

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT  
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM  
CITY OF PASO ROBLES  
PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD: SEPTEMBER 10, 2016 – OCTOBER 11, 2016**

- 1. **PROJECT TITLE:** Destino Paso Resort Hotels  
Planned Development Amendment (PD 08-002)  
Conditional Use Permit Amendment (CUP 08-002)  
Vesting Tentative Tract Map 2962 Amendment  
Oak Tree Removal Permit (OTR 16-009)
  
- 2. **LEAD AGENCY:** City of Paso Robles  
**Contact:** Susan DeCarli, City Planner  
**Phone:** (805) 237-3970  
**Email:** sdecarli@prcity.com
  
- 3. **PROJECT LOCATION:** 3350 Airport Road  
See Location Map – Attachment 1
  
- 4. **ASSESSORS PARCEL NUMBER:** 025-436-029, 025-436-030
  
- 5. **GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** Parks and Open Space with Resort Lodging and Airport  
Overlays (POS/RL/AP)
  
- 6. **ZONING:** Parks and Open Space with a Resort Lodging and Airport  
Overlays (POS/AP)
  
- 7. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**  
The proposed project, Destino Paso Resort, is a request to amend the site plan and architecture of a previously approved Development Plan and Conditional Use Permit, and modification of the Tract Map subdivision layout for a hotel project at the same location, see Attachment 2, Site Plan. The overall intensity of development, 291 rooms and ancillary support uses, is not proposed to change with this application.

The project site is 40.3 acres, and is proposed to be subdivided into six parcels (see Attachment 3, Vesting Tentative Tract Map 2962), as follows:

- Lot 1 – 0.9 acres (No land uses proposed/maintained in agriculture)
- Lot 2 – 6.75 acres (Hotel #3 – Limited services hotel, 28 rooms)
- Lot 3 – 6.3 acres (Hotel #2 – Limited services hotel, 80 rooms)
- Lot 4 – 12.97 acres (Hotel #1 – Full service hotel, bar/lounge, restaurant, ballroom, 136 rooms)
- Lot 5 – 5.09 acres (No new or changed land uses/maintain existing farmhouse and support buildings)
- Lot 6 – 5.00 acres (Hotel #4 – Limited services, 46 rooms)

An access road, Destino Paso Way, (to be dedicated as a 50-foot wide public right-of-way) is proposed to extend from Airport Road towards the eastern property line. The road would provide access to parcels 2,

3, and 4. A separate private driveway access is intended to provide access to lots 5 and 6. No access is proposed for Lot 1 on the west side of Airport Road. A private access easement is proposed on Destino Paso Way to provide access to the property to the north. Walkways are proposed along Destino Paso Way and Airport Road for pedestrian connection.

An existing house and outbuildings are proposed to be demolished on parcel 3 to allow for future development of Hotel #2.

**8. SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:**

The project site is surrounded by generally low-intensity development. The site and surrounding properties are characterized by rolling hills, open space, and oak trees. The Huer Huero Creek is located to the west of Airport Road, adjacent to the site. The Huer Huero Creek is a dry creek except occasionally during significant rain events.

Agriculturally zoned property is located to the north, east and southeast. These properties are minimally developed with rural residences, and agricultural related uses. Property to the south and west are zoned Parks and Open Space. The property to the south is developed with a recreational vehicle (RV) park, and the property to the west is vacant.

The Paso Robles Airport is located within a mile north of the project site. In accordance with the Airport Land Use Plan, the project location is within three different airport Safety Zones, including Zones 2, 3, and 4. A site-specific analysis of land use compatibility was prepared for this project, and is discussed further in Section VII – Hazards, below.

**8. OTHER PUBLIC AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (e.g., PERMITS, FINANCING APPROVAL OR PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT):** None

**ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:**

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

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

**DETERMINATION:** (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

---

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: September 10, 2016

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

**I. AESTHETICS:** Would the project:

- a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

Discussion: In accordance with the City’s General Plan, Conservation Element, the project location is not located within a designated scenic vista, and therefore would not conflict with policies related protecting scenic resources.

The site is visible from Airport Road. As noted in the Project Description, the project proposes several hotels on a rural property with rolling hills that are currently minimally disturbed. Two of the proposed hotel sites are near to Airport Road, and the other two larger hotels are proposed at the upper elevations of the site on the east side of the property. All four of the hotels would be visible, however given the size and placement of the buildings, the end result would be a fairly sparsely developed site, leaving the central open space, drainages and oak woodland undisturbed. Therefore, although the project would alter the existing conditions of the property, the overall effect on scenic resources can be considered less than significant.

- b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

Discussion: The project includes a request to remove seven oak trees to accommodate road improvements to Airport Road, an access driveway, and a parking lot for hotel #2. Most of the oak trees are in fair to poor condition. As noted in the section on biological resources, the project would be required to mitigate the loss of oak trees with oak tree replacements at a ratio of 3:1. This will reduce the loss of these trees to a less than significant level. There are also no rock outcroppings or other unique natural site resources that would be impacted by this project. There are no historic resources identified on the project site. Therefore, with mitigations for the loss of oak trees incorporated, the project would result in less than significant impacts to scenic resources.

