coroner in which the remains are discovered must be contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required, and</p> <p>B. If the coroner determines the remains are Native American:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours.</li> <li>2. The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be most likely descended from the deceased Native American.</li> <li>3. The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the</li> </ol> |                        |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b>   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Impact</b>   | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b>  |
|   | <p>human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public resources Code Section 5097.98, or</p> <p>II. Where the following conditions occur, the landowner or his authorized representatives shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.</p> <p>A. The Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission.</p> <p>B. The descendent identified fails to make a recommendation; or</p> <p>C. The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendent, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.</p> <p><b>CR-1(b) Halt Work Order.</b> If human remains are unearthed, State Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 requires that no further disturbance shall occur until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. If the remains are determined to be of Native American descent, the coroner has 24 hours to notify the Native American Heritage Commission.</p> |   |
| <p><b>Impact CR-3</b> Development under the Specific Plan could disturb or possibly destroy unknown paleontological resources. This is considered a Class II, significant but mitigable impact.</p> | <p><b><u>EIR Mitigation Measures:</u></b></p> <p><b>CR-3(a) Paleontological Resource Construction Monitoring.</b> In the event of the discovery or recognition of any paleontological resources, the following steps shall be taken:</p> <p><i>Macro/Micro Fossil Salvage.</i> In the event that macro and/or micro fossils are encountered during future construction activities, appropriate specimens shall be salvaged as determined by a qualified paleontologist for the purpose of preservation, identification, analysis and the eventual storage of fossils found during future construction activities .</p>  | <p>Impacts to paleontological resources would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of proposed mitigation.</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b>   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Impact</b>   | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>   | <b>Residual Impact</b>  |
| <b>FLOODING AND DRAINAGE</b>  |  |   |
| <p><b>Impact FD-1</b> During construction, disrupted soil may be subject to erosion, sedimentation, and pollutant discharges. This is considered a Class II, significant but mitigable impact.</p>                                | <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Policy LU-18</b> (Erosion, Runoff, and Sedimentation)</p> <p><b>Policy I-16</b> (Drainage Facilities)</p> <p><b>Policy I-17</b> (Drainage and Detention Basin Design)</p> <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>FD-1(a) Notice of Intent.</b> Prior to beginning construction, any applicants pursuant to the Specific Plan shall file a Notice of Intent (NOI) for discharge from the proposed development site.</p> <p><b>FD-1(b) Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).</b> Any applicant shall submit a SWPPP to the City prior to issuance of a building permit, in compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES). The contractor is responsible for understanding the State General Permit procedures and instituting the SWPPP during construction. The SWPPP shall include but not be limited to the components listed in Section 4.9, Biological Resources, Mitigation Measure B-4(b). The SWPPP must be prepared in accordance with the guidelines adopted by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB). The SWPPP shall be submitted to the City along with grading/development plans for review and approval.</p> <p><b>FD-1(c) Notice of Completion of Construction.</b> Any project applicant shall file a notice of completion of construction of the development, identifying that pollution sources were controlled during the construction of the project and implementing a closure SWPPP for the site.</p> <p><b>FD-2(a) Drainage Facilities</b> (discussed below) also applies</p> | <p>Implementation of the mitigation would reduce water quality impacts to less than significant levels.</p>   |
| <p><b>Impact FD-2</b> The project would introduce paved areas and thus has the potential to result in increased peak stormwater discharges and volumes of runoff. Impacts are considered Class II, significant but mitigable.</p> | <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Policy I-16</b> (Drainage Facilities)</p> <p><b>Policy I-17</b> (Drainage and Detention Basin Design)</p> <p><b>Policy I-18</b> (Storm Drainage Construction)</p>  | <p>With implementation of the properly designed storm drains and detention basins within flood control easements, in accordance with City standards, Specific Plan policies, and standard City practice, flooding impacts would be less than significant. Additionally,</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b>  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>   | <b>Residual Impact</b>   |
|  | <p>Responsibility)</p> <p><b>Subarea Specific Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Grading</b> (Applies to Subareas 1 and 2)</p> <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>FD-2(a) Drainage Facilities.</b> All runoff water from paved impervious areas (e.g., parking lots, streets, etc.) shall be conveyed by impervious conduits via energy dissipaters to existing drainage channels. In addition, drainage shall be consistent with approved drainage plans that include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Locations of all proposed pipelines;</li> <li>b. Pipe diameters;</li> <li>c. Locations where the pipe(s) would surface in nearby features; and</li> <li>d. Amount of water that would flow from each pipeline.</li> </ul>   | <p>development of the proposed facilities would reduce peak discharge associated with a 100-year storm event. Following implementation of these measures, the project would result in less than significant impacts related to peak stormwater discharges and volumes of runoff.</p> |
| <p><b>Impact FD-3</b> Portions of Subareas 18 and 19 of the proposed Specific Plan are located within a 100-Year flood hazard area associated with Huerhuero Creek. Impacts related to flood hazard exposure to potential commercial uses in this area are considered Class II, significant but mitigable.</p> | <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Policy I-16</b> (Drainage Facilities)</p> <p><b>Policy I-17</b> (Drainage and Detention Basin Design)</p> <p><b>Policy I-18</b> (Storm Drainage Construction Responsibility)</p> <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>FD-3(a) Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR).</b> Without obtaining a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), development within the portions of subareas 18 and 19 within the 100-year flood plain would not be guaranteed to comply with the National Floodplain Insurance Program (NFIP) requirement that a parcel of land or proposed structure that is to be elevated by fill would not be inundated by the base flood. Prior to approval of grading permits, the applicant shall obtain a CLOMR from FEMA.</p> <p>The CLOMR request shall include detailed flood hazard analyses prepared by a qualified professional engineer, consistent with FEMA requirements. The applicant</p> | <p>Implementation of the suggested mitigations, in conjunction with City standards and practices, would reduce flooding impacts associated with future development in subareas 18 and 19 to less than significant levels.</p>  |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b>  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b>   |
