

# ENVIRONMENTAL INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST FORM CITY OF PASO ROBLES

- 1. PROJECT TITLE:** Vina Robles Hotel, Amphitheatre and Ancillary Support Uses
- 2. LEAD AGENCY:** City of Paso Robles  
1000 Spring Street  
Paso Robles, CA 93446
- Contact:** Susan DeCarli, AICP, Planning Manager  
**Phone:** (805) 237-3970  
**Email:** sdecarli@prcity.com
- 3. PROJECT LOCATION:** 3700 Mill Road, Paso Robles, CA  
APN 025-701-003
- 4. PROJECT PROPONENT:** Vina Robles, Inc.
- Contact Person:** Tim Woodle, Pults & Associates  
**Phone:** (805) 541-5604  
**Email:** twoodle@pults.com
- 5. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION:** Parks and Open Space/Airport Area Overlay
- 6. ZONING:** Parks and Open Space/Airport Area Overlay
- 7. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

The site is currently developed with a hospitality center and winery. The proposed project includes two phases of development including: an outdoor amphitheater (with a performance stage, stage apparatus and seating areas) for a seating capacity of up to 3300 patrons, a 6,000 sf artists compound and ancillary buildings (e.g. restrooms, admission/entry building, first aid/security building, storage buildings, and concession buildings). Phase 2 includes relocation of a 78 room hotel on the same property (which was previously entitled on the property), 10 duplex bungalow lodging units, and additional on-site parking lots.

The project would require site grading to re-contour a natural "bowl" feature on the site for the amphitheater stage and seating area, removal of up to 68 oak trees, and general site/vegetation disturbance. Grading is anticipated to balance soils on the site. An arborist report evaluated potential impacts to oak trees that will remain on the site, and oak tree

protection during construction and site disturbance. The arborist report also provides recommendations for oak tree mitigation measures. A Preliminary Biological Report was also prepared that evaluates potential impacts to sensitive and/or protected/endangered species, habitat and migration corridors.

The project proponents plan to hold up to 50 events per year. Approximately 20 percent of these events are anticipated to be “capacity” events accommodating full capacity of the facility up to 3300 patrons. The majority of events are anticipated to accommodate 1000 to 2500 patrons per event. The number of events per year is anticipated to increase over a 10 year period building up to the maximum number of events permitted per year. Events are planned to extend over a 9 month period from May through January. Events are planned to be evening concerts with performances ending between 10 pm and midnight.

Capacity events are anticipated to generate approximately 1100 cars (with an average persons to vehicle ratio of 3:1). Traffic would enter and exit the site via Mill Road and SR Highway 46 East. The majority of existing traffic is anticipated to travel west on Hwy. 46, and then continue south on Highway 101. Mill Road is controlled by a stop sign. No changes to the intersection of Mill Road and Hwy. 46 are proposed with this project. Trained event staff will be placed on Mill Road to assist safe exiting from events. A Traffic Impact Study was prepared for this project and is attached to this document.

The site design incorporates Low-Impacts Development features to manage storm water from impervious surface runoff on site. Large parking lot areas will be designed with porous, vegetated materials.

**8. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:**

The project site is located adjacent to Highway 46 East on the north, a golf course to the east and wineries to the west and south. The site has an existing oak woodland located on the east side of the property. The area proposed for the hotel is currently flat, without significant vegetation or other environmental features. The amphitheater is proposed in an area approximately 20 to 30 feet below grade from the highway. The general setting is rural agriculture.

The property is located in Airport Land Use Plan, Safety Flight Path, Zone 5. The project is consistent with the Airport Land Use Plan.

**9. OTHER AGENCIES WHOSE APPROVAL IS REQUIRED (AND PERMITS NEEDED):**

SLO County Air Pollution Control District for air pollution mitigation strategies.

**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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Quality               |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources   | <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Geology /Soils                       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions          | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials      | <input checked="" 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 \_\_\_\_\_

## 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

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

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

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

Discussion: The project is located adjacent to Highway 46 East, which is identified in the City’s 2003 General Plan Conservation Element, as “gateway” to the City and a “Visual Corridor”. The project site is visible from the highway, and is part of a scenic vista – visual corridor, as defined in the General Plan.

The property has part hillside terrain, with part of it below the grade of the highway (which contains an oak woodland area). The remaining area is above the highway grade, and has more open, flat to gently rolling terrain with vineyards, site landscaping and occasional oak trees. The existing hospitality center and winery buildings are located on the more open flat areas of the property and are immediately adjacent to and visible from the highway. The property does not present long, uninterrupted (public) views of the landscape from the highway. Instead the eastbound view is of vineyard and large buildings, followed by and oak studded downhill terrain. Adjacent uses include large scale wineries to the west (Robert Hall Winery) and across the highway to the north (Eberle Winery), a golf course to the east and vineyard to the south.

The amphitheater, ancillary buildings and bungalows are proposed to be located within the hillside, lower areas of the site (below grade). The hotel is proposed next to the existing winery and hospitality buildings. The proposed architectural style and form (rustic Mediterranean), colors and materials of the new buildings will be the same as the existing hospitality and winery center.

