

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document is a Revised Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan. The proposed project would guide future development within an 826.7-acre area, which lies entirely within the corporate boundary of the City of Paso Robles. Under the Specific Plan, the site could accommodate up to 1,439 dwelling units, 280,500 square feet of commercial uses, a school, and 303.9 acres of designated open space.

This Revised EIR evaluates a full buildout scenario of the proposed Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan land uses in accordance with the development pattern and standards identified in the Specific Plan. For the purpose of this Revised EIR, “project” refers to all aspects and phases of the proposed Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan, including site preparation, construction, interim phases, and buildout of the Plan. The Plan’s background, as well as the legal basis for preparing an EIR, is described below.

1.1 PROJECT BACKGROUND

Project History. The Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan has been the subject of land use planning efforts in the City of Paso Robles since the 1980s. Most of the properties within the boundaries of the currently-proposed Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan were annexed to the City in 1980 and are subject to obligations for improvements pursuant to an Annexation Agreement. The parcels north of Union Road were added to the City in the late 1980s, and the “Our Town” area was annexed in February 2005.

Active efforts to plan for development in this area began in the mid-1980s. In 1988 the City’s General Plan was amended to require preparation of a Specific Plan for the 1,793 acre Chandler Ranch, both within the City and in the adjacent County Unincorporated Area. This geographic area was the subject of a Specific Plan effort that was active from about 1989 through 1991. In the mid-1990s the City and County portions of the Chandler Ranch were sold to different parties. The Specific Plan currently under consideration includes only the western half of the original 1,793-acre Chandler Ranch, the portion within the City limits. The eastern half was subject to a separate planning effort that was overseen by the County, where an agricultural cluster residential subdivision of 43 dwelling units was ultimately approved by the County in 2001.

During the late 1990s, at the property owner’s request, the City lifted the requirement to prepare a Specific Plan. The property owner submitted a “master plan” for the 673 acres that were then within the City boundaries. In June 2001, a Final Environmental Impact Report was certified but the City Council rejected the General Plan and Zone Change proposal. The City Council subsequently re-established the requirement for a Specific Plan and applied that requirement to a larger geographic area (the current 826.7 acres), including the current boundary of the Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan. The current effort to prepare this Specific Plan has been underway since 2001.

Relationship Between Revised and Original Draft EIR. This document is a revision of the original August 2004 Draft Environmental Impact Report analyzing the August 2004 Draft Chandler Ranch Specific Plan, which was circulated for public review from September 1 through November 24, 2004. After the circulation of the draft and prior to the preparation of a



Final EIR, circumstances arose that suggested a more efficient course of action would be to revise the Draft Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan, revise the Draft EIR, and recirculate both for public review. The circumstances included:

- *A Caltrans request for an expanded traffic analysis;*
- *A desire to modify certain land uses and policies related thereto;*
- *A need to clarify and confirm details regarding land form modification;*
- *A need to resolve identified biological resource impacts to a greater degree of certainty;*
and
- *A desire to update information related to jurisdictional changes and land use authority within portions of the Specific Plan area.*

As the comments on the August 2004 Draft EIR were received and reviewed, it became clear that Caltrans was calling for a significantly broader scope of traffic impact analysis and that some fundamental changes to the Draft Specific Plan were desirable. Planning Areas 4, 5, and 10, all of which are adjacent to Union Road in the northern portion of the Specific Plan area, called for substantial tourist-related commercial development. As indicated in the 2004 Draft EIR, these uses generated significant offsite transportation impacts to roadways that either were not desired or would be difficult to mitigate.

In early 2005, a vehicle trip impact threshold analysis was conducted to verify the level of impact that could be expected due to commercial development within the northern portion of the Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan planning area. As a result of that analysis, the land uses in areas 4, 5, and 10, have been revised to greatly reduce or eliminate potential commercial development. The land use mixture and boundaries within other planning areas have also been modified, in part to address some of the issues identified in the August 2004 EIR or the thresholds analysis, and in part to address other planning considerations more recently identified. However, the overall residential buildout potential of the entire Specific Plan has not changed from the 1,439 dwelling units previously studied. The commercial development potential within the Specific Plan has been reduced by 38%, from 455,000 SF to 280,500 SF.