- c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

Discussion: The site has an existing road and a couple of residences and out buildings located on it, which are surrounded by open space, rolling hills, and oak trees. The proposed project would add four hotels that would be sited on the property with the smaller hotels toward the front near Airport Road, and the larger hotels toward the eastern property line. The placement of the buildings would help reduce the mass of the appearance of the buildings as viewed from the public right-of-way. The overall project would provide a low-density development pattern, keeping a significant portion of the site undeveloped in its natural state. Therefore, although the visual character of the site would change, it would not likely substantially degrade the visual quality of the site.

- d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 1, 2, 10)

Discussion: The project includes installation of site lighting for parking lots and buildings. All lighting fixtures will be required to comply with established lighting standards that require lights to be downcast and shielded, and only as tall as necessary to provide adequate site lighting. The applicants intend to maintain the

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	---	---	----------------------

rural, natural character of the property as an aesthetic amenity for the This will help reduce potential adverse light and glare from the project.

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

Would the project:

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

Discussion: The City’s General Plan EIR indicates that the site has grazing land and Farmland of Local Importance (Arbuckle Fine Sandy Loam) located on it, and that when irrigated could be classified as Class I soils, that have few limitations that restrict their use. The most beneficial soils are those located around the existing farmhouse area. This area is not proposed to be disturbed by this project. The project, as proposed, would be considered to result in less than significant impacts on agricultural resources.

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

Discussion: The property is designated and zoned Parks and Open Space and it is not under a Williamson Act contract applicable to this property. Therefore, the project would result in less than significant impacts to agricultural land.

- c. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

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

- e. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

Discussion: There are no designated forestry

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	---	---	----------------------

resources located within the City limits.

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

- a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (Source: 11)

Discussion: An Air Quality Impact Assessment was prepared for this project by Ambient Consulting, July 2016 (Attachment 4). The study indicates that the proposed project is not considered a large development project that would have the potential to result in a substantial increase in population, or employment. In addition, the proposed project is also consistent with existing zoning designations and would not result in the installation of any major stationary sources of emissions. However, long-term operational emissions associated with the project would exceed SLOAPCD’s recommended significance thresholds. Projects that exceed SLOAPCD’s recommended significance thresholds would also be considered to potentially conflict with regional air quality planning efforts, including the control measures and strategies identified in the CAP. Additionally, the study indicates that uncontrolled fugitive dust generated during construction may result in localized pollutant concentrations that may result in increased nuisance concerns to nearby land uses. Therefore, construction-generated emissions of fugitive dust would be considered to have a potentially significant impact. Both long-term and construction related impacts would conflict with the Air District’s CAP. Therefore, mitigation measures are proposed to reduce emissions to a less than significant level.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would include measures to reduce construction-generated emissions of fugitive dust, as well as, mobile-source emissions associated with construction vehicle and equipment operations and evaporative emissions from architectural coatings. With mitigation, overall emissions of fugitive dust would be reduced by approximately 58 percent. These measures would also help to ensure compliance with SLOAPCD’s 20-percent opacity limit (APCD Rule 401), nuisance rule (APCD Rule 402), and would minimize potential nuisance impacts to nearby receptors. Mitigation Measure AQ-3 includes additional measures to reduce construction generated emissions, including fugitive PM emissions associated with onsite demolition activities.

Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-2 would include measures to reduce long-term operational emissions associated with motor vehicle use and onsite energy use to a less-than-significant level. With mitigation measures implemented, the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in regional emissions, population, or employment, nor would the project involve the installation of any major stationary sources of emissions. For these reasons, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct continued implementation of the CAP, and this impact is considered less than significant. The proposed mitigation measures are incorporated into Attachment 13, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

- b. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 11)

Discussion: See III a. above.

- c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions)

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	---	---	----------------------

which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Source: 11)

Discussion: Construction-generated emissions were quantified using the CalEEMod computer program. To be conservative emissions were quantified assuming that the total site would be rough graded during initial construction of the proposed main hotel, which is anticipated to begin in 2017. Onsite asphalt paving activities associated with construction of the onsite roadways and parking areas were also included. Grading activities were also included for the future construction of the second hotel, boutique hotel, and lodge to account for potential finish grading of these sites. Emissions associated with architectural coating application and building construction were also included for construction of the proposed main hotel, as well as, the future construction of the second hotel, boutique hotel, and lodge. To be conservative, future construction of the second hotel, boutique hotel, and lodge were assumed to occur simultaneously. Construction-generated emissions associated with the initial construction of the main hotel, as well as, construction of the proposed future land uses would exceed SLOAPCD’s daily and quarterly significance thresholds for ROG+NOx. Estimated emissions were largely a result of evaporative emissions anticipated to occur during the application of architectural coatings. Estimated emissions of fugitive PM would not exceed SLOAPCD’s significance thresholds. However, if uncontrolled fugitive dust generated during construction may result in localized pollutant concentrations that could exceed ambient air quality standards and result in increased nuisance concerns to nearby land uses. Therefore, construction-generated emissions of fugitive dust would be considered to have a potentially significant impact.

Long-term operational emissions associated with the proposed project would be predominantly associated with mobile sources. To a lesser extent, emissions associated with area sources, such as landscape maintenance activities, as well as, use of electricity and natural gas would also contribute to increased operational emissions. Operational emissions were quantified for the proposed main hotel; as well as, the future construction of a second hotel, boutique hotel, and lodge.

The project buildout year is currently unknown. Construction of the additional hotels would occur in future years, subsequent to completion of the main hotel, and would depend on market conditions. To be conservative, emissions for project buildout were quantified assuming a buildout year of 2022. With continued improvements in vehicle emissions rates and energy usage rates, operational emissions for future years are anticipated to be less.