Photo-simulations of the proposed project as viewed from key view points from Highway 46 East and Mill Road was provided by the applicant (Exhibit 3, Photo Simulations). They depict the visual character of how the project would be seen from the public realm. The primary views of interest are from the highway. While project structures will be visible from the highway, the visibility of the amphitheater component of the project will be short in duration since the site and structures are setback from the highway (a minimum of 100 feet), and the amphitheater is mostly proposed to be located below the grade of the highway. Additionally, there is significant oak tree canopy in the immediate area surrounding the amphitheater and ancillary structures, which will provide a measure of screening and soften the views of the structures from the highway. The architectural features of the buildings are consistent with the existing structures on the site. Given the existing variety of uses in the near vicinity and lack of intactness in the natural and built environment, viewer expectations would not be particularly “sensitive” to additional, similar buildings added to the view. Therefore, this component of the project will not significantly change the visual character or quality of the site and surroundings.

As noted above, the proposed hotel building would also be constructed with the same architectural design theme and materials as the existing site development. While it would be placed on the more open area of the site, the visual character of the existing development is characterized by large winery and related structures. Given the surrounding landscape with other large winery buildings and the local cultural reference of the “wine region”, viewer expectations of similar buildings is accepted, and valued as part of the regional cultural imperative. This area of the site also does not present an “intact” landscape, and while the visual quality of the view to this area is high, it is high in part by the quality of the exiting on-site and off-site winery developments that are flanked by vineyards. The new buildings would be softened through use of foundation landscaping and purposely positioned trees to accent the site landscaping, open fencing materials, stone work and masonry. The eastbound foreground of the property (to the west of the hotel) will remain open with vineyards and natural features which will help balance the site, transitioning from the natural to more developed features. A more detailed technical visual analysis of this project is provided in Exhibit 3 with the Photo Simulations.

Therefore, given the existing development on the property, and character of the surrounding development, the proposed project will be visible, but it will also compatible with and blend in with the property and landscape.

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

The visual impacts of this project would therefore result in less than significant impacts on the scenic vista from the highway.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project would require removal of numerous oak trees within the development area of the amphitheater and ancillary buildings. However, there are over 250 oak trees within the development area ranging between 6 to 30 inches in diameter. Tree removals will be mitigated per the City's Oak Tree Protection Ordinance through planting of replacement trees. The loss of the tree removals will not impact the overall scenic resource of the oak woodland area due to the abundance of existing oak trees in the oak woodland area. There are no other scenic features that would be impacted by this project. Therefore, impacts to scenic resources would be less than significant.

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

Discussion: See I a. above for analysis of impacts to visual character of the site and surroundings. As concluded, impacts to the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings would be less than significant.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 proposed project includes building lights, parking lot lights, grounds lighting, and stage lighting. All lighting for buildings, grounds and parking lots will be consistent with the existing light standards and shielding design for existing structures and facilities, which are architecturally compatible with the building theme, and are downcast and shielded to control light and glare from the site. Lighting for stage events will be focused toward the stage and to the amphitheater bowl seating area. Stage lights will not be directed off the site or toward the highway. The project includes solid walls and buildings along the north side of the stage area that will reduce the potential for stage lighting to spill onto the highway or off the property. Post events, lighting of the stage and parking lots will be turned off since they would not be in use. Therefore, lighting for events would be short term and only on for evening hours until 12:00 a.m.

Consistent with SLO County Airport Land Use Commission recommendations, the project will be conditioned to prohibit aerial laser light projected into the sky above 500 feet above ground. All lighting shall be consistent with the City Zoning Code. Standard and special conditions will be included with the Conditional Use Permit to control light and glare. Therefore, impacts resulting from creating new sources of light will be less than significant.

---

**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

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

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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: In accordance with the City 2003 General Plan, Open Space Element, the property is not identified as 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. The project property is shown as “grazing land”, however, the development area of the project site is not used for agricultural or grazing purposes. Therefore, the project will have no impact on these resources.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The project site is zoned for Park and Open Space, (not for agriculture), nor is it under a Williamson Act contract. Therefore, the project will have no impact on these resources.

- 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))?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: The proposed project will not conflict with existing zoning nor cause rezoning of forest land, or timberland. There are no forest land or timberland resources on or near the site. Therefore, the project will have no impact on these resources.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: See II a, b, c above. This project will not result in impacts to forest land.

- 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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The project is proposed on a large parcel (21 acres) zoned for Parks and Open Space, and is surrounded by vineyards, wineries and a golf course. The project is a supportive use for winery oriented uses and would not likely result in conversion of the surrounding lands to non-agricultural uses, and therefore not impact other surrounding properties.

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

**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) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: An Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Assessment Study was prepared for this project (Exhibit 4, Ambient, June 2011). The applicant, City and the San Luis Obispo Air Pollution Control District (APCD) have been in consultation regarding emissions modeling, modeling assumptions, potential impacts, and measures to reduce impacts. Through working together, the applicant revised modeling inputs and the output analysis to ensure that it is consistent with APCDs methodologies for analyzing emissions impacts and recommended mitigation measures.

