



CITY OF BISHOP

377 West Line Street - Bishop, California 93514
P.O. Box 1236 - Bishop, California 93515
City Hall (760) 873-8458 - Fax (760) 873-4873

Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact

Date: July 7, 2009

Subject: Proposed Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact

Project Title: Environmental Review / Cottonwood Plaza Demolition

Project Proponent: Bishop Plaza LLC: Richard Maudsley
165 6th Avenue #2402
San Diego, CA

Project Location: The project location is the Cottonwood Plaza, 785 / 787 North Main Street (APN 08-112-13A & 08-112-13C) within the incorporated area of Bishop, California.

Project Description: This Initial Study concerns a request by Bishop Plaza LLC to demolish two commercial structures at 785 and 787 North Main Street. The proposed project will leave the two parcels (APN 08-112-13A & 08-112-13C) vacant for future development.

Proposed Findings: The Initial Study finds that the proposed project would not have a significant adverse impact on the environment for the following reasons:

- Based upon the Initial Study and Environmental Evaluation of the proposed project, and the mitigation measures incorporated herein, the project involves no potential for adverse effect, either individually or cumulatively, on wildlife, native plants, streams, water courses, scenic or historic resources and human beings. The required mitigation measures are as follows:

I. AESTHETICS (Section I. of Initial study)

Potential Impacts: The proposed demolition will have an adverse impact on the downtown, Main Street and surrounding area visual character.

Proposed Mitigation: A landscaped area shall be created and maintained around the perimeter of the site along Main and Yaney Streets. Beyond the landscaped area dust control shall be maintained on the site.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS (Section VII. of Initial Study)

Potential Impacts: (a) The proposed demolition project could have a significant affect on the public through the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

(b) During demolition the potential for emissions or contamination from hazardous materials emitted into the environment could be possible.

Proposed Mitigation: (a) The proponent shall follow California Best Management Practices, covering transport loads and implement a hazardous materials management plan.

(b) A hazardous material survey shall be performed and if hazardous or contaminated material is encountered, the project proponent shall handle all the proper notifications, hazardous material sampling, removal and disposal in conformance with all local, state and federal requirements.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC (Section XV. of Initial Study)


Potential Impacts: d) The existing West Yaney Street right of way does not meet the City standard width for a commercial street or residential collector which creates an intersection, traffic and pedestrian hazard.

Proposed Mitigation: When the project site is redeveloped the City will require addition right of way be dedicated to the West Yaney right of way for circulation improvement.

The City of Bishop has determined that the project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a Mitigated Negative Declaration will be prepared. This Initial Study has been prepared to generally describe the proposed project and solicit input from agencies and the public regarding the scope of the proposed project.

The review period for the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration expires: August 15, 2009

The City of Bishop is not required to respond to any comments received after this date.


Richard F. Pucci, Director of Planning

7-7-09
Date: July 7, 2009

Attachment: Initial Study and Environmental Assessment
Environmental Information Form
Site and Demolition Plan

City of Bishop

Environmental Initial Study

1. Project title: Environmental Review / Cottonwood Plaza Demolition

2. Lead agency name and address: City of Bishop
377 W. Line Street
Bishop, Ca 93514

3. Contact person and phone number: Richard F. Pucci 760/873-5863

4. Project location: 785 / 787 North Main Street
Bishop, CA 93514
APN 08-112-13A & 08-112-13C

5. Project sponsor's name and address: Bishop Plaza LLC: Richard Maudsley
165 6th Avenue #2402
San Diego, CA

6. General plan designation: General Commercial and Retail
7. Zoning C-1

8. Description of project: (Describe the whole action involved, including but not limited to later phases of the project, and any secondary, support, or off-site features necessary for its implementation. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)
This Initial Study concerns a request by Bishop Plaza LLC to demolish two commercial structures at 785 and 787 North Main Street. The proposed project will leave the two parcels (APN 08-112-13A & 08-112-13C) vacant for future development.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings:
The project parcel and adjacent parcels have a zoning designation of C-1 General Commercial and Retail. The setting to the west is single family residential, to the north is Yaney Street and north of Yaney is a motel, to the south is a vacant fast food facility, residential trailer park and beyond that commercial facilities to the east is Main Street and east of Main are government and retail facilities.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)
City of Bishop demolition permit, County of Inyo Environmental Health permit, Great Basin Air Pollution Control District secondary source permit

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

Aesthetics	Agriculture Resources	Air Quality
Biological Resources	Cultural Resources	Geology /Soils
Hazards & Hazardous Materials	Hydrology / Water Quality	Land Use / Planning
Mineral Resources	Noise	Population / Housing
Public Services	Recreation	Transportation/Traffic
Utilities / Service Systems	Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION:

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment, and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.


◆ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment, and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required.

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been

addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.


