



# CITY OF BISHOP

## CITY COUNCIL / PLANNING COMMISSION

### SPECIAL JOINT MEETING AGENDA

City Council Chambers - 301 West Line Street - Bishop, California

#### **NOTICES TO THE PUBLIC**

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting please contact the City Clerk at 760-873-5863. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. (28CFR 13.102-35.104 ADA Title II)

Any writing that is a public record that relates to an agenda item for open session distributed less than 72 hours prior to the meeting will be available for public inspection at City Hall, 377 West Line Street, Bishop, California during normal business hours. Government Code § 54957.5(b)(1). Copies will also be provided at the appropriate meeting.

Members of the public desiring to speak on a matter appearing on the agenda should ask the Mayor for the opportunity to be heard when the item comes up for Council consideration. NOTE: Comments for all agenda items are limited to a speaking time of three minutes.

**TUESDAY, JULY 26, 2011**  
**5:00 P.M.**

#### **ROLL CALL**

**PUBLIC COMMENT – NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC:** This time is set aside to receive public comment on matters not calendared on the agenda. When recognized by the Mayor, please state your name and address for the record and please limit your comments to three minutes. Under California law the City Council is prohibited from generally discussing or taking action on items not included in the agenda; however, the City Council may briefly respond to comments or questions from members of the public. Therefore, the City Council will listen to all public comment but will not generally discuss the matter or take action on it.

#### **DISCUSSION**

1. Joint workshop on Draft Mobility Element Update to the General Plan
  - A. Introduction and slide show presentation
  - B. Comments regarding the Mobility Element
    - (1) City Council and Planning Commission discussion and comments
    - (2) Public comments
    - (3) Closing remarks
2. Update on General Plan Housing Element compliance
3. Discussion on sign ordinance review
4. Discussion on parking regulations review
5. Discussion on term limits for city commissioners

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

This meeting will adjourn to the August 8, 2011, 4:00 p.m. Study Session to be held in the City Council Chambers, 301 West Line Street, Bishop.

TO: CITY COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: JAMES M. SOUTHWORTH, CITY ADMINISTRATOR 

SUBJECT: **Joint Meeting - City Council and Planning Commission  
Workshop for Mobility Element Update of General Plan\***

DATE: July 26, 2011

**Attachments:**

1. Mobility Element (*DRAFT UPDATE*) to the General Plan\*
2. Mobility Element Transportation Report

Background/Discussion:

The purpose of the Workshop is to brief the Planning Commission and City Council on the Draft Mobility Element and its supporting Transportation Report. The Workshop will provide the Council and Commission with an opportunity for questions, and to provide initial feedback to staff and our consultants.

Briefly, the Mobility Element's purpose is to define how the transportation needs of our residents, businesses, and visitors will be served while enhancing the City's environmental, economic, and natural resources. The draft Mobility Element includes many interesting facts and ideas:

- Two thirds of the traffic on Main Street is local traffic, one third is through traffic.
- New streets east and west of the city should be constructed to reduce traffic on Main Street.
- The Wye Road, Park Street, and Grove / East Pine areas may each present opportunities to improve transportation while enhancing the surrounding areas.
- A trucks-only route constructed between Bishop and the airport would reduce truck traffic on Main Street.
- All streets in Bishop should include sidewalks, with certain exceptions.
- Pedestrian, bike, and transit facilities should be expanded.

Recommendation:

Hold Joint Meeting with Planning Commission for the Mobility Element Workshop.

\* *The nine elements of the General Plan include:*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. <i>Economic Development</i>          | 6. <i>Public Services / Facilities</i> |
| 2. <i>Land Use</i>                      | 7. <i>Parks / Recreation</i>           |
| 3. <i>Housing</i>                       | 8. <i>Conservation / Open Space</i>    |
| 4. <b><i>Circulation (Mobility)</i></b> | 9. <i>Safety</i>                       |
| 5. <i>Noise</i>                         |  |

**City Of Bishop General Plan  
2011 MOBILITY ELEMENT**

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW**

July 18, 2011

---

**MOBILITY ELEMENT**



**CONTENTS**

INTRODUCTION .....	1
PURPOSE AND SCOPE .....	1
MOBILITY ELEMENT TRANSPORTATION REPORT .....	2
ROADWAY COMPONENT .....	3
OPPORTUNITY AREAS.....	7
OTHER TRANSPORTATION MODES.....	9
GOALS, POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS .....	12

**LIST OF FIGURES**

1 Roadway Sections .....	5
2 Roadway Classifications .....	6
3 Opportunity Areas .....	8
4 Bikeway Plan .....	10

**INTRODUCTION**

The Mobility Element (ME) of the General Plan (GP) sets out the desired goals and strategies for enhancing mobility in and near the City. It is closely coordinated with the Land Use, Housing, Noise, and Public Facilities Elements of the GP in recognition of the interrelationships between them. The ME includes all travel modes, addressing mobility in the context of driving, cycling, walking, and accessibility to transit and air services. Along with the other elements of the GP, it focuses on the economic stability and vitality of the City, while providing for safe and efficient means of travel within the City and adjacent areas.

California Government Code Section 65302(b) mandates City and County agencies to include within their General Plans a ME, which describes and locates the basic systems that provide for the transportation needs of the community, including local and regional traffic. Previously referred to as the “Circulation Element” of the General Plan, the ME as presented here satisfies that mandate.

**PURPOSE AND SCOPE**

The purpose of the ME is to define how the City will serve the mobility needs of residents, businesses, and visitors while protecting its environmental, economic, and natural resources. The goals and policies of the ME are statements of intent with respect to enhancing Citywide mobility and the implementing actions define how those goals and policies can be achieved.

In accordance with State General Plan guidelines, the ME include goals and policies that will:

- Coordinate transportation systems with planned land uses
- Promote the safe and efficient transport of goods and the safe and effective movement of all populations
- Make efficient use of existing transportation facilities
- Protect environmental quality and promote the wise and equitable use of economic and natural resources

*The city of Bishop has . . .*

*A scenic environment*



*Nearby recreation activities*



*Diverse shopping opportunities*





The City of Bishop ME embraces these guidelines and addresses the City's mobility needs in the context of the following topics:

- Roadways
- Public Transportation
- Bicycles
- Air Transportation
- Pedestrians
- Parking and Access

The ME shows and describes the general location and nature of street and bicycle facilities. Public transportation, air transportation and pedestrian and parking facilities are also discussed. Goals and policies related to each of these transportation modes are presented, establishing a framework for achieving enhanced mobility for the community.

**MOBILITY ELEMENT TRANSPORTATION REPORT**

The Mobility Element Transportation Report (TR) is a separate document with current data that addresses a variety of related topics, providing technical information in support of the ME. Information in the TR will be the subject of regular updates, and includes the following:

- Existing Conditions – As these change over time, the TR will be updated to show current data on traffic volumes, levels of service, etc.
- Related Actions/Studies – These include changes that occur over time (in some cases implementing a specific feature of the ME), studies that have relevance to the ME, and regional changes influencing the City's transportation system.
- Future Conditions – As new information is obtained and/or special studies are carried out, traffic forecast data and related information in the TR will be updated.

*The Mobility Element addresses. . .*

*Driving*



*Cycling*



*Public Transportation*



*Walking*



*as well as air transportation, parking and access*



- **Implementing Actions** – Recommendations regarding implementation projects, special studies, and other actions together with a list of proposed projects are presented in the TR.

The overall intent is that as information becomes available and conditions change over time, the TR will document that information without a need to update the ME. The TR is hence an administrative document that may include recommendations requiring City Council action for implementation but which in itself does not require formal approval.

## ROADWAY COMPONENT

The roadway component of the ME describes the City's arterial street system used for vehicular travel in the City. The street system is planned to meet existing and future transportation demands, and provide for safe and efficient vehicular travel within the City. This is accomplished by designing traffic routes according to their functions, while maintaining sensitivity to surrounding land uses and resources. The effectiveness of the street system directly influences mobility and the overall vitality of the City, and its visual appearance contributes to the image of the City held by residents, businesses, and visitors.



*The Mobility Element seeks to enhance the drivability of the City's roadway system.*

The City of Bishop is served by three State Highways, Highway 395, Highway 168, and Highway 6. The two sections of Highway 395 (Main Street and North Sierra Highway) also provide frontage for much of the City's commercial development. Highway 168 (West Line Street), links residential communities to the west with the commercial center of the City, and provides access to the recreational areas west of the City. The arterial streets under City jurisdiction serve both local and regional traffic in varying capacities.

Streets under City jurisdiction are referred to as Local Streets. They differ in their physical characteristics according to function and location. Essentially there are four variations:

1. Local Residential Streets
2. Local Commercial Streets
3. Interim version of 1 or 2 above (Country Lane)
4. Alleys

<p>City of Bishop General Plan</p>	
<p>MOBILITY ELEMENT</p>	

Figure 1 shows typical cross sections for the first three of these and the following briefly describes their characteristics.

**1. Local Streets in Residential Areas** – These are two-lane streets that pass through residential areas, serving the adjacent residential land uses and through traffic. If bike lanes are added, adequate right-of-way (ROW) is required as per the maximum ROW shown in the cross-section. When the standard (i.e., less than the 60 foot minimum) ROW is not available, consideration is given to reducing lane, shoulder, bike lane, sidewalk, and planter widths.

*Different types of streets serve different functions in the overall roadway plan. . .*



**2. Local Streets in Commercial Areas** – These are two-lane arterials that pass through and serve commercial areas. The emphasis is on accessibility to the adjacent commercial land uses. If bike lanes are added, the maximum ROW shown in the cross-section should be provided. When the standard ROW is not available (i.e., less than the 60 foot minimum), consideration is given to reducing lane, shoulder, bike lane, and sidewalk widths.