Under the project buildout scenario, operational emissions would exceed SLOAPCD’s daily significance threshold of 25 lbs/day, buildout of the proposed project would have a potentially significant impact. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-2 would require the incorporation of measures to reduce operational emissions associated with on-site energy use and motor vehicle use. These measures would apply to all proposed hotel uses. The proposed mitigation measures include SLOAPCD-recommended mitigation measures, as well as, additional measures to further reduce operational emissions associated with energy use and motor vehicle use. SLOAPCD considers implementation of these measures to be sufficient to reduce operational air quality impacts to a less-than significant level. Therefore, cumulative emissions from construction and operations would be less than significant. The proposed mitigation measures are incorporated into Attachment 13, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (Source: 11)                       

Discussion: The project site is located adjacent to and east of Airport Road, north of SR 46 East. The nearest sensitive land use consists of residential dwellings. The nearest residences are located adjacent to and north of the project site. Additional residential dwellings, as well as, the Wine Country RV Resort are located to the

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	---	---	----------------------

south of the project site. Based on the traffic analysis prepared for this project, the proposed project would not result in emissions of CO in excess of the SLOAPCD’s significance threshold of 550 lbs/day. Based on a review of the SLOAPCD’s map depicting potential areas of Naturally Occurring Asbestos (NOA), the project site is not located in an area that has been identified as having a potential for NOA. The project site will require demolition of onsite structures. As a result, demolition activities have the potential to result in the disturbance of asbestos containing material (ACM). Demolition of structures coated with lead based paint can have potential negative air quality impacts and may adversely affect the health of nearby individuals. Improper demolition can result in the release of lead containing particles from the site. Sandblasting or removal of paint by heating with a heat gun can result in significant emissions of lead. Therefore, proper abatement of lead before demolition of these structures must be performed in order to prevent the release of lead from the site. Implementation of the proposed project would result in the generation of fugitive PM emitted during construction. Fugitive PM emissions would be primarily associated with earth-moving, demolition, and material handling activities, as well as, vehicle travel on unpaved and paved surfaces. Onsite off-road equipment and trucks would also result in short-term emissions of diesel-exhaust PM (DPM). If uncontrolled, localized concentrations of PM could exceed air quality standards and may also result in increased nuisance impacts to nearby land uses and receptors. Mitigation measures shall be implemented to reduce expose of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. These measures shall be shown on grading and building plans. These measures are provided in Attachment 13, MMRP.

- e. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (Source: 11)

Discussion: The proposed project would not result in the installation of any equipment or processes that would be considered major odor-emission sources. However, construction of the proposed project would involve the use of a variety of gasoline or diesel-powered equipment that would emit exhaust fumes. Exhaust fumes, particularly diesel-exhaust, may be considered objectionable by some people. In addition, pavement coatings and architectural coatings used during project construction would also emit temporary odors. However, construction-generated emissions would occur intermittently throughout the workday and would dissipate rapidly with increasing distance from the source. As a result, short-term construction activities would not expose a substantial number of people to frequent odorous emissions. For these reasons, potential exposure of sensitive receptors to odorous emissions would be considered less than significant.

---

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:

- a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Discussion: A Biological Report was prepared for this project by Althouse and Meade, Inc., July 2016, provided in Attachment 5. The report indicates that the site has appropriate habitat and soil conditions for seven special status plants and 11 special status animals. However, no state or federally listed or special status plants or animals have been detected on the site. Biological resources that could be impacted by the proposed development include grasslands, oak trees, nesting birds, and common wildlife. Mitigation measures are provided for each biological resources that could be impacted by the project in Attachment 13, MMRP.

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

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

Discussion: There are a few types of sensitive habitat types on the project site. These include blue oak woodland, potential wetland, and riparian area. None of the property with any of these resources located on it are within an area proposed to be disturbed. Therefore, the project would result in less than significant impacts on these resources. The oak trees proposed for removal are not within the oak woodland area. They are proposed to be mitigated in compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, which is discussed in III e. below.

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

Discussion: The biology report prepared for this project indicates that there is an area on the northeast portion of the site that has wetland conditions. A wetland delineation study was not prepared since the project does not propose to affect this area of the property. Therefore, this project could not result in impacts to wetland features.

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

Discussion: There is a seasonal drainage area central to the project site (which is within the oak woodland area). The proposed project would not encroach or affect the drainage area. However, oak tree impact mitigation measures are included to reduce potential impacts to migratory birds, which are provided in Attachment 13, MMRP.

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

Discussion: The project includes a request to remove seven oak trees. An Arborist Report prepared for this project, see Attachment 6, provides mitigation measures in compliance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, as provided in Attachment 13, MMRP. The project would not conflict with any local ordinances that protect biological resources.

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: Not applicable.				

**V. CULTURAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:

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

Discussion: An archaeological Inventory Survey study was prepared for this project to evaluate potential cultural resources, June 2016, Attachment 7. The study indicates that there is an existing early “20th Century” era farmstead with house and barn, which may be a potential historic resource, however the proposed project excludes the area of the property with this facility. Since the project would avoid the farmstead, the study did not include an historic resource assessment. If future development would impact the farmstead, an historic resource assessment is recommended to be prepared.

b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The archaeological study did not identify any archaeological, paleontological or unique geologic resources exist on the property, nor were any noted through various records searches. However, the study recommendations indicate that cultural resources could be buried below the ground surface, and that if significant cultural resources are encountered during site disturbance that activities stop and a qualified archaeologist be contacted to evaluate the find.

c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: See V b. above.

d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: See V b. above.

**VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS:** Would the project:

a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	---	---	----------------------

issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

Discussion: A Geotechnical Engineering Soils Report was prepared for this project, April 2016, Attachment 8. The study includes a seismic analysis and provides site preparation requirements for foundation work for buildings. Additionally, the potential for and mitigation of impacts that may result from fault rupture in the project area are identified and addressed in the General Plan EIR, pg. 4.5-8. There are two known fault zones on either side of the Salinas Rivers Valley. The Rinconada Fault system runs on the west side of the valley, and grazes the City on its western boundary. The San Andreas Fault is on the east side of the valley and is situated about 30 miles east of Paso Robles. The City of Paso Robles recognizes these geologic influences in the application of the California Building Code (CBC) to all new development within the City. Review of available information and examinations indicate that neither of these faults is active with respect to ground rupture in Paso Robles. Soils and geotechnical reports and structural engineering in accordance with local seismic influences would be applied in conjunction with any new development proposal. Based on standard conditions of approval, the potential for fault rupture and exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards is not considered significant. There are no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones within City limits.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| ii. Strong seismic ground shaking? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 2 & 3) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR, the project site is located in an area with soil conditions that have a moderate potential for liquefaction or other type of ground failure due to seismic events and soil conditions. To implement the EIR's mitigation measures to reduce this potential impact, the City has a standard condition to require submittal of soils and geotechnical reports, which include site-specific analysis of liquefaction potential for all building permits for new construction, and incorporation of the recommendations of said reports into the design of the project.

- |                |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Landslides? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See VI a. iii. above.

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

Discussion: See VI a. iii. above.

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
d. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See VI a. iii. above.				
e. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See VI a. iii. above.				
f. Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The development will be connected to the City's municipal wastewater system, therefore there would not be impacts related use of septic tanks.				

---

**VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS:** Would the project:

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

Discussion: A Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) Assessment was prepared for this project, see Attachment 4. In accordance with SLOAPCD recommended significance thresholds, the proposed project would be considered to have a potentially significant impact on the environment if project-generated emissions would exceed 1,150 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>/year.

The City of Paso Robles Climate Action Plan (CAP) includes a “Consistency Worksheet”, which identifies various mandatory and voluntary actions designed to reduce GHG emissions. The *CAP Consistency Worksheet* can be used to demonstrate project-level compliance with the CAP. Consistency with the City of Paso Robles CAP would be considered potentially significant if the proposed project does not incorporate, at a minimum, the mandatory project-level GHG reduction measures, as identified in the *CAP Consistency Worksheet*.

Estimated increases in GHG emissions associated with construction of the proposed project are summarized in Table 18, in the GHG study. Based on the modeling conducted, annual GHG emissions associated with construction of the main hotel would total approximately 643.4 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>. Future construction of the proposed second hotel, boutique hotel, and lodge would generate an additional 519 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>. Amortized GHG emissions, when averaged over the assumed 25-year life of the project, would total approximately 46.5 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>/year. There would also be a small amount of GHG emissions from waste generated during construction; however, this amount is speculative. Actual emissions may vary, depending on the final

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	---	---	----------------------

construction schedules, equipment required, and activities conducted.

Estimated long-term increases in GHG emissions associated with the proposed project are summarized in Tables 19 through 21, in the GHG study. As depicted, operational GHG emissions for the main hotel would total approximately 1,904.6 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>/year. Future construction of the second hotel, boutique hotel, and lodge would generate an additional 2,059.5 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>/year. In total the project would generate roughly 3,964 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>/year under full buildout conditions. With the inclusion of amortized construction emissions and reductions associated with the removal of the existing residential dwelling, the project would result in an estimated overall net increase of approximately 3,997 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>/year. A majority of the increased GHG emissions would be associated with energy use and the operation of motor vehicles. GHG emissions would also be associated with solid waste generation, as well as, water use and conveyance.

Based on the modeling conducted, net increases in GHG emissions would exceed the SLOAPCD’s significance threshold of 1,150 MTCO<sub>2e</sub>/year. If unmitigated, project-generated GHG emissions would also conflict with GHG reduction planning efforts, including the City of Paso Robles CAP. As a result, net increases in project-generated GHG emissions would result in a *potentially significant* impact. The CAP includes a “Consistency Worksheet”, which identifies various mandatory and voluntary actions designed to reduce GHG emissions. With implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1, the proposed project would be consistent with the City’s CAP. Mitigation Measure AQ-2, includes additional measures that would further reduce GHG-emissions, including designated parking space for alternatively fueled vehicles, the installation of energy-saving systems in hotel guest rooms, and the installation of onsite bicycle facilities in excess of current building standards. Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-3,e-k, would help to reduce short-term GHG emissions, including emissions of black carbon. Mitigation measures are provided in Attachment XX, MMRP. With mitigation, increased GHG emissions associated with the proposed project would be considered to have a less-than-significant impact and would not conflict with GHG-reduction planning efforts, including the City of Paso Robles CAP.

- b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses?