The study indicates that due to overall increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) that would result from this project that the project could conflict with the CAP emissions inventory, which may result in an impact that is considered potentially significant. The study identifies mitigation measures AQ-1 (standard mitigations) and AQ-2 (standard mitigations, Best Available Standard Mitigation (BACT), Construction Activity Management Plan (CAMP) and off-site mitigations) that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. These mitigation measures are provided in the Mitigation Summary Table, in Exhibit 12. The analysis identifies that the environmental significance after mitigation would be considered less than significant.

- |    |  |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. | Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (Source: 11) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The AQ Study noted in IIIa. above, indicates that the proposed project may result in short-term construction and long-term operational emissions that would exceed local thresholds for significance, which would be a potentially significant impact. Long term operational emissions associated with the proposed project would be predominantly associated with vehicle travel associated with event attendees traveling to and from the project site. Estimated combined daily emissions of ROG and NOx would exceed APCDs significance threshold of 25 lbs/day. In addition, daily operational emissions of fugitive PM10 associated with overflow parking area during capacity events would exceed the APCDs significance threshold of 25 lbs/day and would be considered to have a potentially significant impact. It is important to note that since events would not occur on a daily basis annual emissions are not projected to exceed APCDs significance thresholds. Nonetheless, because operational emissions would exceed APCDs daily significance threshold for combined ROG and NOx, as well as PM10, long term air quality impacted associated with this project would be considered potentially significant. The study identifies mitigation measures AQ-1 and AQ-2 that would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. These mitigation measures are provided in the Mitigation Summary Table, in Exhibit 12. The analysis identifies that the environmental significance after mitigation would be considered less than significant.

- |    |   |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|----|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project may result in cumulatively considerable increase in criteria pollutants and local thresholds for ozone precursor, due to combined daily and annual emissions for construction pollutants. These emissions would exceed local thresholds of significance, and would be considered potentially

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

significant. Implementation of standard mitigation measures in AQ-1 which includes construction generated emissions reductions and additional mitigation measures noted, that impacts after mitigation would be considered less than significant.

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

Discussion: The project may result in substantial pollutant concentrations (from diesel emissions), however these are considered less than significant with mitigations applied AQ-1 and AQ-2. There are no sensitive receptors such as schools, hospitals, concentrations of residences for elderly in the near vicinity since the property is surrounding by very low density agricultural land. Therefore, impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

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

Discussion: The proposed hotel and amphitheater would not create objectionable odors and there is not a substantial number of people within the near vicinity. Therefore impacts from odors resulting from this project would be 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 Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Discussion: In 2002 the city processed a development application for this project site. At that time a Biological Study was prepared for the prior project. The biological study identified a wetland area/vernal pool and protected fairy shrimp on the property. Additionally, the study identified and evaluated the site for San Joaquin Kit Fox (SJKF) and associated habitat. The prior project avoided the wetland area, which is now in a protected fenced area, and is not disturbed by existing development or future proposed activities. The study concluded that there were no SJKF or any other sensitive, special or otherwise protected species regulated by CDFG or USFWS on the site (except for the wetland area). The area of potential disturbance of SJKF habitat was mitigated through payment of fees for participation in the Palo Prieto Conservation Bank. The area of disturbance of the prior entitlement (21.02 acres) includes the area of SJKF habitat that would be disturbed by the currently proposed project (20.97 acres). Therefore the impacts to SJKF have been previously mitigated, and no further mitigation is required to address this impact. The SJKF Mitigation Agreement and Exhibit of the site disturbance and mitigation is attached in Exhibit 5.

A new Biological Report (Althouse & Mead, Oct. 2010 – attached in Exhibit 6) was prepared for the proposed new project. The report concludes that there are no special status animals (e.g. mammals, birds, reptiles or amphibians) or plants (except for the wetland/vernal pool and fairy shrimp which are avoided) on the project site within the area of disturbance. However, the report notes that while the project design is sensitive to the grassland and oak woodland areas, it could affect special status wildlife animal species and nesting birds and habitats. With specific mitigations, including pre-construction surveys for nesting birds, impacts to special status species and cumulative impacts can be reduced and potential impacts would be less than significant level.

- |  | <b>Potentially<br/>Significant<br/>Impact</b> | <b>Less Than<br/>Significant with<br/>Mitigation<br/>Incorporated</b> | <b>Less Than<br/>Significant<br/>Impact</b> | <b>No<br/>Impact</b>     |
|--|---|---|---|--------------------------|
| 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 Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | <input type="checkbox"/>                      | <input type="checkbox"/>  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>         | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Discussion: The biological report identifies a wetland area that will be avoided and will not result in impacts from the proposed project. There is no riparian habitat on the project site, however there is a drainage area at the east end of the property (near Hwy. 46). The development area will not encroach into this drainage area, including potential release of site drainage. There are no other riparian habitat areas or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service that would be impacted by this project. Therefore, impacts from this project on riparian habitat would be less than significant.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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: As noted in IV a.&b., the project will avoid protected wetlands on the site. Therefore, impacts to federally protected wetlands would be less than significant.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 are no resident or migratory fish on the project site. Potential impacts to SJKF habitat and the SJKF migration corridor have been previously mitigated. The Biological report notes that small animals would be expected to pass through or around the site. Development on the property may alter common wildlife species patterns of movement across the property but would result in less than significant impacts to small mammal movement. Because of the large amount of intact habitats in the Paso Robles region, the Biological Reports concludes that cumulative impacts to common wildlife species movement in the area would be negligible.