*and serve local accessibility needs*





**3. Local Street (Country Lane) – Interim Section** – These are two lane roadways which typically have no adjacent developed land at the time they are built. They will have the full 60 to 70 right-of-way of a local street and can transition to a Residential Street or Commercial Street when conditions change and the need arises.

*and provide connections to recreation opportunities.*




Figure 2 shows the street designations for the Roadway Component of the ME. The local street additions are mostly streets that will provide local accessibility and connectivity when development occurs in currently undeveloped areas. The alignments shown here are conceptual only, and when considered for implementation they will be subject to alignment and impact studies.

In addition to local streets, the City has numerous alleys in both residential and commercial areas. These are City owned and maintained, and have an important function with respect to providing accessibility for adjacent land uses. Their functions include access to parking (e.g., residential garages), access to loading and unloading areas for local businesses, and access to utilities and other services. As such, their inclusion in new developments can provide additional access and locations for utilities, and create separation between properties.




**LOCAL STREET (RESIDENTIAL AREA)**

Note: With the wider roadway width, 5' bike lanes are added.




**LOCAL STREET (COMMERCIAL AREA)**


Note: With the wider roadway width, 5' bike lanes are added.



**LOCAL STREET (INTERIM SECTION - COUNTRY LANE)**

Figure 1  
ROADWAY SECTIONS





The three State Highways through the City have specific function classifications under the California Road System and these are noted in the TR.

### OPPORTUNITY AREAS

There are locations in the City that have traffic related issues, but for which solutions need to be pursued in a broader context than just traffic improvements. Typically, they involve land use and business enhancement opportunities that would accompany beneficial traffic improvements. A brief discussion of these opportunity areas follows and Figure 3 illustrates the locations of the opportunity areas designated in the ME.

*The Opportunity Areas will examine selected parts of the City in a broader context than simply traffic improvements, e.g. . .*

#### Wye Road Opportunity Area

The triangle defined by Highway 395 (as it transitions from Main Street to North Sierra Highway), North Main Street / Highway 6 and Wye Road has traffic issues related to the intersections created by this triangle. Also, the access road from North Main Street into the shopping center to the east has intersection design issues that are related to the roadway configuration created by the triangle to the north. Because three of the intersection legs are State Highways, and land under the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (DWP) ownership and other private ownership would be affected, a coordinated approach to land use and traffic will be required to identify a comprehensive solution for this area.

#### Land Use



#### Accessibility




#### Park Street Opportunity Area

The traffic signal at Park Street is a four-way configuration with Park Street on the east side and access to a commercial property on the west side. Operational issues sometimes occur with vehicles queuing to enter the commercial property and traffic can be heavy in and out of the park during special events. Parking opportunities on the east side of Main Street in the City park and land use changes could create a focal point for tourists and residents. Hence, this intersection and the adjoining land uses provide an opportunity for enhancements that can benefit residents, visitors, and local businesses, thereby helping promote the overall goals of the ME. Potential beneficial enhancements to this area could include the relocation of the Park Street intersection

#### Walkability







slightly northward and the construction of a new street providing connections to the west.

### **Grove-Pine Opportunity Area**

East-west access between West and East Pine Street or between Grove Street and Pine Street is constrained by the offset intersections. Only Grove Street is signalized, and the offset tends to discourage this location as a means of providing east-west relief to the Line Street intersection to the south. While a direct connection between Grove Street and East Pine Street would be the preferred connection, there are land use constraints involved in creating a single intersection. Ideally, any such change would be accompanied by land use changes that could enhance the adjacent commercial areas. The TR discusses potential strategies that could be included in a study of this area.

### **OTHER TRANSPORTATION MODES**

Other modes of transportation modes available to residents of the City include transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and air transportation via the Bishop Airport. Some comments on each of these follow.

#### **Public Transportation**

Transit service provided by the Eastern Sierra Transit Authority (ESTA) includes fixed route and demand responsive service, and current information on these can be found in the TR. Policies in this ME support efforts by ESTA to enhance transit service and usage.

*Public Transportation is an important contributor to overall community mobility.*


#### **Bicycles**

Three types of bicycle facilities are included in the City Bikeway Plan shown in Figure 4.



**Bike Paths** – Often referred to as “Class I Bikeways” these are pathways separated from the vehicular roadway. They may be adjacent to a roadway or a totally separate facility. In some cases they may be a multi-use trail, whereby the pathway is shared with pedestrians.

# MOBILITY ELEMENT





**Bike Lanes** – These represent the “Class II Bikeways” in a Bikeway Plan, and are striped lanes on a roadway. The lane is a minimum of five feet in width, with additional width provided if right-of-way is available.



*Bicycle amenities provide many benefits to the overall livability and vitality of the City.*

**Bike Routes** – These “Class III Bikeways” are designated on-street routes for bicycles. No striping is provided but bike route signs can be installed to indicate that a particular street is a bike route.

The Bishop Bikeway Plan is shown in Figure 4. This bicycle network is consistent with the Inyo County Collaborative Bikeways Plan, with some minor additions where appropriate.



### Bishop Airport

The Bishop Airport, located approximately two miles east of the City, provides a variety of services including aircraft maintenance, aircraft rental, charter services, and instruction. The Airport Master Plan identifies the need for runway improvements, navigational aides, control tower, terminal building, hangars, fire-crash facilities, and added parking, particularly if commercial service is successfully started at the airport. The Airport Master Plan also identifies the need for improved access to the airport from Wye Road. The ME goals and policies include a desire to enhance accessibility to the airport and support the introduction of commercial air services at that facility.

*Air transportation has the potential to enhance visitor accessibility to the Bishop area.*



### Pedestrians

The City provides an attractive walking environment, with many open space areas and scenic vistas. The goals and policies seek to ensure that the mobility impaired including those confined to wheelchairs can share in that walking environment. For residential and commercial streets that include sidewalks, this environment is largely provided through paved sidewalks and associated facilities. While pedestrian facilities are not designated on the ME, the goals and policies include a directive to actively facilitate and enhance walking opportunities for residents and visitors. Sidewalks and walkways should be provided in all developed areas and in areas with pedestrian demand. Creating walking tours, with maps and information to encourage such activities, is an example of actions that could assist in achieving such goals.



*Bishop’s diverse downtown area and attractive local streets provide an ideal walking environment for residents and visitors.*





**GOALS, POLICIES, AND IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS**

The Goals, Policies and Implementing Actions of the ME provide overall guidance for enhancing mobility for the community. Goals are broad based statements of intent, and the related policies give direction to future planning and implementation programs. Behind the individual mobility goals and policies are the overall planning goals of creating positive economic conditions for businesses, enhancing livability, and maintaining the existing character of the City.

The following subsections outline the goals and policies and related implementing actions. Overall ME Goals and Policies are first presented, followed by Goals, Policies and Implementing Actions for the six subject areas addressed in this ME.

<b>OVERALL GOAL</b>	<b>Provide a balanced transportation system that moves people and goods throughout the City efficiently, enhances livability and economic viability, and preserves residential neighborhoods and other environmental resources.</b>
---------------------	---

**POLICIES**

- P 1.1 Promote accessible transportation services and facilities that are responsive to the needs of residents, businesses, and visitors.
- P 1.2 Facilitate future plans and programs for enhancing mobility while preserving the existing character of the City.
- P 1.3 Encourage transportation strategies that achieve energy conservation and reduce air pollution.
- P 1.4 Reduce the need for vehicular travel by facilitating non-auto modes of travel.

Implementing actions relating to these overall policies can be found under the individual subject headings in the sections that follow.

<b>City of Bishop General Plan</b>  <b>MOBILITY ELEMENT</b>	
---	---

<b>Roadway System</b>	<b>GOAL</b>	<b>Provide safe and attractive roadways to serve existing and future traffic demand and enhance accessibility.</b>
-----------------------	-------------	--

POLICIES	Roadway System	Related Actions
P 2.1	Promote street system additions and improvements that enhance accessibility.	<i>A 2.1, A 2.2, A 2.3, A 2.7, A 2.10</i>
P 2.2	Support a system of street cross-sections as guidelines for street operation and improvements, and new street construction.	<i>A 2.2</i>
P 2.3	Require streets to be dedicated and improved in accordance with the adopted street standards, with any modifications requiring approval by the City Engineer and Planning Commission.	<i>A 2.1, A 2.2, A 2.4</i>
P 2.4	Give priority to transportation projects designed to improve the efficiency, safety, and quality of existing facilities.	<i>A 2.4, A 2.5, A 2.9</i>
P 2.5	Promote transportation programs that enhance the downtown area by reducing truck traffic and improving accessibility.	<i>A 2.1, A 2.3, A 2.9</i>
P 2.6	Consider aesthetic values such as streetscape features in new roadways and roadway improvements.	<i>A 2.5, A 2.6</i>

ACTIONS	Roadway System	Related Policies
A 2.1	Pursue the construction of new roadway links as shown on the ME roadway plan.	<i>P 2.1, P 2.3</i>
A 2.2	Develop and maintain the City street network consistent with the ME roadway plan, including appropriate roadway widths, bicycle lanes, and pedestrian amenities.	<i>P 2.1, P 2.2</i>
A 2.3	Pursue financing for all components of the transportation system to achieve and maintain desired level of service standards.	<i>P 2.5</i>

# City of Bishop General Plan

## MOBILITY ELEMENT



ACTIONS	Roadway System (continued)	Related Policies
A 2.4	Provide turn lanes for major intersections where needed and feasible.	P 2.2, P 2.4
A 2.5	Minimize the number of driveways by requiring shared/common driveways where feasible.	P 2.2, P 2.4
A 2.6	Protect and incorporate mature trees located in or adjacent to the street right-of-way into overall street design where feasible.	P 2.6
A 2.7	Require new utilities to be located underground and work with utility companies to move existing overhead facilities underground.	P 2.6
A 2.8	Utilize intelligent transportation control systems to improve traffic flow and safety on the City's roadway system.	P 2.4
A 2.9	Participate with the Inyo County LTC and Caltrans for evaluating measures to improve traffic flow in the City, with focus on major intersections through the downtown area.	P 2.1, P 2.4, P 2.5
A 2.10	Include alleys as a potential requirement for new development where appropriate and beneficial.	P 2.1

