

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT  
INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM  
CITY OF PASO ROBLES**

PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD – MAY 18, 2017 to JUNE 6, 2017

- 1. PROJECT TITLE:** Paso Market Place
- Concurrent Entitlements:** Zoning Code Amendment (ZC) 17-001  
Planned Development (PD) 17-003  
Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 17-007
- 2. LEAD AGENCY:** City of Paso Robles  
1000 Spring Street  
Paso Robles, CA 93446
- Contact:** Susan DeCarli, City Planner  
**Phone:** (805) 237-3970  
**Email:** sdecarli@prcity.com
- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:** 1803 Spring Street (APNs: 008-234-007, -008, and -009), See Vicinity Map, Attachment 1
- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** Deborah Longo
- Contact Person:** McShane Murnane  
**Phone:** (323) 284-8921  
**Email:** mcshane@projectmplus.com
- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** Mixed Use (MU-8)
- 6. ZONING:** T-3 Flex (T-3F) Zone
- 7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** This is a proposal to establish a 15,669 sf mixed-use development project. The project includes restaurant, specialty retail, and residential uses, as follows:
- Building A – Restaurant - 1,200 sf  
Building B – Retail and 3 residences – 4,080 sf  
Building C – Retail, café – 1,162 sf  
Building D – Retail - 3,653 sf  
Building E – Bar/outdoor seating, retail, 3 residences – 4,660 building sf, and 1,150 patio sf

In accordance with the City's Historic Resources Survey, there is an existing historic structure on the property. The project is proposed to rehabilitate and reuse this existing historic residential structure for a restaurant. This structure was most recently used as part of a plant nursery business. The project includes a proposal for four new separate buildings connected together with three breezeways between buildings. The residential units are proposed to be located on the second story of the two 2-story buildings (Buildings B and E). Both Building B and E would include three residences (with four 1-bedroom units, and two 2-bedroom units).

A small, separate kitchen building is proposed for the corner restaurant, which would be attached with a breezeway to the main building. The architectural theme of the new buildings build on rural, agrarian theme with minimal ornamentation, similar to barn-like buildings, yet with contemporary use of glazing, metal, and wood siding. The new buildings are intended to complement the existing historic farmhouse-style building on the site, and the regional agrarian themes in the vicinity.

The new buildings are proposed to be set deep into the property, and would exceed the building placement "build-to" (setback) maximum of 20 feet. The applicant's Site Plan proposes to set buildings up to 75 feet deep from the front property line. The buildings proposed placement helps to maintain the existing healthy oak trees and provides outdoor use areas. Given this, placement of buildings on the site would require approval of an exception modification to the provisions of the Uptown/Town Center Specific Plan development code to be approved the City Council to allow this development as proposed. This may be permitted with specific findings under Section 5.1. D.4 of the Uptown/Town Center Specific Plan, which includes, *"In the event that compliance with the provisions of this Code can be demonstrated to be physically infeasible for any reasonable type of development within any of the zones described in this chapter, the Planning Commission may, subject to development plan review, approve modified development standards upon a finding that the modified standards will not create a physical hazard or negative visual impact when viewed from a street or neighboring property."*

The building type of "flex-shed" is also not a listed building typology in the T3-Flex district. Building types in the T3-F district are limited to only residential or live/work building types. The flex-shed building type allows for a more commercial design form, and lends to the agrarian building form proposed. The prior use of the project site was for a commercial retail plant nursery. Flex-shed buildings are permitted to be up to 36 feet in height, which is what is proposed for Building D. There is a range of building types in the near vicinity, including various types of commercial and residential developments. The flex-shed buildings proposed are similar in mass and scale and intensity to surrounding development. The Zoning Code amendment includes adding flex-shed to the list of building types that may be permitted at this location.

The proposed specialty retail land use is not permitted in the T3-Flex district, however, it is permitted on property located one block south of the site on the east side of Spring Street. Given this precedence and the proposed low-scale development pattern of the project, and the low-intensity uses proposed for this project, the applicant has requested a zoning code amendment to allow retail use on this specific property in the T3-Flex zone.