In the Revised Specific Plan, the potential school site was moved from the southern end of the plan to the northern end (within Area 10), in part because of refinements in the Airport Land Use Plan that showed that such a use would not be within an airport safety zone, which had been a previous concern raised in the August 2004 Draft EIR. At that time, the Airport Land Use Plan update had not been finalized.

In addition to these changes, information related to jurisdictional authority has also changed. The “Our Town” area was annexed in February 2005. This has the regulatory effect of eliminating San Luis Obispo County and San Luis Obispo LAFCO from their roles as a responsible agency under CEQA, since the annexation had the effect of transferring land use decision making from these two agencies to the City of Paso Robles.

The boundaries of the Revised Specific Plan were refined, and the total area was found to be slightly smaller than was studied in the August 2004 Draft EIR. The 826.7-acre Specific Plan area is 10.5 acres less than was previously studied. The difference can be attributed to the fact that the previous plan included portions of certain existing roadways that surround the site, including



portions of Golden Hill Road, Union Road, Linne Road, and Fontana Road, all of which in actuality are just outside the Specific Plan area.

Finally, a number of technical issues surrounding biological resources, the provision of public services, and allowable landform modification were raised in the commentary that responded to the 2004 Draft EIR. This Revised Draft EIR responds to the body of commentary by addressing the issues directly in the Revised Chandler Ranch Specific Plan, and in the revised analysis contained in this Revised Draft EIR.

The comments received during the public circulation period are included in their entirety in Appendix J of this Revised Draft EIR. The intent will be so that readers can review these to provide context to the changes contemplated in the Revised Draft EIR. This approach is allowed under *State CEQA Guidelines* Section 15088.5 (f)(1) pertaining to Recirculation of a Draft EIR, which states:

When an EIR is substantially revised and the entire document is recirculated, the lead agency may require reviewers to submit new comments and, in such cases, need not respond to those comments received during the earlier circulation period. The lead agency shall advise reviewers, either in the text of the revised EIR or by an attachment to the revised EIR, that although part of the administrative record, the previous comments do not require a written response in the final EIR, and that new comments must be submitted for the revised EIR. The lead agency need only respond to those comments submitted in response to the recirculated revised EIR.

This Revised EIR will not include responses to the comments from the August 2004 Draft EIR, but will assume that any necessary changes or corrections have been made to the text or graphics of the Revised Draft Specific Plan or within this Revised Draft EIR. If responses provided in this format are not to a reader's satisfaction, the reader should submit a new comment letter.

1.2 PURPOSE AND LEGAL AUTHORITY

This Revised EIR has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and the State CEQA Guidelines. In accordance with Section 15121(a) of the State CEQA Guidelines, the purpose of an EIR is to serve as an informational document that:

"...will inform public agency decision-makers and the public generally of the significant environmental effects of a project, identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and describe reasonable alternatives to the project..."

This document is a Program EIR. Section 15168(a) of the CEQA Guidelines outlines the program EIR process as follows:

"(A) *General. A program EIR is an EIR which may be prepared on a series of actions that can be characterized as one large project and are related either:*

(1) Geographically;

(2) As logical parts in a chain of contemplated actions;