Discussion: The City of Paso Robles CAP is a long-range plan to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from City government operations and community activities within Paso Robles and prepare for the anticipated effects of climate change. The CAP is intended to also help achieve multiple community goals such as lowering energy costs, reducing air pollution, supporting local economic development, and improving public health and quality of life (City of Paso Robles, 2013). To help achieve these goals, the CAP includes a “Consistency Worksheet”, which identifies various mandatory and voluntary actions designed to reduce GHG emissions. The CAP Consistency Worksheet can be used to demonstrate project-level compliance with the CAP. The City’s CAP consistency worksheet is included in the Air Quality & GHG Assessment (Attachment XX).

The proposed land use would be consistent with current zoning. In addition, the project sponsor has agreed to implement measures sufficient to ensure consistency with the CAP.

---

**VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:** Would the project:

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

	<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
--	---	---	---	----------------------

Discussion: The project would use industry-standard landscape and building maintenance products which would be stored in compliance with all applicable safety requirements. The project does not include use of, transport, storage or disposal of hazardous materials that would create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See VIII a. above.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or use hazardous materials. There are no schools located within a ¼ mile radius of the project site, therefore the project will result in no impact on schools.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is not identified as a hazardous site per state codes.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project location is within the planning impact area of the Paso Robles Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP), Safety Zones 2, 3, and 4. Land uses in Zone 2 are very restrictive. No development is proposed in Zone 2, therefore, the project would not conflict with ALUP Zone 2. ALUP Zones 3 and 4 permits or indicates that certain types of uses may be “compatible”. These are identified in Table 6, Airport Land Use Compatibility Matrix of the ALUP. The proposed hospitality land uses, including hotels, restaurants, and indoor auditoriums & convention centers, are identified as “compatible” in Table 6. Per footnotes in Table 6, of the ALUP, there are additional density specific restrictions that apply to particular land uses in different zones, as follows:

- Zone 3 - The intensity of uses shall not exceed an average 60 persons per gross acre, maximum 120 persons per single acre, at any time. Usage calculations shall include all people (e.g., employees, customers/visitors, etc.) who may be on the property at any single point in time, whether indoors or outside.

<b>Potentially Significant Impact</b>	<b>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</b>	<b>Less Than Significant Impact</b>	<b>No Impact</b>
---	---	---	----------------------

- Zone 4 - The intensity of uses shall not exceed an average 40 persons per gross acre, maximum 120 persons per single acre, at any time. Usage calculations shall include all people (e.g., employees, customers/visitors, etc.) who may be on the property at any single point in time, whether indoors or outside.

Additionally, Appendix E includes development restrictions that apply to particular land uses and this project, as follows:

- Food and Beverage Service, Indoor Entertainment – 1 person/60 s.f. of gross floor area
- Public Assembly – 1 person per seat or per 12 s.f. of gross floor area
- Transient Lodging – 1.8 person per room or group of rooms to occupied as a suit, plus (in addition to) 1 person per 60 s.f. floor area of any restaurants, bars, or night clubs, plus 1 person per 10 s.f. of floor area of meeting rooms.

The applicant has provided an analysis that breaks down the site into one-acre measurements, and calculated the number of people that would occupy an acre of land on average and the maximum. This is the accepted density calculation methodology of the San Luis Obispo County Airport Land Use Commission, and has been used on other similar projects within the City’s ALUP planning area.

The analysis assumptions consider occupancy of all hotels at 100 percent. The analysis indicates that the project would be consistent with the density limitations established in the ALUP, and will not result in a safety hazard for people residing in or working in the project area. See ALUP Analysis, Attachment XX.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| f. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| g. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The City does not have an adopted emergency response plan or an emergency evacuation plan, therefore the project will result in no impact.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| h. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The project is not in the vicinity of wildland fire hazard areas.

**IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY:** Would the project:

- a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Discussion: The proposed project is designed to retain stormwater on-site through installation of various low-impact development (LID) features, in particular a large onsite bioretention basin at the lower area of the property, on proposed lot 2. The project was also designed to reduce impervious surfaces, preserve existing vegetation, and promote groundwater recharge by employing bioretention through implementation of these measures. The applicant prepared a Storm Water Control Plan, and collaborated with the Central Coast Regional State Water Resource Board staff on development of their Plan. See Attachment 10). Thus, water quality standards will be maintained and discharge requirements will be in compliance with State and local regulations. Therefore, impacts to water quality and discharge will be less than significant.

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

Discussion: The proposed project would be connected to the City’s municipal water supply system; therefore, it could not individually impact nearby ground water supplies. The City’s municipal water supply is composed of groundwater from the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin, an allocation of the Salinas River underflow, and a surface water allocation from the Nacimiento Lake pipeline project. The site is designed to reduce impervious surfaces where possible and to direct surface drainage to onsite retention systems to facilitate groundwater recharge.

The City established a groundwater stewardship policy to not expand dependency on the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin (“the basin”) over historic use levels/pumping from the City’s peak year of 2007. The City augmented water supply and treatment capacity by procuring surface water from Lake Nacimiento and construction of delivery facilities to the City. This project will not affect the amount of groundwater that the City withdraws from the Paso Robles Groundwater Basin.

Additionally, the City assigns “duty” factors that anticipate the amount of water supply necessary to serve various types of land uses. These factors are derived from determining the average water demands for each zoning district in the City. In this circumstance, the water supply necessary for development of commercial land uses permitted in the POS Zone includes hotels, as well as other uses, which are incorporated into the water demand assumptions of the 2015 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP). Since this project was approved in 2008, the water demand assumptions in the UWMP include the projected to be needed for this project.