|  | <p>shall comply with all conditions and requirements of the CLOMR.</p> <p><b>FD-3(b) Prohibition of Floodwater Displacement.</b> Prior to issuance of grading permits, applicants within subareas 18 and 19 shall submit plans to the Community Development Department and Public Works Department that identify an overland escape route for runoff to ensure that the placement of fill on the project site to raise the proposed building pads out of the floodplain will not divert runoff onto adjacent properties.</p>  |  |
| <b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>  |   |  |
| <p><b>Impact B-3</b> Development in accordance with the Specific Plan would impact known, and could potentially impact unknown, occurrences of special-status plant species. Development in accordance with the Specific Plan would also impact plant communities of special concern occurring within the Specific Plan area. This would be considered a Class II, significant but mitigable impact.</p> | <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>LU-14</b> (Habitat Protection)</p> <p><b>Subarea Specific Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Rare Plant Mitigation and Enhancement</b> (Applies to Subareas 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 10)</p> <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>B-3(a) Permits and Agreements.</b> In the event that State listed species would be impacted as a result of development, developers shall submit signed copies of an incidental take permit and enacting agreements from the CDFG regarding those species as necessary under Section 2081 of the California Fish and Game Code prior to the initiation of grading. <del>If a plant species that is listed under the federal Endangered Species Act is identified, developers seeking entitlements shall provide proof of compliance with the federal Endangered Species Act, inclusive as necessary of signed copies of incidental take permit and associated enacting agreements.</del></p> <p><b>B-3(b) Special-Status Species Mitigation and Monitoring Plan.</b> A mitigation and monitoring program shall be developed by the City in consultation with CDFG as appropriate when avoidance of the species cannot be achieved. The special-status plant species mitigation program may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overall goal and measurable objectives of the mitigation and monitoring plan;</li> </ul> | <p>Implementation of the above Specific Plan policies and the proposed mitigation measures would reduce impacts to special-status plant species and plant communities of special concern to a less than significant level.</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b> |  |                        |
|---|--|------------------------|
| <b>Impact</b>                                       | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>   | <b>Residual Impact</b> |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific areas proposed for revegetation and their size;</li> <li>• Specific habitat management and protection measures to be used to ensure long-term maintenance and protection of the special-status plant species are to be provided (i.e. annual population census surveys and habitat assessments; establishment of monitoring reference sites; fencing of special-status plant species preserves and signage to identify the environmentally sensitive areas; a seasonally-timed weed abatement program; and seasonally-timed seed and/or topsoil collection, propagation, and reintroduction of special-status plant species into specified receiver sites);</li> <li>• Success criteria based on the goals and measurable objectives to ensure a viable population(s) in the Specific Plan area in perpetuity;</li> <li>• An education program to inform residents of the presence of special-status plant species and sensitive biological resources onsite, and to provide methods that residents can employ to reduce impacts to these species/resources in protected open space areas;</li> <li>• Reporting requirements to ensure consistent data collection and reporting methods used by monitoring personnel; and</li> <li>• Funding mechanism(s).</li> </ul> <p>The special-status plant species monitoring program may include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring shall be conducted by a qualified biologist verified by the City.</li> <li>• Monitoring shall occur annually at an appropriate time of the year depending upon the species, to assess the vigor of the population.</li> <li>• An adaptive management program shall address both foreseen and unforeseen circumstances relating to the preservation and mitigation programs. It shall include remedial measures to address negative impacts to the special-status plant species and their habitats (i.e.: removal of weeds, addition of seeding/planting efforts) as needed.</li> </ul> |                        |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b>  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>   | <b>Residual Impact</b>  |
|  | <p><b>B-3(c) Avoidance of Native Bunchgrass Habitat.</b> About 0.5 acres of native bunchgrass habitat is identified within subarea 5. Although no development is proposed in this area, the Specific Plan shall be modified to explicitly require avoidance of this identified habitat area, as shown on Figure 4.9-1.</p> <p><b>B-3(d) Wildflower Field Habitat.</b> Development of the Gilead Lane crossing of the central drainage shall avoid wildflower field habitat to the extent possible. If avoidance does not occur, this loss of 0.10 acres can be mitigated by enhancing the existing onsite occurrence at a replacement ratio of 2:1. That is, the 0.16-acre occurrence that would not be impacted must be supplemented by 0.20 acres of additional habitat adjacent to the existing area, in consultation with CDFG as appropriate.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Impact B-4</b> Development in accordance with the Specific Plan would affect riparian woodland and wetland habitat. This is considered a Class II, significant but mitigable impact.</p> | <p><b><u>Specific Plan Policies:</u></b></p> <p><b>Policy LU-13</b> (Grading)</p> <p><b>Policy LU-14</b> (Habitat Protection)</p> <p><b>Policy LU-18</b> (Erosion, Runoff, and Sedimentation)</p> <p><b><u>EIR Mitigation Measures:</u></b></p> <p>Mitigation measures from Section 4.8, Impact FD-1, Flooding and Drainage and measure B-4(b) of this section would help to reduce potentially significant impacts to wetlands and waters of the U.S. and State.</p> <p><b>B-4(a) Sediment, Erosion, and Pollution Management.</b> Best Management Practices (BMPs) included in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for the entire site shall be implemented (Section 4.8 Flooding and Drainage; Mitigation Measure FD-1(a) - (d)). The SWPPP shall include the requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System storm water permit from the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Mitigation measure shall include the following components:</p> <p>1) Storm water runoff and nuisance flow drainage shall be directed away from the riparian and wetland habitat /detention basins and into a bio-filtration swale or stormwater filter constructed to</p> | <p>The implementation of applicable agency specified mitigation measures would reduce impacts to riparian woodlands, wetlands, and waters of the U.S. and State to a less than significant level.</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b> |  |                        |