- |   |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 would require removal of up to 68 oak trees. The project site has hundreds of oak trees in the oak woodland area of the site, with 256 oak trees that are large enough to be regulated under the Oak Tree Protection Ordinance within the near vicinity of the project. An Arborist Report was prepared by A&T Arborists (attached) which identifies 240 trees that may be affected by the project. All required tree protection and mitigation measures per the City's oak tree protection ordinance shall be implemented by the

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

applicant. Oak tree replacements for removals (with a replacement ratio that equals 166 inches) will be required to be planted on the project site or at another location at the discretion of the City. Given the abundance of oak trees on the property, especially within the oak woodland area, removal of the oak trees, and replacements required for this project would not be significant. Therefore, with oak tree mitigation and replacement requirements implemented, impacts to oak trees will be less than significant.

There are no other local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources applicable to this site.

- 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: There are no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans applicable to the project site.

**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: There are no recorded or known historical resources as defined in §15064.5 located on the project site. Therefore, there will be no impact to historic resources resulting from this project.

- 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: There are no known archaeological resources on the project site. The Paso Robles area has been classified as territory once occupied by Salinian and Chumansh Native American Tribes. Past populations have been evidenced at several sites within the Paso Robles area, however none have been evidenced on the site or adjacent development at the Hunter Ranch Golf Course. Additionally, there no creeks or other features typically associated with these resources on the project site or in the near vicinity. In accordance with standard conditions of approval, if archaeological resources are unearthed during project construction, all work shall stop and the appropriate authorities and specialists shall be contacted to assess the site. Potential impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

- 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: There are no known paleontological resources existing on the site, nor does the site support the geological resources typically associated with them. Therefore, it is anticipated that impacts to paleontological resources would be less than significant.

- 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: There are no known or recorded burial sites or cemeteries on or near the project site. In accordance with standard conditions of approval, if human remains are unearthed during project construction, all work shall stop and the appropriate authorities and specialists shall be contacted to assess the site.

Potentially Significant Impact

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Less Than Significant Impact

No Impact

Potential impacts are anticipated to be less than significant.

**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 this valley. The Rinconada Fault system runs on the west side of the valley. The San Andreas Fault is on the east side of the valley and runs through the community of Parkfield east of Paso Robles. The City of Paso Robles recognizes these geologic influences in the application of the Uniform Building Code 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 reports and structural engineering in accordance with local seismic influences would be applied in conjunction with any new development proposal. The site is not identified on any Seismic Hazard Zone Maps. Based on standard conditions of approval, the potential for fault rupture and exposure of persons or property to seismic hazards is not considered significant. In addition, per requirements of the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones, only structures for human habitation need to be setback a minimum of 50 feet of a known active trace fault. The proposed structures are not intended for human habitation.

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

Discussion: The City is located within an active earthquake area that could experience seismic ground shaking from the Rinconada and San Andreas Faults. The proposed structures will be constructed to current California Building 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.

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 low potential for liquefaction or other type of ground failure due to seismic events. No special considerations other than what would be required by ordinance or code are necessary.

b. Landslides?

Discussion: Per the General Plan EIR, the project site is not located in an area with a potential for

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

landslide or related risks.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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: The proposed project would involve significant grading, including re-contouring of the natural bowl-like area to create the amphitheater. The majority of the site is comprised of the Arbuckle series and Sesame Loam. These soils are prone to erosion. This could create a significant effect on water quality as a result of erosion. Because the project sites exceed one acre in size, in accordance with the State Water Resources Control Board requirements the project applicant would be required to apply for coverage under the State General Construction Permit in order to comply with federal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements. The project applicant would be required to develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to reduce potential erosion and subsequent sedimentation of storm water runoff. This SWPPP would include Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control erosion associated with grading, trenching, and other ground surface-disturbing activities. The project applicant would be required to submit a grading plan to the City before permits would be issued. Because the project would be required by the State Water Resources Control Board to include a SWPPP, which would include erosion preventative measures, impacts related to erosion, loss of topsoil, or unstable conditions from excavation or grading would be less than significant.

Displacement of soil would also be regulated by the City's ordinances relating to grading and excavation. Soil erosion after construction would be controlled by implementation of approved landscape and irrigation plans, as needed. Because earth-disturbing activities associated with construction would be temporary and would be governed by these regulations, they would not result in a permanent or significant alteration of significant natural topographic features that could increase or exacerbate erosion.