As noted above, the City has augmented future reliance on groundwater resources to surface water resources, and commercial development has been accounted for in the overall water projections and demand for the City. As noted in the Project Description, the proposed project would be served with the City’s municipal water supply system. Since the City’s water supply, as documented in the UWMP, is not reliant on increased groundwater pumping for new development, it demonstrates adequate water supply procured from Lake

Nacimiento to accommodate the projected growth in the City and it demonstrates that this project will have adequate water supply available, and will not further deplete or in any way affect, change or increase water demands on the basin.

In addition, in compliance with recently adopted updates to the applicable code sections of the California Green Building Code (adopted by the City in 2013), the project will be required to install more restrictive water-conserving plumbing fixtures than what would have previously been required in 2010. The City also implements the State Landscape Water Conservation regulations, which requires further reductions in water demand for landscaping. The project will implement *all* best management practices available to reduce water demands. Therefore, this project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or lowering of the groundwater basin, and impacts to groundwater resources would be less than significant.

- c. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? (Source: 10)

Discussion: The drainage pattern on the site would not be substantially altered with development of this project since the project largely maintains the existing, historic drainage pattern of the property, and drainage will be maintained on the project site. Additionally, surface flow would be directed to historic drainage areas for percolation in bioswale drainage features at the northwest area of the property (refer to Stormwater Control Plan, Attachment XX). There are no streams, creeks or rivers on or near the project area of disturbance that could be impacted from this project or result in erosion or siltation on- or off-site. Therefore, impacts to drainage patterns and facilities would be less than significant.

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

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

- e. Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? (Source: 10)

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

- f. Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

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

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

Discussion: In accordance with the General Plan Safety Element, the project site is not within a 100-year hazard or inundation area. No housing is proposed with this project. There is an existing ranch house and outbuildings on the property, however the home is not within or near an area of site disturbance and the project could not result in flood related hazards to that area of the property. Therefore, this project could not result in flood related impacts to housing.

- h. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

Discussion: See IX g above

- i. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

Discussion: See IX h. above. Additionally, there are no levees or dams in the City.

- j. Inundation by mudflow?

Discussion: In accordance with the Paso Robles General Plan, there are no mudflow hazards located on or near the project site. Therefore, the project could not result in mudflow inundation impacts.

- k. Conflict with any Best Management Practices found within the City's Storm Water Management Plan?

Discussion: The project will implement the City's Storm Water Management Plan - Best Management Practices, and would therefore not conflict with these measures.

- l. Substantially decrease or degrade watershed storage of runoff, wetlands, riparian areas, aquatic habitat, or associated buffer zones?

Discussion: The project will incorporate all feasible means to manage stormwater on the project site. There are no wetland or riparian areas in the project impact areas of disturbance, and the project could not result in impacts to aquatic habitat. Therefore, the project will not result in significant impacts to these resources.

---

**X. LAND USE AND PLANNING:** Would the project:

- a. Physically divide an established community?

Discussion: The project is surrounded by agriculture and rural residential development to the west, north, and east, and a RV park to the south. The project will therefore not physically divide an established community.

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

Discussion: The proposed project is consistent with the intent of the City’s General Plan land use designation and Zoning Ordinance land uses and development standards. Should the City Council approve removal of oak trees, the applicant would be required to implement compensatory oak tree mitigation (see Attachment 6, Arborist Report). Therefore, the project can be considered consistent with applicable plans and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

- c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

Discussion: There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans established in this area of the City. Therefore, there would be no conflicts.

**XI. MINERAL RESOURCES:** Would the project:

- a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (Source: 1)

Discussion: There are no known mineral resources at this project site.

- b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (Source: 1)

Discussion: There are no known mineral resources at this project site.

**XII. NOISE:** Would the project result in:

- a. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (Source: 1)

Discussion: The proposed project would not include the installation of major stationary sources of exterior noise. As a result, potential long-term exposure to noise would be primarily associated with vehicle traffic noise emanating from area roadways, such as Airport Road.

For determination of land use compatibility for transportation noise sources, the City’s General Plan establishes a “normally acceptable” exterior noise standard of 65 dBA/CNEL/Ldn. Exterior noise levels of up to 70 dBA CNEL/Ldn are considered “conditionally acceptable” provided necessary noise-reduction measures are incorporated. Exterior levels between 70 and 80 dBA CNEL/Ldn are considered “normally unacceptable”, and levels in excess of 80 dBA CNEL/Ldn are considered “clearly unacceptable”. In addition

to the noise criteria for determination of land use compatibility, General Plan Policy N-1A also establishes exterior and interior noise standards for transportation sources. For hotel uses, the maximum allowable noise exposure within outdoor activity areas is 65 dBA CNEL/Ldn. The maximum allowable noise exposure for interior areas of the hotel is 45 dBA CNEL/Ldn.

The Noise Element indicates that in the future (2025) an exterior noise level of 65 dB would occur at 84 feet from the centerline of Airport Road (at this location). A 60 dB would occur at 181 feet from the centerline. The nearest building proposed to Airport Road would be hotel 4, which is proposed to be approximately 140 feet from the centerline of Airport Road. Therefore, the projected noise level would be within an acceptable range and consistent with the Noise Element. Additionally, with implementation of a future road alignment of Wisteria Lane extending northward to Dry Creek Road/Airport Road, it is anticipated that a significant amount of existing and future traffic will use this road extension instead of Airport Road to SR 46E, thereby reducing future road-related noise experienced from Airport Road on the project site.