As noted above, the existing historic residential structure located on the southeast corner of the site is proposed to remain and be re-purposed as a restaurant. The applicant has proposed to rehabilitate the exterior materials that have deteriorated over time with the same type of

exterior siding, windows and other appurtenances in keeping with the existing historic architectural theme and consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The kitchen building proposed adjacent to the historic building, and is proposed to complement the historic theme and integrity of the historic building. In accordance with the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance, the City Council would need to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness based on specific findings in the ordinance that all exterior work proposed for this building would be in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

The project requires thirty-five (35) parking spaces for the development, which are located on the west side of the property, and are accessed via an existing 20-foot wide alley. Bike racks are also included on the site plan for bicycle parking. Mechanical equipment and garbage enclosures are proposed at the rear of buildings and along the alley. The site is designed with outdoor open space landscape and patio areas surrounding the buildings, where guests can walk around and/or sit outside. The 1,150 sf outdoor patio area near Building E is programmed as outdoor seating area, and is calculated in the parking requirements for the project. The open space area also includes a children's play area. The buildings and outdoor areas are interconnected by a network of smooth, informal, decomposed granite walkways.

There three existing oak trees located on the site near the front of the property adjacent to Spring Street. One of the trees is diseased/dead and was previously approved for removal by the City. The other two oak trees are proposed to remain and be integrated into the site design. A new, large-sized oak tree replacement is proposed in the location where the dead tree was approved for removal. The site incorporates native landscape materials, and a small amount of turf.

Since the existing project site includes four separate parcels, prior to issuance of building permits in the future, the applicant will need to record a Lot Merger to combine the properties into one parcel

8. **SURROUNDING LAND USES AND SETTING:** The project site located in an existing urban infill development area on the west side of the City. There is existing development with a mix of residential and commercial land uses adjacent to all property boundaries. The nearest properties to the west across the alley are developed with single-family residences. There are low-scale commercial businesses and homes to the east, north and south of the project site.
9. **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 type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics               | <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture and Forestry Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources      | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials      | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology / Water Quality          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use / Planning      | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Population / Housing     | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic   | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities / Service Systems        | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance |

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

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

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

Signature: Susan DeCauli

Date 5-17-17

## EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

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

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

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

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project site is located between 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Streets on Spring Street, which is within the “Midtown” neighborhood identified in the Uptown/Town Center Specific Plan. This area is noted to have a residential character with commercial buildings lining Spring Street that are generally one- and two-stories. The Plan suggests preservation of the small-scale character and to preserve historic structures, and to shape the public realm of the street in a pedestrian-friendly manner. It also recommends introducing mixed-use and/or flex uses of buildings along Spring Street. The proposed project would be consistent with this vision and design parameters.

In accordance with the City’s General Plan, Conservation Element, the project is not located in a scenic vista and would therefore not impact a scenic vista. Also, based on the project description, it would be in keeping with the general vision outlined in the Uptown/Town Center Specific Plan, and would not result in an adverse scenic impact.

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

Discussion: The scope of the proposed project includes rehabilitating the existing historic structure and maintaining the existing healthy native oak trees. The proposed buildings are low-intensity with a significant amount of open space and a park-like atmosphere around them. There are no other scenic resources on the project site. The project is not within a state scenic highway area, therefore, the project could not result in a negative impacts to this type of facility or resource.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The existing visual quality of the site is low since it is mostly vacant and has been abandoned the last several years, the existing historic building is in disrepair, and the site is overgrown with weeds and deferred maintenance. There is an existing occupied residence located on the north side of the site on 19<sup>th</sup> Street and the alley that is a low-end, unremarkable building that has not been upgraded and is minimally maintained. The project will greatly improve the existing visual character of the site and surroundings through renovating the existing historic structure, demolishing the existing residence and locating new, attractive buildings, landscaping and site improvements on the property.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (Sources: 1, 2, 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project will introduce new lighting sources to the existing, largely vacant use of the site. The Zoning Code requires all new lighting to be shielded and directed downward in such a manner as to not create off-site glare or adversely impact adjacent properties. The project will be conditioned accordingly. The style, location and height of the lighting fixtures will be submitted with the building plans and subject to approval by the Development Review Committee to ensure compliance of Zoning Code, prior to issuance of building or grading permits. Exterior lighting fixtures are proposed to provide the minimum necessary to provide for safety and security, and will not result in glare or brightness onto adjacent properties, especially

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

residential properties to the west across the alley. Therefore, the project will not result in light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views of the area.