 Signature Richard F. Pucci – Director of Planning

7-7-09
 Date

Signature

Date

Issues:

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

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?
The project site currently has two 2-story commercial structures with a paved parking lot. The project proposes to demolish the two 2-story structures. Removal of the two structures will have a less than significant impact on the scenic vista



b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?
There are no scenic resources on the proposed project site, therefore will not substantially damage any scenic resources.



c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?
The proposed project will have an adverse impact on the existing visual character and quality of the site and its



Potenti ally Signific ant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
----------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------

surroundings. To mitigate this impact landscape shall be created and maintained around the perimeter of the site along Main and Yaney Streets and dust control shall be maintained within the site.

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

There will be no light or glare created from this project, therefore, will have no impact on day or nighttime views.



II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:

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

The project is not located on prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance, therefore, has no impact.



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

The project is located on non-agricultural land located within the City of Bishop.



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

This project site and surrounding sites are a non-agricultural use.



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

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

Prior to the demolition a survey of the site and



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

structures shall be performed to determine whether hazardous materials are present. If hazardous materials are present proper procedures shall be implemented to mitigate the material removal prior to the proposed demolition. During demolition dust will be generated which can be controlled by watering disturbed construction areas, sweeping streets and paved areas and covering vehicles used for hauling dirt and debris. The project proponent must comply with Best Management Practices which will eliminate such dust and emissions during construction. A secondary source permit from Great Basin Air Pollution Control District will be required. By implementing these measures, this potential impact will be reduced to a less than significant level.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?



With the above measures implemented during construction, demolition dust will not cause a significant impact on air quality.

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



With the above measures implemented during construction, demolition dust will not cause a significant impact on air quality.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?



By implementing the above measures for controlling demolition dust, this project will have no impact on any sensitive receptors.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?



This project will not create any objectionable odors, therefore, has no impact.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as



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

a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

The project site is an existing commercial facility located in the down town area which does not contain any sensitive or special status species, therefore, will not effect any sensitive species or there habitat.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, and regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

The project site is an existing commercial facility located in the down town area containing no riparian habitat or other natural sensitive community.

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

The project will not impact any wetlands.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

The project site is an existing commercial facility located in the down town area that will not interfere with native residents, migratory fish or wildlife movement, migration, or nursery habitat.

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

The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.

f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?

The project will not conflict with any local, regional or state habitat conservation plan.



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

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?

There are no known historical resources on the project site. Should evidence of potential significant historical or cultural resources be discovered during demolition, a mitigation plan shall be developed and completed prior to further demolition or earth disturbance. By implementing the above measures the project will have a less than significant effect on historical or cultural resources?



b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?

See V (a) above



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

The project will not destroy any unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.



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

No human remains have been discovered, nor are any expected to exist on this project site.



VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

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



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

There is no evidence of an earthquake fault on this site according to Alquist- Priolo Special Studies Zones, SW ¼ Bishop Quadrangle Official Map.



ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>The project site is in a Seismic Zone 4, seismic ground shaking is a possibility. This possibility should not effect the demolition of the site structures. Therefore, this potential is considered less than significant.</i>			◆	
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? <i>The potential impact of unstable soils has no impact with the proposed demolition project.</i>				◆
iv) Landslides? <i>The project site is level land with the adjacent area within 2 to 3 miles being relatively flat; therefore, the potential to landslides has no impact.</i>				◆
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? <i>The project shall provide erosion control per California Best Management Practices, therefore, will have a less than significant impact.</i>			◆	
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? <i>While the surrounding area is prone to earth quake activity and contains numerous earthquake fault lines, the project site is not located within any earthquake fault zone.</i>			◆	
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? <i>The project is not proposing any structural construction which will have no impact to risk to life or property.</i>				◆
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water? <i>The City of Bishop wastewater treatment facility will provide service for this project; therefore, the project will have no need for a septic tank or waste water disposal system.</i>				◆
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS B				
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the			◆	

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

environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

The proposed demolition project could have a significant affect on the public through the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. With proper mitigation such as following California Best Management Practices, covering transport loads and implementation of a hazardous materials management plan this potential is less than significant.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?



During demolition the potential for emissions or contamination from hazardous materials emitted into the environment could be possible A hazardous material survey shall be performed and if hazardous or contaminated material is encountered, the project proponent shall handle all the proper notifications, hazardous material sampling, removal and disposal in conformance with all local, state and federal requirements. By implementing these measures, this potential impact will be reduced to a less than significant level.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?



There is not a school within a ¼ mile of the project site, therefore, will have no impact.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?



This project site is not located on a list of hazardous material sites.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?



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

This project is within one mile of the Bishop airport and is close to the normal traffic pattern for Runway 30. The project will not significantly increase hazard.

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

There is no private airstrip in the project area.

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

The project will not have an adverse impact with any emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?