Newer building construction typically provides exterior-to-interior noise reductions of 25-30 dB. Based on the predicted exterior noise levels discussed above and assuming a minimum exterior-to-interior noise reduction of 25 dB, predicted interior noise levels for the proposed hotel would be approximately 40 dBA CNEL/Ldn, or less. Predicted interior traffic noise levels would not exceed the City's noise standard of 45 dBA CNEL/Ldn. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

- b. Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

Discussion: Increases in groundborne vibration levels attributable to the proposed project would be primarily associated with short-term construction-related activities. Construction activities associated with the proposed project would likely require the use of various off-road equipment, such as tractors, concrete mixers, and haul trucks. The use of major groundborne vibration-generating construction equipment, such as pile drivers, is not anticipated to be required for this project. Since there is minimal existing development located in proximity to the proposed site, and to noise that may result from short-term construction activities, the potential to expose persons to excessive noise or vibration is minimal, and less than significant.

- c. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Discussion: See XII a. & b. above.

- d. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Discussion: See XII a. & b. above.

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

Discussion: The nearest public or private airport is the Paso Robles Municipal Airport, which is located approximately 0.75 miles north of the project site. In accordance with the Noise Element of the General Plan, the project site is not located within the projected 65 dBA CNEL contours of Paso Robles Municipal Airport.

Therefore, the project site is not subject to high levels of aircraft noise.

---

**XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING:** Would the project:

- a. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (Source: 1)

Discussion: The proposed hotel project will create jobs that can be absorbed by the local and regional employment market, and will therefore not create the demand for new housing or population growth or displace housing or people.

- b. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Discussion: See response XIII a.

- c. Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

Discussion: See response XIII a.

---

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

- a. Fire protection? (Sources: 1,10)

Discussion:

- b. Police protection? (Sources: 1,10)

Discussion:

- c. Schools?

Discussion:

- d. Parks?

Discussion:

- e. Other public facilities? (Sources: 1,10)

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

---

**XV. RECREATION**

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

Discussion: (a & b) As a commercial development project that will not encourage new housing demands and/or use of recreational facilities, it will not result in significant impacts to recreational facilities.

---

**XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC:** Would the project:

- a. Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

Discussion: Applicable plans that affect this project include the General Plan, Circulation Element and the City's Bicycle Master Plan.

A Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA) was prepared by Central Coast Transportation Consulting, September 2016, see Attachment 11. The TIA studied four intersections (e.g. Dry Creek Road/Airport Road, State Route 46 E/(SR46E)/Golden Hill Road, SR46E/Union Road, and SR46E/Airport Road), and evaluated their operations during weekday morning and evening periods, and Saturday mid-day, for existing, existing plus the project, near-term, and near-term plus the project conditions. Assumptions evaluated include trip generation, trip distribution and assignment. The study also evaluated alternative transportation (e.g. bikeways, pedestrian access and transit).

The TIA concludes that the project may result in potentially significant operational traffic impacts, and there are improvements necessary for alternative transportation facilities. The report provides recommended mitigation measures to reduce potential impacts that may result from impacts to traffic operations, and on alternative transportation. Mitigation measures are incorporated into the MMRP. With mitigations incorporated, the project would not conflict with the City's applicable plans and/or the surrounding street network and highways.

The study indicates that under existing conditions the Level of Service (LOS) is unacceptable (LOS D, E or F) at SR46E/Union Road and SR46E/Airport Road. Specific impacts that may result with the project would further reduce the LOS at the same intersections. This is the same (e.g. worsened conditions) under the near-term and near-term plus project conditions.

Mitigation measures proposed to reduce operational impacts include the following Recommendations 1 and

2. As noted in the TIA, the applicant would be permitted to complete and occupy the first hotel (136 rooms), however improvements noted, (whichever is acceptable to the City and applicant), would allow completion of hotels 2, 3, and 4. Recommendation 1 would require approval by the City Council since the City Council has the authority to modify intersection operations. Recommendation 2 may be approved by the Planning Commission as the final review authority.

**Recommendation 1:** Prohibit southbound left turns at State Route 46E/Airport Road to reduce conflict points at this intersection, reduce queuing, and reduce delay on the southbound approach. Intersection delays increase when traffic from Hotels 2, 3, and 4 are included because the southbound and eastbound left turn movements exceed capacity. We recommend prohibiting southbound left turns at this intersection prior to the occupancy of Hotels 2, 3, and 4 unless a local road connection is provided to Wisteria Lane.

Until a local road connection is provided to Wisteria Lane, prohibiting southbound left turns would require vehicles destined to travel east on State Route 46 to turn right onto westbound State Route 46 then perform a U-turn at Union Road or Golden Hill Road. The existing counts show that fewer than ten vehicles currently make the southbound left turn during the peak hours studied, and shifting these trips would have a negligible effect on operations at the nearby intersections of Union Road and Golden Hill Road.

Note that the two alternatives evaluated in the Highway 46/Union Road PSR, to be carried forward in the on-going PR-ED, include modifications to the State Route 46E/Airport Road intersection. The overcrossing only alternative includes conversion to right-in/right-out only access, and the full interchange alternative would disconnect Airport Road completely from State Route 46E.