All construction activities would be required to comply with the City's Building Code, which regulates grading activities, including drainage and erosion control. Compliance with the NPDES permit process and the City Building Code requirements would minimize the effects from erosion. Such compliance would ensure that erosional impacts resulting from project construction would be less than significant.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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: In accordance with the soil subsidence map in the City's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, the site is located in an area with the potential for subsidence. The project will be designed in compliance with standard applicable building codes and engineered accordingly to reduce the potential for unstable soil and resulting structural impacts. Therefore, it is anticipated that impacts resulting from unstable soil will be less than significant.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: In accordance with the General Plan, Conservation Element, the site is not located in an area subject to expansive soil. Therefore, the project would result in less than significant impacts from expansive

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

soils.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project will be required to extend Municipal sewer lines to serve the project site at build-out of the hotel and the amphitheater. However, the amphitheater will be permitted to use a temporary holding tank for waste water collection until such time as the hotel permits are approved and wastewater lines are extended to the site. Post events these tanks will be pumped and materials will be hauled to the City wastewater treatment plant for processing effluent. Therefore the interim system will not use septic tanks which would be subject to soil suitability.

**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: The applicant prepared an Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Impact Assessment Study for this project (Exhibit 4, Ambient, June 2011). The study acknowledges that the SLOAPCD does not have an adopted threshold of significance for determining when project would exceed GHG emissions. However, after consultation with the air district it has been determined that a project would be considered to have a potentially significant impact if the project would be inconsistent with the GHG reduction measures identified by the California Attorney General or the GHG reduction targets identified in ARBs AB 32 Scoping Plan.

Without incorporation of proposed mitigation measures the project could result in significant increases in GHG emissions that could interfere with applicable GHG reduction planning efforts, and as a result this impact would be considered potentially significant. The study, in concurrence with APCD, determined that with mitigation measures AQ-1 and AQ and measures in Table 20 – Methods to Offset or Reduce Global Warming Impacts, that impacts resulting from GHG would be less than significant.

- |  |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: With mitigations incorporated, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation of an agency adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gasses.

**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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project scope (hotel and amphitheater) does not include creating, use of, transport or disposal of hazardous materials, except for use of typical landscape and building maintenance chemicals and/or materials. These substances will be stored, handled and applied in compliance with State and local

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

building health and safety code and materials handling requirements. Therefore, this project will not result in creating a hazard to the public or the environment through the routine use of hazardous materials, and impacts would be less than significant.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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: See VIII a. There are no existing or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project location.

- |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. Therefore, it would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 site is located within Zone 5 of the Paso Robles Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP). The proposed uses are listed as “compatible” uses in this zone. Zone 5 is the least restricted airport zone since it is not directly within the airport approach and take-off flight paths. The size of the property and density of attendees was determined to be consistent with the ALUP by the SLO County Airport Land Use Commission and the City, and would therefore not pose a significant safety risk.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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: There are no private airstrips within the City of Paso Robles.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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: In accordance with the City’s Disaster Preparedness Plan and Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, the project would not interfere with adopted emergency response or evacuation plans.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: There are oak woodland resources on the property, however it is located on the rural fringe of Paso Robles, and is not adjacent to urbanized areas that could pose a threat to residences. The property has significant open space area without woodland/wildland resources that would reduce risk and/or exposure of people to wildland fire risks. Additionally, structures will comply with all applicable building and fire safety codes to protect property and lives prior to issuance of building certificates of occupancy.



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

a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The proposed project incorporates Low-Impact Development (LID) features to control potential erosion and sedimentation, facilitate ground water recharge, and reduce water quality problems from hydromodification that could result from surface water drainage that might compromise water quality on site or in the site drainage areas. The project will retain water on the site through special drain features installed and through use of pervious materials for the proposed parking lot. These features will help filter and clean water, and recharge the groundwater basin from storm water on the site. The project will not violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements and will be in compliance with applicable water quality requirements. The project will comply with federal National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements. The project applicant would be required to develop and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to reduce potential erosion and subsequent sedimentation of storm water runoff. This SWPPP would include Best Management Practices (BMPs) to control erosion associated with grading, trenching, and other ground-disturbing activities. The project applicant would be required to submit a grading plan to the City before permits would be issued. Because the project would be required by the State Water Resources Control Board to include a SWPPP, which would include erosion preventative measures, impacts related to erosion, loss of topsoil, or unstable conditions from excavation or grading would be rendered 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)?	<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>
---	---	---	----------------------

Would decreased rainfall infiltration or groundwater recharge reduce stream baseflow? (Source: 7)

Discussion: The project site will be designed to facilitate groundwater recharge and control offsite surface flow. Additionally, the project will be installed with a dual irrigation system, which will include a “purple pipe” system to accommodate use of recycled water when it becomes available for landscaping to reduce use of potable water for this project.

The site is served with municipal water service. Water use for the hotel and accommodations component has already been evaluated in the prior project environmental determination (2002), and has been accounted for in the 2003 General Plan EIR, which anticipates potential water demands for uses approved at that time, and is consistent with municipal groundwater supply and demands identified in the 2010 Urban Water Management Plan. Thus, this project will result in less than significant impacts to groundwater resources.