|---|--|------------------------|
| <b>Impact</b>                                       | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>   | <b>Residual Impact</b> |
|   | <p>remove pollutants before being allowed to discharge into sensitive habitat areas.</p> <p>2) Depending on conditions for grading, additional inspections may be required to ensure compliance with water quality regulations.</p> <p>3) Any bare soils in detention basins shall be hydroseeded with native non-invasive plant species, prior to October 15 of any construction year.</p> <p>4) Silt fencing, straw bales composed of rice straw (that are certified to be free of weed seed), fiber rolls, gravel bags, mulching erosion control blankets, soil stabilizers, and storm drain filters shall be used, in conjunction with other methods, to prevent erosion throughout the entire site and siltation of stream channels and detention basins.</p> <p>5) Frequency of sediment removal from detention basins, location of spoil disposal, locations and types of erosion and sediment control structures, and materials that would be used on-site during construction activities shall be specified.</p> <p>6) The collection and disposal of any and all pollutants originating from construction equipment shall be identified. During construction activities, washing of concrete, paint, or equipment shall occur only in designated areas greater than 100 feet from sensitive resources where polluted water and materials can be contained for subsequent removal from the site. Washing shall not be allowed near sensitive biological resources. Plastic shall be placed over any ground surface where fueling or equipment maintenance is to occur. Drip pans shall be placed under equipment parked on-site.</p> <p>7) BMPs shall be established for material delivery and storage.</p> <p>8) A list of BMPs shall be attached to project plans and posted at the construction site, or may be included in the SWPPP.</p> |                        |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b>   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <b>Impact</b>   | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>   | <b>Residual Impact</b>  |
|   | <p><b>B-4(b) Wetland and Riparian Regulatory Requirements.</b> If wetland and/or riparian habitat are removed for proposed Specific Plan development mitigation measures shall be carried out as required by the applicable regulatory agencies.</p>   |   |
| <p><b>Impact B-5</b> Development in accordance with the Specific Plan could result in a direct take of individual San Joaquin kit fox (SJKF) through development activities and on-site roadways, as well as reduce the amount of available habitat potentially used by the SJKF within its historic and current range. This potential impact to a Federally Endangered and State Threatened species is considered a Class II, significant but mitigable, impact.</p> | <p><b>General Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Policy C-3B Action Item 2.</b> As part of the environmental review of new development projects, the City will require that mitigation for potential impacts to the San Joaquin Kit Fox and its habitat be provided in consultation with the CA Department of Fish and Game and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</p> <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Policy LU-14 (Habitat Protection)</b></p> <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>B-5(a) Proposed Huerhuero Creek Bridge Design.</b> The Airport Road bridge proposed to span Huerhuero Creek shall be “free-span” and shall be no more intrusive to the Creek, including tree canopies, than the neighboring bridges at Union Road to the southeast and Highway 46 to the northwest.</p>              | <p>The implementation of the mitigation measure, in combination with General Plan, Specific Plan, and other existing state and federal regulatory requirements would reduce impacts on SJKF and its habitat to a less than significant level.</p> |
| <p><b>Impact B-6</b> Development in accordance with the Specific Plan would reduce the populations and available habitat of wildlife in general, including special-status species. Because of the size of the site, and known or potential presence of a number of special-status wildlife species on-site, the loss of wildlife habitat is considered a Class II, significant but mitigable impact.</p>  | <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Policy LU-5 (Open Space Corridor)</b></p> <p><b>Policy LU-25 (Landscaping)</b></p> <p><b>Subarea Specific Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Detention Basins, Vegetation Management, Trail Materials and Design, and Trail Setbacks (Apply to Subarea 20)</b></p> <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p>Several mitigation measures in this EIR or requirements within the Specific Plan lessen impacts to populations and available habitat of wildlife in general, including special-status species. Mitigation measures related to oak trees, special status plants, and San Joaquin Kit Fox are described under Impacts B-2, B-3 and B-5, respectively. Additional measures to reduce impacts to water quality are listed in Section 4.8, Flooding and Drainage of this EIR.</p> | <p>The implementation of the suggested mitigation measures would reduce impacts to wildlife habitat to a less than significant level.</p>   |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b>  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b>   |
|  | <p><b>B-6(a) Ground Disturbance Timing.</b> In order to avoid impacts to nesting special-status bird species and raptors including the ground-nesting burrowing owl and northern harrier, or other birds protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, all initial ground disturbing activities and tree removal conducted outside of the period between September 15 and March 31 must be preceded by a pre-construction survey for active nests within the limits of grading, to be conducted by a qualified biologist. This survey should be conducted within two weeks prior to any construction activities. The purpose of this survey is to determine the presence or absence of nests in an area to be potentially disturbed. If active nests are located, all construction work shall be conducted outside a buffer zone of 200 feet to 500 feet from the nests as determined in consultation with the CDFG. No direct disturbance to nests shall occur until the adults and young are no longer reliant on the nest site. A qualified biologist shall confirm that breeding/nesting is completed and young have fledged the nest prior to the start of construction.</p> <p><b>B-6(b) Control of Exotic Wildlife Predators.</b> Reduction of predators (e.g., bullfrogs that prey on special-status species such as CRLF) shall be accomplished by implementing regular seasonally appropriate dry-down periods of detention basins if necessary (to reduce the likelihood of predators, such as bullfrogs, that require a perennial water source).</p> <p><b>B-6(c) Constructive Notice.</b> Upon the transfer of residential property in Specific Plan area, the developer(s) shall record constructive notice on each parcel, in a form to be approved by the Community Development Department, advising future residents about the impacts associated with non-native animals, especially cats and dogs, and other non-native animals to the Specific Plan area; similarly, inform potential homebuyers of the potential for coyotes to prey on domestic animals.</p> |  |
| <b>PUBLIC SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE</b>  |   |  |