Public Transportation	GOAL	Facilitate public transportation services and facilities that enhance accessibility for residents and visitors, and serve the young, aged, handicapped and disadvantaged.
-----------------------	------	---

POLICIES	Public Transportation	Related Actions
P 3.1	Encourage transit ridership between Bishop and the surrounding communities.	A 3.1, A 3.2, A 3.3
P 3.2	Enhance local transit accessibility for residents and visitors.	A 3.2, A 3.5

# City of Bishop General Plan

## MOBILITY ELEMENT



POLICIES	Public Transportation (continued)	Related Actions
----------	-----------------------------------	-----------------

- |       |   |                     |
|-------|---|---------------------|
| P 3.3 | Support private services that provide additional mobility opportunities for residents and visitors.                         | A. 3.3              |
| P 3.4 | Ensure that public transportation in the City is responsive to the needs of the young, aged, handicapped and disadvantaged. | A 3.1, A 3.2, A 3.3 |


ACTIONS	Public Transportation	Related Policies
---------	-----------------------	------------------

- |       |  |              |
|-------|--|--------------|
| A 3.1 | Cooperate with ESTA, Caltrans, Inyo LTC, and Inyo County in the planning and implementation of public transportation improvements. | P 3.1        |
| A 3.2 | Enhance local/regional bus system interface by providing convenient and attractive access locations.                               | P 3.2        |
| A 3.3 | Assist ESTA in providing access to information on transit services for residents and visitors.                                     | P 3.2        |
| A 3.4 | Provide bus turnouts on Main Street north of Line Street, and bus stops south of Line Street.                                      | P 3.1, P 3.2 |
| A 3.5 | Support construction of tourist railroad service between Laws Railroad Museum and Bishop.  | P 3.2        |

Bicycles	GOAL
	<b>Provide safe and attractive bicycle facilities throughout the City thereby promoting bicycle commuting and facilitating recreation opportunities.</b>

POLICIES	Bicycles	Related Actions
----------	----------	-----------------

- |       |  |                     |
|-------|--|---------------------|
| P 4.1 | Promote bicycle travel as part of serving the overall mobility needs of the City.              | A 4.1, A 4.2, A 4.3 |
| P 4.2 | Encourage productive and complementary use of city street right of way for bicycle facilities. | A 4.1, A 4.2, A 4.3 |




POLICIES	Bicycles (continued)	Related Actions
----------	----------------------	-----------------

- |       |  |              |
|-------|--|--------------|
| P 4.3 | Support the goals and implementing actions of the Inyo County Collaborative Bikeways Plan. | A 4.2        |
| P 4.4 | Promote connections of City bike facilities to trail networks outside of the City          | A 4.1, A 4.2 |

ACTIONS	Bicycles	Related Policies
---------	----------	------------------

- |       |  |                            |
|-------|--|----------------------------|
| A 4.1 | Develop and maintain a system of bicycle facilities.   | P 4.1, P 4.2, P 4.3, P 4.4 |
| A 4.2 | Implement new bike facilities in accordance with the ME Bikeway Plan with emphasis on Class 1 and Class 2 facilities where possible.           | P 4.1, P 4.2, P 4.3        |
| A 4.3 | Incorporate facilities suitable for bicycle use in the design of intersections, and other street-improvement/maintenance projects.             | P 4.2, P 4.3               |
| A 4.4 | Make improvements to streets, signs, and traffic signals as needed to improve bicycle convenience and safety and consider digital way-finding. | P 4.1, P 4.3               |
| A 4.5 | Install bicycle parking in the Downtown area and at City parks, civic buildings, and other community centers.                                  | P 4.1, P 4.2               |
| A 4.6 | Work with the school district and college to promote cycling and bicycle access.   | P 4.1                      |
| A 4.7 | Encourage employers to provide secure bicycle parking facilities.  | P 4.1                      |
| A 4.8 | Support the efforts of the Eastern Sierra Transit Authority (ESTA) to provide bicycle racks on buses.  | P 4.2                      |

**MOBILITY ELEMENT**



<b>Air Transportation</b>	<b>GOAL</b>	<b>Improve access to the Bishop Airport and cooperate with Inyo County to promote air services that can promote tourism in the area.</b>
---------------------------	-------------	--

POLICIES	Air Transportation	Related Actions
P 5.1	Encourage transportation improvements that will serve the Bishop Airport.	A 5.1
P 5.2	Support actions that will provide air services for visitors to the Bishop area.	A 5.2

ACTIONS	Air Transportation	Related Policies
A 5.1	Pursue opportunities for transportation improvements that will improve access to the airport.	P 5.1
A 5.2	Work with Inyo County to identify opportunities for visitor usage of the airport (e.g., recreation charter packages, etc.)	P 5.2

<b>Pedestrians</b>	<b>GOAL</b>	<b>Provide safe and attractive pedestrian facilities throughout the City.</b>
--------------------	-------------	---

POLICIES	Pedestrians	Related Actions
P 6.1	Consider pedestrians in all land use and transportation planning.	A 6.1, A 6.2, A 6.9
P 6.2	Support the implementation of sidewalks and walkways on existing and future streets.	A 6.3, A 6.4, A 6.5
P 6.3	Promote facilities and amenities that enhance the walkability of the City.	A 6.2, A 6.3, A 6.4

MOBILITY ELEMENT



POLICIES	Pedestrians (continued)	Related Actions
P 6.4	Require all new or renovated pedestrian facilities to be of a sufficient width to ensure pedestrian comfort and safety and to accommodate the special needs of the physically disabled.	<i>A 6.4</i>
P 6.5	Promote connections of City pedestrian facilities to trail networks outside of the City.	<i>A 6.8, A 6.10</i>

ACTIONS	Pedestrians	Related Policies
A 6.1	Facilitate the creation of “walking tour” and “way-finding” information that can direct residents and visitors to experience the walkability of the City.	<i>P 6.1, P 6.3</i>
A 6.2	Provide pedestrian-oriented features, such as benches, enhanced landscaping, and trash receptacles, in high pedestrian usage areas such as the Downtown and Park areas.	<i>P 6.1, P 6.3</i>
A 6.3	Work with neighborhoods to implement sidewalks on unimproved local streets and thereby establish sidewalk continuity wherever feasible.	<i>P 6.2</i>
A 6.4	Require new development to provide sidewalks and other pedestrian-dedicated facilities on new public streets. Exceptions may be appropriate where topography is difficult or proposed lots are of a rural or semi-rural nature and would be at the discretion of the City Engineer and Planning Commission.	<i>P 6.2</i>
A 6.5	Pursue funding for the continued replacement and repair of sidewalks that have deteriorated due to age and tree-root invasion.	<i>P 6.1</i>
A 6.6	Develop and implement a program to identify, prioritize, and fund the retrofitting of existing intersections that do not currently have handicapped access ramps at the street corners.	<i>P 6.1</i>

<h1 style="margin: 0;">City of Bishop General Plan</h1> <h2 style="margin: 0;">MOBILITY ELEMENT</h2>	
--	---


ACTIONS	Pedestrians (continued)	Related Policies
A 6.7	Implement measures such as signing in areas of the City with high pedestrian activities to enhance pedestrian safety.	<i>P 6.1</i>
A 6.8	Incorporate pedestrian features such as street “neck-down” in the street design for locations with high pedestrian usage.	<i>P 6.1, P 6.3</i>
A 6.9	Tree planting in sidewalk areas should be implemented and managed to minimize conflicts and drainage.	<i>P 6.2, P 6.4</i>
A 6.10	Coordinate planning for pedestrians with the County and the Bishop Paiute Tribe.	<i>P 6.1</i>

<b>Parking And Access</b>	<b>GOAL</b>	<b>Enhance accessibility to City businesses for residents and visitors by assuring adequate and convenient parking.</b>
---------------------------	-------------	---

POLICIES	Parking and Access	Related Actions
P 7.1	Promote programs such as signage and parking management to facilitate parking for the downtown area and for community events.	<i>A 7.1, A 7.2, A 7.3</i>

POLICIES	Parking and Access (continued)	Related Actions
P 7.2	Encourage and facilitate the establishment of convenient parking areas to enhance parking accessibility.	<i>A 7.1, A 7.2</i>
P 7.3	Ensure that adequate off street parking is incorporated into all new developments and redevelopments outside the downtown commercial area.	<i>A 7.1</i>

ACTIONS	Parking and Access	Related Policies
A 7.1	Pursue opportunities for parking management actions that will result in convenient parking areas for downtown.	<i>P 7.2</i>

<p>City of Bishop General Plan</p> <p><b>MOBILITY ELEMENT</b></p>	
---	--

ACTIONS	Parking and Access	Related Policies
A 7.2	Improve access to local businesses for visitors by providing signed parking areas with convenient accessibility.	<i>P 7.1, P 7.3</i>
A 7.3	Improve accessibility to community events through clear directional signage, parking and shuttle services, and information sources, particularly for tourists.	<i>P 7.1</i>

**City of Bishop**  
**GENERAL PLAN MOBILITY ELEMENT**  
**TRANSPORTATION REPORT**

**DRAFT FOR REVIEW**

July 18, 2011

---

# CONTENTS

---

	<b>Page</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b>	
Relationship to the Mobility Element .....	1-1
Overview .....	1-1
Changes in this Update.....	1-2
Related Actions/Studies .....	1-2
References .....	1-8
<b>2.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS</b>	
Roadway System.....	2-1
Traffic Volumes .....	2-1
Truck Volumes.....	2-6
Existing Operating Conditions.....	2-6
Traffic Patterns.....	2-9
Public Transportation.....	2-10
<b>3.0 FUTURE CONDITIONS</b>	
Growth Forecasts .....	3-1
Future Traffic Volumes.....	3-2
<b>4.0 IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS</b>	
Roadway and Bikeway Improvements.....	4-1
Opportunity Areas.....	4-3
Truck Route Concept .....	4-5
Special Studies/Coordination Actions.....	4-7