- |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project will not alter the existing site drainage pattern or impact the minor seasonal drainages within the oak woodland area. As noted above, erosion and sedimentation will be controlled through the NPDES and SWPPP permitting requirements. Site drainage will be directed to low-impact development features and materials to ensure the existing site drainage pattern is maintained. Therefore, impacts from drainage on water courses will 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) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See IX c. above.

- |  |                          |                                     |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Runoff water will be contained on the project site, and will not be directed to storm water drainage facilities or add sources of polluted runoff into natural drainage systems. The applicant has prepared a Stormwater Quality Management Plan and analysis (Exhibit 8, Wallace Group, May 2011) that identifies specific LID mitigation measures to address storm events. Conditions of approval specifically addressing storm water management and Low-Impact Development (LID) facilities will be applied to this project. Therefore, impacts from storm water impact can be mitigated to a less than significant level.

- |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| f. Otherwise substantially degrade water | <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>
--	---	---	---	----------------------

quality?

Discussion: See IX c and e. Through implementation of LID facilities on the site water quality would not be degraded, and impacts to water quality would be less than significant.

- 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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: Housing is not proposed with this project, thus there would be no impacts from potential flooding to housing.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: In accordance with the City's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, the project site is not located within (or near) a 100-year flood hazard area, and could therefore not impede or redirect flood flows that would impact structures.

- 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?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: See IX h. above.

- j. Inundation by mudflow?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

Discussion: In accordance with the City's Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, the site is not located in an area subject to mudflow or landslides. Thus, the project could not result in inundation by mudflow.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The proposed project will incorporate all applicable and required Best Management Practices (BMPs) and will be conditioned to address storm water management consistent with the City's Storm Water Management Plan prior to issuance of any grading permits.

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

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Discussion: The proposed project will be designed to incorporate LID features to control runoff from the area of development on the site. The existing wetland area will be avoided and will not be impacted by the project. Watershed health and riparian areas are also anticipated to not be significantly impacted through careful site grading and drainage design and implementation of NPDES and SWPPP permit requirements.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<b>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING:</b> Would the project:				
a. Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project site is located at the eastern edge of the City, surrounded by a golf course, wineries and vineyards. Surrounding properties are zoned for either Parks and Open Space or Agricultural uses. Therefore, the project could not 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?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The project is consistent with the City's Zoning Code, 2003 General Plan, and ALUP. There are no other applicable plans to this site.				
c. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: There are no applicable habitat conservation plans that would affect this project site.				

<b>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES:</b> 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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: There are no known mineral resources of value to the region or the state on the 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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: See XI a. above.				

<b>XII. NOISE:</b> 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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Discussion: The amphitheater component of the project is anticipated to generate noise from live performances. A Noise Study was prepared for this project (Exhibit 9, Lord, May 2010) to analyze noise				

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

levels that may be generated from the project. The noise study concludes that the maximum (conditionally acceptable) noise level established in the 2003 General Plan Noise Element of 70 dBA will not exceeded at the property line. This analysis includes sound from a “capacity” event of 3500 attendees, with speakers and audience (cheering) noise. Conditions of approval will be incorporated to ensure maximum noise levels will not be exceeded at the property line for this proposed project. The City does not have other applicable noise control regulations that would apply to this project. Therefore, 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 are anticipated to be less than significant.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. | Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project will not result in groundborne vibration or noise levels. For instance, the acoustic design of the digital speaker system that would be used for the amphitheater is designed to not produce excessive bass tones that may generate groundborne noise or vibration. Construction related noise will not require pile-driver or similar equipment that create vibration. Therefore, exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels are anticipated to be less than significant.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c. | A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project may result in short term event-related noise, however, the use would not result in substantial on-going ambient noise.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d. | A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project may result in short term periodic event related noise, however, the use would not result in substantial on-going ambient noise above existing levels since it would comply with noise limitations established in the Noise Element of the General Plan.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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?<br>(Sources: 1, 4) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See XII a.

---

**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) | <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>
--	---	---	---	----------------------

Discussion: The proposed project would not extend new roads or infrastructure beyond what was already approved with the prior project, which includes extending municipal waste water services. The project would generate hospitality and entertainment related jobs, with proportionally more part-time positions than full-time jobs. Short-term construction related jobs will become available during project construction. The employment market can readily absorb the new positions that will become available with this project. It is not anticipated that this project would induce substantial population growth, and impacts to population and housing needs are anticipated to be less than significant.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b. | Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There is currently no housing on the project property, therefore there would be no impact resulting in housing displacement.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. | Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See XIII b.

---

**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) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The City has adequate fire protection services to serve this project without the need for new facilities or services. The applicant would be required to pay development impact fees to offset impacts to fire protection services. Additionally, the project will be conditioned to require the applicant to submit a supplemental fire and safety plan prior to issuance of building permits approved by the City Emergency Services Department (in addition to building safety requirements) that addresses staff training and emergency management in the event of evacuation or other safety or medical emergencies.

