



CITY OF BISHOP

377 West Line Street - Bishop, California 93514
P. O. Box 1236 - Bishop, California 93515
City Hall 760-873-5863 Public Works 760-873-8458
Fax 760-873-4873

Draft Negative Declaration of Environmental Impact

Date: January 29, 2014

Subject: Ordinance to amend C-1 zoning regulations

Project Title: Environmental Review/Zoning Regulation Amendment, C-1, Permitted Uses

Project Proponent: City of Bishop
P.O. Box 1236
Bishop, CA 93515

Project Location: The City of Bishop

Project Description: The City of Bishop is proposing an amendment to the Zoning Regulations, Chapter 17.48, C-1 General Commercial and Retail, Section 17.48.020, Permitted Uses, to allow retail sales outside of a building on private property by peddlers, solicitors and transient vendors who hold a license issued pursuant to Bishop Municipal Code, Chapter 5.24.

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

- The information provided in this Initial Study indicates that there would be no significant cumulative impacts, or substantial adverse impacts on human beings, or substantial adverse impacts on fish or wildlife or sensitive species or cultural resources. No significant adverse impacts are foreseen, and no mitigation measures are required.

The City of Bishop has determined that the project could not have a significant effect on the environment, and a 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 this Draft Negative Declaration expires: March 3, 2014.

Keith Caldwell, Director of Planning

January 31, 2014

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF
BISHOP, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AMENDING SECTION 17.48.020.
C-1 GENERAL COMMERCIAL AND RETAIL DISTRICT, USES
PERMITTED RESPECTING PEDDLERS, SOLICITORS AND
TRANSIENT VENDORS

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF BISHOP, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Bishop Municipal Code Title 17 ZONING, Chapter 17.48 C-1
General Commercial and Retail District is hereby amended to add new section titles as
follows:

Chapter 17.48

Section 17.48.020 - Uses Permitted is hereby amended to read in its entirety as
follows:

17.48.020 Permitted uses.

The following uses shall be permitted in the C-1 district and no building or structure
shall be used or designed, erected, structurally altered, or enlarged except for the
following purposes:

- A. Retail sales within a building such as:
1. Drug stores;
 2. Grocery, fruit and vegetable stores;
 3. Meat markets or delicatessen stores;
 4. Barber and beauty shops;
 5. Clothes cleaning pickup agency with incidental pressing (no exhaust of
steam on any public way);
 6. Dressmaking and millinery shop;
 7. Shoe repair and sales shop;
 8. Tailor shop;
 9. Automobile parking lots related to a permitted commercial use;
 10. Offices, business and professional;
 11. Auditoriums and meeting halls for fraternal and service organizations;
 12. Automobile sales, new and used cars, including incidental repairs and
servicing when conducted within an entirely enclosed permanent building
(not including body and fender work or painting);

13. Bakeries employing not more than ten persons on the premises and not engaged in the wholesaling of merchandise to other stores either within or outside of the community;
14. Banks, building and loan agencies, lending institutions;
15. Launderettes;
16. Libraries, public and private;
17. Medical and dental laboratories;
18. Movie theaters;
19. Music and vocal instruction studios;
20. Natatoriums (public swimming pools);
21. Public garages or parking buildings with only incidental service facilities and with no body or fender repairs or painting permitted;
22. Photographers;
23. Restaurants;
24. Secondhand goods, sold, displayed and stored within an entirely enclosed building;
25. Service stations;
26. Tire recapping (with the provision that not less than fifty-one percent of the total dollar volume of sales shall be at retail to the ultimate consumer);
27. Taxidermist;
28. Plumbing sales and service, provided sales, display, incidental repairs and storage are maintained within an entirely enclosed building;
29. Establishments where alcoholic beverages are served, or commercial places of amusement where live entertainment or music for dancing is provided;
30. Used car and trailer sales lot;
31. Ice storage (maximum five-ton capacity);
32. Parking building or garage;
33. Repair garages, including automobile and truck repairs, painting and upholstery (conducted entirely within an enclosed building);
34. Super-service stations;
35. Lumber yards, including the cutting of lumber to size but permitting no other milling operations;
36. Automobiles, trucks, airplanes, motorcycles, bicycles, and machinery repair and sales, provided that the activities are contained in an entirely enclosed building;
37. Bowling alleys;
38. Mechanical auto washes;
39. Motels and motor hotels;

- 40. Mortuaries and funeral parlors;
 - 41. Wedding chapels;
 - 42. Television and radio sales and service, provided all sales, display, incidental repairs and storage are maintained within an entirely enclosed building;
 - 43. Electrical supplies, sales and service, provided sales, display, incidental repairs and storage are maintained within an entirely enclosed building;
 - 44. Health clubs and gymnasiums.
- B. **Retail sales outside of building on private property by peddlers, solicitors and transient vendors who hold a license issued pursuant to Chapter 5.24.**
- C. The planning commission may grant a use permit to such other uses as they deem similar but not more obnoxious to surrounding use, nor detrimental to the health, safety and general welfare of the public.