| <b>Impact PS-3</b> The Specific Plan would increase the number of residents served by the City of Paso Robles Fire Department, | <b>Specific Plan Policies:</b><br><br><b>Policy LU-16</b> (Fire Hazard Abatement)   | With proposed mitigation measures, in combination with Specific Plan policies, impacts would be reduced to a less than |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b>   |  |                           |
|---|--|---------------------------|
| <b>Impact</b>   | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>   | <b>Residual Impact</b>    |
| <p>which would impact the ability of the Fire Department to meet their response time goals. This would be considered a Class II, significant but mitigable, impact.</p> | <p><b>Policy C-7</b> (Emergency Access)</p> <p><b>Policy I-11</b> (Fire Flow Requirements)</p> <p><b><u>Subarea Specific Policy:</u></b></p> <p><b>Public Facilities Use</b> (Applies to Subarea 5)</p> <p><b><u>EIR Mitigation Measures:</u></b></p> <p><b>PS-3(a) On-Site Fire Protection.</b> Road widths and circulation, as well as the placement of fire hydrants and installation of automatic sprinkler systems, shall be required as determined by the City of Paso Robles Emergency Services Department. A road system that allows unhindered Emergency Services Department access and maneuvering during emergencies shall be provided. Specifically, the following measures are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific Plan roads must feature an all weather surface at least 24 feet in width, unobstructed by parking. Exceptions to road widths shall be subject to approval of the Chief of Emergency Services. Cul-de-sacs and turnouts must be to Emergency Services Department standards. If the roads are to be a private system, there must be ongoing, legally binding provisions in effect to maintain the roads to Emergency Services and Public Works Department standards.</li> <li>• Structure numbers and street signs shall be lighted to City standards so that emergency vehicles including police and ambulances can locate residences in the event of any emergency.</li> <li>• “City Standard” fire hydrants shall be installed in accordance with Emergency Services Department as directed by the Chief of Emergency Services.</li> </ul> <p><b>PS-3(b) Interim Fire Protection Services Plan.</b> The Specific Plan includes a site that could be used for a future Emergency Services Station. The configuration, design and construction of this facility will be the responsibility of the City unless alternative agreements are reached. It shall be the responsibility of the Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan properties to fund their proportionate share of the Emergency</p> | <p>significant level.</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b> |  |                        |
|---|--|------------------------|
| <b>Impact</b>                                       | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>   | <b>Residual Impact</b> |
|   | <p>Services Station (land, design, construction, and equipment) that is needed to address the development of their property. In the event residential or commercial development occurs prior to the construction of this facility and would be outside the City's current service area, applicants pursuant to the Specific Plan shall prepare and submit an Interim Fire Protection Services Plan to the Emergency Services Department that will ensure that adequate fire protection facilities, equipment, and personnel are made available to sufficiently serve all phases of the Specific Plan. The Interim Fire Protection Services Plan, subject to the approval of the Chief of Emergency Services, may include one or more of the following components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribution towards construction of a new Emergency Services station at a site to be designated by the Chief of Emergency Services; that site could be either within or outside of the Specific Plan area <del>in to the site designated within the Specific Plan area.</del></li> <li>• Provision of fire protection equipment, such as a Type I fire engine, Type IV 4-wheel drive EMS/Rescue vehicle, and/or other equipment.</li> <li>• Funding for new Emergency Services department personnel.</li> </ul> <p><b>PS-3(c) Fire/Vegetation Management Plan.</b> Project applicants pursuant to the Specific Plan shall prepare and submit a Fire/Vegetation Management Plan to the Emergency Services Department that will meet the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan must set forth requirements to assure on-going protection of all structures and roads.</li> <li>• Defensible space around structures shall be maintained. Vegetation within defensible space should be strictly controlled, with specific species such as eucalyptus, juniper, cypress, pampas grass, acacia, or palm trees discouraged. Native species, such as coast live oak (<i>Quercus sp.</i>), California sycamore, toyon and shrubs/trees approved by the Emergency Services Department are encouraged.</li> <li>• The Fire/Vegetation Management Plan</li> </ul> |                        |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b>   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>Impact</b>   | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>   | <b>Residual Impact</b>   |
|   | <p>must clearly state exactly what management practices must be accomplished, date of annual compliance, and responsibility for cost of compliance.</p> <p><b>PS-3(d) Community Facilities District.</b> All properties within the Specific Plan area shall participate in a Community Facilities District to ensure fiscal neutrality in relation to city services, consistent with General Plan expectations.</p>  |  |
| <p><b>Impact PS-4</b> The Specific Plan would increase the number of residents which will impact the City of Paso Robles Police Department's ability to maintain identified officer to resident goals. However, upon payment of public facility fees and participation in a Community Facilities District (CFD) designed to cover the incremental cost of providing City services as a condition of Specific Plan approval, the Specific Plan would not substantially affect the personnel, equipment or organization of the Police Department. This is considered a Class II, significant but mitigable, impact.</p> | <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>PS-4(a) Community Facilities District.</b> All properties within the CRASP shall participate in a Community Facilities District to ensure fiscal neutrality in relation to city services, consistent with General Plan expectations.</p>  | <p>With proposed mitigation measures, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level.</p>   |
| <p><b>Impact PS-5</b> The Specific Plan would generate an estimated total of 546 elementary, middle and high school students. Students generated upon buildout of the Specific Plan would exacerbate existing overcrowded conditions at area Elementary, Middle, and High Schools. Therefore, impacts to schools facilities would be considered Class II, significant but mitigable.</p>  | <p><b>Subarea Specific Policy:</b></p> <p><b>School Siting Priority</b> (Applies to Subarea 10)</p> <p><b>EIR Mitigation Measures:</b></p> <p><b>PS-5(a) Buildout Date Notification.</b> Any project applicant pursuant to the Specific Plan shall work cooperatively with the Paso Robles Joint Unified School District regarding the timeframe of expected project completion, primarily for the purpose of notifying the district in advance to assist in their long-range planning efforts.</p> <p><b>PS-5(b) Statutory School Fees.</b> Applicants within the Specific Plan area shall pay the statutory school fees in effect at the time of issuance of building permits to the appropriate school districts unless the City receives documentation that alternative mitigation measures have been approved by the school district.</p> | <p>Mitigation Measure PS-5(b) would require the full development fees be charged to a developer by the school districts, unless mutually supported alternatives have been agreed upon. These fees would contribute funding for new school facilities for the students potentially generated by the Specific Plan. Pursuant to Section 65995 (3)(h) of the California Government Code (Senate Bill 50, chaptered August 27, 1998), the payment of statutory fees "...is deemed to be full and complete mitigation of the impacts of any legislative or adjudicative act, or both, involving, but not limited to, the planning, use, or developed of real property, or any change in governmental organization or reorganization." Therefore, subsequent to payment of statutory fees, school impacts would be considered less than significant.</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant But Mitigable)</b>  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>   | <b>Residual Impact</b>   |