- |    |                                    |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. | Police protection? (Sources: 1,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The City has adequate police protection services to serve this project without the need for new facilities or services. The proposed entertainment use may result in additional calls for service, however, the applicant would be required to pay development impact fees to offset impacts to police protection services. Additionally, the project will be conditioned to require the applicant to submit a supplemental security management plan prior to issuance of building permits, approved by the City Chief of Police. Said plan will identify staff security operations, training and management program to control alcohol-related issues, safety and security and other potential issues that may occur or be associated with this use.

- |    |          |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. | Schools? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----|----------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project will not impact schools since the project will not create new or demand for new housing.

- |    |        |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|----|--------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| d. | Parks? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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>
--	---	---	---	----------------------

Discussion: The proposed project will not impact parks and/or park services since the project will not create new or demand for new housing.

- |   |                          |                          |                          |                                     |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| e. Other public facilities? (Sources: 1,10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: There are no other applicable public facilities that could be impacted by this project.

**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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Discussion: See XIV d.

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

Discussion: See XIV d.

**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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The proposed project does not conflict with the City's 2011 Circulation Element as it relates to infrastructure capacity performance on the City's network, level of service on the State's highways, and use of multi-modal transportation. Other plans and policies related to circulation in the vicinity include the Route 46 East Comprehensive Corridor Study, State Route 46E Parallel Routes Study and the SLOCOG Regional Transportation Plan. The proposed project does not conflict with these other studies and plans studies.

The applicant prepared a Traffic Impact Study (Exhibit 10, Pinnacle, February 2011), that identifies the existing the conditions of potentially affected streets and highways. The study estimates trip generation (per ITE Manual, 6<sup>th</sup> Edition, trip generation rates) and distribution of traffic on the surrounding circulation system. Finally, the study identifies potential impacts on the function and safety of the affected roadways.

The project site is accessed from a local street, Mill Road. The primary intersection of concern is at Mill Road and Highway 46 East. Other affected intersections studied include Highway 46 at Golden Hill Road,

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

Buena Vista Road and the Highway 101/46 interchange. Highway 46 experiences significant westbound and eastbound peak hour traffic on specific days during summer months (Friday and Sunday evenings, respectively). Given the volume of traffic entering and exiting the project site onto Hwy 46, it is important to determine if/how the project may impact these peak periods.

Project related peak traffic periods would coincide with concert attendance entering the site and exiting after events. The project description indicates that a majority of traffic generated for concerts would occur (mid-week and on weekends) after peak traffic periods (4:00 to 6:00 week days, and 1:00 to 3:00 pm weekend days), that typically occur on Highway 46. The City worked with the applicants and Caltrans, District 5, early on in the project review process to identify potential impacts from the project on the State’s highways and potential safety concerns. Caltrans did not find that controlled traffic at the intersection of Mill Road and Highway 46 East was warranted for safety needs. Additionally, the City and Caltrans will be constructing improvements at the interchange of Highway 101 and 46E that will reduce the potential for stacking/queuing problems after concert events at this intersection. The timing of completion of the interchange improvements would dovetail with the timing of the full build out of the proposed project. Caltrans submitted a formal comment letter to the City on June 9, 2011 (Exhibit 11). The letter indicates that the traffic analysis results are satisfactory. Their letter also indicates that with improvements to be constructed at the interchange that the project would not result in adverse project impacts at the interchange when the improvements are operational. Therefore, the project will not impact this intersection.

It is anticipated that “capacity” events could generate up to 1100 vehicles (average 3 guests per vehicle) arriving to and exiting the site. The peak arrival period to the site are anticipated to occur between 7:30 – 8:00 pm on week nights. The traffic study indicates that with the right turn pocket recently completed at Mill Road, that arrivals will likely be “free-flowing” with adequate deceleration and storage capacity for up to 10-15 vehicles. This is facilitated by “gaps” in eastbound traffic created by the traffic signal at Golden Hill Road. The study indicates that westbound, left turn traffic, (although much smaller in volume), can also adequately accommodate vehicle deceleration, storage and turn movements.

Post event exiting will primarily occur between 10:00 and 11:00 pm. Most traffic exiting events will turn westbound from Mill Road onto Hwy 46, and eventually turn left (southbound) at Hwy. 101. Traffic modeling prepared by the traffic consultants indicate that since there is minimal eastbound traffic on the highways between 10:00 and 11:00 pm in the evening, that the capacity of the highways would be adequate and a level of service (LOS) A or B will be maintained at every affected intersection, except Mill Road which would have a LOS of F for the hour during event exiting. However, there would be negligible traffic generated from other uses on Mill Road since there are only vineyards, a few ranches and wineries located on it. Therefore the significance of LOS F at this time is inconsequential.

The applicant proposes use of flagmen on Mill Road (which is a City street) to assist and direct traffic to the intersection at Hwy 46. However, no formal traffic control is proposed within the Caltrans right-of-way to control east/west bound traffic. Traffic exiting onto the highway would utilize the gap pulses that would occur from signals at Golden Hill Road, which would provide safe opportunities for traffic to enter the highway. The traffic model used for the traffic study also indicates that with exiting traffic and the addition of event related traffic onto Hwy 46, that there would not be significant queuing problems at the intersections along the highway. The applicant anticipates that traffic exiting “capacity” events would take between an hour to 90 minutes to leave the facility.