SECTION 2. Except as hereby specifically amended, all other terms and provisions of Chapters 17.08 and 17.20 of Title 17 of the Bishop Municipal Code shall remain in full force and effect. Ordinance No. 424 of the City of Bishop is hereby amended to the extent that it is inconsistent herewith; however except as hereby specifically amended, all other terms and provisions or Ordinance No.424 shall remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 3. This ordinance shall be in full force and effect thirty (30) days from and after its passage and adoption.

SECTION 4. The City Clerk shall certify to the passage and adoption of this ordinance and shall cause the same to be published in the manner and form provided by law in the Inyo Register, a newspaper of general circulation printed and published in the City of Bishop, State of California which said newspaper is hereby designated for that purpose.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this ____ day of _____, 2014.

JIM ELLIS, MAYOR

ATTEST: Keith Caldwell, City Clerk

By: _____
Robin Picken, Assistant City Clerk

agreement.)
None

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

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

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 Keith Caldwell – Director of Planning

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? <i>The proposed project will not have an impact on any scenic vista</i>				◆
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? <i>The proposed ordinance amendment will not substantially damage any scenic resources.</i>				◆
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? <i>The proposed project will not have an adverse impact on the existing visual character or the quality of the site and its surroundings.</i>				◆
d) Create a new source of substantial light or				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? <i>This project will not create any more nighttime light than what is already present. The project, therefore, will have a no impact on visual resources in this area.</i>				◆
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? <i>The project is not located on prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide importance, therefore, has no impact.</i>				◆
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? <i>The project is located on non-agricultural land located within the City of Bishop.</i>				◆
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? <i>The proposed project will not convert farmland to a non-agricultural use.</i>				◆
III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? <i>This project will not compromise air quality, therefore, will have no conflict or obstruct an air quality plan.</i>				◆
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? <i>This project will not compromise air quality; therefore, will have no impact on air quality.</i>				◆
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)? <i>This project will not compromise air quality; therefore, will have no impact on air quality.</i>				◆
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? <i>This project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</i>				◆
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? <i>This project will not create any objectionable odors, therefore, has no impact.</i>				◆
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game				◆

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? <i>The proposed project is the adoption by ordinance of a zoning regulation which will not effect any sensitive species or there habitat.</i></p>				
<p>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? <i>The proposed project is the adoption by ordinance of a zoning regulation which will not affect any riparian habitat or other natural sensitive community.</i></p>				◆
<p>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? <i>The proposed project is the adoption by ordinance of a zoning regulation which will not have a substantial adverse effect on wetlands.</i></p>				◆
<p>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? <i>The proposed project is the adoption by ordinance of a zoning regulation that will not interfere with native residents, migratory fish or wildlife movement, migration, or nursery habitat.</i></p>				◆
<p>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or</p>				◆

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
ordinance? <i>The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.</i>				
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? <i>The project will not conflict with any local, regional or state habitat conservation plan.</i>				◆
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5? <i>The proposed ordinance will not impact historical resources.</i>				◆
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5? <i>The proposed ordinance will not cause substantial adverse change of archaeological resources.</i>				◆
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? <i>The proposed ordinance will not destroy any unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature.</i>				◆
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? <i>The proposed ordinance will not disturb human remains</i>				◆
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential				◆

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
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. <i>The proposed ordinance will not impact geology or soils, therefore, have no impact.</i>				◆
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking? <i>The proposed ordinance will not impact seismic ground shaking, therefore, have no impact.</i>				◆
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? <i>The proposed ordinance will not impact seismic related ground failure.</i>				◆
iv) Landslides? <i>The potential for landslides is considered insignificant to this project.</i>				◆
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? <i>The project has no potential for soil erosion, therefore, having no adverse 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>The proposed ordinance will not impact unstable soils that would potentially result in landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.</i>				◆
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code				◆

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
(1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? <i>The proposed project will not create a substantial risk to life or property due to soil stability.</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>No Impact</i>				◆
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS B Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? <i>The proposed project will have no impact on the public through the transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.</i>				◆
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? <i>The proposed project will not release hazardous materials into the environment, therefore, creating no hazard to the public or environment.</i>				◆
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? <i>The proposed project will not release hazardous materials into the environment, therefore, creating no hazard to the public or environment.</i>				◆
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled				◆