**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 project site is designated in the General Plan and is zoned on the City’s Zoning Map for mixed-use commercial and/or residential development. The property is not identified in the City General Plan, Conservation Element (Figure C-2, Habitat Map) as having either prime or unique farmland of statewide importance. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts on converting prime or other significant soils to urban land uses.

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

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

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

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

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

Discussion: See II c. above.

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

Discussion: As an urban infill site, no farmland is located within the near vicinity of the project site.

---

**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: The proposed infill development project is consistent with existing zoning and general plan designations, and includew land use and transportation features that would be considered consistent and not conflict with the Clean Air Plan (CAP).

To ensure consistency, the project includes various measures to reduce emissions associated with energy and vehicle use. These measures would include the installation of onsite bicycle parking racks, and provisions for safe and convenient internal access to adjacent uses. There is a northbound transit stop located directly across the street, and southbound bus stops located two blocks north and one block south from the site. Bus service is provided by Paso Express transit service. There are existing sidewalks on all street frontages. For these reasons, the proposed project would not conflict with or obstruct continued implementation of the CAP. Therefore, this impact is considered less than significant.

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

Discussion: In accordance with the San Luis Obispo Air District CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the combination of land uses and square footage are below the air quality impact threshold of significance. Therefore, the proposed project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation.

- c. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (Source: 11)

Discussion: In accordance with the San Luis Obispo Air District CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the combination of land uses and square footage are below the air quality impact threshold of significance. Therefore, the proposed project would not 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.

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

Discussion:

There are residences located in the project vicinity, which are defined as sensitive receptors. The project is a combination of small-scale retail, a couple restaurant/cafes, and 6 small residences. These uses are not uses that emit significant air pollution, as compared to manufacturing or industrial types of land uses that may create air pollution through processes, and/or generate a significant amount of diesel delivery truck traffic,

nor is it a use that would attract high volumes of trip generation, such as a regional commercial center. Additionally, the site is located on Spring Street, which does not carry heavy traffic volumes, nor would this project significantly change the level of traffic carried on Spring Street that would result in significant vehicle emissions, as compared to large projects located on major highways. Site preparation and grading activities would need to comply with standard dust/PM10 control conditions of approval requirements. Therefore, this project would not result in exposure to sensitive receptors of substantial pollutant concentrations.

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

Discussion: The occurrence and severity of odor impacts depends on numerous factors, including: the nature, frequency, and intensity of the source; wind speed and direction; and the sensitivity of the receptors. While offensive odors rarely cause any physical harm, they can be very unpleasant, leading to considerable distress among the public and often generating citizen complaints to local governments and regulatory agencies. Projects with the potential to frequently expose members of the public to objectionable odors would be deemed to have a significant impact.

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: The project site is an urban infill site with anthropomorphic and ruderal vegetation, except for three native oak trees. There are no sensitive species or special status species located on the property that would be impacted or require protection.

As noted in the Project Description, one of the oak trees is dead/diseased and has been approved for removal. In accordance with the City's Oak Tree Preservation Ordinance, the Arborist Report prepared for this project provides oak tree protection measures, which will be included in project conditions of approval to ensure the development doesn't result in negative impacts on the health of the trees. With conditions applied to this project to protect the oak trees, the project would not result in significant impacts to biological resources on the site.

- 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?

Discussion: There is no 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 located on this property, except for the oak trees discussed in item IV a. above. Therefore, this project would not result significant impacts to riparian habitat or other sensitive natural resources.

- 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?

Discussion: There are no wetlands, waterways or other hydrological features located on the project site, or within the near vicinity that could be affected by the proposed project. Therefore, the project will not result in impacts to hydrological features and/or resources.

- 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?

Discussion: The project is not located within 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. Therefore, the project would not result in impacts to these resources.

- e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?

Discussion: Per Item IV a. above, the site has three native oak trees located on. One of the oak trees is dead/diseased and has been approved for removal. The remaining two oak trees will be protected in accordance with the project arborist recommendations. There are no other local policies or ordinances that apply to biological resources on this property. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

- 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?

Discussion: There are no Habitat Conservation Plans or other related plans applicable in the City of Paso Robles.