# LIST OF FIGURES AND TABLES

---

	<b>Page</b>
<b>FIGURES</b>	
2-1 Existing Intersection Controls (Major Thoroughfares).....	2-2
2-2 Existing Midblock Lanes.....	2-3
2-3 Existing (2010) ADT Volumes (average Weekday).....	2-4
2-4 2009 Average Daily Volumes for Highway 395 South of Bishop .....	2-5
2-5 Average Daily Traffic (ADT) Volumes by Month for 2010 .....	2-7
2-6 Existing Weekday Traffic Patterns .....	2-12
2-7 Transit Services .....	2-14
3-1 Future ADT Volumes .....	3-3
3-2 Future Weekday Traffic Patterns .....	3-4
4-1 Truck Route Concept.....	4-6
<b>TABLES</b>	
2-1 2010 Peak Hour Volumes.....	2-7
4-1 Roadway and Bikeway Implementation Projects .....	4-2
4-2 Special Studies/Coordination Actions .....	4-8

# Chapter 1.0

## INTRODUCTION

This chapter of the Transportation Report (TR) gives an overview of the purpose and scope of the document together with related information pertaining to the Mobility Element of the General Plan. Technical information and recommended implementation actions are contained in subsequent chapters of this report.

### RELATIONSHIP TO THE MOBILITY ELEMENT

This TR contains transportation information that has been prepared as a technical supplement to the Mobility Element (ME) of the City of Bishop's General Plan. It is intended as a resource document with up to date supporting information for the ME and with pertinent data on existing and future mobility in the City. The TR will undergo periodic updates so that the information can remain current without the need to update the actual ME. These updates will be an administrative function, requiring formal City Council action only if or when approvals for actual implementing actions are required.

### OVERVIEW

Information contained in this TR includes the following:

**Relevant Studies** – This part of the TR summarizes and lists studies by the City or other entities that have relevance to mobility in the City. An example is the Bishop Area Access and Circulation Study (BAACS) study prepared by Caltrans. This involved a major evaluation of traffic on Main Street/Highway 395, and a summary of that study including the procedures and findings, can be found in Chapter 1.0 this TR. Other Caltrans studies such as Route Concept reports for State routes through the City and local improvement studies are also covered.

**Existing Conditions** - Chapter 2.0 of this TR describes the existing street system and the traffic volumes on that system, together with a discussion on operational issues. Information on existing public transportation is also given in this chapter.

**Future Conditions** - Further growth and the corresponding future volumes on the roadway system are described in Chapter 3.0. Factors contributing to growth in regional traffic through the City are also noted.

**Implementing Actions** - Implementing actions for achieving the City's transportation goals are outlined in the goals and policies section of the ME. This TR translates selected implementing actions into more specific recommendations for undertaking those actions. The Opportunity Areas designated in the ME are also discussed, together with suggestions for improvement strategies that could be considered in the special studies to be carried out for these areas.

## **CHANGES IN THIS UPDATE**

This is the first TR prepared in support of the ME. In subsequent updates, this section will note the changes that have been incorporated into the document since the previous version.

## **RELATED ACTIONS/STUDIES**

This section discusses recent actions and studies that have relevance to the ME.

### **Bishop Area Access and Circulation Study**

The Bishop Area Access and Circulation Study (BAACS) completed in 2007 involved a comprehensive study of traffic in and around the City. It was carried out by Caltrans District 9 at the request of the Inyo County Local Transportation Commission (LTC) with the support of the City of Bishop and Inyo County. The study focused on Main Street/Highway 395, and evaluated options that could reduce traffic, create a more walkable downtown area, improve safety to traffic, bicyclists and pedestrians, and improve ground access to the eastern Sierra Regional Airport (Bishop Airport). Specifically, five study objectives were defined at the beginning to guide the process:

- Improve circulation and safety for all modes of transportation in the downtown area.
- Accommodate commercial truck traffic for US 395 and US 6.
- Plan for downtown improvements (i.e. landscaping, parking, pedestrian facilities, etc.) along with the rerouting of truck traffic.

- Facilitate ground access improvements to the airport and its associated development improvements.
- Keep services in Bishop visible for through-traffic on any route and have easy on/off connections.

A project development team (PDT) was created at the initiation of the project and included representatives from the City of Bishop, City of Los Angeles, County of Inyo, Bishop Paiute Indian Tribe, Bishop Chamber of Commerce, Inyo County LTC and Caltrans. During the two-year study process, regular meetings were held with the PDT to share information and provide direction for the study. Public input was also encouraged and incorporated into the development and evaluation of the alternatives. The following sections provide a brief overview of the work carried out and the findings of the study.

**Existing Conditions** - Traffic count data was collected at several locations in and around Bishop, and existing traffic patterns defined including estimates of local and through traffic. The information was also used to provide an assessment of existing conditions. Some of the key findings in this regard are incorporated into the discussion on existing conditions presented in Chapter 2.0 of this TR.

The evaluation of existing conditions concluded that the basic physical characteristics such as the number of lanes and their configuration of Highway 395 through the Bishop downtown area cannot be changed while still functioning safely and adequately as the only through north/south route in the City let alone a major interregional highway. Constraints such as limited R/W and nonaligned intersections prevent any significant alteration of the current system.

**Alternatives** - The study examined several highway bypass alternatives. The premise was that to meet the future traffic needs and address all the stated goals of the study, the separation of Main Street and Highway 395 would eventually need to be accomplished. The alternatives included both eastern and western bypass alignments, and a special traffic simulation model was developed to test the alternatives.

Estimates of diversion for western alternatives were about 20 percent of total daily traffic passing through the City. If the eastern alternatives included a north connector (i.e., north of Wye Road), then they would have the largest diversion of traffic at about 24 percent of total volumes. Western alternatives were found to divert about 39 percent of trucks and eastern alternatives divert about 67 percent of trucks from the downtown. Hence the Eastern alignments had the potential for removing the greatest amount of truck traffic from the downtown. They would also provide truck access to the Bishop Airport.

**Bypass Issues** - One concern that traveler-dependent business owners had was the potential development of competing businesses along any new bypass corridor. One strategy to prevent this would be to limit development and access on the new corridor. The Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) owns nearly all the lands needed for the routes, and an access agreement between Inyo County, the City of Bishop, Caltrans and the LADWP could effectively prevent any development along the bypass route. The dedication of development rights to a conservation group or the development of a conservation easement along a bypass route could further strengthen the protection of downtown businesses.

The study noted that State Highway truck routes can be enforced to require all through trucks use them, but cannot exclude private vehicles. Since some private vehicles would choose to use the truck route, a reduction in interregional travelers on Main Street/Highway 395 can be anticipated. Hence, while there was community support for a bypass route to reduce traffic in the downtown area, local merchants in general were not supportive of the bypass due to concerns regarding the loss of interregional traveler business.

In the past, Caltrans has developed parallel facilities such as truck routes while still maintaining the existing mainline in the State highway system. However, the State no longer builds or accepts the maintenance of parallel facilities. As a result, it was recommended that the proposed bypass be a locally owned and maintained two-lane facility, built to Caltrans standards. This route could be signed as either Bishop Airport access, and/or truck route. While this recommendation did not meet all the goals of the study, it could remove most of the truck traffic from Main Street, thereby reducing the sense of congestion in the downtown and providing truck access to the Bishop Airport.

One of the study conclusions was that because a large portion of the traffic on Main Street is local traffic, any sort of bypass of Bishop on its own would not enable the physical configuration of Main Street to change.

### **Caltrans Transportation Concept Report**

Transportation Concept Reports (TCR) are long-range planning documents used by Caltrans to guide overall improvements to State highways. They present information on right-of-way, traffic forecasts, accident history, environmental issues, level of service (LOS), and contain recommended conceptual improvements.

The TCR for Highway 395 prepared in 2000 lists improvements that Caltrans sees as important over the next 20 years to improve LOS and safety. In addition to adding lanes where needed, other improvements include widening shoulders, constructing passing lanes, and making curve corrections. Many of the TCR improvements have already been completed.

### **Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan 1998**

The Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP) is the Caltrans version of a Regional Transportation Plan. The ITSP places special emphasis on the statutorily identified Interregional Road System. It identifies several "Focus Routes," including Highway 395, where completion to minimum freeway/expressway standards is a high priority. The purpose of Focus Route improvements is to develop a "backbone" system of high volume arterials to which lower volume state highway routes can connect for purposes of longer interregional trips and access into statewide gateways.

### **Regional Transportation Plans**

Regional Transportation Plans (RTP) are 20 year programming documents outlining general transportation related policies, guidelines, and capital improvement project lists for all transportation facilities/modes. They include programs related to roads, bridges, transit, aviation, goods movement, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and transportation demand management.

An integral part of the RTP process is to identify transportation issues and concerns for the region. Those in the Inyo County 2001 RTP that are relevant to Bishop are as follows:

- Exploring advanced technology applications which inform drivers of dangers and changes in weather conditions
- Providing off-street parking and truck/RV parking in Bishop (and Lone Pine)
- Expanding regional transit service
- Enhancing emergency preparedness
- Connecting bikeways

The Inyo County RTP noted the following:

- The county population is not expected to increase much in the next 20 years

- Tourism will continue to drive the economy
- Inyo County will continue to maintain its rural atmosphere
- The low population density with long distances between residences, services, and employment will continue to make trips largely dependent on the automobile.
- The use of Highway 395 by southern California, Reno, and eastern Sierra commercial vehicle operations is expected to grow in the next 20 years

The RTP discusses the continued need for interregional bus service and coordinating existing transit services. Specific transit projects include the construction of bus pullouts, and vehicle engine retrofits so as to comply with air quality regulations.