- (3) *In connection with issuance of rules, regulations, plans, or other general criteria to govern the conduct of a continuing program; or*
 - (4) *As individual activities carried out under the same authorizing statutory or regulatory authority and having generally similar environmental effects which can be mitigated in similar ways.*
- (B) *Advantages. Use of a program EIR can provide the following advantages. The program EIR can:*
- (1) *Provide an occasion for a more exhaustive consideration of effects and alternatives than would be practical in an EIR on an individual action,*
 - (2) *Ensure consideration of cumulative impacts that might be slighted in a case-by-case analysis,*
 - (3) *Avoid duplicative reconsideration of basic policy considerations,*
 - (4) *Allow the Lead Agency to consider broad policy alternatives and program-wide mitigation measures at an early time when the agency has greater flexibility to deal with basic problems or cumulative impacts, and*
 - (5) *Allow reduction in paperwork.*
- (C) *Use with Later Activities. Subsequent activities in the program must be examined in the light of the program EIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared.*
- (1) *If a later activity would have effects that were not examined in the program EIR, a new Initial Study would need to be prepared leading to either an EIR or a Negative Declaration.*
 - (2) *If the agency finds that pursuant to Section 15162, no new effects could occur or no new mitigation measures would be required, the agency can approve the activity as being within the scope of the project covered by the program EIR, and no new environmental document would be required.*
 - (3) *An agency shall incorporate feasible mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the program EIR into subsequent actions in the program.*
 - (4) *Where the subsequent activities involve site specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the program EIR.*
 - (5) *A program EIR will be most helpful in dealing with subsequent activities if it deals with the effects of the program as specifically and comprehensively as possible. With a good and detailed analysis of the program, many subsequent activities could be found to be within the scope of the project described in the program EIR, and no further environmental documents would be required."*



The Specific Plan is proposed by the City of Paso Robles to implement a portion of its General Plan, and is not the result of any development applications. This Program EIR presents a reasonable worst-case scenario of site development and improvements in accordance with the proposed Specific Plan. As Development applications pursuant to the Specific Plan are received, City staff will identify whether the proposals are substantially consistent with the Specific Plan project as evaluated in this document, or whether the proposals would require additional environmental review pursuant to CEQA.

This report is to serve as an informational document for the public and City of Paso Robles decision-makers. The process will culminate with Planning Commission and City Council hearings to consider certification of a Final EIR and a decision whether to approve the proposed Specific Plan, possibly with conditions of approval.

1.3 SCOPE AND CONTENT

In accordance with the State CEQA Guidelines a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was circulated for review by affected agencies and the public on February 3, 2004. The circulation period endured for 30 days, and closed March 5, 2004. The NOP and responses to the NOP are presented in Appendix A of this report.

This Revised EIR addresses the same issues determined to be potentially significant by the responses to the NOP, and scoping discussions among the public, consulting staff, and the City. The issues addressed in this EIR include:

- *Land Use and Agriculture*
- *Transportation and Circulation*
- *Air Quality*
- *Noise*
- *Safety and Geologic Hazards*
- *Cultural and Historic Resources*
- *Aesthetics and Community Design*
- *Flooding and Drainage*
- *Biological Resources*
- *Public Services and Infrastructure*
- *Growth-Inducing Impacts*

This EIR addresses the issues referenced above and identifies potentially significant environmental impacts, including site-specific and cumulative effects of the proposed Specific Plan in accordance with the provisions set forth in the State CEQA Guidelines. In addition, the EIR recommends mitigation measures that would reduce or eliminate adverse environmental effects.

In preparing the Revised EIR, use was made of pertinent City policies and guidelines, existing EIRs and background documents prepared by the City. The Revised EIR also benefited from the input received from reviewers during its circulation period of September 1, 2004 through November 24, 2004. The written comments received during the circulation of the original Draft EIR are included in Appendix J of this document. A full reference list is contained in Section 8.0, *References and Preparers*, of this EIR.