| <p><b>Impact PS-8</b> The Specific Plan would generate approximately 2,300 tons of solid waste per year, from residential and commercial uses. The solid waste disposal services and landfill that would serve the Specific Plan have adequate capacity to accommodate the additional generated waste. However, the Specific Plan would result in the use of part of the limited remaining capacity of the landfill. Therefore, solid waste generation would be considered a Class II, significant but mitigable impact.</p> | <p><b><u>EIR Mitigation Measures:</u></b></p> <p><b>PS-8(a) Construction Solid Waste Minimization.</b> During the construction phases of development, the following mitigation measures will be implemented to reduce solid waste generation to the maximum extent feasible:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prior to construction, the contractor will arrange for construction recycling service with a waste collection provider. Roll-off bins for the collection of recoverable construction materials will be located onsite. The applicant, or authorized agent thereof, shall arrange for pick-up of recycled materials with a waste collection provider or shall transport recycled materials to the appropriate service center. Wood, concrete, drywall, metal, cardboard, asphalt, soil, and land clearing debris may all be recycled.</li> <li>• The contractor will designate a person to monitor recycling efforts and collect receipts for roll-off bins and/or construction waste recycling. All subcontractors will be informed of the recycling plan, including which materials are to be source-separated and placed in proper bins.</li> <li>• The above construction waste recycling measures will be incorporated into the construction specifications for the contractor.</li> </ul> | <p>Implementation of the mitigation measures would reduce solid waste generation to a less than significant level.</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS III IMPACTS (Less Than Significant)</b>   |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>LAND USE AND AGRICULTURE</b>  |   |  |
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b>   |
| <b>Impact LU-2</b> The proposed project would not impacts any prime soils or those of Statewide Importance. Furthermore, the value of the Specific Plan Area's agricultural land resources, as measured by the Land Evaluation & Site Assessment (LESA) Model, is not considered significant. Therefore, the project would result in Class III, less than significant, impacts related to agricultural conversion. | No mitigation is required.  | Impacts would be less than significant.  |
| <b>Impact LU-3</b> The northern portion of the proposed Specific Plan Area would overlap with the Paso Robles Municipal Airport Planning Area. However, this portion of the Specific Plan area would contain commercial uses that are allowable in such areas pursuant to the Airport Land Use Plan and would therefore be considered a Class III, less than significant impact.                                   | <b>Subarea Specific Policies:</b><br><br><b>Airport Safety Considerations</b> (Applies to Subareas 18 and 19)<br><br>No other mitigation measures are required.               | Impacts would be less than significant.  |
| <b>TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</b>  |   |  |
| <b>Impact T-2</b> If improperly designed, site access and internal circulation roads could potentially result in safety hazards. The Specific Plan includes site access, emergency access, and internal access road standards to accommodate Specific Plan traffic. Class III, less than significant, impacts would result.  | <b>Specific Plan Policies:</b><br><br><b>Policy C-3</b> (Design Standards)<br><br><b>Policy C-7</b> (Emergency Access)<br><br>No additional mitigation measures are required. | Through the implementation of the Specific Plan, less than significant impacts would result. |
| <b>Impact T-3</b> The Specific Plan will include residential and commercial uses, which must provide parking consistent with the City's zoning requirements. This is considered a Class III, less than significant impact.   | No mitigation measures are required since development under the Specific Plan would be required to meet zoning provisions related to providing sufficient parking.            | Impacts would be less than significant.  |
| <b>AIR QUALITY</b>   |   |  |
| <b>Impact AQ-4</b> The Specific Plan traffic generation, together with other cumulative traffic associated with foreseeable development would not result in CO "hotspots". Therefore, the Specific Plan's potential to   | No mitigation measures are required.  | Impacts would be less than significant.  |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS III IMPACTS (Less Than Significant)</b>  |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| generate CO “hotspots” is considered to be a Class III, less than significant impact.   |  |   |
| <b>NOISE</b>  |  |   |
| <b>Impact N-4</b> Subareas 18 and 19 are the only portions of the Specific Plan that would be subject to high traffic noise volumes generated from State Route 46 East. No residences or other sensitive uses are proposed in this area. Some commercial uses would be subject to noise in excess of 70 dB. However, this would not create an unacceptable interior noise environment. Therefore, impacts relating to noise from existing traffic on State Route 46 are considered to be less than significant (Class III). | No mitigation is required.   | Impacts would be less than significant.   |
| <b>Impact N-5</b> The proposed Specific Plan designates residential uses in the vicinity of the existing Barney Schwartz Park. Activities at the park have the potential to generate noise that will impact these residences. Noise impacts on nearby residences from activities at Barney Schwartz Park are considered Class III, less than significant.   | <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Policy LU-20</b> (Constructive Notice Regarding Lights and Noise) <i>Relates primarily to development in the general vicinity of Barney Schwartz Park.</i></p> <p>No additional mitigation measures are required to address this impact.</p>     | Because of the Specific Plan’s avoidance of residential uses directly adjacent to Barney Schwartz Park, and the requirement of constructive notice in other relatively nearby residential areas, impacts would be less than significant. It should be noted that this would not necessarily eliminate the potential for noise nuisance complaints to the City, but that from a CEQA perspective, this impact would be considered less than significant. |
| <b>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>   |  |   |