Short-term bicycle projects identified in the RTP include the Pine to Park bike path and Seibu to School bike path. (The Inyo County Collaborative Bikeways plan is discussed below.) Also, future aviation improvements to the Bishop, Lone Pine, Independence, and Shoshone airports are planned to accommodate potential growth in air traffic.

#### **Wye Road Intersection Improvements**

The Bishop Wye Traffic Circulation Improvement Project proposes improvements to increase intersection capacity and improve safety at the junction of Highway 395, Highway 6 and Wye Road. The improvements are needed to serve increases in traffic, development in the Chalfant, Hammil, and Benton Valley areas of Mono County, development of adjacent commercial parcels, and a potential truck route around the City of Bishop. Congestion and safety issues related to the current configuration will adversely impact Highway 395 and Highway 6 and reduce their effectiveness as interregional corridors, and will also impact North Main Street for the City of Bishop.

The purpose of the Caltrans 2009 Feasibility Study Report (FSR) for the Wye Traffic Circulation Improvement project was to evaluate several alternatives for intersection improvements. Four build alternatives and a no build alternative were studied, and all of the build alternatives were considered viable. Since there are no funds programmed for this project at this time, the FSR evaluated the alternatives in general terms and a more detailed analysis will be carried out for programming purposes at some time in the future.

## **Bishop Reservation Traffic Safety Evaluation**

This 2006 study consisted of two traffic safety evaluations on the Reservation, one focused on engineering and the other on traffic law enforcement. Recommended roadway improvements included the signalization and enhanced configuration of the four-way intersection between Highway 395 (east/west), See Vee Lane (south) and Cherry Lane (north) to improve safety and accessibility for traffic from the Reservation and the Highlands RV Park.

## **Inyo County Collaborative Bikeways Plan 2008**

The Inyo County 2008 Collaborative Bikeways Plan is the official Bicycle Transportation Plan of the County of Inyo, City of Bishop, and Bishop Paiute Tribe for the purposes of Bicycle Transportation Account funding. It builds on the 2002 Inyo County Bicycle Plan, which did not address the City of Bishop and did not cover the Bishop Paiute Reservation. This update includes the following:

- Describes existing bicycle facilities and programs within Inyo County and its surrounding communities.
- Evaluates the need for future bicycle facilities and programs throughout the County, including the City of Bishop, unincorporated communities, and tribal reservations, and describes their relationships to existing facilities and programs.
- Designates new routes and prioritizes their development
- Updates maps for the existing and proposed system of bikeways
- Provides 20 year cost estimates by bikeway classification to complete the system
- Identifies funding sources and implementation phasing for the most important projects
- Defines policies and standards for the improvement of bicycle facilities, engineering practices and procedures, education, and law enforcement pertaining to bicycling. Reinforces the policies outlined in the Inyo County General Plan and the County's 2007/08 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).
- Incorporates comments received on the 2007 Draft Collaborative Bikeways Plan from the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

## **Bishop Paiute Tribal Plans**

The Bishop Tribe currently operates a casino and gas station northwest of town on Highway 395. The tribe has plans to remodel the casino to include a lodging/conference center. Caltrans is working with the tribe on improvements such as roadway widening and turn out lanes.

## **REFERENCES**

1. "US 395 Transportation Concept Report (TCR)," Caltrans District 9, May 2000.
2. "Eastern Sierra US Highway 395 Corridor Enhancement Program, Existing Conditions Report," LSC Transportation Consultants, Inc. January 2009.
3. Feasibility Study Report for "Bishop Wye Traffic Circulation Improvement," Caltrans District 9, June 2009.
4. "Inyo County Collaborative Bikeways Plan," County of Inyo, City of Bishop, Bishop Paiute Tribe, November 2008.

# Chapter 2.0

## EXISTING CONDITIONS

This section of the Transportation Report (TR) summarizes existing transportation data as of the date of this TR. The information includes traffic volumes and travel patterns and existing public transportation services.

### ROADWAY SYSTEM

Figure 2-1 shows the existing roadways and intersection controls for the major streets in the City referred to as the “major thoroughfares” in this report. Midblock lanes on the roadway segments are illustrated in Figure 2-2 for those roadways with more than two lanes.


The two roadway classifications in the ME are State Highways and Local Streets. The State Highways have California Road System classifications as follows:

Highway 395 and Highway 6 – “Other Principal Arterial”  
Highway 168 – “Collector”

Several local streets in the City also have a California Road System “Collector” designation, these generally being the major thoroughfares noted above, and used in this report for describing certain types of traffic information.

### TRAFFIC VOLUMES


Figure 2-3 shows existing average daily traffic (ADT) volumes on the major thoroughfares in the City. They represent annual average weekday volumes, and seasonal variations change these volumes during the year, particularly on Main Street. For example, the annual average of 8,000 ADT south of the City varies throughout the year as illustrated in Figure 2-4. The highest peak is the first weekend in August with a comparable peak over the Christmas/New Year’s holiday. Much of the seasonal variation



**Legend**

- Signal Control
- Stop Control (black bar denotes leg(s) under stop control)

**Figure 2-1**  
**EXISTING INTERSECTION CONTROLS**  
**(MAJOR THOROUGHFARES)**



**Legend**

3\*/5\* Midblock lanes have a center left-turn lane  
 Note: Where not designated, streets are two lanes

**Figure 2-2**

**EXISTING MIDBLOCK LANES**






Figure 2-4  
 2009 AVERAGE DAILY VOLUMES  
 FOR HIGHWAY 395 SOUTH OF BISHOP

is in through traffic, and is related to regional trips for recreational purposes. Local traffic variations could be related to summer visitors lodged in the City, although the increase is somewhat off-set by the reduction in school trips during that time. A further illustration of the variation throughout the year can be seen in Figure 2-5 which shows daily volumes averaged over each month for 2010.

Table 2-1 contains information on peak hour volumes on Main Street in the downtown area. This also illustrates the fluctuation in volumes for different days of the week and different times of the year.

## **TRUCK VOLUMES**

Truck traffic in the City is largely comprised of through trips on Highway 395 and Highway 6. Average weekday truck volumes are around 1,000 vehicles per day. This translates to around six percent of the total traffic just north of Line Street and around 12 percent at the north and south City limits. Because of their large size, a small number of trucks can have a relatively large impact on traffic.

## **EXISTING OPERATING CONDITIONS**

This section discusses existing operating conditions on the City's street system. It is based on existing count data as discussed above and information prepared during the Bishop Area Access and Circulation Study (BAACS) described in the previous chapter. It should be noted that in this discussion the three State Highways serving the City are typically referred to by their local street names rather than the joint City/State Highway name.

### **Main Street/Highway 395**

Main Street in the downtown area is a five lane facility with two lanes in each direction and a center turn lane. Shoulder and sidewalk widths vary, and between Line Street and East Elm Street the right-of-way (ROW) is the most restrictive with a 10 foot center turn lane and 10 foot and 12 foot moving lanes. Shoulders in this segment are less than three feet which is too narrow for bicycles, and cyclists thereby use the curbside traffic lane. The narrowness of the existing ROW, and the development of storefronts at the edge of the ROW, results in short turning radii and short sight distances to/from side streets. As concluded in the BAACS, the only way to increase the capacity of the existing facility, or to




Figure 2-5  
 AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC (ADT) VOLUMES BY  
 MONTH FOR 2010



Table 2-1

## 2010 PEAK HOUR VOLUMES – BISHOP MAIN STREET

Location/Description		AM			Midday			PM		
		NB	SB	TOTAL	NB	SB	TOTAL	NB	SB	TOTAL
<b>North of Line Street</b>										
January	Monday-Thursday	409	355	764	622	490	1,112	609	461	1,070
	Friday	405	331	736	490	525	1,015	741	479	1,220
	Saturday	227	268	495	486	620	1,106	416	744	1,160
April	Monday-Thursday	457	396	853	697	584	1,281	708	501	1,209
	Friday	548	425	973	818	659	1,477	815	555	1,370
	Saturday	246	329	575	457	660	1,117	467	605	1,072
July	Monday-Thursday	512	470	982	822	695	1,517	781	562	1,343
	Friday	570	494	1,064	1,040	722	1,762	891	582	1,473
	Saturday	337	390	727	539	742	1,281	476	495	971
November	Monday-Thursday	429	383	812	649	536	1,185	612	428	1,040
	Friday	430	375	805	670	517	1,187	627	473	1,100
	Saturday	232	265	497	487	472	959	435	425	860
Average	Monday-Thursday	452	401	853	698	576	1,274	678	488	1,166
	Friday	488	406	895	755	606	1,360	769	522	1,291
	Saturday	261	313	574	492	624	1,116	449	567	1,016
<b>South of Line Street</b>										
January	Monday-Thursday	330	335	665	443	531	974	441	435	876
	Friday	335	286	621	359	533	892	551	436	987
	Saturday	165	253	418	377	867	1,244	332	717	1,049
April	Monday-Thursday	359	362	721	509	558	1,067	512	471	983
	Friday	439	392	831	615	611	1,226	598	516	1,114
	Saturday	180	297	477	343	755	1,098	362	567	929
July	Monday-Thursday	411	428	839	608	656	1,264	585	534	1,119
	Friday	449	460	909	862	700	1,562	678	541	1,219
	Saturday	255	369	624	405	730	1,135	371	435	806
November	Monday-Thursday	352	348	700	441	496	937	443	403	846
	Friday	350	340	690	444	515	959	439	410	849
	Saturday	162	240	402	300	440	740	335	385	720
Average	Monday-Thursday	363	368	731	500	560	1,061	495	461	956
	Friday	393	370	763	570	590	1,160	567	476	1,042
	Saturday	191	290	480	356	698	1,054	350	526	876

AM – Highest one hour volume between 7:00 and 9:00

Midday – Highest one hour volume between 11:00 and 1:00

PM – Highest one hour volume between 4:00 and 6:00

provide standard lane and shoulder widths and maintain the current sidewalk width would be to acquire additional ROW and demolish at least the front of many buildings in downtown Bishop.