---

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

- a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

Discussion: In accordance with the City's Historic Resources Survey, there is an existing historic (residential) structure located on the southeast corner of the project site. This building has not been well maintained the last several years, and has fallen into disrepair. The project applicant proposes to restore this building by refurbishing dilapidated siding, windows and other features to the historical integrity of the original building in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

The project scope also includes a future addition to add a breezeway that would connect a future restaurant use to a separate kitchen building to the west of the historic building. In accordance with the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance, a mitigation measure has been incorporated into the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program to require the applicant obtain approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness that demonstrates consistency with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. With this mitigation measure incorporated, the project will not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5.

- b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Discussion: As an urban infill (previously developed) site, there are no known archaeological resources located on the property. However, if any archaeological resources are discovered on the site during project construction, all activities would cease, and a qualified professional would be contacted to evaluate the resource. Therefore, it is not likely that the project would result in substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5.

- c. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?

Discussion: As an urban infill (previously developed) site, there are no known unique paleontological resources located on the property or unique geological features. However, if any paleontological resources are discovered on the site during project construction, all activities would cease, and a qualified professional would be contacted to evaluate the resource. Therefore, it is not likely that the project would result in

- d. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

Discussion: There are no known human remains on the project site, however per conditions of approval incorporated into the project, if human remains are found during site disturbance, all grading and/or construction activities shall stop, and the County Coroner shall be contacted to investigate. Therefore, this project will result in less than significant impacts on cultural resources.

---

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

- a. Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42. (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

Discussion: The potential for and mitigation of impacts that may result from fault rupture in the project area are identified and addressed in the General Plan EIR, pg. 4.5-8. There are two known fault zones on either side of the Salinas Rivers Valley. The Rinconada Fault system runs on the west side of the valley, and grazes the City on its western boundary. The San Andreas Fault is on the east side of the valley and is situated about 30 miles east of Paso Robles. The City of Paso Robles recognizes these geologic

influences in the application of the California Building Code (CBC) to all new development within the City. Review of available information and examinations indicate that neither of these faults is active with respect to ground rupture in Paso Robles. Soils and geotechnical reports and structural engineering in accordance with local seismic influences would be applied in conjunction with any new development proposal. Based on standard conditions of approval, the potential for fault rupture and exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards is not considered significant. There are no Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones within City limits.

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

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

- iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? (Sources: 1, 2 & 3)

Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR, the project site is located in an area with soil conditions that have a 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?

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

- c. Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? (Sources: 1, 2, & 3)

Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR the soil condition is not erosive or otherwise unstable. As such, no significant impacts are anticipated. A geotechnical/ soils analysis will be required prior to issuance of building permits that will evaluate the site specific soil stability and suitability of grading and retaining walls proposed. This study will determine the necessary grading techniques that will ensure that potential impacts due to soil stability will not occur. An erosion control plan shall be required to be approved by the City Engineer prior to commencement of site grading.

- 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?

Discussion: See response to item 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?

Discussion: See response to item 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?

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?

Discussion: In accordance with the San Luis Obispo County Air District CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the combined land uses and square footage of development proposed for this project is below the applicable thresholds of significance that would determine the project would generate greenhouse gas emissions that would either directly or indirectly result in a significant impact on the environment.

- 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 Climate Action Plan (CAP) was adopted by the City Council in November, 2013. The 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 will 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 project would be conditioned to ensure consistency with the City of Paso Robles CAP by preparing a Consistency Worksheet. Therefore, this project would not conflict with the City's 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?

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?

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?

Discussion: The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or use hazardous materials. There is an elementary school (Bauer Speck Elementary) located within a ¼ mile radius of the project site, however, the project will not result in emitting hazardous emissions and would therefore not result in impacts to the 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?

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?

Discussion: The project site is not located within the vicinity of the Paso Robles Airport. Therefore, the project would not result in airport related safety hazards for people residing or working in the project area.

- 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?

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?

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?

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 would be required to comply with local and state water quality standards and wastewater discharge requirements prior to approval required discharge permits into City facilities for all restaurant uses. A Stormwater Management Plan was prepared to demonstrate how the project will comply with applicable Regional Water Board stormwater requirements. 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.

Additionally, the City Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) 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 in the TF-3 district has been accounted for, and the City has adequate water supply to serve this project.

Therefore, as demonstrated in the UWMP, 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 new storm water runoff that would result from impervious surfaces (e.g. building footprints, parking areas and other hardscape surfaces) will be maintained on the project site. Therefore, impacts to drainage patterns and facilities would less than significant.