The Alternatives section of the EIR was prepared in accordance with Section 15126(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines and focuses on alternatives that are capable of eliminating or reducing significant adverse effects associated with the proposed Specific Plan while feasibly attaining most of the basic objectives of the Plan. In addition, the EIR identifies the "environmentally superior" alternative from the alternatives assessed. The alternatives evaluated include:

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

The level of detail contained throughout this Revised EIR comports with the requirements of CEQA and applicable court decisions. The State CEQA Guidelines provide the standard of adequacy on which this document is based. Section 15151 of the State CEQA Guidelines states:

An EIR should be prepared with a sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental consequences. An evaluation of the environmental effects of the proposed project need not be exhaustive, but the sufficiency of an EIR is to be reviewed in light of what is reasonably feasible. Disagreement among experts does not make an EIR inadequate, but, the EIR should summarize the main points of disagreement among the experts. The courts have looked not for perfection, but for adequacy, completeness, and a good faith effort at full disclosure.

1.4 LEAD, RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES

The State CEQA Guidelines define "lead," "responsible" and "trustee" agencies. The City of Paso Robles is the lead agency for the Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan because it has the principal responsibility for approving the Plan.

A "responsible agency" refers to public agencies other than the "lead agency" that has some discretionary approval over the proposed Specific Plan. The following are considered responsible agencies:

- ***U.S. Army Corps of Engineers*** – Section 404 of the Clean Water Act gives the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers jurisdiction of any Waters of the United States, including wetlands within the planning area. Such areas would be subject to permitting authority of the Army Corps of Engineers.
- ***Regional Water Quality Control Board*** – Section 401 of the Clean Water Act requires that if a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers is required, a 401 water quality certification would be required from the Regional Board.
- ***San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District*** – The City of Paso Robles lies within the Central Coast Air Basin which is monitored and regulated by the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District.



- *Caltrans* – The State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) would review and approve the construction, expansion, or modification of State Route 46, which is the only state highway traversing the planning area.

A "trustee agency" has jurisdiction over certain resources held in trust for the people of the State of California, but do not have a legal authority over approving the project. Only four trustee agencies are defined in CEQA, and one applies to this project:

- *State of California Department of Fish and Game* - CDFG is a trustee agency with regard to wildlife, plants and associated habitat on the site.

It should be noted that as a "trustee agency", CDFG in practice also acts as a "responsible agency", in that it will have discretionary permitting authority over biological resources within its jurisdiction.

1.5 EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT

Based on the scoping process for the proposed Specific Plan, the City of Paso Robles determined that there was no substantial evidence that the Project would cause or otherwise result in significant environmental effects in the resource areas discussed below. As indicated in the State CEQA Guidelines, no further environmental review of these issues is necessary for the reasons summarized in the following discussion. The substantiation for determining that these issues would result in no impact, or a less-than-significant impact is described in further detail in Appendix A, NOP, pursuant to § 15128 of the State CEQA Guidelines.

Biological Resources

Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

The site is not located within an area subject to an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No impacts would result.

Geology and Soils

Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i) *Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?*

The site is not located in the vicinity of any body of water that could result in a seiche or tsunami. No impacts would result.

Would the project result in the loss of a unique geologic feature?

No unique geologic or physical features are located on the site. No impacts would result.



Where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water, is the soil capable of supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems?

All new development within the City is anticipated to be connected to the municipal waste disposal system. Thus, impacts related to the use of septic systems are anticipated to be less than significant. No further analysis of this issue will be conducted in the EIR.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the likely release of hazardous materials into the environment?

The proposed Specific Plan would not create reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, as the proposed land uses consist primarily of residential development that would not involve the storage or transport of substantial quantities of such materials, or any hazardous design features. Therefore, the proposed Specific Plan would not expose adjacent receptors to releases of hazardous substances. Less than significant impacts would result.

Would the project reasonably be anticipated to emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

As described above, the proposed commercial and residential uses would not be expected to use substantial quantities of hazardous substances. There is a proposed school site in the Specific Plan. However, because there is no substantial quantity of hazardous substances, no impacts would result.

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

There are no private airstrips near the Specific Plan area. Development under the Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan is not anticipated to interfere with any emergency response programs or plans.

Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The proposed Specific Plan would not interfere with any emergency response plan or evacuation plan since no such plan exists for the Specific Plan area. Individual development will be evaluated for specific impacts regarding emergency response issues on a case by case basis. No impacts would result.

Land Use and Planning

Would the project physically divide an established community?



The proposed Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan establishes a planned land use pattern to guide growth within the study area boundary. Apart from the “Our Town” subdivision, the planning area does not currently have an established community since it is largely rural and undeveloped. The implementation of the Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan is intended to preserve and enhance the quality of the community through the preservation of open space and the protection of natural resources along with the provision of proposed residential and commercial land uses. The Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan is the governing long-range guide for future development in the study area, and all proposed land uses will need to be made consistent with the General Plan. The Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan land use designations guide the general distribution, location, and extent of the various types of land uses in the study area. Proposed land use designations will allow for the conversion of undeveloped or vacant land to urban uses. However, the physical arrangement of established communities would not be disrupted or divided.

Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?

The proposed Specific Plan would not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan because none exist in the vicinity of the site.

Mineral Resources

Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource classified MRZ-2 by the State Geologist that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

The site does not support significant mineral resources, nor have any been classified by the State Geologist. The proposed Specific Plan would not result in impacts to mineral resources.

Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

The site does not support significant mineral resources, nor have any been identified in local plans or resource inventories. The proposed Specific Plan would not result in impacts to mineral resources.

Noise

For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

Although the Paso Robles Airport is located north of the project area, the Airport Land Use Plan indicates the entire site is outside the projected 55 dBA CNEL noise contour. Thus, potential development within the planning area would not be exposed to excessive airport-related noise. Therefore, the project would not be affected by air traffic noise impacts.

For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?



The site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and therefore would not be affected by associated air traffic noise impacts.

Population and Housing

Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Small portions of the site are currently developed. The original Chandler Ranch home site is still located on the site, as are several homes within the Our Town subdivision. These residents own land within the Specific Plan area, and would not be required to develop until a time of their choosing. As such, the existing residents would not be displaced as a result of the proposed Specific Plan. No impacts would result.

Transportation/Traffic

Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?

Development under the Specific Plan would not result in a change to air traffic patterns, or result in an increase to air traffic. The Paso Robles Airport Master Plan addresses future air traffic patterns and volumes, and it anticipates growth called for under the General Plan, including the Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan. No impacts would result.

Would the project result in a substantial increase of hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

Refer to Section 4.1, *Land Use and Agriculture*, for a discussion of impacts related to compatibility between the proposed Specific Plan and on-site and off-site agricultural resources and potential land use conflicts related to farm equipment.

The project is not anticipated to increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible uses. The Specific Plan connects Airport Road to Highway 46 to minimize potentially unacceptable impacts to both local streets and the intersection of Union Road and Highway 46 East which the City has identified as a need. Less than significant impacts would result.

1.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REVIEW PROCESS

The environmental impact review process, as required under CEQA, is outlined below. The steps are presented in sequential order.

1. **Notice of Preparation (NOP) Distributed.** Immediately after deciding that an EIR is required, the lead agency must file a NOP soliciting input on the EIR scope to "responsible," "trustee," and involved federal agencies; to the State Clearinghouse, if one or more state agencies is a responsible or trustee agency; and to parties previously requesting notice in writing (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15082; Public Resources Code Section 21092.2). The NOP must be posted in the County Clerk's office for 30 days. A scoping meeting to solicit



public input on the issues to be assessed in the EIR is not required, but may be conducted by the lead agency. The NOP for this EIR was circulated between February 2, 2004, and March 5, 2004.