### **Main Street/Line Street Intersection**

This intersection has a number of issues that affect traffic operations including high volumes, a slight offset, and sharp corner radii. The sharp turning radii at Line Street is such that large vehicles cannot make the turn from Main Street onto Line Street without using the opposing traffic lane on Line Street. Hence, the intersection is inadequate for truck access, and the BAACS notes that "Another access for trucks must be developed for the County's future plans for the Bishop Airport to move forward." With the main access to the post office and schools located off of West Line Street, this location is the operational "hot spot" in the City's roadway system, especially during school start and end times. The intersection is also the only reasonably close signalized intersection available for controlled left turns onto Main Street for the vast majority of residents on the east side of Bishop, and is the most direct to many destinations for many residents on the west side of the City and areas to the west. It is estimated that most Bishop area residents travel through the intersection several times a day on average.

### **East-West Streets**

Downtown Bishop has two arteries that serve traffic from the west, West Line Street/Highway 168 and North Sierra Highway/Highway 395. These provide access to downtown services for the Bishop Paiute Reservation, West Bishop, and communities to the west.

West Line Street is mostly a three lane facility with center turn lane from near See Vee Lane to Main Street. There are sidewalks on at least one side from the city limit near Pioneer Lane to Main Street. From Home Street east the existing ROW is narrow with storefronts built at the edge of the ROW line, and turning radii to/from side streets are sharp with restrictive sight distances.

North Sierra Highway, adjacent to the City limits in the northwest part of the city and extending further west is a four lane facility with center turn lane. Business storefronts are built at variable distances from the ROW line. Some are built to the edge and the shoulder of the highway is utilized for parking, while others are set further back allowing parking to occur out of the ROW. Caltrans has identified a significant need to better control access on Highway 395 in this area.

Jay Street, South Street, Line Street, Yaney Street, and Wye Road are secondary east-west through streets crossing Main Street. All other east-west Bishop streets end in a Tee-intersection at Main Street. These offset distances are close enough that conflicting turn movements occur in the center turn lane and also from side street left turn movements. However, the offsets are large enough that the intersections do not allow for easy consolidation into single signalized intersections. These offset side streets also contribute to the high volumes on Main Street as local traffic maneuvers for east-west crossing of Main Street. Although the offset limits the value as an east/west route for vehicles, the East Pine Grove route is important for pedestrians, especially school children, and is shown as a preferred route on Bishop Safe Routes to Schools maps.

### **Junction of Main Street/Highway 395 and Highway 6**

Another location with operational issues is the junction of Highway 395 and Highway 6. In the area of the junction, Highway 395 turns 90 degrees and a local street joins the state highways. The proximity of the access road for the Vons/Kmart shopping center to this junction also adds to the operational issues at this location. As discussed in Chapter 1.0, Caltrans has studied a number of options for improving this junction.

### **Local North-South Connections**

North-south connections on the City's street network are limited, forcing local traffic to use Main Street for these trips. There are no streets parallel to Main Street in the city connecting the full length of Bishop's business corridor. Home Street and Hanby/Spruce Streets provide north-south accessibility and See Vee Lane just west of the City limits provides a full north-south connection between North Sierra Highway and West Line Street.

The dependence of Bishop's local traffic circulation patterns on the Main Street and Line Street intersection can be seen from the ADT volumes presented earlier. These show an ADT of 16,000 just north of the Line Street/Main Street intersection, while the ADT south of the City is 8,000 and west of the City (or north on Highway 395) is 9,000.

As noted in Chapter 1.0 under the BAACS discussion, local residents have voiced concerns for the safety and comfort of pedestrian and bicycle users in Bishop's downtown, specifically mentioning trucks as being a problem. While there is community support for an alternative route to remove trucks

and reduce congestion in the downtown area, Bishop merchants in general are not supportive of an alternative route due to fears of losing interregional traveler business.



## **TRAFFIC PATTERNS**

Using data from BAACS and recent counts, estimates were made of the local versus through traffic components of traffic on the State Highway routes in the City. As noted earlier, volumes on major streets such as Highway 395 vary by day of week and by time of year. Figure 2-6 shows typical patterns for an average weekday. The upper part of the diagram shows through traffic at the lower part shows traffic components for selected locations within and outside the City. In the context of this diagram “local” traffic includes trips within the City and immediately adjacent County area. External trips have one end of the trip inside this area and the other end outside the area.

## **PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION**

Public transportation service for the City of Bishop has two components. The fixed-route services are transit lines that operate on regular schedules along a set route and serve primarily regional trips (i.e., to and from locations outside the City). Demand responsive services have defined service areas but do not have designated routes and serve more localized trips (i.e., the Greater Bishop area).

The Eastern Sierra Transit Authority (ESTA) provides both services. The ESTA was established in November of 2006 as a Joint Powers Authority between the Counties of Inyo and Mono, the City of Bishop and the Town of Mammoth Lakes. ESTA replaced Inyo Mono Transit which provided local transit services prior to the formation of ESTA. It was created to meet the growing need for public transportation within the four member jurisdictions and throughout the entire Eastern Sierra region. Services provided include deviated fixed routes, local in-town dial-a-ride services, multiple town-to-town services throughout the Highway 395 and Highway 6 corridors, and interregional service (CREST) extending from Reno, Nevada to Lancaster, California. The CREST and Mammoth-Bishop bus lines operate from a designated access location at the Vons/Kmart Center.



**Legend**

AVERAGE WEEKDAY TRAFFIC (000's)

LOCAL	EXTERNAL	THROUGH	TOTAL
-------	----------	---------	-------

**Figure 2-6**

EXISTING WEEKDAY TRAFFIC PATTERNS

In 2011, ESTA operated four routes through the City of Bishop (see Figure 2-7) with weekday service from seven AM to six PM. The number of lines and routes are adjusted periodically in response to ridership patterns. In January, ESTA provided service to 8,136 Bishop passengers (3,023 Dial-A-Ride passengers and 5,113 bus passengers).





Figure 2-7  
TRANSIT SERVICES

# Chapter 3.0

## FUTURE CONDITIONS

This chapter discusses future conditions on the City's roadway system. Potential growth in the area is discussed, and this is used to estimate future traffic volumes around 20 years from now.

### GROWTH FORECASTS

Traffic growth on the City's street system will occur from two sources, local growth and increases in through trips, primarily on Highway 395. The following discusses each of these.

#### Local Growth

With respect to the City and surrounding area, the following shows population growth over the past 10 years from the recent census data.

	2000	2010	% Change
City of Bishop	3575	3879	+8.5%
County of Inyo	17945	18546	+3.3%
State of California	33,871,653	37,253,956	+10.0%

The 8.5 percent gain in Bishop follows a prior period of relatively slower growth. There are no forecasts for the next 20 years, but factors such as available land for development and job growth suggests a growth rate of below one percent per year, comparable to the past 10 years. A reasonable range for growth in local traffic on the City's street system would be between 10 and 15 percent by 2030.

#### Through Traffic

Caltrans District 9 completed a Transportation Concept Report for Highway 395 in May, 2000. This report provided an estimate of traffic growth over the next 20 years at various locations along the study corridor. On Highway 395 from the San Bernardino County line to the Nevada state line, the report states an estimated growth rate of 1.5 percent per year.

The Bishop Area Access and Circulation Study (BAACS) study in 2006 estimated a slightly lower rate for the section of Highway 395 through Bishop, and used a 1.0 percent annual growth rate. Hence, these two sources suggest a growth in through trips of 20 to 30 percent by 2030.

The average annual growth rate for truck traffic on Highway 395 in Inyo and Kern Counties was about two and three percent, respectively for the period between 1997 and 2007. One development that might affect future truck forecasts in the corridor is the Tahoe Reno Industrial Center, located in Nevada on Interstate 80 east of the City of Sparks. This site has the potential to accommodate 80 million square feet of industrial and commercial space on 102,000 acres. Currently, about nine million square feet have been built and the next phase of 25 million square feet is nearing approval. This supports a growth rate for trucks that is higher than for light vehicles. An increase in truck traffic of around 40 percent by 2030 is thereby a reasonable expectation on the Highway 395 and Highway 6 corridor.

## **FUTURE TRAFFIC VOLUMES**

Future average daily traffic (ADT) volumes on the major thoroughfares are illustrated in Figure 3-1. Figure 3-2 shows the corresponding traffic patterns and traffic components. These forecasts use the high range of the growth estimates noted above as follows:

<b>2011 to 2030 Growth Forecasts</b>	
Local Traffic	15 percent
Through Traffic:	
Light Vehicles	30 percent
Trucks	40 percent

The actual increase at any location depends on the mix of traffic components (local and through) at this location. While 2030 is used here as a future reference year, the actual growth could occur before then, but more likely sometime after that date since the high end of the range has been used in the forecasts.

Of greatest concern from the traffic forecasts, are operating conditions along Main Street and particularly the critical intersection with Line Street. Implementation of parallel roadway connections as depicted on the roadway system diagram in the ME could divert some local traffic from this location and a potential truck route as discussed in the next chapter could divert truck traffic from Main Street.







Figure 3-1  
 FUTURE ADT VOLUMES



**Legend**

AVERAGE WEEKDAY TRAFFIC (000's)

LOCAL	EXTERNAL	THROUGH	TOTAL
-------	----------	---------	-------

**Figure 3-2**

FUTURE WEEKDAY TRAFFIC PATTERNS

# Chapter 4.0

## IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

This section of the Transportation Report (TR) discusses transportation studies and improvements in relation to the Mobility Element (ME). It provides information on proposed or planned transportation projects, and gives guidance for future studies and implementing actions of the ME. It is intended to be more specific than the generalized actions listed in the ME itself, and as such will be updated as studies are carried out and projects are implemented.