- d. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through



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

1. 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 water runoff on the project site. There are no wetland or riparian areas in the near vicinity, and the project could not result in impacts to aquatic habitat. Therefore, the project will not result in significant impacts to these resources.

---

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

- a. Physically divide an established community?

Discussion: The project is a low-scale, low-intensity development project proposed on an urban infill property. The project will incorporate residential and commercial land uses that will blend in with and be compatible with surrounding development. Therefore, the project will 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 Mixed-Use land use designation in the General Plan, and the T3-F district in the Uptown/Town Center Specific Plan, with modifications included in the project proposal to modify the use table to allow for specialty retail in the T3-F district.

- 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 and land uses (e.g. restaurants, retail and residences), are not significant noise generating uses. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to expose persons in the vicinity to noise levels that would exceed adopted noise level standards in City codes and regulations.

- 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 equipment. The use of major groundborne vibration-generating construction equipment, such as pile drivers, are not anticipated to be required for this project. Typical vibration levels associated with construction activities at the nearest offsite structures, which are located in excess of 25 feet from the project site, would not likely exceed the minimum recommended criterion for structural damage and/or human annoyance. As a result, this impact would be considered less than significant.

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

Discussion: Since this project does not include future significant noise generating land uses, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. As a result, this would be considered less than significant.

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

Discussion: Construction noise typically occurs intermittently and varies depending upon the nature or phase of construction (e.g., land clearing, grading, excavation, and paving), resulting in short-term noise generation. However, construction activities would not occur during the more noise-sensitive nighttime hours, and as an urban infill site on a topographically flat property, the project will not require significant grading, pile-drivers or other particularly loud noise generating equipment. Therefore, the proposed project will not result in substantial temporary ambient noise levels.

- 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 proposed project site is located over five miles from the Paso Robles Municipal Airport, and would not be subjected 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)
- b. Police protection? (Sources: 1,10)
- c. Schools?
- d. Parks?
- 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 addressed 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 small-scale mixed-use development project, it will not encourage new housing demands and use of recreational facilities, it will not result in significant impacts to existing or create the demand for new 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: In accordance with the Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation Manual, (6<sup>th</sup> Edition), based on the square footage of the proposed land uses (e.g. restaurant, retail and residential), the proposed project would result in approximately 707 average daily trips into and out of the project site, with approximately 63 AM peak hour trips and 74 PM peak hour trips. This represents an increase of traffic on Spring Street of less than one percent, raising the capacity utilization from 82 percent to 82.98 percent. This demonstrates that the potential traffic impacts that may result from this project would not conflict with and would be consistent with the City's 2011 General Plan, Circulation Element, which is the City's plan and policy document for measuring circulation performance effectiveness.

The property would maintain the existing bike lane on Spring Street, adjacent to the project site. As noted in item III a., there are existing transit stops that will serve this project one block south, two blocks north and directly across the street on Spring Street. The property would also maintain existing sidewalks surrounding the project site on Spring, 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> Streets for pedestrian circulation. Therefore, this proposed project would not result in significant impacts to the City's circulation system and traffic impacts.

- 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: As discussed in XVI a. above, the proposed project would not result significant transportation impacts, and would therefore not significantly degrade the level of service or capacity utilization of the surrounding road networks.

- 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 project site will not affect air traffic patterns at the Paso Robles airport or affect airport operations.

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

Discussion: The project will be accessed from existing improved City streets and alley, and does not include new driveways from the public right-of-way. Therefore, the project could not substantially increase hazards due to design features, and impacts from design features would be less than significant.

- 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: As noted in XVI a. above, the project will maintain surrounding transit, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. Therefore, the project does not conflict with policies and plans regarding these 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 (Stormwater Control Plan, Attachment 4). 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: As noted in section IX on Hydrology, the project can be served with existing water resource entitlements available and will not require expansion of new water resource entitlements.

- 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, there are no protected environmental habitats or species on or near the project site that could be impacted by this project, including fish and wildlife populations. The site is comprised of anthropomorphic and ruderal vegetation. The existing healthy native oak trees will be maintained and preserved on the project site. Therefore, potential impacts to the quality of the environment related to habitats, fish, or wildlife 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 Land Use Plan, Uptown/Town Center Specific Plan, 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 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. Vicinity Map
2. Site Plan & Elevations
3. Arborist Report
4. Stormwater Control Plan