Traffic generated by the proposed hotel and bungalows does not coincide with event related traffic, and does not generate significant traffic during peak periods. The applicant has provided an Event Traffic Management Plan that identifies the locations of traffic safety and parking management personnel that will assist patrons coming and going safely from the site for events. The project will be conditioned to ensure that traffic safety personnel provide traffic circulation services as needed.

Therefore, as demonstrated through the analyses provided in the Traffic Impact Study, traffic impacts on the City and State networks would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>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?</p> <p>Discussion: There are no congestion management programs applicable to this project.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>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?</p> <p>Discussion: The project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns and/or increase in air traffic levels that would result in substantial safety risks.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>d. Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</p> <p>Discussion: The proposed amphitheater would result in significant traffic entering the intersection of Mill Road and Hwy 46. However, the Traffic Impact Study demonstrates that due to the decrease in highway traffic during peak hours for arriving and departing traffic from the site, and with recent highway widening and turn lane improvements, that traffic should not result in significant hazards of traffic on the highway.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>e. Result in inadequate emergency access?</p> <p>Discussion: The site has adequate emergency access to and from the property through access from Highway 46 and Mill Road.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>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.</p> <p>Discussion: 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. However the project location is at the far east side of the City and is not accessed from connected City streets, but instead is accessed off of Hwy 46. The property is surrounded by a golf course, wineries and vineyards. There are no existing pedestrian connections, bike lanes or transit service to this area of the City since access is off the highway. However, to reduce the volume of traffic to the site and vehicle miles traveled by patrons, the project includes mitigation measures to develop a Transportation Demand Management Plan. It will include a shuttle service for guests with pick-ups at local hotels and Park and Ride Lots. Shuttle service will help provide the functional equivalent as transit to the site, and is part of their plans to reduce air pollution emissions and parking demand, and also as a convenience to their patrons.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

- |    |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. | Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project is proposed in two phases. The first phase includes the amphitheater and the second phase includes the hotel and bungalow units. The first phase will be served with a pump station facility. Waste water effluent would be deposited into holding tanks located on the site. The holding tanks would then be pumped out after each event and taken to the City wastewater treatment plant for treatment of effluent. The City currently has adequate capacity to accommodate this increased treatment and processing of the effluent, and would not exceed requirements of the SLO County RWQCB.

The second phase of this project would require the applicant extend wastewater lines to the site prior to construction of the hotel and bungalows. The City has adequate capacity for treatment of this effluent as well. Additionally, the City has programed an upgrade of the City wastewater treatment plan within the next 10 years, which will enhance the ability of the plant to more effectively treat effluent.

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

Discussion: The proposed project (both phases) will not require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project is designed to infiltrate storm water on the site through implementation of LID design features and post-construction BMPs. Therefore, impacts resulting from storm water will be less than significant.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d. | Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: See IX b. In accordance with the City 2010 Urban Water Management Plan, the project will have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 projects projected demand in addition to the providers existing commitments? | <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>
--	---	---	---	----------------------

Discussion: In accordance with the 2009 Sewer Treatment Plant Plan, the City provides municipal waste water treatment, and the City's facility has adequate capacity to treat effluent from this project.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| f. | Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The City owns and manages the City landfill. In accordance with the 2010 Landfill Master Plan, the landfill has adequate capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal and recycling needs.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| g. | Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: The project will be constructed and operated in compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

---

**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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: As identified in the Biological Study prepared for this project and the cultural resource evaluation, the project would not 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 and there are no examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory on the project site.

- |    |   |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Discussion: Potential cumulative impacts of the project on air quality, biological resources and water quality have been adequately reduced, avoided and mitigated to not result in cumulatively considerable impacts.

- |    |  |                          |                          |                                     |                          |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c. | Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|----|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

**Potentially  
Significant  
Impact**

**Less Than  
Significant with  
Mitigation  
Incorporated**

**Less Than  
Significant  
Impact**

**No  
Impact**

on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Discussion: This project could not result in sub 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	USDA, Soils Conservation Service, Soil Survey of San Luis Obispo County, Paso Robles Area, 1983	Soil Conservation Offices Paso Robles, Ca 93446
13	Bicycle Master Plan, 2009	City of Paso Robles Community Development Department 1000 Spring Street Paso Robles, CA 93446
14	2011 General Plan Circulation Element	Same
15	2010 Urban Water Master Plan	Same
16	2009 Sewer Treatment Plant Plan	Same
17	2010 Landfill Master Plan	Same

Exhibits:

- 1 Vicinity Map
- 2 Site Plan and Elevations
- 3 Visual Study Exhibits
- 4 Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Assessments
- 5 Site Disturbance Area for San Joaquin Kit Fox Habitat
- 6 Biological Study
- 7 Arborist Report
- 8 Storm Water Quality Management Plan
- 9 Noise Impacts Study
- 10 Traffic Study
- 11 Comment Letter from Caltrans District 5
- 12 Mitigation Summary Table