### ROADWAY AND BIKEWAY IMPROVEMENTS

Improvements to the roadway system in and adjacent to the City will be required to implement the roadway and bicycle components of the ME. Table 4-1 lists such improvements and the following are comments on selected projects.

**Wye Road Extension**– This project will extend Wye Road to the Bishop Airport as a means of providing a second access, and will relieve traffic on East Line, Hanby, South Third, and Main Streets. The improvement is entirely outside the City, and is currently undergoing design studies.

**East Jay Street Extension** - Jay Street will extend from South Third Street to the proposed “B” Street alignment and East Line Street on the east. This improvement is entirely outside the City, and is currently undergoing design studies.

**Sierra Street Extension** – This extension will provide east-west access from See Vee Lane at Diaz Lane to Home Street providing an alternative for travel from the north and west to the areas in the northeast part of Bishop. As an alternate, West Yaney Street could be extended instead of Sierra Street.

**See Vee Lane Extension South**– This southerly extension will intersect with the westerly extension of Jay Street to the south. It is intended to facilitate north/south traffic. While this improvement is entirely outside the City, it will provide benefits to traffic on the City’s roadway system.

Table 4-1

## SELECTED ROADWAY AND BIKEWAY IMPLEMENTATION PROJECTS

Category*	Location	Project Limits
S(I)	1. Wye Road Extension	Extension from eastern terminus point to airport with County
	2. Jay Street Extension	Extend Jay Street to East Line Street east of Johnston Drive
S(II)	3. Sierra Street Extension	Extend Sierra Street to See Vee Lane
	4. See Vee Extension	Signalize and extend See Vee Lane (joint with County and Caltrans)
	5. Fowler Extension	Extend Fowler Street to Sierra Street
	6. A Street	Construct new street between Line Street and North Sierra Highway (joint with Tribe)
	7. South Street	Extend South Street to B Street
	8. Hanby Extension	Extend Hanby to Wye Road
	9. West Jay Street Extension	Extend Jay Street west to Sunland Avenue
B(I)	Pine to Park Bike Path	Extend as Class I bike path north from B Street
	Siebu to School Bike Path	Class I bike path east from Siebu Street
	Diaz to School Bike Path	Class I bike path east from Diaz Street
B(II)	21. Hobson to Coats Bike Path	Construct Class 1 bike path/pedestrian path from Hobson Street to Coats Street
	22. Pine to Canal Bike Path	Construct Class 1 bike path from East Pine Street to east side of Bishop Creek Canal

\* Categories are as follows:

S(I) – Short-range (10-15 years) roadway project

S(II) – Longer Range (> 15 years) roadway project

B(I) – Short-range (10-15 years) bicycle facility project

B(II) – Longer Range (> 15 years) bicycle facility project

**See Vee Lane Extension North**– This northerly extension will provide connections into neighborhoods along North Sierra Highway such as Highlands Mobile Home Park and Meadowcreek and is intended to facilitate north/south traffic. This improvement is entirely outside the City and will provide benefits to areas northwest of the City.

**Fowler Street Extension** – This will extend Fowler Street to Yaney and Sierra Streets at Coats as a Local Residential Street. Right-of-impacts mean that this can be considered a long term improvement, ideally combined with land use opportunities that may arise in the future.

**“A” Street** – This is a new street located on the west side of the elementary schools running north/south between North Sierra Highway and West Line Street. Parts of this alignment are on the Bishop Paiute Reservation and on a conservation easement granted by the tribe to the Army Corps of Engineers. This route would facilitate north south traffic, would provide access to the elementary schools, and reduce traffic on residential streets in the vicinity of the schools.

**South Street** – The east and west extensions of South Street between B Street and Sunland drive will enhance east-west accessibility in the southern part of the City.

**“B” Street** – This new local street is located outside of the City limits east of the Bishop Creek Canal. It is intended to provide north/south connections on the east side of Bishop, enhancing access to the airport at East Line Street and Wye Road, and providing access to the commercial and industrial areas in the north end of the City. A potential role for this as a truck route is discussed later in this chapter.

**Hanby Extension** - This project will extend Hanby Street northward to Wye Road enhancing north-south accessibility in the eastern part of the City.

**West Jay Street Extension** – This project in the County will provide a westerly extension of Jay Street to Sunland Avenue, improving accessibility in the southwest part of the City.

## **OPPORTUNITY AREAS**

The opportunity areas in the ME are intended as special study areas requiring a coordinated approach between the city, Caltrans, businesses, and residents to developing suitable solutions. The

following discussions on the three opportunity areas notes the issues and opportunities involved and indicates the type of studies to be carried out to identify solutions.

### **Park Street Opportunity Area**

The traffic signal at Park Street is a four-way configuration with Park Avenue on the east side and access to a commercial property on the west side. Operational issues often occur with vehicles queuing to enter the commercial property. The commercial property, the park amenities, including parking, and undeveloped property in the area all present opportunities to create an enhanced focal point for tourists and residents. Also, moving the intersection could allow for a western extension through the DWP property to connect to Home Street and Rome Drive. Hence, this intersection and the adjoining land uses provide an opportunity to benefit residents, visitors, and local businesses, and thereby help promote the overall goals of the ME. It is recommended that a focused land use and transportation study be carried out, involving the various stakeholders such as Caltrans and local land owners/businesses.

### **Grove-Pine Opportunity Area**

East-west access between West and East Pine Street or between Grove Street and East Pine Street is constrained by the offset intersections, which tends to discourage drivers from using this location as a means of providing an east-west alternative to the Line Street intersection to the south. While a direct connection between Grove Street and East Pine Street would be the preferred connection, there are land use constraints involved in creating a single intersection. Ideally, any such change would be accompanied by land use changes that enhance the adjacent commercial areas. An example would be the creation of a focal point to bring traffic off Main Street into a location where convenient parking is provided to serve the adjacent commercial areas. An integrated plan with parking and perhaps a small plaza could thereby provide a local stopping off point for tourists passing through the City, and an identifying feature for residents. It is recommended that this opportunity area be the subject of a focused land use and transportation study involving the various stakeholders such as Caltrans and local land owners/businesses.

### **Wye Road Opportunity Area**

The triangle defined by Highway 395 as it transitions from Main Street to North Sierra Highway, North Main Street and Wye Road has traffic issues related to the intersections created by this triangle. These issues will increase with time as development occurs and traffic, including truck traffic, increases

on Highway 6 and turn movements between the two highways increase. Also, the access road from North Main Street into the shopping center to the east has intersection design issues that are related to the roadway configuration created by the triangle to the north. Because two of the three roadways are State Highways, and the land inside the triangle is under DWP ownership, a coordinated approach to land use and traffic will be required. The 2009 Caltrans Feasibility Study Report titled Bishop Wye Traffic Circulation Improvement provides a suitable starting point for such an evaluation.

## **TRUCK ROUTE CONCEPT**

The bypass route that emerged as a recommendation from the BAACS did not gain full community support because of the potential impact on downtown businesses. Accordingly, consideration could be given to a truck route concept to divert trucks from Main Street, but not divert other traffic. The elements of the concept are as follows:

1. Construct a new north-south two-lane local street between Wye Road and Line Street
2. Prohibit trucks on Main Street except for local deliveries
3. Connect a southern extension of the new north-south street to Main Street

Figure 4-1 provides an illustration of the concept. Initially, the southern part could be the Jay Street extension to East Line Street, currently under study. At a later stage, the existing section of Jay Street could be bypassed. A new north-south road would then connect to Wye Road.

While it is recognized that it could be difficult to prevent light vehicles from using the truck route the overall travel time compared to using Main Street would be longer, thereby discouraging bypass trips by passenger vehicles. The intent would be to provide a means of diverting trucks from the downtown area while at the same time enhancing north-south accessibility on the east side of the City. It would also address one of the Bishop Area Access and Circulation Study (BAACS) recommendations to provide truck access to the airport without the need to use the Main Street/Line Street intersection.

While alignment studies and an environmental impact analysis would need to be carried out, the conceptual alignment shown here is intended to be somewhat removed from residential areas and from the multi-use trail along the east bank of the canal.




Figure 4-1  
TRUCK ROUTE CONCEPT

## **SPECIAL STUDIES/COORDINATION ACTIONS**

Each of the implementation actions discussed in the previous sections require some form of focused study. The work will involve traffic and transportation studies together with other considerations such as land use, environmental impacts and financing opportunities. The studies will also involve a number of stakeholders, both private and public, and require coordination with other entities such as the County, the Bishop Paiute Tribe and Caltrans.

Table 4-2 gives a list of recommended studies/coordination actions to assist in implementing the goals and policies of the ME. In each case, the work will involve establishing purpose and need, defining a scope of work, and creating a participatory framework for stakeholders and involved governmental agencies.

Table 4-2

SPECIAL STUDIES/COORDINATION ACTIONS

<b>Location/Entity</b>	<b>Description</b>
Park Avenue Opportunity Area	Examine land and street system options that will enhance accessibility and provide visitor parking amenities.
Grove/Pine Opportunity Area	Carry out a land use and traffic engineering study to provide a direct east-west connection within the context of enhanced parking and pedestrian amenities.
Wye Road Opportunity Area	Examine alternative connections between Highway 395, Highway 6 and Wye Road, with land use opportunities in the triangle area being addressed in the analysis.
South "B" Street Extension	Carry out a traffic impact study to identify the feasibility and potential impacts of constructing "B" Street as a new north-south roadway with a southerly extension as a truck road to Main Street.
Walking Routes	Work with local entities such as the Chamber of Commerce to identify "walking tour" information for visitors.
Downtown Parking Amenities	Identify and evaluate opportunities to provide public parking amenities that could enhance local and visitor accessibility to the Downtown (the Park Avenue and Grove/Pine studies would be part of this).