| <b>Impact B-1</b> Development in accordance with the Specific Plan would result in the removal of approximately 381 acres of non-native annual grassland habitat. This is considered a Class III, less than significant impact.   | No mitigation measures are required. Mitigation measures listed under impacts B-3 and B-5 address impacts on the San Joaquin Kit Fox and shining navarretia, both of which depend in part on grassland habitat. These measures are intended in part to preserve non-native annual grassland. | Impacts would be less than significant.   |
| <b>PUBLIC SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE</b>   |  |   |
| <b>Impact PS-6</b> The Specific Plan would generate an additional water demand of approximately 2,374 AFY. Additional water supply, storage, and distribution facilities will be necessary to accommodate the additional water demand. However, the Specific Plan includes policies to  | <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Policy I-6</b> (Water Service)</p> <p><b>Policy I-7</b> (Looped System)</p> <p><b>Policy I-8</b> (New Water Supply Wells)</p> <p><b>Policy I-9</b> (Water Storage Responsibility)</p>  | Impacts would be less than significant with the implementation of proposed specific plan policies.  |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS III IMPACTS (Less Than Significant)</b>   |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p>accommodate the additional demand. Therefore, impacts related to water supply would be considered, Class III, less than significant.</p>  | <p><b>Policy I-10</b> (Water Distribution)</p> <p><b>Policy I-11</b> (Fire Flow Requirements)</p> <p><b>Policy I-12</b> (Extension of Utilities)</p> <p><b>Policy LU-25</b> (Landscaping)</p> <p>Implementation of these policies will be sufficient to reduce water demand and provide adequate water supplies to new development in the Chandler Ranch Area. No additional mitigation is necessary.</p> |  |
| <p><b>Impact PS-7</b> Buildout of the Specific Plan would generate an estimated 1.1 million gallons of wastewater per day under peak wet weather flow conditions. The City's wastewater treatment plant would not have the capacity to handle this amount of wastewater without improvements. However, the Specific Plan includes policies and implementation measures that restrict development until such time that adequate wastewater treatment capacity and trunkline capacity are provided. With these measures, impacts from the proposed Specific Plan on wastewater facilities are considered Class III, less than significant.</p> | <p><b>Specific Plan Policies:</b></p> <p><b>Policy I-13</b> (Sewer Service)</p> <p><b>Policy I-14</b> (Sewer Treatment Capacity)</p> <p><b>Policy I-15</b> (Sewer Trunkline Capacity)</p> <p>Implementation of these policies will be sufficient to provide adequate wastewater services to new development in the Chandler Ranch Area. No additional mitigation is necessary.</p>                        | <p>Implementation of the listed policies would reduce Specific Plan impacts related to the wastewater system to a less than significant level.</p> |



**Table ES-1. Summary of Project Environmental Impacts, Mitigation Measures, and Residual Impacts**

| <b>CLASS IV IMPACTS (Beneficial)</b>   |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>FLOODING AND DRAINAGE</b>   |   |  |
| <b>Impact FD-4</b> Under the proposed Specific Plan, much of the site would include urban development which would replace agricultural uses. This would change runoff characteristics within existing drainage areas from untreated agricultural runoff to treated urban runoff. This is considered a Class IV beneficial impact.  | No mitigation measures are required for this beneficial impact. | Impacts from the proposed project development are potentially beneficial to water quality in the Templeton to Paso Robles Watershed and the Lower Huerhuero Creek Watershed. |
| <b>PUBLIC SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE</b>  |   |  |
| <b>Impact PS-1</b> The implementation of 1,439 single-family housing units would generate demand for parkland. The population generated by Specific Plan buildout would impact the City's ability meet its standard of 7 acres of parkland per 1,000 residents. However, as a condition of the annexation, the property owner dedicated approximately 40 acres for use as an active park, and the Specific Plan would contribute 303.9 acres of recreational open space. Therefore, the total far exceeds the project's need to contribute 27.2 acres. Impacts would be considered Class IV, <i>beneficial</i> . | No mitigation measures are required.                            | Impacts would be beneficial.   |
| <b>Impact PS-2</b> The Specific Plan would include a public hiking trail system that would connect Barney Schwartz Park with areas to the south of Linne Road. With respect to the provision of recreation through public trails, the Specific Plan is considered to have a Class IV, beneficial impact.   | No mitigation measure would be required.                        | Implementing the public trail system throughout the Specific Plan would <i>benefit</i> Specific Plan residents and residents within the Specific Plan vicinity.              |



The following table identifies the cumulative impacts which may occur under buildout of the proposed Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan. The cumulative transportation and circulation, air quality, and noise impacts are also included in the previous table (Table ES-1).

**Table ES-2. Summary of Cumulative Environmental Impacts**

| <b><i>CLASS I IMPACTS (Significant and Unavoidable)</i></b>  |
|--|
| <b><i>LAND USE AND AGRICULTURE</i></b>   |
| Cumulative development within the City of Paso Robles and its immediate vicinity would gradually alter the rural character of the area. The proposed project would substantially contribute to this change. This impact would be significant and unavoidable.  |
| <b><i>TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</i></b>   |
| Addition of traffic generated by the Specific Plan to Year 2025 Mitigated Base Plus Specific Plan traffic volumes would cause 4 to 7 major intersections, 2 to 4 major roadway segments, and 5-6 freeway ramps to operate at unacceptable levels depending on whether Airport Road is connected to SR 46E, and whether the Charolais Road bridge is built. This would result in a Class I, <i>significant and unavoidable</i> , impact under cumulative development conditions (Year 2025 baseline, plus specific plan development, plus general plan improvement traffic network built). (Also refer to impact T-4 for further discussion and feasible mitigation measures.)  |
| <b><i>AIR QUALITY</i></b>  |
| The South Central Coast Air Basin is currently in non-attainment for State PM <sub>10</sub> standards. The Specific Plan, in combination with pending development elsewhere in the City of Paso Robles planning area, could contribute to the cumulative degradation of regional air quality. Increases in automobile traffic, resulting from General Plan buildout would cause increases in ozone precursor and PM <sub>10</sub> emissions. In addition, cumulative construction-related emissions would contribute to the cumulative exceedance of the state and federal ozone standard. Because the Specific Plan would incrementally add to the exceedance of these standards, cumulative impacts would be significant and unavoidable.  |
| <b><i>CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES</i></b>  |
| The proposed Specific Plan includes policies to address impacts to historical resources on the site, but there is no guarantee that the key feature that would be impacted—the ranch/barn complex—would be preserved, a necessary requirement to reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Because of the significance of the ranch/barn complex to the City’s and region’s history, this impact would result in a Class I, significant unavoidable cumulative impact to historical resources within the area.  |
| <b><i>AESTHETICS AND COMMUNITY DESIGN</i></b>  |