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</p> <p><i>No Impact</i></p>				
<p>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?</p> <p><i>This project will have no adverse impact on the safety of people working in the project area.</i></p>				◆
<p>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?</p> <p><i>There is no private airstrip in the project area.</i></p>				◆
<p>g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</p> <p><i>The project will not have an adverse impact with any emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.</i></p>				◆
<p>h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</p> <p><i>The project is within an urban area. The potential for a wildland fire will have no impact.</i></p>				◆
<p>VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:</p>				
<p>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</p>				◆

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>The proposed ordinance will not impact any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.</i>				
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)? <i>The proposed ordinance will have no impact on ground water supplies.</i>				◆
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? <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 stormwater 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</i>				◆

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>surface runoff to exceed the storm water drainage system capacity.</i>				
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality? <i>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>No adverse impact.</i>				◆
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? <i>No adverse impact.</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>The proposed ordinance will have impact to potential flooding.</i>				◆
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? <i>This project site is not subject to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow, therefore will have no adverse impact.</i>				◆

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community? <i>The project does not physically divide the community, conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation, therefore, will have no impact on land use and planning.</i>			◆	
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but				◆

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<p>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?</p> <p><i>The project does not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, therefore, having no impact.</i></p>				
<p>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</p> <p><i>This project will not conflict with any conservation plan or community conservation plan.</i></p>				◆
<p>X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:</p>				
<p>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?</p> <p><i>No mineral resources exist .</i></p>				◆
<p>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?</p> <p><i>No mineral resources exist .</i></p>				◆
<p>XI. NOISE B Would the project result in:</p>				
<p>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</p> <p><i>This project will not produce noise beyond the standards set by the City's Municipal Code (Section 8.12).</i></p>				◆
<p>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or</p>				◆

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
groundborne noise levels? <i>This project will not create groundborne noise or vibration for any period of time to be considered an adverse impact.</i>				
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? <i>This project will not increase the vicinity ambient noise levels. Therefore, will not have an adverse impact.</i>				◆
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? <i>This project will not have temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels. Therefore, will not have an adverse impact.</i>				◆
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? <i>The project area is not near an airport.</i>				◆
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? <i>The project is not near a private airstrip.</i>				◆
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 of roads or other infrastructure)? <i>The proposed project will not have an adverse impact by creating substantial growth in the area either directly or</i>				◆

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

indirectly.

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



The proposed ordinance will not displace existing housing therefore, have no impact.

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



The proposed ordinance will not displace people in substantial numbers, therefore, will have no impact.

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 significantly impact the City of Bishop Fire Department

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?

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>This Project will not have an adverse impact on the city's parks.</i>				◆
Other public facilities? <i>The proposed project will not substantially impact other public facilities.</i>				◆
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? <i>The project will not significantly impact the use of local public parks.</i>				◆
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? <i>The project will not require the addition of any additional recreational facilities.</i>				◆
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)? <i>The proposed ordinance will not cause a substantial increase in traffic to the existing traffic load; therefore, will have a less than significant impact on traffic conditions.</i>			◆	
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or				◆

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
highways? <i>The proposed project will not cause a substantial increase in traffic to the existing traffic load; therefore, will have no impact on traffic conditions.</i>				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? <i>The proposed project will not create a change in air traffic patterns or an increase in air traffic levels.</i>				◆
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? <i>The propose project will not create hazards due to design or incompatible uses.</i>				◆
e) Result in inadequate emergency access? <i>The project will not interfere with any emergency response or emergency access.</i>				◆
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? <i>Any proposed vendor site shall not intrude upon the existing facility parking requirement, therefore, will have a less than significant impact.</i>			◆	
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? <i>This project will have no conflict with alternative transportation programs.</i>				◆
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				◆

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
<i>The proposed ordinance will not exceed wastewater treatment capacity of this service provider.</i>				
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? <i>No Impact</i>				◆
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? <i>No impact</i>				◆
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? <i>No impact</i>				◆
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? <i>The proposed ordinance will not impact wastewater treatment facility.</i>				◆
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the projects solid waste disposal needs? <i>The proposed ordinance will impact solid waste disposal capacity.</i>				◆
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? <i>The project will comply with all federal, state</i>				◆

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

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 major periods of California history or prehistory?

The proposed ordinance will not eliminate, degrade, reduce, restrict or endanger existing plant, fish and animal environment or historic resources, therefore have no impact.



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?

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