TO: CITY COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: JAMES M. SOUTHWORTH, CITY ADMINISTRATOR 

SUBJECT: **Joint Meeting - City Council and Planning Commission  
Housing Element Compliance Update**

DATE: July 26, 2011

**Attachments:** (none)

Background/Discussion:

This joint meeting provides an opportunity to update both the City Council and the Planning Commission on the General Plan's\* Housing Element compliance requirements. These include policies that facilitate housing for disabled; zone change and GPA for group housing; and a mixed use overlay. Also, it is noted that there is a potential synergy between the Warren Street improvement project and the long-term Housing Element goal for mixed use development.

Recommendation:

Hear update on Housing Element compliance activities.

\* *The nine elements of the General Plan include:*

- |                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|
| 1. <i>Economic Development</i>   | 6. <i>Public Services / Facilities</i> |
| 2. <i>Land Use</i>               | 7. <i>Parks / Recreation</i>           |
| <b>3. <i>Housing</i></b>         | 8. <i>Conservation / Open Space</i>    |
| 4. <i>Circulation (Mobility)</i> | 9. <i>Safety</i>                       |
| 5. <i>Noise</i>                  |  |

TO: CITY COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: JAMES M. SOUTHWORTH, CITY ADMINISTRATOR 

SUBJECT: **Joint Meeting - City Council and Planning Commission**  
**Discussion Items Requested by City Council:**  
**Sign Ordinance Review**  
**Parking Regulations Review**  
**Term Limits for Commissioners**

DATE: July 26, 2011

**Attachments:**

1. Sign Ordinance - BMC Sections 17.76.100 & .110
2. Parking Ordinance - BMC Section 17.76.060 - .080
3. Commission Membership & Terms provisions from BMC Chapters 2.20 (Parks & Recreation), 2.22 (Water & Sewer), and 2.24 (Plan Com)

**Background/Discussion:**

The City Council previously requested that the Planning Commission review the Sign Ordinance and the Parking Ordinance. Unfortunately, due both to cancelled meetings and some absences, the Commission has not had an opportunity for review discussion by the full commission. This joint meeting allows and opportunity for the Council and Commission to "touch base" on these matters. The sign and parking ordinances are attached as background information.

Also, at the City Council meeting on July 11, the Council requested that the three city commissions consider if there should be term limits for serving on the City commissions. The sections of the ordinances establishing membership terms for each of the three commissions are attached as background information.

**Recommendation:**

Hold joint discussion on these matters.

**Attachment 1**  
**Sign Ordinance**

**17.76.100 - Signs—Residential districts.**

*Signs in all residential districts will be prohibited except for the sale of property of which there will be a maximum of two such signs with a maximum of nine square feet per lot. Said sign is not to be placed within public rights-of-way.*

*(Ord. 406 §23, 1981)*

**17.76.110 - Signs—Commercial districts.**

*A. All exterior signs in all commercial districts shall require a permit to be issued by the building inspector before commencing work. Such exterior signs shall not exceed thirty feet in height or exceed eighty square feet in area, nor shall any such sign, or an accumulation of exterior signs, exceed eighty square feet in area without first obtaining a conditional use permit from the planning commission. For purposes of this section, "business" means any corporation, partnership, individual or other legal entity holding a valid and unexpired city business license.*

*B. Nonadvertising signs having less than twenty square feet, which are securely attached to a building and which are structurally sound are exempt from this section and shall not be considered under this section for any purpose. No permit for such signs shall be required by this section.*

*(Ord. 420 §1, 1984; Ord. 406 §22, 1981)*

**Attachment 2**  
**Parking Ordinance**

**17.76.060 - Parking requirements and specifications.**

A. All the provisions for off-street parking shall apply at the time of erection of any main building, and shall be complied with when an existing building is altered, or enlarged by the addition of dwelling units or guestrooms, or where a commercial use is intensified by the addition of floor space, seating capacity or seats for at least that portion of the facilities that are added.

B. Where automobile parking space, provided and maintained on a lot in connection with a main building or structure at the time this chapter becomes effective, is insufficient to meet the requirements for the use with which it is associated, or where no such parking has been provided, said building or structure may be altered or enlarged or such use may be extended provided additional automobile parking spaces are provided to meet the standards for said use in conformity with the requirements set forth in this chapter for the enlargement, extension or addition proposed.

C. Where calculation of the number of spaces required results in a fractional number, the next higher whole number shall be used.

D. No motor vehicle shall be stored or parked in a residential or commercial zone other than in an entirely enclosed space, unless said vehicle is capable of movement under its own power.

(Ord. 424 Ex. A Ch. 22.44 (B), 1984)

**17.76.070 - Parking area improvements.**

The following specifications for parking area improvements shall apply in all districts, whether now existing or concurrently or hereafter created, except the single-family residential district, or R-1 district, plans for the development of which shall be submitted to the planning department for prior review and approval in accordance with sound parking practice, and such other rules and regulations as may from time to time be established for the city planning department's guidance by resolution of the city council:

A. Not less than two percent of the interior of a parking lot must contain appropriate landscaping. Such landscaping shall be continuously maintained.

B. Lighting where provided to illuminate such parking or display areas shall be so arranged so as not to cause a nuisance either to highway traffic or to the living environment.

*C. All areas shall be surfaced or paved with asphaltic concrete or concrete surfacing. The thickness of the surfacing and base material, if required, shall be determined by the director of public works, and shall be maintained in good condition.*

*D. Where a nonresidential use adjoins a multiple-residential use, or a multiple-residential use adjoins a single-family residential use, they shall be separated by a solid masonry wall five feet in height; provided said wall shall not exceed three feet in height where it is in the front yard area of an abutting residential use. Where no fence or wall is required along a boundary of an area covered by this section, there shall be a concrete curb not less than six inches in height securely installed and maintained as a safeguard to abutting property or public right-of-way. The barrier shall be not less than two feet from any property line, or not less than seven feet from any property line if a walkway is provided, on the subject property.*

*E. Where a nonresidential use adjoins a multiple-residential use, or a multiple-residential use adjoins a single-family residential use, there shall be a border of appropriate landscaping not less than six feet in depth along the residential property. The landscaping shall be of such a variety that it will not grow over three feet high or shall be maintained at a height of not over three feet. Such landscaping shall be maintained. This landscaping shall not be considered as any part of the two percent interior landscaping.*

*F. The location, number and width of all access points shall be as approved by the city planning department. In no case shall the width be less than twelve feet for a one-way access or less than twenty-four feet for a two-way access. In no case shall the nearest edge of the access point be closer than twelve feet to the end of the curb return at a street intersection.*

*G. Concrete curbs shall be placed the entire width of the parking area which fronts on a public street, alley or other public way to delineate the access points.*

*H. The parking area shall be graded so that it is four to six inches above the street, alley or other public way gutter. The parking area shall be graded in such a manner that any drainage will drain towards the street, alley or other public way, and will drain through the access point or points. A grading plan showing elevations every ten feet shall be filed with the city planning department for prior approval. Other satisfactory means of removing any drainage may be approved by the city planning department upon submission of drainage plans.*

*(Ord. 424 Ex. A Ch. 22.44 (C), 1984)*

**17.76.080 - Exempted areas.**

*Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this chapter, the same shall not apply to the following areas:*

*A. That area lying between Main Street as the easterly perimeter, and Warren Street as the westerly perimeter, and Lagoon Street as the southerly perimeter, and Academy Street as the northerly perimeter;*

*B. That area lying between Main Street, as the westerly perimeter, extending easterly therefrom for a depth of one parcel as the same are shown and reflected on the Inyo county assessor's map as of the effective date of the ordinance codified in this title, regardless of ownership, from Clarke Street on the south to May Street on the north.*

*C. The above described parking exemptions shall not apply to activities such as churches, theaters, auditoriums, club houses, fraternity or sorority houses where principal use is not to provide overnight facilities, and similar places of assembly without first obtaining a conditional use permit.*

*(Ord. 486 §1, 1999; Ord. 424 Ex. A Ch. 22.44 (D), 1984)*

**Attachment 3**  
**Membership & Terms of Office**  
**For the Three City Commissions**

**PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION**

**2.20.010 - Created—Membership.**

*There is created a park and recreation commission of the city. The commission shall consist of five members who shall, whenever possible, be residents and citizens of the city of Bishop. Appointments shall be made by the city council on the basis of nominations submitted pursuant to the policy manual of the city. The terms of each member shall be four years. (Ord. 481, § 1, 1997: Prior code § 2-23)*

**WATER & SEWER COMMISSION**

**2.22.010 - Created—Membership.**

*There is created a water and sewer commission of the city. The commission shall consist of five members who shall, whenever possible, be residents and citizens of the city of Bishop. Appointments shall be made by the city council on the basis of nominations submitted pursuant to the policy manual of the city. The terms of each member shall be four years. (Ord. 520 § 1, 2006: Ord. 511 § 1(part), 2004)*

**PLANNING COMMISSION**

**2.24.020 - Membership.**

- A. *The planning commission shall consist of seven members who shall, whenever possible, be residents and citizens of the city of Bishop.*
- B. *Appointments shall be by the city council on the basis of nominations submitted pursuant to the policy manual of the city. (Prior code § 2-16)*

**2.24.030 - Terms of office—Vacancy filling.**

*Of the members of the commission first appointed, two shall be appointed for a term of one year, one shall be appointed for a term of three years, and three shall be appointed for a term of four years, from and after the date of their appointment, respectively. Their successors shall be appointed for terms of four years. If a vacancy occurs otherwise than by expiration of term, it shall be filled by appointment by the mayor with the approval of the city council for the unexpired portion of the term. Any member of the planning commission who fails to attend two consecutive, or a total of four, regular meetings in any twelve-month period, without a prior leave of absence having been sought and granted by the chairman or chairman pro tem, shall be deemed to have resigned from the commission and the vacancy thereby created. Any appointee member of such commission may be removed by the mayor with the approval of a majority vote of the city council. (Prior code § 2-17)*