| The City General Plan land use designation of the proposed project is Specific Plan, which envisions a level of development generally consistent with what is included in the proposed project. Development of the site for urban use was therefore expected and is consistent with the General Plan. Therefore, any impacts to the visual character of the site and the surrounding area related to the conversion of the rural character of the site were anticipated in the General Plan EIR. However, buildout under the General Plan would result in a significant cumulative loss of open space and would irrevocably alter the character of the area from semi-rural to urban. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would incrementally contribute to this change in aesthetic character of the site and the surrounding areas. Cumulative impacts would be significant and unavoidable.  |
| <b><i>TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION</i></b>   |
| Year 2025 Mitigated Base Roadway Operations + Specific Plan traffic is estimated to result in nine roadways and four intersections having unacceptable LOS under both scenarios with and without the Charolais Road Overcrossing. The proposed Specific Plan includes Policy C-2, as shown under Impact T-1 that addresses required roadway segment and intersection improvements. With implementation of these improvements required by the proposed Specific Plan, impacts to roadways and intersection operations would be reduced to the extent feasible. The roadway geometrics and control is shown in Figure 4.2-11. However, as seen in Table 4.2-18 and Table 4.2-19 below, all roadway segments meet the City’s LOS requirements except the Spring St./1st St./Niblick Road intersection, which would remain at an unacceptable PM LOS E under post-Specific Plan conditions. No feasible mitigation measures are available to reduce this impact to an acceptable level. Impacts would remain Class I, significant and unavoidable. |
| <b><i>NOISE</i></b>  |
| The Specific Plan, in combination with cumulative development in the vicinity would add to roadway corridor noise levels already above the 65 dBA CNEL City threshold. This is considered a <i>Class I, significant and unavoidable impact</i> . (Also discussed as Impact N-6.)   |
| <b><i>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</i></b>   |
| Development in accordance with the Specific Plan would contribute to cumulative biological impacts in the region. These impacts would include the loss of special-status plant species and habitat, loss of wildlife foraging/feeding areas for a variety of wildlife species, and restriction of movement opportunities for the SJKF. The extent of these   |



**Table ES-2. Summary of Cumulative Environmental Impacts**

|  |
|--|
| <p>impacts depends on the proximity of other approved and proposed projects under consideration, and the effects of potential buildout within the City and developed portions of the unincorporated County lands. Cumulative development, both within the City and County, is expected to occur within the vicinity of the site and along the Highway 46 corridor. City development under the General Plan is expected to occur adjacent to the site to the northwest, and to the southwest along Creston Road and Linne Road. Although project-specific impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant impact, buildout of this large area in combination with other regional development could result in additional impacts as available land for habitat decreases, and mitigation becomes more problematic as development pressures increase. Because it is unclear whether such impacts associated with regional development could be mitigated to a less than significant level, cumulative impacts to biological resources are considered Class I, <i>significant and unavoidable</i>.</p>   |
| <p><b>CLASS II IMPACTS (Significant but Mitigable)</b></p>   |
| <p><b>FLOODING AND DRAINAGE</b></p> <p>Cumulative development under the General Plan would alter landforms in the City and would expose new residents and property to hazards from erosion and sedimentation that exist in the area. Development under the Specific Plan would contribute to these cumulative impacts. However, grading and associated erosion issues would be addressed on a case-by-case basis to mitigate impacts resulting from individual projects.</p>   |
| <p><b>PUBLIC SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE</b></p> <p>Buildout of the Specific Plan area would increase demands on fire and police protection services by adding residents and generating additional traffic that would hinder emergency response. Without increases in staffing and facilities correlating to these population increases, potentially significant impacts could occur. The Specific Plan would incrementally contribute to this impact. It is anticipated that adequate fire services would be developed to accommodate cumulative demand as long as the City requires participation in a Community Facilities District to ensure fiscal neutrality.</p> <p>The permitted capacity of the City plant is 4.9 million gallons per day (mgd). The current average daily sewage flow into the plant is 2.8 mgd. However, plant capacity is limited due to a high solids loading rate, and available plant capacity has been reduced to 3.7 MGD with current entitlements absorbing the excess capacity. The sewage treatment facility must be upgraded to either 1) incorporate technology that would more efficiently treat wastewater, to better use its existing design capacity; or 2) expand the existing plant capacity to accommodate the City's buildout population, which would include development in the Chandler Ranch Area consistent with the proposed Specific Plan. Recommendations for improving the sewer system and how the improvements will be paid for will be refined in the City's updated 2005 Sewer Master Plan. The payment of the City's wastewater impact fees, which are directed at funding improvements to the Water Reclamation Facility, are sufficient to offset cumulative impacts to the wastewater treatment plant. Other impacts to the City's wastewater conveyance system would be mitigated on a project by project basis, as development occurs.</p> |
| <p><b>CLASS III IMPACTS (Less than Significant)</b></p>  |
| <p><b>LAND USE AND AGRICULTURE</b></p> <p>Individual development projects in the City and within nearby unincorporated areas would have the potential to create compatibility conflicts relating to the interface of existing urban and rural uses and new urban development. Such conflicts are expected to be addressed on a case-by-case basis, and can be resolved through appropriate design. Cumulative land use compatibility conflicts would be less than significant.</p>   |
| <p><b>AIR QUALITY</b></p> <p>The Specific Plan traffic generation, together with other cumulative traffic associated with foreseeable development would not result in CO "hotspots". Therefore, the Specific Plan's potential to generate CO "hotspots" is considered to be a Class III, <i>less than significant</i> impact. (This is also discussed as Impact AQ-4.)</p>   |
| <p><b>SAFETY AND GEOLOGIC HAZARDS</b></p> <p>Buildout of pending and approved projects in the greater Paso Robles area would increase development in the region. Buildout under the General Plan would result in additional residents and structures that could be placed at risk. Such development would alter landforms in the City and would expose new residents and property to seismic hazards that exist in the area. The proposed project would incrementally contribute to these cumulative impacts. However, grading and seismic issues would be addressed on a case-by-case basis to mitigate impacts resulting from individual projects. In addition, mitigation measures including soil and groundwater assessment, measures required in the event that hazardous materials are discovered, and the screening of imported fill material will further reduce impacts related to hazardous materials. Given that all projects would be required to adhere to seismic standards contained in the Uniform Building Code, City requirements pertaining to grading and mitigation measures related to hazardous materials, less than significant cumulative safety and geological impacts are anticipated to result from the proposed Specific Plan in conjunction with other projects in the area.</p>   |