**Recommendation 2:** Complete the local road connection from Wisteria Lane to Airport Road prior to occupancy of Hotels 2, 3, and 4. Upon completion, provide signage on the westbound approach to Destino Paso Way/Airport Road to direct hotel visitors to the new local road connection instead of State Route 46E. We recommend monitoring traffic levels at State Route 46E/Airport Road and Destino Paso Way/Airport Road intersections following the new local road connection to determine if additional measures, such as prohibiting westbound left turns out of Destino Paso Way, are required to avoid operational impacts to the State Route 46E/Airport Road intersection.

Alternative transportation mitigation measures include:

- Modify the bike lane and right turn striping for the northbound right turn lane proposed at Airport Road/Destino Paso Way per Figure 9C-4 of the California MUTCD. The site plan shows the bike lane to the right of the right turn lane instead of between the right turn lane and through lane as recommended by the MUTCD.
- Install the bicycle rider stencil pavement marker only when the bike lanes are continuous to the north and south of the project frontage.
- A walking path along the west side of Airport Road is recommended given site constraints. Detailed construction documents should be reviewed once they are ready to ensure that adequate sight distance is provided at the driveways serving Hotels 1 and 3, which are located on the inside of horizontal curves. Landscaping and other features should be restricted near these driveways to provide clear sight lines to approaching traffic.

b. Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to\_a level of service standards and

travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

Discussion: See XVI a. above. Mitigation measures proposed would ensure the project would not conflict with congestion management plans by reduce traffic delay at affected intersections.

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

Discussion: The proposed project could not affect air traffic patterns since it will not generate new or modified air traffic that would affect the Paso Robles Airport.

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

Discussion: See XVI a. above. Potential hazards on Destino Paso Way are addressed through mitigation measures in XVI a.

- e. Result in inadequate emergency access?

Discussion: The project will not impede emergency access, and is designed in compliance with all emergency access safety features and to City emergency access standards.

- f. Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

Discussion: See XVI a. above. Mitigation measures proposed would ensure the project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.

**XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS:** Would the project:

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

Discussion: The project will comply with all applicable wastewater treatment requirements required by the City, RWQCB and the State. Therefore, there will be no impacts resulting from wastewater treatment from this project.

- b. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Discussion: Per the City's General Plan EIR, Urban Water Management Plan, and Sewer System Management Plan (SSMP), the City's water and wastewater treatment facilities are adequately sized, including planned facility upgrades, to provide needed water and to treat effluent resulting from this project.

Therefore, this project will not result in the need to construct new facilities.

- c. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Discussion: All new stormwater resulting from this project will be managed on the project site, and will not enter existing storm water drainage facilities or require expansion of new drainage facilities (refer to the Stormwater Control Plan, Attachment 10). Therefore, the project will not impact the City's storm water drainage facilities.

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

Discussion: A Water Supply Evaluation (WSE) was prepared for this project, see Attachment 12. As noted in the WSE, the projected water demand for this project is included in the assumptions of the 2015 Urban Water Management Plan. Water supply for the project will include City-supplied potable water and recycled water. Buildout water use of the project is estimated to be 35.32 acre-feet per year (AFY) of City-supplied potable water and 3.94 AFY of recycled water, once it becomes available. In the interim, City-supplies of potable water will be used for irrigation and water features. the project can be served with existing water resource entitlements available and will not require expansion of new water resource entitlements. The study concludes that the City has adequate potable supply to provide reliable long-term water supply for the project under normal and drought conditions.

- e. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project=s projected demand in addition to the provider=s existing commitments?

Discussion: Per the City's SSMP The City's wastewater treatment facility has adequate capacity to serve this project as well as existing commitments.

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

Discussion: Per the City's Landfill Master Plan, the City's landfill has adequate capacity to accommodate construction related and operational solid waste disposal for this project.

- g. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

Discussion: The project will comply with all federal, state, and local solid waste regulations.

---

### **XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

- a. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or

wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Discussion: As noted within this environmental document, and with the mitigation measures outlined in the document, the project's impacts related to habitat for wildlife species (San Joaquin Kit Fox) will be less than significant with mitigation incorporated. There will be no impact to fish habitat as well as no impact to fish and wildlife populations. The site is comprised of disturbed habitat, so impact to fish, wildlife, of plant habitat would be less than significant.

- b. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

Discussion: The project is consistent with the City's General Plan and Planned Development, Land Use designation and Zoning, and the adopted General Plan EIR, which evaluated City growth and build out. Therefore, the project will not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

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

Discussion: As noted within this environmental document, and with the mitigation measures outlined in the document, the project's potential to cause what may be considered substantial, adverse effects on human beings either directly or indirectly is negligible. Therefore, the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.

**EARLIER ANALYSIS AND BACKGROUND MATERIALS.**

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

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

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

## **Attachments**

- 1 – Project Location Map
- 2 – Site Plan & Elevations
- 3 – Vesting Tentative Tract Map 2962, amendment
- 4 – Air Quality / Greenhouse Gas Emissions Assessment
- 5 – Biological Assessment
- 6 – Arborist Report
- 7 – Cultural Resource Study
- 8 – Geotechnical Report
- 9 – Airport Land Use Analysis
- 10 – Stormwater Control Plan
- 11 – Traffic Impact Analysis
- 12 – Water Supply Evaluation
- 13 – Mitigation Monitoring and Report Program