2. **Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) Prepared.** The DEIR must contain: a) table of contents or index; b) summary; c) project description; d) environmental setting; e) significant impacts (direct, indirect, cumulative, growth-inducing and unavoidable impacts); f) alternatives; g) mitigation measures; and h) irreversible changes. The original Draft EIR circulated from September 2004 through October 2004.
3. **Public Notice and Review.** A lead agency must prepare a Public Notice of Availability of an EIR. The Notice must be placed in the County Clerk's office for 30 days (Public Resources Code Section 21092). The lead agency must send a copy of its Notice to anyone requesting it (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15087). Additionally, public notice of DEIR availability must be given through at least one of the following procedures: a) publication in a newspaper of general circulation; b) posting on and off the site; and c) direct mailing to owners and occupants of contiguous properties. The lead agency must consult with and request comments on the DEIR from responsible and trustee agencies, and adjacent cities and counties (Public Resources Code Sections 21104 and 21253). The minimum public review period for a DEIR is 30 days. When a DEIR is sent to the State Clearinghouse for review, the public review period must be 45 days unless a shorter period is approved by the Clearinghouse (Public Resources Code 21091). Distribution of the DEIR may be required through the State Clearinghouse (*CEQA Guidelines* Section 15305).
4. **Notice of Completion.** A lead agency must file a Notice of Completion with the State Clearinghouse as soon as it completes a DEIR.
5. **Final EIR (FEIR).** A FEIR must include: a) the DEIR; b) copies of comments received during public review; c) list of persons and entities commenting; and d) responses to comments. After receipt of comments on the original draft EIR, modifications were made to the Draft Chandler Ranch Area Specific Plan that were designed to alleviate some identified impacts. All of the comments received are incorporated into this Revised Draft EIR in Appendix J, and when possible, addressed in either the content of the revised Draft Chandler Specific Plan or in this Revised Draft EIR, or both. All written comments received as a result of the circulation of this Revised Draft EIR will be responded to in writing, and the comments and responses incorporated into the Final EIR.
6. **Certification of FEIR.** The lead agency shall certify: a) the FEIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA; b) the FEIR was presented to the decision-making body of the lead agency; and c) the decision-making body reviewed and considered the information in the FEIR prior to approving a project (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15090).
7. **Lead Agency Project Decision.** A lead agency may: a) disapprove a project because of its significant environmental effects; b) require changes to a project to reduce or avoid significant environmental effects; or c) approve a project despite its significant environmental effects, if the proper findings and statement of overriding considerations are adopted (State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15042 and 15043).



8. **Findings/Statement of Overriding Considerations.** For each significant impact of the project identified in the EIR, the lead or responsible agency must find, based on substantial evidence, that either: a) the project has been changed to avoid or substantially reduce the magnitude of the impact; b) changes to the project are within another agency's jurisdiction and such changes have or should be adopted; or c) specific economic, social, or other considerations make the mitigation measures or project alternatives infeasible (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15091). If an agency approves a project with unavoidable significant environmental effects, it must prepare a written Statement of Overriding Considerations that set forth the specific social, economic or other reasons supporting the agency's decision.
9. **Mitigation Monitoring/Reporting Program.** When an agency makes findings on significant effects identified in the EIR, it must adopt a reporting or monitoring program for mitigation measures that were adopted or made conditions of project approval to mitigate significant effects.
10. **Notice of Determination.** An agency must file a Notice of Determination after deciding to approve a project for which an EIR is prepared (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15094). A local agency must file the Notice with the County Clerk. The Notice must be posted for 30 days and sent to anyone previously requesting notice. Posting of the Notice starts a 30-day statute of limitations on CEQA challenges (Public Resources Code Section 21167[c]).

1.7 AVAILABILITY OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The Revised EIR for the proposed Specific Plan is being distributed to numerous agencies, organizations and interested groups and individuals for comment during the required public review period for the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR is available for review at the following location:

City of El Paso de Robles
1000 Spring Street
El Paso de Robles, CA 93446
Contact: Robert A. Lata, Community Development Director
Telephone: (805) 237-3970
E-Mail: blata@prcity.com