**Table ES-2. Summary of Cumulative Environmental Impacts**

|  |
|--|
| <p><b><i>CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES</i></b></p> <p>Development under the proposed Specific Plan in conjunction with buildout of the City of Paso Robles has the potential to cumulatively impact archaeological and paleontological resources. Existing General Plan policies are intended to fully protect known archaeological resources, and onsite monitoring and proper handling of potentially uncovered resources would address this impact to a less than significant level.</p>  |
| <p><b><i>FLOODING AND DRAINAGE</i></b></p> <p>Cumulative development would increase overall activity levels in the area, with potential increases in sedimentation and concentration of contaminants such as oil, grease, and solvents in surface runoff that are discharged to local waterways, including Huerhuero Creek, and local groundwater. However, all development on sites of over one acre would be subject to NPDES permit requirements pertaining to construction activity while all development in the City would be subject to various City requirements pertaining to controlling erosion and preserving water quality. These standard requirements would be expected to reduce cumulative impacts to water quality to a less than significant level.</p> <p>All development would have the potential to result in an increase in impervious surface area, thereby increasing peak storm runoff in the area. The proposed project may incrementally contribute to this increase. However, the installation of properly designed retention/siltation basins would reduce peak storm flows. Moreover, all development proposals would be required to upgrade stormwater infrastructure as needed. Thus, with implementation of required improvements, cumulative impacts pertaining to flooding and drainage are anticipated to be less than significant.</p>  |
| <p><b><i>PUBLIC SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE</i></b></p> <p>Development of the proposed Specific Plan in combination with other cumulative projects in the Paso Robles area will have a cumulative impact upon the Paso Robles Joint Unified School District through increased student generation. However, these potential cumulative impacts can be mitigated through payment of developer fees for construction of additional school facilities. With this mitigation measure, the proposed Specific Plan within the cumulative development scenario would not significantly alter regional or cumulative school services.</p> <p>Although the CFD for services participation would in the long-term address staffing needs, development within the Specific Plan area will also need to provide a share of a new Emergency Services facility and in order to have the facility and services in place with initial development, as an interim measure it may be necessary for new development to accelerate the process of facility and/or staffing funding.</p> <p>The cumulative water demands of the City's anticipated population could exceed current capacities. The Specific Plan is included in the future water demand estimates and would not substantially alter the estimates of the cumulative demand or substantially interfere with the planning and implementation of future water supply expansions. In the year 2000, groundwater pumpage in the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin was approximately 82,638 AFY, compared with the perennial yield estimate of 94,000 AFY. It should be noted that the Basin also serves other areas. As shown in Table 4.10-8, water demand from all potentially developable land uses under the General Plan, including sphere of influence and expansion areas, under General Plan Update buildout conditions, would be 6,585 AFY. When added to existing water demand, total General Plan buildout water demand would be 14,682 AFY. Total water demand under General Plan buildout conditions, which includes development of the Chandler Ranch Area, would not exceed the perennial safe yield of the groundwater basin. Like all current development projects, development in the Specific Plan Area would be required to pay for the facilities and infrastructure necessary to meet expected demand. Developers in the Chandler Ranch Area would also be required to pay water connection fees aimed at improving the City's water system. Therefore, cumulative impacts to water supply in the City would be considered less than significant.</p> <p>Water storage and water supply needs would also be required to be addressed by development within the Specific Plan area. Specific Plan policies will specify the manner in which these needs can best be met.</p> <p>Cumulative buildout of the area would increase solid waste generation, thereby reducing the lifespan of solid waste landfills serving the area. Implementation of the proposed Specific Plan would contribute incrementally to the cumulative impact to landfill capacity. However, cumulative development in the area would not be sufficient to require an expansion of the existing facilities beyond the transfer station that is currently under construction. Therefore, the contribution of the Specific Plan to cumulative solid waste impacts would be less than significant.</p> |
| <p align="center"><b><i>CLASS IV IMPACTS (Beneficial)</i></b></p>  |
| <p><b><i>PUBLIC SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE</i></b></p> <p>When the existing 101.5 acres of recreational area in the City are combined with a 303.9-acre contribution from the Specific Plan area, there would be a total of 404.7 acres of recreational open space within the City. This would exceed the 308 acres needed at General Plan buildout. Thus, cumulative impacts associated with the Specific Plan have a Class IV, beneficial impact.</p>   |



Table ES-3 below identifies the potential growth inducing impacts which may occur under buildout of the proposed Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan.

**Table ES-3. Summary of Growth Inducing Impacts**

| <b>REMOVAL OF OBSTACLES TO GROWTH</b>  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Impact</b>  | <b>Mitigation Measures</b>  | <b>Residual Impact</b>  |
| <p>If infrastructure is overbuilt, it could accommodate additional or more intensive development on-site or off-site at some point in the future, thereby removing an obstacle to future growth.</p> | <p><b><u>Specific Plan Policies:</u></b></p> <p><b>Policy I-1 (Utility Sizing)</b></p> <p>The following mitigation measure would reduce the potentially significant physical effects associated with growth that the proposed Specific Plan could indirectly induce by limiting the potential for the Specific Plan to induce growth in the area:</p> <p><b><u>EIR Mitigation Measure:</u></b></p> <p><b>GI-1(a) Infrastructure Capacity Limitations.</b> Water, sewer and circulation infrastructure that serves the Specific Plan land uses should be sized to meet only the demands of the Plan itself, as well as other offsite areas that are included in the 2003 General Plan. Such areas include the Beechwood/Olsen Specific Plan, as well as other citywide development anticipated under the General Plan.</p> | <p>With the above measure, the potential to induce further growth would be reduced to a <i>less than significant</i> level.</p> |