The project shall adhere to California Fire Code, Chapter 14 during demolition, therefore will not significantly increase fire hazard.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY --

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

The project site has an existing fairly new stormwater drainage system which includes a oil water separator, therefore, will not violate any water quality standards or waste water discharge requirements.

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

No Impact

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? <i>This project will not alter any drainage pattern, course of a stream or river or cause any substantial erosion.</i>				
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? <i>The project will not alter the existing drainage pattern or increase the amount of surface runoff creating flooding on or off site.</i>				◆
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff? <i>The project will not alter the existing drainage pattern or increase the amount of surface runoff to exceed the storm water drainage system capacity.</i>				◆
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? <i>The project will not substantially degrade water quality, therefore, have no impact.</i>				◆
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? <i>The project site is within a 100-year flood hazard area (Flood Insurance Rate Map Panel #060074 0001 June 19, 1985). But will be placing no housing within this area, therefore, having no impact.</i>				◆
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? <i>The project will be removing structures that are within a 100-year flood hazard area, therefore, will have no adverse impact on flood flows.</i>			◆	
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? <i>Flooding due to a dam failure at this project site is a possibility according to the inundation maps</i>			◆	

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

prepared by Southern California Edison Co. This possibility is so remote it is considered a less than significant impact.

j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

This project site is not subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, therefore will have no adverse impact.

◆

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

The project will not physically divide the established community, therefore, will have impact.

◆

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

No Impact

◆

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

This project will not conflict with any conservation plan or community conservation plan.

◆

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

No mineral resources exist on this site.

◆

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

No mineral resources exist on this site.

◆

XI. NOISE B Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other

◆

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

agencies?

This project will not produce noise beyond the standards set by the City's Municipal Code (Section 8.12).

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

This project will not create ground borne noise or vibration for any period of time to be considered an adverse impact.



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

This project will not increase the vicinity ambient noise levels. Therefore, will not have an adverse impact.



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

This project will have temporary increases in ambient noise levels during demolition but will not be above or beyond the current ambient noise level of the adjacent highway and commercial area.



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

This project is within one mile of the Bishop airport and is close to the normal traffic pattern for Runway 30. The project will not significantly increase exposure to airport-related noise.



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

The project is not near a private airstrip.



XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension



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

of roads or other infrastructure)?

The proposed project will not have an adverse impact by creating substantial growth in the area either directly or indirectly.

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



The proposed project is the demolition of a commercial use on a commercially zoned property.

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



The proposed project is the demolition of a commercial use on a commercially zoned property.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

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

Fire protection?



The proposed project will not impact fire protection service ratios, response time and performance objectives. It will be required to adhere to California Fire Code, Chapter 14 prior to and during the structure demolition..

Police protection?



The proposed project will not significantly impact the City of Bishop Police Department.

Schools?



The proposed project will not have an adverse impact to the school aged population of the area.

Parks?



This project will not have an adverse impact on the city's parks.

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

Other public facilities?
The proposed project will not substantially impact other public facilities.



XIV. RECREATION --

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?



No. The project will not significantly impact the use of local public parks.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?



The project will not require the addition of any additional recreational facilities.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?



The proposed project will not cause a substantial increase in traffic to the existing traffic load, therefore, will have a less than significant impact on traffic conditions.

b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?



The proposed project will not cause a substantial increase in traffic to the existing traffic load, therefore, will have a less than significant impact on traffic conditions.

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



The proposed project will not create a change in air traffic patterns or an increase in air traffic

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

levels.

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



The existing West Yaney Street right of way does not meet the City standard width for a commercial street or residential collector which creates an intersection, traffic and pedestrian hazard.. When the project site is redeveloped the City will require addition right of way be dedicated to the West Yaney right of way for circulation improvement.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?



The project will not interfere with any emergency response or emergency access.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?



Inadequate parking capacity is not related to this project. Therefore, having no impact to parking.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?



This project will have no conflict with alternative transportation programs.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS B Would the project:

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



Wastewater treatment will be provided for this project by the City of Bishop Public Works Department and will not exceed wastewater treatment capacity of this service provider.

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



The proposed project will not require construction or the expansion of water or wastewater facilities No Impact..

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm

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

water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

The project will not require the expansion or construction of a storm water drainage system.

◆

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

The Public Works Department of the City of Bishop will provide water service to the proposed project. The water system will not require new or expanded entitlements to provide this service.

◆

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

The proposed project will not affect the wastewater treatment provider, therefore, will have no adverse impact.

◆

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

Inyo County Sunland Landfill has adequate solid waste capacity for the proposed project. The proponent will be required to obtain all County landfill permitting and notifications.

◆

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

The project will comply with all federal, state and local statutes and regulation related to solid waste.

◆

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

--

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the

◆

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

major periods of California history or prehistory?
The project site is an existing commercial development surrounded by commercially developed properties with no existing plant, animal or historic resources.

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



The potential impacts are not cumulatively considerable to effect past, current, or future projects.

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



This project does not have any environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.